

Chirac-Thatcher entente fights the 'zero-option'

by Mark Burdman

Following three hours of discussions with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in London April 26, French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac declared that a "grand convergence" existed between Paris and London on how to respond to U.S.-Soviet negotiations toward reaching a "zero-option" disarmament deal in Europe. The bottom line, Chirac insisted, was that both countries agreed that the "denuclearization" of Europe, particularly the removal of American missiles from Europe, which is part of the proposed deal, would be "unacceptable."

Reporting from London April 28, the French daily *Le Monde* asserted that "British observers share the appreciation of M. Chirac: French and British initiatives are now very close." The paper noted that this was tantamount to a "Franco-British entente."

These statements might surprise those familiar with the long history of controversy pitting Britain against France on a wide variety of issues. The disastrous "zero option" has accomplished what nothing else could accomplish; animosities between the two countries have now virtually melted, and shared fear that a superpower INF (intermediate-range nuclear forces) deal would leave Europe defenseless in the face of the overwhelming Soviet strategic threat, has opened up highly interesting possibilities of strategic cooperation.

This entente has three immediate effects.

First, it provides a counterweight in Europe, to the massive pressure being exerted on Europe by President Reagan's White House and George Shultz's State Department, for the Allies to accept the Euromissiles deal.

Second, the vehemence of French-British opposition to

the deal, has surprised the Soviets, who were already reportedly caught off-guard, by the extent of opposition to the zero option expressed by Mrs. Thatcher, during her March 28-April 1 visit to the Soviet Union. The Soviets had also been shocked by the dismantling by the French government of a Soviet spy ring, and the expulsion of a top-level Soviet espionage coordinator in early April. The Soviets had originally thought to have secured their flanks in Europe among conservative governments. Now they are biting the rugs with rage, reflected in a wild April 27 Tass News Agency attack on the French government.

Third, the Franco-British entente could strengthen the position of zero-option opponents in West Germany, where the political-strategic situation is extremely delicate. Under conditions of both superpowers frantically pushing the missiles deal, it is almost impossible for a government in Bonn to openly oppose the zero-option, even if leading influentials are fully aware that such a deal would leave West Germany totally strategically exposed.

Chirac announced he will be going to Bonn May 3. In the days leading up to that visit, certain political signs in Bonn are noteworthy, even if much of what people think cannot be said in public. One such sign was the West German cabinet refusal, April 27, to formally back the enthusiastic endorsement of the zero-option proposed by West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher. Following this, Chancellor Kohl told the Sat 1 television network April 29, that the zero-option could only be reached, if "our safety is increased, and not decreased, after an agreement is signed." He declared "deep disappointment that the Soviets have not signaled any

commitment to reduce their conventional weapons superiority," and said he would "not decide on the zero-option before consultation with all our allies."

One possible sign that Moscow may be feeling some rage about developments in Bonn, is the unexplained and sudden announcement by the Soviets that the anticipated visit to the U.S.S.R. of ultra-détente West German President Richard von Weizsäcker, had been "indefinitely postponed." Other factors may come into play in this decision, but the least that can be said about it, is that it is not a routine, or typical, diplomatic development.

Alfred Dregger, the head of the parliamentary group of the Christian Democratic Union in the Bundestag and a senior CDU foreign policy spokesman, expressed his categorical rejection of the zero option, in an April 27 declaration. Dregger warned that the negotiations for a zero-option deal are leading toward "a nuclear singling-out of Germany. . . . The safety of Germany would be endangered to the utmost by missiles below the range of 500 kilometers. . . . As German politicians, we cannot give our support to this kind of policy." Dregger cited NATO chief General Bernard Rogers and former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's warnings that the zero options would remove the foundation of the flexible response of NATO. Rogers himself, in statements appearing in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* daily April 30, stressed that certain decisions taken in Bonn on the zero solutions, could have a "determining effect" on the future of NATO. Especially as "the future of Europe as a whole is at stake," Rogers exclaimed, why should the schedule of negotiations decided on in Washington "set the tone" for Bonn?

CDU-CSU arms-control spokesman Jürgen Tödenhöfer has sent confidential letters to his colleagues on the foreign affairs and defense committees of the Bundestag, calling on them to deny support to any "isolated zero-option," insisting thereby that arms control talks must link all categories of weaponry, including chemical weapons and conventional forces. It is said that Tödenhöfer is organizing a parliamentary boycott against the zero-option agreement.

One sure barometer that there is resistance in conservative West German circles to the zero-option, is the political disposition of West Germany's left-wing social-democratic appeasers. Suddenly, the extraordinary situation has been created, where the biggest defenders of Ronald Reagan's missiles deal are Social Democratic Party leaders Hans-Joachim Vogel and Egon Bahr, who usually express a manichean's rage against anything Reagan does. These, and others of the same species, have been attacking the West German government's hesitancy on the zero-option, and have even gone so far as to call on President Reagan to apply pressure on Chancellor Kohl, to get him to go along with the new "arms control" deals! This is something they would never do, if the situation inside the Bonn coalition were completely sewn up by the zero-option mafias.

Denuclearization of Europe 'unacceptable'

Speaking in London after meeting Mrs. Thatcher, Chirac declared: "As long as [Soviet] superiority in the domain of chemical and conventional weapons will remain as it is, there will be no other choice except to maintain nuclear deterrence in Europe, and that includes an American deterrence." Chirac declared that a "denuclearization" in Europe, particularly involving the removal of American nuclear missiles from Europe, would be "unacceptable." Security in Europe, he insisted, depends on an equilibrium that "demands the maintenance of a sufficient capacity for nuclear deterrence."

About six weeks before Chirac's trip to London, British Defense Minister George Younger had flown to Paris for meetings with his French counterpart André Giraud. Under discussion were various new forms of French-British nuclear-strategic cooperation, including joint production of long-range nuclear weapons technologies, coordination of nuclear technologies more broadly, and exchange of information on strategic affairs.

General Rogers: 'Europe's future as a whole is at stake'

Speaking to the West German daily *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* from his headquarters in Casteau on April 29, General Rogers stressed that the decisions taken by the West German government in Bonn, on the zero-option, will have "a determining effect on the future strategy of NATO." He criticized the haste in the current discussion in Bonn: "But why should this all be decided in three weeks? Why not give it a half-year? Why should the predetermined [Washington] schedule set the tone, when Europe's future as a whole is at stake?"

Rogers warned of the Soviets' seducing offers on arms-control, and urged the U.S. population, to keep one thing especially in mind: "The American people must recognize that our eastern borders lie at the German-German and at the German-Czech borders, and that we have to be closely allied with Western Europe. Otherwise, this alliance will fall apart, and we make ourselves guilty of having helped the Soviets to achieve their strategic goals." The article appeared under the headline, "'America's eastern border runs through Germany'/General Rogers complains about the zero solutions."

After Chirac had left London, London's International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) warned of the dangers posed by the zero-option to Europe; such warnings are an unusual turnabout for the IISS, which usually supports arms-control deals. In its "Strategic Survey 1985-1986," the IISS charged that "the superpowers pursued a chimera at Reykjavik: dreams and visions of a world without nuclear weapons, and also, for President Reagan, a world of perfect defenses. A sense of unreality pervaded the negotiations."

Tass is not amused

The day after Chirac's departure, the Soviet news agency Tass, under the title, "Atlantic solidarity, obstacle to disarmament," and under the byline, Vladimir Bogachev, issued a violent denunciation of Chirac and Giraud. The nastiness and cynicism of the tone of the article contrasts with the oozing sweetness the Russians are reserving for U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz.

"Certain members of the French government," in particular Prime Minister Chirac and Defense Minister Giraud, Tass-Bogachev charged, have "taken the leadership of the offensive of conservative circles of NATO against disarmament in Europe." The French position in respect to recent Soviet proposals is "much harder than that of other NATO capitals, . . . according to Western observers themselves."

The attack went on: "The Soviet government had declared itself ready, to not take into account the British and French *'forces de frappe'* in the global equilibrium of forces in a potential accord on Euromissiles. This constituted an important concession, to the extent that French military planners calculate publicly the strength of their nuclear forces by the number of Soviet cities that they can destroy.

"But the Parisian high functionaries, who have the short view, fear that it would be more difficult to France to justify the existence of its nuclear forces when the Soviets will have withdrawn its theatre missiles from Europe."

Tass-Bogachev attacked Chirac for "having declared Sunday [in Britain] that the withdrawal from Europe of short-range missiles would be dangerous," and Giraud, for having spoken of a "nuclear Munich," in respect to Soviet disarmament offers.

The piece further attacked France for reinforcing its program of nuclear armament: "Paris is extending its zone of responsibility in Europe, and is replacing its Pluton missiles, of a range of 120 kilometers, with Hades missiles, capable of reaching targets in Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic. The number of nuclear warheads with which the French missiles based on land and on sea are equipped, will reach 600 units in 1992. As an American journalist said, if the French *force de frappe* is a joke, it is less and less funny."

Not coincidentally, the attacks were issued while a French Foreign Ministry official was in Moscow, preparing the scheduled visit of Chirac to the U.S.S.R.

Are homosexuals a

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

This commentary was written on April 26, 1987:

The British weekend press may be fairly described as somewhat dominated by echoes of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's disclosure earlier this past week, that former MI-6 spymaster Sir Maurice Oldfield had been an active homosexual, apparently since his days at Lady Manner's public school. One issue prominently debated, is whether the fact that a person is a lesbian, catamite, or sodomite makes her or him intrinsically too great a security risk to be entrusted with state secrets?

According to accounts, Oldfield, who died in 1981, had been on the MI-6 roster, initially occupied with battering Jews in Palestine, since 1946, and its spymaster from 1973 until he was exposed and discharged for having concealed his homosexual life, in 1980. He is described by *The Observer* as spy-novelist John LeCarré's model for the odious, fictional character of "Smiley."

The controversy appears to center around what should be viewed as merely a significant, but essentially tertiary aspect of the problem, that homosexuals are so much more readily subject to potential blackmail by Soviet or other nasty agencies, that to employ homosexuals for sensitive posts is far too great a risk to be tolerated. The contrary view, expressed by one of the weekend's columnists, is that homosexuals are blackmailable because of society's intolerant attitude toward them, and might not be intrinsically such risks otherwise.

Admittedly, that is the conventional view of the issue, as we might remember from those ironic days the homosexual ring of Sen. Joe McCarthy's Roy M. Cohn was exposing State Department homosexuals as "security risks." Homosexuals are persons, and thus entitled to the civil liberties of persons generally. Consequently, they have the right to seek