

# Europe counters U.S.-China insanity

## *Attempts to salvage detente, cooperation with Soviet Union*

Leading European figures involved in the European Monetary System have moved over the past week to attempt to counter the war danger which has been raised by the overtly insane crisis-mongering of the Carter Administration and closely allied spokesmen such as Henry Kissinger in the wake of Chinese leader Teng Hsiao-ping's visit to Washington.

Last week, following a 12 hour emergency West German cabinet meeting coincident with the conclusion of the Teng visit, both Chancellor Helmut Schmidt and Parliamentary leader Herbert Wehner issued statements sharply distancing West Germany — the linchpin of NATO — from U.S. and British defense policy vis-a-vis the Soviets.

Now, in a Feb. 6 television broadcast in the Federal Republic, Wehner has explicitly countered what he identified as Anglo-American attacks on the Soviet Union by asserting that the Soviets are not an aggressive nation and do not constitute — as Teng et al. claim — a threat to peace. On Feb. 3, in an interview with Norddeutsche Rundfunk, Wehner suggested that the current deadlock in disarmament talks be resolved through the convening of summit on the level of the 1976 Helsinki conference. "It would be wrong," Wehner declared, "to wait for an MBFR or SALT II agreement... I do not want such things to be left to world political developments, which are not very encouraging at the moment..."

Wehner's remarks were definitively supported by Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, whose press spokesman, Klaus Bölling answered criticism from the Christian Democratic Union that the parliamentary leader had spoken out of turn. "It would be very troublesome to try to find any contradiction between the conceptions of Mr. Wehner and the government on questions of security policy," Bölling declared.

According to sources in the Social Democratic Party, Wehner's initiatives represent a conscious effort on the part of the West Germans to "bring reason" to the wildly swinging Carter camp.

If Wehner and other Europeans' remarks had any effect on the Administration, there has so far been no public manifestation of that effect. Administration spokesmen this week compulsively denied that the conclusion of what the Chinese hailed as a Sino-U.S. anti-Soviet pact could have any repercussions in U.S.-Soviet relations.

Among policymaking circles associated with the Carter Administration, however, there is evidence not only that some are aware that the Administration's policy-direction is leading

toward a confrontation with the Soviets, but that they are consciously preparing for it. Writing in the Feb. 3 issue of the London Economist, Henry Kissinger declared that the Soviets are achieving a first-strike capability against the West, and provocatively demanded that the U.S. respond to the threat by developing a first-strike capability of their own. At this writing, the Kissinger interview is being serialized in the U.S. press, and opposition to the Carter policy insanity is confined to regional, rather than national figures.

Commented a Vatican source: "Washington seems to have lost its sense of reality. The opening to China was too rapid and done in a way which appears to justify Soviet reactions...." And an Italian Communist Party correspondent characterized Carter as left holding an empty bag of promises from Teng, while Western Europe considers an agreement with the USSR — on both political-military and economic issues — to be the only course consonant with its safety and interests.

## What Europe said about Teng visit

### **Wehner blames U.S. and Britain**

*West German Parliamentary leader Herbert Wehner for the first time singled out the United States and Great Britain as responsible for impeding the SALT II accords and generally sabotaging the processes of detente and disarmament Feb. 6. Before a television audience, the Social Democratic Party leader reiterated the warnings he had delivered in a recent radio interview that the Soviet Union's defense policy was neither offensive or aggressive. Following are excerpts from the interview.*

**Question:** In recent days you have said that the Soviet Union's arms potential is defensive and is not unconditionally set up for aggression. What brought you to this evaluation?

**Wehner:** It is my understanding that it is just not so with Soviet armaments, which are a burden for everyone, and certainly also for the people in the Soviet Union themselves. But take the com-

parison with those kinds of armaments that finally lead to — and here I'm thinking about 40 years ago — having people say, and in that case, people from the German side, "Massive return fire since 5:45 a. m." That was how Sept. 1, 1939 began and then that automatically rolled right into the Second World War. But, when one is not totally presumptuous, one must nevertheless say that this comparison does not fit Soviet armaments.

**Question:** It was reported that in a Dutch newspaper you criticized the course taken by Foreign Minister Genscher in the MBFR negotiations. You allegedly said that the Federal Republic was a delaying factor there. Was that a footnote, was it incorrectly quoted?

**Wehner:** That was not quoted correctly, and it was a misuse of an interview. I said that there is, when one informs himself — and many people have already said this to me — that concerning the Vienna negotiations on troop limitations, arms limitations, etc., there is information coming up again and again — for example, even from the Americans — that, of course, the Federal Republic is operating with particular reserve. There is also such information coming from the British, who say that it is the Federal Republic.

## French press warns U.S.

*"The Chinese Trap" being set for the U.S. government was clearly described in an article published in the Feb. 2 issue of the conservative progovernment French daily Le Figaro. Authored by a traditionally conservative, anti-Soviet commentator, Jacques Jaquet-Françillon, the article resolutely warns against the China card.*

Jimmy Carter is thrashing about in the Chinese trap like a carp caught in a fish net. Teng Hsiao-ping is a charming guest who excels in verbal hyperbole when it comes to celebrating the historic conciliation between the United States and China. He is not embarrassed by as many scruples when he wants to say what he thinks about the international situation...

Here we have an official guest of the President of the United States, Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-ping, proclaiming *urbi et orbi* that all this (a speedy conclusion of a SALT II treaty, detente with the Soviet Union — ed.) is only illusions and wishful thinking...

While he maintains a polite reserve in his official speeches, all occasions are used since his arrival in Washington — interviews, appearances on television, talks with journalists, cocktail talk — to declare that the detente called for by his host as the primordial goal of his policy is in reality only an illusion.

One can sign as many SALT accords as one wants, this will not change in any way the real intentions of the Soviet leaders who only seek one thing, world "hegemony." And so Teng Hsiao-ping concludes that war is inevitable and there is only one way to "put the polar bear on a leash." That is a solid alliance between the United States, Europe, Japan and China...

And who are these words addressed to? Teng Hsiao-ping makes no mystery of it. To those who, in the Congress of the United States, have sworn to oppose the detente policy of the American Administration.

"There are in this country people who urge the President not

to conclude a SALT accord with the Soviet Union. . . . These people are right!" Who said this? Mr. Teng himself.

Of course, there is nothing new in this language. Peking's leaders have often said this in the past. But the Vice Premier this time speaks on American soil, at the foot of Capitol Hill, a few weeks, or even a few days before the talks between Washington and Moscow open up again...

Could the staggering trade perspectives opening up in the Middle Empire be nothing more than poisoned bait? Can we really take the risk of falling into the trap? What is beginning to bother many Americans is that these perspectives are still very far off, and that the Chinese are asking that they be paid cash in advance on the "political" side of the contract. The Chinese will deliver later. If they don't change their minds before.

## West German analyst calls Teng visit a one-man show

*Approached by the Bonn correspondent for the Executive Intelligence Review, a staff member of a major West German policy institute had this to say on Chinese Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-ping's visit to the U.S. and its meaning for the Carter Administration.*

# Administration

*Refusing to acknowledge the serious implications of allowing Chinese Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-ping to dictate U.S. policy, Administration spokesmen compulsively ignored demands for clarification or explanations from the press. Following is a grid of such interchanges.*

## State Department-Feb. 6

*Q: What is Cyrus Vance's perception of a danger of war?*

*Hodding Carter III: We recognize no war danger.*

## State Department-Feb. 5

*Q: Will you please comment on Khomeini's announcement of a provisional government?*

*Tom Reston: We have no position on Khomeini's announcement of a provisional government. We look forward to supporting the new government.*

*Q: Which new government?*

*Tom Reston: I will not answer that question.*

*Q: Do you consider the Bakhtiar government the legal government of Iran?*

*Tom Reston: I will not answer that question.*

That was quite a spectacular show with the really active partner being Teng Hsiao-ping himself. . . . But the problem for the United States is that it is not able to distinguish between the new Chinese approach — the fine perspective they outlined — and basic reality.

If they come back and face reality, the U.S. will realize that nothing fruitful can come out of it. As for the perspective of industrial development, that is a chimera. China is a poor country, and its infrastructure of power is extremely unstable. Teng's visit was a "one man show." But what about the other 800 millions in China and what about Hua Kuo-feng, of whom nothing is heard anymore?

Teng does not have so much power that he can commit the Chinese to a long-term perspective for the coming five to ten years. His mass of power is extremely fragile. He is not strong enough to determine Chinese policy.

The United States should have been more cautious about that . . . they should have "smelled" something.

China is not going to become a superpower for the next 30 years. It can't make and decide policy in a consequent way; that is a problem which will have to be dealt with by the next generation. . . .

## East bloc issues sharp warnings

### Pravda scores China policy

In its authoritative Weekly Review section Feb. 4, the Soviet Communist Party's daily Pravda quickly dispensed with Carter Administration attempts to deny that the U.S.-China communiqué was aimed against the Soviet Union. Pravda denounced these attempts as "tricks" and warned the Carter Administration that the Soviet Union understood it was playing "no innocent game."

Pravda said further: "The Soviet public cannot close its eyes to the fact that the Peking guest in the capital was given a wide podium for slander against the USSR.

"It seems that anti-Sovietism is the basis of the 'common interests' and 'similar views' which the American-Chinese communiqué mentions. It would be very interesting to know on which concrete viewpoints the opinions of Washington coincide with those of the Peking leaders, who, as is known, demand the

## closes its eyes to reality

### The Office of Cyrus Vance-Feb. 6

Asked to comment on the imminent war danger posed by the Carter Administration's foreign policy alliance with China against the Soviet Union, a Dr. Calder replied, "I will not comment on anything you have said. Absolutely no comment."

### White House-Feb. 5

Sam Donaldson, ABC asked White House Press Secretary Jody Powell to comment on the recent Pravda article which expressed grave concern over the fact that Teng "was given a wide podium for slandering the USSR" in the U.S. and warned the Carter Administration against thinking it is playing "an innocent game."

*Jody Powell:* I don't have to comment on that.

*Donaldson:* This is a major statement with serious charges. You should have a comment.

*Powell:* I don't have to comment.

*NSIPS:* Our allies think the President is insane. What do you have to say about that?

*Powell:* I think our allies are pleased with the process of normalization we are going through with China.

*NSIPS:* Warren Christopher has been responsible for spreading slanders against the U.S. Labor Party among leading businessmen who have worked with the Party. Your comment please.

*Powell:* Which business leaders would be working with the Labor Party?!

*NSIPS:* You shouldn't have said that. This is a Watergateable offense.

One Washington correspondent commented to the NSIPS correspondent, "I don't doubt what you say is true. The State Department was putting a lot of pressure on business over the Argentina loan denials." (Last year the State Department stalled the approval of Ex-Im loans to Argentina on the basis of human rights violations. Warren Christopher was responsible —ed.)

### National Security Council-Feb. 6

Mr. Thornton, National Security Council assistant on South Asian Affairs — which includes Iran — sat in abject silence when asked to comment on the fact that his boss Brzezinski and President Carter are clinically insane.

### State Department-Feb. 6

An aide to David Newsome, the head of the Iran Task Force, responded to charges that the Carter Administration is insane, by saying, "Look, you're talking to somebody involved in policy making. That means you are saying I am insane!"

territory of many countries, who proclaim the inevitability of war and prepare intensively for it."

Two days prior to Pravda's commentary, East German President Erich Honnecker warned, "Recent developments have brought the world to a branching point between war and peace. The Chinese are trying to provoke World War III and may do so by the invasion of Vietnam."

### 'China modernization a cover for war preparation'

*The following are excerpts of an article, distributed by the official Soviet news agency Novosti and authored by Vladimir Potatov, Vice President of the Soviet Academy of Sciences' Far East Institute. It was published in the Feb. 1 issue of the conservative French daily Le Figaro, which has published numerous Novosti releases over the recent period. It is titled "Weapons supplies to China: the Soviet point of view."*

China's leaders have posed for their country the task of making China a strong military power by the end of the 20th century. . . . It was towards this goal that the program of "four modernizations" was launched. Create modern agriculture, industry, army, science and technology. Practice shows that three of these modernizations — that of agriculture, industry, science and technology — serve to reach the main objective: the modernization of the army. . . .

Some of the political figures of the West who lack foresight and who come out in favor of arms supplies to China probably believe that they will succeed in directing the Chinese expansionist spearhead in one direction only: against the USSR. This is a dangerous error! Chinese expansionism is a threat to universal peace and the security of the peoples of numerous countries. No one can ignore, for example, the hegemonist projects hatched by Peking's leaders in South East Asia. . . . The consequences of the policy aimed at encouraging Peking's expansionism are just as evident for Europe.

Peking's leaders continue to propagate the demented idea according to which each generation "must have its own war." Yang Yung, Deputy Chief of Staff of the Chinese army, published an article last December calling for the acceleration of modernization measures for the army, not to lose one moment, and to accomplish all preparations oriented towards an early nuclear war of great scope.

### Czechoslovak commentary

In a separate commentary on China, the official Czech daily Rude Pravo compared Chinese Vice Premier Teng with Hitler. Both warned against "Soviet aggression," Rude Pravo wrote.

On Feb. 5, Rude Pravo called on the U.S. to "sharply repudiate" Teng's threat to "punish" Vietnam. If the U.S. does not criticize Teng, the paper stipulated, on this question of war and peace, this means it is encouraging him. The Czech daily concluded with the warning to the U.S. that it is being "naive" to think the U.S. pulls the Chinese string. It is the other way around. "He who thinks he can set his neighbor's house afire without being seen himself, might burn himself in the end," warned the paper.

## Henry A. Kissinger: West

*Following are portions of former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's interview with the London Economist, dated Feb. 3.*

**Q: Do you think that there is an imbalance even in the present agreement in terms of sheer throw-weight available on both the Soviet and American sides?**

**A:** The real issue is what the strategic forces of the two sides are capable of doing. This in turn decides the impact of military capabilities on the conduct of foreign policy and especially on the conduct of crises. I think it is generally recognized that by some time in the early 1980s the Soviet Union will have the capability to destroy with a reasonable degree of confidence most of our land-based ICBMs. In the same period of time we will not be able to destroy the Soviet ICBM force. This creates a gap in the design of the two forces that is bound to have geopolitical consequences, especially since we are clearly inferior in forces capable of local intervention. . . .

**Q: And you'd like to see that remedied.**

**A:** I would like to set it in terms of geopolitical realities. During the entire postwar period, it is obvious that the Soviet Union has always had a substantial superiority in the capability for local intervention, in almost all crisis areas. But that was counterbalanced to a substantial degree by the strategic superiority of the United States. For purposes of this discussion, I define strategic superiority as the ability by the United States to pose a risk, or at least a perceived risk, to the Soviet Union that it might lose most of its strategic retaliatory force if it pushed a crisis beyond a certain point. This knowledge inspired a high degree of caution. . . . The practical result is that in a local, regional crisis the Soviet capacity for intervention must become more politically significant than in the past. And will be perceived as being more significant. The conduct of American policy in crises will inevitably become more cautious. This is an event of geopolitical significance.

**Q: Can we distinguish for a moment between counterforce capability and the capability of the United States to retaliate against a Soviet attack?**

**A:** . . . Every calculation with which I am familiar indicates that a general nuclear war in which civilian populations are the primary target will produce casualties exceeding 100 million. Such a degree of devastation is not a strategic doctrine; it is an abdication of moral and political responsibility. No political structure could survive it.

**Q: Are you saying that when a SALT treaty comes to be considered, a prerequisite for its ratification by the Senate should be an increase in the United States' counterforce capability?**

**A:** Leaving aside the ratification question, I believe this is a necessity with or without SALT. The dilemmas which I have described will not go away. I am restless when I am told that we