



Europe: The Third World is the issue

Hans Apel: arms, talks and development

West German Defense Minister Hans Apel presented his ministry's "White Book" on defense policy Sept. 4. According to Deutsche Presse Agentur (DPA), Apel told a Hamburg press conference that "arms control policy must be accorded absolute priority." In a Sept. 11 TV interview monitored by our correspondent in the Federal Republic, Apel defined the basis of West German defense policy as consisting of three principles: maintaining military equilibrium, pursuit of disarmament negotiations with the Soviet Union, and the economic development of the Third World.

In answering questions from Winfried Scharlau of ARD Television, Apel elaborated his view of arms negotiations in more detail:

Q: *(In the white paper) you describe the powerful missile weapons which the Soviet Union has set up against central Europe and you speak literally of a strategic threat of a new dimension. Are you not thereby agreeing with the opposition (parties)? For can we not conclude from this that the (present government) has neglected something with respect to armament and security?*

Apel: I believe that you cannot argue this way at all. This white paper describes something, it is a balance sheet, which has been debated for quite some time in NATO circles. ... Otherwise it would be entirely conceivable that NATO is about to take decisions, envisaged for before the end of this year, to cope with this—let us set it in quotation marks—"missile gap" by a dual offer: serious negotiations on arms control ... (and) the offer to, the demand on, Moscow and the Warsaw Pact to eliminate the disparities on their part. Yet, in the event that the Warsaw Pact or Moscow are incapable of doing that, the necessity will be to make up for lost ground in NATO armament so as to restore an approximate parity of all nuclear capabilities.

Q: *How urgent are the measures that you described?...*

Apel: Time frames ... are delineated by technical hand-

icaps. I hope very much that the U.S. Senate will ratify the SALT II treaty. ... Then we could negotiate directly on the imbalances in the European sphere in SALT III talks, to begin in January/February of next year. NATO's decision should be that, if these negotiations fail, new weapons systems will be added. These will be ready for production in 1983 at the earliest. Thus a deployment in Western Europe is entirely inconceivable before that time. By that you can see that we have two or three years to test the serious will of the Soviet Union and to make perfectly clear that we prefer arms control over new defense efforts.

Q: *Isn't the massive Soviet armament a liability to those politicians in the West who are for detente and have worked for detente?...*

Apel: ... Detente policy can only work on the basis of a guaranteed defensive capability, and this also includes additional efforts by NATO, if necessary. ... This shows that the double concept of NATO works: defensive capability, yes; strengthening of the alliance, yes; but also constant preparedness for negotiations. And ten years of detente policy have been possible on this basis only, for detente policy must mean negotiating on the basis of equality, not subjugation.

Le Monde: Europe must orient to Nonaligned

On Sept. 12, the French daily Le Monde's European Affairs editor, André Fontaine, analyzed the "crisis" surrounding the revelations concerning Soviet soldiers in Cuba and asserted that the real strategic concern is the revolt of the developing sector against the lack of economic development assistance.

...The great strength of the U.S.S.R. nowadays...besides its armaments...is that the people of the Third World have become aware...of the reality of exploitation by U.S. multinational corporations; they are seeking to end this exploitation by all means...In this perspective, one is wrong to underestimate the outcome of the Havana Summit. Of course Castro did not obtain everything he wanted. Egypt was not ex-

pelled, the seat for Cambodia was not attributed to the pro-Vietnamese regime of Phnom Penh. But at 87 years of age, Tito had to come in person to defend the cause of nonengagement—towards the East or the West—to which he has devoted himself since Bandung...

It remains that the Nonaligned summit occurred in Havana, the capital of a country aligned in fact on the Soviet camp and that it is Cuba which for three years will preside over the conference. In spite of his alliance with Moscow, in spite of membership in the Comecon, in spite of the Order of Lenin recently given to his brother Raul, the majority of Third World countries continue to consider Fidel as one of them and not as the "puppet" of the Soviets to which Brzezinski thought he could reduce him.

The "diplomatic" advisor to President Carter should recall of State to Lyndon Johnson, was saying the same thing about the Chinese, and that before that, when Tito was creating trouble for the West over Trieste, he was thought to be manipulated by Moscow. In reality, he was criticizing the Soviets for their softness... Who says that the Lider Maximo is not leading the Kremlin leaders, whose dynamism, considering their age, doesn't

seem to be their dominant characteristic, rather than following them?...

In any case, if there is a "puppet," it is the fault of the U.S., which has thrown him into the arms of the Soviets. Cuba today is a poor but dignified country, despite of all its failures, and one which has become—as the magazine *L'Express*, one least suspect of pro-Soviet proclivity, recognizes—a paradise for children, if not for liberty. It is not the sight of Cuba that will prevent the delegates to the Havana conference from thinking that progress is there, but rather in the shantytowns, the ravaged countryside and the torture chambers of too many countries on the American continent. As long as the Western world does not succeed through a bold policy of redistribution of wealth, in showing that it is determined to give priority to the development of the Third World, instability, tensions, local and regional conflicts, the armaments race and thus the risks of war will only multiply. If not the U.S., whose eclipse phase will certainly last at least until the 1980 presidential election, couldn't one imagine that Europe, taking back in hand the destiny it carelessly handed over to the U.S., will do something to break the infernal circle?