

'A Bunch Of Wild Red Indians...'

Even the U.S. editor of the Financial Times, normally staunch supporter of the Carter Administration, has grudgingly acknowledged the "offstage mutterings that can be heard in Europe about President Jimmy Carter's foreign policy." Major opposition to Carter's confrontationist policies — from the dissidents to energy — erupted this week in the pages of the European press. The Financial Times tried to ridicule European (and U.S.) opposition by characterizing their view of the Carter Administration as "a bunch of wild Red Indians with no experience and no control over their tongues, loosely gathered under a tribal chieftain who is trying to run before he has learned how to crawl." But it is clear that much of Europe is recognizing the Carter strategy for what it is — a dangerous confrontationist game played not only against the Soviet Union, but the oil-producing nations, the Third World, and Europe itself on the key issues of defense, energy, and foreign policy.

The following are extracts of commentary from key European newspapers and individuals issued during the last week on the dangers inherent in the Carter Administration's policies.

On Energy

L'Unità, March 3: Reported that layoff threats from the German company Mannesman is a "strong warning from the industrialists to the government not to modify ... the program of nuclear transformation of the energy base of the country and to defend firmly, in the face of the attacks from the United States of America, the contracts signed or to be signed with foreign countries" on nuclear power.

Herman Abs, former chairman of the board of West Germany's largest bank, Deutsche Bank and the dean of West German bankers, told the stockholders of West Germany's largest electricity producer, RWE, during a speech March 3 that "When I hear people talking about lower energy consumption, I get the feeling that they finally want to implement the Morgenthau plan."

On Foreign Policy, Dissidents

Peregrine Worsthorne, columnist for the *Sunday Telegraph* wrote on Feb. 26: "These are the deep and dangerous waters for Western statesmen to fish in, particularly for an angler as inexperienced as President Carter. Conceivably the Western Interest could be served by encouraging the dissidents. But to do so as part of a political response to a concerted campaign by a handful of Soviet writers, artists and scientists, whose present eloquence and past suffering have aroused a wave of Western emotion, makes no sense at all. The West should honor their nobility and courage. But to heed their advice

as to policy would be to go far beyond the call of moral duty, or more important, that of common sense."

Countess Marion von Doenhoff, publisher of West German weekly *Die Zeit* writes in the March 4 issue: "Do we have to put our confidence in this kind of Carter foreign policy, or is it merely a new style that will change with time? One finds few answers in Washington these days, especially on the issues of Carter's utopian nuclear disarmament, the human rights issue and the linkage question. The Americans themselves are full of confidence in Carter ... but policies of morality like those of Dulles and Wilson did not make the world any more moral, but did lead to catastrophes and dead ends.... A great power like the Soviet Union will not accept any conditions and Washington must be clear that the Europeans will not go along with such a policy."

Lord Chalfont, defense analyst for *London Times* and former under-defense minister in the 1964 Wilson Labour government, wrote in the *London Times* Feb. 28 that Carter's decision to cut the technology-advanced weapons systems could put the West at a severe disadvantage: "It seems clear, therefore, that President Carter is taking a very considerable risk — presumably one which has been deliberately calculated. If, as a result of his action, he persuades the Soviet Union to initiate similar delays or reductions in its own defense program, we may be about to see the first serious step towards reversing the dangerous spiral of the nuclear arms race. If, on the other hand, the Soviet Union takes advantage of President Carter's gamble to press forward with the technological and numerical improvement of its own missile system, the West will be left with no alternative but to devote massive resources to a frantic attempt to restore the balances. What is more important, it may be too late. The advance of military technology is now so explosive that it is quite possible for the side which momentarily slackens its efforts to be left irrevocably behind."

Il Giornale Feb. 22 comments that public opinion is split and amazed by the demagogic, populist and messianic tones of Carter's speeches. "The Carter Administration has introduced again the word détente, but how can this concept coexist with the campaign for the respect of human rights in the USSR ... since if pushed to its logical conclusion, cannot but provoke a head-on clash between the two systems? Carter proposed to start again the relationships with Cuba, but he subordinated this to conditions that everybody considers unacceptable to Castro, so what is the sense of this proposal?"

Le Figaro Feb. 23 writes, "Following the refusal of French President Giscard d'Estaing to meet with Soviet dissident Amalrik, State Secretary to Foreign Affairs Pierre-Christian Taittinger was asked by the diplomatic

press corps what he thought of the Carter Administration stand on the dissident question. Taittinger expressed hope that the Belgrade conference, which will be a follow-up to Helsinki, will not turn into a circus where participants would content themselves with setting up Commissions on American Indians rights in the reservations, or the rights of Soviet mathematicians. Answering American criticisms towards the French government policy of ignoring dissidents, Taittinger replied: 'France has no lesson to learn from anyone, especially on the question of refugees, since it is she who, proportionally, welcomes the greatest number of refugees from all political tendencies. President Carter has perhaps been a bit too hasty, but he is soon going to realize, no doubt, that the spectacular is not sufficient to have an impact in the big international game.'

On the Bergland Wheat Deal

Neue Zürcher Zeitung, Swiss financial daily comments March 1: "U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Robert

Bergland's statements have been in a disturbing form ever since he came into office demanding regulations on some prices and markets. The U.S. position on the wheat cartel would sabotage the western negotiating positions at the North-South conference on raw materials.... The first weeks of the Carter Administration have been characterized by various mistakes. President Carter should explain Bergland's statements."

Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung writes March 1: "Bergland's position is undermining the credibility of the western countries at the North-South conference. This makes it more difficult to explain to the Third World that world markets must be organized along the lines of the free market economy."

Sueddeutsche Zeitung writes March 1: "Bergland's aim is not so much to control markets and prices, but to use wheat as a weapon against the OPEC oil cartel, during the negotiations about the price of oil and the volume of oil deliveries."

Carter, Interpol Thwarted In Drive On Schmidt Cabinet

WEST GERMANY

The Carter Administration would be willing to provoke an international crisis around the city of West Berlin in order to break up West Germany's advanced nuclear power industry, charged the leading Ruhr industrialist daily *Handelsblatt* Feb. 25. Addressing Carter's insistent sabotage efforts to force either West Germany or Brazil to cancel a joint treaty for importing \$4 billion worth of nuclear power equipment to Brazil, the daily stated, "If Brazil stands firm (against U.S. pressure) and the United States then brings in its role as the most important ally for protecting Berlin, for better or for worse, we would have to give in."

At a recent meeting of the stockholders of the Rheinischewestfalische Electrizaetswerke, the largest utilities corporation, prestigious Deutsche Bank chairman Hermann Abs warned of the very grave consequences which await heavy industry if the government caves in to Carter's demands for cancellation of the Brazil deal (see above).

Interpol Wants Control

Simultaneously, the Rockefeller-controlled secret service apparatus Interpol is now embroiled in a fierce skirmish with the cabinet of Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, which is moving to cut off Interpol schemes for gaining more direct control over the Verfassungsschutz (Agency for the Protection of the Constitution), the strictly domestic arm of West German intelligence, operating

under the jurisdiction of the Federal Interior and Justice Ministries. In the past ten days, two major scandals were ignited by Interpol-linked networks to begin a public campaign to "change the laws" governing Verfassungsschutz activities.

A Czechoslovakian consular official named Simko, who was stationed in the city of Cologne, suddenly flew to London Feb. 24 to turn himself in as a spy. Simko's testimony is being used to discredit détente and East-West trade; at the same time that Simko issued a list to the West German press of alleged Czechoslovakian agents — all of whom were economics aides — Christian Democrat Werner Marx, a Rockefeller-linked Atlanticist, publicly stated that the case proved that détente as a whole was a myth, and demanded that Chancellor Schmidt cancel a pre-planned state visit by Czech Prime Minister Husak.

The Schmidt cabinet denounced Marx's statements as "exaggerated" on Feb. 26, and succeeded in getting the story played down in the press and media. However, the same day, an even larger public uproar was provoked by *Der Spiegel* magazine, a conduit of Interpol "intelligence leaks." The Feb. 28 issue of *Der Spiegel* charged Interior Minister Werner Maihofer with illegally bugging the apartment of a former nuclear physicist suspected of having links to international terrorist organizations behind the December 1975 shoot-out at the Vienna conference of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). The specifics of the story around Dr. Traube, the physicist, have a number of discrepancies. However, the scandal is being pushed to create a hullabaloo around Verfassungsschutz infringements of "human rights." *Der Spiegel*, for example, ran an