

Former Gaullist minister: INF accord 'terrifying,' 'distant echo of Munich'

Under the title "Smacking of Yalta," Alain Peyrefitte, former Justice Minister in the French government of Charles de Gaulle, attacks the U.S.-Soviet INF accord on the front page of the Dec. 9 Le Figaro. Peyrefitte writes, in part:

How not to rejoice that a stop is put to the mad course of armaments? For the first time in the history of the world, two great military powers are committing themselves to destroy armaments. Even more: They authorize mutual verifications for each other. Even more still: The Americans will eliminate only 350 nuclear weapons, against 1,500 for the Soviets.

Such are the first impressions. But in a domain where psychological war is much more a threat than real war, which no one wants, it is necessary, above all, to avoid being dupes. Let us note that the Soviets will abandon obsolete weapons, which they would have to replace, in any case, by 1990; while the Americans renounce their best-performing weapons. Let us note also, that Europe is absent, more weakened by the failed summit of Reykjavik, while she is at the center of the debate that is proceeding along without her: object, not subject, of history. . . .

The Americans have passed from anti-communist hysteria to the hysteria of the "Gorby-show." Those whom President Reagan denounced several months ago as the "evil empire," he sees as the incarnation of good. And the accord that he has signed, yesterday, does not suffice for him. He has just declared to the *Washington Times* that it is necessary to go toward: the complete denuclearization of Europe and of the world. Terrifying.

Americans who see clearly do not hide that they are terrified: such as the former Commanders-in-Chief of NATO, Generals Haig and Rogers, or former governmental officials, like Henry Kissinger and Jeane Kirkpatrick. But their cries of concern do not suffice to dissipate a euphoria that seems a distant echo of Munich.

Certain voices, including that of M. Mitterrand, speak out to reassure us: 'What are you worried about? We are simply returning to the point of departure, that is, 1977, date of deployment of the first SS-20s.' Triple error.

In 10 years, the psychological situation has reversed itself. The deployment of the Pershings consolidated a new consensus around a firm defense of the West. Their withdrawal is going to shatter this consensus and relaunch neutralism, that is to say, the temptation of 'Finlandization.'

The strategic situation has not evolved any less. In 1977,

the Soviet Union aimed toward Europe only missiles of approximate precision, only utilizable in a grouped and massive row; that is to say, nuclear apocalypse. The missiles which the Soviets now have available—and which are not touched by the accord of Washington—are of a surgical precision. They can hit their objective within a few dozen meters' proximity. Their threat becomes more and more credible: for they are capable of destroying not only cities, but the forces stationed in western Europe.

Finally and especially, the essential quality of the Pershing was not its ability to reach Soviet territory in six minutes. It was to constitute an obstacle such that it would be a tripwire before any Soviet conventional attack.

Already, in 1945, a President of the United States, old and weakened, had abandoned one-half of Europe. He confided to William Bullitt his conviction that Stalin "would not attempt to annex anything, and would try to create a world of democracy and of peace."

Again, an old and weakened American President persuades himself of the good will of the Soviet empire. Is he getting ready to abandon the other half of Europe?

'Spectre of Munich': other opposing voices

French Minister of Culture François Léotard in an editorial page commentary in the newspaper Le Figaro of Dec. 10:

The first reaction [to the INF treaty] is "no" because this agreement is useless and even dangerous for security. Useless because the Soviet nuclear threat over Europe remains practically intact. . . . Dangerous, because this agreement is well-balanced only on the surface. . . .

Nuclear deterrence thus remains essential, and we have to pursue our efforts in order to maintain our technical credibility, in particular in three areas: the submarine component, the neutron bomb . . . and the answer to the progress of the Soviet SDI. This last point, where it appears likely that the U.S.S.R. is in advance for the U.S., implies the modernization of [France's] ballistic vectors.

● *Le Figaro's* front-page cartoon on Dec. 9 shows Reagan and Gorbachov dressed as vaudeville showmen in what

is labeled the "Washington Circus," taking the clothes off a woman wearing a crown with the word, "Europe," on it. The caption is: "Ronny and Gorby, in their wild strip-tease number."

West Germany

● *Josef Joffe in the Süddeutsche Zeitung newspaper of Munich Dec. 9:*

The INF accord crowns 30 years of Soviet campaigns to drive U.S. nuclear weapons out of Europe. Ever since the U.S. brought nuclear missiles into Europe in 1957, the Soviets have looked for ways to have them pulled out again. The meeting of this old aim is the main aspect of the INF agreement just signed between Reagan and Gorbachov.

Spain

● *Andres Garrigo, NATO correspondent, in the Madrid daily ABC Dec. 8:*

Put to sleep by the euphoria of the INF treaty, Europe awakes at dawn, occupied by a massive Soviet invasion force. . . . Behind the bubbles of champagne, NATO is worried [about] a possible Soviet Pearl Harbor strike. The official communiqué [of the NATO meeting Dec. 2] speaks of a "surprise Warsaw Pact attack," and this is no joke. . . . The NATO Supreme Commander has only two choices: submit, or use atomic weapons. . . . Franco-German cooperation is not an adequate response to the challenge of the INF. The only guarantee of security, is to close ranks within NATO and prevent the American connection from being weakened.

● *Rafael Bardaji, the Group for Strategic Studies, in the Dec. 7 issue of the Spanish newspaper El País:*

Reagan is sealing with Gorbachov a piece of utter irrationality insofar as NATO is concerned: Both the strategy and the present nuclear policy of NATO will be smashed. . . . Worst of all, is the sheer naïveté . . . of the self-same American President who denounced the Soviets' systematic violation of arms control treaties. . . . We Europeans had better start thinking now, about what we will say when Gorbachov insists we negotiate over our tactical weapons, our dual-use aircraft, our coastal submarines, and the whole panoply which guaranteed deterrence in Europe. We can only hope, that the withdrawal of the Pershing IIs will not be as disastrous for us, as that of the general they are named after.

Other European

● *In the Rome, Italy daily newspaper La Repubblica, Dec. 9 (bylined Vladimiro Odinzov):*

Next Friday, when Shultz comes to Brussels for the annual Council of Ministers meeting of NATO, there will surely be some allies thinking of Chamberlain coming back from Munich.

● *Russian emigré writer Andrei Navrozov in the Times of London Dec. 7, "Is the Nuclear Munich About to Be Signed?"*

Never has a simpler document been issued in history with consequences more far-reaching or more pregnant with hope." With these words. On September 30, 1938, the *New York Times* reported on the meeting between Hitler and Neville Chamberlain at Munich. "Prime Minister Wildly Cheered by Relieved Londoners," said the headline. . . .

Half a century later, it is easy to see the Munich Pact for what it really was. . . . The euphoria which today permeates Western public opinion over the prospective signing of an intermediate nuclear forces treaty this week by President Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachov is reminiscent of 1938. . . .

Against the background of what Winston Churchill once called "smooth-sounding platitudes," ant facts, desire for popularity, and electoral successes irrespective of the vital interests of the state, the condemnation of the proposed treaty by the French Defence Minister, André Giraud, as a "nuclear Munich" has hardly been noticed in the West. . . .

The truth is that the spectre of Munich has never left us. . . .

● *From a letter to President Reagan from Collège de France fellow Jean-Marie Benoist, West German diplomat Hans Huyn, and the director of the London-based Institute for European Defense and Strategic Studies, Gerald Frost, run in the Dec. 9 Wall Street Journal:*

Mr. President:

As longstanding admirers of your great personal contribution to the cause of freedom we wish to draw your attention, and that of the Senate, to the risks inherent in the agreement now signed to eliminate intermediate-range nuclear forces from Europe. . . . We believe that the accord will seriously and adversely change the balance of military and political forces within Europe in favor of the Soviet Union.

We are also fearful that unless NATO defenses are buttressed by a range of compensatory measures the agreement may set in train a course of events that will progressively undermine the fragile cohesion of the Western Alliance. . . .

. . . The cruise and Pershing II missiles serve a combination of functions that are essential to NATO strategy. . . . The missiles make a general contribution to deterrence through their ability to reach targets deep within the Soviet Union. . . . The missiles link the European pillar of the alliance to the American pillar. They provide a crucial element between the level of tactical missiles and the strategic level. Take away that vital rung in the escalatory ladder and you immediately throw into question the mutual transatlantic involvement and solidarity that have preserved the peace for 40 years. . . .

It should also be remembered that if the Soviets break the agreement—as they have violated earlier deals . . . it is unlikely that any American President will be able to put the missiles back. . . .

We regret that you have not followed the advice of European political leaders who urged that what was needed to preserve deterrence in Europe was . . . a balanced reduction

of INF forces. . . .

United States

● *A newspaper advertisement, paid for by the Schiller Institute for the "Ad Hoc Committee to Stop the INF Treaty," and inserted in several U.S. newspapers as well as the International Herald Tribune, was reprinted in full, in Spanish translation, as a front-page editorial in the Dec. 9 issue of Diario de las Americas of Miami. The newspaper is sold in every major Hispanic community in the United States, as well as on newstands throughout the Western Hemisphere. The editors' introduction said that the ad "was signed by 200 distinguished civic and military leaders of West Germany, England, France, Italy, Holland, Spain, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, Bolivia, and the U.S. . . . Considering it of interest to its readers, we reproduce below a translation of this ad."*

We the signators, direct an urgent call to the governments and parliaments of all NATO countries to prevent the realization of the Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) treaty. What is at stake is nothing less than the political freedom of Western civilization as a whole. We see the acute danger that the ability of the West to defend itself is being irreversibly negotiated away for the sake of short-term political expediences.

The removal of the intermediate range missiles in Western Europe, i.e., the Pershing 2 and 1A, would eliminate the capability of NATO to strike deep into Soviet territory within 13 minutes, and thus would remove a powerful deterrent to Soviet aggression. The military effect of this would be disastrous. Not only would it bring about the danger of an extremely rapid denuclearization of Western Europe, but it would leave the continent vulnerable to the new Russian mobile ICBM systems, the SS-24 and SS-25, and would leave West Germany totally defenseless against the SS-21, and the Russian strategic bomber fleet.

The denuclearization would bring into effect the overwhelming conventional superiority of the Warsaw Pact. If proponents of the proposed INF treaty speak about a subsequent arms reduction agreement in the conventional area, it must be noted that anything less than a 6-to-1 asymmetric conventional disarmament would bring about the irreversible defenselessness of Western Europe. Russia would quickly reach its long-term goal—to conquer the rest of Europe, without the need to fire a shot.

Apart from the militarily irreversible effects, the political consequences of the proposed INF treaty are already shaking the foundations of the Western alliance. Ever since the infamous Reykjavik summit one year ago, patriots of all Western nations have been horrified about the perspective of a new Yalta agreement between Moscow and Washington, which de facto threatens to sell out Western Europe. If West Germany were Finlandized, the rest of Western Europe would soon follow. Moscow would have reached what Lenin de-

finied 70 years ago as the stepping stone for the establishment of world hegemony. The combined industrial and labor power potential of the Warsaw Pact and Western Europe together would leave Moscow as the only superpower.

Gorbachov left no room for doubt about his intentions, when he delivered his speech on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution. Moscow delights in the financial collapse of the West and gloats about the "final breakdown crisis of capitalism." At the same time, Moscow gears up the communist parties of the West and the developing sector and directs them to take control of an escalation in irregular warfare, which has already included the murder of two policemen in West Germany, murdered with the use of firearms, in the context of what security officials described as a military-type operation. While leaders of the terrorist ecologist movement applauded the murder from Moscow, Gorbachov received and praised them.

If the West proceeds to disarm itself, while Moscow continues to build up increasing numbers of such Spetsnaz forces, then, a few years down the road, Moscow will be capable of taking Western Europe, with the help of radio frequency and other such weapons, based on "new physical principles," while the West plunges further and further into the pit of the depression. The West will have been defeated as a political system, and Western Judeo-Christian civilization will have gone under, in a way not so different from the Roman empire.

All of this can be stopped. An economic emergency mobilization of the West and a crash program for the Strategic Defense Initiative and Tactical Defense Initiative could quickly demonstrate the superiority of Western culture and civilization.

But in the meantime, Pearl Harbor Day must not become the day on which the West disarmed itself.

Prevent the realization of the INF treaty!

SILVER

SHORT SQUEEZE

● WHO? ● WHAT? ● WHY? ●

Not what you think! Daily limits soon. Exchange cannot stop this one because it is different. **Send \$5 to SIBBET for information. He is the one advisor who predicted the other two squeezes.**

SIBBET PUBLICATIONS
1091 E. WOODBURY RD., PASADENA, CA 91104

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____