

seas front. With its military involvement under attack at home — from the Left — and abroad — from, among others, the Danes in the European Parliament last week — France is running an increasing risk of burning its fingers in foreign wars....Giscard Africanus is making enemies almost as quickly as friends. Some argue that French intervention works negatively in the long term by encouraging the — already far greater — interference of countries like Cuba.

## French Response: Caution

Les Echos (*Paris*), *May 16*:

...There are no reasons lacking to incite one to prudence either...Particularly, nothing has come to confirm in a categorical way that the Shaba events are not simply the result of a reinforced (internal — ed.) opposition to the regime. Or at least that they are not

meeting favorable echoes in a population suffering from a catastrophic economic situation...In the case of Zaire the border-line between the principle of support for moderate Africa and that of noninterference in internal affairs is very difficult to trace.

Le Figaro (*Paris*), *May 15*:

Paris will undoubtedly make an effort, before taking any decision whatsoever, to verify if the Cubans are really involved in the coup and if the vital centers of Shaba threaten to fall into rebel hands...

Le Figaro, *May 16*:

The information that can be gathered on the situation in Shaba is so **fuzzy**, so contradictory, that it would be imprudent to affirm what will be the attitude that the powers Mobutu called on will take...All the more imprudent since the policy of these powers in Zaire is, itself, extremely undecided.

# 'That Anachronistic British Policy: Hypocrisy'

*As British interests are doing everything possible to foment a race war in southern Africa, the government of Ethiopia this week issued a resounding condemnation of British "colonial" policy in an editorial in the April 23 Ethiopian Herald. Here are excerpts:*

The British government has been lately conducting an extremely hostile and provocative campaign against Ethiopia and its revolution. The recent speech, for instance, of the British Foreign Secretary, Dr. David Owen concerning the internationalist support being rendered to Ethiopia by fraternal socialist states to defend its independence, unity and revolution, may have been prompted by a desire to mislead the world of the essential contents of the prevailing situation in the Horn of Africa. Dr. Owen's thoughtless outbursts reflect not only an automated performance to please his imperialist warlords, but also shows profound confusion in Britain's foreign policy objectives. Indeed Britain's unprincipled position, in the eyes of fair-minded world opinion, has given her the reputation of being opportunistic and of living in a dream old world.

It is to be recalled that Dr. Owen's naive attitude towards the national sovereignty and revolution of Ethiopia drew sharp condemnation on the part of the Ethiopian Ambassador to Britain, Ato Ayalew Wolde-Giorgis, who condemned the Foreign Secretary's remarks as "an effrontery to the honour and dignity of Ethiopia and its revolution." Ato Ayalew also dismissed Dr. Owen's high handed behavior in questioning the sovereign rights of Ethiopia to choose its friends, by stating: "We have the full and inalienable right to ask for and obtain assistance to repel the (Somalia) aggression and to dispel the machinations of the imperialists and reactionary Arab countries."

All along the British government has been deeply engrossed in open acts of animosity and blackmail directed

against the Ethiopian state and the revolution of its people. Ever since the upsurge of the Ethiopian Revolution, British government leaders and the British mass media have been making deliberate attempts to smear our revolution. Runaway feudalists made Britain their sanctuary from where they staged counter-revolutionary plots with the aim of restoring the former feudo-capitalist system. The long series of anti-Ethiopia innuendos by British leaders have been raised to such serious proportions which render continued maintenance of relations meaningless.

Who does not know that Britain, as the greatest criminal in imperialist plunder, has been massacring and dividing people, destroying civilization, stifling culture and expanding slavery and racism to America, the Middle East and Asia? Unable to reconcile itself to having been defeated by the struggling oppressed masses of the world and the attainment of independence by the former British colonies, the British government has arrogated to itself the role of an international policeman. It also continues to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign states.

Britain remains the culprit for the problems of Namibia, Zimbabwe, South Africa, the Middle East, and Ireland which are areas of world tension. The British government is in the vanguard of those western countries which are rendering constant support to the colonial and racist regimes of Southern Africa, in their horrible crimes against the African people. But the British government shall no longer be allowed to go unchallenged and continue with its sinister machinations against the rights of oppressed peoples to achieve independence as well as consolidate and defend their freedom and unity....

Dr. Owen's insulting remarks, therefore, were a climax in frustration by a man with a searing conscience

for all the crimes perpetrated by his country against the oppressed people of the world. These do not in any way do good to uplift Britain's battered image, nor to absolve it of all its past guilt. For all that, the cumulative anti-Ethiopian campaign performance of the British leadership is a masterpiece with the hallmarks of that old British hypocrisy.

## Britain is the Third World's Biggest Enemy

*In the same issue of the Herald is a statement by Major Dawid, Deputy Secretary of the Ethiopian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. We reprint here portions of his statement, which the Herald said, "outlines Ethiopia's position on Namibia."*

It is perhaps useful to recall some of these injustices committed by the British:

1. The British destroyed African civilization, subjugated 20 million people to slavery, and developed its own economy by exploiting African resources and cheap labour.

2. To facilitate and prolong its exploitation the British government established small kingdoms and feudatory states, in its former colonies.

3. Consistent with its divide and rule policy, the British government created contradictions and antagonisms among the people of its former colonies which have been inherited by the present generation.

For example:

—in Sri Lanka between the Tamils and Sinhalese

—in India between the Hindus and the Moslems  
—in Ireland between the Protestants and the Catholics  
—in Palestine between the Jews and the Moslem  
—in Guayana between the Indians and the Blacks  
—in Africa between the Blacks and the Whites  
—in Cyprus between the Greeks and the Turks...

4. Over and above these, the British has purposely left the legacy of border and territorial problems behind it.

For instance:

Between Iraq and Iran  
—India and Pakistan  
—Ghana and Togo  
—Ethiopia and Somalia  
—Kenya and Somalia  
—Sudan and Egypt...

5. It is disheartening to note also that the major problems that are perpetually threatening world peace:

—The Palestine problem in the Middle East  
—the Quebec problem in Canada  
—the problem in Ireland  
—the problem in Namibia  
—the problem in Zimbabwe  
—the problem in Cyprus  
—the problem in South Africa — are all inherited from the British colonial rule....

The British government is the leading imperialist country which is trying to subvert and thwart the endeavour of the Third World countries which are trying to create a society free of exploitation.

This assessment can be corroborated by what this government is doing in Ethiopia against freedom fighters in different parts of the world.

# Soviets Praise Huge Scope Of Bonn Deal; Await U.S. Role

A May 11 joint statement from the Soviet Communist Party Politburo, the Council of Ministers, and the Supreme Soviet Presidium has qualified Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev's visit, earlier this month, to West Germany and the resulting 25-year economic cooperation agreements as "a major event of international scope." Published in large type across the front pages of Soviet newspapers, the joint declaration informed the Soviet population that the economic cooperation planned in the Bonn meetings with West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt will be on a huge scale and is properly viewed as an extremely important policy initiative.

Five days later, on May 16, Brezhnev chaired a session of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet which considered an agenda that included "a new program of measures" for the development of Siberia and the Soviet Far East until 1990. The meeting was expected to further review the results of the Brezhnev trip and the agreements reached which gave the go-ahead for West German participation in just such major trade and development undertakings as the vast Siberian region.

Statements and followup diplomacy on the part of

Brezhnev and Chancellor Schmidt confirm that their agreements are no bilateral deal: the Bonn-Moscow pact constitutes an offer to the United States and other industrialized nations not merely to "get in on" the economic deal of the century, but to shift the world political geometry fundamentally. The Schmidt-Brezhnev agreement offers an alliance for international industrial recovery, which will close out for good the British financiers' and intelligence agencies' options on economic collapse and confrontation with the Soviet Union.

## Inadequate U.S. Response

The package drawn up by Schmidt and Brezhnev can only survive with political support from the United States. So far, the American response is woefully inadequate.

Despite the massive press blackout that has kept news of the Bonn-Moscow breakthrough from the U.S. population, top-level executives in U.S. industry and government are well aware of the scale and potential impact of the agreements. But, from far too many corporate head-