

## Post-INF confab maps pull-out from Europe

by Nicholas F. Benton

Three U.S. congressmen agreed that a first priority of the next U.S. administration will be to convene a special meeting of NATO leaders to hammer out a new strategic policy for the alliance, based on the new reality of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Force (INF) treaty and a prospective major U.S. troop withdrawal from Western Europe.

Sen. William V. Roth (R-Del.), Rep. Lee Hamilton (D-Ind.) and Rep. Dennis Hertel (R-Mich.) were agreed on this perspective for the crucial "first 100 days" of the new administration in their remarks to a Hudson Institute Conference on the Future of the U.S. Military Commitment to Europe's Defense held in Washington, D.C. June 2-3.

All three congressmen warned the participants at the conference of the "growing impatience" in the general population concerning the "unfair burden" the U.S. is now carrying in NATO. "Given that there will be no increase in the U.S. defense budget for the next decade, we are going to have to bite the hard bullet," Representative Hertel said.

The congressmen made their threats without commenting on the effect a U.S. troop withdrawal would have on the vital strategic interests of the United States, or even whether or not a troop withdrawal would be the most efficient way to save money.

Ironically, they appeared to make their demagogic statements only moments after former Pentagon analyst Dr. Richard Kugler showed how a U.S. troop withdrawal is a poor way to save defense dollars. Kugler noted that it costs the United States \$2 billion annually to keep its troops in Europe, and the cost of moving them back to the United States and establishing facilities for them here will be as high as the cost of keeping them in Europe, at least for the first five years.

"With five and a half divisions in Europe, compared to 16 active and 11 reserve divisions, plus 15 individual ground brigades, in the U.S. and Pacific now, it would make far more sense to cut manpower from the U.S. than from Europe if your objective is to save money," he said. "The only way to cut costs by taking troops out of Europe would be to completely demobilize them, while the cost to Europe of making up for the loss of the U.S. troops would be an additional \$10 billion a year."

Dr. Pierre Lellouche, the deputy director of the French Institute of International Relations, added that the "demographics are going the wrong way" for Europe to assume a

greater burden for manpower in the alliance, since West Germany, which already has mandatory conscription, will lose 100,000 soldiers simply because of declining population growth by the end of the 1990s.

"There are only ideological reasons for the removal of U.S. troops from Europe," Lellouche said, "Because it makes no sense from any rational point of view."

He noted the "irony" of the new NATO policy proposed in the recent report of the President's Commission on Integrated Long-Term Strategy. "It seems to operate on the fallacy that the U.S. vital interests are threatened in the Third World and not Europe. In reality, it is exactly the reverse," he said. He pointed out that the disengagement of the U.S. from Europe "has already begun" with the ratification of the INF treaty, and said that if NATO "does not proceed with great care" to ensure the effective modernization of the nuclear weapons that remain in its arsenal "then we will lose nuclear weapons in Europe altogether."

### Rogers hits 'neutralization'

Gen. Bernard Rogers, the former Supreme Commander of NATO, told the conference that if this occurs, then the Soviets will succeed in their primary objective, the neutralization of Western Europe, through intimidation, thereby "achieving the fruits of victory without the pains of war." Rogers appeared on a panel that included British Prof. Laurence W. Martin of the University of Newcastle, and Dr. Hans-Georg Wiëck, the head of West German Federal Intelligence Service (Bundesnachrichtendienst).

General Rogers warned that even the current levels of troops in Europe are inadequate to maintain the basis for NATO's war deterrence policy. He said that policy is based on the ability of conventional forces to fend off a Soviet attack for up to three weeks before NATO is faced with the decision to use nuclear weapons. Now, he said, it is estimated the troops there could hold for about two weeks.

Martin stressed that it is the credibility of NATO's conventional forces which makes its nuclear deterrent credible, and vice versa. "The Soviets recognize this is the key to NATO, and are playing on that fact to weaken it," he said.

*EIR* asked the panel to comment on the Soviets' "new order of battle" for the invasion of Western Europe, devised by Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov. It begins with the use of futuristic technologies, such as radiofrequency and microwave technologies and hand-held nuclear devices, by Soviet special forces (*spetznaz*) operatives already in Western Europe to sabotage and paralyze over 250 NATO installations before the first wave of Soviet forces cross the border.

General Rogers said, "There is the threat you describe." In comments to *EIR* after the panel, Wiëck played down the threat, saying, "We know who these agents are, and would be able to stop them before they could carry out their sabotage," while Rogers remarked to *EIR*, "I don't think we know who these people are, at all. That's our big problem."