

Nigeria Cool

With the Latin American side of his operation well sewn up, Brzezinski tried the same routine in Nigeria. Carter opened his four-day visit to Lagos with a Brzezinski-scripted speech that attacked Cuban presence in Africa as a "new form of domination or colonialism" and insinuated that the Cubans were Soviet "proxies." To soften this line a bit, Carter offered the Nigerians what the April 3 *Daily Telegraph* of London called a promise to apply "more pressure than ever" against the white minority regimes in southern Africa.

Lest such so-called concessions prove insufficient, Brzezinski's friends in London published a steady stream of classic horror stories in the press, as exemplified by the April 2 *Sunday Telegraph* article, "Angola: Land of Cuban Terror." "Children have been shipped to Havana," reported the *Telegraph* with typical British reserve, "possibly to be used as cheap labor on sugar plantations."

Brzezinski's ploy was not well received by the Nigerians, who do not appreciate Soviet military aid. The Soviets supported the Lagos government against the British-engineered Biafran secessionist operation. The U.S. and British media immediately picked up Obasanjo's displeasure, and the final joint communiqué omitted any reference to the issue.

The Nigerian position intersected with a growing

awareness among certain U.S. factions behind Vance and Young that continued Brzezinski control over the situation could lead to war. The hysterical outbursts against Young this week by British political figures and press indicated how seriously this potential threat to Brzezinski's British interests is being viewed.

Young took initial steps to take advantage of this potential by making a separate trip to Africa preceding Carter's, for the purpose of strengthening his hand against the British "internal solution" for Rhodesia. He also set up meetings between Vance and high-level representatives of the front-line states while in Lagos with Carter. In turn, Vance has announced that he will travel to Africa to meet separately with Patriotic Front leaders and with Rhodesia's Ian Smith, prior to his visit to Moscow later this month.

These measures, however, are mere preconditions. Granted, Vance and Young succeeded in convincing Carter to condemn the "internal solution." But veteran observers in Washington were pessimistic this week, pointing out that unless Washington and Moscow agree who have a development policy for the continent, the present situation is heading for a sharp escalation of the fighting on all sides in the Rhodesian question, which in turn will strengthen Brzezinski's hand in convincing Carter to perceive African policy in "anti-Soviet" terms.

—Chris Allen

Venezuela

Carter Backs IMF, 'Gasahol'

Instead of the heralded announcement of a major U.S. policy shift towards the Third World, President Carter told the developing nations and his expectant Venezuelan hosts in Caracas that the U.S. considers its contributions to the International Monetary Fund to be its contribution to the demanded new world economic order. Carter then preached about "limited resources," the need for population control, and called for global conservation of energy!

In a speech delivered to the Venezuelan Congress, Carter stated that "in managing the international economy," the U.S. gives "particular importance to the expansion of the International Monetary Fund," promising that his Administration will "pressure to achieve the rapid approval by Congress of our own contribution to the supplementary means of financing recommended by Mr. Witteveen." He further chastised OPEC for not applying their "excess wealth" to bail out the developing nations' debt as well.

Carter also proposed the creation of an "american foundation for technological cooperation" to handle

increased transfers of technology, but gave the medieval Brazilian program of producing energy from sugar cane — so-called gasahol" — as an example of the "technologies" the U.S. would be offering: "We have begun to cooperate and plan for the judicious use of the earth's limited resources, such as food," Carter said, "and now we should do the same with energy." He then called for the world to "dedicate a larger part of our vast technological resources to world efforts to develop new energy sources, such as solar, and as some Latin American nations have shown us, even sugar and agricultural products."

While Carter made the token promise to supply the Brazilian nuclear program with enriched uranium when he arrived in that country, he immediately reiterated the U.S.'s adamant opposition to Brazil's agreement with West Germany for the construction of a reprocessing plant. Instead Carter pushed the as-yet undeveloped technology of thorium, a supposedly weapons-safe process, as an alternative program for Brazil — a pie-in-the-sky scheme that Brazilians have thus far refused to fall for.

'Confront The Communist Menace'

The front-page editorial in the semi-official Brazilian daily O Globo of April 3 revealed the true central topic of Carter's visit. The editorial, titled, "Danger in the Americas," directly follows the Daily Telegraph line that the Cubans are shifting their theater of operations to Latin America. O Globo details the data on Cuban troop presence in various countries which was first issued by Brzezinski as saying that the Cubans are putting forth a greater proportional effort than the U.S. did in Vietnam.

All this means the Soviet invasion of the continent, in which the Cubans play the role of mere assistant, in payment for its huge debts to the directing power. The expeditionaries from the distant island themselves take the work and the risks which the Muscovite sponsor does not want or is not able to assume directly. They teach, train, plan, operate, shoot, kill, and also die following Kremlin orders.

Soviet expansionism in Africa puts the Atlantic shore of South America under the gun and should arouse, as top priority, the strategic defense interests of Brazil. As it controls more and more of the vital points, seas and routes of the African continent, the advance of the USSR nears our ocean frontier and our own geographic body.

Brazilian foreign policy erred in extemporaneously recognizing the communist government of Agostinho Neto in Angola.... Now there is no time to lose. President Geisel must get Itamaraty (the Foreign Minister — ed.) moving on an immediate and intensive joint effort with the other Latin American foreign ministries and with indispensable U.S. participation to find common ways and means of confronting and deterring the latent menace.

Today, the Soviet-Cuban conspiracy endangers the stability of the African continent. Tomorrow, the Americas will be in danger.

It is up to Brazil, with the responsibilities inherent to the position it holds on the international scene, to take the initiative of bringing the Hemisphere to react, before it is too late.

Brazil's "New Status"

The liberal daily O Estado de Sao Paulo exemplified the euphoric Brazilian reactions to Brzezinski's revival of Kissinger's "special relationship" in its lead editorial. O Globo of March 31 and Folha de Sao Paulo the previous day reached identical conclusions. These excerpts are from the O Estado editorial, titled, "The Traditional Alliance is Reinvigorated":

Carter not only recognized the Western vocation of Brazil... but also invited our country — in accordance with its new status as a great power — to share on an equal basis with the U.S. the grave responsibilities for the destiny of the West, whose existence and whose fundamental values at this moment face serious dangers, which were so realistically analyzed by the U.S. president in his latest speech in Wake Forest University in North Carolina.

...What was most important was that Carter did not

only pronounce words, but he transformed the first negotiations with Geisel into a consultation between chiefs of state on the problems of the Middle East and the "Horn of Africa," theaters of wars which threaten to degenerate into a general conflagration and which could affect the vital point for the survival of the West: oil supplies.

...He also made the logical conclusion from the statements by the Brazilian Foreign Minister, which we consider an act of statesmanship... Da Silveira... affirmed: "In exceptional circumstances, in the face of threats and grave danger to the survival of all, it is natural that collective interests temporarily take on the greatest weight."

The New "Geopoliticians" In Venezuela and Brazil

The *Christian Science Monitor* of March 31 gave Zbigniew Brzezinski the credit for engineering Carter's dazzling diplomatic maneuvers in Brazil, by pointing out that the lanky Pole, as a Columbia University professor five years ago, predicted that "Brazil had more of the makings of a superpower than Japan." He also foresaw that Brazil would be "the source of future Latin American hostilities."

This is the sort of parlance accompanying a revival of the British geopolitical concept of a Brazil-led SATO, or South Atlantic Treaty Organization, which would have a supposedly free hand in confronting "communist aggression" on NATO's "southern flank." The target, of course, is Cuban presence not only in Africa, but in Latin America as well. Thus, under the operant Brzezinski-British gameplan, not only the South Atlantic "rim" but South America as a whole must be organized "geopolitically" around Brazil... or become the object of Brazilian "hostilities."

Such a geopolitical notion is known as Brazilian "living frontiers" — the assertion that Brazil's borders are where Brazilians happen to be; if Brazil's population expands outward, so do its frontiers. It is not accidental that Brzezinski's "working sessions" in Brasilia were held with Golbery Couto e Silva, President Geisel's chief adviser. Golbery is also the author of the "living frontier" doctrine.

Brzezinski's victory in securing an anti-Cuban turn in Brasilia is a clear signal that Golbery has been given the assignment of reorganizing the South American continent according to what the New York Council on Foreign Relations euphemistically calls "new geopolitical realities."

Among these new realities is the fact that a move to isolate Cuba in Latin America will be much more feasible if Venezuela cooperates. One geopolitical thinker linked to Riordan Roett's School of International Studies at Johns Hopkins University commented this week that Venezuela and Brazil will "inevitably" be drawn into a "symbiotic relationship" in order to fend off

"Soviet infiltration" of the continent. The current efforts to create an "Amazon pact" that would revolve around Brazil and Venezuela is the first step toward such a relationship, he said. Meanwhile, a Brazilian specialist in New York directly linked the Amazon pact with the attempts to revive a SATO involving Nigeria and Venezuela. Caracas's sudden enthusiasm towards the Amazon pact in recent months, he continued, is crucial. "Venezuela is the last piece."

Golbery's counterpart in Caracas is the man who has singlehandedly redirected the Pérez government towards the Amazon pact, Foreign Minister Simon Alberto Consalvi. In fact, within the past year, Consalvi has assumed almost total control over every facet of Venezuelan foreign policy.

Not incidentally, when Brzezinski was forecasting Brazil's superpower status at Columbia five years ago, Consalvi was studying under him.

Africa

Nigeria: What Kind Of U.S. Policy?

The African portion of President Carter's recent trip most sharply evidenced the growing policy disagreements of Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and United Nations Ambassador Andrew Young with National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski. While Brzezinski urged Carter to highlight the presence of Cuban troops in Africa, Vance and Young's efforts were directed at convincing the President that an "internal settlement" in Rhodesia excluding the forces represented by the Patriotic Front would not only be unacceptable, but a dangerous folly for U.S. Africa policy generally.

A well-informed African diplomat offered his perception of the trip's outcome in a recent interview.

Q: What do you see as the effect of the condemnation of Smith's internal solution in the joint communiqué signed by Carter and Nigerian President Obasanjo?

A: There is essentially no change in the situation. The Patriotic Front and front-line states made the concession of agreeing to UN-supervised elections, hoping that the Anglo-Americans would concede to a joint British-Patriotic Front-administered interim period leading to independence. The questions of administration of the interim period and the composition of the army (that is, of a major role for the Patriotic Front — ed.) — these are not new. These have always been the two key issues. We have already been through all the meetings Carter has now proposed. We didn't get any signals from Carter indicating concrete steps to resolve these issues.

Rhodesia's Prime Minister Smith is already denouncing the attempts by Carter to call for further meetings. He thinks he has a lot of room to play in the situation. Brzezinski's anti-Cuban, anti-Soviet diatribes have convinced him that if the war escalates, the U.S. will eventually be forced to come to his aid, directly or, most likely, indirectly.

My prognosis is that the guerrilla war against Smith is going to rapidly intensify.

Long-time Washington observers are predicting a grim result should National Security Advisor Brzezinski's strong influence on Carter continue. A Capitol Hill reporter evaluated the effect on U.S. policy in Africa should Africa's planned meeting of all parties involved to work out a settlement for Rhodesia fail to come off:

Q: What are the chances that the Carter Administration will be able to resolve the Rhodesia crisis with this new round of proposed meetings?

A: I doubt that the all-parties meeting can be pulled off. Carter's strategy now rests entirely on these meetings, and if they fail he is in big trouble. If the fighting escalates, and the frontline states bring in Cubans to defend themselves, then I think it is very probable that Carter, at Brzezinski's bidding, will run full speed into a confrontation with the Soviets.

Young Pushes Africa Development...

Young met Carter in Nigeria after completing a tour of southern and eastern Africa, where he tried to set the groundwork for renewed negotiations along the lines of the Anglo-American plan. Since the Anglo-American plan provides a basis for negotiations that at least includes the Patriotic Front, the British have tended to impede any progress toward it.

Previously, Young had met with Kenyan Foreign Minister Waiyaki, and reiterated that the U.S. was interested in developing Africa, not in destroying it.

Young is now being identified as the leader of a faction in the Carter Administration opposing the internal solution and seeking to arrange an acceptable solution to the Rhodesia crisis that will include the meaningful participation of the Patriotic Front. As a result, Young is being attacked by public figures and press in Britain.

...And the British Don't Like It

In a speech at Oxford University on April 1, Harold Wilson, who was British Prime Minister when Rhodesia illegally declared independence, strongly attacked Young:

I have a feeling that people in Britain are soon going to get a little tired of the sententious pronouncements of Mr. Young on the subject of Rhodesia...What is particularly irksome is his statement this week implying that Britain simply wanted to abdicate all responsibility for the problem...If it is not for Britain to decide, still less, with great respect, is it the duty of the New York office of the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations? It is for the Rhodesian people to give their verdict on "acceptability."

In an article by Stephen Barder in the Daily Telegraph of London, on April 3, 1978:

Meanwhile, once again a contretemps has blown up over the tactlessness of Mr. Young.

In press interviews published in Lusaka and Lagos last week, he indicated that America was having to keep the British up to the mark in the matter of standing by the Anglo-American proposals.

In fairness, it has to be said that Mr. Young is not alone amongst American officials in suspecting that, for two pins, Britain would dump the Rhodesia mess in their lap. Indeed, some observers, myself included, feel that they hope to be able to pin the blame on the wicked British if Black African hopes are dashed regarding the rapid removal of Mr. Smith from the Rhodesian scene — which now seems to be a minimum demand.

The State Department Shifts

On Friday, March 31, National Security Advisor Brzezinski leaked charges about "massive" Cuban military activity in the Ethiopian province of Eritrea to reporters. That same day, in the daily U.S. State Department briefing, U.S. officials downplayed the issue in the face of a barrage of questions from reporters on the number and activities of Cubans in Ethiopia. The State Department spokesman said: "Only a negotiated settlement can resolve the Ethiopia-Somalia conflict. The Organization of African Unity is meeting in early April in this regard. Contrary to reports in the press in Britain and elsewhere that the Ethiopians are committing atrocities in the Ogaden region (the region Somalia unsuccessfully tried to annex — ed.), Ethiopia is helping to rebuild the Ogaden...."

On Monday, April 3, following Carter's speech in Lagos, Nigeria, the State Department spokesman adopted a harder line on the Cuban issue. This time the State Department spokesman stated, "The Cuban forces in Ethiopia are excessive. There should be an early and rapid withdrawal."

Washington Post Charges Carter Sympathy for Guerrillas

Undermining the efforts by Andrew Young to resolve the Rhodesia crisis peacefully, the April 4 Washington Post editorially endorsed the internal solution, which excludes the Patriotic Front from participation in the government.

In Lagos...Mr. Carter seems to have succumbed to Nigeria's uncomplicated fervor for a Patriotic Front guerrilla victory. The final communiqué omitted any

mention of progress in Salisbury, though a multiracial interim government now actually exists there...

We understand that the administration seeks to draw internal and external forces together, the better to bring peace to Zimbabwe, preempt Cuban-Soviet intervention...Virtually all his (Carter's) rhetoric favors the external people. He holds Salisbury to lofty moral and political standards, while often appearing to wink at failings of the Patriotic Front. He refuses to say the one thing that might most clear the air: that if the guerrillas reject a fair opportunity to come home while Salisbury moves to honest majority rule, the United States will go with Salisbury. His performance is all the more baffling when you consider that the internal settlement looks to be more democratic, moderate and multiracial than any government the guerrillas might construct.

Boston Globe and Goldwater Defend British Empire

Here are excerpts from an editorial in the April 1 Boston Globe, criticizing Andrew Young for his "reprehensible" attacks on British policy in Africa:

Young has tweaked the tail of the British lion in a manner unbecoming our ambassador...We think he is dead wrong to stand in the way of Rhodesia's chance for peace, and to insist on guerrilla participation in the new government...What is reprehensible is the insulting tone he continues to use against the British.

The Globe quoted the London Daily Mail:

"The British are heartily sick of being insulted. We get it from the three half-penny soap opera at the UN, and we get it from international hustlers wanting to work the old anti-imperialism routine. We don't expect to get it from a member of the U.S. cabinet."

The Globe concludes: These episodes aren't in the interest of peacemaking. They are not consonant with the mission of the United Nations....Mr. Young's tail-tweaking does not enhance the image of the U.S. as a mature and responsible international arbiter, sensitive to the human rights of allies like the British.

U.S. Senator Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.) supported the internal solution in Rhodesia and advocated that the U.S. lift the arms embargo against South Africa during a speaking tour of South Africa that ended the weekend of April 1.

Goldwater made Andrew Young the major target of his remarks throughout the tour. He also contended that blacks in the U.S. opposed Andrew Young:

"Andy Young speaks only for Andy Young, although his position gives his words more credence than they deserve....Most Americans don't know why Carter tolerates him....I don't think many of the black people (in the United States) even look on Andy Young as a black man. Have you ever seen him? He's not very black."