

'The British seek revenge for Suez': London's new moves against the U.S.

by Mark Burdman

"The British government, with the help of some people in Paris, is doing everything it can to undermine the position of the United States in the Middle East. People here are calling it 'Britain's Revenge for Suez.'"

This evaluation was given to *EIR* Feb. 9, three days after the capture of West Beirut by combined Syrian-backed Shi'ite Lebanese and Druze forces, by a Lebanese source in Paris. The evaluation sums up an extraordinary mobilization by British Foreign Office assets across Europe, in league with the Kremlin, to drive the United States out of the Middle East and to come to a general accord with Moscow to divide the Middle East and Persian Gulf oil-producing regions into respective spheres of influence—a "New Yalta."

It might appear that this arrangement went into effect after Feb. 7 with the announcement by the British government that it was pulling its 100-man force out of Lebanon and with the anti-American venom launched in the British Parliament by opposition leader Denis Healey and others. In truth, the deal went into effect much earlier, no later than Jan. 19-20, when British Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe had an extensive private session with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko in Stockholm. They decided to make the Middle East a focal point of European-Soviet "crisis-management" agreements to undermine the Reagan administration and enable the Mondale-Kissinger forces to take control of U.S. policy.

But the British are not acting alone. Their collaborators in the Quai d'Orsay in Paris, in the Italian foreign ministry, and in the Willy Brandt-Olof Palme wing of the Socialist International are on a *tous azimuts* mobilization to destroy U.S. power across the globe, beginning with the Middle East.

One, two, many Neville Chamberlains

The predominant mood in Western Europe in the hours after the Feb. 7 Lebanon debacle was making one's deal with the devil, the Byzantine imperialists seeking to make Moscow the seat of the "Third and Final Roman Empire." Moscow has threatened, through relevant diplomatic channels and by mobilizing its arsenal of Nazi International terrorists, to destroy the nations of Western Europe if they do not force Reagan to back down from a strong national defense policy based on the development of laser ABM defense. Most Western European governments have kowtowed.

When the Amin Gemayel government collapsed in Beirut, the Quai d'Orsay dispatched a special team to Washing-

ton under the direction of foreign office specialist Bonnefous. According to *Le Monde* and other French press, these officials "strongly disagree" with the U.S. attitude toward Syrian President Hafez Assad, believing (as does Henry Kissinger) that a deal can be struck. According to one British insider with good French connections, "[French Foreign Minister] Cheysson leads a school that believes that the U.S. perspective on Syria is all wrong. The French believe they are in a special position to change things in Damascus."

Jacques Huntziger, head of the international department of the French Socialist Party, reportedly shocked the normal run of appeasers in Paris with his response to Lebanese Druze warlord Walid Jumblatt's statement on France's Radio France International Feb. 5 that Gemayel should be killed. Huntziger said that Jumblatt's statement was "excessive," but that "in essentials, Jumblatt is absolutely right" in demanding that the Lebanese government be changed!

Cheysson, in league with Giulio Andreotti, Italy's foreign minister, is pushing a plan for the Western multinational force in Lebanon to be replaced by a U.N. contingent. Since such arrangements must first be subject to a U.N. Security Council vote, the Soviets will veto anything not to their liking.

Andreotti himself has been up to some very nasty tricks. He spent the first days of February consorting with Libyan madman Muammar Qaddafi in Tripoli, proposing that Libya join the European Community. At that moment, Qaddafi was issuing press releases announcing that all Libyans abroad opposed to his regime would be assassinated in the next months. Qaddafi was also putting into motion new plans for terrorism throughout the southern Mediterranean, targetting Andreotti's own country because Italy had agreed to the stationing of American cruise missiles at the Comiso base in Sicily.

Andreotti raced from Libya to Yugoslavia, where he reportedly held private discussions with Syrian Foreign Minister Khaddam, putting forward Italy as the mediating nation to bring Europe closer to Moscow's surrogates in Damascus and Tripoli. Simultaneous with Andreotti's arrival, the Yugoslav government announced that it had signed a \$800 million barter deal for energy resources with U.S. magnate Armand Hammer, one of the prime Western tools used by Moscow for its global imperialist ambitions.

But the depths of appeasing the Soviets have been plumbed by Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreu. Papandreu

announced before an international "peace conference" in Athens Feb. 7 that the United States which was to blame for the huge Soviet intermediate-range ballistic missile buildup in Europe. Reports from "peace movement" sources in Vienna and London are that this Athens conference was seeded with liberal amounts of money from Colonel Qaddafi and that it would be the first in a series later covering Rome, Madrid, and other southern European countries, all with the aim to get the United States militarily out of the Mediterranean and Middle East and to strengthen the Soviet position.

'Kissinger is right'

The public signal of British appeasement was a Feb. 7 editorial in the *Financial Times* of London, the voice of former Foreign Secretary Lord Carrington and the City of London. The "distasteful alternative" for the Reagan administration of further military action in Lebanon "is the road to Damascus. . . . As Henry Kissinger demonstrated after the 1973 Middle East war, it is possible to negotiate and strike a lasting deal with Mr. Assad. It is along that path that the European contributors to the multinational force should be urging Mr. Reagan."

A British insider close to Kissinger told a caller Feb. 9: "The dangers in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf oil regions are now greater than ever, but there is also a positive side to all this. We can now consider a conference of the major powers in the Middle East and bring the Soviets in in a crisis-management capacity. . . . The French and Italians would support this idea, the French have a sophisticated idea of Assad's real ambitions. . . . We need sufficient 'carrots' to tempt Assad into a deal, maybe offer him a revision of the Lebanese constitution to the detriment of continued Christian power there. . . . This could catalyze a necessary reappraisal of policy in the U.S." He stressed that the British Foreign Office was busily opening channels into Syria, particularly through the offices of one Mr. Edgerton, a senior Arab Bureau official.

Lord Caradon, the controller of the Foreign Office Arab Bureau and the brother of former British Labour Party head Michael Foot, told a caller Feb. 8: "The only option for the United States now is to pull out of Lebanon. Clearly this situation strengthens the Soviet position. Britain can take a prominent part in shifting the situation. It may not be a 'New Yalta,' but we could call it a new agreement built on the opportunities emerging out of the current shambles of U.S. policy."

With the exception of a small group of anti-appeasement leaders centered around Parliamentarian Julian Amery, who argued that the pullout from Lebanon would greatly damage Western interests throughout South Asia and the Persian Gulf, the Caradon line was repeated to *EIR* by British military strategists who dropped their usual anti-Soviet posture. One such figure shouted: "Any effort to confront Syria will start World War III. . . . The Western nations should get the hell out of Lebanon! The Muslims have won . . . and we should

all get out!"

Laying the ground for abandoning the Middle East was the announcement Feb. 3-4 by Britain's leading oil companies that they would be increasing exploration, development, and production in new oilfields over the coming months. The British are preparing to ride out an oil blowout in the Gulf. West German government officials told *EIR* on Feb. 8 that West Germany was calm about the prospects of an oil blowout "since we can get the oil we need from Britain and the Libyans."

He might have added: from the Soviets as well. Germany is daily becoming more and more energy-dependent on the East. Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, a protector of Iranian terrorists in Europe, is the go-between. "If we wanted to arrange new deals with the Soviets behind public channels," a London source said, "our best bet would be to work through Genscher."

Genscher has been identified as one of the key Soviet-allied point men in organizing Western Europe to sabotage beam weapons development by the West. Under the direction of his friends in the British Foreign Office Arms Control and Disarmament department, efforts were escalated in early February with the release by senior British military and scientific personnel of *Diminishing the Nuclear Threat*, published by the British Atlantic Committee. This book denounces ABM development as a "fantasy" and as "economically ruinous." The book's co-author, former Ministry of Defense scientific adviser Sir Ronald Mason, is the chief organizer of a Feb. 9-10 conference sponsored by London *Economist* magazine focused on countering the beam-weapon development option. A featured speaker is U. S. Ambassador to NATO David Abshire, a close ally of Kissinger who tells callers to his Brussels office that *EIR* founding editor Lyndon LaRouche, the catalyst of the U. S. beam-weapon policy, is a "crackpot and a troublemaker" and that the Reagan administration "has made no commitment to any ABM system beyond scientific research."

The Nazi angle

A crucial instrument in concretizing the New Yalta arrangement is the terrorism capability of the Swiss-based Nazi International.

Leading Swiss Islamic-Nazi Ahmed Huber, based in Berne, told a caller on Feb. 7 that "the events in Beirut are wonderful!" Laughing uproariously, Huber said, "America will now have to get out of the whole Middle East. . . . The Islamic movement is growing. . . . In Saudi Arabia, too, there will be changes sooner than anybody thinks. . . . Western influence will end. Islam will come again." He continued: "The Enemy Number One is America! America will see more and more trouble." Asked about what effects this would have on the political future of Ronald Reagan, he commented: "As the president of the Parliament of Iran recently said, 'Allah will decide if President Reagan lives or becomes President again!'"