

through the private interest to take over the economies of these countries . . . but through a cooperation for progress . . . for development. That is what we would like to do. We have not the money, but we have the people that could help. But you have the money and the French have the money . . . and perhaps the Soviet Union is willing, too. I cannot commit them but I am willing also to cooperate in this. Why not cooperate instead of fighting each other?

*Q: Mr. Vice President, you feel very strongly that Mr. Brzezinski is not a friend of Cuba? Is he an enemy of Cuba, do you feel?*

*A: I feel it, and not only of Cuba, but of all the progressive people of the world...of the movement of the national liberation, of the Soviet Union, of Socialism? . . .*

*Q: You don't feel that he's trying to block Soviet influence?*

*A: I know Mr. Brzezinski's ideology. His ideology is not the ideology of the American people...not the ideology of the American people.*

*Q: You feel it is harmful advice he is giving the President?*

*A: I believe so. I am strongly convinced of that.*

*Q: And do you think that he lies to the President?*

*A: I have not known what he is telling to the President. I could tell you after you told me what he is telling the President.*

*Q: You also said that there is also a way of cooperation.*

*A: Yes, I think so.*

*Q: What is that way?*

*A: Well, we talked about this with Mr. Friedman, who is the president of Business International. There's a way. Africa needs financing, as every underdeveloped country needs financing. Not only in Africa, but in Latin America and in Asia. We could cooperate in the problem of development for these countries peacefully without fight. There are many things in which you can put your money and your equipment. It would be a good business for the United States, not through private enterprise. Private enterprise is doomed to failure, in the underdeveloped countries. They have shown through years that private enterprise wants to seek maximum profits and this is no longer possible, they don't want to be exploited that way. But we can cooperate. You can sell your (?), you can sell your equipments, you can contribute money in investments in financial terms. In proper time — you will receive the interest, you will receive the profits of the enterprises. If you give assistance to men who'd cooperate, the Soviet Union would put the equipments, it's a problem which...we are talking now of peace, of disarmament. Why not give a part of the money that is safe in disarmament to the cause of cooperation in Africa. It would be important. That is what founding fathers talk about, that is what Jefferson talked about, and it's the only way to see peace.*

*Q: I'd like to go back over one question. Mr. Rodriguez,*

*you said that you have not armed or in any way aided the Katangese. How can Americans believe that you would not help them when you helped the Angolans. What's the difference?*

*A: There's a lot of difference. You remember Barbara that we have long-standing relations with liberation movements. We felt that we owed this to Angola because they had been attacked by South Africa and by Zaire. And the difference is that we are against secession in Africa. We respect the African point of view about borders and frontiers. We are against any movement that will split African peoples. I will be happy if the people of Zaire...we are not doing anything to control Mobutu...we are not in Africa to overthrow government...this is our position. We have come to support the independence of Angola nothing more nothing less. And Angola is having our troops there in order to be able to prepare the armies that they are preparing. As soon as President Neto tells the people you don't need anymore we want these people out.*

## Japan's Sonoda: Fusion Power And Development Assistance

*Exclusive to the Executive Intelligence Review*

At the United Nations, May 30, Japanese Foreign Minister Sunao Sonoda reported that U.S. President Jimmy Carter "has taken up the Fukuda fusion proposal at a cabinet level with the view of responding to it shortly." Sonoda was replying to a press conference question on the joint fusion project proposal made by Prime Minister Takeo Fukuda in early May.

Fukuda called for a \$1 billion fund for the crash development of fusion energy and joint initiatives by the United States and Japan in development projects in Third World nations, particularly Southeast Asia.

Sonoda indicated that the Japanese government is anxiously waiting for the U.S. Administration's response; in the meantime, he said, "we are developing the appropriate machinery to make the effort a success... I feel this is a very important issue bearing on the future of mankind. For this reason many countries, not just the United States and Japan, are invited to participate in this effort."

Sonoda also took the opportunity "to respond to criticism that Japan has had to face on its trade surplus. For my American audience I will say often the argument has been made that Japan should reduce its trade surplus. If we just reduce the surplus, it will lead to a contraction in the world economy. The world community desires an expanded world economy, let me say, and expanded world economy at an equilibrium." In this light, Sonoda suggested possible ways of "several surplus countries releasing their surplus for purposes of developmental assistance to Third World countries. We should explore multilateral framework to do this. In the past bilateral aid has not always achieved what the donor or the recipient have wanted, so we have to change past patterns of assistance."

Sonoda responded to the query on why Japan has been

so "passive" in the Mideast by saying: "You are right. Up to now we have been a little 'passive. But this will change. We are working on a 3 point Mideast peace and development package which the Prime Minister will take with him to the Arab nations when he visits later this

year. I am not at liberty to say what the points are, but let me say this. We will place as much emphasis on relations with the Middle East nations as we now do toward the ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) group."

## Schmidt: I Have A Few Questions For Brzezinski

*The following are excerpts of West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt's statements on CBS-TV's "Face the Nation" May 28. Schmidt was questioned by Richard C. Hottelet and George Herman of CBS and Henry Trehwitt of the Baltimore Sun.*

**Herman:** Chancellor Schmidt, you said in a recent interview in Newsweek Magazine, let me say again that leadership from the United States — financial, commercial, monetary and political — is sorely needed. How do you evaluate the state of American leadership of the Western Alliance at this time?

**Chancellor Schmidt:** I could've said this already four years ago, after the outbreak of the oil crisis, and in fact, I have said it four years ago, and I have been saying it all the time. And if you look back onto those four years, back until '73, roughly speaking, taking all into account, there has been quite a bit of leadership in the West all along, but as regards the economic field especially — balances of payments, exchange rates, credit policies, monetary policies — a little additional leadership wouldn't be bad. This does not apply to the present-day administration only, but also to the two previous ones....

**Hottelet:** Mr. Chancellor, in your speech in the General Assembly on disarmament, you also underscored the need for balance, and balance is indeed, in principle, accepted everywhere. The Russians speak of parity now and —

**Chancellor Schmidt:** Rather recently only.

**Hottelet:** Rather recently — and you speak of parity. But there was a striking discrepancy in the disarmament debate this past week, where Vice President Mondale said that the Soviet buildup of military conventional and nuclear forces in Europe was an escalation of what he called the Soviet nuclear threat, and he spoke of a three-to-one superiority in tanks of the Warsaw Pact against NATO. . . . a day or two later, Mr. Gromyko said that a parity exists, that the Soviet Union had not built up its forces in Europe for a long while, and that, in a word, it was NATO's fault if there was any problem. Now one has here an acceptance of the principle of balance, and yet it seems that people mean opposite things when they use the same word. How are you going to get around that?

**Chancellor Schmidt:** Well, first of all, let me stress that everything the West does . . . the targets of western negotiators ought to be balance. This is one thing. I think it's progress. It's a step forward that also the other side is now using the term balance. It has to be found out what

really means balance, for instance, in the field of tanks or in the field of medium range ballistic missiles.

**Hottelet:** But doesn't it mean one to one? Doesn't . . .

**Chancellor Schmidt:** It doesn't necessarily mean one to one. It could mean 1.5 to one in this field and 0.8 against one in that field, but it ought to be an overall balance, of course. One must say that the Soviets have maintained military forces always to a higher degree than, by my judgment, has been necessary for their self-defenses. This was true over all the three and a half decades since the war. On the other hand, although I am strongly criticizing that, I would, among ourselves, admit that they have some experiences, going back to 1941-1943 when in numbers they were superior and nevertheless came into great danger. . . .

**Hottelet:** You were the last man to see Mr. Brezhnev, who just completed a visit to the Federal Republic. What was your impression of his mood, and from what he said, of the prospects for a sensible and balanced resolution of this limitation of strategic arms?

**Chancellor Schmidt:** I understand this question of being directed at the personality of Brezhnev mostly, and as regards him, I have no doubt. He's not a young man; he is nearing the end of his political career, given his age. I have no doubt that he wants deeply to save his country and his nation from the dangers of a future war. I think he personally, really, has a great feeling for the necessity of peace. This does, of course, not exclude that, like any other government, especially so the Soviets, try to seek advantages in negotiations....

**Trehwitt:** ...I'm concerned that the (Atlantic) alliance is drifting a bit in an area where no one seems quite to know what to do, and I will ask you, how important do you think a resolution of the Greek-Turkish problem is, what we frequently refer to as the southern flank of NATO?

**Chancellor Schmidt:** Let me answer that one in a two-fold way. Number one, headlines about the so-called crisis of NATO, we have seen for 25 years now. It's in a way the habit of the western media to describe NATO as to be in the middle of a mess or a crisis —

**Herman:** Only the media? (laughter)

**Chancellor Schmidt:** Well, sometimes also political speakers — you need not take this too serious, number one. Second part of the answer — having said this, I think that the situation in the Mediterranean is not a healthy