

## 2. How The Soviets See Carter

The Soviets have responded vigorously, with the clearest possible public warnings, to U.S. National Security Council Chief Zbigniew Brzezinski's move to grab control over the Carter Administration and use it as the base for his war provocations. Having long experience with Brzezinski's efforts to destabilize Eastern Europe and, more recently, to wield the "China card" and threaten war in the Middle East, the Soviets know Brzezinski as a major source of war danger.

Moscow has repeatedly identified Brzezinski as the catalyst for U.S. and Israeli efforts to use the Camp David summit to create a separate peace or to introduce U.S. troops into the Middle East region.

Statements by Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko and authoritative press organs of the Kremlin (see below) repeated the warning that what happens in the Middle East is a matter of direct concern to Moscow, especially any Israeli attack on Syria, whose Foreign Minister Khaddam visited Moscow in early September. A Tass commentary released Sept. 5 warned that "giving the U.S. a foothold in the Middle East" — a reference to Brzezinski's project of deploying U.S. forces as part of an Israeli-Egyptian deal — "would introduce a new dangerous element into the situation in that area."

These statements give the lie to Brzezinski's claims that Moscow will not respond strategically to provocations in the Middle East because it has its hands full with Peking and Eastern Europe.

Behind Moscow's tough warnings to the U.S. is a vigorous debate in Soviet policymaking circles over who really makes policy in Washington. *Pravda*, in a Sept. 2 attack on Secretary of Energy James Schlesinger, and *Izvestia* in an Aug. 26 analysis of what distinguishes Europe's Soviet policy from Washington's, identified the existence of power centers separate from the U.S. presidency, whose aim is to force President Carter onto a path of confrontation with the USSR, against American national interest.

With these increasingly accurate attempts to analyze the U.S. situation, the Soviets recognize that President Carter is being hamstrung from outside. *Literaturnaya Gazeta's* correspondent, in his call for Congressional hearings on "anti-American activity" (see below), asked: "Who gains?" — When that is answered, the deadly game of London financiers and the British oligarchy to set the USSR and the U.S. against each other will be up.

### Pravda Blasts Schlesinger

On Sept. 2, 1978, *Pravda* correspondent S. Vishnevskii blasted Energy Secretary James Schlesinger as a man in the mold of Zbigniew

*Brzezinski and an equally dangerous threat to world peace. The article entitled "The Little Pentagon' — Behind the Mask of the U.S. Energy Ministry" is excerpted below.*

Many American legislators, politicians and journalists name James Schlesinger "the energy tsar." This monarchical title is, of course, not given to a member of the cabinet coincidentally....

Since his youth (Schlesinger's) life has been involved with military affairs. In 1960 the 30-year-old doctor of economics published a book called *The Political Economy of National Security: An Investigation of the Economic Aspects of Modern Conflict*. This work could much more precisely be titled *The Political Economy of the Military-Industrial Complex*. Its main thesis is the need to ensure the world leadership of the USA "at any price." The doors of the Rand Corporation — the brain trust of the militarists — opened hospitably to the author.

During the second half of the 1960s he was invited to the capital to work as a government consultant on military budget and energy problems. At the beginning of the decade, under R. Nixon, he began his rapid ascent up the Washington hierarchy.

The lightning rise began to ring in his ears. The aggressivity of the Pentagon chief knew no bounds. He had no desire to heed the positive moves in Soviet-American relations. In endless speeches he raved about "the dangers of détente," the "Soviet military threat," announced schemes by the United States for first nuclear-missile strikes, propagandized the theory of "limited nuclear war," pushed the growth of the Pentagon budget.

During the 1976 electoral campaign, Schlesinger carried out noisy propaganda work. He issued aggressive foreign policy recommendations left and right. He was not ashamed to be the advisor to the candidates of various competing parties and groups — R. Reagan, H. Jackson, and finally, J. Carter....

Why, asks the monthly *Economic Notes*, must the development of nuclear weapons be part of the activity of the Energy Department rather than Defense? Here is hidden the main "secret" of the atomic-militarists: to conceal in the labyrinth of 19 basic energy programs the scale of the most sinister work on growth and modernization of the thermo-nuclear military arsenal of the USA....

J. Schlesinger himself, as chairman of the (Atomic Energy) Commission, gave the green light for the neutron bomb....

The White House's decision to postpone temporarily production of the neutron weapon did not dampen Schlesinger's ardor in the least. The American press reports that in his department, with full encourage-

ment from the Pentagon, plans for new "neutron variants" are proceeding full steam ahead....

The status of Schlesinger's department encompasses his active participation in the formation of the U.S. foreign policy. Quite a few reports are filtering into the press that Schlesinger often gives the White House top-secret recommendations which are constantly aimed to subvert the process of détente.

This summer, according to the *Washington Post*, the Secretary personally gave the President's cabinet a "super-restricted letter" in which he tried to torpedo the negotiations of the USSR, USA, and Britain on full and universal banning of nuclear weapons testing.

Although the contents of the conversations of the "Energy Tsar" during his overseas trips were kept a secret, informed journalists let it be known that his "personal diplomacy" is exactly the same as Brzezinski's. He continually frightens foreigners with

### Soviets, Syrians Confer; Moscow Warns On Camp David

*Concluding three days of talks in Moscow, Syrian Foreign Minister and the Soviet leadership issued a communiqué Sept. 1 which stated, in part:*

... the Soviet Union and Syria view the continued unflagging development and deepening of their friendly relations as an important foreign policy task . . . .

... As a result of actions by Israel and the imperialist forces standing behind it . . . the situation in (the Middle East) remains explosive. The efforts of Israel and Egypt, undertaken with active participation of the U.S. and directed at replacing a comprehensive, just Middle East settlement by partial, separate deals, present a special danger . . . . The real meaning of this policy is beyond doubt: it is a plot behind the backs of the Arab peoples, on an anti-Arab basis . . . .

The Soviet Union and Syria affirmed their resolve to continue joint efforts to obtain a comprehensive, just Middle East settlement . . . .

Reviewing the situation in Lebanon, the sides condemned the unceasing interference of Israel in the internal affairs of that country. They announced their intention to aid the normalization of the situation in Lebanon on the basis of ensuring its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. The sides called for strengthening the legal power of the Lebanese government throughout the territory of the country and observing the legal interests of the Palestinian resistance movement in Lebanon.

the "growth of the Soviet threat," demands increases in the military might of NATO. He himself revealed one side of his activity in a speech to the U.S. army association, when he defined "ensuring the real security" of oil supplies in the Middle East as "a task of a military nature."

Now a trip by the Secretary to China is planned. His last voyage there was in 1976. At that time Schlesinger came out with openly provocative speeches on "the absolutely obvious threat from the North" which supposedly hangs over China, proclaiming Peking to be virtually an ally of the United States. Such statements soothed the ears of the Peking hegemonists. To them, Schlesinger is "a man who understands better than others the danger of détente," said Lesley Gelb, now one of the top officials in the State Department. Official Washington has since refused to give correspondents any information whatsoever about the Energy Minister's possible trip. But it doesn't take a great deal of imagination to realize that what is up is yet another irrational attempt to play the "China card."...

### Soviets Ask: Who Gains By East-West Trade Sabotage?

*V. Syrokomskii, a correspondent for the Soviet weekly Literaturnaya Gazeta who just completed a tour of the United States, concluded a three-part series in August with a call for Congressional investigation of the sabotage of East-West trade. Senator Adlai Stevenson III (D-Ill.), Chairman of the International Finance subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and International Affairs, is in fact preparing hearings on barriers to trade. Syrokomskii wrote:*

Trade with the Soviet Union is necessary and beneficial for America. The potential of economic cooperation of the two greatest industrial powers is hard to overestimate. But here in the U.S., artificial barriers are constantly being created. American-Soviet trade is sacrificed to conjunctural, narrow purposes, hostile to the cause of détente and peace.

Government and business specialists have shown that this also inflicts tangible harm on the U.S. Who is doing this? Who gains? Who is acting against the national interests of the country, and on whose orders? In short: who is interfering in the peaceful, mutually beneficial cooperation of our countries, and what for?

That would be a hearing to conduct in the U.S. Congress! It would be interesting to see how Senator Jackson behaved in such a case. And the list of those who should be called before such hearings, inflicting tangible harm against their country and the whole cause of international cooperation, would be easy to draw up. *Literaturnaya Gazeta* is ready to report in detail on the results of such an investigation of anti-American activity.

## *Izvestia*: Europeans On Safer Course Than Carter

In an Aug. 26 article contrasting U.S. policy to that of key West European leaders, *Izvestia's* political commentator S. Kondrashov portrayed President Carter as a capitulator to, rather than an initiator of, antidétente moves. Kondrashov was formerly *Izvestia's* correspondent in Washington.

Kondrashov noted President Carter's restrictions on trade deals with the USSR, specifying the role played by Samuel Huntington, colleague of National Security advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, in getting them imposed. He continued:

In the case of the computer (whose sale to Moscow was banned by Carter — ed.), the Western European partners of the U.S. demonstrated a sensible approach, in refusing to follow the example of the U.S. President.

Of course the bases of their military-political alliance with the United States remain, but in foreign economic questions Western Europe is exhibiting increasing independence.... This is a case where it would be wrong to say that politics is politics and trade is trade. Yes, economic cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries has become a real and highly valued fruit for the Western European states. At the same time, this growing trade influences politics, and strengthens a more careful reaction than in the U.S. to the present and the future of détente. Western Europe does not want to repeat the American zigzags, which reflect both the fluctuations of the domestic political conjuncture in the U.S. and the inconsistency of the present Washington Administration's course....

The Ford Administration and later Carter tried to obtain a review of the (Jackson-Vanik) amendment in Congress, but not actively enough, for games with the devil of anti-Sovietism continued and even intensified in the White House itself.

### 3. China Seeks Allies Against Soviets

The leaders of the People's Republic of China are aggressively playing their part in the anti-Soviet gameplan, and many U.S. strategists of the Brzezinski factional stripe are pointing to the "Chinese card" as one guarantee of success for a U.S. confrontation course against the Soviet Union in the Middle East and globally.

What these strategic wizards have blinded themselves to is the stated goal of this Chinese policy: to provoke a thermonuclear war that will wipe out both "superpowers" and leave China ruling over the radioactive remains.

China's Hua Kuo-feng made the most demonstrative move against the Soviets with his tour last month of Romania, Yugoslavia, and Iran. The subversive, ultraprovocative purpose of Hua's trip to the two Eastern European countries was all too apparent. Part of a British-orchestrated gear-up toward large-scale destabilizations modeled on the 1956 Poznan and Budapest events, the Hua trip was openly intended to help saddle the Warsaw Pact with *casus belli* conditions. Only slightly less obvious was Hua's intent in Iran: to recruit that nation as an anchor in the Middle East Treaty Organization scheme publicly proposed by Zionist lobby leader Edgar Bronfman (for details, see the last issue of the *Executive Intelligence Review*). It is because Hua did not succeed that the Shah of Iran has been hit with massive destabilizations in retaliation.

The Brzezinski group's view is indicated by a recent *Christian Science Monitor* article by Joseph Harsch, which described the troika of NATO, China, and an

Iran-centered Mideast bloc as an unbeatable combination. The same lunatic "encirclement" strategy was expressed in an interview last week by strategist Marshall Goldman (see below). These and other public and private statements make it clear that the Brzezinski camp is fully committed to pursuit of an "encirclement" gameplan with China, together with the actual launching of Warsaw Pact member "defections" from the Soviet Union through a combination of insurrections and British-network coups in Eastern Europe.

What the Great Han chauvinists of China know, however, is that these policies mean inevitable thermonuclear war. In full accord with Chairman Hua's speech at the United Nations General Assembly last spring, the Chinese have once more restated — in even harsher terms — their perspective of a near-term U.S.-Soviet war, this time in the Aug. 11 issue of the *Peking Review*.

#### China's Plan for War

*This article by Hsu Hsiang-chien, Defense Minister of the People's Republic of China, appeared in the Aug. 11 issue of the Peking Review.*

... The Soviet revisionists babble that "detente is of a stable and irreversible nature" and that "conditions are now available to rule out the inevitability of war"...

The views of Marxists are diametrically opposed to this. In our opinion... war is a continuation of politics