

The Anglo-American strategic miscalculation

by Criton Zoakos, Editor-in-Chief

The war in the south Atlantic, part of a larger strategy by Great Britain to redirect NATO military forces in "out-of-area deployments" to crush developing world nations, is rapidly driving the already calamitous world situation to a point where senior personalities of international political life see a "world catastrophe." In the past week, the potential for a superpower confrontation and for the use of nuclear weapons has become the subject of public concern as I write on May 28.

It is a confirmed fact that Britain's naval task force in the South Atlantic is equipped with nuclear weapons and that its commander, Admiral Woodward, has received authorization to employ them in case of "dire need." It is also confirmed that some seven Soviet submarines are prowling the area of combat with an as yet undetermined assignment. Numerous responsible international leaders, including former Venezuelan President Carlos Andrés Pérez, have warned repeatedly that the danger of a nuclear superpower confrontation continues to mount every day that Britain pushes forward its colonial cause.

In the past few days, Argentinian leaders, including that nation's Defense and Foreign Ministers, stated clearly that, given the massive U.S. military support for Britain, Argentina will not exclude the possibility in the future of seeking Soviet military aid, if Argentina's survival is put to question by the war. The Soviet Union, so far, has limited itself to strident denunciations of the

British colonial war and the support it receives from the United States.

The extent to which the nuclear confrontation threat becomes a likelihood, is defined by the following overall strategic factors.

RDF in the Gulf

In the course of the next week or so, there is the strong likelihood that large military forces under NATO jurisdiction may be deployed in the Persian Gulf under the rubric of Rapid Deployment Force policies. The collapse of the Iraqi military effort in the Iran-Iraq war, orchestrated by Britain with United States and Israeli participation, is threatening to ruin every Arab state in the area. U.S. Secretary of State Haig, in a Chicago speech on May 26, made it clear that the State Department will not attempt to avert such a destruction of the existing regimes in the region but rather will try to use their expected destruction for the purpose of introducing the Rapid Deployment Force in what he expects to become a classic NATO "out-of-area" deployment. The stupidity and recklessness of the scheme bears the imprimatur of Her Majesty's government, the usual supplier of policy to the foolish Mr. Haig.

As a senior Egyptian military source emphasized after the collapse of Iraq's military effort, "nobody knows what the Soviet Union will do." The fact of the

matter is that the U.S.S.R. currently has the military capability, based on its verified current deployments, of putting some 22 divisions into any spot of the Gulf they desire. By comparison, the RDF is as effective as a USO troupe commanded by Bob Hope. Iraq's defeat has created a situation in which the Soviets have the option of taking over the Middle East. Whether they shall take this option or not is not known at this time. Further, it cannot be predicted what general course of action the Soviets will select. *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche, the Democratic Party leader, upon receiving the news of Khorramshar's fall to the Iranian army, commented: "The entire region is now going into a rapid qualitative transformation, a phase change, in which no expert can predict the consequences. All we can say at this time is that the Soviets have been given the option of picking off the Middle East. But how the Soviet Union will move cannot be known at this time by anyone. Over the next 30 days the Soviets themselves will be deciding on how to take advantage of their new opportunities."

North versus South

The process occurring in the Gulf area is being repeated throughout the globe: British or British-assisted forces have put into effect a grand strategy of using military force to destabilize and ruin all governments and nations of the developing sector. The war of the Malvinas was used by Britain as a level to oblige NATO adopt its current "out-of-area deployment" posture. When the NATO Defense and Foreign Ministers unanimously approved this fateful resolution, they took the step of proclaiming a war of the "North" against the "South." Most influential governments of the "South" are now proceeding from the fact that NATO poses a military threat to their existence.

This North-South conflict has in fact now become the central issue in politics and diplomacy. Broadly, the non-aligned, developing sector will be wide open to Soviet influence, in pursuit of military safety from NATO's "out-of-area deployments." What is being done to Argentina could be done to any one of them, is the generally accepted sentiment. The ways in which the Soviet Union will move to provide backup militarily will to a large extent determine whether the world will face a thermonuclear nightmare, or whether it will fall under Soviet hegemony, or whether it will allow its "Southern" portion to be exterminated by British-led RDF-style "out-of-area deployments."

Her Majesty's miscalculation

The conduct of British strategists in the case of the Malvinas War identifies conclusively the source of the kind of "strategic miscalculation" which may well lead to thermonuclear war. According to the British scena-

rio, Argentina should have been a "pushover." It was supposed to have collapsed early on, thus demonstrating to reluctant NATO allies the efficacy of "out-of-area deployments," and giving a terrible lesson to other, presumably awed, nations of the "South."

Instead, Argentina has put forward a gallant and inspiring resistance. This resistance has now caused a strategic earthquake—virtually all of Latin America is moving in the direction of a break with the United States. Latin America is about to become the most influential sector of the non-aligned movement. Nations of the "South" are demonstrating a resiliency far greater than British planners had assumed. NATO's threat to launch out-of-area deployments, rather than destroying the "South," is now functioning as a stimulus, driving these nations toward the objective of strengthening their defenses and reinforcing their societies. They have to do so in order to survive the British-inspired NATO onslaught. To be able to do so, they shall need, at least temporarily, outside assistance. Given present realities, such assistance would only be forthcoming from the Soviet bloc.

This is the gist of Her Majesty's strategic miscalculation: NATO'S military adventures, insufficient to destroy the better-developed nations of the "South," are enough of a threat to compel these nations to seek the means of their self-defense in the Soviet bloc. The whole strategy, instead of producing broken, servile client-states, is now about to produce resurgent, mobilized nations which, in a world of "East" and "West," view the British-dominated "West" as their destroyer and pronounce themselves non-aligned.

Thus the West has now two options open before it. Either it removes Her Majesty from the driver's seat and restores the United States to the status of a super-power committed to the rapid economic, industrial, and technological development of the "South," or it escalates, under the leadership of Her Majesty, its military provocations to the only level at which the West's military power is credible: nuclear confrontation with the Soviet bloc.

The pace of developments in the Gulf and in Latin America indicate that in the course of the coming month these issues will be on their way to being resolved. No one should entertain the delusion that a British military victory over Argentina in the Malvinas would in any way abate the crisis. As the Bank of England well knows, the minute the British forces capture the islands, some \$250 billion worth of Latin American debt will be declared in default against British banks, with far-reaching strategic consequences. If the Bank of England knows what is good for it, it should issue explicit orders to Admiral Woodward not to dare win his assigned military task.