

# Carrington organizes Europe against SDI

by Vivian Freyre Zoakos

The secretary general of NATO, Lord Peter Carrington, is leading an international effort to organize Western Europe into the role of a Soviet satrapy. In an interview given to the *Christian Science Monitor* on June 12, Carrington boasts of the role played by him in sabotaging European support for President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), the defense program which Moscow is attempting to kill at all costs—precisely because it offers the only hope for avoiding Moscow's successful seizure of world hegemony sometime within this decade.

In a disingenuous attack on the SDI, spoken in diplomatese, Carrington told the *Monitor* that Europeans "try to look a bit further ahead and say, well, what would the consequences of this be . . . if you had the ultimate solution, a [defensive] umbrella over the U.S. and an umbrella over Europe?"

(How terrible, indeed, to have protection from Soviet missiles.)

Europeans, he continued, "feel that they have lived under a system of a nuclear deterrent which has worked very well for 35 years and are obviously anxious that what is put in its place is as effective."

Carrington makes another important point, i.e., that he considers NATO foreign ministers' meetings to be "the more appropriate forum for discussion of the SDI and arms control," rather than such bodies as the NATO defense ministers. Carrington's model is the NATO foreign ministers meeting that took place in Lisbon, Portugal, June 6-7. There, thanks to the NATO secretary's personal efforts, the United States was humiliated and Western strategic interests seriously imperiled, when the ministers refused to endorse the SDI, yet vehemently endorsed continued American observance of the SALT II strategic arms accords, despite overwhelming evidence of continuous Soviet violations of same.

That the issue of European endorsement of the SDI was on the foreign ministers' agenda in the first place, occurred thanks to the coup which Carrington pulled at the May 21 Brussels meeting of the NATO defense ministers.

Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger attended that meeting armed with a briefing on the SDI which was to culminate with a firm endorsement of the program on the part

of the allies, over and above the common statement of "support in principle" which the ministers had passed at their March meeting in Luxembourg. Weinberger had a right to expect such a statement of support, particularly since in the interim between Luxembourg and Brussels, the governments of West Germany and Italy, two of the major European allies, had given their national support for Reagan's strategic defense project.

Weinberger's expectations may have been reasonable, but they failed to take into account the activities of Lord Peter Carrington. Arguing from the standpoint that there was both no urgency to get a European endorsement immediately, and that the danger of splitting the alliance over SDI represented a greater threat, Carrington effectively muzzled Weinberger, who was not even able to give his planned, extended briefing on the American defense project.

The controversial issue of the SDI was taken off the agenda. At Carrington's recommendation, discussion of the SDI was postponed to the NATO foreign ministers' meeting scheduled two weeks later. The moment this was agreed upon, the pro-SDI side had already lost the battle.

To a man, the NATO foreign ministers—including Secretary Shultz—are among the most visible proponents of an appeasement policy toward the Soviet Union. Each had already promised Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, during their private and joint meetings with him in Vienna in early May, that they would make the upholding of deterrence doctrine the key target of their Lisbon meeting.

Deterrence, or Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD), is the doctrine of "military revenge" responsible for the present state of political near-dissolution of the Atlantic Alliance. It is the diametric opposite of the SDI which, as President Reagan has often emphasized, implies conversion to a doctrine of Mutually Assured *Survival* (MAS).

Keeping their promise to Gromyko, then, the foreign ministers took three initiatives at their meeting: 1) they insisted on the supremacy of deterrence doctrine, as Carrington reemphasized in his interview; 2) they refused to endorse the SDI; and 3) they insisted on American adherence to the SALT II agreement, despite knowing—and even admitting—that the U.S.S.R. has been grossly violating the agreement.

West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, one of Carrington's co-conspirators, opened the Lisbon meeting by admitting that the Soviets have been violating the SALT II and ABM treaties (the latter covering limitations on development of SDI). Yet, in the same breath, Genscher demanded that the United States adhere to these treaties anyway, and renounce both strategic defense and missile construction required to close the gap resulting from Soviet violations. The cynical Genscher argued, "Neither observance of the antiballistic missile (ABM) treaty, nor respect for the SALT II agreement, should be diminished in their value by the Soviet Union's adopting an attitude contrary to their spirit and letter."