

proponent of decoupling the U.S. and Europe, Vasilyev said: "I remember that at the SALT I negotiations, Kissinger refused to ban the MIRVs, but later he agreed that this was the biggest mistake of his career." He said Europe is now the hottest spot on the planet.

As the Italian daily *La Repubblica* pointed out, all the objections to beam development posed by Vasilyev and his associates are the same used by those scientists in the United States who oppose beam weapons.

Following the opening speech by Professor Zichichi, *EIR* contributing editor Webster Tarpley addressed the audience from the floor, denouncing the Soviet refusal to accept the U.S. offer to collaborate on the beam-weapons policy, and exposing the Soviet war buildup since they shot down a Korean Airlines jetliner last year, killing 269 civilians. Tarpley attended the meeting with Giuseppe Filippini, president of the Italian branch of the Fusion Energy Foundation. The Italian daily *Il Secolo XIX* on Aug. 23 called the Foundation's *Fusion* magazine the one which "most clearly expresses" the thoughts of the pro-beam-weapons scientists of Lawrence Livermore.

Tarpley stressed that in the past year the Soviets have destroyed all channels for dialogue with the West, burying the resolution signed last August in Erice.

Debate broke out again on Aug. 22 as Vasilyev laid out a series of what he called "unsolvable problems" preventing beam defense, including the weight of the platforms needed to support the lasers and the number needed to destroy missiles within 100 seconds of launch.

West German Ambassador Henning Wegener, head of the German delegation to the Geneva disarmament conference, leaped into the fray. How could any nation, he asked, be sure that the Soviets were not themselves building the weapons, given the absolute secrecy of all military activity in the U.S.S.R.? "Our secrecy," Vasilyev responded, "is the result of our history."

Lowell Wood jumped up to say that the systems developed in the United States have shown that the missiles can be hit in the boost phase much more easily than in the final phase and that all problems are political, not technical. "I do not believe," he told the Soviet delegation, "that you are not doing anything in this regard, since you are investing twice what the U.S. does in research, and we know this." Wood invited the Soviet delegation to sit at the same table and discuss the issues; the Soviets refused.

In a later exclusive interview for *EIR* with Tarpley and Filippini, Wood stressed that beam-weapons development would be critical in "coupling" the Atlantic Alliance. He called for a crash program along the lines of the Manhattan Project during World War II.

Tarpley also questioned Professor Vasilyev on the Soviets' refusal to continue cooperation for peace? Vasilyev answered: "This is not an honest question. We speak to U.S. scientists all the time, with the [anti-beam weapons] Union of Concerned Scientists.

Who's giving away Morocco—and why?

by Thierry Lalevée

By Sept. 1, Libya and the Kingdom of Morocco will become a single country. If a physical merger of both countries is impossible, thanks to thousands of kilometres of Algerian territory in between, the so-called merger of Libya and Morocco will encompass all other levels.

The merger will be concretized on Aug. 31, by a national referendum in Morocco and a vote of Libya's Popular Committees. This represents very rapid follow-through on the agreement, as the treaty was only signed on Aug. 13. The speed of the merger's realization was imposed by Libya, which on Sept. 1 will celebrate the 15th anniversary of Qaddafi's bloody dictatorship: What better trophy to display at the military parade than either King Hassan himself or his Crown Prince as newly found allies! After years of ostracism, and despite his record of international criminality, he has not been overthrown or forced to change; others have been forced to bow to him! On Aug. 17, he announced that he wanted Algeria's Chadli and Tunisia's Bourguiba to attend to sign a "treaty of Maghreb unity."

There is little chance that such a diktat will be fulfilled. Far from fostering "Maghreb unity," the merger of Morocco and Libya has tremendously increased tension. It could not be otherwise. It is no secret that the newly created Rabat-Tripoli axis was built to counter the "friendship treaty" between Tunisia, Algeria and Mauritania, from which Tripoli felt excluded—and rightly, as Tripoli has been busy financing Islamic fundamentalist terrorists against these countries. In addition, there are growing ties between Algiers and Cairo, in opposition to Rabat-Tripoli.

The two Maghreb blocs are effectively arrayed against each other as military alliances, with each nation at least implicitly pledged to the defense of its treaty partners. And in fact, when Morocco recently threatened to attack Mauritania over its Polisario support activities, Algeria threatened to attack Morocco. The merger of Morocco and Libya has thus brought regional warfare a step closer.

Two capitals, one country

What the merger between Rabat and Tripoli actually means is a union at the top. While a Libyan with the title of Minister-Resident will be allowed to join Morocco's ministerial coun-

cils, a Moroccan will do likewise in Tripoli; a permanent secretariat will be created whose chairman will be a Libyan but whose secretary general will be Moroccan. In sum, economic, foreign, and defense policies will be coordinated at the highest levels; on a lower level, the intelligence services will work hand in hand—at least ostensibly—while a customs union will allow free travel between the two.

Moroccan officials may think that their security services are strong enough to resist an influx of Libyan agents and terrorists into their country, and the transformation of Morocco into a launching pad for Libyan terrorism against Algeria or against Europe via Spain. But observers are rightly worried that of the two partners, it is Qaddafi who is the strongest. As seen in many previous ventures of the same kind, Qaddafi has little to lose in the game, and perhaps he will gain a political boost of great importance.

On the other side, Morocco thinks it has won a great deal by cutting the financial and military cordons between Tripoli and the Polisario guerrillas in the former Spanish Sahara, now part of Morocco. It may soon wake up to a bitter reality: Morocco has no way to check and confirm that Tripoli will actually stop supporting the Polisario; furthermore, how can Morocco influence Tripoli's longstanding allies, such as Iran,

“The only choice in coming weeks is to abort the merger by strengthening Morocco, and paving the way for a real Maghreb unity between Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, and Mauritania. Otherwise, there will be war.”

which will continue supporting the guerrillas? A “deal of dupes where each one wants to cheat the other,” commented Hissen Habré of Chad.

That Habre was one of the first to react so strongly, in contrast to the silent approval of many Western capitals, has not been by chance: Chad is directly affected by the deal and faces dismemberment as Morocco recognizes Libya's right to occupy northern Chad on the grounds that its population is of the same ethnic stock as Libya's.

That a merger between Libya and Morocco includes such a regional redivision of spheres of influence and occupation gives a strong hint to the real background and nature of this operation.

Who applied the pressure?

There is little doubt that Rabat was put under tremendous pressures to merge with Libya. Not an insignificant pressure

has been Morocco's economic crisis, tremendously aggravated by the Sahara war with the Polisario. Having postponed, like Tunisia, the implementation of International Monetary Fund austerity measures to avoid further riots and a defeat at the Sept. 15 national parliamentary elections, Morocco's current government was ready to welcome any outside economic help: At the core of the merger is a several-billion-dollar package deal from Tripoli.

But who did the pressuring? Claude Cheysson, the French foreign minister, has been reported quite happy about the deal. The Mitterrand government has been looking for a face-saving formula which will allow French withdrawal from Chad altogether, giving Libya whatever it wants. Intelligence sources say that Cheysson was not foreign to the merger terms, as it means that Paris can make a deal with Morocco, which will negotiate on Qaddafi's behalf, and leave.

Not foreign to such a deal either was Gen. Vernon Walters, who was kept completely informed of the recent weeks' talks and gave the Moroccans the impression that the Reagan administration would welcome it as a “Moroccan initiative to open Qaddafi to the West.”

This points to the more sinister underbelly of the merger. The “New Yalta” deal between the Western oligarchy for which Henry Kissinger and Lord Carrington speak, and the oligarchy in the Kremlin, not only involves giving Europe to the Soviets. Walters and his crowd, in their determination to bog the United States down in Western Hemispheric population wars, are putting most of the world up for bargaining with the Russians. Is not the decision to give Morocco away, via Qaddafi, a good signal to Moscow that all the countries of the region can be traded off?

And in fact, similar negotiations are taking place across the African continent. After having looted and destroyed Mozambique, the Kremlin has allowed the Maputo government to begin an “opening to the West,” and even to sign a cooperation treaty with South Africa, one of Moscow's daily propaganda targets. Moscow has also allowed its Ethiopian client state, where 7 million people are immediately in danger of death because food aid cannot reach them, to call on Britain for economic help, and to ask London to mediate between the Ethiopian capital, Addis Abbaba, and the Arab countries which are supporting the Eritrean independence movement against the central government.

Is Moscow getting Northern Africa in exchange for these and other trade-offs? Western diplomats may not think of it in quite such terms; some may perhaps consider that they are appeasing the Soviets and their allies and helping to maintain “détente,” or even that the merger between Rabat and Tripoli could lead toward the overthrow of Qaddafi.

This is, however, a very remote possibility, as Qaddafi stands stronger than ever. The only choice in coming weeks is to abort the merger by strengthening Morocco, and paving the way for a real Maghreb unity between Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, and Mauritania. Otherwise, there will be war.