Schmidt NATO Policy: Almost Good Enough

The following statement was released May 15, 1977 by U.S. Labor Party National Chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.:

Although German Federal Republic Chancellor Helmut Schmidt's May 12 London NATO policy is absolutely correct in opposition to Rockefeller-Haig-Giscard policies, it contains one potentially fatal weak flank which Schmidt's opponents will unquestionably attempt to exploit to the fullest advantage.

The most efficient way in which to define the weak flank of the Schmidt NATO policy is to compare his May 12 London statement with the contents of a May 13 Brussels dispatch to the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (FAZ)*. The latter dispatch projects an extended discussion of possible "humanization" of the Hague Convention for the NATO Brussels meeting of May 16, 17, and 18.

To understand the overall problem confronted by Chancellor Schmidt, to understand why his policy includes this critical weak flank, one must appreciate the political reasons why Schmidt would consider it unthinkable to withdraw the BRD from the NATO alliance. It is unnecessary for this writer to advise Chancellor Schmidt on that point in itself; the Chancellor is most painfully aware of such facts, and for the moment adopts the view that it is beyond his immediate power to alter that side of the situation. However, it is necessary to emphasize the point — not for Chancellor Schmidt's instruction — but to other forces, inside and outside the BRD, who have the power to aid the Chancellor's government in securing new, suitable strategic options by which the difficulty might be eliminated.

Schmidt's Weak Flank In General

The specific weakness in Schmidt's policy is identical with the absolute folly of the proposed "humanization" agenda proposed for the Brussels NATO discussions of May 16-18. The essence of the matter is as follows. The MBFR (Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction) negotiations are important as well as useful, because they represent the chief diplomatic conduit through which the risk of triggering a general war in the European and Mediterranean theaters can be significantly minimized. If successful, such MBFR agreements between forces led respectively by Chancellor Schmidt and Brezhnev can reduce the ability of the Rockefeller's puppet-Carter Administration and France's Giscard to launch World War III. However, under conditions in which World War III is triggered, none of Chancellor Schmidt's doctrines could conceivably function to eliminate hideous damage to the BRD.

What MBFR can accomplish militarily for the case of World War III is delimited to the following.

There will never occur a theater-limited military confrontation between USA-NATO and Warsaw Pact forces, either in Europe or any other part of the world. Any war between the USA-NATO and Warsaw Pact forces is a full-scale intercontinental ABC war from the first hour of war-fighting. A "conventional war in central Europe," just as much as a theater-limited nuclear war in any theater of the world is an imbecilic fantasy.

Under conditions of war, there is no possible treaty agreement which can induce the Warsaw Pact command to "respect" certain zones of USA-NATO allied nations as "non-combatant" zones. Once war begins, the sole objective of the Warsaw Pact command is to win thermonuclear intercontinental war as rapidly as possible, with the aid of maximum necessary destruction of first-line and in-depth war-fighting capabilities of every nation allied with the USA-NATO forces. Hence, the proposed agenda for the Brussels NATO meeting of May 16-18 is nothing but an obscene joke on anyone credulous enough to take the matter seriously.

For the conditions of war, in a war in which the BRD — for example — is part of NATO, the only preparation which could reduce the extent of Warsaw Pact targets in the BRD is the reduction of the number of priority Soviet targets in the BRD.

The first, obvious step, is to eliminate every possible USA military force-concentration from the BRD, since every such concentration is a priority target of concentrated Warsaw Pact strategical and tactical ABC measures. (For example, the Frankfurt-Weisbaden-Mainz area, and its populations, are virtually assured of the maximum rate of civilian casualities and related destruction as a by-product of USA forces' deployments. Bremerhaven is a similar case, and so forth.)

The second, also obvious step, is to eliminate every nuclear deployment from the BRD, since every such deployment is a high-priority target for Warsaw Pact saturation of the target and adjoining areas with ABC sanitization.

The third, related and obvious step is to eliminate all elements of forward defense from the internal-BRD NATO military posture, and to limit the internal BRD posture to the traditional NATO-attempted "conventional forces" line of containment on the West Bank of the Rhine. This and related measures minimize the destruction of civilians and economic-recovery potential in the BRD during an actual war between the USA-NATO and Warsaw Pact forces.

In short, BRD military posture is shaped properly by the following strategic realities. The combined USA-NATO forces represent sufficient deterrence, a sufficiently high threshhold of deterrence that no *unprovoked* military or related provocation by Warsaw Pact forces is objectively possible. However, for conditions of actual general war, the Warsaw Pact command has presently a small but distinct marginal military war-fighting advantage, and decisive war-winning advantage in depth based upon its civil-defense potential. Therefore, under *any present or intermediate-*

future conditions in which David Rockefeller and his allies provoke the Warsaw Pact to general war, the BRD is stuck in the position of a front-line losing position in World War III.

Hence, every sane person inside or outside the BRD must support Chancellor Schmidt on two vital points. *Point One:* wreck to the maximum the Carter Administration's potential for provoking World War III; that is the first-line and only effective defense of the BRD. *Point Two:* in anticipation of the worst case, general war, reduce the number of civilian targets within the BRD, to ensure thus the maximum potential for survival and recovery of the majority of the nation.

It is unnecessary to list here the reasons why the BRD government does not seek the only certain avoidance of the danger: pull-out from NATO, into the neutral policy China will, for example, most probably follow during World War III.

Strategic Imbecility In NATO Circles

Since European NATO countries, especially the BRD, are faced with losing a war if they remain in NATO, and since they are unwilling — for obvious reasons — to pull out of NATO, the natural reaction-formation among military and related circles typified by the *FAZ's* "strategically schizophrenic" Adelbert Weinstein is to attempt to revert to mid-eighteenth century military doctrines of "set-piece wars." That miserable atavism among terrified general officers and others is the essence of the proposed "humanization" agenda for the NATO May 16-18 meeting.

The root of this "humanization" agenda nonsense is the Anglo-American "utopian" military doctrine in general. It flows from the same strategically-incompetent mentalities who first created and credulously swallowed the idiotic "flexible response," "forward defense," and related parodies of mid-eighteenth century military "set-piece war" doctrines. More specifically, one of the best-known efforts to put across the "humanization" agenda with the Soviets was Rockefeller's silly attempt to induce the Soviets to set aside certain zones in both the USA and the Warsaw Pact nations as non-target zones under conditions of war. All such proposals are childish imbecility, which could not possibly be honored under actual conditions of general war.

Let it be emphasized once again: The Soviet military command is operating on the proven basis of the Soviet Clausewitzian strategic doctrine through which it won World War II. Consistent with that doctrine, since the early 1960s, the Soviet command and Warsaw Pact command have not only adopted a thermonuclear war-winning policy, but have developed Warsaw Pact forces and the order of battle to afford the Warsaw Pact forces a margin of war-winning advantage.

Several points must be emphasized in that connection.

First, the Soviets have a deployable current war-winning advantage and are two to four years ahead of the US-NATO forces in basic physics technology of strategic military relevance. The Warsaw Pact command will, under no circumstances, either negotiate away any portion of that marginal advantage nor will they yield that advantage through theater-limited deployments.

Second, whenever Rockefeller's Carter-puppet Administration and its Vichy-OAS and Israeli allies cross the threshhold into general war — as combined Middle East and African operations would do — the Warsaw Pact command will go to general, full-scale intercontinental war in a way and at a time of its own choosing within the framework of choices available to it.

Third, when that war is launched, the first objectives are objectively-determined to be the following: (1) The immediate deployment of all available, relevant strategic ABC throwweight to eliminate the United States as a functioning nation — 160 to 180 million USA civilian casualities in the first hours of war; (2) Total destruction of USA-NATO naval ABC capabilities; (3) Total neutralization of all USA-NATO bases and force concentrations in every part of the world — especially in the European and Mediterranean theaters. Everything which represents a target of initial strike by ABC forces will be immediately and full struck in the opening hour of war, because the realization of a Warsaw Pact military war-winning potentiality absolutely demands that all such targets be "over-destroyed" to more than offset penalties inflicted upon Warsaw Pact forces by the USA-NATO forces.

No doctrines or previous treaty agreements to the contrary will survive the first hour of war.

From that initial opening of general war, onward, the next, follow-up objective will be the total occupation of Western Europe, apart from an England which has virtually ceased to exist as a nation — there will be nothing to cross the channel to conquer. The further destruction effected by the Warsaw Pact forces will be determined by the resistance met.

The agenda at Brussels this week will therefore be nothing but foolish babbling among those too frightened to face simple strategic realities. The only way to defend Western Europe is to prevent war. Schmidt is pushing in a fruitful direction in a most important way. Others must act to absolutely stop Carter, Giscard and the lunatic Israelis.