

London, the “concerned scientists” in question were Field Marshal Lord Carver, Lord Solly Zuckerman (Lord Mountbatten’s erstwhile scientific adviser), Lord Flowers, and Lord Gladwyn. The subject of these three press conferences was how to lower NATO defense spending from the current levels of 3 percent per year for Europe and 7 percent per year for the United States down to 2 percent per year, as demanded by the IMF and the Bank for International Settlements.

How such a reduction might be achieved was the subject of a lengthy study by Vice-Admiral John Marshall Lee (a conventional buildup scheme close to what is known as the Bernard Rogers Plan) and its overall political principle was explained in an interview by Robert Strange McNamara, published in the *New York Times* of the following day. The article, titled “No Second Use,” called for the United States and NATO to unilaterally renounce the right to retaliate to a nuclear first strike, to subsequently call on the Soviet Union to do likewise, and to then proceed into a massive conventional buildup to ensure “adequate conventional deterrence.”

This scheme has a decidedly Venetian flavor, having its origins in the Club of Rome wing of NATO civilian intelligence, a grouping of oligarchical European families organized around the Société Européen du Culture, a known strategic intelligence outfit of old Venetian outlook as well as pedigree. Prince Raimondo Torre e Tasso (or Thurn und Taxis in the German appellation) is an associate of both Lord Zuckerman and the Club of Rome’s Alexander King, thus defining the core of strategic gamemasters who dominate the policy-making of the ESECS group on behalf of the NATO civilian oligarchy.

This group’s financial power of the IMF, BIS, the World Bank, the central banks of England, Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium, Holland, et al., is the power engine of influence which has compelled the Reagan administration to its present course of suicidal economic policy, with main emphasis on budget cutting at all costs. As of the present time, these gentlemen’s influence has imposed upon the Reagan administration the irrational policy of judging

A falling out among East and West ‘peacenik’ allies

Shouldn’t Yuri Zhukov, chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, be pleased? The Movement for European Nuclear Disarmament (END), the continent-wide extension of Bertrand Russell’s Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, is picking up steam under the direction of ex-communist E. P. Thompson. It is preparing to convene its second large conference in May. END supporter Rudi Bahro, an East German citizen said to have “ties in the upper ranks” in East Berlin even though he emigrated as a dissident, has ascended to the leadership of the Green Party in West Germany, which is campaigning to go into a government with the Social Democrats there, a government that would wreak havoc in NATO and dismantle West German industry. Thompson holds that END’s appeal for “a European nuclear-free zone” is a top priority for the movement, just as Moscow has revived a plan for denuclearization of a large area in Central Europe.

But Yuri Zhukov is not pleased. In December he dispatched to 1,500 peace activists in West Germany and Britain a denunciation of END and the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation. Zhukov, *Pravda*’s senior foreign affairs commentator and a participant in Moscow’s disar-

mament campaigns since the late 1940s, accused them of acting so as eventually “to split the anti-war movement . . . and to infiltrate ‘cold war’ elements into it.” Since then, dozens of column inches in the British weekly *New Statesman* have been the arena for civilized mud-slinging between Zhukov and the END.

Zhukov’s objections were two: the injection of “ideological struggle” into East-West peace movement discussions and a plan “to bring a so-called ‘German question’ into discussions at the convention” in May, which is slated to be held in West Berlin. The first refers to “human rights” debates launched by Thompson’s people when he visited Hungary last year.

The second gets to something fundamental in European politics, especially since various circles, both socialist and royalist, have been talking in ever louder whispers about schemes for “neutralization,” not to say reunification, of the two Germanies. Those who assess Yuri Andropov as a reincarnation of the KGB chief Lavrentii Beria, who would succeed in the takeover Beria failed to accomplish in 1953, recall that Beria was charged for having been prepared to sacrifice East German in a strategic deal with the West, particularly Britain. The memory of that, and today’s whispers, are the cause of nervousness in East Germany.

The vitriol against Thompson’s END this time came not from East Berlin, but from Moscow, and here it should be noted that the U.S.S.R. makes arrangements with friends in British intelligence, but for its own purposes. Sometimes the word comes back, as from Zhukov to his peace friends—keep off our turf!