

tuency-based national sovereign states and their replacement with an "American Commonwealth."

The July Trilateral report, (see Counterintelligence Report), authored by current U.S. Undersecretary of State for Economic Affairs Richard N. Cooper and recently appointed head of the National Intelligence Estimates Robert Bowie, called for the imposition of energy cutbacks and deindustrialization for the advanced sector and labor-intensive primitive agriculture and raw material extraction for the Third World. With respect to the issue of national sovereignty, Cooper and Bowie offered the following:

"The desire for national autonomy and the traditional concept of sovereignty aggravate the tension between national policies and transnational interaction. The public and leaders of most countries continue to live in a mental universe which no longer exists — a world of separate nations...It rarely pays domestically to raise long-term problems, particularly if this means confronting voters with difficulties ahead and the need for sacrifices to master them. Thus long term problems and stra-

tegies to solve them are not discussed as concrete political issues. The failures of American and Western European politics to respond adequately to the necessity to reduce oil consumption provides a telling example."

In his *Le Monde* interview, agnelli cited the crescendo of terrorism in Italy and West Germany as evidence that national governments are no longer capable of ruling Europe.

Echoing this sentiment is top British intelligence terrorist controller and head of the U.S. Justice Department's LEAA Task Force on Terrorism and Civil Disorders H.H.A. Cooper (see below). Cooper predicted that Europe would degenerate into a state of armed repression parallel to the "Guatemala model" and that increasingly, national governments would be replaced by more functional local autonomous bodies regulated by "transnational institutions" — like NATO and the International Monetary Fund. "It's about time the United States assumed its place of responsibility," railed the British national Cooper, "at the head of a unified West."

## Soviet Delegate Ponomarev: USSR, U.S. Bear Heightened Responsibility For World Peace

*Boris Ponomarev, an alternate member of the Soviet Politburo, is in the U.S. at the head of a delegation of members of the Supreme Soviet. On the first leg of their tour, which will take them to Houston, Los Angeles, Detroit and New York, the Soviet officials met Congressmen and Administration officials in Washington. Ponomarev's remarks to the Congressmen, which were hardly reported in the U.S. press, are excerpted here in translation from Pravda of Jan. 24.*

Practice shows consistently that every step on the path of developing Soviet-American relations on a mutually beneficial, fair basis, serves the interests not only of our two countries, but of all peoples. It is no accident that the whole world follows the state and development of Soviet-American relations so attentively. Now things are in a peculiar situation. On the one hand many good words are being said in favor of peace, and on the other, the arms race is accelerating....All countries are called upon to contribute to preventing war and to the development of international cooperation in the name of the very existence and future of humanity. But the USSR and the USA bear a heightened responsibility in this great cause....

Increased arming of NATO troops has been started and there are plans to equip them with "cruise missiles," as well as plans to station the neutron-bomb on the territory of West European countries. Such a development of events can lead to a destabilization of the political and military strategic situation. This is laden with great dangers not only for Europe, but for the entire world. The Vienna talks (on force reductions in Central Europe —

ed.) should get moving and stop serving as a cover for a buildup of NATO military strength....

The Soviet-American agreement on trade, signed October 18, 1972, has as yet not entered into force — and you well know why (Ponomarev is referring to the Jackson-Vanik and other amendments restricting credits to the USSR — ed.). And the sorry result is that in 1977 our trade with the USA fell to \$2 billion from \$2.9 billion in 1976....We continue to advocate the development of our trade and economic ties on the basis of equality and mutual benefit. We see in the development of international economic ties an important element of the improvement of international cooperation overall.

### *Reston:* 'Arguing For The Status Quo'

New York Times, "Our Soviet Visitors," by James Reston, Jan. 25:

Ten members of the Supreme Soviet, which is not really "supreme" in Moscow but still influential, have been in Washington these last few days expressing their regrets about the decline in American-Soviet relations, and asking for explanations.

This has been an interesting and maybe even significant event. The Soviet delegation, headed by Boris N. Ponomarev, has talked with the leaders of the House and Senate, and with reporters on the side. They have

been unfailingly courteous and even amiable, but somehow they were not able to agree with officials or Congressmen here, or even to discuss objectively, why Washington and Moscow were misunderstanding one another....

There is a more troublesome dilemma between these two delegations. The Soviet officials ask: What is the primary question of world affairs? Isn't it the control of nuclear weapons and the avoidance of a nuclear world war? This, they insist, is the presiding question in the interests of the United States and the Soviet Union, and of world peace, so why don't we concentrate on that?

Why divide Moscow and Washington over "human rights," they ask. Why not agree on the basics and separate this cataclysmic question of nuclear war from all these other subsidiary questions in Europe, the Middle East, Africa and Cuba?

There have been some really tough arguments with the Soviet delegation here on these issues, and they have the opportunity to argue it out with the Secretary of State, with Zbigniew Brzezinski, the head of the National Security Council, and even to philosophize about all this in the homes of American officials. No such thing, of course, could be imagined in Moscow by Soviet Foreign Secretary Gromyko, or even by Ambassador Dobrynin. But somehow this dialogue does not seem to be working.

The representatives from Moscow obviously want to have it both ways: They want an agreement on strategic missiles with the United States, particularly on the cruise missile. They also want the right to build their own missiles and move their own developing navy into the Indian Ocean and establish their power in Ethiopia along the Horn of Africa and in Angola along the oil sealanes from the Middle East to industrial Europe.

When the members of the Supreme Soviet raised what they called the "main question"—the control of nuclear weapons—Mr. Brzezinski told them quite frankly that they had to choose. They could not get selective agreements with the United States. Either they would work with us for a new world order, limit strategic weapons and arms shipments, or continue the arms race and the strategic game, which was in nobody's interest.

The Soviets are really inviting a big-power deal with the United States. Ever since their revolution in 1917, they have been arguing against the status quo, for the destruction of the old imperial empires, and for the liberation of new nations. But now their tune has changed.

The Soviets are now arguing for the status quo, particularly in Eastern Europe. It is the United States that is now insisting that liberty is the issue, that is arguing for human rights in the last of the imperial domains of Communist Eastern Europe, and challenging Moscow to stop sending arms into Ethiopia, Angola and the other strategic points of Africa....

There is something rather sad about all this. The hope of these talks between leaders of the Supreme Soviet and the Congress and with the Executive in Washington was

that they might be able to look beyond the contemporary struggles and find some ground for compromise; but the Russians seem merely to have had a junket and repeated the same old propaganda.

*Evans And Novak:*

### Carter's New Realism

Washington Post, "Facing Eurocommunism," By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, Jan. 24:

President Carter's new warning against dangers of "Eurocommunism" in Italy reflects a confrontation with reality after one year in office—by the President in general and by Ambassador Richard Gardner in particular....

This shift is only the latest signal that Carter is reverting to more conventional anti-Soviet policies, following the confusing rhetoric early in his administration. No longer is the Soviet-Cuban intervention into Angola rationalized as "stabilizing." A strong U.S. reaction to the Soviet role in Ethiopia is now given top priority.

The rhetorical shift on Eurocommunism, proclaimed in a Jan. 12 statement, typifies the administration's new realism about military and political vacuums. Carter is now aware they will quickly be filled by Soviet penetrations if the United States fails to make the case for the Western democracies publicly and forcefully.

So the Jan. 12 statement was both public and forceful: "We do not believe that the Communists share" the "profound democratic values and interests" of Western political systems. The United States "would like to see Communist influence in any Western European country reduced."...

The administration's claim that the new policy is a restatement of the old is belied both in the words themselves and in Gardner's profound conviction—the product of one year's experience in Rome—that Soviet influence is pervasive at top levels of the Italian Communist Party. He is also convinced that the Soviet Union, helped by the Czechoslovak and East German Communist parties that has brought Italy close to anarchy.

Gardner's quick flight to Washington two weeks ago to argue for the new hard-line policy was intended as a warning to the old guard of the Christian Democratic Party not to yield to Communist Party pressure without an all-out fight. Strong factions in the old guard, which has ruled Italy for 30 years, would accept alliance with the Communists to cling to power in a coalition government.

Younger, more progressive Christian Democrats seek another course: a top-to-bottom shakeup of their stratified party and its stale, rigid policies. That is also what Gardner wants, on the basis of his political education in Rome.

H.H.A. Cooper:

## 'Ultimately All Politics Rests On Force'

*Exclusive to Executive Intelligence Review*

*Following is an interview with H.H.A. Cooper, a terrorist controller and head of the U.S. Justice Department's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Task Force on Terrorism and Civil Disorders.*

*Q: Mr. Cooper, what do you see as the motivation for the wave of terrorism spreading throughout Europe at this time? Do you agree with your colleague, Dr. Hubbard of the Texas Aberrant Behavior Center, that terrorism is merely the work of lone, crazed social misfits?*

*A: While the individual terrorists are not themselves generally conscious agents of any deploying agency, you have to understand the way this thing really works. There are, broadly speaking, three levels. At the top you have the thinkers, the people who determine how terrorism can best be employed in order to achieve their ends. This level operates in a way analogous to corporate America, you see, and they are never mentioned in the press, never publicized. Underneath them you have two layers, and these are the mercenaries. The individuals who actually perform the terrorist acts are the social misfits who are easily manipulable. They may, and in fact generally don't know that they are working for anybody, but they are. They are a pool of persons constantly available to either the left or the right. Above them, and a very important layer indeed, are the controllers, the sophisticates who deploy the terrorists, figure out the targets for terrorism, work out the logistics, etc.*

*Q: Who are the unpublicized strategists, "thinkers" as you call them, of international terrorism?*

*A: You must understand that terrorism is the political mass aspect of a global struggle for power. The majority of terrorists are footsoldiers who are utilized for political ends. And the world at this time is divided into two camps each vying for power: the Western system of free enterprise capitalism, and the Soviet system of state capitalism. For example, West German terrorism originates from East Germany, and that in turn can be traced back to the Kremlin. Terrorism is only one facet of the continuing warfare between these two blocs, and other issues such as fuel and energy are also areas of the same power struggle.*

*Q: What are your predictions for the future, both in terms of the future of terrorism and the broader context of the power struggle between these two blocs?*

*A: National governments have gotten progressively weaker. You have to understand this and see terrorism, for example, on a geographic rather than a national basis. Look at the Labour government of Britain, for instance. Labour doesn't lead the country; it's being swept by events. People are so blinded by the situation in Northern Ireland that they don't see the more significant phenomenon of terrorism inside Britain and its corollary social dissolution. The Labour government doesn't have*

any credibility or real decision-making leadership powers. And if the Tories came to power the situation would be the same. What is going on in Britain, as everywhere else throughout the West, is that large nations are breaking up into regionalism. Central governments are discredited, and regional loyalties and entities are on the rise. This is the direction in which we are rapidly moving.

*Q: What you suggest however is an unacceptable situation from the Western standpoint. What will happen in such areas as the management of international trade, not to mention the Western military alliance once national governments become completely impotent and inoperative? The only answer would be complete chaos.*

*A: You are right, and this is why we must move now and orient toward the future. The key is the United States. The U.S. has never made full use of its power, and this must be corrected. We need a strong leadership at the international level, and the U.S. is the only possible leader of this supranational community. Carter does not have a firm grasp of the complexities of world events, and this a major problem.*

*Q: This supranational agency would have to have executive powers though, wouldn't it, and the means to back up its executive decisions?*

*A: Of course I agree with you that ultimately all politics rests on force. Such a supranational governing executive would have to be equipped with force to carry through its decisions.*

## Tempest In A Cold Teapot?

The U.S. press devoted its best efforts to turning the disintegration of a Soviet reconnaissance satellite on its return to the atmosphere Jan. 24 into a major public panic over supposed nuclear fallout, improved Soviet spying capabilities, ...and possibly, World War III.

On Jan. 25 the *New York Times*, *The Trib*, and the *New York Post* all used the story as a page-one lead-story item, however the *Post* took the lead in scare stories with the headline "Hint Satellite was Soviet A-Weapon." *The Trib*, on the other hand, made an open bid for the anti-Soviet sentiments of the Cold War era with their headline: "Spy Satellite, Story Behind the Crash of Space Age U-2"

The story of what actually happened, as explained by competent scientists, is far less sensational. According to one U.S. scientist, observer satellites are commonly constructed to disintegrate in the atmosphere. Generally, the nuclear reactor aboard which powers such crafts is jettisoned in space, before the satellite re-enters the earth's atmosphere. This mechanism failed in the case of the Soviet vessel, *Cosmos-954*, not the first time this has happened.

In 1964 and 1970 two U.S. spacecraft bearing nuclear power sources re-entered the earth's atmosphere and disintegrated. Like the *Cosmos 954*, both of the nuclear generators powering the ships disintegrated in the atmosphere without posing any serious threat of pollution of the atmosphere or contamination of the population.