

pressuring the visiting Japanese military delegation to form a Japanese version of the anti-Soviet "Committee on the Present Danger." Any collaboration with such circles is a subterfuge for direct U.S.-Chinese ties.

The basis for such ties is the regime of Japanese Prime Minister Fukuda, an ally of Carter. In addition to the military visits, Fukuda sent a top aide, Shinsaku Hogen, to hammer out the final details of a "peace treaty" desired by China that includes a clause attacking the Soviet Union as "hegemonist." On May 16, it was indicated that Fukuda himself is definitely considering a trip to China in August to sign the treaty, assuming it is ready to be signed by that time.

Fukuda's "China turn" is an attempt to revive the Kissinger "Peking-Tokyo-Washington axis" against the Soviet Union. But one sticking point has always been the Koreans, which remains a major point of global strategic confrontation. Some solution to the problem of the divided peninsula, which would place Peking, Tokyo and Washington on the same side of the issue — Peking now supports North Korea, Washington and Tokyo South Korea — is now sought. Kissinger had previously proposed the outlines for such a deal in a "four-power" agreement whereby China, the U.S., North and South Korea would concur on a formula guaranteeing the security of the peninsula and joint recognition of the two Koreas. Japan was to be included and the Soviets added on at some later date.

There are signs that discussions along these lines are again underway, with the Chinese being probed as to a possible Taiwan-for Korea tradeoff. A North Korean government delegation is presently making a first-ever official trip to Japan, with the express approval of Fukuda, and the delegation is headed by North Korea's long-time Ambassador to Peking, whom one Korea expert described as a virtual agent of the Peking regime. The same expert felt that Japan in this case was acting as a go-between for North Korea and the Carter Administration, with the Chinese and North Koreans both looking for firmer guarantees of the seriousness of the Carter Administration's plan for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Korea. North Korea's bizarre imitation of Mao Tse-tung, President Kim Il-sung, recently gave an interview to the Japanese daily *Yomiuri* in which he praised Jimmy Carter and, Chinese-style, asked for a clear expression of Carter policy on Korea.

The one obvious roadblock in this byzantine course is South Korean President Park Chung-hee, who would resolutely oppose any such deal and is already resisting plans for the withdrawal of the U.S. military presence from his country. President Park has been at the top of the National Security Council's "wanted list" for some time, and his removal via NSC machinations is becoming an increasing priority.

Fukuda's emphasis on developing closer relations with China has led to strained bilateral Japan-South Korean relations. In particular, the ruling LDP of Japan has thus far failed to push through the Diet ratification of a 1974 agreement with the Republic of Korea to jointly develop the oil reserves off their respective coasts, in large part out of deference to opposition to the accord voiced by China. China claims that it must be included in any discussions concerning the demarcation of the waters of the Yellow and China Seas.

While the Lower House of the Diet has ratified the accord, and Fukuda himself has nominally endorsed it, Fukuda's LDP has pursued a parliamentary "strategy" toward the ratification bill that will likely see the current Diet session end without the bill being passed — for the third year in a row. Fukuda has gone to great lengths to prevent his public endorsement of the bill from angering the Chinese, instructing his Ambassador in Peking to "explain" his position on the issue to Chinese officials.

The South Koreans, for their part, have strongly hit the filibustering by the LDP on the continental shelf bill and President Park has publicly committed the country to unilaterally begin development of the oil reserves on the shelf if the Diet fails to ratify. Park has threatened to abrogate the Japan-South Korea fishing accord if the bill does not go through.

In dealing with Park, the NSC also confronts considerable resistance to the implementation of Carter's "human rights" policy within the U.S. government itself — for example, in the State Department — and among conservative circles within Congress and elsewhere.

The lengths to which the National Security Council is willing to go to construct this edifice in the Korean peninsula signals their determined commitment to bring the Chinese "second-front" into play.

— Peter Rush
— Daniel Sneider

USSR: 'Western Circles Delude Themselves ...'

Below are excerpts from a 3,000 word article headlined "Peking: Course to Wreck International Détente Under the Cover of Anti-Sovietism" published in Pravda May 14. The article was signed by I. Aleksandrov, known as a pseudonym for the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party.

...The present leadership of China, jointly with the most reactionary forces of imperialism, is issuing attacks on the socialist countries, attempting to aggravate the international situation, to return humanity not only to the times of "cold" but also of "hot" war.

In Peking, an anti-Soviet campaign is continuing, taking on an ever more unruly character. The issue, however, is not only anti-Sovietism, but also the fact that, covering themselves with the flag of anti-Sovietism, the Chinese leaders are trying to undermine the international relaxation of tensions, to aggravate the situation in the world to the maximum.

Recently the fifth volume of the *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung* was issued in China, and on May 1 the present chairman of the CCP, Hua Kuo-feng, wrote an article commemorating this volume. In this article Hua proclaims the loyalty of the new Chinese leadership to

the internal and foreign policies of Mao, the nationalist, great-power, militaristic course....

In May, Hua Kuo-feng repeated his call for "preparation for war" during an inspection visit to the north-east provinces of China....

The staggering shortsightedness of some people in the West is truly amazing; they are so blinded by anti-Communist prejudices that they pay no heed to the enormous danger of Maoist policy for their own people....

It is not clear that the nuclear missile race being carried out by China, not without the approval of the military-industrial circles of the USA, BRD, several monopolies of France, Japan and Great Britain, is directed at creating a threat not only to the Soviet Union and China's other neighbors, but to worldwide peace? Doesn't the radioactive dust from nuclear weapons tests in China fall over Japan, the USA, and the countries of Southeast Asia?

Judging from everything, Western circles instead of soberly looking the facts in the eye, delude themselves that they can successfully ward off Peking's expansionism and direct it in another direction. They are forgetting the bitter lessons of recent history, when appeasement of the aggressor turned into a catastrophe for the very "appeasers" and for the whole world. Where is the guarantee that history will not repeat itself?...

"We must conquer the globe," said Mao Tse-tung at the conference of the Central Committee of the CCP as early as September 1959....

The Maoists poeticize war....Mao said at the Second Session of the VIII Congress of the CCP: "War is fine. There is no reason to fear war. War means people will die....In my opinion, the atomic bomb is no more frightening than a great sword. If half of humanity perishes in war, this has no significance. It is not frightening if only a third of the population remains...."

The successors of Mao have picked up this militaristic baton. They continue to affirm: "Sooner or later war will break out...We must prepare to fight."

It is extremely dangerous since these are not only words, not only poetry and prose, but also real deeds, and practical politics....

The Chinese economy is being put on a military footing; the military industry is given priority....Seeing this, the bosses of the military-industrial complexes of the USA, West Germany, Japan and several other capitalist countries are actively discussing the question of possible supplies of weapons and military equipment

to China. Their lobbies are exerting pressure on the ruling circles of their countries, demanding agreements with China on the development of cooperation in the military sphere.

We would like to ask these people who, delighted by Peking's anti-Soviet attacks, have become deaf to its other, truly expansionistic statements and are eager to ally themselves with Peking for the struggle against "Soviet hegemonism": whom do such aims of the Chinese leaders threaten, against whom are they directed?

...The real meaning of Peking's advances to Washington was revealed in particular by the head of the international affairs department of the CCP Central Committee Hen Byao in a speech before graduates of the diplomatic academy: "At the present moment let the USA defend us against the influences of Soviet revisionism...When we think that the time has come, we will say to Uncle Sam: "Be so kind as to pack your bags...."

To contemplate these cynical statements of Peking would be useful for those Western leaders who, encouraging the military preparations of the Maoists, naively suppose that the sword of Chinese militarism has nothing to do with them....The Peking hawks nourish illusions that in a nuclear war most of China's population would remain intact.

Cynical but futile hopes! If a world thermonuclear conflagration were to arise provoked by the Maoists, it would bring incalculable sufferings to all the people of the earth, not sparing the Chinese people.

The adventurism of Peking's policies is all the more obvious since its vain hegemonistic efforts are not backed up by the slightest solid material basis; it is perfectly well known that the Chinese economy, its industry, its armed forces are very far from any modern level. In this regard it is all the more obvious how unworthy is the striving of the Peking leaders to push other peoples and states into the abyss of a new world war, to — as they say — use the hands of others to feed the fire....

It would be an unforgivable mistake to take an impulsive position towards Peking's reckless policy, and to wait until the danger has grown to disastrous proportions. All to whom peace is dear, who want to peacefully pursue their constructive labor, must jointly direct their efforts to unmasking and suppressing the most dangerous designs and actions of the Maoists and other provokers of war.