

Europe's rendezvous with destiny

by Criton Zoakos

A strong possibility exists that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization may break up before January, and unleash an uncontrollable course of events leading toward a full-scale thermonuclear confrontation between the two superpowers during the early months of 1984.

True, on Nov. 16, the Italian parliament, the Belgian parliament, and the largely ceremonial but politically significant European Parliament all voted by comfortable majorities in favor of stationing the Pershing II and cruise missiles at the agreed-upon date of Dec. 15, "should the Geneva negotiations fail." But on Nov. 18 the U.S.S.R. rejected the latest reasonable negotiation proposal made by the United States at the Geneva Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) talks, prompting speculation that the Soviets may walk out of the talks entirely within two weeks.

Then come the West German Social Democratic Party and Free Democratic Party congresses during the weekend of Nov. 19-20. Two days after these party congress balloting, the German parliament (Bundestag) will vote on the final stationing of Pershing II missiles on the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany. As matters now stand, the Bundestag is expected to vote in favor of a very limited version of deployment, a version which will be the equivalent of national suicide for Germany and for a string of other European nations. That version, bearing the stamp of approval of the Soviet military strategists and represented by the joint policies of Britain's Lord Carrington, "our own" Henry Kissinger and West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, was spelled out by a letter of Italian Socialist Prime Minister Bettino Craxi to President Reagan: let's go ahead with the preliminary deployment of "some" (15 or so) "Euromissiles," then freeze all further deployment

and return to the negotiating table under new auspices. The "new auspices" will essentially mean that these Western European appeasers, under Lord Carrington's coaching, dictate negotiating terms to the United States. These terms are supposed to be so designed as to be pleasing to America's Soviet negotiating counterparts.

The primary truth about the "Euromissiles" to bear in mind is: The Soviets are not concerned militarily with them, because the cruise and the Pershing II are militarily worthless, as this review has insisted since December 1979. Yet the Soviet marshals, upon overcoming their ecstasy at the idiotic 1979 NATO decision to "deploy if. . ." these contraptions, started howling howls of horror and indignation against these supposedly devastating instruments of "mass annihilation." The marshals ordered their hapless mouthpieces in the Politburo to issue similar howls of horror and indignation. Then, the marshals and the Politburo started making the rounds of Western Europe bullying everybody in sight to start howling the same thing. If anybody in Western Europe refused to so howl, marshals and Politburo would point ominously to the accumulating numbers of SS-20, SS-21, SS-22 and so forth missiles looking down at their Western European targets: "Howl or else." The greater the number of Soviet SS-20s deployed, the louder the howls against the future American "Euromissiles" became. When the marshals had deployed over 2,000 nuclear warheads on their SS-20s alone, the howls against the still non-existent American missiles became a true pandemonium. We had a whole "peace movement" then.

Thus the Soviets welcome the Euromissiles as the occasion for a Soviet scenario to split NATO. Will the scenario be played out to its end? Will Western Europe break with the

United States between now and Christmas?

If the breakup occurs, it will instantaneously produce a world strategic crisis which could trigger nuclear war-fighting during the early part of 1984. Even the appeasement-minded *Washington Post*, in an uncharacteristic lead editorial on Nov. 13, reported that it had come to a similar conclusion, and claimed that deployment of the Euromissiles is the safest way of trying to avoid thermonuclear confrontation.

Even such authors of disaster as the editors of the *Washington Post* have managed to see this much ahead of their nose: the issue of the Euromissiles is not a military issue. It always has been an exclusively political issue, a central component in a Soviet strategic maneuver to bust up NATO. Even they managed to see a small frightening part of that universe which lies just beyond that fateful instant in which NATO breaks up. Let us not yet dwell upon the characteristics of the new political universe which threatens to break out, except to say that it will be quite unlike anything any one of us has known or imagined through the entire post-war period. With NATO collapsing, what collapses is that which, for better or for worse, had kept world strategic relations within the domain of relative stability. How threatened nations and institutions will act in a universe of instability, under conditions of a manifest global strategic challenge to their existence, cannot be forecast by linear extrapolation from events and behavior patterns in the pre-collapse universe.

One thing is for sure: nations and institutions will find themselves be falling back to those kinds of inner resources which can be evoked only under conditions of threatened national and institutional extinction. A collapse of NATO will uncork forces beyond the manipulation of those like Carrington and Kissinger who are now playing the game of dismantling NATO.

The Craxi plan and the Bundestag

Consider the last-minute so-called Craxi formula of deploying "a few" Euromissiles and then going back to the negotiating table "under new auspices," a last-minute effort to stick fingers into the bursting dam. This piece of fantasy was outlined in detail by Dr. Theo Sommer, a colleague of Kissinger, Carrington, and Craxi on the pages of the Hamburg weekly *Die Zeit* on Nov. 17. The *Die Zeit* proposal is in summary the following:

First, allow the initial deployment of 32 Cruise missiles and nine Pershing IIs on condition that the Americans understand that this will mark a "completely new starting point for NATO." Then freeze. Then, the "Europeans," (i.e. Lord Carrington's and Countess Dönhoff's stable of kept diplomats), must force on Washington an altogether new code of conduct. Washington must be made to follow a world economic policy and a world diplomatic course which is to the liking of these "European" diplomatic boys. Washington must be made to agree that future armament programs of the West be within "reasonable limits"—namely, no weapons of strategic defense, no anti-missile beam weapons, no "Star Wars."

Then, Washington must slowly and carefully be goaded into proclaiming that it shall never use nuclear weapons. (A variant of "our own" Robert McNamara's program of unilateral surrender.) In short, *Die Zeit* proposes, let us make the deployment of nine Pershing II and 32 cruise missiles the price we shall pay to the United States in exchange for which the United States will surrender its means of national policy making to the famous stable of Messrs. Carrington, Kissinger, and Genscher.

This particular matter will be settled on Nov. 22 when the German Bundestag votes for or against the final deployment. Genscher's FDP parliamentarians will go into that session with the following proposal: Yes, we shall approve the initial phase of the deployment only if that deployment will be understood to be a "completely new starting point for NATO." For starters, Genscher's FDP parliamentarians will demand that NATO pass a resolution "repudiating the first use of nuclear weapons." Innocuous as it sounds, the maneuvering for this resolution will be the opening phase for carrying out the program of *Die Zeit*. Genscher's FDP will threaten on Nov. 22 that if this stipulation is not accepted by their conservative Christian Democratic Union government coalition partners, they won't be able to vote in favor of the initial phase of deployment. Without the FDP vote, the Kohl government would be doomed to defeat in parliament, as the votes of the Socialist and Green parties are already cast against deployment.

As matters now stand, the Nov. 22 Bundestag vote is bound to be a fateful occasion. If the FDP-CDU coalition breaks up on the Euromissile issue, West Germany may be forced into either a constitutional crisis or a general election under conditions of hysteria under the shadow of Soviet missiles. If a vote approving the deployment is upheld on the terms dictated by *Die Zeit* and the Carrington and Kissinger crowd, the event will signal a new Soviet onslaught against Western Europe. That onslaught will find the NATO alliance even more weakened than at present.

"What is Moscow aiming for?" is the essential weakness of the Carrington-Kissinger proposal in *Die Zeit*. Three full months after the disappearance of Yuri Andropov from public view, the appeaser faction in the Western alliance, failing to see that the Soviet marshals are in control of the Soviet Union and that they are directing that nation's policies on a course of global military domination, still believes that the war threat, the nuclear blackmail of Europe, can be stopped by the promise of "redivision of Empire" as proposed by Carrington and as outlined by *Die Zeit*. It won't happen. If the marshals see the German Bundestag vote for Genscher's proposal, a vote produced mainly by their nuclear blackmail, they will not stop that blackmail. The marshals will instantly go for more. This is the truth that neither Carrington, nor Kissinger, nor *Die Zeit* dares face: Moscow has gone out of control and the marshals are going for the "whole thing." A "New Yalta deal," a "redivision of Empire," is not in the cards.