

“parties” at Rambouillet have decided anything. “It is simply prudent military planning,” a ministry spokesman said.

What is the Rapid Reaction Corps? *EIR* will take up this issue again, but for now, let us stress that the whole Kosova operation—which is already under way—is under the command of the ARRC commander, British Lt. Gen. Sir Michael Jackson. General Jackson will have a French general as his second-in-command. The British and French will supply most of the troops and, for the first time in such “peacekeeping” operations, the United States will make a limited contribution in men and will accept deployment of U.S. troops under a foreign ground commander.

The ARRC is an international general staff under total British control. Starting with the Kosova operation, France will be integrated into the ARRC command, and, given that Paris is not part of the integrated NATO chain of command to which the ARRC—at least formally—belongs, the French Defense Ministry has devised a liaison mission. That means, in the words of the ministry, “a soft and pragmatic reinsertion” of France into the NATO military command. The ministry stressed, in the worst tradition of the Entente Cordiale, that the preparation of the “peace force” has been carried out in “total concert with the United Kingdom.” France has already been given the power to “oversee the maritime traffic in the Adriatic.”

The ARRC was activated on Oct. 2, 1992, and became operational at the beginning of 1995. It was part of the restructuring of NATO after the fall of the Berlin Wall. It was established in Germany, but it has been a British operation from the beginning. After 1989, a broader discussion took place on NATO, as it existed during the Cold War, was still necessary, especially the large British and French military presence in Germany. NATO’s new “strategic concept” was soon justified because of the explosion of Yugoslavia, thanks to Milosevic.

NATO British representative Sir John Weston stated in December 1992 that “the work of defining NATO’s future contribution to international peace and stability is unfinished. The terrible bloodshed in former Yugoslavia is a forceful reminder.” Sir John also predicted the “risks to international stability” that made necessary the new “strategic concept” and the creation of the ARRC: 1) ethnic and territorial disputes in Central and Eastern Europe, and economic and political instability; 2) proliferation of ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction; and 3) the threat of conventional, chemical, and nuclear forces left by the disintegration of the Soviet Union. He “foresaw”: “Above all, the U.K. will lead the ACE Rapid Reaction Corps. A very significant proportion of the British Army will be assigned to it. . . . This is a vital part of our future contribution to the defense of Europe. . . . It is an excellent example of how NATO’s military structures are being adapted. . . . The Corps exemplifies the increasing prominence of highly mobile, multinational forces. They will be central to the future integrated military structure.”

---

## Wehrkunde Conference

---

# China, Russia, India challenge NATO insanity

by Rainer Apel

The fact that the end of the century also marks the end of a whole era, was illustrated by the 35th Munich Conference on Security Policy, which took place under the theme, “Global Security on the Threshold to the Next Millennium,” on Feb. 5-7. The annual “Wehrkunde” gathering of several hundred leading military officers, defense experts, and politicians from NATO member and other Western countries, which for the last few years has also seen representatives from Russia and eastern Europe, featured an entirely new aspect: For the first time ever, senior government representatives of China and India were invited to present their views.

By contrast with the constructive views of China and India, the performance of the Western attendees illustrated the fact that the elites of the West have lost the ability to contribute something conceptually useful to the world. The ruling Western elites have grown decadent, tending to view the rest of the world only in terms of “threats,” and calling those nations “rogues” that do not want to adopt the rules of a collapsing monetarist system, or who have gotten in the way of Western policymakers for other reasons. This rotten elitist tendency has found one of its worst representatives in U.S. Secretary of Defense William Cohen, whose speech at the conference on Feb. 6 made that all too evident.

### Cohen lashes out against ‘rogue nations’

Cohen’s central message to the audience was, that NATO must arm itself against the threats coming from “rogue nations.” He said that when the 34th conference gathered last year, “the eyes of the world were focussed on Iraq, as Saddam Hussein sought to thwart the UN inspectors with a pattern of obstruction and obfuscation—a pattern that ultimately prompted our sustained strikes, which, with the help of our British friends and coalition partners in the region, diminished Iraq’s ability to deliver weapons of mass destruction and to threaten its neighbors.”

But Saddam Hussein’s Iraq is only one among those “rogues” that give Cohen bad dreams: “Only weeks after we gathered last, Serbian forces swept into Kosova, unleashing a torrent of terror and prompting preparations for NATO air strikes, strikes that remain an option, today.” And, there are others that Cohen dislikes: “Since we gathered last, nuclear

explosions in India and Pakistan sent shockwaves of concern reverberating around the globe. Terrorists slaughtered hundreds and injured thousands—most of them African and many of them Muslim—near U.S. embassies in Africa, and they planned and attempted many more attacks, prompting our targeted action in self-defense. North Korea stunned the world by firing a long-range Taepo Dong 1 missile over Japan and into the Pacific. We ignore this present at our peril.”

Then, on the agenda of the upcoming NATO summit in Washington, D.C., on its 50th anniversary, Cohen, who referenced Winston Churchill’s infamous “Iron Curtain” speech in Fulton, Missouri in 1946, said:

“Our first over-arching challenge of building a new NATO is therefore to adjust and transform the Alliance to meet new challenges.

“The Book of Proverbs tells us that ‘where there is no vision, the people perish.’ In order to transform its defense capabilities, NATO must embrace a ‘common operational vision’ that includes four ‘core capabilities.’

“We must be mobile enough to project forces as rapidly as possible. We must effectively engage by delivering the right response, whether it be combat or humanitarian support, when and where it is needed. We must increase our sustainability by supporting our forces with more tailored and efficient logistic systems. Finally, we must enhance the survivability of our forces by protecting them from *terrorist, chemical, biological, and electronic attacks*.

“At the same time, among the best methods for protecting ourselves from those who would unleash weapons of mass destruction against us—be they nuclear, chemical, or biological—is by reserving the right to *respond to such attacks with any means at our disposal*.

“This year I can report that the United States has matched our words with deeds. President Clinton’s budget proposal to Congress makes available \$112 billion in additional defense resources over the next six years, our largest sustained increase in defense spending in 15 years. . . . This infusion of funds will allow us to equip our forces with the next generation of ships, aircraft, and weapons that they will need to carry out equally *revolutionary operational concepts that will change the way we fight in the future*.

“Our budget not only reflects the world as it is, but as it might become. It continues funding to develop and deploy air and missile defenses designed to protect U.S. forces overseas, as well as our friends and allies. Our budget also contains substantial new funding for our National Missile Defense (NMD) program, designed to *protect the American homeland against the emerging strategic ballistic missile threat from rogue nations*” (emphasis added).

The speech resembled the approach U.S. Vice President Al Gore chose at the APEC conference in Kuala Lumpur last November, when Gore lashed out against his host, Malaysia’s Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad, who was sitting

close by. And, in Munich, Cohen’s remarks provoked a strong response by those attacked, as well: The response by the Russians, Chinese, and Indians, who felt attacked by Cohen, although he chose only to name India in his speech, came after an interlude of several provocative questions to him by Western members of the audience.

Cohen went on to state that, as the international debate about Iraq had shown, nothing would have been done against Saddam Hussein, had the Americans and “our British friends”—a phrase Cohen used repeatedly—not dismissed the dispute with the other standing members of the UN Security Council, notably Russia and China, and gone for the strikes on Iraq.

### **The Russians reply**

The provocation to the Russians and the Chinese was put so bluntly, they simply had to respond. Cohen and his supporters were grilled by persistent questions, particularly from the Russians—among them, Deputy Foreign Minister Yevgeni Gusev and Deputy Chief of General Staff Col.-Gen. Leonid Ivashov.

Ivashov came first, with a whole list of questions about the real nature of Cohen’s “new agenda”: Why a revision of the ABM Treaty, which is seen as a provocation by Russia; why the U.S. defense budget needed an increase by \$112 billion, and against whom was the increase directed; whether Cohen would define the NATO of the 21st century as a mere defense alliance, as a component of some kind of broader collective security system, or as something else; why Cohen wants to provoke a new arms race in missile forces. Ivashov later asked where the kind of NATO that Cohen envisages would define the ultimate boundaries of its “area of responsibility,” whether it would be “the Persian Gulf, the Indian Ocean, or the Urals.”

Deputy Foreign Minister Gusev also asked Cohen to define the “area of NATO responsibility,” saying that if what the Russians fear was implied in what Cohen wants, with his new agenda, “Then I am shuddering at the prospect of the world we are creating, in the 21st century.”

Cohen and some of his supporters in the audience chose not to answer these questions directly, but the way they insisted on proclaiming an undebatable “sovereignty of decision” for the Anglo-Americans, while at the same time insisting that Russia and others lay out their views, before their sovereignty and their role at the United Nations could expect to be respected, delivered an unmistakable message to the “rogues.”

### **The Chinese and Indian responses**

Also the Chinese, led by Me Zhaorong, of the Beijing Institute of the Chinese People for Foreign Affairs, who delivered his conference speech the day after Cohen, posed similar questions. He began with a personal greeting to the conference by Chinese Prime Minister Zhu Rongji, and said that the

kind of military alliances that are being created, with American assistance, and the planned revision of the ABM Treaty, do not fit with the concept of a 21st century that many hope will be a century of peace and cooperation.

Lu Qiutian, the Chinese Ambassador to Germany, asked the Russians to elaborate on the "identity of Russia also being a nation that extends to Asia, being a Eurasian nation," if they are concerned about what NATO plans for the European end of the continent, under the new Cohen agenda.

Baresh Mishra, national security advisor to India's Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee, explained in his speech why India chose not to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and rather to develop its own, national nuclear strike capability: not because it wanted to act as a "rogue" that did not respect international law, but because it felt threatened by nuclear weapons that some of the neighboring states possessed in the late 1960s, when the NPT and India's signature were discussed, and because other nuclear powers refused to give India guarantees for protection.

The Russians, Chinese, and Indians demonstrated, each in their own way, where the limit, or as the Russians put it, the "red line" of the world design of the Cohen cabal was: namely, at the sovereign borders of these nations. Furthermore, that sovereignty also applies to economics, to the role that a nation wants to define for its economic contribution to the world.

Me Zhaorong, in his speech, emphasized that point:

"The development and peace in the Asian Pacific region is an important subject of this conference. It is also an issue of common concern for countries and people in the Asian Pacific region and the international community. I would like to share with you some perspectives and possibilities on this subject.

"The stability and prosperity of East Asia and the Asian Pacific region at large are significant contributions to peace, stability, and development in the whole world.

"Let us look at the issue of development. While globalization has brought favorable conditions for speeding up development, it also exposed countries in the Asian Pacific region to various risks. The Asian financial crisis is a hard present from globalization. It not only shocked the economy of this region, particularly that of many developing countries, but also led to political unrest and social crisis in some countries. How to safeguard a nation's economic security in the process of globalization has become the most serious subject for countries in this region.

"The top priority of this moment is to tighten *supervision and control of the flow of short-term capital*. That is what concerns the safeguarding of economic security of the East Asian countries and the economic stability and development of the Asian-Pacific region.

"As a Permanent Member of the UN Security Council and the largest developing country in the Asian Pacific region, China views and deals with major issues related to global

and Asian Pacific peace and development with a high sense of responsibility.

"Despite immense economic pressure and the catastrophic floods, China took the overall interests into consideration and stayed committed not to devalue the RMB. China has also provided more than US\$4 billion of financial assistance in various forms to crisis-hit East Asian countries. China in good time formulated the policy of stimulating domestic demand. Our GDP growth reached 7.8% in 1998. That is nothing short of a remarkable achievement. Hong Kong of China has also maintained economic stability in a challenging environment. At present, China is continuing to implement a positive fiscal policy and has adopted a series of measures to deepen reform and further open up. It might be said that China's biggest contribution to the development of East Asia lies in its continuous work on political stability, economic development, and social progress."

### **'Eurasian Development'**

India's Baresh Mishra even went a step further, by directly addressing the term "Eurasian development" in his speech: "The world we are contemplating today is qualitatively different from even 10 years back. . . . The geography of the world has also changed, with the emergence of a united Germany and the collapse of the U.S.S.R. All this has created altogether new arrangements, particularly in the Eurasian land-mass. The effects of these changes are playing themselves out and it is up to us to ensure that these processes evolve in directions that answer the collective needs of a shrinking global community. Geo-strategists who are thinking in terms of either a clash of civilizations or a new bipolarity are all missing the point. The new world will and should be both multipolar and accommodating. Only then will the eventual arrangement be stable and peaceful. India can contribute greatly to the stability of the eastern end of the Eurasian land-mass and at the same time to the cooperative arrangements in the Asia Pacific region. As the largest democracy in the world, one of the more dynamic economies in the world and the second-most populous nation in Asia, we can play a stabilizing role in the global arena."

China and India speak for those who have a positive, future-oriented worldview, nations that are developing, approaching the rest of the world with an offer for cooperation. What more evidence is required, than this contrast with the Cohen cabal, to show that development and cooperation are not on the agenda of those that, at the end of this millennium, are trying to push NATO and the West to "the threshold of insanity in the next millennium"? The message from China, from India, and also from Russia, is that if the Western elites choose to go insane, they cannot expect the Eastern elites to go with them. May some among the Western side of the Munich audience take that message home, as an incentive to re-think the policies of the West in military-strategic and economic terms.