

Arms-controllers help peace movement to map terrorism and riots for Europe

by Charlotte Vollrads in West Berlin

In the spacious, ultra-modern International Congress Center of West Berlin, a remarkable scene unfolded on May 9 as the participants in the Second Conference on European Nuclear Disarmament arrived for their one-week session. Saffron-clad monks from the Far East joined peace-movement activists and well-dressed men with briefcases—the arms-control “managers” and “experts” from “research institutes” around the world.

The arms control apparatus and the terrorist wing of the peace movement are now laying the groundwork for the anticipated “hot autumn” in Europe, especially in the Federal Republic of Germany. They have all agreed that it is no longer possible to prevent the stationing of Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe. They therefore plan to have the November party conference of the Social Democrats (SPD) reject that stationing, and, in unity with the Greens and the peace movement, induce the Social Democratic rank and file to “take to the streets.”

“Experts”—particularly from the United States—supplied the activists with targets for blockades and worse: West Germany’s MAN Company, the Martin Marietta Corporation (which produces the Pershing missile), the air bases at Ramstein and Miesau, and the planned Pershing sites in southern Germany. It’s impossible to stop the American missiles from being stationed in Europe, they told the frustrated peace activists, *therefore*. . . .

For the longer term, the Berlin conference had essentially one goal: to propagate a conception of a nuclear-free *Mittel-europa* (Central Europe), an alternative defense concept under which its members are to conduct a conventional military buildup—a process which would redraw the political map of Europe.

The conference had been initiated by a call from the British Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation for a nuclear-free Europe from Poland to Portugal. Its German advisory council included Green Party guru Rudolf Bahro, former NATO general Gerd Bastian, and nuclear energy opponent Robert Jungk. Financing was provided by the Netzwerk Selbsthilfe (Self-

Help Network), which has also been a mainstay of the West Berlin squatters movement.

The conference’s Social Democratic and Green Party coordinators had invited both official and unofficial peace spokesmen from Eastern Europe, but with the exception of a few individuals, they did not make an appearance. During the conference, nonetheless, Green leader Petra Kelly and her fellow parliamentarians hit the front page of the East German newspaper *Neues Deutschland* with their “spontaneous” demonstration.

Together with a conference in Cologne a few days earlier of the left-wing militant “autonomous” side of the peace movement, the conference was the beginning of a series of actions and coordinating meetings slated for the coming months.

The question of power

After the movement “takes to the streets,” the “conservatives” in Bonn can stand up to the United States, as a prominent Green spokesman has put it, and reject the missiles on the basis of the “overwhelming resistance of the population,” a position they will not be unhappy to take. In the course of this process the SPD would lose its last shreds of political responsibility and give up opposing the onslaught of unemployment and austerity. “No one,” says SPD strategist Egon Bahr, “will have anything to smile about in the fall and winter of 1983.”

Former Pentagon official Daniel Ellsberg declared in an interview with the pro-terrorist Berlin *Tageszeitung* newspaper that in view of “the threat under which we live,” the “right time has come for extreme action.” At the conference, Professor Ekkehard Krippendorf, a member of its West German advisory council with close ties to American and Italian extremists, announced “resistance in the streets by every means.” “The military as such is our enemy,” he said. His scenario: when the stationing begins, “state repression” against “the resisters” will be as harsh as it was against the student movement in the late 1960s, and the counterreaction—as it

did then—will produce terrorism. Others, such as Ulrich Albrecht of the Free University in Berlin, talked about the consequences if the first violent battles take place at highly sensitive military installations, the U.S. Army uses its weapons, and people are killed.

A former senior member of the Carter administration had commented a few days earlier in Washington that “bloody battles will erupt throughout Europe” if the Pershings are stationed. “Thousands of people will be wounded or killed! The SPD will be split; part of the SPD will go out into the street battles. American soldiers and military bases will be attacked. Bombs will be thrown. Battles between the left and the right will break out. Nothing like this has been seen since the 1920s. It will all start as the deadlines for the stationing get closer.”

Specific forms of “resistance” are being planned: sit-ins at consulates and embassies, a blockade of the parliament or defense ministry, blockades against industrial plants, streets, and railroad lines. The Cologne conference of the autonomous peace movement discussed surveillance of the U.S. Army’s weapons transports and nationally coordinated steps toward sabotage. The “action groups” within the movement (the stamping grounds of the terrorist Revolutionäre Zellen) such as War Against War, the Göttingen Group Against Nuclear Power, and the Rainbow Alliance, concluded that they should not isolate themselves from the peace movement at large, but take part in its actions and thereby make the “military infrastructure” of the entire nation into a target—not simply the Pershing installations, but armament companies, supply depots, barracks, and so forth.

In Berlin, the conference debates which the peace activists found so tiresomely theoretical provided the possibility of recruiting many of these frustrated people into radical groups. From the array of knitting women who always attend such occasions came the protests against the “cold, masculine, insensitive” atmosphere of the experts’ debates. When they launched hand-holding musical renditions of “Give Peace a Chance,” from the podium, Professor Senghaas, overcome with solidarity for the weaker sex, joined in. Other reactions were more dangerous—widespread contempt for the feckless peace movement and its obvious inability to develop concrete actions against weapons producers and the nuclear industry. Thus did the autonomists build support for terrorism.

***Mittleuropa* against the superpowers**

The “experts,” meanwhile, were thinking further than the “hot autumn.”

According to Egon Bahr’s front man Erhard Eppler of the Social Democrats, “The resistance must be built up for the long term, if it is going to be part of a campaign for a new peaceful order in Europe.” An “Austrianized” Europe would undergo a conventional military buildup (in accord with NATO’s Rogers Plan) which, in the words of General Bastian, would free it from its unnatural partnership with the U.S.

Richard Barnet, director of the Institute for Policy Studies, put it this way: “The long-term goal of the peace movement is the elimination of nation-states in Europe.” Egon Bahr, speaking as a representative of the Palme Commission on Disarmament (to which KGB General Milshtein and Moscow’s Georgii Arbatov also belong) stated to the conference that “both superpowers must remain in a state of vulnerability. If the balance of vulnerability is destroyed, then stability will be destroyed.”

From that point of view, Bahr proceeded to attack President Reagan’s new strategic defense policy, dismissing the idea that there could be any chance of survival in the event of a nuclear war, and asserting that it is totally impossible “for a superpower to close the window of vulnerability and no longer be open to attack.” Bahr charged that the Reagan policy would simply invite a Soviet first strike before the new defense system was in place. That was the first and only time the new strategic doctrine was referred to.

The security of East Germany, Bahr said, is also our security; Europeans have fundamentally different self-interests from those of the superpowers. Yet the two blocs must be maintained, because their dissolution would be destabilizing for Europe; what is needed is a conventional balance of power in Europe, which could come “through an accord with the Soviet Union.”

From Sweden, Club of Rome spokesman Johan Galtung had been invited as “a critic” of the Palme Commission’s proposals. To the applause of the participants, he asserted that negotiations are useless unless a representative of the peace movement is included in them. He also attacked laser weapons technology as a violation of the ABM Treaty, then proceeded to advocate their development nonetheless by both sides. The peace movement, he said, must work out an alternative defense system on the model of Switzerland, Yugoslavia, Albania, Finland, and Austria. Naturally this will involve conventional armaments (the pacifistic audience applauded this as well).

Ex-General Gerd Bastian expressed his support for the Palme Commission’s proposed nuclear-free zone in central Europe and the Bahr demand to station nuclear weapons only in the countries where they are produced. It is “political mythology,” he said, that the Soviet Union could be aggressive, and it is false to talk about Soviet superiority. Later, to the delight of the East Germans, he joined the Greens in a peace demonstration at East Berlin’s Alexanderplatz; party chief Erich Honecker expressed his regret that he could not personally participate. “We favor a nuclear-free zone in Central Europe, . . .” he said, “and, as you know, so does the Soviet Union.”

Next, a Green delegation is expected to conduct a “peace mission” trip through Eastern Europe. Seymour Melman, vice-president of the SANE peace group in the United States, who organized Kelly’s and Bastian’s U.S. trip, left the Berlin conference in mid-week for a trip to Moscow.

The intra-German question

A "Yugoslavization" of East Germany and a "Swedification" of West Germany are among the disarmament movement's goals. Socialist International chairman Willy Brandt's son Peter Brandt, the head of the intra-German policy committee of the Berlin "Alternative Slate" (Alternative Liste) has sought for a long time to enlist the left in this cause, which had become confined to the right, beginning with the neo-Nazi NDP. Brandt's effort requires a reshaping of the peace movement, since it has trouble reconciling such ideas with a purely pacifist position. A new military strategy presupposes "an extraordinary financial effort," and "would mean defense preparedness on the part of the population and a certain [defensive] militarization of civilian life, as is currently the case only in countries like Yugoslavia," according to Peter Brandt.

This German question was discussed for an entire day in Berlin. Most prominent was the position of Green Party federal executive committee member Rudolf Bahro (a recent emigré from East Germany), who demanded that the East-West borders be open to "the opposition movements that are springing up for the first time in East and West." Members of the Berlin Alternative Slate, who are heavily recruited from former Maoist groups, demanded reunification along the lines of Bahro's proposal: East and West Germany would be split into 30 "eco-republics." ("Eco" stands for ecological.) That happens to be identical with the early-1920s program of the storm-trooper SA, under the Strasser brothers, who wanted 12 to 14 "*Landschaften*," each comprising a "*Ständestaat*" (feudal state). The *Landschaften* or eco-republics in both cases would be autarkic, according to the principle of pre-capitalist craft economies; primitive barter of agricultural and handicraft products would occur among them.

Islamicization of the movement

In order to carry out this madness, the peace movement in East and West has to be brainwashed all over again. The image of Iran's return to a new dark age under Khomeini has an irresistible attraction for the controllers of the movement. Bahro demanded a "spiritual dimension for the new culture." Jan Oelberg, a Swedish "peace researcher," declared that the root evil today is "Christian-Western-materialist culture," which must be eliminated if there is to be peace in the world. Alfred Mechttersheimer, a member of the conference's advisory board who has close ties to Libya's Qaddafi, thinks the peace movement will run out of steam unless it adopts the new "universal impulse" from "the Islamic world." Robert Jungk has been talking for years about the necessity of finding alternatives to Western culture in the lore of primitive Indians.

Ahmed Huber, a Muslim convert close to Nazi International financier François Genoud, commented this March about the Greens: "They are moving away from the right-left schema, and developing very special and interesting religious impulses. In a few years, they will be totally transformed."

'Diplomatic season' on now open in earnest in

by Daniel Sneider in Bangkok

In this corner of the world, the year is divided into two parts—the six months of the dry season, now coming to a close, and the rainy season, when the monsoon rain falls. The continuing political and military struggles over the fate of Kampuchea are usually analyzed in terms of that conventional wisdom, as follows.

During the dry season, when ground conditions permit the use of tanks and other heavy equipment, the Vietnamese army and its Kampuchean allies in the Phnom Penh-based Heng Samrin government conduct offensives against the Khmer Rouge, i.e., the guerrilla forces of the deposed Pol Pot regime, and their "coalition" partners, the followers of former Prince Sihanouk and former premier Son Sann. During the past month, the offensive was carried out with relatively greater determination as the base camps of the guerrillas along the Thai-Kampuchean border were attacked by artillery-supported Vietnamese army forces.

The rainy season has now arrived, and this is the time when the guerrillas can supposedly operate with greater ease, reinforcing their claim—backed by the Chinese, the United States and the Southeast Asian nations of ASEAN (Thailand, Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia)—that they are seriously contesting the control of Kampuchea.

However, as a quip now making the rounds in Bangkok puts it, there is really a third season which has begun in earnest—the "diplomatic season." For both the Vietnamese/Indochinese side and the Thai/ASEAN side, a complex game is on, each side seeking tactical advantages in the process of moving toward serious political negotiations over the future of Kampuchea and ASEAN-Indochinese relations. A breakthrough toward direct negotiations has never seemed closer, but so far it remains a "light at the end of the tunnel."

The diplomatic season began as soon as the heavy guns started to fall silent on the Thai-Kampuchean border. The Vietnamese and their Kampuchean allies announced the withdrawal of a substantial number of Vietnamese troops (estimates range from ten to twenty thousand) from Kampuchea. A large group of foreign journalists was invited into Phnom Penh to watch the troops cross into Vietnam, an obvious public relations show meant to counter claims that a previous troop withdrawal last year had been a mere rotation of units. While Thai officials continue to publicly dismiss the latest move as cosmetic, well-informed sources in this capital