

The growing crisis in Western security

by Criton Zoakos, Editor-in-Chief

No previous strategic crisis in the entire postwar era has been as close to a Sarajevo-style global blowout as the period before us from now to September-October. The high command of the Western alliance is essentially outmaneuvered and outclassed by their Soviet counterparts as a result of strategic blunders committed during the 1960s period, when the basic commitments for a "postindustrial society" future were laid down in the West.

In its current form, the crisis is centered around the issue of stationing intermediate missiles on West European soil capable of reaching Soviet industrial sites and ICBM installations in the Volga to Urals region. If these missiles are deployed, it is going to be the first time ever that Soviet strategic targets can be reached by nuclear weapons stationed elsewhere than on United States soil.

The Soviet leadership, having shifted to a purely military-strategic mode of functioning since the election of François Mitterrand as president of France, has sent one single, persistent and unyielding message to all interested quarters in the West: "Stationing of Pershing II missiles on West European soil is absolutely unacceptable. If attempted, it will cause dramatic 'qualitative changes' in the world situation."

Among the leading circles in the West, no such unified line is coming out. The Reagan administration seems to be virtually exclusively interested in the speedy deployment of the Euromissiles, before even considering anything else, such as qualitative improvement of America's strategic forces or arms control negotiations. Significantly, those American leaders who are pushing the

Euromissile issue the hardest, such as Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, are also the strongest proponents of suicidal fiscal and monetary policies which are the single greatest obstacle to a sensible and credible military recovery of the United States. The current policy of high interest rates and budget cuts is doing more to sabotage the industrial and technological base of any future credible military buildup effort than any conceivable enemy agent ever could.

The entirety of President Reagan's economic officialdom from Federal Reserve Chairman Volcker, to Treasury Secretary Regan, to OMB Director Stockman et al., is uniformly and unanimously incompetent to identify the connection between economic policy and military capability. As a result, the United States military is, on the whole, in worse shape under President Reagan than it was under Jimmy Carter. It is not only the economic officials but also the national security-related officials of the administration who are totally incapable of drawing the interconnection between fiscal and monetary policies, economic health and military competence. Thus, Secretaries Weinberger, Haig, and National Security Adviser Richard V. Allen are attempting to shape immediate short-term policy accommodating to the assumption that the United States and the West as a whole will continue into a near economic depression for the indefinite future. Thus, such officials tend, in varying degrees, to gravitate toward the same policy: deploy the Euromissiles in Europe; go for the fast fix.

Information filtering out of the Soviet Union, on the other hand, indicates that the Soviets intend to be very



Lord Carrington

nasty and ominous in this matter. In the eyes of the Kremlin, the current situation is a "Cuban Missile Crisis in reverse." They shall not allow their strategic assets to become exposed to American nuclear missiles stationed on non-American soil any more than President Kennedy allowed Cuban-based Soviet missiles to threaten American targets in 1962.

The deadline for the actual stationing of these Pershing missiles is the end of 1982. As the two nuclear superpowers are set on their respective intransigent policies, an eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation is building as each week passes. A fantastic array of kaleidoscopic reactions and political sideshows has unfolded. The basic question is: what happens to Western Europe while this "Cuban Missile Crisis" inexorably builds up? The *Wall Street Journal* of July 15 published a nightmare scenario written by Irving Kristol of the American Enterprise Institute. The item was extensively discussed within a closed circle of policy-makers before it was published. Its basic argument is as follows:

The underlying problem of the Atlantic Alliance during the post-World War II period was that it relied on the concept of *strategic deterrence* and thus neglected to build a competent military establishment which can plan and fight wars rather than occupy its time with fantasizing that its nuclear deterrent prevents the outbreak of war. Why is this the West's underlying problem? Look at the situation of Western Europe, Kristol argues: its defense is dependent upon the American nuclear umbrella, the American deterrent. But the Soviet SS-20s, the intermediate-range nuclear missiles, are threatening Eu-

rope at this time. In return, the United States argues that Europe in order to locally respond to the Soviet SS-20 threat, must station the intermediate Pershing II missiles. This American argument carries with it the inevitable implication that if Western Europe is attacked by SS-20s, then Western Europe cannot rely on the legendary American nuclear umbrella; it must rely on its own Pershing II and related regional nuclear deployments. Or, as the typical Western European politician asks himself, "Why do I need Pershing II if I am already covered by the American nuclear umbrella? Is there anything wrong with the American nuclear umbrella?"

If there is nothing wrong with it, then the demand to station the Euromissiles has no military substance. If, however, there is something wrong with it, then who is going to defend Western Europe against whatever force the Soviets might decide to apply to prevent the stationing of the Euromissiles, or if stationed, their subsequent removal? One way or another, Europe ends up a radioactive field of rubble, whether or not the United States and the Soviet Union decide to subsequently annihilate each other as well.

This whole problem has arisen because the West has relied on the concept of deterrence and thus failed to develop a military establishment capable of carrying out real-life war-fighting.

The unstated conclusion of the *Wall Street Journal* article is that the Western Alliance, NATO, must seek a way of constructing a "military establishment" of this sort. Readers of this magazine are well acquainted with our own views of how one ought to go about creating such a thing. Basically, in order to be competent in war-fighting, nations must first have a well-grounded notion of how to "win the peace," i.e., a competent perspective of scientific, technological, and industrial development. In the context of the currently imminent worldwide financial collapse, this means return to the gold standard, gold-backed monetization of the huge U.S. debt in the Eurodollar markets, lowering of interest rates, and massive availability of cheap credits for industrial and agricultural expansion. For related political and economic reasons, such mobilization requires the nationalization of the Federal Reserve, the abandonment of the IMF and its replacement with a system of economic development, and trade agreements among sovereign nations which have subordinated their central banks to their sovereign-nation policies, as opposed to the policies of the IMF, the World Bank, and the Bank for International Settlements of Basel, Switzerland.

The people in charge of policy-making in the security establishment of the West, however, are axiomatically opposed to such policies, because so far, they are committed to the preservation of the world financial and monetary system associated with the IMF, the BIS, and so forth. Their question thus remains: how do we build a

“military establishment” in the West on short order?

Two distinct types of conflicting answers are being advanced at this time. One is the “American cowboy” answer associated with Weinberger, Richard Allen, Irving Kristol, Fritz Kraemer and even some “well-meaning” fools around the Reagan White House: create a political combination in the Atlantic Alliance which shall ensure the early deployment of the Pershings in Europe, and this “political combination” will eventually, somehow, become the basis of our required “military establishment.”

The second, rival view is now being advanced by circles associated with British Foreign Secretary Lord

Thatcher government: no advanced weapons

The following is excerpted from an article by Philip Webster in the Times of London that appeared July 9.

Mr. Nott [British Secretary of State for Defense] described as nonsense a contention in a letter to the *Times* on Monday by Air Vice-Marshal Stewart Menaul that the Trident missile system could be obsolete before it was introduced in the early 1990s.

The air vice-marshal wrote that the most important aspect of recent intelligence information about Soviet activities was their huge research and development efforts in space-based chemical lasers and charged particle-beam weapons. . . .

Mr. Nott said there was no grounds for believing that a system would be developed in the next decade which could successfully knock out a ballistic missile system.

Mr. Nott asked whether it was really suggested that the United States would be considering going into the Trident II ballistic missile system and the MX missile system if it believed a laser and particle-beam weapons system that could knock out ballistic missiles was about to be invented.

“Is it suggested that the Soviet Union would be going into a whole range of new ballistic missile systems if they believed they could get lasers up into space which could knock out ballistic missiles? We know they cannot.”

Carrington, backed by the British Royal Household and the British military leadership: abandon monetarist economic policies, go for a rapid fascist reorganization of all the economies of the OECD nations, and within the context of a fascist economy, undertake a dramatic high-technology-oriented military buildup effort. To succeed in this undertaking, the West must gain time. Therefore, go through the motions of a so-called “New Yalta” negotiation with the Soviet Union. Thus, the current period is not one of military confrontation with the Soviets; it is a time for stalling the Soviets while the West moves for imposition of fascism by emergency decree and “crisis management.”

We reprint below the argument of the Carrington faction as stated by Air Vice-Marshal S. W. B. Menaul. The British high command has identified the answer to the West Europeans’ question: why is the American nuclear umbrella unreliable to the point of requiring Pershing deployment in Europe in order to defend Europe? The answer is: the American nuclear umbrella is either already technologically outflanked by Soviet developments in high-energy weapons systems, or is about to be outflanked. According to the British high command, the old-style arms race is finished forever. We now have before us a technology race which must be fought under conditions of world economic collapse. Hence, the British opt for fascism by emergency decree and crisis management.

The extent to which the British leadership is committed to this perspective must not be underestimated. The extent to which the American confrontationist “cowboys” are contemptuous of this British approach must also not be underestimated. The current outbreak of massive rioting throughout Great Britain is one of the major elements by which this battle is being fought. A number of intelligence and covert operations networks have converged to make the riots happen, including Israeli intelligence networks and probably KGB-associated networks as well as Anglo-American networks sympathetic to Richard Allen’s views to the effect that Lord Carrington represents the apex of “British degeneracy.” On top of this, however, Lord Carrington and the Royal Household stand smiling, and amuse themselves with the thought that these riots have unleashed a political process which best facilitates what they have next in mind: the elimination of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher (and her defense minister), and the emergence of a military-run dictatorship with power transferred to Prince Charles, backed up by the military leadership for which Air Marshal Menaul speaks. It is a scenario well spoken of in the halls of Buckingham Palace. The suspect security arrangements for the upcoming Ottawa summit and the renewed assault against the CIA (upon Lord Carrington’s arrival in the United States) fit the Prince Charles scenario all too well.