
THE EEC SUMMIT

Europe resists Iran caper manipulation

The two-day meeting of the European Common Market heads of state ended Monday, April 28 with results wildly different from what the British press and spokesmen had been predicting throughout the preceding week. Instead of a newly unified Europe patching up its differences for the sake of Western "solidarity in this time of crisis," the profound rift that has long existed between the Franco-German alliance and Britain was left gaping wide.

Worse yet for the British gamemasters who had planned to emerge from the summit as the anointed "mediators" between continental Western Europe and the Carter administration, well-informed press circles are now predicting that French President Giscard d'Estaing and West German Chancellor Schmidt will be renegotiating the Treaty of Rome, the EEC's founding document, to create a two-tiered Europe: a Franco-German directorate running policy, and Britain and its client states relegated to second class membership status.

That informed speculation is going this far is a clear indication of the state of affairs when the talks ended. After Giscard and Schmidt bent over backwards British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher refused generous offers to settle disputes revolving around Britain's monetary contributions to the EEC and agricultural prices, Giscard uncustomarily lost his temper. Slamming his fist into the negotiating table, Giscard ended the talks stating: "Under these circumstances, Madam, there is nothing more I can do for you." The French delegation issued a statement calling the summit a failure because of "the English position, characterized by unreasonable intransigence." Giscard added that "I will not allow such a contemptible spectacle in Venice," the next European summit in June.

Giscard did not even attend the concluding press conference, leaving his ally Helmut Schmidt to explain to the gathered reporters that much to their regret, he and Giscard considered Britain's policy a blow against a common European policy.

As for the British Broadcasting Corporation, it described the aftermath: "Britain is alone out in the cold ... it was a hard and horrible discussion."

Maggie Thatcher played the game of chicken, and

lost. It is doubtful she will get a second chance. Schmidt, with the support of Giscard, made the final offer: to reduce Britain's net contribution to the EEC in 1980 from \$2.2 billion to \$750 million. Schmidt later said at a press conference that he would not repeat the offer, and his Finance Minister Hans Matthoefler declared that since the proposal would require West Germany to up its own contribution by \$700 million, "Schmidt can't make the offer twice without my agreement ... If I say don't do it, then he won't do it again."

The Commission of the EEC, its supranational body in which the British play a dominating role, is now issuing dire predictions of the Community being "paralyzed" as a result of the failure in the talks.

Shattering the aura of unity

Few signs pointed to such an outcome on Sunday, when the heads of state first gathered in Luxembourg ready to come to terms with Anglo-American pressure on Europe to back President Carter's Iran policy. It seemed that the ongoing fight between the continent and London would be hastily resolved in the name of European unity and solidarity with the United States in a serious crisis period. By Monday evening, however, the tenuous aura of unity had been shattered.

What had happened in the interim was the resignation of Secretary of State Cyrus Vance over the aborted Iran rescue mission. This broke the myth of a monolithic America gathered around its President and demanding the same from the European allies. The French conservative newspaper *Le Figaro's* report April 29 of the impact of Vance's announcement, echoed the rest of the European media: "Cyrus Vance's resignation is in some sense the official confirmation of Jimmy Carter's incompetence ... Americans can no longer ignore this essential fact: for the first time, the President is not just criticized by double-faced adversaries or overly cautious allies afraid of endangering their selfish interests. He is condemned by one of his closest collaborators, the chief of American diplomacy." Furthermore, "with Vance, it is the 'establishment' that is deserting Carter."

The British had been cleverly and systematically using the argument of the unity demanded since the Iran crisis combined with the dangers inherent in Carter's obvious instability, to position themselves in a mediating role between the United States and Europe as a whole. Because of the special Anglo-American relationship dominant throughout the postwar period, Britain argued, differences within the EEC would have to take the back seat because the increasingly desperate Europeans needed the British to help control Carter.

As the London *Guardian* gloated in its lead editorial April 28: "redefine Europe as an entity and as an international force ... Not we the British, or we the Germans or even ... we the French. We the Europeans. Outside

Europe ... we could realistically seek to operate as little more than Washington's cheerleader across the water ... As an entity ... Europe offers an infinite variety of opportunities ... For the moment, in the quaking aftermath of the Iranian fiasco, the potential of a more unified Europe does not need to be argued point by point. It is an obvious necessity."

The signs of acquiescence to Carter's policies that began to emerge when the administration threatened military intervention in Iran if the "allies" didn't tow the line, now appear to be dissolving. West Germany's press, which is by no means known for being disrespectful to the American President, launched a joke campaign at the expense of Carter. At the same time, Helmut Schmidt's maneuvering room appears to have grown. While he has recently painted himself into a corner with electoral considerations, a poll taken by his own office indicates a solid mandate for the independent policy course he had been mapping out. Forty-nine percent of those polled indicated that they think West Germany should be more independent from the United States, with only 29 percent opposed. Sixty percent said they oppose the deployment of more nuclear weapons on German territory.

That very issue, which came to the fore with NATO's December decision to deploy Pershing II missiles in the BRD, is bound to be a top item on the agenda of Schmidt's talks with Leonid Brezhnev when he goes to Moscow this June.

Die Zeit

'The super-bomb in the American White House'

The following article appeared under the headline "The Bomb in the White House" and the byline of Wolfgang Ebert in the April 30 edition of the West German daily Die Zeit.

The Americans have the bomb. The Superbomb. It is in Washington. More precisely stated: in the White House.

When it goes, it will be all over. It makes no distinctions between good and evil. That is why we are all so afraid. A few lonely shepherds in New Zealand, they just might survive it. But even that is not certain. The radius of the effect of the bomb is supposedly very large, and no one can feel safe from it. The Americans call it, tenderly, "Jimmy."

What makes the bomb in Washington so dangerous? It is so incalculable. It is a time bomb, but no one knows when it is set to go off. There is also a version in the form

What the press is saying

The following is an excerpt of Le Monde's editorial of April 30, entitled "The Post-Rome Treaty?"

Can the Community be made to function without London? ... The Germans and the French have in mind a "two-tiered Europe" ... which means—a profound change in the nature of the Community. In fact, this solution—the nightmare of the orthodox Europeans—has always been practiced implicitly. Doesn't the European Monetary System only regroup eight out of the nine member states of the community?

The idea launched by Giscard d'Estaing ... to redefine a new financial mechanism for the Community, based on the heretical rule of "just return," announces a new era, that of the post-Rome Treaty ...

No one really knows whether Giscard d'Estaing and Schmidt aren't just using this weapon as a scarecrow for the benefit of the smaller countries ... (But) one thing is certain: the French and German leaders, are seriously thinking about a reform which would have a certain logic for them ...

The following is excerpted from the lead editorial of Corriere della Sera, April 30, by Alberto Cavallari, Paris correspondent.

All the European capitals tried yesterday to undramatize the collapse of the Luxembourg summit ... But this is a pious lie to hide ... the brutal news that the crisis has reached its lowest point.

... What counts is that the EEC has been reduced to a multinational ship without a rudder; it is entirely paralyzed ...

The very technical solutions advanced by the French and Germans in Luxembourg to resolve the British problem through a new financial arrangement foreshadow the end of (EEC) solidarity, the birth of a "two speed" Europe, the superseding of the Treaty of Rome. But if financial solidarity is abandoned, it will mean the destruction of the cornerstone of Europe ... It is perfectly legitimate to say that the governments of Bonn and Paris, profoundly skeptical about the Community and disillusioned by Community misadventures, are dreaming of a reform of the Treaty of Rome that would put Britain and the smaller countries at a grade B level.

of a missile. The firing ramp for the missile is just in back of the Rose Garden of the White House. Since it is a missile, it can also backfire.

The point is only whether or not we can survive the bomb. That is the point that all the responsible authorities in Bonn are concerned with. Even there, people are shuddering about the bomb in Washington.

Dr. End-Game, as we visit him in his new, and we hope bomb-secured, alarm station, characterizes the bomb as "Bombenerfolg (a bombastic success), that is the bomb in Washington looking around for successes."

"We are in the special department exclusively dealing with keeping the bomb in the White House under observation," he explains to us.

"Is there any protection against the bomb in Washington?" I ask.

"That is what the whole world is working on feverishly. It is a race against time," he tells us. "According to the recent experience with American technology there is still a certain chance that it might not function when the going gets tough." Dr. End-Game nods to himself absent-mindedly and observes a telex machine. "But you can't absolutely rely on that either," he then opines.

"What are you doing concretely against the bomb?"

"We are having it observed and we are continuously informed of any change in its condition," we hear Dr. End-Game say.

"Wouldn't that be easier if it were done from Washington itself?" I ask. "Then if Bonn or anyone else was interested they could be informed that there was a danger that the bomb was about to go off?"

Dr. End-Game laughed: "Surely you mean the much-cited obligation to consult among alliance partners. No, in Washington, they think it suffices if we take co-responsibility for a decision which was made previously without us. Besides, what you suggest would take away the surprise effect. And after all what are radio and television for?"

"Is there a chance of defusing the bomb?"

"What do you think Schmidt and the other allies are continuously trying to do? The problem is that hardly have they managed to get the trajectory which had once again lost its orientation back on course, disarmed it, when a new horror report comes in. Here, thank you," he then said, and took a telex report.

We read: "Insecurity advisor Brzezinski had just entered the Oval Bomb Room with a kalaschnikoff in his hand, muttering 'God stand by us.'"

"Dr. End-Game, one last question: How long do we have to live with this bomb?"

"If we are lucky, only until the end of the year."

"And if we are not lucky?"

"Much shorter."

THE KREMLIN

'The U.S. is on the brink of madness'

The Soviet Union's immediate response to last week's aborted rescue of American hostages in Iran was to describe it as an action "on the brink of madness" which could easily have led to war over the Persian Gulf. The news agency TASS on April 25 blamed Western Europe for failing to prevent Carter's actions.

Soviet spokesmen then began to hint that a much bigger operation was afoot in Iran than a simple surgical rescue of the hostages, aborted due to mechanical failure. While Moscow is not telling everything it knows—and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko admitted that he is bewildered by what the United States is doing—some indications of the larger dimension of the affair have begun to emerge.

TASS issued a release April 27 charging that the raid was intended to spark a coup against the Ayatollah Khomeini, while the Italian Communist Party daily *Unità* reported April 28 that high-level Soviet circles in the Foreign Ministry and the Communist Party believe that the United States was and may still be planning a larger-scale invasion of Iran, using base facilities in Israel, Egypt and Pakistan.

Unità also reported April 27 that the Soviet Union was quite well informed of U.S. moves throughout the period of the military operation, by radar monitoring in Armenia, Turkmenia and Azerbaijan, and that Soviet diplomatic intervention to block the intervention may well have taken place.

Some sources report that Soviet President Brezhnev was on the telephone "hot line" with President Carter during the mission.

Vance's resignation

The first Soviet public reaction to Secretary of State Cyrus Vance's resignation was a TASS comment April 28 that "Carter administration policy will be showing ever more manifestations of adventurism whose symbol Brzezinski is."

A Soviet television commentator said that the resig-