

National News

Former CIA official says Carter caused Afghan crisis

A former deputy director of the Central Intelligence Agency and a former science advisor to President Dwight D. Eisenhower have co-authored an article appearing in the *Boston Globe* Feb. 28 charging that Carter administration actions are directly responsible for the "hard-line" shift in the Soviet Union's political-military posture as reflected in the Afghanistan invasion.

The authors of the article, Herbert Scoville (CIA) and G. B. Kistiakowsky, argue that "in reality, it was actions by the President designed to appease his hardline political opponents at home that destroyed the fragile balance in the Soviet bureaucracy between those advocating the brutal use of military power and those urging restraint. In reality, neither doubling our defense budget nor even more direct military threats would have kept the Russians out of Afghanistan, their vassal in revolt."

"The arguments that stilled the voices of the Kremlin moderates grew out of the approaching demise of the SALT II treaty and the sharply anti-Soviet drift of Carter's policies. His increasing propensity for accepting the views of National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski led to the Kremlin's anticipation of dominance in the United States by the hawks for many years to come," they write.

Scoville and Kistiakowsky single out Brzezinski's "China card" policy as a special type of war provocation. "While Brezhnev was being scheduled to come to Washington for the SALT II treaty signing planned for February 1979, a visit of Chinese Vice Premier Deng was arranged for January. On arriving here as a guest of the United States, Deng

made harsh anti-Soviet remarks and threatened to punish Vietnam, a Soviet ally, without any disavowal by American officials. Not surprisingly, Brezhnev's visit was cancelled and the signing of the treaty was delayed."

"Well before the Afghanistan invasion, an announcement was made that Secretary of Defense Harold Brown would go to China," say the authors. That was "an event without parallel in all our postwar relations with the Soviet Union. Not unreasonably, Soviet analysts may have concluded that a military understanding if not an outright military alliance between the United States and China was in the making."

Scoville and Kistiakowsky conclude: "While Carter is creating a tough-guy image of himself, our country is being led into a protracted Cold War, perhaps to the brink of hot war. There is a policy alternative—we should be putting steady but quiet pressure on the Soviet Union while seeking the reversal of the present dreadful slide to nuclear disaster toward a modicum of peaceful co-existence. Common sense demands no less."

Democrat secures recount in New Hampshire

Representatives of Citizens for LaRouche secured a signed agreement from Secretary of State Gardner in Concord, New Hampshire Feb. 28 to hold a recount of the Democratic primary vote, held Feb. 26.

Although candidate LaRouche is presently claiming only 18 percent of the primary vote, sample indications in a number of key areas of the state suggest the LaRouche vote exceeded 20 percent, say spokesmen. They explain the discrepancy between their claim and the official returns, which gave LaRouche only 2-3 percent, on the basis of vote-fraud. "Hard claims" are based

on a 35,000 name listing of persons who are known to have voted for LaRouche through name-by-name canvassing after the election.

At present, they say, they have no hope of recovering more than a portion of the votes for LaRouche cast by persons not on their computer listing.

The statisticians aiding the LaRouche campaign trace the majority of the stolen LaRouche vote to the large totals reported for Senator Edward Kennedy. However, according to LaRouche spokesmen, a study of the latest, upward-adjusted tallies for Gov. Jerry Brown of California has led them to conclude that Brown must have received a lesser portion of the LaRouche vote than that distributed to Kennedy.

They conclude that Carter ran two-to-one over Kennedy, and consider it probable that LaRouche's true vote may have equalled or exceeded Kennedy's.

Mexican press reports New Hampshire fraud

Mexico's largest daily newspaper, *Excelsior*, in its story today on the New Hampshire presidential primary, reports Democrat Lyndon LaRouche's charge that the election returns were massively falsified.

"The electoral computation center was installed by the ABC, CBS, and NBC television networks, to process the results of the primary election and to disseminate them immediately," the article says.

"Democratic candidate Lyndon LaRouche charged that the elections were a fraud, based on a sampling of his own computerized list of 30,000 individuals who had expressed interest in the LaRouche campaign. 'Sixteen percent of the total vote was for LaRouche,' said an advisor to the candidate. Extraofficial counts are giving him only 4 percent."

Another major Mexico daily, *El Sol*, covered the story this way:

"For its part, the committee of Citizens for LaRouche, which promotes the candidacy of Lyndon H. LaRouche within the Democratic group (although he belonged to the Liberal Party), [sic] denounced irregularities in Wards 11 and 12 of Manchester.

"They noted that everything indicated that electoral fraud had occurred, because LaRouche had the lead—recognized by the other participants—in the French-American wards. Gerard de Grace, ex-official of Hillsborough County, told electoral officials that what was occurring was 'the biggest case of electoral corruption that has ever been seen.'

"According to house-to-house sampling, LaRouche was expected to achieve about 23 percent of the vote, or about 30,000. However, despite the fact that he qualified for federal matching funds and for inclusion in the primary, the big television networks have refused to cover his candidacy."

Kennan: Carter exaggerates Soviet threat

The Carter administration has greatly exaggerated the possible threat to Persian Gulf oilfields or to Pakistan posed by Soviet forces in Afghanistan, according to George F. Kennan in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Feb. 27. Mr. Kennan described as "an emeritus diplomatic specialist in Soviet American affairs," was once American ambassador to the Soviet Union.

In statements delivered last week, he called for the U.S. to stop playing the "China card," which is the real cause of Soviet action in Afghanistan; he also proposed that Jimmy Carter fire Zbigniew Brzezinski, the architect of the

policies that have led to Soviet military action.

Mr. Kennan also told the Senate committee Feb. 27 that the "overriding national interest" was to keep the "disturbed situation in western Asia" from degenerating into war with the Soviet Union. He called for "considerably more restraint in official public utterances" about military steps and the possibility of conflict.

There is "very small likelihood" that the Soviet Union intended to follow its move into Afghanistan with an attempt to seize the oilfields of the Persian Gulf.

Kennan was not only critical of the U.S. for attempting "too much" in the case of Afghanistan, but attacked the administration for doing too little to free American hostages in Iran. He proposed that the U.S. should have declared a state of war with Iran, interned Iranians in the United States and then offered Iranian internees in exchange for the hostages. Mr. Brzezinski has been behind a policy to actually ally with the Iranians against the Soviet Union.

"If we temporize too long," Kennan said, "our country's concern for their safety may be deprived of much of its meaning." He said that the longer the hostages are held the greater the risk they will suffer major psychological damage.

Kennan also attacked the press for its handling of Iran and Afghanistan. Officials and journalists were talking too much and unnecessarily about war and military buildups, he said. This sends "misleading signals" to Moscow, representing "conjuring up, by warnings or loose speculations, of dangers the reality of which has not been clearly demonstrated." He ascribed the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan to a desire to quell instability in an adjoining nation, and recommended against given military aid to Afghan rebels or engaging in other covert action in the region.

Briefly

● **HAROLD BROWN** admitted to the House Budget Committee members hearing his testimony on the defense budget that the U.S. was giving arms to rebels in Afghanistan. Brown insisted however that "it is the Soviet invasion, the Soviet involvement, the Soviet intervention that causes the deaths and the turmoil... There are Afghan insurgents, there are Afghan refugees who do go back and forth across the border and they may very well get arms from Pakistan." Those arms, in turn, are supplied to Pakistan by the United States.

● **FELIX ROHATYN**, the Lazard Freres banking executive who supervised the bankruptcy of New York City warned Feb. 28 that the nation's economy was headed for bankruptcy if it did not take such measures as a 12-month wage-price freeze and a Federal Budget cut of at least 20 percent. Rohatyn also called for a 50-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax, a "dialogue" with oil producers on "alternative means of payment" for oil, and a National Economic Commission representing all sectors of the nation to draft "an integrated economic strategy, both domestic and international".

● **SEN. LOWELL WEICKER** has questioned George Bush's competence to lead the nation in a time of crisis, according to a report in the Feb. 29 *Washington Post*. Weicker raised questions about the ethics of Bush's behavior during the Watergate affair, when he reports that the current presidential candidate, then Republican Party chariman, called him to inquire what to do with a list of financial contributors. Bush said "What do I do, burn them?" Weicker does not say that Bush acted illegally, but questions how he would handle himself when confronted with a potential public embarrassment.