

to join — is Britain.

Over the last two weeks, the following chain of events unfolded.

Over the weekend of Nov. 4-5, the Royal Institute of International Affairs held a conference to decide whether or not Great Britain would enter the EMS by Jan. 1. The elite of London banking left that conference preaching the need of UK adherence. The characteristic line, as typified by Lloyds chairman Jeremy Morse, argued that the EMS could only be “improved” from within, with London a full-fledged member. Prime Minister James Callaghan spoke to Parliament in positive tones on the issue.

Just one week later, Prime Minister Callaghan was telling the audience at the Nov. 13 Lord Mayor of London’s banquet that he was pessimistic about whether the country would be able to join the new system by Jan. 1 or even at a later point. On Nov. 14, William Solomon of London’s REA Bros. authored a piece for the West German *Die Welt* stating categorically that the City of London bankers were *not* in support of the EMS as it was currently constituted — belying the testimony of these same bankers to Parliament just days earlier.

What happened?

For one thing, the West German and French government leaders of the new EMS made it clear that they could not be swayed into providing bailout funds for the industrially collapsed British sinkhole. Said one highly placed West German official: “We always have to tell our British colleagues that the European Monetary System is for the growth of the entire European economy, not for bailing out London.”

— Renee Sigerson

4. Europe says ‘no thanks’ to arms buildup

For the second time in two months, the West German government has found it necessary to denounce officially the written allegations of a British subject, Robert Moss, concerning West German defense policy matters.

A spokesman from the West German Defense Ministry attacked Moss for writing in a recent London *Daily Telegraph* article that West Germany would “drastically reduce” all future NATO military maneuvers on its territory. “*The Daily Telegraph* may believe in the practice of getting at the truth by repeatedly printing false and biased information. I do not believe in such a policy,” the spokesman declared.

The last time around, Moss had written that certain West German Social Democratic Party officials were secretly conspiring with Moscow to have West Germany withdraw from NATO. Government spokesman Klaus Bölling had only one word to describe that allegation: “Baloney.”

To an outsider, it may seem strange that the West Germans — usually so reserved in their official statements — would bother to single out for criticism the crankish lies of a writer for the London *Daily Telegraph*. Robert Moss, however, is far more than that. Because he is part of the inner circles of the British oligarchical elite, Moss represents the crucial obstacle to a new economic and military order currently being evolved by West Germany and France. And because Moss is controlled by the same grouping that controls NATO Supreme Commander Alexander Haig and Henry Kissinger, Moss provides the key to understanding the rapid shifts in the offing in Europe’s defense posture.

The Moss line

Robert Moss functions as the coordinator of the flow of disinformation from the British oligarchical elite into the United States news media. Compare, for example, the following statements from his Nov. 13 *Daily Telegraph* article, “U.S. Defense Policy — Why the SALT Sellers Are Wrong,” with what has subsequently appeared in the U.S. media:

“Soviet military writers state explicitly that nuclear superiority is politically usable and that the Russians believe that, if they achieve it, they would be ready to carry their advantage to the limit. . . . This is not to say that the Soviet leaders want a nuclear war. Of course they don’t. They want to use evident strategic superiority to pursue their political objectives through a combination of diplomatic pressure, the deployment of proxy troops like the Cubans, and perhaps, in the near

future, the deployment of Warsaw Pact conventional forces.”

It would be hard to count all the lies and distortions contained in this one statement. The aroma, however, becomes particularly pungent when one recalls the way in which Admiral Stansfield Turner and Zbigniew Brzezinski engaged in outright lying around Cuban presence in the Shaba II affair. Moreover, any competent military thinker knows that the Soviet Union would never launch a mere conventional assault on Western Europe alone.

Moss is particularly obsessed by the role of West Germany in European defense policy-making:

“According to my NATO sources, Chancellor Schmidt’s decision to receive Mr. Brezhnev in Bonn was a direct consequence of Mr. Carter’s indecision on the neutron bomb and the embarrassment it caused Herr Schmidt personally.”

His “NATO sources” are incorrect, of course. Schmidt’s primary consideration during his historic meeting with Brezhnev last May was the signing of a 25-year economic and technological cooperation treaty which would create the long-term basis for peaceful relations through massively expanded trade.

Another part of Moss’s line on West Germany oozed into the columns of the French daily *Le Figaro*. That newspaper’s Bonn correspondent strongly suggested that the new Soviet ambassador to Bonn, Vladimir Semyonov, had been sent there solely for the purpose of “negotiating Germany’s neutrality” and “detaching Bonn from the Atlantic Alliance.” “Isn’t Semyonov bringing in his diplomatic pouch a new version of the old neutralization plan, only this time by the detour of disarmament?” the correspondent asked.

Chancellor Schmidt himself has refuted this particular slander. Speaking over Stuttgart radio he said that the new Soviet ambassador would be doing no such thing. “Leonid Brezhnev and Andrei Gromyko know perfectly well that that is not possible.”

The momentous shift of the EMS

What upsets the West German government about these statements, however, is not the fact that they are stinking lies, but rather how they function to obscure a momentous shift in Europe’s military status, which will occur Jan. 1, 1979: the establishment of the European Monetary System.

The concept behind the EMS — high rates of capital formation and massive expansion of trade based on stable currency rates and cheap credit — is directly in opposition to the no-growth program Britain is currently attempting to impose upon the United States. Ever since the end of World War II, Britain’s credibility as a viable nation has been staked on the credibility of precisely this austerity model. The establishment of the EMS is a direct threat to the “special relationship” Britain has enjoyed within the NATO command since the alliance’s establishment.

(It is an open secret that London, and not Paris or Brussels, has always been the seat of all significant policy decisions within NATO.)

Moreover, the rapid expansion of Europe’s export markets embodied in the EMS concept necessarily means that the countries of Europe must make major commitments to develop the economies of the East bloc countries, as well as to collaborate with these countries in developing markets in the Third World.

One further implication of the EMS is the fact that France, as a cofounder of the system, will necessarily begin to resume her proper role in the formulation of European defense policy.

Under these conditions, any massive buildup of arms and troops in Central Europe is a sheer waste of time and money. It has already been unofficially announced that West Germany has flatly turned down a NATO proposal to increase NATO’s European deployments by eight new mobile divisions. Instead, the West German Defense Ministry has just announced a five-year plan for its army that will keep troop levels the same, with only three new brigades to be created out of present troop strengths.

In short, the fate of NATO as a credible institution for European defense hangs in the balance during the upcoming months. This — and not Robert Moss’s maunderings — is the background for understanding the recent unprecedented disputes between West German government officials and NATO Supreme Commander Alexander Haig.

Haig was recently interviewed by Jacques Guilleme-Brulon of the daily *Le Figaro*. Guilleme-Brulon reported.

“. . . When I brought up the recent criticisms by West German Defense Minister Hans Apel of the big NATO maneuvers in September which, under the code name ‘Autumn Force,’ had mobilized about 325,000 men from Norway to Turkey, the General refused to discuss the differences ‘which do not exist in effect’ between Hans Apel and NATO. But he added caustically, raising his hands in the air, ‘Oh, you know, it’s nothing new. The military make proposals and the politicians make decisions.’ ”

Detente, according to Guilleme-Brulon,

“leaves him stone-cold, insofar as he feels that it is an instrument which can function according to the ingenuity, talent, and especially the will of those — the politicians — who are, by definition, in charge of using it.”

Haig aims at the Third World

On the other hand, Haig heatedly defended another possible use of NATO:

“I would like to stress that our deterrent is still convincing . . . but I also insist on warning you, since it is my duty: the Soviets’ forces have become global, notably their naval forces. They are, in effect, capable of playing an offensive role in the peripheral regions of the Third World,

among others. We must especially not make any bad calculations as to the Soviets' intervention capability in the Third World, in the short term."

The French and West German governments have already explicitly debunked Haig's interview point by point. French Defense Minister Yvon Bourges told the National Assembly Nov. 7, "Never mind, we French believe in detente," when asked about the interview.

On the same day a spokesman for the West German Defense Ministry said at a press conference that his government is not alarmed by Haig's statement because

"all military men call for increased armaments and criticize the government for doing too little. . . . Of course we will continue to develop defense, but at the same time we will continue to talk to the other side. The current situation is forcing the present rates in armament expansion, but this is not where the people really want to go."

At a more recent press conference, West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher repeated his promise that his country will never tolerate the "transplanting of the East-West conflict into the Third World" — a policy which has won West Germany many friends and business partners in the developing sector over the past months.

What will follow NATO?

Another implication of the EMS not to be overlooked is the fact that many of the Mediterranean countries may be participating in the system from the very start. Last week the Nordic Council (consisting of all the Scandinavian countries plus Iceland) also gave their full support to the EMS and advised their finance ministers to work out a proposal for concrete collaboration. In military terms, this means that Haig and his mentors can say good-bye to another of their pet projects: the "weak flanks" of NATO. On cue, NATO-linked writers in the daily *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* have begun to issue expressions of "growing concern" over the postponement of military budget increases in both Norway and Sweden.

None of these considerations, however, answers the most important question of the future of European defense: if NATO ceases to be a credible institution, what will replace it?

Certainly the cornerstone of the new institution will be French-West German collaboration in the EMS — with or without support from the United States. In the admittedly linked sphere of disarmament, France's proposal for new comprehensive European disarmament negotiations in the context of the Helsinki agreements points in the right direction. So

Using suicide to scare the Soviets

Hans Morgenthau, chairman of the National Committee on American Foreign Policy, made these remarks in a recent interview.

Q: What is your assessment of the effect of Camp David on the U.S. posture toward the Soviet Union globally?

A: The Soviets have been suspiciously quiet on the Middle East until now. But now they see a possibility to try to break the Camp David agreements by pushing Iraq and Syria into conflict with Israel. What we must do is apply the same readiness as we evidenced in the October '73 war. We must put to the test the determination that, if the Russians make a move to back up Syria and Iraq, such as by airlifting troops, we will go on general nuclear alert as in '73. The Rus-

sians must be made to measure our readiness without ambiguity.

Q: Then how do you evaluate recent European determination to improve trade and other relations with the Soviets — what some people refer to as "Finlandization"?

A: Well, the Germans have always had an eastern option, but under the present circumstances they won't go East. The Europeans have to be convinced of our determination to back them up. It is not popular to pose it in this way these days, but the key question is, "Will we blow ourselves up to save Europe?" And the answer here is decisively "yes" at this point.

In a recent statement to a pro-Israel group, retired Gen. George Keegan made the following attacks on U.S. support for a Camp David "linkage" between the Sinai and West Bank-Palestinian components of the accords.

The Administration is simply not gauging the mood now in Israel. If this ignorance continues, the government won't last long, and will be replaced by a lot less temperate one. No Israeli government can accede to demands for linkage. I know from expressed views of members of the Israeli Cabinet, in private, what the mood is, and they simply won't accede to the linkage idea. Nor will the Knesset.

The Administration is asking Israel to give up all its defensible borders, in a way such that by 1985 Israel will be faced by an Arab coalition with arms greater than all of NATO put together. This will make a new war soon much more likely.

The behavior of the U.S. is unconscionable. We need a strong Israel to stop the Soviets. Israel's being strong is the only thing that has kept the Saudi monarchy in power.

And keep in mind what will happen if this government falls. Nothing stable could replace it.

also does the proposal made by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko on his recent Paris visit to integrate all the nuclear nations into the current SALT II negotiations.

A more comprehensive solution was recently proposed by Paul Granet in the French daily *Le Figaro*. Basing his ideas on those of Trade Minister Jean-François Deniau, Granet wrote:

“Political Europe is only possible in independence, and we cannot talk about European independence as long as NATO exists. . . . In this area, one can only advance suggestions with prudence . . . but finally, wouldn't it be possible to arrive at a joint political Europe in those sectors which come into play in defense policy: computers, weaponry, space and nuclear? Couldn't we endow Europe with a permanent conference of Ministers and a permanent group to investigate and evaluate crises (which would have nothing to do with NATO's institutions)? Are such perspectives utopian? Times have changed.”

— John Sigerson

5. Pushing a U.S.-USSR Mideast showdown

Current efforts to set the stage for a U.S.-Soviet confrontation are, in the Mideast context, the direct response to growing consensus in the Arab world and Europe that reconvening the Geneva peace talks, rather than the Camp David fiasco, is the proper forum for negotiating a peace settlement.

With the Camp David accords fast disintegrating as a result of Israel's fanatic refusal to “link” the West Bank-Gaza Strip issue to a bilateral settlement with Egypt over Sinai, elaborate efforts are afoot to undercut international pressure on Israel that could topple the Begin government.

Israel has its back to the wall. Its backers know this, and are out to force the U.S. into line behind Israel's war government by raising the spectre of the escalating Soviet threat to the Middle East.

However, the principle Zionist excuse — that Israel must fight to survive as a nation — now stands

You would have chaos, one government after another will fall, and Israel will be like the French Fourth Republic or like many recent situations in Italian history.

Nix to comprehensive peace

These portions of a commentary by Joseph Churba, former intelligence analyst for the Air Force chief of staff, appeared in the Nov. 15 Baltimore Sun:

The Carter Administration's current interpretation of the Camp David accords is much more damaging to peace prospects than anything the Soviet and Arab rejectionists have so far been able to mount. By its behavior the Administration is making it highly uncertain that the forthcoming Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty will facilitate any broad accommodation in the Middle East. . . .

Presumably, the State Department prefers to encourage Arab solidarity rather than to strengthen the pro-Western regimes of the area. As in the past, this approach plays directly into the hands of the radicals and Moscow. American overtures to Damascus will be used as a weapon against Cairo and as proof that no “genuine” peace is possible without the cooperation of Syria, the PLO and Moscow. This is precisely the disastrous formula envisaged in the Soviet-American statement of October, 1977. Observers will recall that joint communiqué as a major factor in prompting Mr. Sadat's journey to Jerusalem last November. Then, President Sadat's bilateral initiative pre-empted Mr. Carter's comprehensive approach. The danger today is that shifting U.S. interpretations of the Camp David accords intended to facilitate a wider peace are threatening to destroy the prospective Egyptian-Israeli settlement.

Washington Post syndicated columnist Joseph Kraft boldly called for the U.S. to lay off Israel and forget about a comprehensive peace settlement. In a Nov. 14 op-ed, Kraft points out that insistence on an overall settlement may bring down Begin's intransigent coalition.

Putting new pressures on Israel at this time . . . makes little sense. The parts of the agreement that make for pressure — the parts relative to Jerusalem and the Palestinians — cannot be immediately operative anyway. Sadat does not need concessions on these items to carry his country. So for the time being, at least, the issues of Jerusalem and the Palestinians are secondary. What is primary and immediate — and what the Carter Administration ought to concentrate on almost exclusively — is the Sinai accord between Israel and Egypt.