

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."

U.S. Ambassador to Italy Richard Gardner will cease to determine the rise and fall of Italian governments.

European leaders, LaRouche indicated, should ask Washington if the U.S.-China commitment means that the United States will stop insisting that Congress should subordinate the European Monetary System to the International Monetary Fund.

LaRouche invited Zaccagnini to submit copies of his inquiry to NSC chief Brzezinski and the U.S. embassy in Rome.

It should also be asked, LaRouche continued, whether under the terms of "antihegemony" the Chinese will stop supporting client governments such as the deposed Pol Pot regime in Cambodia, which murdered half of that country's population. Does the clause mean that the People's Republic of China will abandon its cooperation with the Ch'ao Ch'ou overseas population of Chinese opium traders, whose illegal drug revenues funneled through the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong currently form the major source of foreign exchange for Red China at the expense of the economies and populations of other sovereign nations?

Does the "antihegemony" clause mean that the Chinese will stop cooperating with Israel to subvert and overthrow sovereign governments in Africa and Asia, and replace them with fascist dictatorships?

If not, the 1980 presidential candidate warned, world leaders must regard the touted "antihegemony" clause as a total fraud.

U.S. stumbling toward Mideast war?

In response to the failure of the September Camp David summit to wring Egypt away from Arab ranks into a separate peace with Israel, U.S. State Department and National Security Council policymakers are now considering alternative options that will either commit American prestige to another embarrassing tripartite summit or into an increasingly open endorsement of Israel as the so-called "pillar" of North Atlantic Treaty Organization military strategy in the region.

Either alternative will, at minimum, lead to a rapid increase in U.S.-Soviet tensions and very possibly to a thermonuclear confrontation between the world's two superpowers.

The developing crisis in American policy has been epitomized by the recent excursion of State Department special envoy Alfred Atherton to the Middle East. During a stopover in Israel, Atherton spent hours trying to negotiate disputed details of the Camp David accords. Most embarrassing to international perceptions of the U.S., Atherton compromised with Israeli insistence that the presumed treaty include clauses sundering

China says war is inevitable

Despite ostensible changes in perspective since the death of Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese leadership has yet to cease its warnings that "war between the two superpowers is inevitable." Anyone who thinks this warning unserious, metaphorical, or obsolete in the minds of the Chinese is mistaken — like those who thought Adolf Hitler could be steered east without first conquering the west. China's firm belief in the inevitability of a superpower war is proven by their calculated actions in behalf of bringing about the very holocaust they warn of. China knows full well that the Soviet Union can be forced to war if its strategic interests are threatened. China eggs on the U.S. to so threaten these interests, while doing everything they can in their "sphere of influence" to aid that effort — as in Cambodia, the Middle East, Northeast Asia, and parts of Africa.

That much of China might be destroyed in such a confrontation did not deter Mao. He believed that the sheer size of China's population would ensure the nation's survival as the preeminent remaining power. Teng Hsiao-ping more deviously believes he can manipulate the U.S. and the Soviets into a series of escalating limited confrontations from which China can opt out — up to the point of a strategic total war that would leave China relatively unscathed. This view

and every action that Teng advises China to take to further this policy is insane, and places the world, contrary to Teng's intentions, on a very short fuse to Armageddon. Those who disbelieve the Chinese view do so at the peril of humanity.

China conspired to give Israel the H-bomb

A usually reliable and well-informed source in Western Europe reports that the State of Israel and the Peoples Republic of China have closely cooperated since the Communist takeover in China in 1949, and that China gave Israel the atomic bomb.

According to the source, Israel would not have attained nuclear weapons if it had not been for the early aid of the Chinese. It was the leaders of the PRC who in the early 1960s under Chou En-lai provided facilities for Israel to test the results of its bomb programs.

This information is corroborated by what is known to be massive cooperation between Israel and China against Islamic nations. Red China and Israel worked together in support of the military junta that overthrew Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, the legally elected prime minister of Pakistan. Bhutto is now threatened with imminent hanging by the military dictatorship that replaced him two years ago.

The basis of the China-Israel collaboration lies in the fact that China supports the use of nuclear weapons against the Arab nations.