
Conference Report

European military spokesmen declare the need for beam weaponry

by George Gregory in Bonn

Executive Intelligence Review sponsored its second seminar in the West German capital city of Bonn on beam weapons, entitled "Beam Weapons: The Strategic Implications for Western Europe." The seminar took place on Oct. 5, 1983. Bonn officialdom remembers well the first *EIR* seminar, held in November 1982 following Dr. Edward Teller's Washington, D.C. appeal for development of beam weapon defense against missiles in October of that year. On March 23, 1983, President Reagan's historic address constituted American commitment to ushering in a new strategic regime, that of "Mutually Assured Survival."

This second seminar, devoted to "the strategic implications for Western Europe," had as little official backing as the first, except that President Reagan himself and numerous spokesmen of the administration had repeatedly emphasized that beam weapon defenses were to defend "our territory *and* that of our allies." In the months following President Reagan's March 23 address, there was a wave of vilification of beam weapons in the West by Pugwash Conference associates, and in the East by Andropov and his own closest associates with epithets like "Star Wars," "Fortress America," "casus belli," and so forth. That vilification was repeated by official military and political personalities in Europe, including the West German Minister of Defense, Manfred Wörner, who derided beam weapon defense as "music of the future," and therefore dangerous to the Atlantic Alliance at the present time. The *EIR* Oct. 5 seminar, in that light, turned out to be a milestone in American-European strategic deliberation which must come to represent the standard quality of deliberation within the alliance.

Apocalypse or capitulation

Western Europe's strategic reality has been, effectively since the early 1960s, a simmering morass, in which "the fact for every soldier has been that, if 'deterrence' fails and the great clash occurs, the only choice is between Apocalypse and capitulation," as *EIR*'s Michael Liebig pointed out. Up until recently, the military strategic task of beam weapon defenses for the United States has been conceived as the capability to destroy incoming strategic nuclear ICBMs, al-

though the imminent probability that the Soviet Union will soon deploy shorter-range nuclear capabilities nearer the borders of the United States confronts the U.S.A. itself with at least part of the horror facing Western Europe.

For any design for the defense of Western Europe, even Soviet short- and medium-range missiles have the status of "strategic systems." Only the development and deployment of layered and nested complementary point-defense and area-defense beam weapon systems in Western Europe represents the backbone of a credible strategic posture in Western Europe and in the Federal Republic of Germany. That, however, is really only the first layer of the strategic reality confronting America's alliance partners in Europe. The implications of the revolution in warfare and the order of battle for real defense under the strategic regime of beam-weapon defense technologies are such that, as Dr. Edward Teller among others has insisted, the emergence of "Mutually Assured Survival" (MAS) is necessarily a "joint NATO project." In the West European theater, the Soviet deployment of batteries of high-precision short- and medium-range nuclear missiles, as well as the arrays of Soviet conventional arms deployed to exploit the results of nuclear bombardment of NATO military targets and infrastructure, make the deterrent-value of NATO conventional forces in Western Europe a farce.

Without beam-weapon defenses in Europe, there is no such thing as defense, in either of the meanings of the term perversely bifurcated by the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction/flexible response, i.e., "strategic" or "conventional."

Those gathered at the Bonn seminar represented the best of the European historical military policy tradition, whose commitment is indeed the "joint NATO" realization of the strategic policy launched with the Reagan address March 23. The fact that *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche had just declared his candidacy for the Democratic Party presidential nomination was viewed by the 60 or so military, political, diplomatic, industrial, and scientific participants in the seminar as of crucial importance. As a West German military officer put it, presenting his own political map of the United States, "Outside of LaRouche on the Democratic Party side,

you only have adherents of the freeze movement, disengagement-from-Europe, or worse. On the Republican side, there is President Reagan and his best people, but it is difficult to see that the core of the Republican Party is any better than the Democrats. LaRouche's commitment to genuine European defense is known."

In his own concluding remarks, LaRouche described the strategic and political realities of the alliance in a way that drew a remark from a Christian Social Union (CSU) policy advisor that "Finally, someone dares say what has to be said so that we can get down to work!" LaRouche had stated that "The U.S. situation is a highly flexible one, in which the role played by Europe in dove-tailing with the efforts of myself and others in the United States is crucial. You cannot think of the United States as having a fixed policy in any respect now. . . . You have only two choices in the United States of any importance. One choice is symbolized by me, the other by Henry Kissinger. If you get Kissinger, you'll get war. If you get Henry Kissinger, Europe will be abandoned. If you get me, in the sense of what I represent and the people who think like me and the people who work with us, Europe will not be abandoned under any circumstances."

European military policy tradition

The European representatives on the discussion panel of the afternoon session included the following personalities: Gen. (ret.) Revault d'Allonnes of the Compagnon de la Libération, the closest associates of Gen. Charles de Gaulle, who continues to play an active role in French military policy; Brigadier Gen. (ret.)

deswehr, who is a former general of Training and Education of the West German Army, as well as a former battalion commandor in a tank reconnaissance unit and a department head in the Bonn Defense Ministry; Gen. Giulio Macrì of the Italian Army, who is a former commander of the Tank Warfare Training School in Sardinia, as well as the head of the Italian delegation of SHAPE, and author of numerous articles in Italian military journals, such as *Rivista Militare*, *Rivista Aeronautica*, and *Difesa Oggi*, on beam weapon defense and space warfare; Col. (ret.) engineer at the Commissariat à l'énergie atomique, identified in recent years for his strong support of the French neutron bomb program; Michael Liebig, business manager of *EIR* in Western Europe, who specializes in military strategic issues; and Col. (ret.)

is an executive board member of the Kyffhäuser Bund as well as vice-president of the European Organization of Military Associations.

Participants in the seminar included an official observer delegated on behalf of the Chief of Staff of the Italian armed forces, as well as a delegate from the Army Department of Munitions in Italy; seven active representatives of the West German military, including persons appearing on behalf of

corps commanders, and one of the top 20 members of the General Staff; a dozen representatives of West German military industry firms, as well as members of the civilian and military research and development community; French civilian representation included one of the largest high-technology military firms in France. Three observers from the West German Parliament attended, including one Christian Democratic Parliamentary Deputy. There was high-level diplomatic representation, with some 15 embassies, including ambassadorial office delegates and military attachés from several Western European NATO countries, developing countries, as well as a strong representation from Southeast Asian countries and Japan. The U.S. Embassy in Bonn boycotted the seminar.

Following the morning session of the seminar, during which Dr. Jonathan Tennenbaum spoke on the scientific and technological status of directed-energy beam weapons, and *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche delivered his presentation on "Beam Weapons Mean a Return to the Carnot-Scharnhorst Tradition" (published in *EIR*, Oct. 25), the afternoon session featured Helga Zepp-LaRouche, chairman of the Club of Life.

At the outset of her presentation on "The Significance of the Doctrine of Mutually Assured Survival for Countering the Ideology of the So-called Peace Movement," Zepp-LaRouche stated that "there are tendencies developing in this country, which will threaten the very existence of the Federal Republic of Germany as a sovereign nation, and as part of the Western Alliance if they continue to unfold as presently is the case. . . . Everyone knows," Zepp-LaRouche said, "that Bundeswehr maneuvers in NATO stop at the very point at which the use of nuclear weapons would begin in actual war. This means that under the present doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction, the Federal Republic is not defensible. Secondly, we should expect to be confronted with a new Sputnik shock in one or two years . . . it can be concluded from the present state of Soviet research on laser technologies that, one fine day, the Soviets will erect manned space stations, with beam weapons."

Analogy with Prussia's defeat

Current political and military developments parallel precisely developments which led to the defeat of Prussian forces at the battles of Jena and Auerstadt in 1806, Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche argued. "It is clear that, faced with the threat of its destruction, leading institutions of the Federal Republic are infected with dangerous tendencies to capitulate," just as the Rheinbund princes and most of the Prussian population were convinced that "appeasement" and "making deals with Napoleon" were prudent because "the majority was simply afraid of the advancing and apparently unbeatable Napoleonic troops. . . . People think that the United States is far away, that it is unreliable and, after all, the weaker power, so they want to get into a good position early on vis-à-vis the Soviet occupying power. It is my firm conviction that it is this

cowardice, which has seized large parts of our institutions, which is the reason for today's appeasers' attitude, not only in the peace movement."

The result of the Prussian defeat of 1806 had been the reforms instituted by the "Prussian Reformers," the Humboldt brothers, Vom Stein, and Scharnhorst, who introduced "republicanism, in the tradition of the American Revolution and the beginnings of the French Revolution to Germany for the first time." The Wars of Liberation of the reformer-led Germany were less directed against France than the expression of a "constitutional movement," representing "the highest level of culture and morality ever achieved in this country." The German "national problem" does not originate merely with the end of World War II, but rather with the fact that the work of Vom Stein et al. represents an unfinished "republican revolution." Following the Congress of Vienna in 1815, "the attempt to form a real nation was crushed . . . a sudden shift to cultural pessimism occurred, which led to the Romantic movement, to Nietzsche, the youth movements at the beginning of this century, and finally to National Socialism."

West German sovereignty and defense

"I am convinced," said Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche, "that under the strategic doctrine announced by President Reagan, that of Mutually Assured Survival, the Federal Republic will have the chance for the first time to determine its own defense; it will be possible to shift toward cultural optimism, because our population can have the confidence that we are not only the 'tripwire' to a potential nuclear superpower confrontation." Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche emphasized that this also meant overcoming the destruction of the economy of the Federal Republic and Western Europe as a whole.

In her appeal to the participants to work to influence American policy to assure the realization of the U.S. beam weapons policy, she added that "unfortunately, we still do not have a sovereign nation of Germany, which is due to a glaring mistake of the Anglo-American occupation powers, who had absolutely no interest in permitting the emergence of an organic German state after World War II. The Anglo-American occupation powers have, with operations like Wilton Park and other 're-education' programs, contributed considerably to the extent of pacifism here today. Contrary to MacArthur, the occupation powers have not permitted the German population to find a new identity. McCloy here and MacArthur in Japan: Those are two extremes of American policy. . . . ever have the chance not only to develop a national, sovereign Federal Republic of Germany, but especially to achieve a reunification under conditions which are tolerable."

Michael Liebig from *EIR* opened the panel discussion with an analysis of the European design for beam-weapon defenses and the contrasting horror of present strategic realities based on his previous strategic discussion memorandum (see *EIR*, Sept. 20).

Liebig was followed by Gen. d'Allonnes, who began with a profound remark which all participants understood as far more than a gesture, in light of the presentation by Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche. "Germany is presently denied the right of having nuclear weapons. But the present or future emergence of beam weapons, she is permitted to have, will finally allow Germany to regain the stature of other nations, on an equal footing, with all her dignity and power. I am delighted by this prospect!" Gen. d'Allonnes added that "I can assure you that I support a rapid development of beam weapons in France. . . . I think that the challenge posed to us by Russia's own building of beam weapons gives us the opportunity to reinforce our inter-European ties, together with our American friends. If we turn this solidarity of military people such as are here today, of industrialists, and of politicians into concrete realizations, through mutual deliberation such as this conference represents, we may indeed be able to stop the horrible processes unfortunately unfolding, as was so clearly expressed here this morning by Mr. LaRouche, that lead directly to a horrible new war . . . therefore, we will double, and then triple our efforts; we will build these weapons, we will deter the Soviets and convince our governments."

Replacing MAD with MAS

Gen. Karst provided an overview of the strategic options being offered today, all the way from Western Europe's entering a "security partnership" with the Soviet Union to various forms of "neutralization." He discussed ten questions often raised in Europe on the beam-weapons issue, including how to develop a defense strategy which assures that there is no "decoupling of Europe from the United States. The beam-weapon strategy, he concluded, "seems feasible to me. The idea of replacing MAD with MAS is intriguing and promising, and we should propagate it."

Gen. Macrì offered a strategic overview of current Soviet actions headed toward overt showdown and confrontation with the United States. He underscored Soviet refusal to date to negotiate American offers to discuss parallel development and deployment of beam weapons in light of the Soviet drive to confrontation. Gen. Macrì took up again the remarks of Gen. d'Allonnes, saying that "neither West Germany nor Italy can produce nuclear weapons, but nothing prevents us from initiating and participating in a beam weapons program."

Col. Geneste and Col. Seuberlich developed extensively the "holes" in current NATO defense doctrine, a point which Col. Geneste punctuated with a series of cartoons caricaturing the development of NATO doctrine, ending with a shred- Only if ded nuclear umbrella.

Lyndon LaRouche was asked to make some final remarks. "Our situation is desperate, but not hopeless," he said. "We are just a tiny force, but as a catalytic force we are decisive. I am committed to the policies I have announced here today, and to the extent that we have collaboration and that I have influence, that is the policy of the United States for Europe."