

## NATO summit aims at big war in Europe, expansion vs China

By *Elisa Barwick and Rachel Douglas*

The 75th anniversary summit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), held 9-11 July in Washington, DC, was a witches' sabbath of war-mongering against both Russia and China. Its bellicose proceedings and communiqué, along with military decisions announced by NATO members on actions outside the NATO framework proper, bring us closer to the verge of a nuclear world war.

The leading themes of the NATO summit were three:

- Keep the US/UK/NATO proxy war against Russia going in Ukraine, despite the devastating losses Kiev's forces have sustained in recent weeks. "Trump-proof" NATO's arming of Kiev, given the former and increasingly likely future US President's negative attitude towards funding NATO and stated desire to make a "deal" to end the Ukraine war. Build up for an expanded, Europe-wide war against Russia.

- Carry the permanent war policy into Asia, aiming chiefly against China.

- Gear European and American economies towards war production, a boom for the military-industrial complex.

The stated motivation for all of the above is to defend the "rules-based international order"—the construct that denotes hegemony by the Anglo-American financial oligarchy. That order is faltering because of its own rotten policies and because the collective "Global South", representing the world majority in terms of population and economic growth, is not covering at Anglo-American threats as individual nations once did.

The Anglo-American alliance is operating from a position of weakness, but is doubling down on its strategy of survival through military force, and is willing to set off World War III in the process.

Amb. Chas Freeman, the distinguished retired American diplomat, summarised the NATO summit outcome well, in a 13 July YouTube interview by Dr Pascal Lottaz of Neutrality Studies: "This was a great event which claimed to represent the unity of NATO members and the empowerment of NATO; that's the theme of the [summit's] Declaration. But, from a broader perspective, you could argue that it represents the retreat of the G7, of the European and American North Atlantic Treaty partners, into a citadel which excludes the majority of the world. Or, in other words, it puts the trans-Atlantic relationship, the Atlantic community, as it were, at odds with the majority of the world."

### Permanent war in Europe

The NATO Declaration gave Volodymyr Zelensky, who was present at the summit (still acting as President of Ukraine, though his term expired in May), some of the language Kiev wanted on an "irreversible path to full Euro-Atlantic integration, including NATO membership" for Ukraine. The summit's decisions and those of the NATO-Ukraine Council, which also met, "constitute a bridge to Ukraine's membership in NATO", it said, and "Ukraine's future is in NATO." NATO leaders are aware, of course, that Russian President Vladimir Putin last month identified a pledge by Kiev for Ukraine to be neutral and not seek NATO membership, as one of the pre-conditions for ending the current conflict. Zelensky had agreed to those terms in March 2022, before British and American intervention torpedoed peace negotiations between Russia and Ukraine.

In addition to the Declaration, 25 members of NATO plus

the European Union signed a "Ukraine Compact". It effectively institutionalises war against Russia by establishing, in US President Joe Biden's words, "a unified, co-ordinated, and comprehensive architecture to support Ukraine not just for now but for years in the future."

Particular decisions announced in the Declaration include:

- establishment of NATO Security Assistance and Training for Ukraine (NSATU), to centralise NATO-provided military equipment and training for Ukraine;

- a Pledge of Long-Term Security Assistance for Ukraine including at least €40 billion within the next year;

- creation of a NATO-Ukraine Joint Analysis, Training, and Education Center (JATEC). NSATU is to be a European-led entity based in Wiesbaden, Germany, taking over from the nearby "Ramstein Group" under US command, which has coordinated weapons for Kiev hitherto.

The new agencies are part of the "Trump-proofing" effort, by being based in Europe and long-term, designed to continue regardless of what US voters decide in November. Ohio Sen. J.D. Vance, chosen by Trump as his running mate, is a vocal opponent of funding the war in Ukraine.

Britain's Royal United Services Institute (RUSI) terms the US presidential election "trans-Atlantic political volatility", and sees it as "a real opportunity for the UK to increase its leadership role within NATO". RUSI Senior Research Fellow Ed Arnold wrote 12 July on its website that the "NATO credentials" of the UK's new Labour government under PM Keir Starmer is to be welcomed. Arnold's main emphasis is in getting ready for a wider war in Europe, which he presents as inevitable. "British Defence Intelligence and the wider UK Intelligence Community", he demanded, "should be used to make an assessment of when the government believes the UK might have to commit to war in Europe.... [T]he difference between getting ready for 2027 versus 2033 is stark."

In the perspective for a full-scale European war (which, in reality, would be a world war) this decade, Arnold proclaimed that "the role of UK nuclear weapons should be emphasised. The UK, unlike France, assigns its nuclear forces to NATO, and in a more dangerous world and with the risk of a disengaged US, Europeans are putting more emphasis on nuclear deterrence. The UK's nuclear capability should also be better used as a bargaining tool".

On 11 July, as the NATO summit concluded, the US Biden Administration and the German government took an additional dangerous step, by rekindling a missile crisis on the European continent. They jointly announced that the United States will deploy its Multi-Domain Task Force to Germany starting in 2026, as part of preparation for the permanent stationing



The 10 July *Washington Post* confirmed the push to insulate NATO's war agenda from potential sabotage by Trump. Photo: Screenshot

of long-range missiles in Europe. “When fully developed, these conventional long-range fires units will include SM-6, Tomahawk, and developmental hypersonic weapons, which have significantly longer range than current land-based fires in Europe” the announcement said. The SM-6 missile has a range of 240-460 km, but the Tomahawk, depending on the version, has a range of 1,600 to 2,500 km, giving it the capability to directly threaten Moscow from Germany.

“Do they really not understand in Germany that the appearance of the US missile strike capabilities on German territory means that these capabilities will end up in Russian crosshairs?”, asked Russian Ambassador to the USA Anatoly Antonov, an arms control expert.

### **Making China into an enemy image**

Whereas the NATO Strategic Concept, adopted at its 2022 summit in Madrid, called China a “challenge” for the North Atlantic alliance, this year’s Declaration let loose with much harsher language against Beijing. The document labelled China as “a decisive enabler of Russia’s war against Ukraine through its so-called ‘no limits’ partnership”.

The statement proclaimed Russia, China, North Korea and Iran to be enemies of NATO. Russia is enemy number one because it “seeks to fundamentally reconfigure the Euro-Atlantic security architecture”, but China, too, “pose[s] systemic challenges to Euro-Atlantic security”, it stated. Outgoing NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg, one of Europe’s top war-mongers, expressed pleasure that the NATO document had so explicitly targeted China.

The summary statement of why China-Russia collaboration has the Anglo-American and European elite behind NATO in a rug-biting rage, comes in Paragraph 4 of the declaration: “The deepening strategic partnership between Russia and the PRC and their mutually reinforcing attempts to undercut and reshape the rules-based international order, are a cause for profound concern” (emphasis added).

These themes were echoed by Australian deputy PM and Defence Minister Richard Marles, who travelled from the Washington summit to the UK. Marles spoke 14 July at the Forgemasters heavy engineering company in Sheffield, where, he claimed, submarines for Australia under AUKUS are “being made as we speak”. He warned that the rules-based order “is under pressure” in eastern Europe as well as in the “Indo-Pacific” (NATO’s term for Asia and the Pacific), adding that because Presidents Putin and Xi Jinping signed a partnership agreement shortly before Russia launched its Special Military Operation in Ukraine, therefore “The war in Ukraine is shaping the Indo-Pacific.”

Citing Russia’s military operations to block NATO’s advance in Ukraine as a compelling reason for the North Atlantic alliance’s expansion into Asia, is merely an excuse; schemes for “Global NATO” have been under development for years, as the AAS has reported during the past decade. In line with much of the other rhetoric issuing from the summit, the Declaration asserted that NATO’s role as self-appointed guardian of a globalised “rules-based order” means extending its sphere of action to Asia. “The Indo-Pacific is important for NATO, given that developments in that region directly affect Euro-Atlantic security”, claimed the document.

On 11 July Biden met with South Korean President Yoon Suk Yeol, Japanese Prime Minister Kishida Fumio, New Zealand Prime Minister Christopher Luxon, and Australia’s Marles on the sidelines of the summit. They discussed “the increasing connectivity between Euro-Atlantic and Indo-Pacific security, noting that challenges in one region affect the other”, according to the White House readout. The nations

reaffirmed 100 per cent support for Kiev and denounced increasing cooperation between Russia and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (North Korea), while expressing “shared concerns over the People’s Republic of China’s support to Russia’s defence industrial base”. (NATO figures often refer to any Sino-Russian trade in industrial goods as such “support”, citing the “dual use”—civilian or military—nature of various technologies.)

Stoltenberg met with the same four leaders, again on the topic of coordination to “protect the rules-based international order”, in his words.

Another indicator of the intention to transform NATO into a supranational institution for permanent war against Russia, China and the Global South, in the name of protecting the “rules-based order”, was the release of a NATO Industrial Capacity Expansion Pledge, which features *measures to integrate all the military and armament production facilities of NATO member countries into a single coordinated activity*. Aimed at building a unified NATO military-industrial complex, the Pledge contends: “We will leverage the Alliance’s role as convenor, standard setter, requirements setter and aggregator, and delivery enabler to expand defence industrial capacity.”

### **NATO is not united**

Also on 11 July, Biden presided over the Ukraine Compact launch. Aside from the befuddled US President’s introducing Zelensky as “President Putin”, the most notable feature of that event was who was not there. Absent from the list of signers were NATO members Hungary, Slovakia and Türkiye. The latter has been a member of NATO since 1952, three years after its founding, is the easternmost country of the alliance, and boasts the largest NATO army in Europe.

President of Türkiye Recep Tayyip Erdogan told reporters on the sidelines of the NATO summit, TRT World Now reported, that “NATO must never become a party to the conflict in Ukraine.” He called for a resumption of diplomacy, adding that “when a fair peace deal is signed, there are no losers”.

Hungary’s Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, since Hungary assumed the EU’s rotating presidency on 1 July, had travelled to meet Zelensky in Kiev, Putin in Moscow, and Xi Jinping in Beijing, before attending the NATO summit. Orbán says that the goal of his peace diplomacy is to engage, besides Ukraine and Russia, three other key players—China, the USA and the EU—to kickstart a process of ending the conflict. On 11 July he went from the NATO gathering in Washington to Mar-a-Lago, Florida, to meet with former President Donald Trump.

Orbán’s spokesman described the meeting “as the next stop of his peace mission.... The discussion was about the possibilities of peace”. Trump posted on the Truth Social network: “Thank you Viktor. There must be PEACE, and quickly. Too many people have died in a war that should never have started!”

People at the Atlantic Council, the British government-funded Washington centre known as the think tank for NATO, are beside themselves over such diplomacy. President and CEO of the Atlantic Council Frederick Kempe titled his 9 July article “Putin, Xi, Orbán, and Modi Provide a Disturbing Backdrop to the Start of the NATO Summit”. He railed against both Orbán’s diplomacy and the visit by India’s PM Narendra Modi to Moscow on 8-9 July, when he met with Putin to upgrade Russian-Indian relations across a broad front. The two countries are members of both the BRICS group and the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation—core bodies for building a Eurasian security architecture and for the Global South as a whole.

*This article includes reporting by EIR News Service.*

# Malcolm Fraser in 2012: Australia needs to be independent

*Following is an excerpt from the late former Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser's 6 June 2012 Gough Whitlam Oration, published here in response to North Atlantic Treaty Organisation's plans to expand into Asia, which Malcolm Fraser would have opposed fiercely, as he believed NATO should have been disbanded at the end of the Cold War.*

I believe that in dealing with countries in our own region, we need to show a greater element of independence and a greater strength of mind.

We need to increase our sophistication in our approach to relationships throughout East and South-East Asia. For example our government still tends to say that strategic considerations have no impact on our good economic and trade relations with China. That is plainly not true. We cannot expect our trade relationship to be unaffected if on every occasion we follow America in strategic matters.

Independence of mind and recognition of Australia's national interests will become more important in the light of developments in the relationship between China and the United States. If the United States wishes to maintain a position of primacy over all others, that will not be acceptable to China. No less, if China because of its increasing economic influence and growing military strength, seeks to replace the United States, that will not be acceptable to the United States.

There has been a recent conference in Singapore, the 11th International Institute for Strategic Studies Asia Security Summit. The most thoughtful, constructive and rational presentation by far was made by the Indonesian President Yudhoyono. By contrast the United States Secretary of Defence's main thrust was the rebalancing of military forces into the Pacific. It was not a constructive speech because it shows quite clearly that the United States believes that the backdrop of military power is necessary for her to achieve the outcome that she wants. One could almost believe from that speech that the Secretary of Defence regarded the Western Pacific as a region to be controlled by the United States. The way Australia immediately rushed in, and once again tied herself to American coattails shows that the Australian Government does not understand how to secure peace.

The only solution that I can see of minimising the potential friction between these two major powers, is by co-operation. It is by partnership. It is, if you like, by a concert of nations. This should contribute greatly to peace, security, progress throughout our entire region. A major part of Australian policy should be to work for such a result.

Such a result is well capable of achievement. A senior Chinese official said to me the other day, China does not want America to withdraw from the Western Pacific. China knows that her strength and increasing influence causes some concern amongst neighbouring countries, that concern would be all the greater if the United States withdrew. It is in China's interests also for America to remain a country of influence. This suggests that a concert of nations, acting with due respect to all countries does hold promise.

Australia does need to play a part. If we have independence of mind, if we have confidence in ourselves, as indeed we should as an independent nation, we cannot just keep doing as we have in recent times, just doing what America wants. Troops in Darwin, military activities on Cocos Island, our following America into Iraq, staying in



Malcolm Fraser. Photo: Screenshot

Afghanistan, all indicate an unthinking compliance with American policy.

If we continue on this path we will very soon find that we have made ourselves irrelevant to East and South-East Asia, politically and strategically. Irrelevant, because Australia will have nothing to contribute. Being and being seen to be independent and having a clear-eyed view of what can achieve security and continued peace throughout this whole region is critical to Australia's future.

The choice for Australia to make is not for China or for the United States, but independence of mind to break with subservience to the United States. Subservience has not and will not serve Australia's interests. It is indeed dangerous to our future.

Australia should not do anything, for example, that suggests that we could be part of a policy of military containment of China, but marines in Darwin, spy planes in Cocos Island make us part of that policy of containment.

We would not be alone in opposing containment. At the InterAction Council meeting in Tianjin, China which I recently attended, with 20 countries represented, including a significant number from our own region, Singapore and South Korea included, endorsed a Communiqué which condemned containment. In his opening speech, former Prime Minister of Singapore, Goh Chok Tong had this to say: "Any rhetoric of 'containment' is dangerous. My view is that any attempt by the US to contain China will not work, nor will countries in the region want to take sides on this." These are strong words for a Singaporean former Prime Minister. Singaporean Governments have normally avoided public criticism of the United States.

We should be trying to lead the United States away from containment.

It is not always understood as China understands very clearly, that the United States is running a two-track policy. When I was in Beijing recently, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton led a large, effective delegation to China for a 4th round of Strategic and Economic discussions. It appeared that those discussions went well. A number of continuing dialogues were established. We want consultation. We want mutual understanding. We want to resolve difficulties through diplomacy and dialogue. We want to understand each other better. That seemed to be the message coming both from China and the United States.

If that is the true American attitude, why does the United States talk of rebalancing military power to the Pacific? They already have massive power in the Pacific. More than all other nations combined. Do they really need more? For what purpose? What is the need to enhance naval cooperation with the Philippines and Singapore? What useful purpose do marines based in Darwin fulfil? What is the purpose of spy planes on Cocos Island? Add to this, strategic discussions involving the United States, India and Japan and naval exercises between those three countries.

The United States can say this is not containment, as does the Australian Government, but nobody believes them. To continue to say that something that is obvious is not so, is to damage your own credibility. If the United States is genuine in wanting dialogue and discussion with China, what is the need for this military rebalancing?

There are further disturbing elements. The House Republicans added to the defence appropriation bill for the coming year, obligations on the administration "a report on deploying additional conventional and nuclear forces to the Western Pacific region to ensure the presence of a robust conventional and nuclear capability, including a forward-deployed nuclear capability ..."

I have some reason to believe that the current United States administration has at some levels begun such discussions. For Australia to be part of such a policy would be dangerous to our future. I would sooner be out of ANZUS altogether than have any nuclear weapons on Australian soil.

American military expenditure is 43 per cent of the world's total. China's is 7 per cent or a little over. When China increases her military expenditure, our newspapers have alarmist headlines: "China rearming"; "China expanding her military". There is little effort of explanation, there is little logical analysis. There are claims China is being more assertive. Reports are often couched in such a way as to cause concern.

By contrast, if America renews her arms or develops new weapon systems, we generally applaud. We need balance and we need better comprehension.

China has perhaps the most unstable borders of any country in the world. North Korea, Iraq, Iran, tensions between India and Pakistan, Afghanistan. The China nuclear arsenal is not much bigger than Israel's. The fact that she is now seeking to strengthen her navy is being used by some to create another element of concern. People ask, "Why does China need a navy? For what purpose do they want an all seas navy?" Well there is one answer, China is the last major nuclear state to put her nuclear missiles on submarines. It is necessary for China to do something to increase the viability of a small deterrent force, about the size of Israel or a little more. As comparison, Russia and the United States have 10,000 warheads each.

The future cannot be predicted with any real degree of accuracy. But there are some things that are likely; one of them is that if the United States believes the way to establish good relations with China is to have a military alliance of nations whose purpose is to limit China's influence, or to contain China, the United States is mistaken. This is the wrong way to preserve peace and security. We should not be part of it.

Such views demonstrate a significant failure to learn from the military mistakes from past decades starting with Vietnam. It demonstrates a failure to realise that the break-up of the Soviet Union created a different post-Cold War world. The United States' response is a Cold War response.

The great task for the United States is to recognise that many of the things she wants for herself and for others cannot be achieved by military means. She needs to place much more emphasis on "soft power", on diplomacy, and not allow joint facilities on Australian soil to be used to support containment. Australia should use every effort to persuade the United States that her two-track approach to relationships with China is wrong. We should tell the United States that we will not be part of it and not allow joint facilities on Australian soil to be used to support it.

Historically, China has not been an imperial power the way most European States have been imperial powers, and America, and Japan. There is no real evidence that they wish to become such a power. We need to understand that what China becomes, how China's influence is used in future years is not only a function of China's own internal dynamics, or her perception of the world, but it is also a function of how the United States and countries like Australia and Japan and many others, deal with China. We need a better understanding that China's policies will be formed, in part as a consequence of the attitudes and policies of the United States and of countries with which she deals.

If the consensus that military containment of some kind prevails then there will be prospects of military conflict and military conflict between China and the United States is the one thing that would be most dangerous to Australia.

In 1956 when many feared that China might invade Taiwan, Eisenhower moved the 7th Fleet in or close to the Taiwan Straits. Many feared war between the United States and China over Taiwan. Prime Minister Menzies then advised President Eisenhower that if there were such a conflict between these two powers, Australia would not be part of it, it would not be our affair. Menzies had a keen understanding of Australia's own interests, which seems to be quite lacking in today's world.

Australia needs to be confident as well as independent when we seek to advance values that are important to us. We also need to be clear eyed and understand how other countries see us.

Not least, we could argue more strongly for the universality of human rights if we were more effective in overcoming our own deficiencies, especially concerning our current attitude to refugees, which is in clear breach of the Refugee Convention, and our failure to lift the standards of Australia's Indigenous People.

We are still the only western country with an indigenous minority which continues to have a trachoma problem. If other countries have been able to solve that particular disease, why has Australia failed? Why do too many Aboriginal Australians live in third-world conditions?

An understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of our own democracy would strengthen our own diplomacy throughout East and South-East Asia and make us a more effective partner.

Australia's objective should be to promote peaceful resolutions of disputes through diplomacy, through the application and acceptance of international law. We need to articulate Australia's national interests as a country allied to, but separate from the United States and with some interests that can differ quite sharply. We need leadership that will tell Australians in plain terms that our security ultimately depends upon ourselves and the relationships that we can build with the countries of the Western Pacific and of East Asia. At the end of the day it is our relationship with these countries that will determine our security.