

surveillance capability has enabled the United States to receive copies of all orders transmitted to the Argentine high command and hand them over to the British.

This "modest" aid for Great Britain's colonialist warfare is already costing the United States \$1 million a day. By itself, Great Britain, which has been bankrupted by its anti-industrial economic policies, cannot finance a war in South America.

## From the NATO communiqué

*What follows is Paragraph 8 of the May 7 communiqué of the Defense Ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.*

The ministers stressed their common interest in the security, stability and sovereign independence of the countries outside of the NATO area, and at the same time stressed . . . military operations in areas outside of NATO as having the potential to threaten the vital interests of members of the alliance. Members of the alliance are able to contribute either directly or indirectly to the effect of deterring aggression and to respond to requests by nations outside the NATO area to help in resisting threats to their security or independence.

In this respect, they reaffirm that consultations on any out-of-area deployments . . . such as emerging from the U.S. concept of Rapid Deployment Forces are intended to identify common objectives taking full account of the political situation in the areas concerned, and of the effect on alliance security and defense capability as well as the national interests of countries. . . .

The ministers recognize that the policies which nations adopt in this field are a matter of national decision. The ministers confirmed that the effect of such a deployment on alliance security and defense capabilities should be examined collectively in the appropriate NATO bodies.

In this respect, NATO ministers stressed that contingency activities must take account of requirements which may arise from such consultations. They also agreed that in the light of NATO consultations, members of the alliance may be required to facilitate out-of-area deployments in support of the vital interests of all. The military committee is studying the implications for the alliance of the United States' strategic conception for Southwest Asia. Report will be made to Defense Ministers at the December NATO meeting.



## Churchill: 'No danger in attacking mainland'

*Winston Churchill III, a Conservative Member of Parliament and a leader of the Tory ultra-right, offered a resolution in the House of Commons on May 6, supported by half the Conservative M.P.s, to bomb the Argentine mainland. Below are excerpts from a May 6 EIR interview with Mr. Churchill.*

**EIR:** From your standpoint, where will the next steps lead in this conflict in the Argentine theatre?

**Churchill:** We are still anxious for a negotiated settlement. We'd be happy to accept a ceasefire once there was evidence that the Argentines were willing to comply with U.N. Resolution 502 and remove their invading forces from the Falklands. We must liberate our countrymen and kick the invaders out of the Falklands, if negotiations fail.

**EIR:** How does the sinking of the *Sheffield* affect your country's approach to the conflict?

**Churchill:** The sinking of the *Sheffield* and the *Belgrano* compresses the time-scale in this situation, whether it be for negotiations or for military action.

**EIR:** Are you thinking that your country must now attack the Argentine mainland directly?

**Churchill:** There is a strong case for the United States taking positive action to redress the air imbalance. We could do this in two ways. One would be to strike the bases where the aircraft is based that is responsible for damaging the *Sheffield*. Or, we could double our Harrier deployment on the scene.

**EIR:** We have heard that your country is appealing for the United States to supply B-52s for use in the conflict, whether flown by British pilots or by Americans.

**Churchill:** The B-52s are not nearly as capable as our Vulcan bombers. We don't need B-52s! What you are

saying is absurd! Can you imagine American crews bombing a Latin American country? Anyway, I prefer our pilots any time. Regularly, when there are organized competitions between our RAF and the American pilots, we win the competition. So why should we want American pilots, when our people are superior?

**EIR:** But hitting the air bases in Argentina would minimally meet the Argentinians' heavy air defense.

**Churchill:** What the Argentines can put up is peanuts compared to what the Vulcan has been equipped to do vis-à-vis penetrating the much denser Soviet air defenses. I know for an absolute fact that there is no military problem if the government seeks to hit the bases on the mainland. The Soviets have 12,000 air-to-air missiles for their defense, and the Vulcan is prepared to penetrate these, so, relatively speaking, as I said, what the Argentinians have is peanuts.

**EIR:** Some of our sources tell us that any attempt to hit the Argentine mainland would be the first shot in World War III.

**Churchill:** You have access to extremely silly sources! Why would the Soviets come in? They have no defense treaty with Argentina. We are fully entitled to take such defensive measures as are appropriate under the United Nations charter.

**EIR:** What is your evaluation of how the United States is acting, from the standpoint of what you expect in the future from the United States?

**Churchill:** The United States has acted according to all Britain's expectations. Mr. Haig did exactly what was necessary in seeking to have a mediated settlement. I just regret that he couldn't bring those fascist thugs to heel in time to prevent further conflict.

## Latin Americans protest Washington's policy

*Since Alexander Haig and Anglophiles in the U.S. Senate manipulated the United States onto the side of Britain in the Anglo-Argentine conflict, Latin American leaders have condemned the U.S. action as the rupture of inter-American relations and voiced their solidarity with Argentina. Here is a sampling of recent statements by Latin American leaders.*

### Venezuela

- Foreign Relations Minister José Zambrano Velasco accused the United States of being "an accomplice of colonial violence" in the Americas and warned that

the United States siding with Britain "will affect the future of inter-American relations [because] it contravenes the letter and the spirit of the TIAR [1947 Rio Treaty] resolution."

- President of Congress Godofredo González blamed "Washington for the explosion of armed conflict in the South Atlantic. The battles were precipitated by the United States . . . The world asks itself what effectiveness could TIAR have if the United States has repeatedly violated its precepts."

- Venezuela's chiefs of the navy and army issued a joint declaration stating: "We only await a presidential order to put our professional capabilities at the disposition of our brother republic of Argentina."

- Venezuela's OAS Ambassador, Hilarion Cardozo: "The United States has destroyed its foreign policy in Latin America, which it has built up over many years, by helping England in this crisis. . . . It is a little premature to talk of reorganizing the OAS, but my government is thinking of a purely Latin American organization for the future."

### Peru

- Peruvian Minister of War Luis Cisneros pledged that "The Peruvian army is ready to intervene in support of Argentina, if circumstances require it. . . . The position taken by the United States is a very serious problem because it does away with the doctrine promulgated by President Monroe's America for the Americans."

- Foreign Minister Javier Arias Stella: "A country like the United States, which has been propounding the thesis of the Americas for the Americans, now appears to be propounding the thesis of the Americas for Great Britain. Mr. Haig's statement was anti-historical. . . ."

### Costa Rica

- President Rodrigo Carazo charged that the behavior of the United States, "constitutes a rupture of continental solidarity . . . a severe blow to the inter-American system which puts in danger the very future of the Organization of American States."

### Uruguay

- President Gen. Gregorio Alvarez issued an official declaration stating, "Uruguay condemns Great Britain's armed action in the South Atlantic and views the position taken by the United States in the Anglo-Argentine conflict as damaging Latin American unity."

### Mexico

- Pro-British Mexican Foreign Minister Jorge Cas-teñeda was forced by pro-Argentine public opinion to state that the U.S. decision in favor of Britain "has aggravated the situation still further."