

# Why General Singlaub Is Right

---

## KOREA

---

The "Singlaub Affair" has now brought to the front pages of the U.S. press a raging battle over the Carter Administration's Korea troop withdrawal policy. General John K. Singlaub, the Chief of Staff of the U.S. forces in South Korea until his dismissal last week by President Carter, sparked the controversy with his statements to the *Washington Post* and this week before a Congressional committee. Singlaub told them: "If we withdraw our ground forces on the schedule suggested it will lead to war." Singlaub's views are shared, according to him and to others, by the entire command structure in South Korea, both Americans and Koreans, by most of the U.S. Embassy including the Ambassador, and by the majority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Pentagon. One officer in Korea, quoted in the *Washington Post* put it this way: "I don't know anyone who is not staggered by it (the withdrawal plan). There's no military or strategic logic to it."

General Singlaub and his associates are right — the danger of war as a consequence of the Carter policy is very real. But they are wrong — there is a strategic logic to it, but it has very little to do with Korea. The logic, and the use of that word is admittedly generous in the case of the maniacs who put this policy together, lies in the *raison d'être* of the U.S. Far East policy since the Kissinger era: the Grand Alliance with Peking.

Kissinger, whose ghost can be found often these days wandering through the White House, constructed his Far East policy on the foundation of an alliance with Maoist China against the Soviet Union. This strategy — known as the "second front" policy — aimed at creating a NATO-type front in the Far East involving Japan, China, and the U.S. It rested on the insane belief that the Soviet Union could be pinned down on this "second front."

Korea's place in this grand strategy is as a bargaining chip with the Chinese. The Kissinger plan was formulated in a so-called "4-power agreement" whereby China, the U.S. and the two Korea's would revise the existing armistice agreement with China, pulling the North Koreans into line and the U.S. doing the same with their client, South Korea.

The stickler in this little scheme — which may include a Taiwan for Korea deal as well — has always been (at least from the U.S. side) the complete refusal of the government of President Pak Chung-hee in South Korea to go along. The U.S. answer to this is the withdrawal of U.S. troops, an act of political destabilization of the Pak regime which has absolutely no military reasoning behind it.

While the Singlaub hearings were taking place this week in Washington, a high-powered U.S. mission arrived in Seoul headed by Assistant Secretary of State for Political Affairs Phillip Habib and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General George Brown. The purpose of the mission was ostensibly to discuss the timetable for the withdrawal of U.S. troops, but it rapidly became clear that the Pak regime itself was a target of the trip.

Assistant Secretary Habib announced upon his arrival in Seoul that he would meet with leading figures in the anti-Pak circles, including the head of the Protestant National Council of Churches. Habib also met briefly with former Korean President Yo Pu Sun, who has been convicted of trying to overthrow the government and is awaiting appeal on his sentence. Habib's little imitation of Andrew Young's South African escapade did not go unnoticed by the Pak regime which made it clear that they considered the act of meeting with a person convicted of treason an affront.

The official response of Pak was to accept the U.S. fait accompli while making it clear that they do not support the move. One Pak aide was quoted in the *New York Times*, in response to Habib's assurances that the U.S. would continue to defend the security of South Korea: "In the post-Vietnam era, it is a rare Asian who would be satisfied with bland statements." The *Washington Post* reported May 25 that another Pak aide, following the meeting with Habib and Brown, stated that the Koreans would take all measures to ensure their security. Specifically he added: "As to the question of nuclear weapons, we would consider the matter on that basis."

The Korean response ironically is unanimous among all political layers. The leading opposition groups have issued statements opposing the pullout as did all the leaders who met with Habib. Small demonstrations were held in Seoul at various locations, including the residence of the American Ambassador, protesting the U.S. pullout. The Korean press as well has been strongly attacking the U.S. policy and giving extensive coverage to the Singlaub affair and the statements of other U.S. military and political leaders in opposition to the Carter policy.

### *The Soviet Response*

The Carter-Brzezinski policy on the Second Front has not gone unnoticed in Moscow, the target of this scheme. The principal Soviet response, however, has not been directed against the U.S. but against China and Japan. The Soviets have moved along two tracks — hitting the Chinese hard for their efforts to provoke a U.S.-Soviet confrontation and more carefully making it clear to Japan the disadvantages of playing into the China alliance strategy.

On the Japanese side there are two events which signal

this approach — the handling of the recent fishing agreement and the announced visit of Soviet Trade Minister Patolichev to Tokyo. The fishing dispute has functioned as a surrogate battleground on the China issue. The Soviets have played it tough on the talks in direct response to moves by the Fukuda government to open up military and other discussions with the Peking regime. This linkage has been played from both sides.

The signing of the fishing agreement this week in Moscow after more than two months of negotiations marked a clear step forward in the state of Japan-Soviet relations. At the talks a curious series of events took place. After a long session of talks between Soviet Fishing Minister Ishkov and his Japanese counterpart, Suzuki, an agreement was reached with concessions from both sides in the form of the Japanese acceding to Soviet fishing areas including the disputed Northern Islands territory and the Soviets agreeing to the inclusion of a clause that the agreement did not prejudice outstanding Japanese claims. After the agreement was reached Ishkov walked in the next day and announced that they wanted to revise the clause, immediately causing a Japanese trauma and reports that the talks had collapsed again. The next day Ishkov walked in and announced that they should forget what he said the day before and the agreement would go ahead as planned.

What's going on here? The *Executive Intelligence Review* does not have any inside information, but it is safe to say that a high-level shift took place in the Soviet leadership to ensure a settlement of the dispute. Immediately following that came the announcement this week of the visit of Patolichev to Tokyo for a meeting of the Japan-Soviet Economic Commission and the signing of various trade and economic cooperation agreements. This visit was originally scheduled for last January and postponed by the Soviets as a protest against the Japanese handling of the infamous MIG 25 affair which sent Japan-Soviet relations into the deep freeze. Moscow go-ahead on the trip is a clear signal of their initiative to warm things up, a far more sophisticated and preferable approach to dealing with Japanese overtures, at Washington behest, toward Peking.

As for the Chinese, the Soviets have been far less pleasant. Since they broke the ban on attacks on Peking with the Politburo editorial blast in *Pravda* two weeks ago, increasing comments have been issued. According to at least one informed source, China was a major issue in the recent Soviet leadership shakeup, with criticisms of Soviet handling of China being voiced. The new head of CPSU relations with ruling Communist Parties is said to be a China expert and the former Ambassador to Mongolia, some indication of the verity of our sources assessment.

Yesterday the followup to the *Pravda* editorial was made public in *Pravda* in the form of a Soviet note delivered to the Chinese Ambassador in Moscow May 19. The note strongly protested the anti-Soviet propaganda now emanating in large doses from Peking's propaganda outlets and warned that the Chinese must "take on before their own people a grave responsibility for the consequences that could result from the continuation of such a campaign." The warnings here can be interpreted in several ways, but the Soviets linked it clearly to their

larger perception of the war danger now prevailing in the world.

The note concluded: "One can only conclude that China is not preoccupied with the future of humanity, including its own people.... Precisely in this area China stands together with the designs of the imperialist states. It stands on the side of these reactionary circles in its campaign of hostility toward the Soviet Union and is dangerous to the cause of peace in the entire world."

#### *Whig-Soviet Alignment Against Second Front*

With the Soviets carrying out a counter-attack against the Chinese Second Front and American military and political circles on the warpath against the Carter Korea policy there now exists a de facto united front against the insane Second Front strategy. American conservatives are not unaware of the China connection to the Korea issue as was evidenced at the Singlaub hearings.

An American conservative posture on this issue must address a real solution to the Korean dispute, which General Singlaub addressed in detail. Singlaub stressed the unpredictable nature of the North Korean leader Kim Il Sung and the fear that a signal of U.S. abandonment of the south in the form of the withdrawal would encourage an attempt to carry out a military solution to the dispute of the divided peninsula.

An incompetent Congressional Budget Office report, authored by the Brookings Institution, the originators of the pullout plan, has been issued and cited by numerous pro-Carter types. The report isolates the issue as one of numerical military balance between North and South Korea and on this basis claims that a U.S. pullout would not alter that military balance. The report admittedly and conveniently ignores the political effect of the pullout, preferring to concern itself only with comparisons of the numbers of tanks, artillery pieces, jet fighters, etc. on both sides.

The issue here is understood in more serious circles as one of the creation of a permanent structure for political settlement of the Korean dispute within which a U.S. pullout would be an included feature without its presently destabilizing effect.

The outlines of such a statement must include:

One, an agreement among the major powers concerned — the Soviet Union, China, the U.S., and Japan — and the two Koreas for a guarantee of the neutrality, security and stability of the peninsula. An agreement of this kind — in contrast to Kissinger's Middle East-modeled 4-power agreement which deliberately excluded the Soviets — must have a guarantee of the non-use of force by the two Koreas and of non-intervention by the major powers.

Second, within that treaty structure, which would replace the existing outdated United Nations armistice agreement, the two Koreas can immediately proceed to negotiations on the peaceful reunification of the country, the stated goal of both governments.

Third, a basic feature of the agreement which would provide an actual basis for peace must be a large-scale economic development program for Korea, including as first steps, opening of trade relations between the two Koreas. Both Koreas possess remarkably well-developed industrial sectors in comparison with the rest of the

developing world and complementary resources which, if joined, would make Korea a major foci of industrial development for the entire region.

Ironically both Koreas also suffer from severe foreign debt burdens which if provided with a debt moratorium combined with large-scale infusion of industrial-related credits and investment would experience massive leaps in their economic growth.

A Korea development plan could be and should be

posed as part of an integrated industrial and resource development plan for all of northeast Asia, including north China and Manchuria, the Soviet Far East, and with Japan acting as the principal source of industrial and technological input into the area's development. With such a program, a secure and stable basis for permanent peace, in which all the powers concerned would have a strong stake, would be assured.

— Daniel Sneider

**EXCLUSIVE**

## 'The Indian Political System Is A Shambles'

### INDIA

The government of Indian Prime Minister Morarji Desai has been completely paralyzed by the decision it made several weeks ago to call state elections in eleven northeastern states. Focus within the country has moved significantly away from overall economic and political issues to a desperate fight inside the ruling Janata Party to resolve internal differences and produce a 'united' public appearance to gain majorities at the June 11-15 elections. This would enable it to take control of several state governments. Ten thousand candidates have filed for the electoral contest for a total 2,000 available seats from the Janata Party alone, producing a situation where candidates from the same party are contesting each other in key constituencies. So far the central Janata leadership has failed in its efforts to dissuade the "surplus" candidates, mainly because many leaders feel that such candidates may decide to run as independents with sponsorship of faction leaders inside the Janata Party. This would make a mockery of the new "unity" the Janata front displayed when all its constituent parties merged on May 1.

The breakdown of unity in the Janata is largely a product of the actions of pro-zero-growth Home Minister Charan Singh. The calling of state elections itself was an unconstitutional product of Singh's naked bid for power. Singh has attacked every basic pro-growth development policy pursued by India in the post-independence period, alienating most of the pro-socialist members of the government. These forces, led by the Congress for Democracy (CFD), have become the targets of Singh's attacks. In every state candidate selection committee, Singh's forces have closed in on the CFD by giving it the minimal possible number of seats, insulting its leaders, and running terror operations against the party's mass workers.

This assault on the CFD, which only a few weeks ago merged with the Janata only to find all its merger agreements violated, has resulted in an overwhelming belief, by government and political circles in India that the only alternative to the current 'political shambles' is the formation of a broad-based multi-partisan coalition to fight for India's growth and development. New Wave, a weekly that speaks on behalf of these forces, in a May

15 editorial titled, "Let Us Turn Back with Courage," produced the reasons for this view, tracing the subservience of Indian political leaders to the World Bank-International Monetary Fund dictated policies and attacking this as the basis for the failure so far to launch a viable political fight for India's economic development. The editorial is reprinted in full below.

### Let Us Turn Back With Courage

If the Himalayas were to crack up the whole of Asia would be reduced to rubble, unprecedented tidal waves will wash away large parts of the world, and no corner of the earth will escape the tremor.

If a 90-year old national organisation, which challenged the almighty British imperial rule, won national independence and chalked out a wide-ranging programme of national reconstruction, betrays the principles on which the national polity was founded, and in the process, crashes, not only does the whole nation suffer; the way is also cleared for a change in the balance of world forces with disastrous consequences.

Maoist China has been whispering since 1962 that India is the sick man of Asia. This prophesy is likely to come true if the drift towards disaster is not quickly checked by initiating a vigorous struggle against the World Bank-IMF policy package and by restoring the policy of economic development, evolved in the second half of the fifties.

The Indian political system is in a shambles. There is no basic difference between the socio-economic outlook of the Indira caucus and Janata conglomerate. The policies for which the erstwhile Swatantra Party, Syndicate and the Jana Sangh fought for during and since the debate on the second five year Plan, were adopted by Lal Bahadur Shastri-L.K. Jha clique soon after Jawaharlal Nehru's death.\*

Indira Gandhi pretended to be opposed to the reversal of the basic policies so long as Lal Bahadur Shastri was alive. Once in power, two well known spokesmen of the World Bank IMF line, C. Subramaniam and Asoka Mehta, digged in around Indira Gandhi and the reversal of Nehru's policy of independent development was fur-

\* L. K. Jha, C. Subramaniam, Ashok Mehta are three finance ministry-linked figures most closely associated with the World Bank-IMF policies in India.