

**Q:** What can be done to stop it?

**A:** If you are an American, you vote against Reagan. . . . Experts know that you should not say such ridiculous nonsense—that you can build an antiballistic-missile system in space capable of making the U.S. immune from nuclear attack. Everybody knows that you can have the cruise missiles on submarines or in the air which can hit the United States. In every way it is folly, folly. It could only come from the U.S., the kind of thinking that there are solutions to everything. There has to be great pressure on Reagan from Europe to sit down with the Soviets and talk about areas of common interest, such as reducing arms and confidence-building in central Europe. Germany is a crucial country in this respect.

**Q:** Who are your favorite U.S. presidential candidates?

**A:** I prefer anybody but Reagan. It would be so much easier for the Democrats to deliver arms-control agreements. . . .

**Q:** Does Mondale have a chance?

**A:** I don't think he can win, but he is the best in the Democratic camp. . . . The only way you can beat Reagan is to stand up and tell him the truth—that he is disastrous for peace and security, that his policy is likely to lead to more confrontation. . . . Reagan might decide on the 29th of January that he is not running again. Then you might get a compromise candidate, like Sen. Howard Baker, who would probably be a good President and engage in a dialogue with the Soviets.

**Q:** What about a potential new Berlin crisis?

**A:** I think the Russians will do their best to intimidate the Europeans. The only way they can do that is in West Germany. The only way they can respond to what they perceive as a Western offensive against them is to strike back, and to strike back means to run into West Berlin. There would be great appeals from Europe to the Americans to cool down.

**Q:** Which people are capable of realizing your perspective in Germany?

**A:** That's half the problem. You have had men of such stature like the last three chancellors, who understood how the world worked. Today, you have a younger generation like Carsten Voigt and Iris Steiger of the SPD who are very able. . . . I know who is *not* capable of leading Germany—the present chancellor!

**Q:** What about the possibility that the Kohl government will fall?

**A:** It seems to me that the economy is not showing any signs of improvement, and it is possible that you have to go back to a grand coalition [between the CDU and SPD].

**Q:** On the CDU side, who would join the grand coalition?

**A:** I know who I would like to see—our next [Aspen] president, Richard von Weizsäcker. He knows what needs to be done, he is smart, and he is in the right wing.

---

## Socialist International

---

# Willy Brandt exposed as

by Umberto Pascali

Only a few weeks before a joint meeting in Rome of the Brandt Commission on "North-South Issues," and the Palme Commission on "East-West issues," scandals have exploded into the Italian press exposing the chief protagonist of the upcoming meeting, Willy Brandt, as an asset of the Soviet intelligence services. The joint meeting, to open on Jan. 20 in the Italian capital, will be attended by the director of the U.S.A.-Canada Institute in Moscow, Henry Kissinger's well known friend Georgii Arbatov; former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance (of Iranian hostage infamy); and the queen of the pro-KGB U.S. establishment media, *Washington Post* publisher Katharine Graham.

But things have gotten so hot for Willy Brandt that, as of ten days before the meeting, no location in Rome has been announced for it.

The charges against Brandt have come from a number of sources, including a large faction in the London-headquartered Socialist International of which Brandt is the chairman. They come at the same time as a Europeanwide press blitz portraying the 70-year-old Brandt—recently remarried to a young leftist in the German Social Democratic Party (SPD), which he also chairs—as the "symbol of East-West dialogue," the leader who could re-create the conditions for a West German ruling coalition between the SPD and the Free Democratic Party of Hans-Dietrich Genscher. The revival of the SPD-FDP coalition, toppled in 1982 when Genscher pulled his Free Democrats out to continue as foreign minister in partnership with the Christian Union parties, would almost automatically mean abandonment of NATO by West Germany for a Soviet-dominated "neutrality."

### Brandt, the 'Nazi-Communist'

On Jan. 2 the Italian weekly *Il Borghese* published a long story on Brandt, "The Soviet Agent Inside the Socialist International," citing documents compiled by the wartime American intelligence service, the OSS, which proved close links between Brandt and the Soviets in Stockholm during the secret separate-peace negotiations between the Nazis and the U.S.S.R. Among the Soviet delegation there during the war was the current ambassador to Bonn, Vladimir Semyonov. The OSS documents partially came to light in the 1974 "Guillaume Affair," when Brandt's personal secretary was arrested as an East German spy, and Brandt was ousted as chancellor.

In the archives of the U.S. State Department, a document

---

---

# Nazi-communist agent

marked with the number 862-01/639 contains a report sent by U.S. envoy Hershell Johnson in Stockholm to Secretary of State Cordell Hull. Johnson accompanied the material on Brandt with a note: "Brandt is a Soviet agent. His escape from the prison camp has been facilitated by the communist clandestine network. He is in contact with the Rote Kapelle, the Soviet espionage organization. . . ." Throughout his career, Brandt's ties to the Soviet Union have resurfaced again and again.

The better kept secret is the Nazi side of Willy Brandt. But, as shown by the documentation in *Il Borghese*, Brandt has been an admirer of Nazism, and in particular the Nazi labor policy, all along. He wrote at the end of the war: "It will be necessary to confiscate everything, typewriters, furniture, bank accounts, and to transform the Arbeiterfront (Nazi Work Front) into an integrated Socialist trade union. It will be the easiest thing to do. It will be enough to change the name." Brandt was also known for his advice not to permit the Jews to return to Germany.

## A secret caucus

The more damaging scandal, however, concerns Brandt's current activities on behalf of the resurgent Nazi-Communist alliance. An article in the Milan daily *Il Giornale* Dec. 12 by London correspondent Gino Bianco first revealed that the Brandt wing of the London-based Socialist International tried to cover up a secret meeting of Latin American Socialist parties that schemed in January 1983 to drive the United States out of the Caribbean.

The article was based on documents reportedly found in Grenada during the U.S. intervention there. *EIR* has reconstructed the whole story.

On Jan. 6 and 7, 1983, a secret meeting took place in Managua, Nicaragua with the participation of several Latin American delegations, which formed what they called a "Secret Regional Caucus of the Progressive Socialist International Parties." The whole operation had been organized by the Soviets, the Cubans, and the Grenada government. The parties represented were: The FSLN of Nicaragua, the MNR of El Salvador, the RP of Chile, the PNP of Jamaica, the PCC of Cuba, and the NJM of Grenada. Their declared aim was to deploy their forces in order to influence the Sidney, Australia Congress of the Socialist International in a pro-Soviet direction.

The minutes of this meeting, found in Grenada, read in

part: "There is a split inside the European [Socialist] parties on how they look at Latin America. Our friends are ready to accept a revolutionary process in Latin America. . . . Our allies in Europe are the northern Socialist International parties and the Dutch party. There is also a strong potential in the Canadian UDP."

The "northern parties" are the parties of Brandt, Palme, and Austria's Bruno Kreisky, a friend of Col. Muammar Qaddafi. According to leaders of the Socialist International, it has been these three individuals who have pushed for intense activity by the Socialist International in Latin America in collaboration with the Cubans. Brandt in particular has been recognized as the godfather of this Latin American strategy.

The secret caucus also planned a series of visits by representatives to Europe, in order "to strengthen our friends and to confuse our enemies." In short, the whole strategy was arranged with Brandt to get control of the Socialist International and lead it in a "neutral," anti-American direction. The caucus declared its crucial objective to be destroying the "CIA influence" in the International, exemplified by the U.S. social democracy. To create the necessary "financial muscle," the plotters agreed "to establish a regional institute for political and economic research with Jamaica's Paul Miller as director, plus an open bank account in the Bahamas, with the signatures of Miller and Ector Oqueli of El Salvador. . . ."

The minutes of the secret meeting were made available to the Socialist International office in London by the U.S. social democracy, but nothing was done. Later, the Barbados Socialist Party issued a denunciation of the caucus. At this point, the bureau of the International, despite Brandt, had to convene.

The bureau meeting occurred in Brussels Nov. 24-25, but due to heavy pressures from Brandt and others, nothing of what was discussed there was made public. Finally, however, on Dec. 12, the minutes were published.

Leaders in both of Italy's Socialist International affiliated-parties have denounced the Brandt cover-up to the press. Carlo Ripa di Meana, Italian Socialist (PSI) member of the European Parliament, said: "The news on the Soviet-Cuban infiltration of the Socialist International, published by *Il Giornale* is, unfortunately, true. Jan. 6 and 7 there was a meeting in Managua. . . . The participants decided upon several initiatives of pressure and subversion. . . . In November in Brussels during a meeting of the Socialist International bureau, where I was present, Oqueli [of El Salvador] was forced to admit it. The battle to free the International from men and parties working for the international communist movement will be long and difficult and will require political determination and clear ideas."

In another statement, Ripa said: "If we don't succeed in getting rid of the Soviet influence, we might be pushed, after the June 17 European elections, to create a separate group [of socialists] in the European Parliament including Italians, French, and maybe Belgians. The idea of a split emerged

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.