

entire editorial board of the paper made its own sentiments known by placing Rosenfeld's comments next to an Evans and Novak column arguing that in the event of a nuclear war, the Soviet Union would lose 4 million people and the United States 70 million.

The same day, *New York Times* correspondent Drew Middleton reported that Carter's B-1 decision "represents a basic shift in the United States strategic doctrine," which has Air Force brass in an uproar over the "trend away from development of sophisticated military technology."

Even before the Carter press conference, Middleton had reported that U.S. allies, particularly in Western Europe, strenuously objected to Carter's willingness "to rattle the cage and arouse the bear.... Allied military opinion is that there has been an overall shift in the power balance...in favor of the Soviet Union," Middleton observed June 29, at a time when Carter's continued provocations threaten to ignite armed hostilities in which Europe and the United States would perish. This is occasioning some serious reappraisals of the Atlantic Alliance in European capitals, the writer concluded.

The same day, the *Washington Post* nervously elaborated Middleton's fears. In an article datelined Bonn, Michael Getler predicted that badly strained relations between the White House and Kremlin had motivated Soviet President Brezhnev "to win friends and influence governments among Washington's allies" in order "to isolate the United States from its allies." Brezhnev's visit to West Germany this fall "could introduce pressure between the two Western capitals," Getler noted, particularly in light of the already tense relations between Bonn and Washington over the issues of nuclear power, monetary policy, human rights, and defense capability. Brezhnev and West German Chancellor have reportedly already agreed that their discussions should include the subject of mutual East-West troop reductions in Central Europe, even if no SALT agreement has been concluded by that time.

Syndicated columnist Marquis Childs privately confided this week that Carter's human rights offensive has profoundly disturbed our European allies. Just back from a month in Europe, Childs reported that most European leaders believe that Carter deliberately wrecked the SALT negotiations by interfering in the

internal affairs of the East Bloc via his human rights campaign. "Carter must have known this would wreck SALT," Childs agreed.

— Barbara Barré

State Department: Europe Is Always Nervous

The following interview was made with a member of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff:

Q: Drew Middleton had an article today in the *New York Times* warning that Europe is very upset over the Carter Administration's policy of confronting the Soviets in every hot spot. What do you think of this?

A: Middleton is oversimplifying things. There is a strand of nervousness in Europe about our approach to the Soviets. Any approach to the Soviets by the Administration makes the Europeans nervous. They were nervous about Kissinger. Beyond that there is a great deal of nervousness about the human rights issue, especially Germany. On the Horn of Africa and the Middle East they question our tactics. They also oppose reflating their economies.

Q: The Soviets are apparently pushing hard on expanding trade with Europe and vice versa. The Soviets have begun discussing the use of the transfer ruble for this.

A: Well, the Europeans are eager for trade and they badly need it. If the Soviets did something about the ruble, it will help, but there is a growing East European debt, although the Soviets are careful about their creditworthiness.

Q: Kissinger said today that trade with the East bloc should be linked to political concessions. What do you think?

A: He doesn't speak for this Administration. His precious linkage was not usable. My own view is you cannot bargain trade with politics.