

## *EIR* intervenes in Dutch security crisis

On May 23, *EIR* held a seminar on beam weapons and their strategic significance for Western Europe at The Hague, the capital of the Netherlands. Attended by more than 30 representatives of the country's top military, political, and industrial institutions, the seminar brought the question of beam defense into the middle of the Dutch crisis over the deployment of cruise missiles.

Participants were briefed by Dr. Jonathan Tennenbaum, editor of the German-language *Fusion* magazine, on directed-energy technologies, and heard a presentation on the devastating capabilities of the neutron bomb to stop Soviet armored formations by Col. Marc Geneste, retired officer of the French Army and now of the Center for the Study of Total Strategy, Paris. *EIR* contributing-editor Michael Liebig presented the current strategic crisis and decoupling tendencies in the Atlantic Alliance. *EIR* military analyst Dean Andromidas outlined the role of Henry Kissinger and his accomplices in attempting to sabotage the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative.

The discussion period was dominated by questions on why the United States has not been more forthcoming with technical information, what this approach means for East-West relations, what were the technical capabilities of the beam-defense system, and how this will affect the cruise missile debate in the Netherlands.

The seminar marked *EIR*'s first public event in this country, giving *EIR* its first on-the-scene impressions of this troubled member of the Atlantic Alliance. At first glance the Netherlands might appear as merely one of the smaller members of the Alliance, with a peace movement large enough to exert dominating influence on the country's defense policies. However, the Netherlands was found to play a larger role on the strategic map of Western Europe than its comparatively small size suggests.

### **Dutch play key defense role**

Scheduled to deploy 16 cruise missiles by 1986, the Netherlands lies on the North Sea and is responsible for several military tasks that are crucial to the North Atlantic Alliance. Its navy has considerable anti-submarine warfare responsibilities in the North Sea, and in guarding the crucial entrance to the Baltic Sea, the huge Soviet navy's entrance to the North Atlantic. Other naval tasks include tracking Soviet ballistic-

missile-carrying submarines that threaten both the coast of Europe and the United States. Its army and air force, though small, have a capacity to deliver nuclear weapons by aircraft and artillery. This is a fact of tremendous importance, considering that in time of war the Dutch army's zone of operations would be northern Germany, currently the zone of operations of the German Bundeswehr, an army prohibited by international treaty from possessing nuclear arms. This northern flank of NATO is currently under tremendous Soviet pressure.

Furthermore it is a center of a technologically very advanced electronics defense industry and research establishment, as evidenced by the attendance at the *EIR* seminar of representatives of seven research laboratories.

The political deadlock over the cruise deployment is being orchestrated by Soviet channels of influence operating through the Interchurch Peace Council and pro-decoupling tendencies that cross all party lines from the far left to the far right. The June 1 cabinet decision to delay deployment of the U.S.-made nuclear missiles until 1988, unless developments in U.S.-Soviet arms talks require otherwise, makes the fall of the center right government of Prime Minister Ruud Lubbers a strong possibility. Moreover, the Dutch decision may trigger a chain reaction in the alliance, particularly affecting Belgium, Italy, and West Germany.

Despite reports of the strength of the peace movement and popular opposition to the missile deployment, *EIR* found a significant faction in the military as well as veterans' organizations and traditional conservative layers deeply involved in building a popular opposition to the decouplers. Many in these circles are linked to Prince Bernhard, the former Inspector General of the Netherlands Armed Forces. It was called to our attention that a recent article in *EIR* dealing with Henry Kissinger's European tour characterized the Prince as a Nazi collaborator. Although the Prince is associated with such organizations as the Bilderberg group, the World Wildlife Fund, and other organizations whose zero-growth orientation is demonstrably against the interests of Western industrial society, the characterization of Bernhard as a Nazi collaborator cannot be reconciled with the fact that he was head of the Dutch Army in exile and the head of the wartime official resistance organizations.

The real test facing the Netherlands is not just the cruise missile deployment decision, but whether an approach to a forward looking policy represented by beam weapons will serve as a basis to defeat the "peace" movement and growing tendency toward appeasement. The deep interest in this approach is evident in the turnout for the seminar. It apparently did not go unnoticed by the anti-beam-weapon clique in the U.S. State Department, which reportedly sent a representative to the Netherlands Defense Ministry only two days after the seminar to tell Dutch officials that the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative was only a "research" effort and did not represent any change in U.S. strategic doctrine.