

which means a change in Washington. Do you think that the real solution to the problem is to put LaRouche in the White House?

A: Yes. And to implement LaRouche's program. To have a world gold-based monetary system means that the lender can lower interest rates as he knows exactly what he will reap from his investment. Taxes should be lowered for high technology projects and high mechanization technology in agriculture; industrial investments must be stimulated. As for the question of Third World debt, a solution must be found enabling the Third World to increase its purchasing power in the industrialized world, thus creating a boom in the latter due to increased trade. Nuclear energy for industrial purposes must be developed.

This is one whole package. What is important is not only that LaRouche should be elected, but that his programme should be carried out, as in my opinion, it is really the solution to the economic crisis.

Q: What are the historical precedents of LaRouche's policy?

A: De Gaulle, as you know, who had as advisor Jacques Rueff, who was another friend of Lyndon LaRouche, carried out this policy with the Third World, when he called for a gold-based monetary system. This was more than thirteen years ago. If de Gaulle had been alive he would have denounced Nixon's dropping the dollar from the gold standard in 1971. In 1968, when I led a parliamentary delegation to Mexico—I was also in the USA at that time—and everyone said, "Why is de Gaulle industrializing the Third World, investing heavily in high technology ... this is what we in France call *the plan*. This is the five-year plan system which de Gaulle very much favored. This enabled him to extend low interest rates to the sectors of the economy which were the most worthwhile, those which created productive jobs. De Gaulle did all this. In a book called "Les Chenes Qu'on Abat" (The Oaks Which Are Felled) by Malraux, reporting on the last de Gaulle-Malraux discussion, de Gaulle said, "My economic policy is sound, but I have always had against me money." (By money he meant financial power, as "money" in English is not the right word). "I was always convinced that the great financial powers were ruining the world, that they defeated me in 1969." I hope that this time these financial powers will not defeat LaRouche.

And I must protest, that the Americans always thought that de Gaulle didn't like America. De Gaulle loved America. He believed in the future of the United States, it is a wonderful young country, as if it were his own son. And he once said to me: "What could I have done if I had been President of the United States!"



India

Gromyko is briefed on Gandhi's peace drive

by Daniel Sneider

The Indian government, under Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's direction, is now spearheading a peace initiative in the South Asian region aimed at defusing tensions which could lead to war. The center of attention is Pakistan and the U.S. efforts to build up that nation as a military base against Afghanistan. The Indian initiative is basically simple—to persuade Pakistan to abandon a path of confrontation in exchange for a withdrawal of the large Soviet troop-contingent from Afghanistan.

It was this initiative that brought Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko to India this past week for extensive talks with Indian officials including private talks between himself and Mrs. Gandhi. Before Gromyko set foot in New Delhi, a team of Indian special envoys had visited all the capitals of the region—Pakistan, Afghanistan, Nepal, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka—seeking some sort of regional consensus on the Indian effort. The results of those talks were presented to Gromyko, and from what is publicly available, some kind of basic "understanding" was reached, although practical results may not be visible for a time.

The Indian initiative flows from the visit of French President Giscard d'Estaing to India in late January, a visit which created a strong tie between Giscard and Gandhi and a common commitment to preventing the outbreak of thermonuclear war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union over events in the region. The two leaders have adopted a division of labor in search of regional and international stability clearly visible in the French role in Europe and the Indian role in Southwest and South Asia.

While Western press reports tend to distort the Gromyko trip's results—emphasizing "differences" between India and the Soviets on the principle of Soviet troop presence in Afghanistan, informed sources in Delhi have emphasized that, to the contrary, the talks went very well. The Soviet Union is not concerned whether India formally endorses every point of Soviet policy on Af-

ghanistan—the even-handed and independent role of India, which includes a tough stand on the U.S. buildup efforts, makes it far more useful in trying to effect a settlement of the problems in the region. Gromyko is reported to have expressed his “deep appreciation” of the Indo-French position as expressed in the results of the Giscard visit.

The third-force idea

The essential idea of Indian policy is in tune with that of Giscard's Gaullism—a “Third Force” in global politics, attached to neither superpower and committed to halting the Cold War clash. The government of Iraq, with good ties to the Soviets, has carved out a similar role for the Arab world. Like India, Iraq has good ties with France, and has been able to both criticize Moscow and harshly reject the military buildup policies of the U.S. It is not without note that Iraq President Saddam Hussein sent a special envoy to Delhi two weeks ago and established immediate, good ties with the new Gandhi government.

The Indians have indicated their view that the efforts to secure a peaceful solution to the problems in the region have been effectively blocked by the continued military buildup and provocations carried out by the Carter administration and its allies. An Indian government spokesman, at the conclusion of the Gromyko visit, responded to a question about whether the Soviet troops might withdraw, with a sharp reminder that other factors are involved. “Many things which are happening in the world impinge on the situation in Afghanistan,” he said, citing in particular U.S. efforts to secure base facilities in the Indian Ocean area, a “massive buildup” of U.S. naval forces in the Indian Ocean, and “fairly hard intelligence” that there has been “a quantum leap in the military improvements” at a U.S. naval and air base on Diego Garcia island in the Indian Ocean.

The spokesman also attacked the U.S. threat to use tactical nuclear weapons in the Persian Gulf region. “The presence of a large U.S. naval fleet, including I believe, some equipped with tactical nuclear weapons, certainly adds to the crisis in the region,” he said. “So let the world change before we start speculating about when and how and what the time frame is” for the withdrawal of Soviet troops.

Other factors complicating the situation are the reports of admitted U.S. training, arming and otherwise supporting the guerrilla attacks of Afghan rebels operating from Pakistani bases. Several days ago the Egyptian Defense Minister stated that Afghan rebels are being trained and armed at camps in Egypt. The Egyptian statement was followed by revelations in the U.S. press that the CIA, with the authority of President Carter, is funneling in arms to the rebels and has been providing “technical advice” to them. While the reports claim these

activities began after the Soviet troop movement into Afghanistan, other reports months ago indicated U.S. British, Chinese and Egyptian efforts to back the rebels, reports previously dismissed by U.S. spokesman as ‘Soviet propaganda.’

According to information received by this news service, one “rebel leader,” Khan Zia Nassry, an Afghan with U.S. citizenship who has been traveling back and forth between Pakistan and the U.S. for the past year, was in Washington this past week for meetings with White House officials and people in the Congress. Zia Nassry was recently expelled from Pakistan for declaring a “government in exile” not favored by the Zia regime; he was also in Egypt less than two months ago where he had highly publicized meetings with Egyptian officials, including the Defense Minister.

The target for pressure is Pakistan, which has been told quite directly by Moscow that it has two choices—desist from providing backing for the Afghan rebels operating from its border regions or face a tough response from the Soviet Union, including the possibility of armed strikes against the Afghan guerrilla bases inside Pakistani territory. Gromyko put it more diplomatically in his banquet speech in New Delhi:

(After noting the U.S. buildup in the Indian Ocean)
Also of this kind are machinations which aim to turn Pakistan into a seat of tension, into a bridgehead for further unfolding aggression against Afghanistan. If Pakistan proceeds further along this path, it will gain nothing good from this and will undermine its position as an independent state. Its interests would be best served by a strengthening of its independence and maintaining good, friendly relations with all neighboring countries.

The Indians have sought to assure Pakistani leaders, including the country's military dictator General Ziaul Haq, that a path of negotiation would best guarantee Pakistan's security, not a flow of U.S. arms and “guarantees” of U.S. support in the event of conflict with the Soviet Union and Afghanistan. This was the task of Indian Foreign Secretary Sathe who went to Islamabad for talks with Pakistani leaders two weeks ago.

The Soviets have also sent signals to Islamabad that they are willing to sit down and talk. According to U.N.-based sources, this includes a direct Soviet offer to hold talks. The Soviets were reportedly told to hold off, as Islamabad was too busy with the present flow of visitors.

The Afghan government has declared that it “desires to solve all its problems with Pakistan through peaceful and amicable negotiations” and stated that it “will not resort to the use of force provided Pakistan, in conformity with the aspirations of its people, reciprocates with similar intentions and adopts a more responsible attitude toward Afghanistan.”

The Afghan government statement coupled a possible withdrawal of Soviet forces with an end to Pakistan's hostile attitude and a cessation of the U.S.-sponsored military buildup of that country. The statement concluded that "The limited contingent of Soviet troops will withdraw as soon as the cause for inviting them ceases to exist under a *credible guarantee*."

The immediate response of the regime of Pakistani military dictator General Zia is reported to be a refusal to enter into talks with Afghanistan until all Soviet troops are withdrawn.

However, according to informed Indian sources, the result of the Gromyko visit will be seen not in moves from Moscow but in further initiatives coming from the Afghan government. These initiatives, the source revealed, are aimed not so much at the Zia regime which is firmly tied to the U.S. and China, its principle backers, but at the Pakistani population which supports neither Zia nor his war provocations and alliance with the U.S. According to this view each initiative refused by Zia will find him in deeper trouble at home.



China

Is the U.S. building Peking's nuclear capability?

by Daniel Sneider

Among the circles of China experts in the United States, particularly those who watch their defense establishment, there is one question above all being asked: What did Harold Brown *really* give the Chinese? For at least one top expert on the Chinese military, the fear is that the Defense Secretary delivered significant inputs in terms of both military and military-related technology and strategic guarantees by the United States for the defense of China.

This question is usually accompanied by another question which has popped up of late in the press: Will the Soviets decide to launch a preemptive strike against Chinese nuclear facilities in response to the evidence of a de facto U.S.-China military alliance? That they will is the interpretation given the reported remarks of Soviet President Brezhnev to visiting French dignitary Chaban-Delmas. "Believe me," Brezhnev is reported saying, "after the destruction of Chinese nuclear sites by our missiles, there won't be much time for the Americans to choose between the defense of their Chinese allies and peaceful coexistence with us."

The London *Guardian*, which reported this, cited the Soviet view that "the most dangerous U.S. move of all has been to encourage China and play the 'China card' to the extent of offering military cooperation." The Soviets are weighing options on how to respond to this danger. "The most serious of all," the *Guardian* says, "would be a preemptive strike against China and there are odd hints coming from Moscow that some thought is being given to that."

Crossing the threshold

According to experts the threshold for the Soviet Union is defined by U.S. augmentation of Chinese strategic nuclear weapons capability, particularly the development of their ICBM delivery systems and the targeting and thrust of those missiles. In this area, the reports from the Brown trip are already disturbing. The already agreed on technology and the mooted further sales of technology are what are called "grey technology," technology that can do a lot for Chinese military capability without directly qualifying as military technology.

One good example of this is the LANDSAT satellite system which Brown agreed to give the Chinese access to through a U.S.-constructed ground station. While the LANDSAT is supposedly for agricultural purposes, providing geographic and similar data, experts say it would give the Chinese a "quantum leap" in the targeting of their missiles into the Soviet Union. At this point, the Chinese are dependent on data mostly from Soviet geographic guides, some of which is deliberately falsified to mask the location of potential targets.

Another example cited is oil exploration gear which contains sonar equipment readily convertible to antisubmarine warfare uses.

As for ICBM capability, there is already considerable evidence that the Chinese have the booster sections of an ICBM available and capable of delivering a nuclear warhead payload into the Soviet Union. The CSS (Chinese Surface to Surface) X-4 has already been used for sending Chinese space vehicles into orbit, including a January 1978 satellite launch which featured the successful return by soft landing of a camera pack. A recent British visitor to China, Sir John Keswick, is also reported to have confirmed that the Chinese have developed a solid fuel system allowing them to replace the antiquated liquid fuel systems which are much easier to detect in pre-launch mode and hit with preemptive strikes.

Another recent development, again according to U.S. experts, is evidence that the Chinese are working on tactical nuclear weapons. In March of 1978, they carried out a test of a nuclear device with a yield less than 20 kilotons, the yield of a tactical weapon that could be mounted on existing Chinese jet aircraft or heavy howitzers for delivery against Soviet conventional tank and infantry assault.