

among others. We must especially not make any bad calculations as to the Soviets' intervention capability in the Third World, in the short term."

The French and West German governments have already explicitly debunked Haig's interview point by point. French Defense Minister Yvon Bourges told the National Assembly Nov. 7, "Never mind, we French believe in detente," when asked about the interview.

On the same day a spokesman for the West German Defense Ministry said at a press conference that his government is not alarmed by Haig's statement because

"all military men call for increased armaments and criticize the government for doing too little. . . . Of course we will continue to develop defense, but at the same time we will continue to talk to the other side. The current situation is forcing the present rates in armament expansion, but this is not where the people really want to go."

At a more recent press conference, West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher repeated his promise that his country will never tolerate the "transplanting of the East-West conflict into the Third World" — a policy which has won West Germany many friends and business partners in the developing sector over the past months.

What will follow NATO?

Another implication of the EMS not to be overlooked is the fact that many of the Mediterranean countries may be participating in the system from the very start. Last week the Nordic Council (consisting of all the Scandinavian countries plus Iceland) also gave their full support to the EMS and advised their finance ministers to work out a proposal for concrete collaboration. In military terms, this means that Haig and his mentors can say good-bye to another of their pet projects: the "weak flanks" of NATO. On cue, NATO-linked writers in the daily *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* have begun to issue expressions of "growing concern" over the postponement of military budget increases in both Norway and Sweden.

None of these considerations, however, answers the most important question of the future of European defense: if NATO ceases to be a credible institution, what will replace it?

Certainly the cornerstone of the new institution will be French-West German collaboration in the EMS — with or without support from the United States. In the admittedly linked sphere of disarmament, France's proposal for new comprehensive European disarmament negotiations in the context of the Helsinki agreements points in the right direction. So

Using suicide to scare the Soviets

Hans Morgenthau, chairman of the National Committee on American Foreign Policy, made these remarks in a recent interview.

Q: What is your assessment of the effect of Camp David on the U.S. posture toward the Soviet Union globally?

A: The Soviets have been suspiciously quiet on the Middle East until now. But now they see a possibility to try to break the Camp David agreements by pushing Iraq and Syria into conflict with Israel. What we must do is apply the same readiness as we evidenced in the October '73 war. We must put to the test the determination that, if the Russians make a move to back up Syria and Iraq, such as by airlifting troops, we will go on general nuclear alert as in '73. The Rus-

sians must be made to measure our readiness without ambiguity.

Q: Then how do you evaluate recent European determination to improve trade and other relations with the Soviets — what some people refer to as "Finlandization"?

A: Well, the Germans have always had an eastern option, but under the present circumstances they won't go East. The Europeans have to be convinced of our determination to back them up. It is not popular to pose it in this way these days, but the key question is, "Will we blow ourselves up to save Europe?" And the answer here is decisively "yes" at this point.

In a recent statement to a pro-Israel group, retired Gen. George Keegan made the following attacks on U.S. support for a Camp David "linkage" between the Sinai and West Bank-Palestinian components of the accords.

The Administration is simply not gauging the mood now in Israel. If this ignorance continues, the government won't last long, and will be replaced by a lot less temperate one. No Israeli government can accede to demands for linkage. I know from expressed views of members of the Israeli Cabinet, in private, what the mood is, and they simply won't accede to the linkage idea. Nor will the Knesset.

The Administration is asking Israel to give up all its defensible borders, in a way such that by 1985 Israel will be faced by an Arab coalition with arms greater than all of NATO put together. This will make a new war soon much more likely.

The behavior of the U.S. is unconscionable. We need a strong Israel to stop the Soviets. Israel's being strong is the only thing that has kept the Saudi monarchy in power.

And keep in mind what will happen if this government falls. Nothing stable could replace it.

also does the proposal made by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko on his recent Paris visit to integrate all the nuclear nations into the current SALT II negotiations.

A more comprehensive solution was recently proposed by Paul Granet in the French daily *Le Figaro*. Basing his ideas on those of Trade Minister Jean-François Deniau, Granet wrote:

“Political Europe is only possible in independence, and we cannot talk about European independence as long as NATO exists. . . . In this area, one can only advance suggestions with prudence . . . but finally, wouldn't it be possible to arrive at a joint political Europe in those sectors which come into play in defense policy: computers, weaponry, space and nuclear? Couldn't we endow Europe with a permanent conference of Ministers and a permanent group to investigate and evaluate crises (which would have nothing to do with NATO's institutions)? Are such perspectives utopian? Times have changed.”

— John Sigerson

5. Pushing a U.S.-USSR Mideast showdown

Current efforts to set the stage for a U.S.-Soviet confrontation are, in the Mideast context, the direct response to growing consensus in the Arab world and Europe that reconvening the Geneva peace talks, rather than the Camp David fiasco, is the proper forum for negotiating a peace settlement.

With the Camp David accords fast disintegrating as a result of Israel's fanatic refusal to “link” the West Bank-Gaza Strip issue to a bilateral settlement with Egypt over Sinai, elaborate efforts are afoot to undercut international pressure on Israel that could topple the Begin government.

Israel has its back to the wall. Its backers know this, and are out to force the U.S. into line behind Israel's war government by raising the spectre of the escalating Soviet threat to the Middle East.

However, the principle Zionist excuse — that Israel must fight to survive as a nation — now stands

You would have chaos, one government after another will fall, and Israel will be like the French Fourth Republic or like many recent situations in Italian history.

Nix to comprehensive peace

These portions of a commentary by Joseph Churba, former intelligence analyst for the Air Force chief of staff, appeared in the Nov. 15 Baltimore Sun:

The Carter Administration's current interpretation of the Camp David accords is much more damaging to peace prospects than anything the Soviet and Arab rejectionists have so far been able to mount. By its behavior the Administration is making it highly uncertain that the forthcoming Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty will facilitate any broad accommodation in the Middle East. . . .

Presumably, the State Department prefers to encourage Arab solidarity rather than to strengthen the pro-Western regimes of the area. As in the past, this approach plays directly into the hands of the radicals and Moscow. American overtures to Damascus will be used as a weapon against Cairo and as proof that no “genuine” peace is possible without the cooperation of Syria, the PLO and Moscow. This is precisely the disastrous formula envisaged in the Soviet-American statement of October, 1977. Observers will recall that joint communiqué as a major factor in prompting Mr. Sadat's journey to Jerusalem last November. Then, President Sadat's bilateral initiative pre-empted Mr. Carter's comprehensive approach. The danger today is that shifting U.S. interpretations of the Camp David accords intended to facilitate a wider peace are threatening to destroy the prospective Egyptian-Israeli settlement.

Washington Post syndicated columnist Joseph Kraft boldly called for the U.S. to lay off Israel and forget about a comprehensive peace settlement. In a Nov. 14 op-ed, Kraft points out that insistence on an overall settlement may bring down Begin's intransigent coalition.

Putting new pressures on Israel at this time . . . makes little sense. The parts of the agreement that make for pressure — the parts relative to Jerusalem and the Palestinians — cannot be immediately operative anyway. Sadat does not need concessions on these items to carry his country. So for the time being, at least, the issues of Jerusalem and the Palestinians are secondary. What is primary and immediate — and what the Carter Administration ought to concentrate on almost exclusively — is the Sinai accord between Israel and Egypt.