NATO's fifth column targets beam weapons

by Herbert Quinde

Petra Kelly and her KGB-linked Green Party associates could not have done more to sabotage the North Atlantic Assembly (NAA) as an organization for the security of the West than was accomplished by the ostensible NATO advocates who attended the NAA conference in Copenhagen June 9-13. The NAA, composed of parliamentarians from NATO member countries responsible for representing NATO security interests in their respective legislatures, ended its meeting by adopting a resolution to ban space-based weapons, preventing for the present European participation in developing the space-based ballistic missile defense (BMD) proposed by President Reagan March 23.

Assembly organizers had predetermined that President Reagan's initiative would be buried in silence. Jeff Seabright, full-time director of the NAA Military Committee, revealed prior to the meeting that "our position is clearly stated in the resolution we proposed for banning space-based weapons. The issue will die down. . . ."

Klaas de Vries, a Dutch Christian Democratic member of the First Chamber of the States-General, was even clearer on the assembly's tactics of sabotaging the national political and economic mobilizations that would be necessary to develop beam weapons. De Vries, claiming to endorse Reagan's "positive proposal," then stated, "Reagan should have just started developing these weapons quietly instead of announcing it to the general public. Now he has given a target to the entire West European peace movement."

At the conference, Sen. Charles Mathias of Maryland, chairman of the U.S. Senate delegation which also included Claiborne Pell (R-R.I.) and Larry Pressler (R-S.D.), argued that NATO must develop new mechanisms for action to deal with the explosive situation in the developing sector—particularly the dangers inherent in the international debt crisis. NATO must establish a new "diplomacy of deterrence" toward the Third World, "our prime market." The threat to the advanced sector's relations with the Third World does not lie in Soviet influence, Mathias said, but in the Third World's "nature" which needs greater interdependence with the North. Senator Pell, the only member of the Malthusian Club of Rome in the U.S. Congress, played a decisive role in NAA's adoption of the resolution for banning space weapons.

Comment on space-based nuclear defense was left to Thomas-Henri Lefebvre, a Canadian Liberal Party member of parliament. When a scheduled guest speaker on the subject failed to appear, Lefebvre, general rapporteur of the NAA's Scientific and Technical Committee (STC) and author of a highly questionable report on the alleged effects of acid rain, reiterated for the assembly the anti-beam weapons arguments of British Conservative Party member of parliament Robert Banks (see *EIR*, May 17), now a standard text of the peace movement.

The report accepted by the NAA conference shows that the attendees are aware how rapidly the U.S. policy change would alter the strategy of international confrontation that has prevailed since the death of Franklin Roosevelt. "The six months since the the STC's 1982 'Information Document on the Technology of Military Space Systems' has seen a continued high level of activity in both general research and specific military uses of the outer space environment. Perhaps the most visible and controversial element of this activity was President Reagan's March 23, 1983 address. . . . The President spoke of developing a system based on current research into 'exotic' techniques of anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defense. His call for a concerted national drive similar to that of the Apollo space program or Manhattan Bomb Project has evoked considerable discussion . . . on comprehensive ballistic missile defense."

Lefebvre acknowledged that the development of beam weapons would help revitalize the civilian economy through spin-off technologies, but gave a list of arguments on why such development was impossible—coherent with the nuclear freeze movement's opposition to changing the world strategic situation by ending the depression. Lefebvre asserted that it would be 20 to 30 years before an ABM defense could be deployed, and that such a system would require the abrogation of the 1972 ABM Treaty. Such a defense policy, he went on, would create a "dangerous and divisive current within the alliance and promote decoupling," and would "create the illusion of a technological fix . . . [for] superpower confrontation."

The depth of disinformation in both Lefebvre's and Banks's work was demonstrated when Michel Veillette, also a member of the Canadian parliament, pointed out at the November 1982 NAA's STC meeting in London that Banks's statement that Soviet aerospace technology was 8 to 10 years behind that of the West was "incorrect," and in fact a lie. In the case of aerodynamics and directed energy, explained Veillette, the Soviet Union has caught up with the United States, something also true for almost the entire aerospace field.

The only glimmer of recognition of the danger of the international strategic situation was U.S. Rep. Elliot Levitas's response when Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme told the plenary session that Europe must become a "nuclear free zone." Incensed, Levitas told the assembly: "The worst problem we are facing is false illusions. . . . Palme shows us what depth these things can go to. A man who had Soviet submarines crawling up to his harbors is treating them as vistors on some kind of pleasure trip."

40 International EIR July 19, 1983