

monopoly in the field of strategic weapons. . . . In 1980, numerical equivalence will be reestablished, but the Soviet weapons will be more powerful. Under these circumstances, to ask for SALT guarantees would be ridiculous, because in this state of equivalence, military means would be aimed solely at the annihilation of civilians. . . .

It is necessary to redefine the military objectives of the United States. First, to reconstitute our tactical supremacy. Then, to give the United States better means of intervention in cases of local conflicts (Iran, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Morocco). What chances do these countries have of surviving without foreign interference? Their freedom is a function of our military capacities: witness, the recent Russian success in Ethiopia, and the coups d'etat in South Yemen and Afghanistan, against which we have no remedies here. . . .

*From the column in the London Times editorial page Oct. 9 by Richard Davy, coming off a conference of the London Institute for International and Strategic Studies: What sort of Soviet Union are we going to be dealing with over the next ten years or so? . . . Western*

policy-makers. . . want to know whether there is likely to be continuity in Soviet policies or whether they are going to be facing some basic re-thinking. For instance, will the Soviet Union's military effort proceed undiminished or will slower economic growth constrain it? . . .

Whatever the answer, it still leaves western policy-makers profoundly uncertain whether there is any real hope of drawing the Soviet Union into a sense of joint responsibility for world order and economic development, or whether all-out rivalry is going to be unavoidable. This will be one of the key questions of the decade and there is simply no answer to it at the moment. . . .

The Russians would like to cut their military spending but will not succeed in doing so to any great extent unless there are big unexpected changes in East-West relations. Arms control agreements could help a little but will not in themselves make a big difference to defence budgets. . . .

*From a speech given by Zbigniew Brzezinski to the Weizmann Institute in Chicago on Oct. 8:*

In seeking U.S.-Soviet detente, we have also attempted to foster

greater American ties with Eastern Europe. We do not believe that our relations with Eastern Europe should be subordinated to our relations with Moscow and we are pleased by the progress we have made in our relations with several Eastern European countries. . . .

The President stressed more than a year ago that we see American-Chinese relations as a major element in our global policy. We believe that a strong and secure China can contribute to international stability. . . .

To be sure, to be globally effective, the U.S. must be militarily secure. Hence the President also ordered in Presidential Directive 18, issued in June 1977, a comprehensive review of U.S. military posture. At his direction we will maintain strategic equivalence, strengthen NATO, develop a more rapidly deployable force capable of defining our major interests worldwide. . . as for example in the Persian Gulf or Korea, maintain an effective military presence in the Far East and the Atlantic and re-examine our strategic doctrines in terms of changed needs of the 1980s. . .

## 4. Policy disaster in Africa

Not to be outdone by the stupidity of the White House, 27 conservative U.S. Senators hosted the Prime Minister of outlaw Rhodesia for a visit to the United States that began Oct. 7. These duped conservatives have demonstrated their blindness to the danger of U.S.-Soviet confrontation in southern Africa, and turned their back on legitimate American and development interests in the region to support Ian Smith's slave-based economy in Rhodesia.

The State Department and the White House compounded the policy mess by allowing Smith a visa, thereby putting the U.S. in direct violation of the United Nations sanctions against Smith's racist regime.

Then, while Smith declared on U.S. television that he was only following Henry Kissinger's plan for

resolving the region's problems, the Carter Administration found itself simultaneously:

(1) effectively endorsing Smith and his "role in the major confrontation...between the free world and the non-free world," as Smith put it on the eve of his arrival in America;

(2) fronting for Britain's declared plans to intervene in the area, while allowing London — which refused Smith's request for a stopover there — to lay the onus of the entire business on the Carter Administration;

(3) championing a provocatively anti-Soviet "China card" strategy in the region;

(4) and overseeing an International Monetary Fund assault on Rhodesia's neighbor, Zambia, that promises to unleash region-wide war as its immediate consequence.

## **The China card and other blunders**

Ever since a special National Security Council meeting was held on southern Africa Oct. 11, conservative circles have been buzzing with reports that the U.S. will side with Chinese-backed forces in that region, in order to "keep the Soviets out." For the first time ever the Chinese have given support to UN peacekeeping forces — for Namibia — and according to the newsletter of the UN Association, China hopes to take an even more active role. Observers close to the U.S. intelligence community are now saying that U.S. backing to China-allied grouplets in the region would be a means of shutting out Soviet influence.

This is only the icing on the cake, however, for the preconditions for regional war and a U.S.-Soviet faceoff are already in place.

A new Anglo-American plan for Rhodesia has been unveiled which, as the *Washington Post* admits, was devised to tempt Joshua Nkomo, head of the Rhodesian nationalist Patriotic Front, to make a separate deal with Smith.

The new plan, dubbed "Option B," calls for an all-party conference to agree on a "transitional constitution" and a new governing body.

But, as the London *Sunday Times* forewarns, this "Camp David Summit" on Rhodesia may prove "impossible to assemble" or quickly end in failure. "In that case, the only thing left would be the perilous, but perhaps inevitable course by which Britain steps in and administers the colony, probably in conjunction with a UN presence, for a transitional period."

A split in the front-line states or Patriotic Front would aid this British scenario for direct or proxy military intervention into Rhodesia. It would also force the African nations to turn to the Soviet Union for support, setting the stage for confrontation.

Under pressure from the International Monetary Fund Zambia's President Kenneth Kaunda was forced to violate UN-imposed sanctions against the outlaw Rhodesian government and reopen its rail trade link through Rhodesia.

The destruction of the Benguela railway by the UNITA terrorists fighting against Angola left Zambia dependent on the Chinese-built Tanzam Railway

which is incapable of handling the volume of copper exports or fertilizer imports necessary for the country's economic survival.

For a year now, the IMF has been saying to Zambia that it "would be necessary to reopen the southern route" through Rhodesia as a precondition for aid, the London Financial Times reported this week. A team of Zambian officials flew to Washington late last week to tell the IMF that Zambia has met this precondition for another cash disbursement.

The implications of Kaunda's forced move are grave. While Mozambique and the forces of Patriotic Front coleader Mugabe have been the target of bloody Rhodesian raids, so far Smith has refrained from military incursions into Zambia and against Nkomo's forces in the hopes of securing a separate peace. Now the IMF has maneuvered Zambia closer to such a breakaway agreement.

Presidents Nyerere of Tanzania and Machel of Mozambique, who have both condemned the Smith visit to the U.S., flew to Zambia on Oct. 7 for emergency talks with Kaunda. Late reports indicate that the two front-line Presidents were unable to secure a reversal of Kaunda's decision and have reportedly agreed not to cooperate with the transport of goods from their ports through South Africa and Rhodesia to Zambia.

### **'Name the names'**

But the British have yet to achieve their hoped-for split of the front-line states or the Patriotic Front. Speaking before the UN General Assembly yesterday, Tanzania's Foreign Minister Mkapa said it was time to name the names of those countries that are creating obstacles to the realization of the new world economic order.

Earlier, Patriotic Front coleader Nkomo marked the opening of a school in Zambia with an angry denunciation of the IMF, Great Britain, and the U.S. for contriving the economic difficulties which forced Zambia, his principal base of support, to capitulate to the demand for a reopening of its borders with Rhodesia.

—Kathy Stevens