

Pugwashers seek to 'denuclearize' Europe

by an EIR Investigative Team

The one-world-federalist Pugwash Group is mediating a strategic arrangement between the Soviet General Staff and the Western appeasers of the Trilateral Commission, the aim of which is the unilateral nuclear disarmament of Western Europe. Coinciding with the Reykjavik summit's push for a "zero option"—withdrawal of both Soviet and U.S. nuclear missiles from Europe—the Pugwash effort is promoting the "denuclearization" of Europe.

The Pugwash Group was set up in the 1950s by associates of Britain's Lord Bertrand Russell, as an East-West "back channel" for arms control. For the past four years, Pugwash has sponsored a Conventional Defense Task Force to study "alternative defense strategies" premised on the "denuclearization of force-structures." The central work of this task force has been done at the Max Planck Institute in Starnberg, West Germany.

The last meeting of this special unit took place in Pisa, Italy, during the first half of October of this year, under the direction of Denmark's Anders Borsup—a strategist credited by some with having authored the "denuclearization" and anti-NATO policies of the West German Social Democratic Party and the British Labour Party—and Professor Müller of the Max Planck/Starnberg group. The meeting featured representatives from the East bloc, including individuals seconded by Soviet General Staff member Col.-Gen. Nikolai Chervov, an expert in propaganda and disinformation, as well as strategists from the planning divisions of the Hungarian and Czechoslovakian ministries of defense.

What differentiated this meeting from previous work of the task force since 1982, Western Pugwash sources report privately, is the sudden interest shown by the East bloc delegates in the "alternative defense strategies" doctrines. This shift is not surprising, for the Pugwash plan amounts to the unilateral disarmament of the West, as one Pugwash source candidly admitted: "Why should the West stick to the nuclear game in Europe? Our strategy, now, is to pretend that we will use nuclear weapons on the fifth day of war, all of which has little to do with security policy. Why not let it be up to the other side to insist on nuclear use? Leave the decision up to them! We can free ourselves from such choices."

The Pugwashers attempt to sell the idea of the "denuclear-

ization" of Europe, through paeans to "conventional defense." Said a Pugwash source: "We are studying how we could achieve a military regime of what we call mutual defensive superiority, to decouple offensive and defensive capabilities. We want to base stability, or crisis-stabilization, on the very force-structure, to shape force-structures on the basis of giving bonuses to the defensive role."

The Soviets have absolutely no intention of giving up their overwhelming superiority in conventional forces in Europe, but if they can foment the illusion that they would modify their capabilities for offensive attack, how much more quickly can they destabilize NATO military strategy, and achieve hegemony over Europe.

The Soviet-Trilateral game

Through the good offices of Pugwash, a dangerous diplomatic game is going on. First, from the Soviet side, laser physicist Yevgenii Velikhov has let it be known that Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachov will, around the time of the German elections of Jan. 25, 1987, make a major offer to "reduce offensive capabilities on both sides." As a Pugwash source had it from Velikhov: "He will acknowledge the Western arguments about Soviet conventional superiority, and make an offer in the form, 'We can maintain our security, without threatening you.'"

The "Gorbachov offer" will be an expansion of a bogus offer for negotiations on conventional force reductions made by the Warsaw Pact command on June 13, 1986, in Budapest.

Second, from the Trilateral Commission side, there is a parallel process in motion. Kurt Biedenkopf, head of the North Rhine-Westphalia branch of the Christian Democratic Union, will be releasing a new book, immediately after the Jan. 25 elections, which will incorporate the kernel of the Pugwash "alternative defense" notions. Biedenkopf, a Trilateral Commission member at various points in his career and a leader of the "Moscow faction" of the CDU, is an intimate of the Pugwash/Max Planck group in Starnberg. An aide to Biedenkopf reports that he was there, for private discussions, during the afternoon of Nov. 20.

A Pugwash source familiar with the political and strategic debate in West Germany states, "There is growing awareness of, and support for, the ideas of Pugwash in West Germany. The Social Democrats have already adopted the Pugwash 'alternative defense' doctrine through the paper of [Andreas] von Bülow [a Social Democratic strategist who advocates German withdrawal from NATO, denuclearization, etc.]. As for the Free Democrats, we have [Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich] Genscher, whose recent speech in Vienna was most welcome, calling for new 'security structures' for Europe. The last to pick it up are the Christian Democrats, and that is changing with Kurt Biedenkopf, who will try to bring these issues into the CDU."

A foretaste of what to expect from Biedenkopf has come from another West German CDU Trilateralist, Volker Rühle. On Nov. 14, Rühle called for the "denuclearization" of West-

Soviets make separate arms offer to Europe

Immediately after the collapse of the Oct. 11-12 superpower summit in Reykjavik, Iceland, top Warsaw Pact officials launched a high-publicity campaign to break Western European support for the U.S. negotiating position. It had become apparent to the Soviet leaders that President Reagan was definitely not going to use the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) as a "bargaining chip" in arms-control negotiations—despite the urgings of White House Chief of Staff Donald Regan and Secretary of State George Shultz; the Kremlin therefore initiated what veteran "back-channel" diplomat Georgi Arbatov called, in a statement at the close of the Reykjavik meetings, "a big diplomatic offensive" in Western Europe.

The point-man for the drive was Viktor Karpov, Moscow's chief arms negotiator, who set off in mid-October on a whirlwind tour of European capitals, pledging Soviet readiness to discuss "the possibility of finding a solution on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe separately from space and nuclear offensive arms." This, despite repeated statements from Gorbachov that the arms-control "package" would absolutely have to include a U.S. back-down on the SDI.

The Military Council of the Warsaw Pact countries met Nov. 12-14 in the Romanian capital of Bucharest, "to evaluate the post-Reykjavik situation," as the Soviet gov-

ernment daily *Izvestia* reported on Nov. 15.

The immediate outcome of this meeting was the announcement by Viktor Karpov on Nov. 18 that the Warsaw Pact was about to issue an appeal to NATO for direct contacts on limiting and reducing conventional forces in Europe. The obvious effect of this would be to short circuit the Moscow-Washington negotiations, by appealing directly to the Europeans.

Karpov announced that a "special working group" of the Warsaw Pact was meeting in Sofia, Bulgaria "to study the possibility of comprehensive reduction of conventional forces and weapons in Europe," as was proposed by the June 1986 Budapest summit meeting of Warsaw Pact nations. Karpov demanded the convening of NATO-Warsaw Pact negotiations to discuss the Pact's conventional forces proposals: "The Soviet Union is being accused of wishing to maintain a clear imbalance of conventional forces in its favor. The West however, will not negotiate on this. We want contacts between NATO and the Warsaw Pact."

NATO headquarters officially rejected the Karpov proposal on Nov. 20. An official NATO spokesman in Brussels confirmed that Moscow had tried to establish direct contacts with NATO, first in an approach to NATO Deputy Secretary-General Marcello Guidi, and then through Italian diplomatic channels. Moscow was told that "the normal way" for the Warsaw Pact to make contact for dialogue with NATO, was through bilateral channels with individual member countries. The French government was reported to be particularly angered by the Soviet attempt.

ern Europe, in light of what had been discussed at the Reykjavik summit. He welcomed the views of West German Social Democratic strategist Egon Bahr, the notorious pro-Moscow appeaser. During the week of Nov. 24, Rùhe is scheduled to go to Moscow—despite Soviet cancellation of visits by leading West German officials, supposedly out of anger about Chancellor Helmut Kohl's recent likening of Gorbachov to Nazi propaganda chief Joseph Goebbels.

One other dirty nest, is that around Bonn Defense Ministry State Secretary Lothar Ruehl, himself nominally an FDP Genscherite, but whose "post-Reykjavik strategic ideas" are being circulated by the public-relations office of the CDU-CSU parliamentary faction. Ruehl, the same individual responsible for destabilizing disinformation leaks about a supposed change in the "Quick Reaction Alert" of nuclear missiles stationed in Western Europe (see article, p. 39), is coordinating a new task force of senior Western Europe civil servants in Bonn, which is discussing "alternative defense strategies."

At this rate, the Pugwash Conventional Defense Task Force may already be dictating the policy of Western governments, by the time of the group's next meeting in Sweden, in April 1987. The Pugwashers are counting on two factors of irrationalism in the West, to achieve their aim.

First, Pugwash is trying to spread panic, to the effect that the United States is about to abandon Europe militarily. As one Scandinavian Pugwasher puts it: "Opinion is moving a bit in our direction. This is because people are getting scared; there is a growing fear in Europe that America will sell the European forces down the drain. Now, all sorts of ways to alternatively defend ourselves, on our own, are becoming discussable."

Second, Pugwash is counting on the cost-cutting mania now overcoming Western capitals. If "alternative defense strategies" become acceptable in enough minds, the thinking goes, then why bother to spend all that money on modernization of nuclear capabilities, sophisticated strategic-defense capabilities, and the like?