

The New York Times, May 3, 1982: "The use of limited force in defense of clear principle, can sometimes be justified."

Prime Minister Thatcher, in response to Pope John Paul II's plea for peace, May 23: "That our cause is just and that the principles which we uphold are shared and understood by democratic nations, I have not the slightest doubt. Aggression must not be allowed to succeed.

"International law must be upheld. Sovereignty cannot be achieved by armed invasion. . . . The world has seen too often in this century the tragic consequences of failure to defend the principles of justice, civilized values and international law. We seek peace with freedom, not peace at the expense of freedom."

INTERVIEW: Julian Amery

'Every crisis is part of the global struggle'

British Conservative Party member of Parliament Julian Amery, in an Oct. 26 interview with EIR's Mark Burdman, defended American military actions in Grenada and distanced himself from the public outcry in Britain against the President's policy, which Amery likened to the "appeasement" policies of the Neville Chamberlain grouping in the United Kingdom in the years leading up World War Two. It was Amery's father Leo who made the famous speech in 1940 telling Neville Chamberlain, "In the name of God, go!", a speech which officially led to the transition from Chamberlain to Churchill.

Amery is a senior figure in the defense and security advisory group to the Conservative Party. In Parliament Oct. 25, he said that Britain should have agreed to "lead and coordinate" the military landings. "Here was an opportunity for Britain as a leading Commonwealth power, to give a lead. As a result of our relapse into pallid abstention the Caribbean turned to the U.S. and went ahead." He warned that Britain had "abdicated any form of leadership." The problem now, he concluded, was to repair the damage done to "Britain's relations with her closest ally," damage which was unnecessary since there was only a "marginal difference" between the views of Britain and the United States on this affair.

EIR: To what do you attribute this incredible outcry in Great Britain against the United States?

Amery: My basic view is that there exist two kinds of views

of the world. One is from those who say that conflicts should be looked at from the standpoint of their purely local aspects, on their local merits, in accordance with the local dynamics.

The other view asserts that there is a global struggle between the Soviet imperialists versus the Free World, a protracted struggle of long duration, like the Hundred Years' War. Every crisis, from this standpoint, must be seen in the large battlefield of this.

I subscribe to the second view, and so does President Reagan, and I've thought that Mrs. Thatcher also thinks that way. Look at Grenada. It was being destabilized from the outside by Cuba and Nicaragua. It was better to move now rather than later, when it would have been more problematic. The United States was right. The United States was smart, the Caribbean people were smart. This area is important to the United States. What is involved here are important trade routes from the West Coast of the United States, from California, through the Panama Canal, toward Europe. The United States has an interest that this area be stable. We should have taken the lead in this situation.

EIR: What is particularly shocking is the British reaction in view of how President Reagan—wrongly, in our view—bent over backward during the South Atlantic adventure to back the British position.

Amery: Yes. It's an open and shut case for me, the Grenada affair. But the Foreign Office is cautious, and the Commonwealth takes many things into consideration. The Foreign Secretary, in my view, responded too late. I am hoping that this doesn't create problems now for the situation in Belize.

EIR: We would see the problem as arriving from a global decision by the Foreign Office crowd, Lord Carrington, the Royal Institute, and so on, for a New Yalta agreement with Moscow, covering not just the Western Hemisphere, but the Middle East, probably Asia, and so on.

Amery: You attribute too much intelligence to these people when you attribute to them an explicit New Yalta strategy. It's more of a reflex action on their part. It is a tendency toward appeasement, as we saw before the last war.

EIR: We see the tendency as having been signaled in the recent period by the Oct. 7 piece in the *London Times* by David Watt attacking the "Churchill Posture" and defending an explicit Neville Chamberlain viewpoint, attacking those who compare the current situation to that of 1938 as "wretched."

We are very concerned about similar trends in the Middle East. The *London Times* editorial of Oct. 24 called for a deal in the Mideast with Syria. There are signs that some people in the Foreign Office want to dump King Hussein. None of this functions outside of a global arrangement of some sort with the Soviets.

Amery: All I would say is that there certainly could be nothing much worse than trying to appease the Syrians.