

The battle for Europe will determine if the world averts thermonuclear war

by Vivian Freyre Zoakos

As 1983 comes to a close, the Battle for Europe dominates the global political situation.

What we are witnessing is the playing out of the final consequences of the doctrine of flexible response, originally developed at the 1958 conference of the Pugwash East-West "backchannel" and later made public in the early 1960s by Robert McNamara. As a concoction of Anglo-Soviet networks, the doctrine created the foundation for a rift between the United States and its European allies, introducing the notion that the United States would not necessarily respond to a Soviet attack of Western Europe with a full American strategic barrage.

Rooted in the untenable doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD), the crack in the alliance implied by flexible response has today become a chasm. It is impossible to say whether in the course of 1984 any nation of Western Europe will remain in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

If such a European decoupling occurs, full-scale thermonuclear war becomes likely to the point of near certainty. It is in Europe, and not in the Middle East or other hot spots that humanity's political and strategic future is being played out.

Nineteen eighty-three can be characterized in part as the year in which the Soviet Union began to take off its gloves in its strategy of terrorizing Western Europe, using political and diplomatic means and, toward the latter part of the year, outright military means to do it. In this Moscow had the enormous advantage of being able to play on the issue of the so-called Euromissiles, American-built intermediate-range nuclear weapons whose deployment in Europe began this past November. These forward-based missiles, whose premise was the doctrine of flexible response, had been voted up at NATO's 1979 year-end meeting, once again under the aegis of Pugwash channels, in this case principally through the efforts of Henry Kissinger.

The issue of the Euromissiles was never a military one; it is a central component in a Soviet political strategy to decouple Europe from the United States. This became an urgent

priority following President Reagan's March 23 announcement of a new strategic doctrine based on the development of a beam weapons ABM defense. Because Reagan's policy offered the first hope for bringing Europe and the rest of the world out of the conundrum created by MAD and flexible response, the beam weapons question after March 23 began to shape European political behavior.

Response to Moscow

As Moscow stepped up the pressure, ostensibly over the Euromissiles, which they had in fact pre-discounted, two types of European responses began to emerge. On the one hand there were the appeasers, led by newly General Secretary Lord Peter Carrington, German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, Italian Foreign Minister Giulio Andreotti, and outright Soviet asset Olof Palme of Sweden. Carrington's election to the NATO post at the December NATO year-end meeting was viewed rightly by Moscow as a major victory. The Carrington policy was spelled out in mid-November in an article in the Hamburg weekly *Die Zeit* written by one of his intimates, Theo Sommer, who stated the faction's fundamental demand: that President Reagan scrap his March 23 program or face the dissolution of the Atlantic Alliance.

The second, European response to Soviet pressure has been from the outset in one manner or another, tied to the efforts of this journal's staff and of the European Labor Party, which used the Reagan beams ABM policy to spark a resistance movement regrouping the best and most combative political and military forces remaining in Europe. Through a series of *EIR*-sponsored conferences thus far held in Bonn, Rome, Oslo, Vienna, and Paris, large groups of military and political leaders representing all the leading nations of Europe were brought together to confer on the strategic and specifically European implications of these weapons' development. The process began to directly and indirectly create the basis for a European leadership who could reverse the drift toward Finlandization.

A crucial measure of the success of this effort was the November speech delivered at the British Institute for International Strategic Studies by Jacques Chirac, head of the French Gaullist party, *Rassemblement pour la République*. Chirac's speech was a signal to both Moscow and their appeaser allies that the old continent was not about to roll over and play dead at Moscow's behest. Issuing the first public statement of support for Reagan's beams policy of any elected European leader, the Gaullist leader did so in the context of arguing against the currently rampant notion that a Soviet takeover of West Germany might be tolerable. Chirac argued that far from abandoning Germany, Europe must bring that nation to take greater responsibilities inside the Atlantic Alliance, situating beam weapons as the key to revitalizing the alliance and ending the one way street to war of MAD and flexible response.

Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger gave the Europeans a complete, closed-door briefing on the U.S. beams weapons policy at the Dec. 10 NATO meeting, emphasizing the American commitment to joint cooperation in the development of the weapons. This doused any remaining European excuses for refusing to take a stand on the issue due to being "insufficiently briefed" by the United States.

Now, either the proponents of beams weapons take control of the future of European policy-making or, probably within the first half of next year, we will be faced with a map on which the entirety of the continent will be under Soviet domination. The United States would then be vastly outgunned, politically and militarily. The only possible outcome would be an (unlikely) American capitulation, or a thermo-nuclear confrontation in which superior Soviet forces are committed to wiping out every inch of the United States. Either way, the cultural legacy represented today uniquely by Western European civilization and its North and South American transplants will have been eradicated for the future generations of humanity. Ruling the globe instead will be the fascist Soviet heirs of Byzantine cultism, the faithful heirs of that world which broke with the West precisely on the point of repudiating the Western tradition's conception of the primacy of the individual's creative powers as representing mankind's God-like attribute. These, and nothing less, are the stakes in the current Battle for Europe.

Destabilization and 'reunification'

For its part, the Soviet Union is deploying all its capabilities to destabilize Western Europe as well as terrorize it militarily. Such Soviet tactics as the December walkout from the INF Euromissile negotiations and the Soviet cessation of the START (strategic weapons) and MBFR (conventional forces) talks are best understood as diplomatic terror aimed principally at Europe.

Alongside this, the Soviets are conducting a custom-made operation against their principal target: the West Germans, the backbone core of European NATO. While threatening the Federal Republic through domestically conducted

destabilization operations, and waving their military might in front of the country's leadership and population, Moscow is also holding out the possibility of German reunification in exchange for a German pull-out from NATO. Negotiations to this end have been in process during the past year between the U.S.S.R. and the remains of the old Nazi networks left scattered throughout German institutions and nurtured by post-war British and anglophile American collusion.

Working with these treasonous negotiators at the top is the West German foreign minister, Free Democratic Party (FDP) chief Hans-Dietrich Genscher. Others involved are the two heads of the Social Democratic Party (SPD) Parliamentary fraction, Egon Bahr and Horst Ehmke, who have also guided the SPD's increasing alliance with the fascist Green Party ecologists/peaceniks and the rejection on Nov. 20 of the SPD's former pro-Euromissile policy.

Working with Genscher, Bahr, Ehmke, and their ilk are representatives of the old Nazi apparatus such as Lieutenant-General Otto Ernst Remer (see article, page 15). A living representative of the old Hitler-Stalin pact, Remer has called for an alliance with Russia against the United States. Raving that "the Americans, not the Russians, are the aggressors," Remer states that "we have to leave NATO, leave the European Community, become a neutral country, then we can reunify."

This, in summary, represents the policies of the beam-weapons opponents. It is what Chirac was addressing in his cited speech, as well as at an earlier speech delivered in Germany in which he insisted that the security of the entire continent was indissolubly bound up with the question of Germany.

The Soviets are playing on these appeasement tendencies and the fear that often underlies them, making good use of the resources of the enormously powerful, Swiss-centered neo-Nazi networks. The leaders of the "peace" movement, funded by Moscow and Moscow's Muammar Qaddafi and logistically led by the neo-Nazi Soviet allies, this year declared a Hot Autumn against the continent and especially against West Germany. The resulting destabilizations involved more than large-scale marches in the streets decrying the Euromissiles and the United States. They involved the widespread use of outright terrorist tactics in the form of bombings against military-connected targets, beginning with the computer center of the German MAN firm this autumn. This terrorist phase of the campaign has only begun. With the beginning of Euromissile stationings in Britain in November, and in West Germany and Italy in December, the peace movement leaders have already announced that the terror will now increase dramatically. They were urged in this by the Soviet party paper *Pravda*, which printed marching orders after the missiles began arriving telling "the movement" that they must now escalate operations.

Beginning roughly last May, the U.S.S.R began additionally to flex its military muscles against northern Europe, with West Germany once again the ultimate target. This



Soviet activity set off a chain of events which has weakened the northern flank of NATO to the point that several nations are hanging on to their Western loyalties by the merest thread.

The northern tier

Denmark is having elections on Jan. 10 whose outcome may well mean the country's de facto withdrawal from NATO. The Belgians have decided to withdraw from the Central Front NATO air defense belt. The Dutch parliament voted in December against the stationing of American cruise missiles in Europe. "Neutral" Finland, and only somewhat more slowly, Sweden, are being roped into defending Soviet territory from Western-launched cruise missiles. Behind this is an arrogant Soviet military show of force in the area.

The British began to report Soviet submarine sightings off their northern coasts beginning last May. On Dec. 12, former British Navy Minister Speed warned of a shift of "significant numbers of Soviet cruise missile submarines from their Northern fleet to the Baltic, to put them closer to targets in this country and Northern Europe." The mini-sub incursions into Swedish territorial waters which caused such an international stir last spring are continuing. There were 62 such incursions officially reported in the course of this year. An *Oskar*-class Soviet submarine carrying 24 cruise missiles three weeks ago staged a breakout off the waters of Norway. This was a Soviet exercise in demonstrating to NATO that Moscow has the capability to maneuver with impunity through Western anti-submarine screens.

Underlying the fear generated by these staged shows of force is the fact that NATO military strength relative to the Warsaw Pact in the area is already abysmal—and Moscow continues its arms buildup. To give an example of force levels in indicative categories: According to Pentagon figures for

early 1983 covering the area sweeping from Norway to Denmark, there are 100 NATO tanks facing 1,700 Soviet tanks; in artillery and/or mortar batteries, NATO has 500 units, as opposed to 2,000 for the Soviets. Additionally, the enormously rapid buildup of Soviet MI-24 attack helicopters in the northern tier is threatening to completely saturate the Western border air defense systems there. Moscow already has 1,800 of these very fast and deadly helicopters stationed and, according to one German authority, more are continuously being mass-produced and stationed.

The reason for the Soviet focus on the northern flank is once again West Germany. Authorities in the United States and Europe have for the past months been circulating scenarios based on observation of Soviet behavior and knowledge of Soviet thinking. Typical of the scenarios floated in the course of the past year was the book *Soviets Threaten Sweden* authored by Estonian refugee Jurij Lina. Lina—and many military experts agree with him—says the U.S.S.R. will very likely stage an invasion of Sweden by 1986 at the latest. Lina's hypothesis is that the Soviet leadership will provoke Sweden into violating its de facto "treaty" with Moscow—its neutral stance—and this would be used as a pretext for invasion. Indeed, various Soviet moves are underway today in this direction, and Soviet foreign minister Andrei Gromyko pointedly told the visiting Finnish foreign minister in Moscow in December that the Moscow government "observes the relation between Sweden and the U.S.S.R with grave worry."

The reason for the Soviet takeover of Sweden would be to secure the northern flank preparatory to a Soviet military incursion into West Germany. *EIR* has learned that already in 1976, the East Germans and Soviets had conducted military maneuvers based on just such a scenario. Code-named "Plan Polarka," the exercise involved a surgical, conventional attack into northern West Germany including a full propaganda barrage around a supposed revival of Nazism in West Germany serving as the maneuver's political cover.

Given the limited sovereignty agreement signed by the World War II allies in 1958, Moscow reserves to itself the right under articles 95 and 105 of that treaty (articles eventually repudiated by the Western allies, although not by the U.S.S.R.) to invade West Germany in the event of a resurgence of Nazism. The 1976 Plan Polarka was based on the activation of these treaty clauses. Crucial to the exercise was a Baltic-Scandinavian deployment to seize the area and seal northern access routes to the NATO enemy.

The southern flank

The NATO southern flank is also in abysmal shape. Greece, like Sweden, is ruled by a second generation Soviet agent: Prime Minister Papandreou, who is already behaving more like a Warsaw Pact satrap than a NATO member. 1983 saw Greece begin to deny the U.S. and NATO the use of its air space, while granting the Warsaw Pact refueling rights at its ports. Papandreou, together with another notorious Soviet KGB asset, Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau,

has also pioneered in the West the propagandizing of any and all Soviet disarmament proposals while loudly attacking President Reagan's beam weapons alternative.

Turkey is beginning to come under massive Soviet pressure. Given that the stationing of Euromissiles in Turkey would be of great significance for the West in militarily countering the Soviet war danger, the Soviet newspaper *Red Star* began this month to issue harsh warnings to Turkey not to accept the weapons or face serious "retaliation." Intelligence sources in Europe have warned that the Soviets are ready to throw everything in their arsenal short of launching an actual war to destabilize Turkey, including terrorism, left-right destabilizations, and exploitation of an ongoing faction fight in Ankara between nationalist/pro-American military layers and the newly installed Ozal government.

Most decisive of all for the southern flank is the situation inside Italy, headquarters of the NATO southern command and the bridge between Europe and the Mediterranean border nations. Nineteen eighty-three saw the takeover of the Italian premiership for the first time by the Socialist Party (PSI), under PSI general secretary Bettino Craxi who succeeded the collapsed Christian Democratic Fanfani regime. Over and above the problems inherent in any government led by Craxi—an individual whose terrorist-linked career this journal has documented for many years—the decisive factor strategically in Italy has been and remains the role being played by Christian Democrat Giulio Andreotti in the role of foreign minister. Andreotti is the lifetime agent of certain Vatican elements represented by the internationally prominent Father Morlion, whose oligarchic world view is expressed by his visceral attacks against the notion of the nation-state and who admits to conducting ongoing back-channel negotiations with Moscow. To the extent that this faction has gained the upper hand in the Vatican, Andreotti has been conducting Italian foreign *and* military policy under an appeasement formula that has led to his alliance with NATO's new secretary general, Lord Carrington, and West Germany's Genscher.

France, Britain, and Germany

Proceeding northward again, we come to France, which is today in a political category uniquely its own. Not only has President François Mitterrand behaved over the past year as the staunchest American ally on issues of military policy, France is the only European country whose government has begun to actively cooperate with the United States on the beam-weapons question. Exactly what this cooperation entails is not publicly known, but apart from Jacques Chirac's intervention on the matter, French Defense Minister Charles Hernu signaled a positive government response to the March 23 Reagan proposal in the course of responding to a Parliamentary enquiry last October.

The catalyst that made such a development possible was the creation this year of an organization named "La France et son Armée" launched jointly by the European Labor Party and leading members of the World War II French Resistance, principally the celebrated Mme. Marie Madeleine Fourcade.

Encompassing well-known figures within French military circles, such as Gen. Revault d'Allonnes and Col. Marc Geneste, La France et son Armée has functioned as the core for rallying the French leadership around fighting for Western survival through beginning to move around the beams weapons conception.

In Britain, there was a temporary emergence of a "Churchillian reflex" factor among ruling circles in the earlier part of the year. Thus, in the immediate aftermath of Reagan's March 23 address, it was the British, including Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, who delivered the most positive response. This included speeches by Thatcher on the importance of emerging technologies applies in the military sphere, and her announced commitment to enhance the country's peaceful nuclear energy capabilities. The backers of what they themselves called the "Churchillian reflex" based their behavior on the recognition that Moscow was out to seize control of the West, and any private back-channel negotiations with the Russians would be as useful as earlier attempted negotiations with Adolf Hitler had proven to be.

The Churchillian faction was ousted from power in the course of the autumn, with the Thatcher government reshuffling and the corresponding return to prominence of Lord Carrington. For the moment the Carrington faction is in command in London, although opposition against him and his policies is still rife and may surface again as the Soviets become more blatant in demonstrating their actual policies for the continent, Britain included.

Finally, returning to West Germany, we find the government of Christian Democrat Helmut Kohl virtually under siege. The Social Democrats led by Egon Bahr and Horst Ehmke have virtually transformed this mass party into an extension of the Moscow-run Green Party and its attached fascist ecologist/peace movement. Coalitions between both parties are currently under negotiation in various German states. Inside the government, the central problem is that foreign *and* military policy is under the control of Foreign Minister Genscher, one of the leaders of an East-West German unification movement under Soviet domination.

The ouster of the traitor Genscher is thus of international strategic significance, given the outstanding importance of West Germany in the global military and political arena. Around the Battle for Germany, the Battle for Europe will either stand or fall. Inside Germany, that battle is being led by the European Labor Party, the only centralized political force working to combine all the extant nationalist networks opposed to a Soviet takeover of the country under any terms. The potential that exists was proven by the attendance, reported earlier in the *EIR*, of the magazine's beam-weapons conference in Bonn in the late fall of 1983. However, it is crucial that more external public initiatives of the type taken by Chirac in this cited speech be taken by other European leaders, giving support to the anti-Finlandization forces already existing inside Germany itself. This, coupled with a rout of Genscher, is required if the West is to thwart Soviet plans for the political and military takeover of Europe.