

ders of Taiwan with promises to maintain the free enterprise system there — but still refusing to rule on the use of force in reunifying Taiwan. Robert C. Byrd (D-W. Va), the Senate Majority leader, told reporters after the meeting that his concern on the Taiwan question had been “considerably allayed,” while according to the Jan. 31 New York Times, at least two Republican senators, Schweicker of Pennsylvania and John Tower of Texas, said Teng had made a favorable impression. It was left to Maoist sympathizer Scoop Jackson (D-Wash.) to comment that the Chinese deserve most-favored-nation status since there is “no doubt” that its emigration policies — unlike the USSR’s — meet the requirements of the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

Reports that Teng has said he would not object in principle to a proposed Senate resolution expressing concern over the potential use of force by China against Taiwan, and the Administration’s announcement Jan. 31 that it would not oppose such a resolution, indicate strongly that the Chinese leader has merely decided to make this unsubstantial concession in order to garner U.S. acquiescence to his much larger goals.

Thus far, the Carter Administration has given no sign of being disturbed by Teng’s antics, including his brazen support of the President’s opponents of SALT. While it is reliably reported that Teng told Carter during their private meetings that the U.S. is not being tough enough on the Soviets, both the President and his press secretary, Jody Powell, have been describing the talks as “harmonious” and Teng’s visit “as one of the most historic events in our nation’s history.”

Nor does anyone in the Administration seem to be in the least aware of how easily the United States is being pulled about like a marionette by the Chinese and British puppeteers. Despite Teng’s ominous hints of Chinese intervention into the Cambodia-Vietnam dispute, the Vice-Premier has also made it quite plain that China has no intention of getting itself involved in a military confrontation with the Soviets — preferring to leave that to the U.S. and whomever else it can bamboozle in similar fashion. “We are an insignificant, poor country,” Teng told Time magazine’s Hedley Donovan — much to Donovan’s consternation. “You have made a poor friend.” Teng played on this same theme in his National Gallery speech, asserting that China cannot afford to go to war because this would interfere with its modernization drive.

This fiasco, on top of the Administration’s Middle East debacle, its stupidity in handling the British-inspired destabilization of Iran, and its appalling economic performance, will put an additional strain on U.S. relations with its major European allies, as well as doing serious damage to U.S.-Soviet ties. At the Guadeloupe summit, French President Giscard and West German Chancellor Schmidt firmly squashed British Prime Minister Callaghan’s attempt to get approval for the sale of Britain’s Harrier jets to the Chinese. Instead, Giscard and Schmidt stressed to Carter the compelling urgency of putting the U.S.-Soviet relationship on a more positive footing and of getting a SALT II accord signed and ratified as soon as possible. Now, just three weeks later, Carter has bent over backwards to propitiate the Chinese, risking World War III in the process.

— Kathleen M. Murphy

BRD warns U.S. on China card

Leaders of the West German government have issued stern warnings to the United States government that playing the “China card” would be a disaster. In an officially sanctioned interview with the Neue Ruhr/Rhein Zeitung on Jan. 31, Social Democratic Party parliamentary leader Herbert Wehner warned that he and Chancellor Helmut Schmidt were concerned that East-West relations not “sink below minus degrees.” A possible alliance between the U.S. and China, he said, would in fact “be disastrous.” The Japanese, Wehner noted, have rejected similar offers from the Chinese for an anti-Soviet alliance.

Wehner made his statement in the context of discussing the necessity for detente, a Strategic Arms Limitation agreement between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, and maintaining the world’s strategic balance. Schmidt and I are worried, he said, about the maintainability of detente because “there is so little progress in disarmament negotiations.” He warned against a “lack of patience” at the disarmament talks and, in a direct attack on NATO for stalling detente, Wehner accused the West of

Moscow demands clarification from U.S.

Within hours of release of the U.S.-Chinese press communiqué which referred to “hegemony,” the Soviet Union replied in a sharply worded statement by the press agency TASS. The TASS dispatch left an open door for the U.S. Administration to disassociate itself from what it called Teng’s “incendiary” statements, but suggested that the U.S.-Soviet Strategic Arms Limitation Talks might be put in jeopardy.

Soviet Ambassador Anatolii Dobrynin was reportedly received by U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance on Feb. 1, the same day the U.S.-Chinese statement was made public.

The TASS release said:

Teng Hsiao-ping’s persistent attempts to lecture the American Government on how to conduct its foreign policy were noted in the United States. It was also noted that some of his statements were actually an attempt to undermine the positions of President Carter, who wants the conclusion of a new treaty with the Soviet Union on the limitation of strategic arms.

not having come up with any decent disarmament proposals for the MBFR talks.

Wehner gave his interview during an unprecedented 12 hour cabinet session called to discuss disarmament and China relations. Before the meeting, State Secretary Donanyi gave West Germany's answer to China's call for a European-U.S.-Japanese alliance with China against the USSR. West Germany will not develop any "China card" options and will stick to its commitment to detente, he said.

The next day, Chancellor Schmidt flew to France for discussions with French President Giscard on these issues. On French television that evening, Chancellor Schmidt said that Europe would become a superpower greater than both the U.S. and USSR and that this superpower would lead the way to peace and economic prosperity.

In an earlier speech in Essen, right before he left Germany, the Chancellor discussed the necessity for industrial progress, stressing that industrial modernization is the answer. He warned against "citizens' initiatives" that seek to prevent industrial expansion. Alluding to Britain's push for a "New Dark Ages" that has been spelled out in the books of George Orwell, Aldous Huxley, and H.G. Wells, Schmidt attacked those who express "civilization pessimism." Anyone can discuss the environment and similar issues, he said, but he doesn't want them to "talk about George Orwell."

LaRouche: Is the China pact serious?

In a statement released from his headquarters in New York City today, 1980 presidential candidate and U.S. Labor Party national chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. invited responsible world political leaders to demand that the United States clarify whether an "antihegemony" clause signed by the governments of the U.S. and the People's Republic of China is indeed to be taken seriously.

LaRouche invited President Lopez Portillo of Mexico to ask the Carter Administration if its commitment to fight "hegemony" means the U.S. is repudiating PRM-41, the presidential review memorandum drafted by National Security Council Director Zbigniew Brzezinski. PRM-41 calls for the United States to treat Mexico's natural resources (particularly its oil and gas reserves) as its own, in violation of Mexican sovereignty.

The presidential candidate also invited Benigno Zaccagnini, Secretary General of the Italian Christian Democracy, which has just been ordered to dissolve the Italian government, to inquire if the "antihegemony" agreement means that Brzezinski and

Many words were spoken by the American side in connection with Teng Hsiao-ping's stay. But these words do not reveal the attitude of the U.S. Administration to the incendiary statements by the Chinese guest of the White House, to the slanders against the policy of detente, to the condemnation of efforts to restrict the arms race, to calls to create "a united front against the Soviet Union."

All this calls for clarification, since, in statements by the American side, it was said that the talks with Teng Hsiao-ping had revealed the existence of "many common perspectives" that the two sides could facilitate the attainment of "analogous aims" and that the sides had agreed "to conduct regular consultations on questions of common strategic interest."

State Dept. responds

On Feb. 1, the Soviet Union, through its official government news agency Tass, called on the Carter Administration to "clarify" its position vis-à-vis China in light of the joint communiqué issued by U.S. President Carter and China's Vice-Premier Teng Hsiao-ping. They received that "clarification" the same day from State Department spokesman Hodding Carter III.

"We don't think anything in the language of the communiqué has an anti-Soviet cast," said the State spokesman.

At the State's press briefing the next day, Hodding Carter was asked by a reporter from **Executive Intelligence Review** whether there was any reason why the Soviet Union should not view the Administration's capitulation to Teng and the total insanity of President Carter as anything but the failure of detente between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Carter answered: "The Soviet Union has expressed concern over some of the things Teng has said. Otherwise, I reject your assumption.

"The Soviet Union has made it clear from the beginning of the detente process that there can be no linkage. If there had been linkage, then the U.S. would have stopped certain aspects of detente because of Soviet efforts in Africa, etc."

Hodding Carter is brazenly telling the Soviet Union to put up or shut up: either quietly accept a U.S.-China anti-Soviet alliance or face a breakdown in the SALT negotiations and in the detente process as a whole.

According to sources, Soviet officials are viewing these latest provocative statements from the State Department as "amazing ... lies. This is worse than Hitler, a greater danger to world peace than anything since Hitler."