

## II. Carter's foreign policy debacle

### The 'China Card'

#### Brown asks arms pact of cautious Chinese

One can only wonder what glazed expression graced the features of U.S. Secretary of Defense Harold Brown as he told Chinese tank commanders, according to WCBS news, "I hope one day American troops and Chinese troops will stand together against the common enemy."

Apparently, Brown and the entire Carter administration have lost all sense of self-restraint in their pursuit of Zbigniew Brzezinski's vision of a U.S.-China military alliance against the Soviet Union. Even the strident Chinese were reportedly taken aback by Brown's still more strident calls for "wider cooperation on security matters," "coordination of policies against the Soviet threat" and "complimentary actions in the field of defense" particularly in regard to the Pakistan-Afghanistan and Thailand-Cambodia "theaters."

Rather than immediately embracing Brown's proposal the Chinese responded with repetitions of their standard polemics against Soviet "hegemonism."

Brzezinski and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance completely revamped the long-scheduled Brown trip following the Soviet march into Afghanistan. They decided that forming closer security ties with China was the most effective way to respond to the Afghan crisis. U.S. officials commented, "The Soviets have forced us and the Chinese into a posture in which we both see the world in the same way."

At a Jan. 2 National Security Council meeting, policymakers decided to form a military alliance with China including: sales to China of Western armaments and military-related equipment; joint military aid to Pakistan and Afghan rebel remnants now based in Thailand; and joint military aid to Thailand and the Pol Pot remnants based in Thailand. It is not reported whether the meeting also decided to make explicit an endorsement of China's planned, new invasion of Vietnam.

The Carter administration refused to release details

until after Brown's return to Washington, but confirmed a Chinese report that Brown not only urged China to take actions against the U.S.S.R., but emphasized that "the U.S. and China should coordinate their policies in the face of the Soviet threat."

China, having just seen a demonstration of Soviet ability to move massively and quickly across a border, cautiously welcomed the new U.S. bellicosity toward the U.S.S.R., but declined to agree to full-scale cooperation in any concrete way. Deng told Brown that the two countries should "do something in a down-to-earth way" against the U.S.S.R.

China is expected to continue or even accelerate its long-standing substantial arms aid to both Pakistan and the Muslim Afghan rebels. For more than 15 years, China has been the major arms supplier to Pakistan. Tens of thousands of Chinese coolies have spent years building the Karokarom Highway across the mountains in order to better funnel military and other supplies. Chinese arms have gone for months to Afghan rebels based in Pakistan.

In the Afghan-Iran-Pakistan sphere, however, any Chinese action would put it directly into military conflict with the U.S.S.R. China's vision is directed much more at its efforts to dominate Southeast Asia, with—it hopes—a U.S. guarantee against Soviet retribution. While China arms the remnants of Cambodia's genocidal Pol Pot regime, the United States is boosting military aid to Thailand itself, a good deal of which is funnelled to Pol Pot's allies, the forces of former Prince Sihanouk.

Both U.S. and Chinese high-level military delegations have visited Thailand in recent weeks and months in preparation for an expected renewed Chinese invasion of Vietnam for which Thailand-Cambodia border tensions might provide the pretext. If China invades again, it is quite possible the Soviet Union will extend its military forces from Afghanistan into Pakistan and perhaps take direct military action against China as well. American military sources opposed to Carter's proposed alliance with China are wondering if Brown has promised some sort of U.S. protective military umbrella to China in case of such Soviet response.

—Richard Katz

## Documentation

### Brown asks war pact; Chinese cautious

The following are excerpts of comments made by U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown to his Chinese hosts:

*To Defense Minister Marshal Xu Xianquian at the opening banquet:*

(Sino-American cooperation) should remind others that, if they threaten the shared interests of the United States and China, we can respond with complementary actions in the field of defense as well as diplomacy. ... Increased cooperation between China and the United States can be an important—and is a needed—element in the maintenance of global tranquility. ...

We meet at a time of severe challenge to those fundamental principles that sustain a peaceful community of independent nations—principles to which both our countries are committed. In the Middle East, Iranian kidnappers backed by the Iranian government hold American government personnel as hostages, contrary to the most fundamental rules of international conduct. In Southeast Asia, Vietnam, with Soviet backing, has invaded its neighbor Kampuchea (Cambodia), callously inflicting untold human suffering in the process. In Southwest Asia, the Soviet Union has invaded and is occupying a nonaligned neighbor in an effort to subjugate the Muslim people of Afghanistan. The Soviet Union has overthrown a friendly government—one with which it has a peace-and-friendship treaty. ...

(The U.S. and China) have no reason to be enemies and we have compelling reasons to be friends. (Our previous enmity) diminished our ability to deal with the real threats to our security. ... But now the United States recognizes its stake in a secure, strong, peaceful and friendly China and we believe that China recognizes the benefits it derives from a powerful, confident and globally engaged America ... if we consult closely ... aggression that could precipitate global conflict can be deterred. ...

It is particularly important that we discuss the situation in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iran, Indochina and northeast Asia. (We need) arrangements for expanding (contacts between) our defense establishments."

*To Chinese Vice Premier Deng Xiaoping:*

The United States and the Chinese should coordinate their policies in the face of the threat from the Soviet Union.

*The following remarks were made by Chinese Vice Premier Deng Xiaoping in discussions with Defense Secretary Harold Brown:*

China and the United States should do something in a down-to-earth way so as to defend world peace against Soviet hegemonism ... all countries in the world should enter into an alliance to deal seriously with Soviet expansionism. ... (the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan is) a grave step taken by the Soviet Union to make a southward thrust to the Indian Ocean, control sea lanes, seize oil-rich areas and outflank Europe so as to gain world hegemony. ... (China will) work together with the Afghan people and all countries and people who love peace and uphold justice to frustrate Soviet acts of aggression and expansion.

*The following are excerpts of Chinese Defense Minister Xu Xiangquian's remarks:*

People have come to see more clearly that Soviet aggression and expansion are the source of serious threats to world peace and to the independence and security of all countries. All justice-upholding countries and people should unite, take effective measures and fight relentlessly in defense of world peace against hegemony ... we cannot fail to see the growing turbulence and unrest in various parts of the world. ... Recently the Soviet Union has flagrantly made a massive armed invasion into Afghanistan, unscrupulously interfering in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, using tens of thousands of Soviet troops to impose military occupation there and ruthlessly suppressing the Afghan people. (We must view Sino-American relations) in light of the global situation and long-term political and strategic considerations. ... (Brown's visit) will greatly help to promote our relations and strengthen our cooperation in preserving world peace and security.

## **The 'Islamic card'**

### **Carter's "Islamic Alliance" another paper tiger**

One aim of administration policy is to forge an anti-Soviet "Islamic military alliance," backed by NATO and a U.S. military presence on the southern flank of the U.S.S.R. The strategy is to use the Persian Gulf as an area to confront the Soviets. Under the atmosphere of Cold War, Washington is preparing to invade the Persian Gulf, and in so doing shut off the 20 million barrels a day of oil which passes through the gulf to the West.

Washington and London are jointly courting the regimes of Pakistan, Iran, Egypt and Israel which are pegged to become a Chinese-backed foundation of the Islamic alliance. Late last week, U.S. security chief Zbigniew Brzezinski, in a background briefing, stressed the "complementarity of interests" between the United States and Iran. Brzezinski's remark, which stunned conservatives on Capitol Hill, confirms his documented complicity with the Iranian Islamic dictatorship of Ayatollah Khomeini.

The same day that Brzezinski issued his statement, London's Lord Carrington announced he would begin a tour of Pakistan, China, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and India. Tass attacked the Carrington tour as an effort to build support for "Muslim rebels" in Afghanistan.

The day after Brzezinski's briefing, Secretary of State Cyrus Vance began a round of talks with Sadiq al-Mahdi, a Sudanese Islamic leader and fellow-traveller of British intelligence's Muslim Brotherhood. Vance later met with United Nations Secretary General Kurt Waldheim and the pro-Khomeini, liberal Irish lawyer, Sean Macbride, to discuss setting up a tribunal to investigate the crimes of the shah as a means of acquiring a release of the hostages. A covert agreement on freeing the hostages by Washington's calculations would clear the way for Iran to join the anti-Soviet alliance.

Both Sadiq al-Mahdi and MacBride visited Iran under the aegis of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Their purpose in Iran complemented that of Waldheim's. To say the least, their activity calls into question the neutrality of the United Nations Organization.

The Kuwaiti daily *Al Qabaas*, on Dec. 31, questioned the relationship Brzezinski is cultivating with "Islam"

and concluded that the U.S. has decided to "mobilize Islamic forces against the Soviet intervention into Afghanistan in light of a discouraging Soviet response to U.S. ultimatums against such a move." *Al Qabaas* cites plans studied by Brzezinski's National Security Council "aimed at forming a unified Islamic front and reviving a CENTO-type alliance, which was a military alliance comprising the Islamic countries of Iran, Turkey and Pakistan in addition to the U.S. and Britain...." In another commentary from the United Arab Emirate daily, *As-Siyassah*, on Jan. 1, European diplomatic sources are cited as having warned the U.S. repeatedly, well in advance of the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. *As-Siyassah* concludes that Washington did not heed the warnings, based on its calculation that "the Soviets would encounter hostility from the Islamic world."

Last month a delegation from the Department of Defense held secret talks with the governments of Oman, Somalia, and Kenya over future U.S. military presence within those countries. Reports this week indicate that all three nations gave the U.S. a green light.

In truth, Washington's "Islamic allies" are not reliable. Consider an "Islamic military alliance," composed of Pakistan and Iran, highly unstable and militarily no match for anyone. Soviet troops are massed on the Iranian border, and Soviet Ambassador to Iran, Vladimir Vinogradov, assured the Iranian regime that his government was prepared to move into Iran militarily if the U.S. sent troops in. Such sobering warnings, plus the military display of Soviet capabilities in Afghanistan, make Brzezinski's "Islamic card" as much of a "paper camel" as his "China card" is a "paper tiger."

Understandably, therefore, the partners to the Camp David agreement, Egypt and Israel, are being cultivated by London and Washington as the cornerstone of the anti-Soviet bloc. Earlier this week, Egyptian Defense Minister Gen. Hassan Ali revealed that Egypt and the U.S. had already begun joint military maneuvers in preparation for a possible move into the Persian Gulf from Egyptian territory. Sadat, the day after the Soviets occupied Afghanistan, offered Egyptian soil to the U.S. military. At the same time, Egyptian Vice President Hosni Mubarak began a tour whose itinerary is nearly identical to that of Lord Carrington.

Israeli Premier Menachem Begin and Sadat commenced a series of meetings this week in Aswan, Egypt. Press accounts of their talks indicate that the two focused primarily on "stopping the Soviets" and "defending" the Persian Gulf.

### **The Saudi Arabian obstacle**

Saudi Arabia and its OPEC ally Iraq remain prime obstacles to the "Islamic Pact" scheme. According to highly placed oil industry sources, the Saudis are refusing

to play along with Brzezinski's Islamic card and instead are attempting to undercut Egyptian President Sadat by organizing the Islamic nations of the Arab world and the Indian Ocean region under Saudi Arabian leadership.

Fred Dutton, a public relations agent for Riyadh, is cited in the *Christian Science Monitor* Jan. 8 saying that the royal family wants nothing to do with an alliance with Pakistan, but is interested in pursuing close relations with the new government of India's Indira Gandhi. Saudi Arabia's recently established security agreements with Iraq, which has a military treaty with Moscow, in combination with Gandhi, who has always had friendly relations with the Soviets, presents a formidable obstacle to the realization of London-Washington's objective.

Sadat challenged the Saudis in an interview with Al-Akhbar two weeks ago. According to the *Guardian* Dec. 27, Sadat boldly stated that the Saudis got what they deserved when Muslim Brotherhood insurgents occupied the Grand Mosque in Mecca. Sadat reiterated his contempt this week, stating that "all my people" will soon rise up against the Gulf families.

Israeli Defense Minister Ezer Weizman, who just returned from a series of meetings in Washington, this week predicted that the Saudi royal family will be in power no longer than 6 months.

Both Libya and Syria have reacted harshly to Egypt's open complicity with Washington in setting the stage for a U.S. takeover of the Persian Gulf. The same day that Mubarak arrived in Peking, Libya announced that it was severing all trade relations with China and voiced its support for the Soviet Union.

Since the Meccan incident, the leading members of the Saudi royal family have been meeting non-stop, according to a diplomatic source. Saudi Arabia's First Crown Prince, Fahd bin Abdul-Aziz, who is traditionally the strongest policymaking force in the kingdom, has moved quickly to shore up his position. Coinciding with the Meccan incident, a scandal-mongering campaign was unleashed by British intelligence mouthpiece Robert Moss of the London *Daily Telegraph*: to undermine the royal family's credibility, particularly Prince Fahd. But since then Fahd has initiated a major clean-up operation of the Saudi military and the government in Mecca. A former Middle East diplomat interpreted this as the first in a series of shake-ups aimed at cleaning out corruption. Japanese radio yesterday predicted that there would be a major cabinet shake up soon in Saudi Arabia as part of the campaign.

—Judith Wyer

## Documentation

### Prince Fahd warns U.S.A.

*Saudi Arabia's most influential leader, First Crown Prince Fahd, said the following during an interview with Le Figaro Jan. 9.*

**Q:** Since the events in Mecca, Saudi Arabia has been aware of being the victim of a slanderous press campaign which twisted the facts. Didn't you ask Brzezinski if the American Administration was linked to that campaign of slander?

**A:** That's right, and America sent David Newsome to assure me that the campaign did not reflect the opinion of the government. The press is free in America, he said. I told him, we accept criticism, but not lies. It's not in the interests of the American press or the American people to see an unjust campaign forming against us. Especially at a time when those who proclaim themselves friends of the U.S are rarer and rarer. Our friendship is not based on sentiment but on reciprocal advantages. There is no single state in the U.S. which does not profit from our friendship....

Hundreds of well-known Americans sent us telegrams condemning the campaign. It is in the U.S. interest to see its friendship with Saudi Arabia place itself on the level of today's events. ... We don't want a one way friendship. Nothing forces us to be friends with America. Numerous other alternatives are offered to us in the military, economic and technological domains. There are many other countries, which, like the U.S. are ready to supply everything we need. We can replace American aid without difficulty ... all the European countries which have capacities in the industrial-technological fields, and in the field of defense. But we are faithful to our friends.

**Q:** In the U.S. recently, I heard that a new campaign is in preparation specifically directed against the Saudi royal family, that would be launched against it at the end of the Iranian crisis.

**A:** That's possible and we are preparing ourselves. If it was the case, we would not remain silent. We have done this for too long. We would exercise our right of legitimate defense. There are sincere people in the U.S. who appreciate the value of American interests in Saudi Arabia. They should protest against such a campaign. They should ask if American policy is not identical to Zionist policy.