

"Sunbelt" interests have been exerting over Carter in recent weeks and they are in principle committed to undermining the American institution of the presidency at a time when they are pushing the nation's economy to bankruptcy.

The issues of war, peace, economic recovery or depression and that of internal political stability, have all in the present instance been woven into one: The principal proponents, in the Administration, for a defenseless dollar, for destruction of our nuclear industry and our advanced technologies must be dumped. This primarily means Schlesinger and Blumenthal. In a broader context it includes National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski and Defense Secretary Harold Brown.

Dumping any combination of these individuals at this time will have the immediate salutary effect of signaling to this nation's friends in Western Europe, Japan, Saudi Arabia, and elsewhere, to take up again their defense of the U.S. dollar and resume their effort to bankrupt London. This by itself will create the momentum to restore the possibility for putting together the context for a long term war-avoidance policy to be agreed upon by both the United States and the Soviet Union.

As part of the immediate remedial measures, President Carter, Vance and others in the Administration must urgently cut through ordinary tactical considerations and push through SALT at all costs. Opinions in the Senate should not be allowed to obstruct the effort. Objections in the Cabinet itself should be ignored. What is required to extricate the nation from the present abysmal trap is the exercise of bold leadership that will force the shaping of new opinion and new consensus. A serious American initiative can get the SALT talks revived quickly and concluded. It will require returning to the agreed upon Vladivostok guidelines and an earnest round-the-clock round of intensive negotiations until the agreement is hammered out. A breakthrough of this sort is needed before the early summer in order to restore the major, exclusive negotiating partner relation status between the U.S. and the USSR. Cabinet members, such as Schlesinger, Blumenthal and certain others who will predictably object to this procedure, should be dumped or fired, preferably the first. It can be done.

—by Criton Zoakos  
Director of Intelligence  
U.S. Labor Party

## Soviet Strategic Hardening Signalled

*Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev received his country's highest military decoration, the Order of Victory, in a Feb. 19 Kremlin ceremony. Presenting Brezhnev with the medal, previously awarded only to commanders responsible for turning an entire front into Soviet wartime victory, Politburo member Mikhail Suslov praised:*

Your outstanding services in strengthening the country's defense, and in the development and consistent implementation of the foreign policy of the Soviet state, reliably ensuring the development of the country in peacetime conditions. You know the great price of victory....

*In a major article in the Communist Party journal Kommunist, Defense Minister Dimitrii Ustinov gave prominence to the military responsibilities of "Marshal Brezhnev," calling the President by his military title. Reviewing the 60-year history of the Soviet Armed Forces, Ustinov wrote:*

In the terrible days of the civil war, the party produced a magnificent pleiade of talented commanders and political cadre, such as Budyennyi, Voroshilov, Kirov, Kuibyshev, Stalin, Tukhachevskii, Frunze and others.

*When Ustinov again mentioned Stalin's name, during a Feb. 20 commemoration of the Armed Forces anniversary, his speech was interrupted by applause. In Kommunist he also wrote:*

A great organizer of the struggle of the Soviet people (during World War II—ed.) was the glorious Communist Party, which unflinchingly followed the Leninist teaching on the necessity of unity of political, economic and military leadership. In the achievement of success, a great role was played by the State Defense Committee.

*The theme of the unity of political and military command has also received wide exposure with the publication, in the monthly New World and the Armed Forces daily Red Star, of Brezhnev's war memoirs.*

*Ustinov was not the only top military officer to recall Marshal M.N. Tukhachevskii, originator of the "theory of the offensive," in recent days. Chief of Staff Marshal N. Ogarkov wrote in a Feb. 19 Pravda article under the headline "Soviet Military Science":*

One great service of Soviet military thought was the development of scientifically grounded views of the character and specifics of the coming war....Soviet military science first resolved the complex problem of breaking out of the so-called 'positional dead end,' by developing the theory of deep combat operations. M.N. Tukhachevskii, V.K. Triandafillov, A.I. Yegorev and others made a great contribution to its development and practical testing. The essence of this theory was establishment of the possibility of simultaneous destruction of enemy defenses across all their depth, with artillery and air strikes....(During World War II), Soviet military art was especially developed, in particular the theory and practice of the deep offensive combat operation.

*The concept identified by Ogarkov in this way carries over today into Soviet war-winning strategy for nuclear war.*

*Affirming again that the Kremlin is anxious to see the "green light," as Pravda put it Feb. 11, turned on again for progress in strategic arms talks with the U.S., Brezhnev addressed a meeting of the Supreme Soviet Presidium Feb. 24. Agreements signed over recent years*

created the conditions for normalization of international relations, said Brezhnev, and today there is the basis for a SALT agreement. But "some people" in the U.S. are throwing up obstacles, he warned. Backing up Brezhnev, the Soviet media have particularly been warning on the deployment of either cruise missiles or neutron bombs in Europe. L. Semeiko commented in Red Star Feb. 10.

It is well known, that one of the U.S. military strategy concepts is the "high nuclear threshold," i.e. use of nuclear weapons at the latest possible stage of a conflict in order to delay as much as possible the infliction of an annihilating retaliatory strike. But the neutron weapon will certainly lower that threshold....Any "flexibility" (referring to "flexible response" strategy—ed.) so far has in fact turned out to be the inevitability, or at least the high probability of the escalation of nuclear war, with the possibility of nuclear destruction of the United States...

*A Soviet news agency commentary quoted in the West German press stated bluntly that any use of the neutron bomb, however "tactical" it was supposed to be, would provoke a full strategic "powerful counterstrike" from the Warsaw Pact.*

## Britain: Time For A U.S.-USSR Showdown

*To use the United States to protect British interests, even at the risk of a U.S.-USSR thermonuclear confrontation, has been the thrust of a torrent of recent articles in Britain's press. Here are excerpts from one of the worst examples, an inflammatory article by Lord Chalfont appearing in the Feb. 20 London Times. Lord Chalfont, London Times Defence Correspondent and British negotiator at the 1963 Test-Ban Treaty talks, entitled his article "The Risks in the Horn of Africa."*

Predictions about international affairs are notoriously unreliable, but I will risk one now, and it is this. If the "statesmen" of the West continue to behave with such extraordinary lack of courage and perception, within a year at most the Soviet Union will control not only Ethiopia but Somalia as well....

This latest exercise in blatant imperialism provides yet another example of a most interesting variation on the theme of colonial expansion — the systematic use by the Russians of satellite or surrogate forces — a technique designed principally to create the impression that what is happening is that one Third World country is coming to the aid of another, and to conceal the fact that what is happening is a classic exercise in naked super-power politics....

What we are faced with in Ethiopia is the latest phase in a carefully coordinated Russian plan. What happened in Angola is now happening in the Horn of Africa. If it succeeds there as it succeeded in Angola, the next target will be southern Africa; and there is little reason to

suppose that the West will have any clearer idea of how to defend its interests there than it has had up to now.... The Horn of Africa, and much of the rest of the continent, is now a focal point of superpower politics and if we do not recognize the fact soon it will be too late....

They (USSR—ed.) should understand that they cannot expect economic cooperation, arms control agreements, and brotherly love in one part of the world while in another they are singlemindedly engaged in damaging our economic interests, threatening our strategic security and undermining our legitimate influence in the developing world.

If the United Nations are as powerless as they seem to be to influence what is happening, then the West must be prepared to defend its own interests, whatever the immediate costs. The risks of intervening in the Horn of Africa may be considerable, but they are as nothing compared with the risks of continuing to do nothing except make faint and spineless noises of protests.

## Press Moot Military Buildup

*New York Times, "Brown Says U.S. Will Strengthen Its Forces in Asia," Feb. 20:*

LOS ANGELES, Feb. 20—Defense Secretary Harold Brown said tonight that the Carter Administration was planning to strengthen its strategic forces in Asia and upgrade the Pacific Fleet because of growing Soviet military strength in the region....

"We are and will remain a major force in the Pacific....It cannot be otherwise. We cannot be strong in Europe and weak in Asia. Indeed our strength in Asia supports our strength in Europe and vice versa. They are two sides of a coin.

"If we don't give Asia its due—if we don't maintain the necessary military forces, as well as enough political and military strength, in the region to hedge against uncertainties—the favorable political balance we now find in Asia could deteriorate rapidly," said Mr. Brown.

Besides the growth of Soviet military power in the Pacific, Mr. Brown cited a handful of "uncertainties" that the United States faces in the area. These include possible changes in Chinese-Soviet relations, the continuing North Korean threat toward South Korea, which could disrupt peace and involve the great powers, possible faltering economic development of less-developed non-Communist nations, and fear that Vietnam "might undertake an adventurist policy against non-Communist neighbors....

"We are a Pacific power—with vital interests and solemn commitments in the region," Mr. Brown said. "Our military presence and planned improvements to our forces are designed to insure that we have the capability to continue to protect these interests and commitments. We cannot fail to do that, nor can we avoid our responsibility to maintain peace in Asia. For these purposes we will need our forces in Asia for some time to come. Everyone should understand that."....

*Baltimore Sun*, "Soviets said to lead NATO in Land, Sea, Air, Buildup," Feb. 21:

The British government said yesterday that the Soviet military buildup is outstripping that of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in the air, at sea and on land.

The Labor government report said the Russians are spending between 11 percent and 13 percent of their resources on the buildup.

"Soviet forces have in many areas been strengthened in size and quality on a scale which goes well beyond the need of any purely defensive posture," it said....

It gave these examples of increases in Soviet naval power in the Eastern Atlantic and in land power in Central Europe in the past 10 years:

°The number of nuclear-powered submarines increased from 44 to 104, or 136 per cent.

°Missile-armed cruisers and destroyers increased from six to 23, or 283 per cent.

°Fixed-wing maritime aircraft increased from 170 to 220, or 29 per cent

°Battle tanks increased from 7,250 to 9,500, or 31 per cent.

°Artillery increased from 3,200 to 4,400, or 38 per cent.

°Fixed-wing tactical aircraft increased from 1,655 to 1,975, or 20 per cent.

The British also outlined what they said is today's balance of forces between the Soviet-led Warsaw Pact bloc and the NATO countries in the Eastern Atlantic and in Central Europe:

°In surface ships, the Communists have 1.2 vessels for every single NATO warship.

°In submarines the ratio is 1.4 Communist vessels to every NATO sub.

°There are 1.2 Communist troops to every NATO soldier.

°The Communists have 2.7 main battle tanks against each NATO tank.

°In sea-based, fixed-wing tactical aircraft there is parity between the two sides. But there are 2.4 land-based, fixed-wing tactical planes on the Communist side to every one Western alliance warplane.

*Washington Post*, "Belgrade Meeting: Lost Hopes and Stalled Effort at Detente," Feb. 23:

The East-West conference on European security and cooperation here, once looked up with great expectations, will soon become one more ingredient on the pile of generally stagnating Soviet-American relations.

After nine months of debate, it is now clear that there is virtually no chance of any positive resolutions coming out of this 35-nation gathering....

It is those human rights pledges that turned this review

conference into a confrontation between East and West, and especially, though not exclusively, between Washington and Moscow....

"This whole campaign on human rights in the press, and started by the U.S. delegation," says Polish Ambassador Marian Dobrosielski, "has not helped one single person in this respect. Rather, it has hardened positions and increased suspicions. No socialist country can permit itself to be dictated to as to what they have to do with this or that person or group," he added, referring to the American-led campaign to ease pressure on specific dissidents.

"The American tactics, or better said the tactics of 'your judge,'" as the Soviet-bloc refers to (former Supreme Court Justice Arthur) Goldberg somewhat derisively, "have poisoned the atmosphere," another East European says.

"Even if we want to do something, we are reluctant too because it looks as though we are being forced," he said....

...Goldberg has drawn criticism for another sharp attack on the Russians near the final stages on January 27 that is viewed by some here as ending any doubts in the Kremlin to reject any but the most bland final statement and accept no criticism....

"Maybe there have been some initial disappointments and there is a need to rethink tactics," says the new Norwegian delegate. "But Soviets clearly know now that everyone else except their own kind take it seriously and it can't be ignored and it's not coming just from the U.S."...

Goldberg, 69, says everyone knows it is unrealistic to expect the Soviets to allow a conference to dictate their internal situation. "But we had to speak out honestly to maintain our credibility, because the Final Act of Helsinki provides for this, and because it will not deter the process of detente. The SALT talks go on, they signed a grain deal with us, and the tone of talks in Washington is not the same as in Belgrade....

"Does anyone have any doubt about the restraining influence that the eyes of the Western and neutral world has on them," he asks.

"How long—after trying quiet diplomacy—could you sit here and not make a statement on a family reunification case in which the person loses his job because he asks for a visa and then is arrested as a parasite for not having a job."...

Another American, trying to sum things up, says "you can't say it was Goldberg either way on the question of whether we got as much as possible out of this. The delegation is working under White House orders and you couldn't sweep human rights under the rug. It's a part of American foreign policy."