

## Countdown for war on the European battlefield

by Vivian Freyre Zoakos

“Some people regard U.S. attempts to whip up the atmosphere in the Persian Gulf region as an integral part of the *general American plan to provoke a level of confrontation whereby economic self-sufficiency and political independence would become impossible for Europe*. If Washington succeeds in causing a quarrel between West European countries and Iran, and consequently the entire Muslim world, . . . then the main fuel supply channels will be closed and Western Europe will suffer a serious reverse in its economic development.

“The American ultimatum is to be examined at the conference of the Common Market foreign ministers. . . . Whether or not they manage to find a reasonable way out at this meeting, one thing is clear: The policy of confrontation which Washington is trying to revive severely restricts West Europe’s freedom of action in foreign policy and its economic independence.”

This precise, if understated, assessment of the reasons behind the American provocation of the Iran crisis appeared in the April 16 issue of the Soviet party newspaper *Pravda*. The so-called Iran crisis, which the *Executive Intelligence Review* has documented to have been willfully provoked and manipulated by the United States, is in fact an instrument to force Western Europe to capitulate to American dictates in all areas of policy.

President Carter shed all attempts at disguising this fact in his statement of April 17, where he threatened

Europe with a war confrontation in Iran if Europe refused to actively endorse his policies. The American press and media, always abominable and misleading in their coverage of Europe, have attempted to portray this situation as one in which President Carter legitimately calls upon his allies for due support at a time in which American lives and national prestige are at stake.

This is a cynical lie. First fact: as *EIR* has documented together with other European sources, the ouster of the Shah, the subsequent ascent of Khomeini to power, and the seizure of the American hostages were all aspects of carefully planned Anglo-American strategy, in which Henry Kissinger, David Rockefeller, and Zbigniew Brzezinski in behalf of the Trilateral Commission played leading roles (see Middle East Report).

Second fact: Iran is a secondary issue. Ever since the United States and Great Britain forced West Germany, in particular, to capitulate to the proposal for the stationing of medium-range nuclear missiles on European soil at the NATO summit of late last year, the U.S. has been engaged in a deliberate strategy of forcing a superpower confrontation in which continental Europe would be forced to “choose sides.”

The current issue of the London *Economist*, influential spokesman for the British elite allied to the Washington administration, laid out the true facts of the case in its lead editorial. “. . . (R)egard the unhappy diplomats as the equivalent of prisoners of war. A great power does not shape its strategy around the release of 50 POWs in a minor theatre of war. . . . The containment of dangerous



*Chancellor Helmut Schmidt (right) with U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, who toured Europe recently to let the continent's leaders know that the Carter administration is crazy enough to do anything if Europe doesn't conform to its wishes.*

big Russia is the item that should be at the top of the western agenda. ... *Perhaps (Europe's) giving support to America on Iran will not, after all, become a way of dodging support for America on Afghanistan ... and thus encouraged, the west will apply itself with new heart to the business of containing Russia.*" (Emphasis added.)

To achieve this "solidarity" on the part of Europe, the United States has applied massive pressures up to and including threats of withdrawing the nuclear umbrella from the continent. The pressure has been so extreme that its nature has been leaked to the press. The London *Guardian* for example reported recently that Washington in armtwisting West Germany has "made threatening noises about Berlin."

The Franco-German war avoidance policy is now in the process of collapsing under these intense conditions of blackmail.

U.S. Defense Undersecretary Robert Komer was dispatched to Europe earlier this month as part of the ongoing U.S. pressure tactic, again exploiting the Iran crisis to speed the pace of war preparations in Western Europe. At an extraordinary session of the NATO Defense Planning Committee, Komer demanded the acceleration of the spring 1978 NATO decisions to increase national defense budgets by 3 percent, waving the "threats" posed by the Iran crisis and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan to press his point. Going beyond the 1978 decisions, he also pressed on West Germany support for the Anglo-American (it is now official British defense policy) plan for an "evolving division of labor" within

NATO to allow the United States to carry out its outrageous confrontationist posture in the Indian Ocean and in the Persian Gulf, if need be.

### **Europe begins the slide into capitulation**

Franco-German war avoidance for the past two years has been based on strengthening relations with the Soviets on the stable basis of increased economic, scientific and technical ties. Related to this, France and Germany developed plans for an international economic development policy based on cheap credits for the development of the Third World. The first phase of this program was shaped in last spring's creation of the European Monetary System. As authoritative West German spokesmen had stated at that time, including the Chancellor himself, the EMS was grounded on the earlier commitments and treaty relations established with the Soviets during President Leonid Brezhnev's visit to Bonn in May of 1978.

This war avoidance policy is now crumbling, as the U.S. forces Europe to choose sides once and for all in the context of the now established confrontation of the superpowers.

As a result, the meeting of the European Community foreign ministers of April 21-22, convened to respond to Carter's demand for action on Iran, presented a spectacle not seen throughout the past decade. The British, the allies of Washington in the attempt to destroy the Franco-German alliance, were allowed the role of "mediators" between the hardliners who wanted the adoption of full economic sanctions against Iran (reportedly West

Germany), and those others (France) who opposed sanctions altogether.

The proposal finally adopted was that put forward by British Foreign Minister Lord Carrington for a two-tier approach. In the first phase, the EC immediately reduces the size of its embassy personnel in Teheran, makes visas harder to come by for Iranian nationals, and ensures a complete arms embargo against Iran. The second phase, scheduled for adoption May 17, would be full scale sanctions if the hostages are still being held at that time.

Lest anyone be deceived that this was indeed a "compromise" with the more direct measures demanded by Carter, it should be noted that the Carrington plan had its origin at the Aachen, West Germany, meeting of the Bilderberg Society held just prior to the ministers' conference. An elite grouping of the leading Anglo-American ruling circle, with other European participation, the Bilderberg Society is one of the chief planning and policy-making bodies behind the drive to "break" continental Europe.

On the same day that President Carter was delivering his ultimatum to Europe, French Foreign Minister Jean François-Poncet was making a watershed speech before the National Assembly. The speech marked the first clear-cut sign of beginning European capitulation to the Anglo-American alliance.

François-Poncet began by denying American interference into Afghanistan before or after the Soviet invasion, putting instead complete blame on the Soviets for the collapse of detente. This formulation is a "first" for the Giscard government. Driving his point home, the foreign minister went on to cite Soviet "actions undertaken in Angola, in the Horn of Africa, in Yemen and Cambodia" as undermining peace.

The statement took on special significance because it was delivered less than two weeks before the scheduled visit to Paris of Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko.

While he blamed "lack of continuity and firmness" on the part of Washington for feeding the climate of international tensions, François-Poncet went on to absolve the U.S. of all fault for the current crisis—a crisis which incidentally Chancellor Schmidt recently characterized as identical to 1914, immediately prior to the outbreak of World War I. Berating Moscow, he concluded, "Force always ends up by provoking a contrary force. The lack of trust it engenders is contagious."

François-Poncet still attempted to maintain some measure of policy independence for France, even as he said this. In the conclusion of his speech he stated that "the solidarity which united France and the U.S. in this crucial experience of the hostages cannot mean that France doesn't have to decide on her own, and at the opportune time, the measures it deems appropriate."

Indeed, the French did put up resistance at the foreign ministers meeting. However, the end result speaks for itself. As *Pravda* correctly noted, each step taken by the Europeans to try and appease Carter, heading off a presumed worse disaster thereby, only limits their subsequent independence and room for maneuver in foreign policy.

A further indication of the growing capitulation in continental Europe is the near-resolution of the standing conflict with Britain. As recently as two months ago, France and Germany were speaking of forcing Britain out of the European Community if necessary if London continued to demand special privileges within the EC. They had already "locked out" the British in important measure through the creation of the European Monetary System, which Britain could not join since it stood for an economic and foreign policy completely inimical to British plans.

The EC dispute revolved on British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's insistence on having £1 billion of British contributions to the EC budget returned to British coffers. The latest reports all indicate that a compromise is now being hastily worked out, awaiting only the upcoming EC summit meeting before being resolved, at least in broad policy outlines.

As the London *Guardian* gleefully noted April 21: "The Iran crisis is thought by some people to be likely to produce one unexpected bonus—a compromise agreement over the British EC budget complaint. ... It was inevitable that the two issues should become intertwined."

---

## Documentation

---

### *Paris Match: 'American who's gone berserk'*

*The million-run French weekly Paris Match April 25 ran the following analysis of James Earl Carter's erratic behavior, entitled "Blaming Europe." The author is Arthur Conte, a noted French journalist who once headed the government's radio-and-TV agency. Conte is a close personal friend of President Giscard d'Estaing.*

Everything is fraudulent. Perhaps never in history has the world seen such confusion, nor such deep and

unbelievable contradictions, nor such a complex game of poor strategies.

Fraudulent is the game of Jimmy Carter. He was presented as an all-out pacifist ... and we see him at present as a passionate maker of war, an "enraged sheep," even a systematic provocateur. ... Never has such a weak person been called upon to carry out such giant tasks. Here he goes, playing the worst sort of electoral games. ... Not only partners and allies come to doubt Carter, but even America herself. Never has a president given us such a murky and false image of his people. ... When we need a clear and determined America, we have instead an American policy that has never been so chaotic ... jerky ... with nervous fits. ... The eruption of an America going berserk.

American strategy in Iran ... is a fraud. Carter thought to do well as early as 1978 in accelerating the departure of the Shah. ... The fact is that it was he who initiated the process intended to put the young prince in surrounded with the mullahs. ... Such a religious solution should please this religious mind [Carter's], but we know what the ayatollahs did with that...."

---

---

## *The Kremlin: 'Carter's mask is thrown off'*

*The following are excerpts from "The Mask Is Thrown Off," by Vsevolod Ovchinnikov, appearing in Pravda, April 10.*

Washington is not only going to aggravate its conflict with Teheran. Judging from everything, it is a risky bluff: blackmailing with the threat of direct military confrontation both Iran and those allies of the U.S. who depend on oil deliveries from the Persian Gulf region; putting Western Europe and Japan in the position of involuntary parties to a game intended to strengthen the shaken positions of American imperialism in the Near and Middle East....

As for the preparation of military interference, this is recalled by the presence of an American naval armada off the coast of Iran. It includes almost thirty pieces, including two aircraft carriers, and the Pentagon has just decided to dispatch still more forces to the Persian Gulf.

Even if this rattling of weapons is all bluff, it is still dangerous adventurism. Washington is waving a torch near a powder keg....

This reckless step by the U.S. threatens the security of all the states of the region and threatens general peace. This is how the world public evaluated it.

---

---

## *Schmidt: 'Neither power has a plan against war'*

*Following is a report on the speech which West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt delivered to an SPD conference on security policy on April 20.*

Chancellor Schmidt's remarks echoed earlier statements he has made both in public and private. He warned again about the war danger: "I am certain that both world powers and their leaderships do not want a war, but I am afraid they do not presently have a sufficient war-avoidance strategy at their disposal. In any case, it is not recognized by the world public. I fear that both world powers presently do not speak openly enough with each other about their fundamental aims."

Schmidt claimed that both sides were not able to place themselves in the position of their adversaries and allies. This was shown when Moscow intervened in Afghanistan and when Moscow refused to negotiate on middle-range weapons. He said that he did not want to enumerate the respective mistakes of the West.

Schmidt rejected the idea that NATO is in deep trouble: NATO has a crisis "as often as church fests." In NATO, the U.S.A. and Europe are dependent on each other. This should also be understood by the United States, said the Chancellor.

Schmidt stressed: "We will in any case and in all world political, albeit confused, situations not lose sight of the real interest of the German nation." But this German interest can only be pursued "with our partners in the alliance, especially with France, because of historical and moral reasons, and especially with the United States of America."

But solidarity, said Schmidt, should not be misunderstood as the "speechless acceptance" of "what others have already decided." Let nobody doubt we will go along with the sanctions, but we will only support measures which are reasonable in our view.

Schmidt then specified his military concept: "The Soviet Union said some weeks ago that NATO should suspend its decision [to deploy middle-range weapons in Europe], then they would be immediately ready to negotiate on the middle-range weapons. That is of course not possible ... It is desirable (since the West needs until well into the year 1983 before the middle-range weapons can be brought into combat position) that both sides do not bring their rockets into combat position and start immediately negotiating. This should be independent of the question of whether SALT is or is not ratified...."

---

---

## The Times: 'The way to avert a new 1914'

Following are excerpts from an article in the April 20 Times of London contributed by Theo Sommer, editor in chief of the West German daily Die Zeit.

...No matter how erratic and incompetent they may think he [President Carter] is, they [Europe] know that in the last analysis they will have to go along with him. Whatever its current weaknesses may be, the U.S. is still the vital, indispensable and irreplaceable guarantor of Europe's survival. This explains the grim sentence recently ascribed to the French President Giscard d'Estaing: "When the chips are down, we will have to stand by the Americans—even if they are deadly wrong."

But now the time for quibbling is over. As the West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt puts it: "Europe cannot possibly leave America in the lurch." ...

What it takes at this juncture is probably a diplomatic initiative far broader than the European proposal to neutralize Afghanistan....

\* An initial step might consist of a set of unilateral declarations by the United States, Russia, Pakistan, India and China pledging recognition of Afghanistan's sovereignty, territorial integrity and nonalignment....

\* The Kremlin should side squarely with the White House in the Teheran hostage crisis. In return, the Carter administration should renounce economic sanctions against Russia....

\* Then, President Carter could resubmit the SALT II treaty to the U.S. Senate....

---

---

## The Guardian: 'Europe has only ten days'

Following are excerpts from a London Guardian article of April 21, entitled "EEC has ten days to defuse crises."

The events of the next 10 days could have a more radical impact on United States/European Community relations and on relations between Britain and her Community partners than anything that has happened since the UK joined the Common Market. Tomorrow, the foreign ministers of the Nine meet in Luxembourg to try to hammer out a common line over Iran. Five days later, in the same city, the Community's heads of government

meet to try and solve the crisis over Britain's budget contributions to the EEC.

It was inevitable that the two issues should become intertwined....

The Iran crisis is thought by some people to be likely to produce one unexpected bonus—a compromise agreement over the British EEC budget complaint....

There appears to be three reasons for the more hawkish West German policy on Iran [as compared to that of France]. The first is that they have been made the prime target for unprecedented U.S. pressure. Even extending, according to some reports, to threatening noises about Berlin.

Secondly, Liberal Party ministers in the Bonn coalition (notably the FDP leader Hans-Dietrich Genscher) seem worried that any hesitation in giving 100 percent backing to Mr. Carter will be exploited by Franz-Josef Strauss and the right-wing Christian Democrats....

---

---

## The Economist: 'facade of Atlantic solidarity'

Following are excerpts from the London Economist's editorial of April 19 entitled "Help! Who, us?"

... The glow of apparent solidarity may be misleading because Mr. Carter is using his limited store of alliance-rallying credibility against his less important target, Iran, instead of the more important one, Russia-in-Afghanistan....

They (Europe) ... have not yet understood how rough the 1980s are going to be, if Russia continues to stir the international waters....

The containment of dangerous big Russia is the item that should be at the top of the Western agenda. ... An expansionist new version of the Brezhnev doctrine of international politics ... claims that Russia has the right to use its armed forces not only to keep existing communist governments in power ... but also to help communists dig themselves into power. Since Russia is running short of oil, the implications of that are even more alarming for an EEC which gets 70 percent of its oil from the Gulf area, and a Japan which gets 67 percent, than for the United States. ...

But a Europe which still shelters under the American nuclear umbrella, still relies on 300,000 American troops ... and still expects America to ensure the flow of oil from the Gulf, has an obligation of interest as well as of gratitude to do more than grumble. It should show some solidarity with its protecting superpower.