

Franco-German summit: The danger of doublespeak

by Laurent Murawiec
Wiesbaden correspondent

While President Giscard d'Estaing and Chancellor Helmut Schmidt opened the 35th Franco-German summit meeting, dubbed "the most important since 1963" by the German press, Soviet President Brezhnev was toasting visiting Cambodian leader Heng Samrin. The Soviet President directed his words to Paris, as he called for a renewal of detente. Meanwhile, Henry Kissinger prolonged his sojourn in Paris to keep close to the action. The encounter of the heads of state of Europe's two great powers was clearly seen as a potential turning point in the current world crisis by all powers concerned.

The final joint communique issued after three days of summit talks uses biting vocabulary to chastize the Soviet military move into Afghanistan, demands the withdrawal of troops, and warns the Soviets that there is a 'linkage' between this and further detente moves. The document is ostensibly a "categorical assertion of faithfulness to the Atlantic alliance," as the Paris daily *Le Figaro* put it. Its contents, however (see box), represent little more than a step towards "calming American nerves," in the words of a *Financial Times* editorial. But they are, in fact, a sign of appeasement thrown to the Anglo-American forces, and the Carter administration's policy of playing a poker bluff with nuclear chips.

A London *Daily Telegraph* editorial responded to the summit's outcome with alarm: "Anything else than a total commitment will leave openings into which Russia can drive wedges." British Foreign Secretary Lord Carrington sharply criticized the lack of any "concrete sanctions" against the Soviet Union, charging that the two

continental leaders were "by-passing the rest of the (European) community" and jeopardizing Euro-American relations.

This glaring contradiction, between the words couched in the formal statement and the operational assessment of it made by such spokesmen for the British oligarchy, reflects the 'doublespeak' of Giscard and Schmidt. Their desperate concern is currently to contain the element of insanity represented in world affairs by the Carter administration's policies. But containment efforts—attacked by the British—do not meet the requirement of an independent European intervention to stop the war danger, all the more urgent since the Carter administration has formally launched a deadly game of serialized mutual escalations, pompously christened the 'Carter Doctrine.'

Such interventions did emerge when President Giscard and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi powerfully defined the 'third way' available to detente-minded western industrial powers and nonaligned developing nations: economic development as the basis for drying out the conflict potential in the Third World.

However, confronted by the Anglo-American pressure encapsulated in Kissinger's remarks that it was 'intolerable' for Europe to claim American military protection and "think that it has a monopoly on detente negotiations," and Harold Brown's threats of using tactical nukes in the Gulf area against the Soviet Union (and Europe's own oil supplies), President Giscard and Chancellor Schmidt took the view that the best way for

the doctor to deal with his insane patient was to imitate his behavior, to 'appease' him.

And in order to appease the Anglo-American forces hell-bent on their geostrategic bluff, both European leaders issued a rather rhetorical statement, whose practically noncommittal nature has been fiercely denounced by the Anglo-Americans. Meanwhile, the Europeans continue doing business at diplomatic and economic levels with the Soviet Union. Indeed, President Giscard immediately told a press briefing that he "explicitly opposed trade sanctions and similar measures of the kind taken by President Carter." He added that "there were initiatives to be taken to prevent an extreme East-West confrontation, and leave the diplomatic door open for a Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan."

Additionally, sources in Europe stress that the French are quietly selling grain to the Soviets, and providing them with (U.S.-boycotted) oil-drilling technology. There is heavy traffic on the Ruhr-Moscow business line. Signals are being conveyed by leading West German businessmen and bankers, whose collective weight in Moscow is no second to Schmidt's.

In short, the French-German attitude is the product of a crisis-management view of the situation: to avoid the early outbreak of confrontation, a confrontation whose threshold to general nuclear war is low, they verbally appease the "Washington crazies," as the U.S. administration is termed in West Germany these days, and send Moscow signals that not one concrete bridge is being burnt.

"If they do that, why don't they just say it?" the question will correctly arise.

There is a fundamentally false perception which underlies Franco-German policy: the notion that there is nothing better they can do than contain, from one day to the next, from one insane outburst to the next, the mighty United States gone haywire under the current administration. In turn, this is based on the self-fulfilling delusion that the card represented by Democratic candidate for president LaRouche is "too small and too late" to have effective impact on the administration's policy.

Insofar as the Europeans wrongly delude themselves that a clean break with the follies of the Carter administration would not be supported and endorsed within the United States, they then accommodate to the crazies' every whim—crisis management. The fact that LaRouche's two recent half-hour prime-time nationwide TV addresses permanently altered the fabric of U.S. policy-making by subjecting the controllers of the administration to unheard-of domestic political pressure, is stupidly overlooked, out of the old, awed 'political dwarf' conception imposed on postwar Germany. And the hubristic quality represented by General de Gaulle's ruthless intervention directed at changing U.S. policies, has not yet been mustered by his successors.

That is the reason why, contrary to their best, and sometimes stated knowledge, Giscard and Schmidt go for 'doublespeak' and refuse to name the names of insanity: Brzezinski, Vance, Kissinger and the Council on Foreign Relations "controlled disintegration" policy behind them.

The potential for LaRouche to rally the U.S. population against administration policy—the number one parameter in the world situation given the 'multiplier effect' of driving the U.S. away from its current confrontation course—is the crucial element of 'flexibility' being neglected. Schmidt and Giscard paint themselves into a corner, from which their sole way of escape is the rhetorical 'Atlantic' posture they adopted, while telling the Soviets that "the next" incident like Afghanistan will surely terminate detente—another manner of saying that this one has not.

There are two levels of priority in the demands formulated towards Europe by the Anglo-Americans: comply with U.S. sanctions against the USSR, and accept the much-vaunted "division of labor" between the western powers. The latter is merely the fallback applied since Europe refused to slit its own throat with sanctions. The 'division of labor' doctrine emerged in the mouth of Germany's peabrained Foreign Minister, Hans Genscher. According to its exponents, the doctrine implies essentially that Germany fills the gap left in the European theater by the leave-of-absence taken by British and American troops from their treaty-established NATO commitments on the Rhine and the Elbe in order to go lose a war in the Gulf, Pakistan or elsewhere. It also calls for Germany to shoulder the burden of financially bailing out the flickering regimes stretched along the arc of crisis which have been bled economically dry by the Anglo-American 'decoupling' policy that denies any sort of economic progress to nations in the southern hemisphere.

The imbecilic flaw in the doctrine, which Genscher articulates as loudly and clearly as he does with every invention which Georgetown University plugs into Henry Kissinger, is that division of labor implies a modicum of community of principles between the laborers. Such a community exists neither in the minds of the Anglo-American promoters of the doctrine, nor in those of its intended European victims. In this case, the doctrine only means that, somehow, the doctor must accept a "division of labor" with the madman intent on murdering him. Concretely, any step taken towards appeasing the madman lowers the threshold for war, as it conveys to the Soviet command the message that Europe increasingly reveals itself unable to withstand the pressure, which is precisely what the pressure is intended to effect. The 'new consultation mechanism' Henry Kissinger has proposed is simply the institutionalization of the hegemony of Anglo-American policies, like the IMF in mon-

etary affairs, the International Energy Agency in energy questions, etc.

One friendly government temporarily gone haywire can and should be firmly, if gently contained. But nothing short of sheer diplomatic muscle, of 'rollback' brute force, can 'appease' the evil represented by the CFR's policy of 'controlled disintegration of the world economy,' the fundamental cause for the current escalation into war. By failing to loudly expose that axiomatic feature of the present situation, however it may shape their own private perceptions, the Europeans have declined to identify the primary cause of the present mess.

While the Giscard-Indira Gandhi New Delhi talks were explicitly setting the policy-frame for solving this problem, by announcing bold initiatives to relaunch the North-South dialogue and to reorganize the world's monetary system, in such a way that the new monetary institutions will be fully geared towards producing credit for Third World development, the Paris communique merely contains vague and highly implicit references to

both the problem and its proposed solution: there can be no peace so long as the West is plunging headlong into the worst economic depression of its history, and while the Third World is deliberately being 'decoupled.'

Funding Pakistan, Turkey, Yugoslavia, strengthening European-Persian Gulf relations, all commendable moves in their own right, do not even offset the effects of controlled disintegration. It is feeding caviar to a moribund.

What in fact the European leaders have shied away from is immediately implementing, as the French originally intended, phase two of the European Monetary System, the European Monetary Fund, the gold-backed, cheap-credit-generating facility and policy whose intellectual authorship belongs with Lyndon LaRouche. The crisis-management flaw in the French-German posture is their inability to shift the resolution of the war crisis into the higher dimension of economic development, and as a result, delaying the EMF and stalling Giscard's major monetary initiative. Publicly recognizing La-



The Giscard-Schmidt joint communique

What follows is an excerpted English translation of the joint communiqué issued by French President Giscard d'Estaing and West German Chancellor Schmidt following their weekend meeting in Paris. The text of the communiqué was released by the Federal Press Agency in Bonn.

President Giscard d'Estaing and Chancellor Schmidt have discussed the international situation in view of the events in Afghanistan... They have come to the following conclusions:

- 1) They share the view that the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan cannot be tolerated and presents a serious danger to world stability and the security of peace.
- 2) It is imperative to immediately end this intervention in the way demanded by the General Assembly of the United Nations, by a large majority vote. This is the only means by which a situation that corresponds to the rights of the Afghan people and the requirements of international peace can be reestablished.
- 3) They share the view that the present situation is of a character able to set into motion a process—even if unwanted—which can lead to grave consequences. Both statesmen are concerned about the need to stress that under these circumstances, their two nations want to hold to loyalty to the Atlantic Alliance and to the decisiveness to fulfill their duties in this framework.
- 4) They state that through the events in Afghanistan, detente has become more difficult and more insecure, and that therefore the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghanistan is urgently required. They state that detente would not survive another shock like that [represented by Afghanistan] and that in this case France and the Federal Republic of Germany will take the measures required for securing and defending the security of their countries.

Rouche's decisive input would be the crucial element of 'flexibility' in an otherwise strictly predetermined mechanism leading into war via any suitable Sarajevo.

Neither Giscard nor Schmidt is actually doing what he is saying; channels are being kept open with Moscow, development initiatives are indeed being prepared and partly implemented on the quiet, outside the policy-framework set by Anglo-American demands. But France and Germany are also not saying what they are doing, dangerously denying their unique role in world affairs. The international weight and authority of the French government—and singularly that of the heir to General de Gaulle, President Giscard d'Estaing—and the strength of West German industry, are the two elements which have, over the last four years, kept the world from the brink of general thermonuclear war. Such a responsibility cannot be eschewed, all the more now that the forceful emergence of the LaRouche presidential campaign within the United States signifies a real potential return of the U.S.A. to reason.

5) They understand the worries voiced by those nations committed to a genuine nonalignment, and stress that these nations must play an important and independent role for peace and stability in the world. Therefore it is necessary to avoid a spreading of the East-West conflict into the Third World.

6) The citizens of France and the Federal Republic of Germany have experienced the horrors of two world wars on their own soil and have worked for the creation of a more stable and peaceful world during the past 30 years. In this context, their mutual rapprochement and their common efforts to rebuild Europe have been crucial steps on this course. They share the view that the European powers have to bear special responsibilities under present circumstances, and they thereby try—together with their alliance partners—to guarantee the fundamental balance upon which the security of their nations and the security of Europe depend.

7) Their efforts to overcome this crisis will only make sense if the Soviet Union states publicly its commitment to respond to these efforts. France and Germany have recognized the statements given by the U.S.S.R. that they intend to withdraw their troops from Afghanistan. New actions are required to follow these declarations of intent. This is necessary for successful efforts on which the security and future of peace will depend.

U.S.S.R.

Scientist's rise a clue to policy

by Rachel Douglas

One week ago a 47-year-old member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences who has spent the past 17 years working in its Siberian Division was vaulted into the powerful post of Chairman of the U.S.S.R. State Committee on Science and Technology and became a Deputy Prime Minister of the Soviet Union.

The State Committee where G.A. Marchuk takes the reins is responsible for submitting influential recommendations on Soviet Research & Development budgeting, for drafting long-term science and economic plans, and for arranging aspects of Soviet economic deals with Western countries.

Marchuk's transfer to this command point in Moscow is part of a mobilization of resources in the Soviet Union, which is occurring because the Russian leaders consider all-out war a growing likelihood. His experience in Siberia means that Marchuk will bring to the job the competence of running vast projects, where efficiency and skillful deployment of resources are vital. He also brings first-hand contact with the U.S.S.R.'s most advanced work in mathematical physics, which is the basis of Soviet weapons development.

Before his 1962 move to Novosibirsk headquarters of the Siberian Division, itself the location of top Russian laboratories, Marchuk worked for nine years at the Physics & Power Institute at Obninsk, a research center which was also the home of the first Soviet atomic power station.

Other causes of the shakeup which brought Academician Marchuk from Novosibirsk to Moscow are also important, but subordinate to the primary fact of a Soviet pre-war mobilization. These include a push by Soviet leadership elements who have the least confidence or interest in restoring East-West scientific ties to shut them down for the long term, by such measures as the arrest of dissident physicist Andrei Sakharov with its subsequent, inevitable wave of protests from Western scientists, and the removal of Marchuk's predecessor, V.A. Kirillin, who had chaired both the Franco-Soviet