

of Eastern Europe. If an all-embracing European structure ever comes to pass, the existing dividing lines may seem less crucial. . . . The most effective structure for Atlantic cooperation is a partnership between the United States and a united, supranational Europe."

Recent efforts to resurrect the Western European Union, which pre-dated the founding of NATO, are part of a renewed attempt in this direction. Lord Carrington confirmed this in his press conference, while continuing to deny profusely that he has any intention of "decoupling" Europe from the United States.

"Well, this is part of the Kissinger question, in many ways," he said. "If we could identify ourselves and have a more European identity, without decoupling. . . . The Western European Union is an organization which is part of the Brussels Treaty. . . . It really fell into disuse. . . . If you could have it as a forum in which the security of Europe were discussed. . . . you could have greater identity for European defense. . . . If the result is only to create a Club within a Club, to create suspicions within the United States, or to make the United States feel that the United States is no longer needed within NATO, that would be infinitely worse than any conceivable gain that could be gotten out of it."

Lord Carrington insisted repeatedly throughout the press conference that Kissinger had not called for "decoupling" in his *Time* magazine piece. When first asked about his former

business partner's scheme to pull U. S. troops out of NATO, Lord Carrington said: "Yes, my business partner, well, Henry was really trying to do something a bit different from what you're saying. I think he was just trying to get a debate going about a European identity through defense."

With this response and his profusions of undying loyalty to the United States, Carrington is playing the old British game of empire manipulation, described aptly by Sir George Catlin in his book, *Kissinger's Atlantic Charter*. Since World War II, Catlin shows, Great Britain thought that it could simultaneously resurrect the conditions that prevailed after the 1815 Congress of Vienna, in which (as Kissinger reports in *A*

agency of the Habsburg empire and Prince Metternich, while at the same time rebuilding an "English-speaking Commonwealth" or Anglo-American Empire. Within that latter "special relationship," Kissinger declared (in *The Troubled Partnership*), Great Britain "has tried hard to give the impression that American policy is strongly influenced, if not guided, by London."

Sir George was one of the "Founding Fathers" of NATO whom Carrington invokes, along with the Fabian Society's Walter Lippmann; heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne Otto von Habsburg; and the arch-enemy of France's Charles de Gaulle, Jean Monnet, who envisioned using the Western European Union and NATO as vehicles to create a suprana-

The WEU: vehicle for a European deal with Moscow

The work of the Western European Union (WEU) opened in Rome on Oct. 26 with French Foreign Minister Claude Cheysson conspicuously absent. Although he had been among the main instigators of the meeting, he preferred to show up late so that he could take part in celebrations sponsored by the Soviet embassy in Paris. Thus Cheysson set the tone for the Rome conference, making explicit the direction of this meeting—to cut Western Europe out of its alliance with the United States and deliver it prone to Soviet military and political hegemony.

The Western European Union was formed under the Brussels Treaty before NATO came into being. Today, the circles around Henry Kissinger and NATO Secretary-General Lord Carrington are trying to pump new life into it, as a forum for Europeans to talk about their security "independently" of the United States—a sly cover for decoupling from the Atlantic alliance. This is what Carrington means by boosting the "political" role of NATO and the WEU.

Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher of West Germany, during the final press conference of the Rome meeting, was asked by *EIR*'s correspondent whether President Reagan's proposal for Europe to collaborate with the United States in developing space-based antiballistic-missile beam weapons had been taken into consideration. Genscher responded in a fury, brandishing the microphone and screaming, "There has never been any American proposal for the common use of space. . . ." Coming from Genscher, the lie was especially brazen. During the recent meeting of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group in Stresa, Italy, with Genscher present, U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger had formulated a proposal for cooperation between the United States and Europe precisely for the development of space defense.

A dream world

The atmosphere that reigned among the participants, the foreign and defense ministers of Italy, France, Great Britain,

tional Europe, as opposed to de Gaulle's plan for a confederated "United States of Europe."

In *Kissinger's Atlantic Charter*, published in 1974, Catlin shows that when Sir Winston Churchill allied with this group and with Bertrand Russell's "World Federalist" movement after World War II, he pursued a policy of duplicity similar to Lord Carrington's present one. Churchill's postwar policy underwent a number of shifts, from his appeal for an Anglo-American alliance in Fulton, Missouri, to his overtures to the European Parliament. "The ambiguity between the Fulton position, which stressed the alignment, historically and in two wars, of Britain and North America, and Churchill's new Zurich 'Concert of Europe' position, continued—although an ambiguity it was thought undesirable to emphasize in those days."

As for Kissinger, in a May 10, 1982 speech before London's Royal Institute for International Affairs (Chatham House), he admitted that he had served as a lifetime agent for the British oligarchical plan, adding: "In my White House incarnation . . . I kept the British Foreign Office better informed and more closely engaged than I did the American State Department." This is the real substance of Kissinger's and Carrington's "decoupling" plans, which seek to submerge the alliance between the United States and Europe under a British mandate, while overseeing the demise of European "sovereign nations."

Misinterpreted?

Lord Carrington now claims that Kissinger was grossly misinterpreted in the *Time* magazine piece, published just days before Kissinger's appointment to the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. In that article, Kissinger demanded the withdrawal of half of the U.S. troops from Western Europe, among other decoupling measures. Carrington is right that Kissinger does not simply want to "pull U.S. troops out of Europe"; he wants to destroy Europe altogether, according to the outlines of the "New Yalta" scheme.

If Kissinger's earlier statements in *The Troubled Partnership* leave any doubt, or his repeated statements in *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy* on behalf of "limited nuclear warfare" in Europe and "a more flexible commitment" by the United States, his plan for an "Austrian solution" for Germany should clear this up. According to Kissinger, one goal of a more politicized NATO of the sort now recommended by Lord Carrington must be the neutralization and reunification of Germany. This is the heart of the "New Yalta" plan, and is identical to the proposals of West German Social Democrats like Egon Bahr who are seeking an accommodation with Moscow. Under current international strategic-military conditions, Germany will be reunified under Moscow's terms—or not at all.

Here is what Kissinger proposed: "A commission com-

West Germany, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg, was artificial and somnolent, as if the growing Soviet threat did not exist, as if reality were constituted only by computer printouts and the eggheads of supranational organizations like the Trilateral Commission and the Council on Foreign Relations. Italian Defense Minister Giovanni Spadolini, chatting with journalists, made it clear that the WEU is needed as a crucial element in the strategy of constructing a united Europe based on the idea of perennial détente.

The question is: Since in the case of real danger between East and West, Europe must turn to NATO—i.e., to the alliance with the United States—then what is the purpose of the WEU? Curiously, only the British delegation raised this obvious objection at the Rome conference, pointing out that all the functions that the WEU is supposed to take care of are already supplied by NATO.

Spadolini himself, who came up with the idea of reviving the WEU during a meeting with his French colleague Charles Hernu some months ago, explained that its aim is to promote European unification on a supranational model. With the procedure for at least two annual meetings of the WEU Council set up at the Rome get-together, there is now a plan for integrating the armed forces and military production of Eu-

ropean countries and for greater independence from the United States. The project closely echoes the project of Kissinger and the Trilateral Commission to detach Europe from the United States, in order to create various strategically "independent" areas—but, be it understood, under the control of Trilateral diplomacy.

The European foreign ministers' club, dominated by Genscher, Cheysson, and their Italian cohort Andreotti, is only too ready to sell out Western interests in the search for an accord with Moscow. Almost all of them felt the need to stress that the WEU is being revived not *against* the Atlantic alliance, but within the alliance. Even a *New York Times* journalist noticed that something was wrong, and asked Genscher if he did not think it possible to allow at least one U.S. observer in the WEU meeting. Genscher replied that to inform their U.S. ally, normal diplomatic channels would be used!

Outside, the "peace" movement staged an anti-WEU demo, but fewer than a thousand people showed up—a sign that the Italian Communist Party did not support it. Nor did it need to. In the present strategic situation, the WEU's policy is tantamount to voluntarily bowing down before Holy Mother Russia.