

Brzezinski's Trade Cutoff: 'Economic Retaliation' Against USA

Last week's decision by President Carter and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance to acquiesce in a policy of "economic retaliation" against the Soviet Union, ostensibly conducted to further the cause of "human rights" in the USSR, is potentially disastrous for U.S.

USSR faces an "oil shortage" in the 1980s, that they will be unable to exploit their Siberian reserves without U.S. technology, and that therefore the U.S. should use a scheme of "rewards and punishments" akin to those "learning devices" favored by such rat-running psychologists as B.F. Skinner to shape Soviet foreign and domestic policy.

FOREIGN POLICY

foreign policy interests around the globe, and may produce damage to the U.S. economy far out of proportion to the loss of the few hundred million dollars currently at stake in U.S.-USSR non-agricultural trade.

U.S.-Soviet relations are now as bad as relations between Peking and Moscow, the *London Times* gloated shortly after the decision was made public. The City of London hereditary oligarchs who manipulate the floating crap game known as the Eurodollar market clearly anticipate that the decision will give them a new lease on life for their economic warfare operations against the U.S., West Germany, and Japan.

The Carter Administration took two specific actions. First, it canceled outright an export license for several million dollars worth of Sperry Rand Univac computer equipment to be sold to Tass, the Soviet news agency, for use during the 1980 Olympic Games to be held in Moscow. The Administration said this action was taken in response to Soviet civil court proceedings against two reporters from the *New York Times* and *Baltimore Sun*. Second, it placed all oil drilling and exploration capital goods and technology, which require review by the National Security Council and the President before such deals can be approved, under similar export restrictions. Immediately threatened is a \$144 million deal negotiated by the Texas-based firm Dresser Industries to export an entire plant for manufacturing oil drilling bits to the USSR. As of this writing, the White House is expected to eventually approve the Dresser deal, in part because certain of its blueprints and technology have already been made available to the Soviets, and the heaviest penalty for cancellation would obviously fall on the U.S. firm.

National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski immediately hailed the new export restrictions as "a genuinely important act" which would give the U.S. "new leverage" in its relations with Moscow. Brzezinski and Energy Secretary James Schlesinger had lobbied heavily for the export restrictions, arguing that the

Carter, Vance Under Pressure

President Carter, Secretary Vance, and the Commerce and State Departments resisted the scheme for several weeks, and only capitulated in the wake of the Shcharansky trial after Brzezinski's staff "leaked" the details to trade warrior Sen. Henry Jackson, who together with the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, the AFL-CIO, and various other groupings heavily associated with the Israel Lobby, launched a "public outcry" for immediate cancellation of the Dresser and Sperry Rand deals, threatening unilateral congressional action of the kind which produced the 1974 Jackson-Vanik amendment linking trade credits to Soviet emigration policy. There is every reason to believe that Carter and Vance acted primarily as a result of this pressure, and will seek to reverse its results as soon as they find it politically expedient. Nevertheless, as the Soviet Union has vigorously resisted such quid pro quo linkage of trade with its domestic policies in the past, there is no reason to believe that it will not reject the Brzezinski-Schlesinger economic wargame out of hand, correctly interpreting it as a return to cold war tactics.

This is all the more likely in view of the fact that the Administration has resisted similar export restrictions against the Republic of South Africa; has sanctioned the export of oil technology with military applications (unlike the Dresser Deal) to the Peoples Republic of China, and has persistently refused to withdraw American military supplies to Israel despite that nation's repeated violations of the Arms Export Control Act in Lebanon, all during the past six months.

Meanwhile, every Soviet action not to the liking of Jackson, the Zionist Lobby and those Republicans under the sway of former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger will be greeted with demands that Carter "exercise his leverage" with some new punitive action against the Soviets. Under these circumstances, concluding SALT II and other arms control agreements and repairing relations with the USSR will be extraordinarily difficult at best.

What London Is Up To

The City of London financial forces for whom Jackson, Kissinger, Brzezinski et al. are mere pawns are not primarily interested in stiffening the U.S. spine against the Soviets, protecting human rights, or any of the various other motivations attributed to their pawns' actions. Their primary goal is to block U.S. partnership in the emergence of significant new economic relations, including the formation of a new world monetary system, among Western European nations and Japan, who are getting significant tactical support in this undertaking from the Brezhnev faction in the Soviet Union. Brzezinski's new economic retaliation is a direct attack on the May 1978 25-year economic agreement between West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt and Brezhnev, and represents a successful step in London's consistent drive to bring down the Schmidt government, as well as undercutting the Brezhnev leadership in the USSR.

Such foolish U.S. political figures as Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, now calling for an "International campaign" to get other nations to enforce similar trade sanctions on the USSR, on behalf of "Human Rights," are playing right into London's hand. Such a campaign to brand the Soviets an "outlaw nation" has already been initiated from London around the tactical objective of forcing the withdrawal of the 1980 Olympics from Moscow.

---Don Baier

U.S. Press: Curb Brzezinski, Work With Brezhnev Elite

As the Soviets themselves have not hesitated to point out, the confrontationist policy course advocated by Brzezinski, Kissinger, Jackson and their fellows does not enjoy wide support among the American population. Brzezinski, the architect of Carter's "human rights" campaign, who has followed the path of Kissinger in turning the National Security Council staff into a vehicle for competition with the State Department for policymaking authority, has come under especially heavy criticism in the U.S. press. The following columns published in last week's U.S. press reflect this dissatisfaction.

Christian Science Monitor, "The Push for Power in Foreign Policy," by William J. Porter (former U.S. Ambassador in the Nixon Administration), July 18:

... There is no "security adviser" in the White House. Mr. Brzezinski, technically speaking, is an "assistant to the President for national security affairs," not an adviser on the subject.

If the President, however, uses him as such, that's where the difficulties originate. The two presidential advisers on national security legitimately invested with the title are the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and

the Director of the CIA. Mr. Brzezinski is actually head of the national security staff, which was designed to be a coordinating and administrative body.

Traditionally our presidents have entrusted principal responsibility for advising them on foreign affairs to the Secretary of State.

Mr. Brzezinski and the rest of the National Security Council staff ... like his predecessor, is showing a marked penchant for a more substantive role ... and as Mr. Brzezinski is serving a president whose forte is not foreign affairs, he is finding an outlet for his aspirations.

Mr. Brzezinski and his staff should be situated in the State Department at an appropriate level below the Secretary of State. There, they should revert to a coordinating function only. Such a position inside the hierarchy would effectively take care of persons working on security affairs who are afflicted by drang nach osten complexes. We have had our fill of that....

Baltimore Sun, "Signs of a Certain Restraint," by Joseph Kraft, July 18.

"Foreign journalists in this country (the Soviet Union) study two things. In the morning they get up and read the official press. In the evening they go and see those who want to emigrate. But the truth about Russia is not in the official press, nor with the dissidents. It is in between, with the millions of Russians who want to live here and improve the climate."

The ... comment ... was made by a Soviet painter, Yuri Glazunov. I think he is right in asserting that the dissidents who want to leave Russia are not representative figures. On the contrary they are a tiny minority, largely Jewish, whose complaints have become an international cause célèbre precisely because they have contacts abroad through the press and television.

The Jewish dissidents are not simply unrepresentative. They are, as Mr. Glazunov suggests, an object of suspicion to many Russians. It is highly tempting for the régime to persecute them particularly when, as now, it is frustrated in efforts to improve the domestic economy and promote the policy of détente with the United States. Given that temptation, indeed, the lumping of the trials in the same week, the relatively innocuous play in the Soviet press, as well as the access allowed Western reporters to relatives of the defendants, are signs of a certain restraint.

The unwillingness to go all-out for a long series of anti-Semitic show trials suggests that there is in the Soviet Union a group which cares about improving conditions. That group is built around sensitive, humane Russians with skills and abilities forged in the West that give them influence in the leadership ... they represent the best instrument for promoting change for the better in Russia. So the United States should spend what little capital it has with Russia in dealing cards to them rather than to the Jewish dissidents.