

Editorial

Thatcher lays down the law

On July 28, Margaret Thatcher took to the British airwaves to unequivocally reject British participation in "Europe 1992." She attacked the proposals of European Community head, Jacques Delors, for the creation of a supranational European government in the early 1990s as "airy fairy ideas," and vowed that Delors's vision of a united European government would "never come in my lifetime, and, I hope, never at all."

In an irony of which the French must be particularly sensible, she likened herself to Gen. Charles de Gaulle—who had in fact, held up Britain's entrance into the European Economic Community for a decade, much to the disgust of its British Conservative Party advocates. In the 50-minute BBC broadcast, she said that she "was really very much [in agreement] with de Gaulle, that is [his concept of] a Europe of separate countries working together." Since any one of the countries of the EC has absolute veto power, this means that effectively the Europe 1992 proposal is dead.

Informed sources in Britain have told us that this intervention by Mrs. Thatcher was prompted by fears, among top governing circles in Britain, of the shape which the present helter-skelter rush to accommodate the Soviets is taking. The situation inside South Africa has become a focal point of their concerns that the currently emerging arrangement with the Russians will raise another Frankenstein's monster. This section of the British elite remembers all too well how Neville Chamberlain's policy of accommodation to Adolf Hitler resulted in World War II.

They see the so-called pacification of Angola as a Russian move to be in on a grab for South African strategic raw materials, with the tacit agreement of a foolish United States. While the U.S. State Department believes that it is conducting clever negotiations with Moscow, the reality is that a section of the European oligarchy is negotiating another deal behind the scenes, one that would not include the United States.

The British, who value their "special relation" with the United States, and the independent bargaining po-

sition which that has given them in the past, are alert to the dangers of this new condominium in the wings—of which Thatcher has now said she wants no part. This "European" condominium would include the Soviets, and would give them a stranglehold on high technology, raw materials, and credit agreements.

In the British estimation, South African President P.W. Botha is so enraged by the U.S. sellout of South Africa, that he is willing to deal directly with the Soviets; but if he is not willing to make the demanded concessions to them, then the British fear that a scenario of terrorist-inspired chaos is in store for South Africa.

In the past Margaret Thatcher has served as a rallying point for some patriotic forces in the United States who otherwise were fearful of opposing the rapid political, military, and economic destruction of their nation. We can hope that this will be the case now.

One positive indication from within the United States is the testimony before Congress by David Packard, who has come out with a smashing attack against the U.S. Congress and the Justice Department for using police-state tactics against the Pentagon.

Beginning from the premise that the strength of an economy is the determining factor in world leadership, he decries the decline of the United States, and condemns the drift of government from a democratic republic to tyranny. The immediate issue which he addresses is the introduction of abusive oversight procedures into Pentagon procurement practices which have resulted in criminalizing them—and even more serious—in paralyzing the maintenance of an adequate U.S. defensive capability; underlying it is the deliberate weakening of the United States as a superpower.

Obviously we concur with both Packard and Mrs. Thatcher. Their interventions are long overdue. There is not too much time left for patriots within the Western alliance to heed the "call to arms." In the first and second world wars, it was the United States which determined the outcome. That capability is presently being systematically destroyed.