

etary affairs, the International Energy Agency in energy questions, etc.

One friendly government temporarily gone haywire can and should be firmly, if gently contained. But nothing short of sheer diplomatic muscle, of 'rollback' brute force, can 'appease' the evil represented by the CFR's policy of 'controlled disintegration of the world economy,' the fundamental cause for the current escalation into war. By failing to loudly expose that axiomatic feature of the present situation, however it may shape their own private perceptions, the Europeans have declined to identify the primary cause of the present mess.

While the Giscard-Indira Gandhi New Delhi talks were explicitly setting the policy-frame for solving this problem, by announcing bold initiatives to relaunch the North-South dialogue and to reorganize the world's monetary system, in such a way that the new monetary institutions will be fully geared towards producing credit for Third World development, the Paris communique merely contains vague and highly implicit references to

both the problem and its proposed solution: there can be no peace so long as the West is plunging headlong into the worst economic depression of its history, and while the Third World is deliberately being 'decoupled.'

Funding Pakistan, Turkey, Yugoslavia, strengthening European-Persian Gulf relations, all commendable moves in their own right, do not even offset the effects of controlled disintegration. It is feeding caviar to a moribund.

What in fact the European leaders have shied away from is immediately implementing, as the French originally intended, phase two of the European Monetary System, the European Monetary Fund, the gold-backed, cheap-credit-generating facility and policy whose intellectual authorship belongs with Lyndon LaRouche. The crisis-management flaw in the French-German posture is their inability to shift the resolution of the war crisis into the higher dimension of economic development, and as a result, delaying the EMF and stalling Giscard's major monetary initiative. Publicly recognizing La-



## The Giscard-Schmidt joint communique

*What follows is an excerpted English translation of the joint communiqué issued by French President Giscard d'Estaing and West German Chancellor Schmidt following their weekend meeting in Paris. The text of the communiqué was released by the Federal Press Agency in Bonn.*

President Giscard d'Estaing and Chancellor Schmidt have discussed the international situation in view of the events in Afghanistan ... They have come to the following conclusions:

1) They share the view that the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan cannot be tolerated and presents a serious danger to world stability and the security of peace.

2) It is imperative to immediately end this intervention in the way demanded by the General Assembly of the United Nations, by a large majority vote. This is the only means by which a situation that corresponds to the rights of the Afghan people and the requirements of international peace can be reestablished.

3) They share the view that the present situation is of a character able to set into motion a process—even if unwanted—which can lead to grave consequences. Both statesmen are concerned about the need to stress that under these circumstances, their two nations want to hold to loyalty to the Atlantic Alliance and to the decisiveness to fulfill their duties in this framework.

4) They state that through the events in Afghanistan, detente has become more difficult and more insecure, and that therefore the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghanistan is urgently required. They state that detente would not survive another shock like that [represented by Afghanistan] and that in this case France and the Federal Republic of Germany will take the measures required for securing and defending the security of their countries.

Rouche's decisive input would be the crucial element of 'flexibility' in an otherwise strictly predetermined mechanism leading into war via any suitable Sarajevo.

Neither Giscard nor Schmidt is actually doing what he is saying; channels are being kept open with Moscow, development initiatives are indeed being prepared and partly implemented on the quiet, outside the policy-framework set by Anglo-American demands. But France and Germany are also not saying what they are doing, dangerously denying their unique role in world affairs. The international weight and authority of the French government—and singularly that of the heir to General de Gaulle, President Giscard d'Estaing—and the strength of West German industry, are the two elements which have, over the last four years, kept the world from the brink of general thermonuclear war. Such a responsibility cannot be eschewed, all the more now that the forceful emergence of the LaRouche presidential campaign within the United States signifies a real potential return of the U.S.A. to reason.

5) They understand the worries voiced by those nations committed to a genuine nonalignment, and stress that these nations must play an important and independent role for peace and stability in the world. Therefore it is necessary to avoid a spreading of the East-West conflict into the Third World.

6) The citizens of France and the Federal Republic of Germany have experienced the horrors of two world wars on their own soil and have worked for the creation of a more stable and peaceful world during the past 30 years. In this context, their mutual rapprochement and their common efforts to rebuild Europe have been crucial steps on this course. They share the view that the European powers have to bear special responsibilities under present circumstances, and they thereby try—together with their alliance partners—to guarantee the fundamental balance upon which the security of their nations and the security of Europe depend.

7) Their efforts to overcome this crisis will only make sense if the Soviet Union states publicly its commitment to respond to these efforts. France and Germany have recognized the statements given by the U.S.S.R. that they intend to withdraw their troops from Afghanistan. New actions are required to follow these declarations of intent. This is necessary for successful efforts on which the security and future of peace will depend.

## U.S.S.R.

# Scientist's rise a clue to policy

by Rachel Douglas

One week ago a 47-year-old member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences who has spent the past 17 years working in its Siberian Division was vaulted into the powerful post of Chairman of the U.S.S.R. State Committee on Science and Technology and became a Deputy Prime Minister of the Soviet Union.

The State Committee where G.A. Marchuk takes the reins is responsible for submitting influential recommendations on Soviet Research & Development budgeting, for drafting long-term science and economic plans, and for arranging aspects of Soviet economic deals with Western countries.

Marchuk's transfer to this command point in Moscow is part of a mobilization of resources in the Soviet Union, which is occurring because the Russian leaders consider all-out war a growing likelihood. His experience in Siberia means that Marchuk will bring to the job the competence of running vast projects, where efficiency and skillful deployment of resources are vital. He also brings first-hand contact with the U.S.S.R.'s most advanced work in mathematical physics, which is the basis of Soviet weapons development.

Before his 1962 move to Novosibirsk headquarters of the Siberian Division, itself the location of top Russian laboratories, Marchuk worked for nine years at the Physics & Power Institute at Obninsk, a research center which was also the home of the first Soviet atomic power station.

Other causes of the shakeup which brought Academician Marchuk from Novosibirsk to Moscow are also important, but subordinate to the primary fact of a Soviet pre-war mobilization. These include a push by Soviet leadership elements who have the least confidence or interest in restoring East-West scientific ties to shut them down for the long term, by such measures as the arrest of dissident physicist Andrei Sakharov with its subsequent, inevitable wave of protests from Western scientists, and the removal of Marchuk's predecessor, V.A. Kirillin, who had chaired both the Franco-Soviet