

throughout the entire world;

- To counter the vile slander against the conference published in the *Wiesbadener Kurier*, attempting to link the attendees to the neo-Nazi Wehrsportgruppe Hoffmann;

- To organize world-wide Schiller festivals on Nov. 10 to celebrate the 225th birthday of Friedrich Schiller;

- To expand the “telephone tree” briefing networks, initiated by Mrs. LaRouche in August, to make it possible to deliver briefings and marching orders to tens of thousands of Institute supporters within hours;

- To expand the work and influence of the Schiller Institute, culminating in another international conference to be held on or about Nov. 20 in Washington, D.C. This third international conference of the Schiller Institute should aim at doubling the number of participants, and bringing a 500-person European delegation—already named “The Friedrich List Brigade.”

The international delegations

The two-day conference included presentations on defense policy, culture, economic development, and science, by participants from around the world. In order of presentation, the following individuals contributed: Hartmut Cramer, chairman of the European Labor Party in the West German state of North-Rhine Westphalia; Will Wertz of the Schiller Institute in New York; *EIR* counterintelligence specialist Paul Goldstein; Dr. Henryk Olesiak, a Polish exile living in Düsseldorf; Angelika Raimondi, a Schiller Institute Board Member; *EIR*'s European Executive Director Michael Liebig; French Col. (ret.) Marc Geneste, who has been called the father of the French neutron bomb; U.S. Col. (ret.) Alfred Michaud, a former national councilman of the Reserve Officers Association; Gen. (ret.) Wilhelm Kuntner, former Deputy Commander of the Austrian Armed Forces; Gen. (ret.) Giulio Macri, formerly the ranking Italian officer at SHAPE headquarters of NATO; Vice Admiral (ret.) Karl-Adolf Zenker, the former chief commander of the West German Navy; Col. Mario Davite, a manager of the Italian “Military News Agency”; Robert Becker of the Reichsbanner German resistance organization; Estonian exile leader Olev Ruuben; Swedish lawyer Lennart Hane; the former national chairman of the Swedish Transport Workers' Union; Uwe Friesecke, head of the Africa Commission of the Club of Life; former Manhattan Borough President Hulan Jack; Giuseppe Puglia, national secretary of Italy's FAISA CISAL trade union; former Peruvian Labor Minister Dr. Antonio Pinilla; Dr. Meir Pa'il, a retired colonel and former member of the Israeli Knesset; Fiorella Operto, secretary general of the European Labor Party in Italy; Webster Tarpley, a foreign policy adviser to Lyndon LaRouche; Dr. Jonathan Tennenbaum, chairman of the West German Fusion Energy Foundation; chief librarian of the Lower Saxony State Library, Dr. Reimar Eck; Dr. Karin Reich, a Stuttgart mathematician; and Dr. David Flinchbaugh, an American aerospace specialist.

Maritime aspects of

by Vice-Admiral (ret.) Karl Adolf Zenker

The Western Alliance is faced with an immediate threat of a dual nature: “from the outside” by a military confrontation with the Soviet Union; “from within” by those who would decouple Western Europe from the United States.

In the spring of 1983, Russia committed itself to seek a military confrontation with the West. This confrontation strategy was the Soviet response to President Reagan's offer to negotiate on development of new means of strategic defense. Apparently, the Russian leaders decided that the emerging capability of the United States to neutralize, by means of directed-energy technologies (beam weapons and neutron weapons), the nuclear and conventional assault-superiority that the Russians have built up over a period of decades, would force them to act quickly to secure world domination, before the “window of vulnerability” closed.

Since the fall of 1983, the Soviet Union has continuously and systematically escalated its steps toward confrontation. This has not gone unnoticed by experienced military officers in the United States and Western Europe.

Among the speakers at the second international Schiller Institute conference were six ranking military officers who elaborated the Soviet military threat and expressed their support for the work of the Schiller Institute: French Col. Marc Geneste, who has been called the father of the French neutron bomb; U.S. Col. Alfred Michaud, a former national councilman of the Reserve Officers Association; Gen. (ret.) Wilhelm Kuntner, former Deputy Commander of the Austrian Armed Forces; Gen. Giulio Macri, formerly the ranking Italian officer at SHAPE headquarters of NATO; Col. Mario Davite, a manager of the Italian Military News Agency; and Vice Admiral (ret.) Karl-Adolf Zenker, the former chief commander of the West German Navy. Admiral Zenker identified the need for the West to embark on a maritime building program comprising both merchant and military fleets in his presentation, printed below.

If one examines the strategic situation of the free world, as representatives of the Schiller Institute are doing at the conference in Wiesbaden, maritime features cannot be left out of account, although there is a strong tendency to do so among those who have had wars primarily with their immediate neighbors, because these are usually land wars, which

the strategic situation of the Free World

encourage a continental thinking. Even in such conflicts, unimpeded access to sea lanes has often been an essential contribution to the outcome of the war, and blockades against the adversary, or adversary blockages, have often led to the success or failure of the efforts of war. History provides numerous examples of this—in the modern period, there were the Napoleonic wars, as well as the two world wars of this century.

The most energy-efficient form of transport

Since men have been able to construct ships of sufficient carrying capacity, they have used the sea to provide them access to areas of the world that they could not reach over land. Secure use of sea lanes enabled them to carry on imports and exports with foreign countries, as well as to assert their military policies in these countries, whether by means of direct effect upon the coasts of the adversary, or by combatting the adversary's fleet. Maintenance of sea connections for reinforcement or supply of raw materials can be of vital importance for nations that are not autarkical.

Furthermore, the sea is the medium of transport where the ratio of energy-expenditure to volume of goods transported is the most favorable. This feature of sea transport has not changed with modern technology, with large-volume transportation by air or in outer space. In other transport media, a larger share of energy is used to move goods than by ship, because ships carry volumes several times larger than aircraft or spacecraft. With all due caution, this situation is likely to remain in force for the foreseeable future, since it has become possible to construct ships larger and larger, with sufficient safety, and since the possible development of new sources of power would likely be applied to all modes of transportation in similar ways. Maritime transport does have the disadvantage, in comparison to more modern modes of transport, that more time is required to fulfill a transport mission, which has already led to a shift of passenger traffic from ships to aircraft. Bulk freight, nevertheless—and raw material and other heavy goods transportation is essentially bulk freight—will still rely on the sea lanes for the foreseeable future. Freedom of the seas is, therefore, of essential importance for the people of the free world, who cannot be supplied with these goods by land.

The alliances of the free world have the common feature that they can only be held together if the maritime connections between their member states are not broken. This is especially evident in the case of NATO, whose headquarters are located on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. NATO has no "internal line," which would assure an unhindered transportation over land. The same holds for the relationship between the U.S.A. and Japan, where their strategic cooperation depends upon control over the Pacific Ocean.

Neither Europe nor Japan has sufficient resources within its own geographical areas to supply its population with the necessary commodities and keep its economy running; both of these factors, however, are essential for maintaining social peace and the entirety of the economic system. For this reason, maintaining secure sea lanes between these regions and America, and the unhindered use of the sea lanes of the Persian Gulf, in the Indian Ocean and its peripheral waters, as well as around Africa, are vital for the free world.

The situation for the populations of the East Bloc is quite different. All these countries are immediate neighbors of each other, and they are each accessible to each other at any time over land. Within the immense land mass that comprises their territory, they have nearly all of the raw materials that they need, in adequate volumes—any sources have by no means been exhausted, and there are presumably far more as yet untouched, not even discovered. The East bloc therefore enjoys the advantage of the "internal line," as it does not depend upon the seas to exist, or, in times of emergency, to survive.

Soviet sea-power: characteristics and objectives

If the East bloc, nevertheless, has engaged in an intensive development of maritime capabilities, the East is obviously pursuing goals far different from those of the West, for which free access to the seas is of vital importance. The strong maritime efforts of the East, which go far beyond that necessary for a purely coastal defense and defense against nuclear missile carrying vessels at sea, have a clearly offensive character. Admiral Gorskov, Supreme Commander of the Soviet Navy for many years, has spoken of the aim of the Russian fleet, in several of his many writings, as being to

make itself felt upon all the seas of the world, and he has asserted that domination over the peripheral seas of the great oceans is the indispensable prerequisite to this end. That Gorskov means this seriously is shown by the permanent presence of a unit of the Soviet fleet in the Mediterranean Sea, which is attempting, with increasing success, to turn the countries on the north coast of Africa into a Soviet zone of influence.

In evaluations of Soviet naval armaments, it is not sufficient to add the numbers of individual ships of various types, and compare these numbers to the Western naval forces. One must take into account that the advantage of the "internal line" enjoyed by land forces is simultaneously a significant disadvantage for naval forces. The bases of naval forces do not lie on the large world oceans, but rather on the peripheral seas, the Barent Sea, the Baltic Sea, the Black Sea, and the Japanese Sea. These bases, therefore, can not be linked with each other without long marches over the oceans where, at the same time, the naval forces of the adversary are also present, capable of interdicting them. The result is that the four partial-fleets must possess all of the required types of ships necessary to fulfill their missions, and therefore the number of the units on the whole must be larger than would be the case under more favorable geographical conditions. Thus, if the totality of the Soviets' naval forces drew equal with those of the West, that would still not mean that the Soviets would be equally strong, because their unification into one area of operations is not possible. For that reason, there is no reason for the free world to panic because of the Russian maritime efforts, even though parts of the modern Soviet fleet can exert considerable influence upon the freedom of the sea lanes.

Changes in the dislocation of individual parts of the fleet, i.e., shifts of forces into certain areas or withdrawal from home bases, can be indications of power political intentions. For that reason, such movements in the peripheral seas to the West are carefully and continuously observed, and carefully evaluated, to be able to adopt counter measures in time if necessary.

The tasks that the Soviet leadership sets for its navy—for its military as well as merchant navy—clearly show that they are holding firm to the goal of proliferating the Marxist-Leninist system throughout the world. Negotiations on issues like so-called peaceful coexistence and economic cooperation among different social systems are merely tactical maneuvers to divert attention from their true intentions.

The military navy has the mission, in peace time, of providing aid for the establishment and stabilization of communist regimes located on the sea, wherever these states will accept such aid—the best known example is Cuba. This does bring the U.S.S.R. into a bit of a conflict with its own theory of anti-colonialism, since according to that theory the U.S.S.R. ought not to maintain bases on foreign territory. The U.S.S.R. has found an elegant solution, however, to

circumvent this difficulty. They build ports and docking facilities, and equip them with the same equipment used by their own armed forces, and then they send a large number of specialists as instructors. The recipient of such aid is thereby forced to use Soviet materiel in its own armed forces, and then, in case of a conflict, the Soviets have the materiel for use of their own forces in place, and can also rely on personnel familiar with its materiel there on the spot. The presence of the Soviet fleet upon all the seas of the world, and its high technological standard, is supposed to impress foreign populations and make them more malleable for Soviet political designs. This tactic has clearly been quite successful in a number of places.

The obvious task of the Soviet navy in wartime is to sever the maritime connections among the nations of the West, to employ their submarines, that are difficult to locate, to exert an immediate threat against the territory of the adversary, and thus to maintain a second strike capability should their intercontinental missiles be knocked out, as well as to destroy Western armed forces, and to prevent them from securing the sea lanes of the alliance, or from bringing nuclear missile carrying units into firing positions from which they are capable of reaching the territory of the East bloc.

The merchant marine, of course, has other tasks. But its activities, too, promote the grand plan of Soviet world domination. The ships of the merchant marine, first of all, earn foreign exchange, which makes it possible for the East bloc to pay for the imports it urgently requires because of the inefficiency of its own economic system. The East has to buy far more than just food, but also technical equipment and scientific knowledge in the West. Maritime trade is a perfect instrument to this end, as indicated, for example, by the passenger ships that the Soviets have bought from all over the world, carrying almost exclusively non-Russian passengers on their cruises—passengers that pay, naturally, in hard foreign currencies.

Soviet merchant ships, run by state-owned shipping companies, which therefore need not operate at a profit, and are subsidized, are driving other shipping lines out of business, by offering dumping prices that ruin shipping lines that depend on the earnings of its owners. The Soviets are creating a dependency of other populations on their tonnage which would necessarily lead to the collapse of maritime transport if the Soviet leadership orders the Soviet merchant fleet to no longer offer its services. Governments in the free West have to counter this danger by maintaining their own shipping lines.

Evaluation of the naval strategic situation on the whole shows that the use of the oceans for shipping by the free West is indeed threatened by activities of the U.S.S.R. There is still no reason for the West to fall into resignation, as long as the West does not neglect its own efforts to strengthen its military navy as well as its merchant marine. The dictum holds here too that vigilance is the price of freedom.