

junction with peaceful use of nuclear energy, and in order further to develop this non-proliferation policy.

3. The goal of this consultation should be to promote the further development of agreements that still more effectively ensure non-proliferation — multinationally, non-discriminatory and in a generally binding form. In

this procedure, the German Federal Government attaches primary importance to the working out of comprehensive international control measures.

4. A non-proliferation policy must, in order to be effective and successful, be supported by the agreement of the greatest possible number of members of the Community of nations.

## European Press Agrees: Carter's Plutonium Policy Will Isolate USA

*The following is a grid of this week's European press reaction to Carter's plutonium ban and energy policy.*

### West Germany

*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, April 12: Carter's scarcely hopeful theses are derived from a study made by the Ford Foundation. Their contempt for plutonium and their tough recommendations could lead to a situation in which a group of energy-poor nations will act against the USA, which in turn would injure America's cause rather than aid it. America has never put itself in the shoes of those countries which almost entirely depend on foreign resources for their energy supplies. For these countries, their risk and dependency are becoming even more pressing. Japanese Prime Minister Fukuda was speaking for all of them when he made clear to Carter that Japan will not give up plutonium. The time is ripe for a new concept, modeled on the old precept "Atoms for Peace."

*Die Welt*, April 12: Two variant philosophies are now confronting each other. The time for a decision (on nuclear shipments to Brazil — ed.) has been well chosen by the federal government of West Germany. It was well chosen because it comes just prior to Carter's April 20 speech. Following that date, such a step would have been more difficult. The majority in Europe is of the opinion that Carter is increasingly isolating himself. Even if all of this speaks in favor of Bonn's decision, it is not without risk. It is naive to believe that Washington will make accommodations. But such a confrontation can also be continued far behind the scenes. Carter would be ill-advised if he were now to pull out a big stick.

*Süddeutsche Zeitung*, April 12: West German policy is a house without foundation. For the moment, Carter may leave aside open threats, but there are still no illusions: he has made up his mind. Bonn and Washington have different foreign policies. This can seriously burden the foreign policy situation of the Federal Republic. Bonn's fear is that the USA, Canada and the Soviets will continue to fight them; the question is, are they strong enough?

*Frankfurter Rundschau*, April 12: Carter wants to move against plutonium. At first, the U.S. couldn't get enough

plutonium for the development of atomic bombs; now they want to ban it. This fight is senseless; fast breeders are very economical. The USA has no problems in supplying its own energy needs.

*Die Welt*, April 13: International criticism of Carter is increasing.... Bonn sees the statements of IAEA head Dr. Eklund as being extremely important, since he is responsible for all controls on nuclear proliferation. Peter Hermes, State Secretary at the Foreign Ministry, has stated that Bonn is not willing to join Carter's policy. Hermes also stated that the rumor circulated in *Newsweek* about a "secret deal" is utterly false.

---

### France

*Matin de Paris*, April 13: "To transpose this kind of argument to the rest of the world, is, to say the least, to have an egocentric and unrealistic approach to the energy problem of the other countries concerned," according to one French official... Another remark which comes up frequently in the comments of Europeans: "It is clear that the Carter program puts off to the Greek Kalends the development of fast-breeders consuming plutonium and the Americas are very far behind European technicians in this area... At the nuclear conference in Chiraz, Iran, several delegations from the developing countries manifested their bad humor towards the American delegation. And some, who have the feeling that they were mystified, are threatening to denounce the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, because they consider the American initiative a violation of Article IV of the treaty, which states that the signers have the right "to undertake research, produce and utilize nuclear energy towards peaceful ends, with no discrimination."

*Le Figaro*, April 12: "The decisions made by President Carter last Friday could have, in the weeks to come, important consequences for world peace. The new strategy adopted to limit the threat of dissemination of the atomic weapon could have the opposite effect... The Iranian meeting (on nuclear technology — ed.)... was transformed as of yesterday into a real war machine against the new policy of President Carter. Among the

500 participants who came from all the horizons, there could be found in effect no experts who would support the new American nuclear strategy... Only the French camp showed some discretion which surprised certain observers."

---

## Britain

*London Sunday Times*, April 10: In an Op Ed Ian Smart, Director of Studies, Royal Institute of International Affairs, stresses the impossibility of implementing a conservation program adequate enough to cut back all dependency on nuclear energy, and warns that even if Europe adopted the Carter program in toto, by the year 2000 there would still be "a deficiency equivalent to the energy from another 240 nuclear reactors which have not yet been ordered." Attacking any "free-market" conception of energy supply, Smart warns, "The world food market has always been balanced by price — but a price which has included famine and sometimes war. It will be no consolation to have the energy market balanced by its own version of starvation. That is simply a prescription for intolerable domestic and international friction." Smart concludes by calling Carter's "policy gap" as critical as the "energy gap" itself, and warns that "the policy gap on energy, like the policy gap on nuclear proliferation, has to be filled internationally, in concert, and now."

---

## Italy

*Corriere della Sera*, April 9: "Europe does not share the opinion of the U.S. government either on the risk or on the economic inconvenience of new technologies, as demonstrated by the opposition of France and West Germany to efforts by the United States to suspend sales to Pakistan and Brazil."

*Corriere della Sera*, April 13: "There is the possibility that at the London Meeting of the Group of Seven the Soviets will take sides with the Europeans and will offer them uranium supplies... This will render Carter's pressures useless."

*Unita*, April 13: "Carter's stance has already provoked the first reactions in Europe which seem destined to act as a catalyst for a much broader opposition to the White House's policy... Renouncing this (nuclear — ed.) technology would mean to continue to depend on USA electro-nuclear facilities and on American supplies of enriched uranium."

*Unita*, April 14: "The debate on the nuclear plants has been re-opened after Carter's speech... Great Britain is first in line in the construction of nuclear stations... Prime Minister Benn has expressed strong reservations regarding the revision of American strategy... Opposition will come out unanimously by the end of the month when the (European) countries will meet in

*London Times*, April 11: Printed a letter by Conservative Party spokesman on Energy, Tom King, addressed to the *Times* and Prime Minister Callaghan calling for a full parliamentary debate as soon as Parliament returns on April 18 to discuss the ramifications of the Carter nuclear statement. According to the *London Times* of April 11, King's letter reflects the fact that "MPs of all parties are concerned about the implications of President Carter's statement for the British nuclear power industry and the development of fast breeder reactors, where the United Kingdom has a decisive lead."

*The Financial Times*, April 13: Has a strong editorial attacking Carter's unilateral action on nuclear policy, the editorial follows continuous coverage in the *Financial Times* on Europe's and the Third World's rejection of the U.S. stand. The paper rejects Carter's tactics to limit fuel reprocessing, warning that "by implication, this would increase rather than reduce the chances of proliferation as other countries sought not only their own access to enriched uranium, but also their own reprocessing facilities." "The correct approach," the editorial concludes, "is to intensify these international discussions and bring in the customers as well as the suppliers. President Carter, however well-intentioned, has jumped the gun by acting unilaterally. He should not be surprised if, however unjustly, the U.S. is also suspected of furthering commercial aims."

London...to express their dissent against the U.S.'s unilateral position and the presumption that other nations would accept to depend on the USA government and industry for their energy supplies."

*Sole 24 Ore*, April 14: "It is difficult for Europe to accept Carter's dictate... The internationalization of the energy fight (after Carter's decision) is not unpleasant to Bonn, which before was facing the Brazil question alone... Bonn will pick up the U.S. challenge... Is Carter's hope that Europe will follow the U.S. an illusion? Regarding Germany, yes. Carter's decision was not a surprise for the Germans and, deep inside, they did not dislike it. Now Bonn will find broader support... France cannot renounce to the self-breeder reactors... while rumors have it in Paris that the countries excluded from nuclear energy — the Third World — could organize a pressure group to stand up for their nuclear rights."

### CORRECTION

#### TENG HEADS ANTI-MAOIST FACTION

The fourth paragraph of last week's (EIR No. 15) article on China's leadership faction fight inadvertently reversed the identification of the factional leaders. Hua Kuo-feng heads the "continuity" faction, supported by Wu Teh and Wang Tang-hsing, and Teng Hsiao-ping heads the anti-maoist forces, supported by Yeh Chien-ying and Hsu Shih-yu.