

Europe Waffles On Giscard's Zaire Adventure

French President Giscard d'Estaing and the French-speaking African heads of state led by Ivory Coast President Houphouet-Boigny and Senegalese leader Senghor reportedly agreed April 20 to "institutionalize" the French-Moroccan intervention force recently dispatched by Giscard to help battered Zairian President Mobutu put down the rebellion in the copper-rich province of Shaba, according to a British radio report. This decision follows by two days the European Economic Community's (EEC) failure to condemn Giscard's airlift of troops to the routed Zairian army.

Giscard justified the action in the name of protecting the "community of French-speaking African nations" from "foreign aggressions" allegedly led by Soviet- and Cuban-trained national liberation forces.

A Tacit Approval

This French neo-colonialist escalation in West Africa could not have come about without the (at least) tacit approval of France's partners in the EEC, whose nine Foreign Ministers met in London April 18. Although several EEC countries — predominantly Italy, but also West Germany and Britain — are known to have had serious misgivings about Giscard's interference in the Zairian conflict two weeks ago, they failed to raise more than formal objections at the meeting, focusing instead on the issue of France's pretense to have acted "in the name of the EEC."

This followed French Foreign Minister Guiringaud to alter the content of Giscard's initial formulation to mean "in the spirit of Europe," a juridically innocuous enough interpretation to be immediately endorsed by West German representative Hans-Dietrich Genscher. After Guiringaud explained that France had taken care of "informing" Belgium, Great Britain and West Germany of its impending intervention because of these countries' "historical ties" to Zaire, the other European ministers could only grumble some remarks about "absence of consultation" and then agreed on a communiqué denouncing "foreign interventions in Africa!"

Italian, West German and British press organs had repeatedly expressed reservations about Giscard's internationalization of the Zaire conflict, and the London *Financial Times* wrote this week that British government circles are privately quite hostile. The actual content of the British position was expressed by an aging Fabian in France, Claude Bourdet, who in a lengthy op-ed column in the Paris daily *Le Monde* April 19, characterized Giscard's French-Moroccan troops as "the Cubans of the Americans."

This apparent contradiction between European mouths and feet is resolved once we look at the respective interventions of British Premier Callaghan and West German Chancellor Schmidt at the "Socialist International" conference held April 16-17 in Amsterdam, Netherlands. Speaking on the first day of the conference, Schmidt indirectly criticized Soviet involvement in Africa by calling for an immediate "geographical ex-

tension" of the regions of the world where East-West cooperation can guarantee peace. The next day, Callaghan granted that the USSR has "legitimate rights in Africa," but added that it must assume "super-power responsibility" and thus "know when to stay out." At a later press conference, Callaghan said African problems should be solved internally or Africa would once again become a cause of superpower rivalry. "In the present state of our nuclear armory, that is not a development I would want to see," he concluded.

French Press: Is Giscard One Of 'The Americans' Cubans'?

The French daily Le Monde published this response to Giscard d'Estaing's Zaire policy on April 19, headlined "The Americans' Cubans":

The pertinent question of Gaullist spokesman General Buis asked on television: "Will America also have its Cubans?" can be applied to others besides the king of Morocco. Despite the amusing remarks of Valéry Giscard d'Estaing on the "spirit of independence" which marks the French engagement in Zaire, it must be emphasized that the new foreign policy of the United States, conceived by the Trilateral Commission and applied by its 16 representatives in the Carter Cabinet and other high administrative posts, implies the intervention by sub-imperialisms in a more methodical manner than during Kissinger's time. What David Rockefeller, Brzezinski, and the Trilateral Commission reproached Kissinger for is not this strategy, which is theirs as well, but the visible, provocative aspect of the former Secretary of State's methods.

What is essential today is that the hand of the U.S. is never seen. Who will believe that Hassan, who never makes a step without consulting Washington and whose country is the United States' number one African base, sent his troops to Zaire without consulting Carter? Who will believe that the French airlift cooperation, indispensable for this operation, was called for?

However, there is a big difference between the Cubans and Giscard d'Estaing. The former supported the more modern and progressive elements in Angola than did their competitors aided by Zaire, South Africa, and the U.S.; the Moroccans and French support in Zaire one of the most reactionary and unpopular chiefs of state in the continent....

But this attitude (support for Mobutu in return for access to raw materials - ed.) is habitual and not occasional, and those knowledgeable about Africa must have had a good laugh when they heard the French President defend himself from any charges of neo-colonialism! At Cotonou, the failure of the Jan. 16

aggression against the Popular Republic of Benin has permitted access to the list of European mercenaries of the commando squad: they are almost all French, were trained in Morocco, and there were also indications of the French banks where their pay was deposited in their accounts. Without doubt, it is not Paris which organized the aggression; it is the African states, "friends of France," precisely those whom Giscard wants to "protect."

Was it done without the green light from someone in Paris? One can try to believe that if one wants. In Brazzaville a few weeks ago, President Ngouabi was

assassinated by an ex-captain, a former super-cop who was linked to the French intelligence services, and was the collaborator of Massemba-Debat, minister of Fulbert-Youlou, one of the principle African straw men of the French Fifth Republic....

The ideology that Africa is rejecting is neo-colonialism. And it is doubtful that the Soviets will ever get a foothold in Africa. If they do it, it will be because the Africans have had to defend themselves against the racism of South Africa and against the intrigues of the Americans, and their French, Moroccan, and other agents.

The National Security Council's War By Proxy

A modern-day Wallenstein's Army has descended on the southern Zaire province of Shaba as the military component of the U.S. National Security Council's war by proxy against Angola and the Soviet Union. The military arm of the forces fighting the Shaba insurgents is currently made up of 1,500 highly trained Moroccan troops, 200 French officers, U.S. advisors, Israeli advisors, a rag-tag Zairean army, and an undetermined number of private mercenaries who were conducted through private intelligence networks associated with Interpol.

Just as in Vietnam, the orchestrated counterinsurgency of these combined forces is geared to provide the pretext for a long-term commitment of military strength to the central African region, and an open confrontation with Angola in the near future.

From the "purely military" standpoint of opposing the Katangan insurgents, the larger part of the mercenary army is superfluous. The Moroccan forces on the scene are sufficient to at least hold a stalemate with the Shaba insurgents, who are largely grouped near and supplied through the Benguela railroad.

The counterinsurgent specialists, the mercenaries, and the advisors are the "militarily superfluous" sections of the forces fighting for Zaire. They are there to provide for the National Security Council's political aims — the use of "limited, surrogate warfare" to internationalize the conflict through continual escalation of various components of the scenario. While protecting the outlaw Mobutu government from an already overripe coup, these privately controlled outfits provide the special operations capability at the front lines for border raids into Angola and similar provocations. The model for these incidents is Operation "Cobra 77" (also known as Operation "Christmas in Luanda), a U.S. special forces-designed hit and run campaign to retake the Angolan capital this coming fall.

Reports emanating from the area (which is barred to the press) indicate a Goebbels-type media escalation designed to provide the pretext for a move into Angola itself. Every so-called "reliable" report which has come from the fighting has been qualified or reversed within hours of its appearance, and at the time of this writing

absolutely no accurate assessment of the balance and composition of forces there is available.

The Mercenary Option

Well known military sources, including Drew Middleton of the *New York Times*, agree that the deployment of private mercenaries to fight in Zaire is in itself the most provocative thing that puppet Mobutu could do vis-à-vis the Angolans. The fact that there are limited numbers of mercenaries in Zaire, however, does not restrict the scope of the provocation solely to the "justification" which it provides the Angolans for a counterattack against invading mercenaries. The mercenaries themselves represent the easiest way in which formal command channels can be bypassed by the National Security Council and its political controllers, for the initiation of special incidents which would create a crisis-level atmosphere which the entire NATO chain of command would then be forced to enter.

The current deployment of private mercenaries comes from three related sources. David Bufkin is recruiting special forces veterans from his base in San Diego, California. David Sterling, a former operative of Britain's Special Air Services, is reportedly recruiting from London. And Colonel Franceschi of the French OAS is recruiting scattered elements of that fascist organization. In addition, South Africa and Portugal have also reportedly been sources for mercenary forces.

It is highly significant that the CIA has denied involvement in recruiting activities. The CIA's non-involvement has been substantially confirmed by well placed sources, several of which were themselves formerly involved in similar types of mercenary operations have elaborated on the difficulty that mercenary recruiters are having in the wake of the Angola trials last year. More generally, they point to the reluctance of major portions of government intelligence networks, especially in Britain and the U.S., to support the aspirations of the Carter regime.

The relevant case in point is David Sterling, the former SAS operative, who was cut loose from British government sponsorship and has since become the premier "networks" and assassination agent for Rockefeller