

# The Military-Strategic Debate In Western Europe

## SPECIAL REPORT

The inevitable hardening of the Soviet Union's political and economic policies respecting the U.S. Administration of President Carter has put Western Europe's military thinkers into a situation where they must make certain decisions they have preferred to postpone until now. By now there is general agreement in such layers on the bankruptcy and dangerousness of the poker-game bluffing associated by the "Schlesinger Doctrine;" no one, however, has yet been able to act upon the full strategic implications for NATO of the Warsaw Pact's threat of full-scale, worldwide thermonuclear war. Their day-to-day preoccupations still revolve around "substrategic" questions such as "cruise missiles," instead of NATO's central strategic question, the West's bankrupt monetary system.

In spite of this inadequacy, the "cruise missile" question has defined an absolute boundary line between the utopian scheming of Carter and Defense Secretary Harold Brown, and everyone else. At a just concluded meeting of NATO's political advisory body, the Western European Union, a call was issued to completely exclude the cruise missile from negotiations for SALT III, since it would only hinder a likely agreement. The same sentiment was echoed by the West German daily *Süddeutsche Zeitung* June 24, which advised that "Carter must think about whether it is good for further SALT talks to include these difficulties."

Hans Rühle, an advisor to the head of the West German parliamentary defense committee, while not totally excluding the use of the "cruise" as a "bargaining chip," warned in the weekly *Deutsche Zeitung* that any attempt to actually use these glorified V-2s would cause the Soviet Union "to consider a first strike indispensable, and immediately launch a thermonuclear war here."

All that Carter's few remaining supporters can throw against this is a wild-eyed hysteria. Exemplary is an editorial in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* June 24 by military writer Adalbert Weinstein. According to him, the cruise will introduce "a new military age," since they will be "the determining factor" in all future military policy. They are also "challenging the myth of the invincibility of the Red Army." Weinstein then rationalizes that since it would be disastrous if actually used, "we are therefore counting on the cruise missile as a weapon of non-war."

The theses of former U.S. Air Force Intelligence head Gen. George Keegan have come under attack from these same hold-outs. Both the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* and the weekly *Die Zeit* (linked to the London Institute for Strategic Studies) have printed detailed

"refutations" of the famous *Aviation Week* article on Soviet electron beams and related Soviet military-technological capabilities. *Die Zeit* goes so far as to say that both Keegan and the editor of *Aviation Week* have "swallowed" a rumor purposely put into circulation by "secret services" in order to "steer attention away from other military-technological themes." Although *Die Zeit* does not directly identify what these "other themes" are, such "Wunderwaffen" as the cruise missiles are the obvious implication.

### *Forward or In-Depth Defense?*

Beyond this dispute, however, confusion still reigns among those opposed to Carter's course of sure thermonuclear destruction. This is best illustrated by a problematic assertion by Christian Potyka, military correspondent for the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* and associated with nuclear physicist and think-tanker Carl Friedrich von Weizsäcker. Uneasy about returning to a full-scale arms race, Potyka wrote that "What makes a return to this course of more and more arms so difficult, is also the East's macabre military philosophy, which clings to the mistaken theory that one can *conduct* a nuclear war, and under certain circumstances even *win* it. This is documented over and over in the simple-minded writings of the East." Hence, Potyka admits that the Soviet Union has a "war-winning strategy" and will not be swayed from it by either Carter or agents of influence within the Soviet leadership such as Georgii Arbatov; but at the same time he will not acknowledge this "simple-minded" approach to be the only possible sound military policy for the Soviet Union. He still leaves a glimmer of hope that maybe the "mistaken" Soviets will see "reason" and conform to NATO's scenarios.

This problem characterizes the proposals made by all of Weizsäcker's collaborators, who include Gen. Emil Spannocchi, retired head of the Austrian Alpine Land Army, French Major Guy Brossolet, and Weizsäcker's closest collaborator Horst Afheldt. These three strategists all propose variations of a model whereby NATO's current "forward defense" posture would be replaced with "in-depth" stationing of many small, mobile, technological sophisticated "commandos." Such teams, they claim, would gradually wear down the advancing Soviet tank squadrons.

Given the reality of what Soviet strategy is, such proposals are patently absurd. They hysterically deny the fact that any Warsaw Pact attack will begin with a full-scale thermonuclear strike against the major population centers of both the United States and Western Europe, to be followed up with biological and chemical salvos in Europe in order to clear the way for the advancing Warsaw Pact forces. The simple reality is that *there is no conceivable successful military defense of the European theater under present circumstances.* The only sane course for the major "front line" country, West

Germany, is therefore to take every possible measure to reduce destruction of the country's industry and population in the event of war, while taking the necessary international financial initiatives in order to deal with the danger of war at its monetarist source.

#### *Call for Arms Race*

The absurdity of the Weizsäcker group's proposals has laid them open to attacks from all sides, causing even more confusion around the military-strategic debate. From the utopian side, the above-mentioned Adalbert Weinstein has used this vulnerability to attack Major Brossellet's theories. "We can not use the depths of our (West Germany's) territory," Weinstein argues, "since we can not plan upon giving up any territory at all. No citizen of the Federal Republic would accept a defense conception which envisions the clearing out of entire regions as the recipe for victory" — as if there were any chance for victory!

On the other side, in a recent issue of *Europäische Wehrkunde* Weizsäcker's theories were criticized by Erhard Rosenkrankz, a collaborator with Gen. Baudissen of the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg.

Rosenkrankz argues in favor of maintaining the discredited "flexible response" strategy, since Weizsäcker's proposals for "in-depth" defense would be no less "precarious." (The latter assertion is indeed true.) He then proceeds to say that "flexible response" must be subsumed under the higher priority of political negotiations with the Soviet Union, which could achieve "a reduction of tensions, increased economic ties and agreements on military methods, possibly also in order to keep options open." Agreements as the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR) talks in Vienna have a special significance in this, he asserts.

In form, this argument is similar to Henry Kissinger's call for a new arms race. The maintenance of "flexible response," can only lead to a new and more intensive rearmament, which would only postpone the danger of full-scale war for a few years, rather than prevent war. But conversely, if the "Baudissen School" were serious about the priority of economic cooperation, it would have to admit the absurdity of "flexible response" in an environment no longer dictated by the monetarist economic and utopian military policies of Carter, David Rockefeller and the International Monetary Fund.

— John Sigerson

## Grunwick Strike, Test For Government's Industrial Strategy

---

### BRITAIN

---

Developments around the ten-month old strike at the Grunwick film processing plant in North London have exposed the fundamental differences between the Callaghan government's industrial regeneration strategy, and Conservative Opposition leader Margaret Thatcher's Friedmanite policy of "economic growth" through austerity and union-busting.

The strike was called in support of the right to unionization; both ultra-right and ultra-left agents have tried to use it to provoke a full-fledged "class war," in order to derail the government's continued efforts to force a broad trade union-industrial coalition for domestic industrial growth. The provocations have apparently failed in the face of strong counter-pressure by the trade unions and the Callaghan government itself.

#### *Callaghan Attempts Early Reconciliation for Industrial Strategy*

Under pressure from his own party and trade unions to reaffirm the government's commitment to industrial growth as a basic part of its economic strategy, Callaghan has taken personal leadership of a series of two conferences to be held with trade unionists, industrialists and government officials this summer. This

is an attempt to push the government's outlined growth strategy into action. In the first of these meetings, June 22, Callaghan outlined a basic 10 year strategy which would use revenues from North Sea oil to boost industrial investment in key sectors such as machine tools, engineering, and high technology goods.

Thatcher's calls to send in the police against the strikers have only betrayed the implications of her no-growth economic strategy. While calling for doubling of company profits to ensure economic "expansion," Thatcher has made it understood that her government would back only "reasonable" trade unionists who accept that funds for industrial investment could only come out of continued collapse in working class living standards — the basis of the Chilean and Brazilian "economic miracles."

An editorial in the June 22 *Times* of London makes Thatcher's outlook even clearer: "The industrial revolution and the railway age provided the technological impetus for the nineteenth century. The internal combustion engine and the higher technological revolution, combined with military expenditure and more lately the exploration of space, such an impetus during this century. It is not clear what is to take their place." Maintaining that the world economy will not grow, the *Times* calls for a return to "free collective bargaining" by which the trade unions can fight out among themselves who will continue to get wage increases as the economy shrinks.