

following the Soviet-Cuban infiltration and the wavering of the German SPD and its charismatic leader, Willy Brandt.”

The former vice-secretary of the Italian Social Democratic Party (PSDI), Antonio Cariglia, commented: “The only point on which I disagree with Ripa is: Why did he take this initiative so late?” The organ of the PSDI, *L'Umanità*, wrote: “Inside the Socialist International two opposite positions are emerging; one is the neutralist one that, on behalf of an unarmed pacifism, pushes in a direction incompatible with Western security.”

The International Secretary of the SPD, Hans Eberhard Dingels, declared that the SPD was not going to deny anything, because “that meeting was not secret and there is nothing to deny.” Ripa di Meana said: “Nobody can deny these facts, and in fact, nobody did.”

INTERVIEW: Antonio Cariglia

‘Brandt neutralism is helping Soviets’

The Honorable Antonio Cariglia has been a deputy in the lower house of the Italian parliament since 1963, where he formerly chaired the foreign affairs committee and the parliamentary caucus of the Italian Social Democratic Party (PSDI). He is currently a deputy in the European Parliament in Strasbourg. He is a former vice-secretary of the PSDI and a member of the party's executive committee. For 20 years he has been a permanent member of the bureau of the Socialist International. He was interviewed in Rome Jan. 5 by EIR correspondents Maria Cristina Fiocchi and Umberto Pascali.

EIR: American Defense Secretary Weinberger at the last NATO meeting in Brussels definitively clarified that the defense of the United States from a possible Soviet attack is indivisible from the defense of the Atlantic Alliance, and he asked for an active commitment of Europe to the new defense program announced by President Reagan last March, of which Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. has been one of the principal authors and supporters. What is your view of this?

Cariglia: I think that Weinberger is right to pose the problem of how to shore up this alliance between the United States and Europe. Here I believe that we may remind the Americans that the concept of defense is insufficient; we must go back to the moment when the North Atlantic Treaty was

signed to rediscover those ties which are not only of a military nature, but of an economic, as well as cultural nature, so that this defense of the West would not pass as a kind of Holy Alliance of capitalist powers counterposed to the communist world, but would be above all the defense of a common civilization, the matrix of the values we all believe in. . . . We do not sufficiently emphasize the fact that the Atlantic Alliance is a defensive alliance created in a definite historical moment when the fate of Europe was in danger. Europe had just emerged from the war against Nazism and fascism and was then exposed to the peril of Soviet domination. There was no other way to defend ourselves but to ally with the United States, with which there was, besides, a common civilization. The second point is *how* we should defend. I am not very familiar with beam weapons, but intuitively, this is a weapon whose deployment will resolve things much more decisively than others. . . . If the common decision is that we defend ourselves, then whatever weapons the community has available, we should use for defense.

EIR: There is talk of Finlandization of the European continent, the danger of a split between Europe and the United States.

Cariglia: I maintain that the danger of Finlandization in Europe is an objective peril due to the disproportion in defense capacity of Europe vis-à-vis the Soviet power and above all due to the enormous pressure that the U.S.S.R. exerts on the countries of Western Europe. They leave no stone unturned in their effort to weaken Western Europe even though no danger for their security and political regime comes from Europe. Europe has never considered calling into question what are called the conquests of the Soviet system. This ought to give pause to European public opinion, which all too simplistically latches onto the easy equation that the United States equals U.S.S.R., because both are superpowers, both have opposing interests, and the two alignments obey only these conflicting interests. This is wrong, because Europe must affirm the principle of democratic values in which we believe, which can be summed up in the right of every country to assert its free opinion. . . . In the communist bloc countries, there is no hindrance to governments' actions because there is no public opinion capable of making itself heard. If we kept this feature of our situation clearly in mind, we would have more polemical force to contrast the behavior of the Soviet Union and challenge it. . . . In the immense Soviet empire there is nothing that allows millions and millions of youth to come to Europe, to America; it is practically an impenetrable field where generations and generations grow up without having any terms of comparison between their experience and the rest of the world's. All this should worry us, because it means that those who govern those countries do not prepare their people for peace. They are preparing for war, because only in that way could one explain the total impenetrability of the Soviet world by the Western one, whereas we know that the Western world is largely penetrable by the communist world.

EIR: Speaking of the penetrability of the Western world, in December various Italian spokesmen of the Socialist International denounced the infiltration of the KGB into the Socialist International.

Cariglia: I cannot know Socialist International, but I can affirm that the Socialist International no longer corresponds to what its original task was. The Socialist International has become a kind of permanent conference of movements whose democratic and socialist nature is not always demonstrable. . . . Someone has wanted to change the International's nature, so that political parties which should have had the right to be members, like the Argentine Radical Party, are not there, and some African and Central American countries that seem to prefer the sound of machine guns to political debate, are there. In my view this is a mistake because the Socialist International's job is to make an important contribution to a peaceful solution to the problems exploding in the world. Hence that moral tension which used to characterize the Socialist International has drifted away from the role of mediation. Sometimes it gets involved, without wanting to, in schemes having nothing to do with freedom.

EIR: In public statements Hon. Carlo Ripa di Meana referred to the secret meeting in Managua of the Socialist International, where there was an attempt to shift the axis of the International toward Cuba. There was talk of the role of Brandt, Kreisky, and Palme in the appeasement policy toward the U.S.S.R. What do you think about these statements?

Cariglia: The secret meeting, which was discussed during the Brussels meeting of the Socialist International where I was present, was a meeting alleged to have taken place at the initiative of some Central American parties belonging to the Socialist International. At the International meeting a document was read which was obtained after the American intervention in Grenada, and the document was not substantially denied. The only thing that was said is that the nature of the deal was not to infiltrate the Socialist International but to aid the movement which had arisen in Grenada. Naturally as far as I am concerned—and I think also for others like Ripa di Meana—the Socialist International has been tainted with presences having nothing to do with its tradition and statutes. As for the role of such important men as Willy Brandt, Kreisky, and Palme in the Socialist International: Theirs is not a secondary role, and for various reasons they have been pushing the neutralization of Europe for some time. For those of us who have a precise idea about this proposal, neutralization amounts to subjecting Europe to the hegemonic power, in this case the Soviet Union. It seems to me that the split already exists and is well known, and that on this point there is absolutely no mutual understanding. That these positions end up helping the Soviet Union in its propaganda effort against the West, is also an objective fact. I believe that the protagonists themselves are aware of this. We are trying to beat our own path and have no intention of giving up our position. For years the Italian Social Democrats, the French Socialists, and

other parties have been convinced that the problem of neutrality is against our interests, because neutrality puts us at the mercy of the hegemonic continental power, i.e., the Soviet Union.

EIR: Germany is the weak point of Europe. Don't you think that the present policy of the Foreign Minister Genscher is taking Germany out of the Atlantic Alliance?

Cariglia: I rule out Genscher being able to impose his own line of foreign policy. His position must match that of the coalition parties in the government. I must maintain that whatever his personal intentions may be, it is difficult to foresee a change in the present German foreign policy, well known to us all. I see Genscher's attitude as an alarming symptom of the German reality, alarming for the future of a Germany caught between several fires. In Germany there are those who cherish the hope of reunification through neutrality, and those who instead think that the path to attaining reunification is that of having a Germany economically strong and guaranteed in its security. Hence a Germany as a political subject. I am convinced that in German public opinion the idea of maintaining of all those bulwarks of security prevails, and the Atlantic Alliance is Germany's fundamental bulwark. If Germany should succumb to the idea that there is some shortcut to reunification, then I strongly fear that the objective will not be reached, or if it were, it would be under enslavement.

EIR: How do you see the Italian situation in the light of this strategic situation?

Cariglia: I think that it is positive that we are finally beginning to talk about foreign policy again. There was a long period, coinciding with the so-called policy of national unity, when foreign policy was banned from Italian political discussions, as if it did not exist. Today, the policies of the Atlantic Alliance, the Pershing missiles, and SS-20s, have brought about a rediscovery of foreign policy. I, however, am not sure about the total commitment of our country, not so much because I don't trust the leaders, but because I think Italy is a country where commitments are often undertaken much too lightly. People are also happy when certain commitments, once undertaken, find a way of being delayed in their implementation—the fact, for example, of having put off for four months the stationing of the missiles at Comiso was cause for relief for some sectors of the Italian political class. We should convince ourselves that we must build in Europe, together with the Americans and the other national communities, a common defense of our common heritage. For this, the ritual of discussing foreign policy at the level of international institutions is not enough. The debate has to get down to the depth of public opinion, pulling it off the false track of one-way pacifism, and instead bringing out the problems of security intimately connected to the values of freedom and democracy which we hope to be able, one day, to find also widely accepted in the countries we confront today, in this case the countries of the communist system.