

From Tokyo to Sarajevo

Not by coincidence, a rash of newspaper commentary advocating early use of a U.S. military strike force to occupy Mideast oil fields appeared this week just as General Alexander Haig returned to the United States from his former post as NATO's commander-in-chief in Europe.

Haig, the principal undeclared candidate for the U.S. presidency, is a disciple of Great Britain's Royal Institute of International Affairs, the U.S. Council on Foreign Relations, and the International Monetary Fund. He is an open champion of U.S. military intervention in order to maintain the hegemony of Anglo-American financier-aristocrats over a world now being subjected, by their deliberate design, to "controlled economic disintegration." Soviet efforts to maintain detente and economic cooperation with Europe and Third World nations are an obstacle. In a July 4 speech in Philadelphia, Gen. Haig again called Europe and the U.S. to install "a post-Vietnam leadership that will not recoil from confronting the Soviet Union."

Whether Haig is personally responsible for the rash of rug-chewing, go-get-'em editorials or not, it is in that policy that one locates the essence of the Haig campaign. Looking at the world in the wake of the Tokyo economic summit, it is obvious that Tokyo was a great boost for Haig's candidacy. The willingness of France, West Germany and Japan to compromise with the British-dominated Carter Administration and the IMF "to buy ourselves some time" has only accelerated the frenzy in Washington and improved the chances that one of the numerous "hotspots" will explode into a Sarajevo, escalating rapidly into World War III.

In the Middle East, as we go to press, reports of troop movements from Israel, Syria and Iraq underline the possibility that the secret clauses in the Camp David agreements could produce a fifth Middle East war overnight. In Central America, barely covert Carter administration support for the discredited Somoza forces threatens to precipitate a chain reaction producing a Vietnam-style 30-years-war phenomenon in the U.S.'s own "backyard." Southeast Asia, scene of the continuing China-Vietnam conflict, reminds us of how close we have already come this year, with the Chinese invasion of Vietnam, to the threshold of total war.

As for the United States, President Carter's systematic leaks of his plan to go public with a massive synthetic fuels program modeled on the example of Nazi Germany have done nothing to restore public confidence in his administration. Cart-

er's abrupt decision to cancel at the last minute a scheduled July 5 television address produced new cries of alarm and a floodtide of oratory on the need for a "strong leader" who could ram an economic austerity-cum-military buildup policy past an angry and volatile citizenry. For the moment the Europeans' Tokyo "success," an apparent admission from the U.S. that nuclear energy expansion is vital, has been quickly coopted by such Haig cronies as West Germany's Franz Josef Strauss, whose commitment is only to maintaining a narrow high technology base for a war economy, while destroying the Third World under IMF rule.

For Americans, Europeans, Arabs, and the socialist bloc countries, the time for time-buying is over, and the time for a new world economic order is overdue.

—Don Baier

The Week in Brief

Soviet Academy of Sciences President Anatoly P. Aleksandrov warned in an interview with the *Washington Star* July 4 that without rapid expansion of nuclear energy, the struggle for dwindling fossil fuels will lead to war.

Aleksandrov, a member of the Soviet Central Committee, explained:

"You know that all gas and oil deposits are likely to run out in 30 to 50 years ... but in 30 years it is impossible to reorganize the world in terms of energy from coal.

"We must therefore build nuclear power reactors in all parts of the

world, otherwise wars will one day be fought over the remnants of oil and gas deposits. And they will be capitalist countries, because the Soviet Union will have concentrated on the production of nuclear power and be ahead of everyone else."

For the first time, a top Soviet official directly intervened against what the Kremlin can see is a U.S. course for an antinuclear, war-threatening policy:

"All people with common sense should realize that by the end of the century, the United States will be compelled to create new nuclear pro-

duction facilities, possibly nuclear fusion plants, otherwise she will find herself short of energy. There is no other way to preserve the modern way of scientific development."

Aleksandrov commented on the U.S.A.'s Three Mile Island incident:

"There was no serious danger and whatever danger might have existed was exaggerated."

* * *

Former West German Defense Minister Franz Joseph Strauss was named this week by the Christian Social Union as their candidate to oppose incumbent Chancellor Helmut Schmidt in the 1980 elections. Strauss opened his campaign July 3 with a speech in the parliament attacking Schmidt for his refusal to acknowledge the Tokyo summit as a failure, and for his failure to compel the Willy Brandt faction in his own Social Democratic party to support nuclear energy.

A personal friend of British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and NATO's Gen. Alexander Haig, Strauss has adopted a pro-nuclear profile in an effort to win support from labor and industrial constituencies now backing Schmidt. Taunting the Chancellor, Strauss reminded him, "When a close collaborator of yours says that in Kiel the SPD is against nuclear energy, but is for it in Bonn ... then this is an incredible act of irresponsibility."

* * *

One week after the Carter administration, acting on Great Britain's initiative, put the issue of Southeast Asia's "boat people" on the agenda of the Tokyo summit, the European Economic Community Commission has voted a cutoff of food and medical aid to Vietnam.

EEC member governments are reportedly following suit, and naval vessels from Italy and West Germany are patrolling off the coast of Vietnam.

The Deputy Chief of Staff of the Chinese army, the man who led Chinese troops in their invasion of Vietnam earlier this year, is now in London for a 12-day visit at the invitation of British Chief of Staff Neil Cameron. On a 1978 visit to Peking, Cameron toasted a U.S.-Chinese alliance "against our common enemy, the Soviet Union."

China's government, backers of the deposed Pol Pot regime which murdered an estimated 3 million Cambodians, has consistently refused to accept refugees from Vietnam, most of whom are of Chinese ethnic origin—and whom, at various times, the Chinese leadership has openly incited against the government of Vietnam.

* * *

The Soviet Union has reacted sharply to U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown's announcement that a 110,000 man "quick strike" force had been formed for use in any global hotspot outside the European theater. The Soviet government daily *Izvestia* on June 27 branded Brown's remarks "a completely naked bellicose statement."

Several days later, on July 1, the Soviet military newspaper *Red Star* published a detailed report on the strike force. "Such a stake on armed intervention inevitably leads to the undermining of detente, the creation of new hotspots of tension ..." wrote commentator Capt. V. Pustov. The United States has threatened to use its intervention force against the oil-exporting nations, since "the creators of American policy fear the possibility that the states of the Persian

Gulf and other regions, not taking account of the interests of the foreign monopolies, will decide for themselves how to allocate their natural resources. ... The Chatter about 'Soviet military threat' is nothing more than a propoganda camouflage hiding plots and plans to use any means, including the force of arms, to perpetuate American imperialism's exploitation of the natural riches of other countries and peoples."

* * *

The following item was printed July 5 in the *New York Times*, under the headline, "U.S. Is Chided for 1776 'Fiasco'".

LONDON, July 4—In an editorial titled "The Fourth of July Fiasco," The Guardian observed today that if the British Empire had not been dissolved, the West might now have a good deal more oil than it has, and gently blamed "our cousins" in the United States for having started the trend in 1776.

"By proclaiming themselves independent, the Americans set a fashion which they must now regret," the newspaper declared. "Had they not given the signal for the dissolution of the British Empire, most of the major oil-producing regions of the world would today be under British control."

The Guardian conceded that George III was "in some ways a deficient monarch," but it argued that ... "today Americans observe Independence Day when they have never been so dependent in their lives."

"Although it is too late now for harboring regrets and although we wish our cousins well on their national day of rejoicing or atonement," the editorial continued, "it is hard not to feel that a less abrupt course of action 203 years ago would have stood their country in better stead."