

Schmidt Leads European Rejection Of Carter War Plans

The Italian newspaper *Corriera della Sera* last week compared U.S. President Carter's crumbling international image and his calls for Dark Age energy austerity with one of Hieronymous Bosch's phantasmagoric little monsters. After a week of consultations with the fraudulent Mr. Carter, Western Europe's leaders have become convinced, to varying degrees, that the U.S. Administration is heading the world towards a nuclear holocaust more horrible than the nightmare depicted by Bosch.

The balance of the "Downing Street" summit, the "three powers" meeting on Berlin, the North Atlantic Council meeting, and numerous side meetings, is Europe's clear refusal to support the cornerstones of Carter's policies. There was no agreement on an inflationary bailout for the bankrupt international monetary system; Europe refused to halt its ambitious nuclear development and export programs; there was no effective consensus on Carter's "human rights" provocations; and a deep reluctance was manifested towards undertaking any military actions which the Soviet Union could interpret as preparation for war.

Over the week, West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt emerged as the most respected and coherent spokesman for Western Europe's actual interests. Following the North Atlantic Council meeting, he dismissed Carter's calls for increased arms build-up with a few polite words, and proceeded to lambast "certain publishers and generals" for advocating knee-jerk military reactions to the Soviet Union's growing military-strategic superiority over NATO. "It would not be good for the feelings of 60 million Germans, if all their efforts at détente were in vain," he said. Schmidt repeated his determination to conclude a serious settlement at the Mutual Balanced Force Reduction talks in Vienna.

Schmidt's efforts at arms reductions have nothing at all to do with the fakery planned by U.S. negotiator Paul Warnke for the Vienna talks. This is demonstrated by an article appearing in *Wehrkunde*, an influential forum for conservative layers within the NATO command. The article accuses both the "doves" represented by Warnke, and the "hawks" of the Nitze variety, of being equally misguided. They have both been merely "discussing around nuances," without realizing that Soviet commitment to prepare for total war "is a foreign body in a system of balances." *Wehrkunde* concludes: "The fact that the Soviet Union, with its striving for military superiority, obviously does not accept the system of mutual deterrence, fundamentally means no more and no less than the total failure of America's security policy."

This is the light in which Schmidt and Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti have time and again warned

Carter about his irresponsible and dangerous "human rights" provocations. In an interview with the Italian daily *La Stampa*, Schmidt directly attacked Carter for using the expanded "Radio Free Europe" and "Radio Liberty" operations to jam important radio transmissions from East bloc countries.

Not all European leaders, however, are as clear as Schmidt and Andreotti about the full extent of Carter's plunge towards war. Contrary to West Germany, the Rothschild-influenced government of Great Britain is giving unreserved support to U.S. proposals to bail out the International Monetary Fund with the infamous "Witteveen facility," and the British press has been full of praise for Prime Minister James Callaghan's "good working relationship" with Carter. As a gesture of goodwill, Callaghan has just sent his son-in-law, Peter Jay, to head up the British embassy in Washington.

"We've got a very good situation in NATO, a good perspective for increasing its strength which at present is evolving increasingly around the French. The French are working to build up their forces as a model of what other European countries should be up to militarily. You know everyone says that France is out of NATO but that's not true. They are only out of the military chain of command. They are participants at every other level however.

"The British are squeezed for economic reasons and the Germans are slightly less enthusiastic, but with France in there we can pull the Dutch, Belgium and Norway to support a real military growth program."

— Dr. Donald Brennan, Hudson Institute and Committee on the Present Danger May 12, 1977

The goodwill stops short, however, when it comes to the actual effects of such policies on the British economy. While Callaghan silently sat through Carter's warmongering speech on NATO, the domestic press was rejecting the idea of any increase in military spending. The *Financial Times* specifically warned against U.S. efforts at arms standardization, which is synonymous with U.S. attempts to squash Europe's own growing high-technology industries.

French President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing's role, on the other hand, was full, if low-keyed, support of Carter. Although France did block with the rest of Europe on the question of nuclear energy, the formal position of France outside of NATO allowed Giscard's insane Zaire intervention to get by with relatively little open discussion.

The Summit

Contrary to desperate contortions of the major U.S. press to portray the London summit meeting as a "victory" for the U.S. President, it is universally understood in Europe that Schmidt and the other heads of state merely "agreed to disagree" with Carter. On the crucial issues of the monetary system, inflation and unemployment there were fine words and no action, the outcome of which will be a further exacerbation of the Rockefeller banks' desperate situation. The same was true for the issue of protectionism.

But on the nuclear energy question this same "agreement to disagree" had the definite quality of a European victory. According to the *Washington Post*, Chancellor Schmidt has forced Carter to drop completely his attempts to sabotage West Germany's \$5 billion nuclear technology deal with Brazil. As one Carter aide defensively put it, "We never *really* intended to make the West Germans back off!" Now that the Soviet Union has reaffirmed its commitment to a breeder-based energy economy, no power in the world could shake Europe from their nuclear programs.

Hence, much of the sickly-sweet coverage of Carter in the European press is merely praising him for being a good loser, undergoing a "learning process," as the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* has put it.

The spirit of the summit was continued in the communiqué on Berlin signed by Schmidt, Carter and Giscard. Although it had been advertised as a "harsh warning" to the Soviet Union with intimations about the Middle East and Africa, the actual communiqué is a jumbled compromise. Strict adherence to the existing Berlin agreements, it says, is "indispensable to the continued improvement of the situation and essential to the strengthening of détente, the maintenance of security and the development of cooperation throughout Europe."

But contradicting this Schmidt-inspired affirmation of the Helsinki accord, another clause provocatively says that the three Western powers will resist infringement "in all of Germany and in all four sectors of Berlin." Perhaps this jumble is what prompted Carter to mix up his programmed learning sequences and tell some astounded journalists that "We maintain, as you know, American, French, British and West German patrols in East Germany...."

The real reason why the U.S. felt compelled to issue a statement on Berlin, is the imminence of a significant breakthrough in East-West relations centering around the West Berlin question. Dietrich Stobb, the new Mayor of West Berlin, is a known supporter of Chancellor Schmidt, and has been moving rapidly to transform the local administration from an instrument of psychological warfare against the East bloc into an important confluence of East-West economic relations. The Soviet Union has given positive signals in return: Soviet ambassador to East Germany Falin recently praised Mayor Stobb for not being "burdened by the past," thus opening the doors to expanded cooperation.

Although less likely to produce a clear-cut victory for anti-Carter forces, the Helsinki follow-up conference in Belgrade is still the center of a number of important initiatives. At this week's meeting of the Western European Union, a European defense grouping within NATO, the Maltese delegation has proposed that the issue of Mediterranean security be included on the Belgrade agenda, thereby giving Europe and the East bloc countries a chance to put public pressure on the psychotic government of Israel and its U.S. controllers. The meeting also endorsed a strong pro-Helsinki resolution put forward by Italy's Andreotti government in collaboration with the Communist Party, which has a de facto alliance with Andreotti particularly on such foreign policy matters.