

The 'Two Tracks' Of U.S. Foreign Policy

How long will Vance let Brzezinski play the China card?

The Soviet Politburo has, through a direct signed statement, put the U.S. government on notice that pursuit of a geopolitical "encirclement" strategy against the USSR-Warsaw Pact nations is a track that can have but one outcome — war. The statement served as the latest in a series of sharp warnings to the Administration that continued White House and State Department wavering on reining in the British faction in the Administration will mean the creation and rapid escalation of a U.S.-Soviet conflict, culminating in war. This faction, including National Security Director Brzezinski, Department of Energy head Schlesinger, Vice-President Mondale and Treasury Secretary Blumenthal, are the promulgators of a policy of active encouragement to the Begin government of Israel, and the Chinese nuclear war lords.

Matters are already coming to a head. Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko issued a harsh denunciation of the plan supported by Canadian whiskey magnate Edgar Bronfman and Henry Kissinger being thrust on Carter by Brzezinski, to station U.S. troops and military bases in the Middle East. Gromyko warned of "clear dangers to international peace" if that plan is adopted. The Soviets' focused warnings of the consequences of the "encirclement" strategy are — for the most part — blacked out in U.S. media.

There is much propaganda of late in British-run press conduits in the U.S. such as the notorious *Washington Post*, portraying the Administration as pursuing a "Two Track" foreign policy. This two track policy somehow mysteriously "reconciles" U.S. pursuit of mutually beneficial relations with the Soviet Union, while permitting simultaneously escalating play of the "China card" by the Administration, and minimizing urgently needed application of pressure to contain the Israeli outlaws.

The reality is that the "two tracks" are completely irreconcilable. As in every prewar situation, the combination of the imminent Middle East war and the internalization by the sane professionals of the State and Defense Departments of the significance of the Soviet warnings, has already created an all-out fight — now raging "in private" — which will erupt publicly.

Some public and pointed refractions of this fight are clearly visible. The State Department and the Department of Commerce are openly resisting the attempt by Brzezinski and Schlesinger to torpedo the trade package between the Dresser Corporation and the Soviet Union for advanced oil drilling equipment. Brzezinski and Schlesinger hope to use a dead Dresser deal as a "precedent" to scuttle all technology exports from the United States to the USSR. Resistance to the "China card," using the positive approach of normalization of relations with Vietnam has been gathering momentum in Congress since the return of the House delegation from Vietnam, chaired by Rep. Sonny Montgomery (D-Miss.) The day before the group's push for U.S. recognition of Vietnam, Sen. George McGovern (D-S.D.) charged the Cambodian government with genocide against its population and urged an international intervention to curb the regime's brutality.

METO and the China Card

But the quality of the fight necessary to derail the Brzezinski-Schlesinger war policy is woefully inadequate, and the dangers are compounded by the congressional vacuum occasioned by the Labor Day recess period.

The centerpiece of the Brzezinski-Kissinger "strategy" is to attempt a geographical "encirclement" of the Soviet Union with a "triangle" of NATO, the British aristocracy-proposed Middle East Treaty Organization (METO), and China. The "China Card" and the "METO" scheme, launched by Edgar Bronfman in a *New York Times* op-ed last month, are integral parts of the same game — fomenting an East-West confrontation to sabotage implementation of the Bonn-Bremen accords for a new world monetary system to replace the bankrupt British.

National security advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski is now in the process of convincing the ill-informed President Carter to adopt METO. Carter, rightfully worried over Soviet reactions, is being lied to by Brzezinski that "the Soviets won't interfere". An insider, close to Henry Kissinger has confided that Kissinger is actively working toward METO's adoption.

The very "cornerstones" of this Guelph-geopolitical madness attest to their clearly defined goal of anchoring the United States — via a Brzezinski-Schlesinger cold coup against Carter and Vance — to align with and underwrite the desperate bid of the world's three worst outlaw states to wreck the Grand Design. Can the government and Congress permit the United States of America to be anchored to Great Britain, Israel and China?

—Konstantin George

Washington Post: Vance and Brzezinski on Two Tracks

Washington Post reporter Don Oberdorfer candidly outlined "two tracks" American foreign policy is presently on, in an article centering on the Administration's plans to normalize relations with China. Headlined, "Asia's Communist Powers — China and Vietnam — Now Woo U.S.," the article appeared Aug. 27.

... For domestic and foreign policy reasons, the Administration seems to have decided that the normalization of relations with Hanoi should await major decision-making on relations with Hanoi's rivals in Peking. The timing of China ties, in turn, is closely connected with the state of U.S.-Soviet especially the domestic debate over ratification of a new strategic arms limitation talks (SALT) treaty. . . .

On policy toward the great powers of the communist world, there are now effectively "two tracks" within the top rank of the U.S. government, according to a high official, with Secretary of State Cyrus Vance carrying on relations with the Soviet Union and Brzezinski increasingly active in dealings with China. . . .

Brzezinski and some other high officials, reportedly enamored of the "China card" as a bargaining counter with the Soviet Union, also believe that warmer relations with the communist giant of Asia are fundamentally important in themselves. . . .

Some officials believe that if the SALT negotiations falter, however, pressure will mount sharply for a "tilt" toward China that puts Peking normalization first. Adding to this possibility is the urgency about U.S. ties reportedly being expressed in private by some top Chinese officials.

While taking an official view that Washington-Hanoi relations are none of their concern, the Chinese have also made clear that they see no reason for any U.S. steps toward Vietnam. One recurrent Chinese remark is that help of any kind for Hanoi would only lighten the burden on Vietnam's current major sponsor and supplier of aid, the Soviet Union.

Soviets Warn China

On Aug. 27, the Soviet Union issued a major Politburo policy statement warning of China's "dangerous" and "inflammatory" role in current world affairs. Major portions of the statement, as it appeared in the Aug. 27 Pravda, appear below.

The Politburo of the CC CPSU attributes great significance to the fact that during the Crimean meetings, a deep analysis of the current international situation was made and, in light of that analysis, conclusions were drawn on the necessity of further active efforts by the socialist states and their interaction in the interests of consolidating and deepening the relaxation of tension as the leading tendency of international life.

The events of the recent period, and above all the decisions of the Washington NATO session on the further buildup of armaments on a broad scale and the subsequent approval of a record military budget by the American congress, show with all clarity the true goals of the organizers of the racket in the West about the supposed "military threat" from the socialist states. It is an attempt to create a sort of propaganda screen for an imperialist policy which runs counter to the aspirations of the peoples, who demand firm peace and an end to the arms race.

The systematic attempts of the U.S. and some other NATO countries to interfere in the internal affairs of the socialist states under the cover of hypocritical campaigns about supposed "violations of human rights" in the socialist countries are also exerting a negative influence on relations among states with differing social systems. Such attempts are a gross violation of generally accepted norms of international law, a violation of the letter and spirit of the Final Act adopted in Helsinki.

The Politburo of the CC CPSU stresses the serious danger presented for the cause of peace and socialism by the actions of the present leaders of China. Conducting a great-power, hegemonistic course, Peking openly aims to heat up international tension and uses all means, to subvert the position of the socialist community and the revolutionary, liberation forces of the present day. Striving to gain access to NATO military arsenals, the rulers of China advertise in every way their hostility towards the Soviet Union and the other countries of socialism and call for an unbridled arms race. This policy is all the more dangerous, in that it is supported by the most reactionary circles of the imperialist states.

The Chinese leadership today is already not stopping at direct expansionist actions. Evidence of this is the crude chauvinist pressure of China on the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, its inflammatory role in Kampuchea's military provocations against the SRV, and Peking's pretensions to the territory of

neighboring countries.

The Politburo of the CC CPSU again affirms the unbreakable solidarity of our party, the Soviet state and all Soviet people with the heroic Vietnamese people, which is firmly defending the integrity of its territory, independence, and rights to carry out socialist construction in its country without interference, threats and pressure from outside.

The Politburo of the CC CPSU declares that in the present difficult international situation, the Soviet Union, guided by the decisions of the 25th Congress of the CPSU, still intends, together with its friends and allies, to seek the deepening of the detente process, the expansion of peaceful and mutually beneficial cooperation among states, and above all, the cessation of the arms race and transition to disarmament.

Major questions related to stopping the arms race are already the subject of negotiations. It is important that the work accomplished at these talks not be erased, but rather crowned with weighty results. This concerns, in particular, the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of offensive strategic weapons and the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

The Politburo of the CC CPSU considers that, under contemporary conditions, it is absolutely necessary to counteract with all decisiveness any steps, which could undermine the detente process and turn international developments back to the time of the "cold war." Now more than ever it is required to adhere strictly to the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, to respect the right of all peoples to freedom and independence, and to step up efforts for the development of their peaceful cooperation, the potential of which is clearly outlined in the Final Act of the pan-European Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe, the resolutions of the United Nations Organization, and in other international documents.

The Politburo of the CC CPSU expresses satisfaction that during the Crimean meetings, the importance was affirmed anew of the further development of the fraternal countries, on the stable basis of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism, and the coordination of their actions in the interest of sure movement forward of the cause of peace and social progress. The Crimean talks between Comrade L.I. Brezhnev and the leaders of the fraternal parties and states mark an important step in the further strengthening of the socialist community and the deepening of comprehensive cooperation of the fraternal parties, countries and peoples in the construction of socialism and communism and create favorable conditions for preparing new steps in the development of this cooperation.

The Politburo of the CC CPSU has adopted several resolutions on concrete questions of realizing the bilateral understandings reached at the friendly meetings in the Crimea.

Chinese-Zionist Alliance Takes Shape

The past weeks have provided signs that cooperation is tightening between the People's Republic of China, Israel and leading Zionist support layers internationally.

The sharpest policy signal of this alliance appeared in a mid-August edition of the *Canadian Jewish News*, a paper published jointly by Canadian Zionist controller Edgar Bronfman, head of the Seagram's liquor interests, and Murray Koffler, head of the Canadian section of the Jerusalem Foundation. Written by Henry Srebrnik, a Canadian professor, the article was also printed in the Aug. 15 *Montreal Gazette* under the title, "China's Enmity Toward Israel Seen Losing Steam."

According to Srebrnik:

There have been small and subtle shifts in Chinese attitudes to Israel over the past three decades, based on China's own internal ideological, and foreign policy zig-zags, than on anything Israel has done. Another might be in the wind.

Israel recognized the new People's Republic not long after the collapse of Chiang Kai-Shek's Nationalist regime, but the Peking leadership never reciprocated, and the two countries have never exchanged ambassadors.

Nonetheless, there were limited contacts between the two states in the early 1950s, seemingly encouraged by then Foreign Minister Chou En-lai. Some of the left-wing Israeli kibbutzim even considered China sympathetic to the Jewish state. . . .

Chinese anti-Zionism, insofar as it has emphasized ethnicity, has tended to be "racial" rather than purely anti-Semitic; Israel is simply a "white settler state," and no blatant anti-Jewish imagery is used. . . . It seems, however, if one reads between the lines, that Chinese policy towards Israel might be undergoing some small changes under the more pragmatic Teng-Hua leadership. Peking has its own axe to grind, after all.

China is now playing "power politics" in the Middle East, and wooing even ultra-conservative regimes, especially as these are anti-Russian.

There has thus been a de-emphasis on revolutionary rhetoric and exhortations to armed guerilla struggle. As well, the tone of articles on Israel has become less vituperative, when compared to those written in the heyday of Mao and the "Gang of Four". . . .

Ironically enough, when it comes to the large overseas Chinese communities in Southeast Asia, the Chinese have themselves become more "Zionist" of late, assiduously courting richer ones, like those in Singapore, while stepping in to protect those in trouble, as recent events in Vietnam indicate. It seems China now has its own Diaspora to worry about.

Israel-Chinese Meetings

Since June of this year, deployments have begun which fit into a pattern of an actually concretizing

Israeli-China connection. In June, top U.S.-based Zionist policymaker — and British subject — Edward Luttwak of Johns Hopkins University traveled to Hong Kong and Israel.

Weeks later, Eugene Rostow, founder of the Committee on the Present Danger and top pro-Israel, anti-Soviet hawk, made a trip to China. On return, Rostow told a reporter that “the Chinese were well aware of my connection to Israeli circles and were very eager to talk about it.” According to Rostow, the Chinese have adopted a “dual policy,” or a “policy of both hands,” toward the Middle East by which they will maintain channels to both the Arabs and Israel.

On the way home, Rostow stopped in Iran to encourage Iranian-Chinese relations. This detour exposes the true story behind an Aug. 18 national French radio analysis on the late-August trip to Iran of Chinese Communist Party Chairman Hua Kuo-feng. According to the French government media, “the Chinese are intending to pressure the Iranians to adopt closer cooperation with Israel,” especially through Iran increasing “oil deliveries and financial help” to Israel.

An “Israel-Iran axis” to contain the Soviets is a keystone of British strategy toward the Middle East.

On an official plane, Israeli and Chinese meetings have already taken place. According to both French press and United Nations journalist sources, Israeli ambassador to the United Nations Chaim Herzog held at least one meeting earlier this year with Chinese U.N. officials in New York.

Soviets Warn of Chinese Intentions

In an Aug. 30 analysis carried by the Soviet Union’s Radio Peace and Progress network, the Soviets attacked Chinese intentions to build an anti-Soviet alliance throughout the Mideast.

“Peking wants relations with Israel,” Radio Peace and Progress charged. “In 1957, Chou En-lai letter to (U.S. senator) Henry Jackson that Peking wishes a strong, powerful Israel. This message was taken with delight in Tel Aviv.” Citing an account in the Arabic language paper *An Nahar Al Arabi*, Radio Peace and Progress stated, “Peking is ready to support relations with Israel. Its aim is to keep the Middle East region alive as a powder-keg.”

Rep. Montgomery Tells Why U.S. Should Resume Relations With Vietnam

An exclusive interview with the House MIA Subcommittee Chairman

The following is the text of an interview by EIR Asia desk chief Daniel Snieder with Rep. G.V. “Sonny” Montgomery (D-Miss), chairman of the House Veterans’ Affairs subcommittee dealing with the soldiers missing in action (MIA) issue, who recently returned from a trip to Vietnam.

The Montgomery mission included the whole MIA subcommittee and traveled widely throughout Vietnam. Discussions were held with Vietnam’s highest officials, including Prime Minister Pham Van Dong. Since their return, numerous members of the mission have urged the Carter Administration to revive stalled talks with Hanoi about normalizing relations.

Rep. Montgomery, who was a strong supporter of United States intervention in Vietnam during the war, has become one of the most outspoken members of Congress favoring United States resumption of relations. The Congressman’s recent trip was his second to Vietnam concerning the MIA issue.

Q. Could you summarize the results of your trip to Vietnam?

A. I think that the trip was a historic one in that we found out a lot of things going on in that part of the world which we will take to the State Department and take to President Carter who will be interested in this area.

We brought back the bodies of 11 MIA’s and in Laos,

for the first time — it was a breakthrough — the Laotians are going to go out to look for American MIAs. The Vietnamese have done this, but Laos hasn’t done anything before this.

We found out that the attitude (of the Vietnamese —ed) has changed toward the U.S.; they would like to have diplomatic relations, with no preconditions. They are having their problems with a shooting war on the Cambodian border and their problems with China . . . They told us that no Russian ships have moved into Cam Ranh Bay and Haiphong. . . The Vietnamese kept stressing to us that they are an independent and sovereign nation, and they don’t intend to be dominated by anybody.

Q. Are you convinced of that?

A. I am convinced there are no Russians there now.

Q. The Vietnamese have indicated previously their willingness to restart negotiations on normalization of relations without preconditions on U.S. reparations, but the State Department has not moved on that, saying that they have not been told directly of any change in the Vietnamese position. Do you think that will now change?

A. We said, in the report we made, that the State Department should consider resumption of talks again with the Vietnamese on normalization of relations.