

Havana's View Of Peking's Geopolitical Gambit

I have recommended to *Executive Intelligence Review* that it republish two recent *Granma* editorials, to afford the policy-maker access to the flavor as well as the content of current Cuban party-leadership perception of Peking's geopolitical gambit.

It should be clear that Havana has understood two crucial things concerning Peking-Brzezinski relations. First, Havana recognizes that the emerging geopolitical role of China during the past two decades is essentially a direct continuation of British Russian policy for Germany from the turn of the present century; China has replaced Germany in London's almost eighty-year-old project for the military balkanization of Russia. Second, Havana accurately assesses Peking's world-outlook in this geopolitical game.

The editorials do not show that Havana has adequately understood the political-economic content of the original British geopolitical doctrine — i.e., Karl Haushofer, Alexander Helphand-Parvus, Haushofer-Schacht protégé Adolf Hitler. Nor do the editorials make the connection between the London authorship of the past and current geopolitical doctrines and the bearing of this on the struggle between London and Peking over a (Peking-favored) *Atlantic-centered* thermonuclear war and a (London-favored) *Pacific-centered* thermonuclear war.

Nonetheless, during recent months, especially since the Schmidt-Brezhnev summit, Moscow's press has made great advances in quality of appreciation of the underlying internal policy differences within the industrialized capitalist nations. Contrary to the popularized, false image of Cuba and Fidel Castro in most of the U.S. press, Cuban Africa policy has been almost consistently directed to effecting stability on that continent and to heading-off a Soviet-U.S.A. confrontation in that region. Few know the specific efforts Fidel Castro has made during recent years to head off a confrontationist course of action from the side of the Soviet Union and its allies. Ambassador Andrew Young does appear to comprehend the policy options Cuban policy does place on the table for the U.S.A.

Carlos Rodriguez's ABC-TV interview with Barbara Walters (May 30, 1978) should be viewed in the same context as the enclosed, republished Havana editorials on Peking policy. Just as Havana views Peking's interventions as aimed at provoking war between the United States and the Soviet Union, so Havana views economic cooperation among the U.S.A., Western Eu-

rope, the Soviet Union, Cuba and others in the capital-intensive economic development of Africa as a means for eliminating the war danger.

As we emphasized in our advice to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, published this past week, the underlying source of the continuing danger of thermonuclear war is the policies of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. This is understood by leading French Gaullists, whose criticisms of President Giscard d'Estaing are chiefly motivated by Giscard's continued toleration of IMF rules. Giscard will soon be faced with the crisis of either dumping the IMF or losing French influence throughout Africa. This will be key to the forthcoming Bonn conference. Since the OECD draft has been scrapped, the Schmidt government's Schmidt-Brezhnev ace, and German government "Grand Design" perspectives for Africa and other developing regions will be pitted in fact against the neo-Schachtian, pro-IMF proposals of a bankrupt Britain and its supporters.

In any case, neither Moscow nor Havana can tolerate IMF, World Bank and "Brandt Commission" policies. If OECD nations dump the IMF and World Bank and their policies, it is in Moscow's and Havana's interest to seek economic-cooperation formulas which cover the security of new capital flows into the developing nations. Although Havana is by no means an admirer of Zaire's President Mobutu SeseSeko, Havana and Moscow cannot tolerate Peking's support of IMF-directed economic genocide in Zaire. However, suitable agreements can be negotiated pending key nations' pull-out from support of IMF and World Bank policies, and once the IMF and World Bank schemes are dumped, such agreements among Moscow, Havana and industrialized capitalist nations can go into effect.

As of this moment, as long as Kissinger's and Brzezinski's influence is efficient in U.S.A. policy, Peking has succeeded in putting the world onto the track toward an *Atlantic-centered* thermonuclear war within the medium term. The alternative to such a war is "Grand Design" principles of economic cooperation between the OECD nations and Moscow, along lines adopted in the Schmidt-Brezhnev accords. Thus, Havana's editorial attacks on Peking's geopolitical gambit and Carlos Rodriguez's offer in his ABC-TV interview should be viewed as two aspects of the same policy options for the U.S.A. in our relations with Havana.

—Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr.