

Editorial

Strategic miscalculations

If one took the threats and actions of the Soviet Union seriously, one would have no doubt that they are fully prepared to precipitate a superpower crisis that will threaten world survival in the weeks and months ahead.

But who is taking the Soviets seriously?

Certainly not the U.S. press, which has gone out of its way to try to prove that Marshal Ogarkov and the Soviet leadership are just demonstrating their "reasonable outrage" at the "warmongering provocations" of the Reagan administration. This is understandable only from the standpoint of the long-term Malthusian deal which the Council on Foreign Relations-based controllers of that press think they have with the Soviet leadership. They want the Soviets to play the angry bear—but they expect them to continue to abide by the rules of the game.

Certainly not the West German government, which has uttered the most ludicrous drivel in support of the hysterical wish that the Soviets will come back to the negotiating table. The West Germans may not believe what they are saying, but they are clearly willing to grovel before the Soviet Union in the conviction that any sacrifice would be better than further enraging the beast.

In fact, it appears that not even certain high-level advisers to the President are taking the Soviets seriously. These advisers are, and have been, fully committed to the program of directed-energy beam-weapons defense, and understand the necessity of proceeding with the development of that capability very rapidly to try to defuse the emerging war showdown. But many of these advisers are caught in the psychosis of the election ritual. They don't *want* to overturn the customary banality and compromise of the President's reelection campaign in order to mobilize the country for the coming showdown. In effect, they have convinced themselves that the Soviet Union (with its great respect for democracy?) will also respect the election rules—and wait to provoke a superpower showdown *after* President Rea-

gan is re-elected in November of 1984.

What we are facing is indeed a grim prospect. For if the leading circles of NATO, led by the United States, do not immediately mobilize a show of strength—with an alliance-wide crash program for beam weapons at its center—there will be nothing to stop the Soviet Union from escalating its campaign of intimidation to a showdown.

It's about time we stopped interpreting the Soviet threats as the demands of the latest union negotiator. Just look at the record recently.

Marshal Ogarkov and the official Soviet press had promised before NATO carried out the deployment of the Pershing IIs in Europe that they would walk out of the negotiations on the intermediate-range nuclear force if the missiles were deployed. They did.

Secretary of State Shultz, for one, didn't seem to think that was so serious. He proposed to meet with Foreign Minister Gromyko at an upcoming conference on arms control in Sweden earlier this year. Marshal Ogarkov, in his press conference of Dec. 5, was not impressed. We're serious, he said, and we're not interested in meeting with the Americans who emplaced these missiles in Sweden, or elsewhere.

How long are we going to continue to ignore the clear implications of the Soviets' actions and words? They are acting under a unified military command, putting into implementation precisely the order of battle which General Sokolovskii outlined in the 1966 party Congress, and which has governed Soviet actions ever since. There has been strict political continuity in the Soviet military command, and an explicit commitment on their part to *total and victorious* war for the Motherland.

Of course, the Soviets too are miscalculating—miscalculating that the United States will back down before their threats. The longer we ignore the truth of their intent, the more dangerous and irreversible the danger of total war will become.