

Germany, is therefore to take every possible measure to reduce destruction of the country's industry and population in the event of war, while taking the necessary international financial initiatives in order to deal with the danger of war at its monetarist source.

Call for Arms Race

The absurdity of the Weizsäcker group's proposals has laid them open to attacks from all sides, causing even more confusion around the military-strategic debate. From the utopian side, the above-mentioned Adalbert Weinstein has used this vulnerability to attack Major Brossellet's theories. "We can not use the depths of our (West Germany's) territory," Weinstein argues, "since we can not plan upon giving up any territory at all. No citizen of the Federal Republic would accept a defense conception which envisions the clearing out of entire regions as the recipe for victory" — as if there were any chance for victory!

On the other side, in a recent issue of *Europäische Wehrkunde* Weizsäcker's theories were criticized by Erhard Rosenkrankz, a collaborator with Gen. Baudissen of the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg.

Rosenkrankz argues in favor of maintaining the discredited "flexible response" strategy, since Weizsäcker's proposals for "in-depth" defense would be no less "precarious." (The latter assertion is indeed true.) He then proceeds to say that "flexible response" must be subsumed under the higher priority of political negotiations with the Soviet Union, which could achieve "a reduction of tensions, increased economic ties and agreements on military methods, possibly also in order to keep options open." Agreements as the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR) talks in Vienna have a special significance in this, he asserts.

In form, this argument is similar to Henry Kissinger's call for a new arms race. The maintenance of "flexible response," can only lead to a new and more intensive rearmament, which would only postpone the danger of full-scale war for a few years, rather than prevent war. But conversely, if the "Baudissen School" were serious about the priority of economic cooperation, it would have to admit the absurdity of "flexible response" in an environment no longer dictated by the monetarist economic and utopian military policies of Carter, David Rockefeller and the International Monetary Fund.

— John Sigerson

Grunwick Strike, Test For Government's Industrial Strategy

BRITAIN

Developments around the ten-month old strike at the Grunwick film processing plant in North London have exposed the fundamental differences between the Callaghan government's industrial regeneration strategy, and Conservative Opposition leader Margaret Thatcher's Friedmanite policy of "economic growth" through austerity and union-busting.

The strike was called in support of the right to unionization; both ultra-right and ultra-left agents have tried to use it to provoke a full-fledged "class war," in order to derail the government's continued efforts to force a broad trade union-industrial coalition for domestic industrial growth. The provocations have apparently failed in the face of strong counter-pressure by the trade unions and the Callaghan government itself.

Callaghan Attempts Early Reconciliation for Industrial Strategy

Under pressure from his own party and trade unions to reaffirm the government's commitment to industrial growth as a basic part of its economic strategy, Callaghan has taken personal leadership of a series of two conferences to be held with trade unionists, industrialists and government officials this summer. This

is an attempt to push the government's outlined growth strategy into action. In the first of these meetings, June 22, Callaghan outlined a basic 10 year strategy which would use revenues from North Sea oil to boost industrial investment in key sectors such as machine tools, engineering, and high technology goods.

Thatcher's calls to send in the police against the strikers have only betrayed the implications of her no-growth economic strategy. While calling for doubling of company profits to ensure economic "expansion," Thatcher has made it understood that her government would back only "reasonable" trade unionists who accept that funds for industrial investment could only come out of continued collapse in working class living standards — the basis of the Chilean and Brazilian "economic miracles."

An editorial in the June 22 *Times* of London makes Thatcher's outlook even clearer: "The industrial revolution and the railway age provided the technological impetus for the nineteenth century. The internal combustion engine and the higher technological revolution, combined with military expenditure and more lately the exploration of space, such an impetus during this century. It is not clear what is to take their place." Maintaining that the world economy will not grow, the *Times* calls for a return to "free collective bargaining" by which the trade unions can fight out among themselves who will continue to get wage increases as the economy shrinks.

The strike at Grunwick has been used by agent circles around Thatcher and the far left to create phony "left-right" scenario, in order to bust up Callaghan's still shaky control over his coalition government. Playing an obvious provocatory role, the National Association for Freedom (NAFF) is coaching Grunwick's director on his hard line stance against the unions. The NAFF has as one of its leading members Robert Moss, who is one of Thatcher's primary foreign policy speech writers, and a known advocate of Chilean style economic and union policies as a model for Britain. Moss is being backed by Thatcher's key policy advisor Sir Keith Joseph, who charged that the labour government has been complicit in using "all means, illegal and legal, fair and foul, to coerce workers into joining organizations they do not wish to join." Employment Minister Albert Booth has already warned Keith to either substantiate his charges immediately "or provide full public retraction" of "these serious allegations" to avoid legal action.

Despite such provocation, as well as attempts by the ultra-left "rent-a-mob" minority at the strike site to provoke police, the trade unions and the government

have held firm. While Employment Minister Booth is engaged in active attempts to negotiate a settlement between the union and management at Grunwick, Attorney General Sam Silkin has backed the important right of peaceful picketing, while warning against the use of violence or provocation of violence during strikes.

More importantly, Trades Union Congress head Len Murray called for full TUC support of the strike specifically attacking the NAFF, which "by its intervention at an early stage...has protracted and exacerbated the situation." Murray affirmed that the TUC itself was "one of the national associations for freedom." He said, "I deprecate attempts by any political organization to move into an industrial relations situation. In no circumstances would I try to defend the actions of people who attempted to latch on to industrial disputes for their own purposes." The head of the trade union directly involved in the strike, Roy Grathan, warned strike supporters against violence, and pledged that his union "will be seeking ways in which to ensure that in the future there will be no violence from either side."

Will BRD Labor-Industry Alliance Finish Brandt?

WEST GERMANY

Herbert Wehner, the West German Social Democratic Party's (SPD) Parliamentary fraction chairman, has launched a campaign "to drive SPD Chairman Willy Brandt into a self-imposed resignation," according to the June 22 daily *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. The imminent demise of Brandt, who has been handpicked by World Bank president Robert McNamara to chair his bank's new Third World commission, is being looked upon with great relish by West German industrial and labor sectors.

Brandt ensured that this labor-industrial alliance would move against him when he permitted a number of SPD "leftists" in Parliament last week to vote against the Social Democratic-Free Democratic government's tax budget. These parliamentary leftists were publicly supported by the "zero-growth" oriented SPD youth organization, the Jusos, whom Brandt has always encouraged to factionalize against the SPD center around Wehner and SPD Chancellor Helmut Schmidt. Schmidt and Wehner have seized on this opportunity to put a national spotlight on both the leftist SPD parliamentarians and the Jusos, who could have caused the budget's defeat and a subsequent collapse of the Schmidt government.

Even though the Brandt left acquiesced under pressure, the attacks on them by the Schmidt and Wehner forces have expanded over the past week. The initial charges — of sabotaging SPD support for Chancellor Schmidt — have developed into a barrage of attacks against the SPD left for wanting to halt the

government's growth and trade-oriented policies in favor of zero growth.

These attacks reflect a bullish confidence in growth that is becoming increasingly dominant in export-oriented West Germany, coupled with no-nonsense intolerance of Carter Administration-type no-growth proposals. The West German press have given prominent coverage of a projected 300 percent increase in French-Soviet trade as a result of Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev's visit there June 21, and at the same time the Schmidt government has authorized a 300 percent increase in export credit guarantees this year to Third World countries. Brezhnev is expected to visit Bonn this fall, and is expected to sign a number of big contracts at that time.

Unionists Treated to Criticism of Brandt

Wehner's attacks were first publicly aired two weekends ago at the SPD's trade union organization, the "Working Group for Labor Questions," to which 300,000 SPD trade unionists, one third of party membership, belong. Brandt was accused of "failing to provide the party with information that would support Chancellor Helmut Schmidt" in last week's tax vote. Egon Bahr, a long time Brandt crony and presently SPD business leader, was also attacked by Wehner for allowing the SPD to degenerate into threatening its own government's very existence.

To make the point crystal clear, two days later the Foreign Ministry unprecedentedly refused to grant visas to two of Brandt's associates who had planned to visit Poland, leaving Brandt to travel there alone.

Industrialist Otto Wolff von Amerongen, an SPD member and a leading East-West steel trader, kept up