

Will Europe stop the drive toward world war?

by Criton Zoakos
Contributing Editor

During the grave strategic crisis in the aftermath of the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan, a very important formulation was put forward by the continental European leadership which, however, was blacked out by Washington and ignored by virtually all of our ostentatious political commentators. President Giscard d'Estaing of France and Chancellor Schmidt of the Federal Republic of Germany met in an emergency consultation in Paris over ten days ago. Their joint attitude toward the United States was characterized by the French daily *Le Figaro* as one of "solidarity, but not alignment."

The implications of this "not alignment" were to become evident during and after the EEC's Foreign Ministers' meeting on Jan. 15, an affair which was run jointly by French Foreign Minister Jean François-Poncet and his West German counterpart Hans Dietrich Genscher. The substance of the meeting was to vote up an independent European initiative toward the Middle East and the Third World. As per the official communiqué, this policy represents a French diplomatic triumph within the EEC: it charts Western Europe's basic role for the present decade as one of providing both the advanced technologies and the political and financial stability required for the development of key Third World nations, with special emphasis on the development of the Arab nations and of India.

This breakthrough development has reshaped the world strategic situation into the following picture:

Washington's greatest fear in the aftermath of the Afghanistan events is not primarily any future Soviet military moves. It is, as Secretary Vance repeatedly pointed out, the Soviet Union's expected "peace offensive" in Western Europe which allegedly will endeavor to "drive a wedge between the United States and its NATO allies."



Photo: Sygma

Moscow's policy in fact cannot be characterized exactly as a "peace offensive." It is simply a straightforward presentation of the "bottom line" to the Europeans: From Vladivostok, to Murmansk, to Riga and to the frontiers with Sinkiang, the Soviet High Command displays a centrally deployed disposition of military forces meant to back up the warning they delivered in Afghanistan: what they shall and what they shall not tolerate of Zbigniew Brzezinski's strategy of encirclement has been clearly articulated. Simultaneously, the Soviet leadership through Leonid Brezhnev and through lesser official spokesmen have clearly stated to Western Europe that they do not consider the Carter leadership in the United States as a "reliable partner" in international affairs, for reasons associated with President Carter's current commitment to Brzezinski's policy of controlled disintegration. The Soviets, in official statements, also made it clear that they also object to the Carter administration's current policy of wrecking the domestic United States economy.

Thus, the Soviets, rather than launching a so-called peace offensive against Western Europe, are presenting the European leaders, principally Giscard and Schmidt, with the challenge to define and push forward a general strategic perspective for the Western World as a whole—a strategic perspective which will be (a) different from the Carter administration's idiotic commitment to "con-

In this section

This week's Special Report examines the meaning of European repudiation of the new "Cold War" doctrine emerging from Washington and London in the wake of the Afghanistan events. Can Europe stop a new world war? First, contributing editor Criton Zoakos analyzes the Soviet policy toward the West, the Carter administration policy toward the Soviets, and the generally unreported degree to which France and West Germany, are now determined to formulate their own policy, independent of the Atlantic alliance. Then, we take a look at the overall policy of the European community nations who have spurned current Carter policy—France, Germany, and Italy. As the continent's No. 3 nation, the Italian answer is of a major strategic significance. Finally, Soviet desk chief Rachel Douglas reports on the Soviet Union's most recent policy pronouncements respecting both Carter and the Europeans, featuring the full text of Soviet President Brezhnev's unusual personal interview with *Pravda*, and a significant commentary from *Red Star*, the Soviet military newspaper.

trolled disintegration” and (b) one with which the Soviet Union and its allies will be able to live. Once again the Soviet leadership, both in private discussions and in public statements, has made it clear that unless Western Europe succeeds in enforcing such a policy, the U.S.S.R. will be compelled to rely on military means for the protection of what it considers its vital interests.

The Europeans’ world strategy

The *Paris-Bonn* axis has, so far, responded to the Soviet challenge and to Washington’s hysteria about the “Soviet peace offensive in Europe” by initiating a sharp definition of its own independent foreign policy, one which both Giscard and Schmidt characterize as “not aligned” with the United States. It is this continental European independence which Carter, Vance, Brzezinski, et al., abhor more than anything else and which they shall shortly attempt to mischaracterize as “capitulation to Soviet pressure.”

The current European policy thrust threatens to destroy the policy of “controlled disintegration” and “decoupling” of the world economy to which the Carter administration is committed on behalf of the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the London and New York banking interests.

The Bonn-Paris axis is currently launching a worldwide strategy based on three parallel thrusts: First, launch Phase Two of the European Monetary System, a gold-backed system to provide long-term, low-interest development credits to key Third World nations for the financing of development projects which will function as the engine for a prosperity policy in the advanced sector; second, a massive upgrading of the European-Arab dialogue by means of intensified political and economic cooperation defined around massive “oil-for-technology” deals currently being signed by West German and French delegations in the Middle East; third, preparations for massive economic/industrial cooperation with the new Indira Gandhi government in India—Europe is about to play its own “India Card.”

If Washington rediscovers sanity and joins in this strategy, the current world military-strategic crisis will soon abate. If, as seems more likely, the Carter administration persists on its insane course, the outcome will be either a grand scale strategic humiliation of the United States which will finish off Carter as well as Kennedy as viable Democratic presidential candidates or the outbreak of general thermonuclear war.

At this time, the strategists of the Carter administration are wavering between two equally untenable, alternate courses, as means of frustrating the European strategic initiatives. One is to threaten Europe with some sort of military action in the Straights of Hormuz which will

have the net effect of turning off all Europe’s petroleum supplies. The second is the attempt to impose alliance discipline by means of a rehashed “Truman Doctrine.” Both are abstractions that cannot work.

The U.S. policy of threats

The threat to blow up the Gulf, as the Europeans know, is principally an issue of world war and peace between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., something which, the Europeans also know, cannot be affected by what they do or do not do; moreover, the flaw of this policy of threat is that the threat, once carried out, is no longer a threat and thus cannot influence the behavior of the threatened party: there is no telling what the Europeans will do if their Middle East oil supplies are cut.

The second Carter administration ploy, the rehashed “Truman Doctrine,” cannot work because every living European politician knows that that policy of the 1950s worked then because of two conditions: the undisputed nuclear strategic superiority of the United States during that period, and also the undisputed conventional superiority of the United States at that time in the principal theaters of Europe, the Middle and Near East and the Far East. None of these conditions exists today.

So long as the Carter administration muddles along this path, the European diplomatic offensive will have its greatest impact in the Middle East. European and Arab pressures are now mounting against the so-called Camp David powers in the area. Both France and West Germany are putting out the analysis that the Middle East, including Iran, were destabilized because the Camp David agreements were pushed for implementation. The two policies of Zbigniew Brzezinski, Camp David and Islamic fundamentalism, are now on a head-on collision course. As one helps destroy the other, the options for a decisive EEC intervention in the Middle East along the lines of the European Monetary System seem increasingly more propitious.

A European victory in this domain, contrary to what hysterical commentators peddle, will also be an American victory. The consequent, well deserved discrediting of the Carter team will dramatically open up the prospects of Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., the much feared “dark horse” in the Democratic presidential race. Barring a thermonuclear catastrophe by miscalculation, the pitched strategic battles ahead ought to be resolved with the United States developing the leadership to join the European Monetary System, go for gold monetization and launch a protracted era of industrial prosperity throughout the Western alliance. Under such altered, auspicious circumstances, the Soviet leadership ought to, and most likely will, oblige.