

the Soviet leaders to conclude that the benefits of accommodation are greater than the shortsighted attempt to exploit global difficulties. . . .

We have made, it seems to me, very proper, balanced proposals. If they are accepted, we could have agreement within days. If they are not accepted, we will wait until they are accepted. . . .

The Africans are intelligent and mature people. They have international organizations of their own. It seems to me that African problems ought to be solved by the Africans themselves and not by 40,000 Cuban troops armed and delivered by the Soviet Union. . . .

The United States and the Peoples Republic of China do have parallel interests. In the pursuit of these parallel interests, we do undertake certain actions. If we understand each other better, this as of itself is of great significance. . . .

I think the question whether individual African countries are strategically important is not determined by whether the Cubans go into them, but by the nature or location or resources of these countries.

. . . The nature of these strategic concerns can be given an altogether new dimension. If a proxy power acting on behalf of our major rival in the world intrudes itself militarily, this does entail political consequences which one cannot afford to ignore.

The proper response to it is not panic or hysteria, but serious discussion of what this might mean in the longer run and on that basis a proper international response.

I do not believe that sticking one's head into the sand is the best solution to difficult problems in the world.

French and Soviet Press Fall For Brezinski's Africa Gambit

"The Red and the Black" by Andre Fontaine, *Le Monde*, May 31:

The Zaire affair seems to have convinced opinion that the misfortune of Africa results less from its poverty than its richness, that what's at stake in the conflicts tearing Africa apart is not the liberation of its peoples, but control over its raw materials. The spectacular increase in (the price of) cobalt, after the raid on Kolwesi, and that of copper to a lesser but still important

extent, in a depressed world market, seem to confirm this. And also the Soviet attitude: the moods of *Pravda* have usually more to do with geopolitics than bourgeois sentimentality...

Would Giscard continue to support the gangrened regime of General Mobutu, would he show so much esteem for a person like the present President of Gabon, would he commit himself like he did in the Western Sahara affair, if these countries did not spill from their guts, according to each case, so much copper, diamonds, cobalt, uranium, iron, oil or phosphates?

"Africa: Cut the Cuban Pipe-line" by Jacques Guilleme-Brulon, *Le Figaro*, May 31:

I do not know if the African intervention force will ever see the light of day in an efficient form. What is, on the other hand, certain is that the action of France in Shaba — and the merit belongs to Giscard d'Estaing — has knocked over the Soviet chess board. It has played a revealing role which, this time, has serious chances of shaking up the apathy of our friends on the other side of the Atlantic... And what if tomorrow, in order not to let itself get dragged into the 'African beehive' Washington decided — this remains within its reach — to simply cut off the Cuban pipeline from Africa. Wouldn't this be the most effective weapon to 'destabilize' the champions of 'destabilization'? Even if this caused Mr. Andrew Young to cry tears of blood.

"Recolonization" by Soviet news service Novosti correspondent Andrei Dolgov in *Le Figaro*, May 31:

Why didn't the governments of France, Belgium, and the U.S. make contact with the National Front for the Liberation of Congo for the evacuation of the Europeans? Why did they rush to send parachutists just when the Front had opened up contact with the Red Cross? The answer is simple. From the beginning, the 'human mission' was nothing other than a hypocritical veil thrown over a direct interference into an internal conflict... Following the seizure of Kolwesi and the evacuation of the Europeans, the Belgian troops left the city, but the French Legionnaires remained... it is the United States who, without any doubt, were the instigators of this intervention... The intervention of NATO countries is not only of great scope, but carefully coordinated.

Detente Foes Hamper UN Disarmament Session

The special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament began May 23, providing a unique opportunity to bring together leaders from both East and West to speechify and consult on the remaining barriers to serious world economic development and concomitant mutual reduction of armaments. It had even been rumored that Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev would attend, following up on his May visit in Bonn with West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt.

Such a prospect was put to rest when President Carter, obviously under pressure from Zbigniew Brzezinski and Vice-President Mondale, decided not to attend, sending Mondale in his place. Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko's careful speech reflects an awareness of this problem in the U.S., while Chinese representative Huang Hua made it clear that China is playing along with Brzezinski's "China option."

The special session has nevertheless provided a forum for significant new initiatives, notably that of French

President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, who called for the creation of a new forum for talks on disarmament in Europe, under the umbrella of the Helsinki agreements. Although Gromyko expressed little enthusiasm for such a proposal, it was approved by Chancellor Schmidt, who probably had a hand in its formulation.

The session will continue until June 29 and is expected to produce broad resolutions covering the entire scope of disarmament questions.

Andrei A. Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR:

... Detente offers the opportunity of choosing the road of peace. To miss this opportunity would be a crime. The most important, the most pressing task now is to halt the arms race, which has engulfed the world. . . .

Every unbiased person knows that whenever the Soviet people had to go to war it was to repel the aggressors, for wars were imposed on the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has never unleashed war and will never do so. . . .

Despite all its ups and downs, the current international political climate, of which detente has been a dominant feature for quite a few years, now is favorable to serious arms limitation efforts. There has been no such precedent in the history of interrelationship between the two world social systems. Some degree of international trust, though still insufficient, of course, has been attained. The recent talks of Leonid Brezhnev with the leaders of the Federal Republic of Germany have given a powerful impetus to all these processes. . . .

One hears it said at times: "You know, we too favor non-proliferation of nuclear weapons but what if it harms international cooperation in *peaceful uses* of the energy of the atom?" The answer is no, it would not. It is possible, without infringing on the interests of nonnuclear countries in this field, to preclude at the same time the possibility of someone, say, in the deserts and jungles of Africa or Latin America trying to find some roundabout way to manufacture nuclear weapons. . . .

Walter F. Mondale, Vice-President of the United States:

We and our NATO allies are strong, and we will remain strong to provide for the defense of our peoples. But we face a continuing buildup of unprecedented proportions in Europe. The Warsaw Pact has developed an almost 3-1 advantage in tanks. The SS-20 nuclear missile now being deployed against Western Europe is a new departure in destructive power and represents a substantial increase in the nuclear threat of the Soviet Union. The NATO Summit meeting next week in Washington will recommit the Western democracies to a military posture capable of deterring and defending against attacks. We will remain prepared to resist attack across the spectrum of conventional, tactical nuclear, and strategic forces. . . .

My country for years sought to limit military shipments to Africa. Our economic assistance far outstrips the amount of military assistance we have provided. In 1977, the United States contributed \$327 million in economic assistance to African nations, compared to only \$59 million in military aid. This record, with its special emphasis on funding for food, stands in marked contrast to the predominant military assistance extended by others. . . . The choice here is one of

encouraging the constructive and creative capabilities of the developing world, or of encouraging those tendencies which generate conflict.

Helmut Schmidt, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany:

...I am speaking on behalf of a country that cannot and will not act as a big power. We are, however, aware of our share of the responsibility for peace....

Though progress toward arms limitation has up to now been modest, it has brought one important strategic result at least: the superpowers have redefined their own security requirements. They no longer regard the unilateral growth of nuclear power automatically as an increase in their own security. . . .

The world's statesmen must talk to one another; hence they must know each other. . . .

The element of predictability, necessary for security and peace, must go far beyond the transparency of military capabilities. It must apply above all to the basic concept and the objectives of political strategies. The better other states can predict future developments, the less the danger of surprise and, as a consequence, the greater the prospects for international security. Anyone who acts unpredictably is liable to create hazards....

The Nonproliferation Treaty has definitely proved valuable in limiting nuclear armaments. It has so far on the whole halted the geographical proliferation of nuclear weapons.

On the other hand, become an obstacle for the peaceful use of nuclear energy. To many countries not possessing sufficient sources of energy, nuclear power is indispensable. . . .

During the recent visit to my country by Secretary General Brezhnev both sides stated — for the first time in a joint East-West declaration — that they deem it most important that neither side should seek military superiority and that approximate equality and parity suffice to safeguard defense.

We consider this declaration to be a major conceptual contribution to the safeguarding of peace. The more so because the Soviet Union has shown in this declaration its willingness to discuss weapons up to now not covered by the SALT negotiations, such as medium-range missiles.

These weapons, owing to their huge destructive power, are as lethal a threat to Europe and to other regions, as are the strategic intercontinental weapons to the superpowers. They therefore cannot be ignored in a system of military balance. From this standpoint I look upon French President Giscard's proposal with interest. . . .

There are highly productive countries who have a large military potential, and who make exceptionally heavy financial outlays for it — but who at the same time make a totally inadequate contribution to the transfer of capital and technology to developing countries.

Weapons supplies are no substitutes for economic development. . . .

I would like to take this opportunity to outline my own country's policy in this field. We refuse as a matter of principle to grant developmental assistance for the export of weapons. . . . On the other hand, we have massively increased our development aid budget, so that

it is now the equivalent of more than one tenth of our defense effort. If every country in the world could say this of itself, many people in the developing countries would be better off. . . .

Anyone who dismisses the idea of compromise in principle is not fit for peace. If he is not prepared to meet others half way he cannot expect them to move towards him. Anyone who cultivates enemy stereotypes and prejudices will himself be regarded as an enemy.

Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, President of the French Republic:

France is proposing studies on the creation of a satellite monitoring agency. . . .

The idea of a link between disarmament and development has been evident for a long time. So far it has not been translated into reality. . . . Setting up a special disarmament fund for development is still a difficult undertaking. France has drawn up proposals on this subject and will submit them for discussion by this General Assembly. . . .

Let us look at the military map of the world. Two large zones are apparent . . . First let us consider *the nuclear-free zones*. Nothing would be more destabilizing and nothing would enhance more considerably the legitimate right to security than to introduce nuclear weapons in these zones . . . *Nuclear-weapon states should in particular preclude, according to a formula to be defined, the use and threat of use of nuclear weapons against states that are part of a nuclear-free zone*. In terms of their development, this decision should be accompanied on the part of the countries supplying materials and equipment for nuclear power by the implementation of an appropriate policy of non-proliferation . . . (which) would have to be an open policy in order to provide *easier access to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy* (emphasis added — EIR). . . .

France is proposing to all the countries which are concerned with the future of European security and which participated in this capacity in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe that they should meet in conference to discuss disarmament in Europe

. . . The conference advocated by France would aim in the first state at building trust among all the countries of Europe by instituting measures to provide appropriate information and notification and in the second stage at achieving a genuine reduction in weapons within the geo-strategic complex of Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals (emphasis in the original — ed.).

Huang Hua, Foreign Minister of the Peoples Republic of China:

One superpower is bent on expansion; the other has its vested interests to protect. As the struggle intensifies, they are bound to fight it out some day. The tense confrontations in Europe, the turmoil in the Middle East, and the gathering storm in Africa are all visible indications of the growth of factors for war. . . .

The two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, are deliberately confusing the issue by advocating disarmament by all. Their armaments already far exceed their defense needs and are being used as tools of aggression and expansion and tools in the struggle for hegemony. They are subjecting countries in all parts of the world to threats of force, military control and even armed aggression and they are busily preparing to unleash a new world war. . . .

The people of the whole world eagerly demand nuclear disarmament and the elimination of the danger of a nuclear war. We do not believe in the horror story spread by the superpowers that a nuclear war will destroy all mankind, but like the people of other countries, we Chinese are firmly opposed to a nuclear war. . . .

Therefore, the struggle for disarmament can help to put off a war only if it is accompanied by full exposure of the superpowers' plot of sham disarmament and real arms expansion, and if the people of the world are alerted to the danger of war. The lesson must never be forgotten that both world wars broke out amidst a chorus of "peace" and "disarmament."

. . . The superpowers want to grab world hegemony by launching a world war, and in preparing for this war, they are committing acts of hegemonism in all parts of the world. . . .