

## Aren't Brezhnev's Favored Writers Helping Schlesinger Out?

Among the large number of analyses in Soviet publications to the effect that the Carter Administration is pursuing a laudable and promising course towards new strategic arms agreements with the USSR, an article entitled "Mondale's Trip: Strategic Aspects," which appeared in the government daily *Izvestia* Feb. 6 over the signature of A. Bovin, bears special attention. Like other recent writers on the topic, not excluding that frequent guest at Rockefeller-sponsored indoctrination sessions, USA Institute head Georgii Arbatov, Bovin averred that Carter is earnestly committed to achieving a speedy SALT agreement and that doing so will reduce the chance of nuclear war.

A. Bovin has a reputation as a mouthpiece for party General Secretary Brezhnev and is a well-established commentator on matters of "detente." He tends to find "realistic forces" where other Soviet observers, including well-placed people in the military, would perceive a menace. It was not only this reputation that distinguished Bovin's presentation of the case, but his astounding attempt to draw a line of distinction between the U.S. president and a viewpoint readily identifiable as that of the Trilateral Commission — David Rockefeller's organization without which there would be no President James Earl Carter, nor the Vice President Walter Mondale who most immediately occasioned A. Bovin's remarks.

The thinking behind Bovin's article is the same misconception on the part of leading Soviet circles to which the Trilateral Administration's "hard cop-soft cop" performance, epitomized by the debate over the appointment of Paul Warnke to head the SALT negotiating team, is designed to appeal. As has been aptly observed by a few columnists in the West, Warnke's, Secretary of State Vance's and Carter's own apparent readiness to oblige in reaching a SALT accord must be nectar and ambrosia to the Soviets compared with what might be forthcoming from Zbigniew Brzezinski and James Schlesinger — whom they rightly fear and hope to see little of in strategic negotiations.

Such distinctions and such hopes are groundless. If nothing else has, Carter's press conference yesterday should erase them. Carter's rush for SALT is a rush for the Schlesinger doctrine and nuclear war! "We have the capability, as do the Soviets," said Carter, "to detect the launching of opposing missiles and then I, as President, and the leaders in Russia would have to be faced with the question of how much of a retaliatory attack to make." This is, undisguised, the "nuke and negotiate" prospectus of Mr. Nuclear War, Schlesinger himself.

### *Bovin's Ruminations*

For starters, A. Bovin dismissed as "rhetoric not politics" Carter's statements on U.S. "leadership in the world community." Next he severed Carter from the Trilateral Commission basic principles, as follows: some "Western observers," he said, consider that Carter puts first foreign policy priority on relations with "natural friends and allies" (Western Europe and Japan - with the U.S., the components of Trilateralism), second on "North-South" relations, and only third on the U.S. stance towards "potential adversaries" like the USSR.

"It is entirely possible, that some foreign policy strategists in Washington prefer precisely this schema of priorities," proceeded A. Bovin. But not Carter! "This (schema), however, is not viable. No one can abstract away from the main, most acute political problem of today — preventing world nuclear war... No subjective preferences (sic!) can change the real situation. And it seems that the new president fully understands this. At any rate, his energetic statements on the necessity of moving ahead with disarmament, banning all nuclear tests, and completing SALT 2 permit such a conclusion."

Following the same line of thought as A. Bovin, G. Kuznetsov in the military daily *Red Star* Feb. 2 anticipated that from the SALT agreements Carter seeks, there will emerge "a further purification of the international atmosphere and reduction of the danger of war." Academician Arbatov contributed a two-page article to *Pravda* for the purpose of refuting the "Soviet threat" campaign in the U.S. — and counterposed Carter's "positive" approach. TASS issued the pre-profiled welcome to Warnke as a dove.

How far this misplaced confidence can be stretched is largely a matter of the inevitably increasing visibility of Schlesinger's hard hand at the control end of Carter's puppet strings. There are those in the Soviet Union and elsewhere in Eastern Europe who already perceive with alarm the direction of Carter's actually Schlesingerian pronouncements. As Carl Gustav Stroehm, military correspondent for the West German daily *Die Welt* described it, if the Soviets are pushed too far — around the "dissident" issue or other questions fundamental to the security of the Soviet state — the "new generation" of military leaders may go so far as to carry out a "Bonapartist" coup. These military men, Stroehm wrote Feb. 8, think in global, Clausewitzian terms; they will not permit the Soviet Union's overall strategic position to be undermined.

The "Clausewitzian" line has emerged primarily in the Czechoslovak press and Soviet military publications. "It

would be a mistake," said a recent issue of the Soviet journal *Communist of the Armed Forces*, "to ignore the danger arising from imperialist policies." In the 1930s, the article said, imperialism used the economic depression to establish "an open terrorist dictatorship of monopoly capital" which launched a new world war. *Rude Pravo*, the Czechoslovak Communist Party daily, exposed the fraud of Carter's phony "disarmament" line in a Feb. 2 commentary, attacking Defense Secretary Harold Brown for his remark at his first press conference that the SALT I expiration deadline is a long way away — October — and therefore there is no need to rush anything. This is "blatantly false," said *Rude Pravo*: "while it may be true that 90 percent of the agreement has been reached, the remaining 10 percent is an extremely complex problem which cannot be dismissed." The article also pointed out the farcical nature of Harold Brown's proposed defense budget cuts. Despite some dovish statements by Vice-President Mondale during his recent trip to Europe, the purpose of his visit was to "increase the aggressive forces of NATO, increase military budgets, and support the enemies of international detente," *Rude*

*Pravo* charged.

This hard line will lawfully grow stronger as Carter drops his "pro-disarmament" mask. But will there be other than military options when the illusion is shattered and it is recognized that the entire Trilateral Administration is a war machine?

The crowning blunder of A. Bovin's article is instructive in connection with this question. Referring to the clashes between Mondale and the Europeans down whose throats he tried to ram Trilateral doctrines, Bovin overlooked the fact that the West Europeans were throwing Mondale's words back at him *labeled as Trilateral garbage*. Bovin declared that the Veep's problem was attempting to stabilize the capitalist system, "an impossible task."

Although that latter estimation is not shared throughout the Soviet leadership, as Soviet initiatives for stabilizing trade and political collaboration with European governments attest, it is a statement of political ignorance entirely coherent with Bovin's views on Carter and SALT. Either idea, pursued consistently, would leave no option but war at a point not too far off.