

Lord Carrington: Use beam weapons as a bargaining chip in arms talks

by Scott Thompson

Lord Peter Carrington, the NATO secretary general and former business partner in Kissinger Associates, called at a press conference in Los Angeles on Oct. 26 for President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative to be relegated to the status of a bargaining chip in the arms talks with the Soviet Union that he and Henry Kissinger are demanding. Under the Carrington plan, the U.S. program to develop a beam-weapon defense capability would be sacrificed on the altar of a "New Yalta" division of the world into Western and Soviet oligarchical spheres of influence—an arrangement which, given the current military realities in Europe, would mean Soviet domination of the continent.

At the same time that the duplicitous Lord denied vehemently charges from *EIR* that Kissinger had called for "decoupling" the United States from Europe in his infamous March 5 article in *Time* magazine, Carrington applauded efforts now under way to revive the Western European Union, as an agency to turn NATO into a supranational political body to rule a One-World federalist empire.

Lord Carrington lied that President Reagan's proposal for a Strategic Defense Initiative using "exotic technologies" is nowhere near implementation. Said the NATO chief and former defense minister: "I think that's so very, very much in the future. I mean, nobody knows whether this is possible to do. What the United States is doing at present is a research program, which is going to last, well, some time." Contrary to Carrington's disclaimers, it was the widely respected British journal *The Aeroplane and Astronautics* which first reported back in 1961 that ballistic-missile defense through advanced beam technologies was not only feasible, but under intensive research in the Soviet Union.

Carrington and Kissinger, rejecting President Reagan's bid to negotiate with Moscow a new doctrine of "Mutually Assured Survival" (MAS), want to use the beam-weapons issue to bring the Soviets into the "New Yalta" arms talks. "I think the one area in which the Soviet Union is really quite worried is the Anti-Ballistic Missile and 'Star Wars' side. . . .," he said. "Now that would seem to me the opening . . . with which they can get off their hook. I mean, you start

talking about these sort of things, and then you go on from there."

Lord Carrington defended the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD), first publicly proclaimed by Henry Kissinger in his book *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy*, published by the New York Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) in 1957. "If you don't know whether somebody is going to be . . . mad enough . . . to use nuclear weapons in retaliation for aggression," said Carrington, "it's a very good reason not to have an aggression." The MAD doctrine was overthrown by President Reagan's strategic defense concept—and Carrington and Kissinger have been out to derail it ever since MAS became official U.S. policy in March 1983.

Western European Union

Carrington described how NATO would be transformed from a military organization for the defense of Western Europe, into a political instrument for control by the One-World federalists, as proposed after World War II by the evil Earl Bertrand Russell. Carrington stressed that as NATO secretary general, he would follow NATO's oligarchical "Founding Fathers" in "emphasizing the political aspects of NATO," not just its usefulness as a military confederation.

This means the destruction of the nation-states of Europe, the chief embodiment of republican principles of natural law. Kissinger, who would hesitate to speak so openly today about his supranational designs, laid out the plan most explicitly in his *The Troubled Partnership*, published in 1965 by the CFR. Calling for both the United States and Great Britain to disengage their strategic nuclear forces from support of their European allies, Kissinger said:

"The obstacle arises because there is no scheme which can reconcile these objectives perfectly so long as the Atlantic Alliance remains composed of sovereign states. . . . The long-term hope for German unity therefore resides in the unity of Europe. As nations lose their former significance, the fear of any one state will diminish. A united Western Europe moreover will be a powerful magnet for the countries

of Eastern Europe. If an all-embracing European structure ever comes to pass, the existing dividing lines may seem less crucial. . . . The most effective structure for Atlantic cooperation is a partnership between the United States and a united, supranational Europe."

Recent efforts to resurrect the Western European Union, which pre-dated the founding of NATO, are part of a renewed attempt in this direction. Lord Carrington confirmed this in his press conference, while continuing to deny profusely that he has any intention of "decoupling" Europe from the United States.

"Well, this is part of the Kissinger question, in many ways," he said. "If we could identify ourselves and have a more European identity, without decoupling. . . . The Western European Union is an organization which is part of the Brussels Treaty. . . . It really fell into disuse. . . . If you could have it as a forum in which the security of Europe were discussed. . . . you could have greater identity for European defense. . . . If the result is only to create a Club within a Club, to create suspicions within the United States, or to make the United States feel that the United States is no longer needed within NATO, that would be infinitely worse than any conceivable gain that could be gotten out of it."

Lord Carrington insisted repeatedly throughout the press conference that Kissinger had not called for "decoupling" in his *Time* magazine piece. When first asked about his former

business partner's scheme to pull U. S. troops out of NATO, Lord Carrington said: "Yes, my business partner, well, Henry was really trying to do something a bit different from what you're saying. I think he was just trying to get a debate going about a European identity through defense."

With this response and his profusions of undying loyalty to the United States, Carrington is playing the old British game of empire manipulation, described aptly by Sir George Catlin in his book, *Kissinger's Atlantic Charter*. Since World War II, Catlin shows, Great Britain thought that it could simultaneously resurrect the conditions that prevailed after the 1815 Congress of Vienna, in which (as Kissinger reports in *A*

agency of the Habsburg empire and Prince Metternich, while at the same time rebuilding an "English-speaking Commonwealth" or Anglo-American Empire. Within that latter "special relationship," Kissinger declared (in *The Troubled Partnership*), Great Britain "has tried hard to give the impression that American policy is strongly influenced, if not guided, by London."

Sir George was one of the "Founding Fathers" of NATO whom Carrington invokes, along with the Fabian Society's Walter Lippmann; heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne Otto von Habsburg; and the arch-enemy of France's Charles de Gaulle, Jean Monnet, who envisioned using the Western European Union and NATO as vehicles to create a suprana-

The WEU: vehicle for a European deal with Moscow

The work of the Western European Union (WEU) opened in Rome on Oct. 26 with French Foreign Minister Claude Cheysson conspicuously absent. Although he had been among the main instigators of the meeting, he preferred to show up late so that he could take part in celebrations sponsored by the Soviet embassy in Paris. Thus Cheysson set the tone for the Rome conference, making explicit the direction of this meeting—to cut Western Europe out of its alliance with the United States and deliver it prone to Soviet military and political hegemony.

The Western European Union was formed under the Brussels Treaty before NATO came into being. Today, the circles around Henry Kissinger and NATO Secretary-General Lord Carrington are trying to pump new life into it, as a forum for Europeans to talk about their security "independently" of the United States—a sly cover for decoupling from the Atlantic alliance. This is what Carrington means by boosting the "political" role of NATO and the WEU.

Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher of West Germany, during the final press conference of the Rome meeting, was asked by *EIR*'s correspondent whether President Reagan's proposal for Europe to collaborate with the United States in developing space-based antiballistic-missile beam weapons had been taken into consideration. Genscher responded in a fury, brandishing the microphone and screaming, "There has never been any American proposal for the common use of space. . . ." Coming from Genscher, the lie was especially brazen. During the recent meeting of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group in Stresa, Italy, with Genscher present, U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger had formulated a proposal for cooperation between the United States and Europe precisely for the development of space defense.

A dream world

The atmosphere that reigned among the participants, the foreign and defense ministers of Italy, France, Great Britain,

tional Europe, as opposed to de Gaulle's plan for a confederated "United States of Europe."

In *Kissinger's Atlantic Charter*, published in 1974, Catlin shows that when Sir Winston Churchill allied with this group and with Bertrand Russell's "World Federalist" movement after World War II, he pursued a policy of duplicity similar to Lord Carrington's present one. Churchill's postwar policy underwent a number of shifts, from his appeal for an Anglo-American alliance in Fulton, Missouri, to his overtures to the European Parliament. "The ambiguity between the Fulton position, which stressed the alignment, historically and in two wars, of Britain and North America, and Churchill's new Zurich 'Concert of Europe' position, continued—although an ambiguity it was thought undesirable to emphasize in those days."

As for Kissinger, in a May 10, 1982 speech before London's Royal Institute for International Affairs (Chatham House), he admitted that he had served as a lifetime agent for the British oligarchical plan, adding: "In my White House incarnation . . . I kept the British Foreign Office better informed and more closely engaged than I did the American State Department." This is the real substance of Kissinger's and Carrington's "decoupling" plans, which seek to submerge the alliance between the United States and Europe under a British mandate, while overseeing the demise of European "sovereign nations."

Misinterpreted?

Lord Carrington now claims that Kissinger was grossly misinterpreted in the *Time* magazine piece, published just days before Kissinger's appointment to the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. In that article, Kissinger demanded the withdrawal of half of the U.S. troops from Western Europe, among other decoupling measures. Carrington is right that Kissinger does not simply want to "pull U.S. troops out of Europe"; he wants to destroy Europe altogether, according to the outlines of the "New Yalta" scheme.

If Kissinger's earlier statements in *The Troubled Partnership* leave any doubt, or his repeated statements in *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy* on behalf of "limited nuclear warfare" in Europe and "a more flexible commitment" by the United States, his plan for an "Austrian solution" for Germany should clear this up. According to Kissinger, one goal of a more politicized NATO of the sort now recommended by Lord Carrington must be the neutralization and reunification of Germany. This is the heart of the "New Yalta" plan, and is identical to the proposals of West German Social Democrats like Egon Bahr who are seeking an accommodation with Moscow. Under current international strategic-military conditions, Germany will be reunified under Moscow's terms—or not at all.

Here is what Kissinger proposed: "A commission com-

West Germany, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg, was artificial and somnolent, as if the growing Soviet threat did not exist, as if reality were constituted only by computer printouts and the eggheads of supranational organizations like the Trilateral Commission and the Council on Foreign Relations. Italian Defense Minister Giovanni Spadolini, chatting with journalists, made it clear that the WEU is needed as a crucial element in the strategy of constructing a united Europe based on the idea of perennial détente.

The question is: Since in the case of real danger between East and West, Europe must turn to NATO—i.e., to the alliance with the United States—then what is the purpose of the WEU? Curiously, only the British delegation raised this obvious objection at the Rome conference, pointing out that all the functions that the WEU is supposed to take care of are already supplied by NATO.

Spadolini himself, who came up with the idea of reviving the WEU during a meeting with his French colleague Charles Hernu some months ago, explained that its aim is to promote European unification on a supranational model. With the procedure for at least two annual meetings of the WEU Council set up at the Rome get-together, there is now a plan for integrating the armed forces and military production of Eu-

ropean countries and for greater independence from the United States. The project closely echoes the project of Kissinger and the Trilateral Commission to detach Europe from the United States, in order to create various strategically "independent" areas—but, be it understood, under the control of Trilateral diplomacy.

The European foreign ministers' club, dominated by Genscher, Cheysson, and their Italian cohort Andreotti, is only too ready to sell out Western interests in the search for an accord with Moscow. Almost all of them felt the need to stress that the WEU is being revived not *against* the Atlantic alliance, but within the alliance. Even a *New York Times* journalist noticed that something was wrong, and asked Genscher if he did not think it possible to allow at least one U.S. observer in the WEU meeting. Genscher replied that to inform their U.S. ally, normal diplomatic channels would be used!

Outside, the "peace" movement staged an anti-WEU demo, but fewer than a thousand people showed up—a sign that the Italian Communist Party did not support it. Nor did it need to. In the present strategic situation, the WEU's policy is tantamount to voluntarily bowing down before Holy Mother Russia.

posed of European neutrals, Sweden, Switzerland, Austria, and perhaps Finland, would monitor the free elections and demilitarization provisions. Those provisions demand that: 'The Federal Republic would renounce access to the ownership of nuclear weapons.'" In exchange, Moscow would force Poland to return German "territories east of the Oder-Niese line, which had been German for centuries," to East Germany. Fifteen years later, after this "free election," according to Kissinger's plan outlined in *The Troubled Partnership*, final consideration would be given to reunification for a neutral, nuclear-free German state.

Asked whether he would support such a reunification plan as part of his greater emphasis upon a "political NATO," Lord Carrington said: "I don't think there is any country in Europe which wouldn't welcome that, but I think you have to be very realistic about the chances of it happening. The fact is that the present leaders of the Soviet Union, and Dr. [Armand] Hammer I think can bear me out on this, still have a very lively recollection of what happened in 1942. I do not think within my lifetime that they will be prepared to see the reunification of Germany. I think that that would be one of the cardinal objectives of Soviet policy."

Although Lord Carrington appears thus to have dropped this "Austrian solution" for turning a reunified Germany into a neutral, nuclear-free zone from his own scheme, he remains committed to making NATO the vehicle for negotiating a "New Yalta" settlement. "The Founding Fathers of NATO," he said, "always thought that the other object of NATO was to create a stable relationship between East and West." Later, he said, "there are other things than arms talks, which we could all take part in. I made a speech two or three years ago that wasn't terribly popular along these lines. What I was saying was, and I still believe it to be true, is that we have far too little contact with the Soviet Union." As for Eastern Europe, Lord Carrington says that the bloc is crumbling from internal dissension, but the Soviets must be the final arbiter: "All of us would very much like to see those Eastern countries coming back in the West; after all, they used to be there: Romania, Bulgaria, Poland, Latvia . . . and there are ways and means of gradually bringing them closer to us by economic contacts and cultural visits. . . . But there again, you've got to be wholly realistic. . . . You can see that there is control over these countries." Lord Carrington's proposal that a more political NATO might act as a "magnet" for Eastern European countries is merely a foot-in-the-door for resurrecting the NATO "Founding Fathers'" vision of a "supranational Europe."

Last fall, *EIR* warned that Lord Carrington's appointment as NATO secretary-general would mean an intensified crisis for NATO. His efforts to emphasize "the political aspect of NATO," while calling for expanded Soviet-NATO "dialogue" employing the Strategic Defense Initiative as a mere bargaining chip, are the seeds for a potentially global "New Yalta" disaster.

Ibero-America sets up multinational anti-drug army

by Valerie Rush

On Nov. 6, the governments of Ibero-America began meetings to forge a unified military command for war against the narco-terrorist network which threatens to engulf the continent. The justice ministers of Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, Peru, Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay, and others are meeting in Bogotá to put together a multinational "anti-drug army" to conduct a continent-wide offensive against the parasitical multi-billion-dollar drug trade.

For several nations, this regional anti-drug command will come not a moment too soon. In particular, the Siles Zuazo government of Bolivia is just managing to keep its nose above water in its battle with the drug mafia, awaiting the backup of precisely such a regional defense mechanism.

A step toward Ibero-American integration

A key proposal being considered at the meeting will be constituting this multinational force with army troops from all the participating countries, which would then be given the freedom to cross national borders in hot pursuit of drug traffickers seeking refuge in the continent's vast jungle regions. The meeting, according to reports published in the Colombian press, is also attempting to put together a common legal code covering crimes related to the production, consumption, and traffic in illegal narcotics, a code premised on the notion first elaborated at the Aug. 10 Ibero-American Summit in Quito, which declared drug trafficking a "crime against humanity."

Toward this end, Colombian President Belisario Betancur met on Oct. 23 with his full cabinet to consider new and dramatic anti-crime legislation designed to serve as a model for anti-drug enforcement regionwide. Among some of the proposals of Colombia's new Anti-Narcotics Law are:

- strict state control over imports of all chemicals, such as acetone, chloroform, ether, sulfuric and hydrochloric acid, ammonia, and so forth, used in the processing of illegal