

Georgetown conference plots decoupling of NATO

by Kathleen Klenetsky

U.S. strategic policy, dealt a possibly fatal body blow by the Senate's recent approval of a freeze on military spending, is coming under attack on another key front: its commitment to defend Western Europe. On May 15-17, Georgetown's Center for Strategic and International Studies, held a conference in Washington to advance the plot to "decouple" the United States and Europe—whereby Moscow hopes to so weaken and divide NATO, that its scheduled 1987-88 military offensive against the West will triumph.

The meeting took place just days after President Reagan had visited Europe for the express purpose of reassuring the allies that the United States was committed to their defense. But that didn't stop the "conservative" CSIS, nor the former and present members of the Reagan administration who attended, from conspiring to sabotage the President's stated policy toward Europe.

Billed as a conference on "The Future of East-West Relations," the CSIS gathering featured such proponents of decoupling as former Reagan United Nations Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, Zbigniew Brzezinski, the Polish aristocrat who served as Jimmy Carter's National Security Adviser, and Henry Kissinger. Also participating were State Department representatives.

CSIS is an influential think tank which has placed its people in key Reagan administration positions (e.g., former CSIS Director David Abshire is now ambassador to NATO), and has been in the forefront of the "decoupling" scenario. In 1984, it published a study which claimed that the principal security threat to the United States had shifted from the Western European theater to Latin America, and called for redeployment of U.S. troops from Europe to the Americas. The *Strategic Requirements for the Year 2000* report was commissioned by the U.S. Army, and has greatly influenced administration policy.

CSIS also functions as home base for Henry Kissinger,

who attempted to popularize the notion of a U.S. disengagement from Europe in an essay in *Time* magazine in March 1984. Kissinger's article was seized upon by another CSIS associate, Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.), to justify the amendment he introduced last June mandating a 50% reduction in U.S. troop strength in West Germany.

Kissinger was speaking for his masters in both Moscow and the Western oligarchy, who have been conspiring to clinch a "New Yalta" deal, which will divide the world into "Eastern" and "Western" feudalistic empires. Under this deal—which the Kremlin has no intentions of honoring—the Western elites have agreed to allow Western Europe to become an economic satrapy of the Soviet Union, giving the Russian imperialists complete control over Europe's industrial base.

'Fixation' on Europe?

The decoupling scenario calls for the Soviet Union and its assets in the State Department to create a classic diversion in Central America and Mexico. The turmoil there would be used to lure Reagan into a deeper military engagement in the area. Once enmired, Vietnam-style, Reagan would be forced to redeploy troops from Europe to Central America. And once the American military presence had been sufficiently reduced, the Soviet Union could rule Europe without firing a shot.

Soviet leader Yuri Andropov had hinted at such a scenario in April 1983, when he told the West German magazine *Der Spiegel*, that the Soviets would give the United States a free hand in Nicaragua, in exchange for U.S. recognition that the Soviet sphere of influence included Western Europe and South Asia.

This was precisely the line taken by the CSIS conference. The tenor of the meeting was established by Kirkpatrick, who opened the conference by castigating America's "fixa-

tion on Europe." Kirkpatrick argued that "the most significant problem for the U.S. lies outside of NATO in the Third World, which is the area of greatest Soviet expansion. . . . I fear that we believe our security concerns were defined forever in the immediate postwar period."

One of the most fervent proponents of enhanced U.S. intervention in Central America, Kirkpatrick is touring the country raising money for the Nicaraguan "contras."

The practical implementation of this "strategic reorientation," was laid out by Brzezinski, who declared that America's priority should be to encourage a "neutralized Europe," on the model of the 1955 Treaty of Vienna, which established Austrian "neutrality." "There is too much rigidity in the U.S. attitude toward its troop commitment to Europe," Brzezinski charged. "I believe there is a disproportionate degree of U.S. effort focused on Europe. . . . We must consider changes in the U.S.-European relationship which today we might be inclined to rule out."

Citing Kissinger's *Time* article, Brzezinski called for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe, even while admitting that this "will not be followed by a Soviet troop withdrawal" from Eastern Europe! But don't let that bother you, Brzezinski assured his audience. A U.S. pullout will intensify political pressures on Moscow, from both Western and Eastern Europe, to allow the "reunification" and "neutralization" of the continent. Reiterating what was a constant theme of the conference, Brzezinski claimed that the real Soviet threat to the United States is coming from Central America.

Brzezinski's credentials as a strategic thinker are less than impressive: During the Carter era, he urged that the United States back Islamic fundamentalist insurgencies in the Mideast, on the grounds that this would infect the Muslim minorities in the Soviet Union. The result of that gambit was the Khomeini takeover of Iran, the shrinking of U.S. power in the Mideast, and the strengthening of the Soviets' own "Islamic card."

Kissinger: Seek accommodation

The final speech of the conference was left, fittingly, to Kissinger, who intoned solemnly that the time has come for the United States to seek an accommodation with Moscow; because of internal political and economic problems, now is one of the few times in which the Soviet leadership is inclined to reach an arms-control

of reaching a breakthrough on Reagan. The administration, he said—not Moscow—"will have to overcome many philosophical preconceptions."

The major preconception that Reagan must get rid of, Kissinger hinted, was his commitment to the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Although Kissinger went to great lengths to portray himself as a supporter of strategic defense—he claimed that he has entertained "grave misgivings" about Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) ever since he cooked it up in the 1960s, and he attacked the arms control

community, of which he is a charter member, for "insisting that we hold our populations hostage to nuclear annihilation"—he nevertheless made it quite clear he wanted an arms-control treaty based on "linking offensive and defensive weapons systems."

That is a jesuitical formula for strangling the SDI by trading off its development for an agreement by the Soviets to reduce their offensive arsenal.

Kissinger's attempt to pawn himself off as an ardent advocate of the SDI, went somewhat awry when *EIR*'s correspondent asked him whether, given his own claim to support the program, combined with SDI director Lt. Gen. James Abrahamson's revelations that the Soviets are ahead in both ground-based lasers and particle-beam technology, he didn't think that the United States should abrogate the ABM Treaty and embark on a crash program to develop the SDI.

Kissinger turned ashen, fumbled with his papers, then answered, with quaking hands and trembling voice, "We must have defensive systems. But I don't think the Soviets are ahead of us in ABM technology. They don't act like they are. If they were, then they wouldn't be trying to put a ban on strategic defense. The Soviets have never tried to ban a system that they were ahead in!"

Decoupling in high gear

The timing of the CSIS conference coincides with a gear-up of the decoupling scenario. Developments over the last weeks, since Reagan decided to embargo Nicaragua, strongly indicate that the scenario is rapidly becoming operational. One sign of this was CIA director William Casey's May 17 speech to the San Antonio World Business Council, in which he claimed that Nicaragua will become a "Latin American Lebanon." Casey stated that the Sandinistas have taken "33 out of the 46 steps" intelligence analysts say are on the Soviet Union's blueprint for seizing and consolidating power there. He added that the Soviets and Cubans want Nicaragua for a "beachhead" and a "launching pad" to subvert the rest of Central America and Mexico, and that Nicaragua's Marxist government is a threat to the Panama Canal.

Moreover, *EIR* has learned that the President has been presented with an "intelligence analysis" showing that the Sandinistas are planning a massive offensive against rebel forces, to begin circa June 15.

Proponents of the "New Yalta" deal see in the recent deep cuts which Congress has imposed on defense spending, a golden opportunity for forcing the United States to make sharp cuts in its military commitment to Europe. As various speakers at the meeting gleefully pointed out, the fact that the United States has itself now fallen below the 3% military spending guidelines mandated for NATO members, will make it much more difficult to convince Europe to maintain a sufficiently high level of military spending to ensure NATO's viability. Should President Reagan fall into the Central American trap, which the CSIS meeting helped to bait, that will surely seal Europe's fate.