

conference where "all aspects of the Eastern threat are analyzed, forward policy is coordinated, and joint defense measures against terrorism and subversion are agreed upon.

*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* Dec. 28—In reporting the competing Central Intelligence Agency evaluations of Soviet strategy, Jan Reifenberg writes that "Just as in 1960, when the fight over the 'missile gap' introduced a basic change in U.S. strategy, so these days Carter's judgment of the background of Soviet rearmament can decisively shift the essence of U.S. defense policy. The burned children of 1960—who following Kennedy's takeover found out that the 'missile gap' was a fantasy—will be in power again in January." A "powerful group of hawks," including Schlesinger, Nitze, and Jackson, are trying to influence Carter. Since people like Nitze doubt whether it is possible to reach a new SALT agreement, the question is coming up whether the U.S. President alone should make the final decision on the launching of nuclear weapons.

### London Times Questions Times' Motives

In a Dec. 29 article, London Times Washington correspondent Fred Emery questioned the motivation behind a report "leaked" in the New York Times on Sunday, Dec. 26 that the U.S. intelligence had been won over by "outsiders" to the view that the Soviet Union is seeking immediate military superiority. "The fact that the top secret so-called 'national estimate' of Soviet objectives has reached the New York Times in such a timely fashion," writes Emery, "has raised suggestions here today that the defence hardliners wanted deliberately to ensure as much exposure as possible before the new man took office." This switch in thinking is likely to "precipitate political controversy" and is obviously "the stuff of fierce debate," notes Emery. He sees the key item of contention as the report's conclusion that the Soviets are bent on disrupting fuel and raw materials supplies and on developing first strike capabilities. The newspaper quotes Carter's designated Secretary of Defense Harold Brown as saying in an interview with the Los Angeles Times that "the belief on either side that you can survive a strategic thermonuclear war as a going society—when you cannot—is the worst possible situation for the world to be in."

### London Times Scoffs At Carter's Summitry Attempt

Carter's announcement that he will meet with Brezhnev next year should be greeted with "mixed

feelings" writes the London Times in a lead editorial Dec. 29. Mutual distrust between the Soviet Union and the United States "is not going to be removed by handshakes and reassuring words" and even agreement on strategic weapons such as SALT should not be seen as the "end all" of relations between the superpowers, says the editorial. "Their military significance is strictly limited and they become politically significant only if they fit into other arrangements that lower the level of confrontation or lessen the danger of conflict." Carter of course "can make progress. . . but there is something a little dispiriting about his way of starting." A man-to-man summit is a "familiar routine" which can not really resolve any fundamental differences. Carter "would probably have been wiser to say cautiously that he would be happy to meet Mr. Brezhnev as soon as he was convinced that serious business required the personal attention of both men.

### Venezuela's *El Nacional*:

#### Jimmy Carter: Portrait of a Robot

. . . This Mr. Carter has a marked vocation for order, discipline and method. . . .

However, being a formidable organizer may help win elections, but I am afraid it does very little for running the United States. We are in the presence of a great executive. . . . But he is not a statesman.

. . . His total lack of humanist education is frightening. He is a reader of briefs and memoranda. . . .

What would this technocrat do when confronted with international crises of the calibre of those of Berlin (1948), the Suez (1956), the Bay of Pigs (1961), or the Missile Crisis (1962)? I suspect that Jimmy Carter, given his psychological makeup, would get along better with the hawks than with the doves. The language of military officers must be more familiar to him than that of politicians.

He will surround himself with technicians, with specialists incapable of thinking in abstractions, with men who have quick answers for extremely complex problems. If this hypothesis is correct, I believe that Mr. Carter's finger will be closer to the trigger than that of Mr. Ford. . . .

Then, supposedly, there is the religious theme. Carter is a believer, but that doesn't change anything. Truman was perhaps the most religious of all American presidents and he did not hesitate to inaugurate nuclear war. Mr. Carter is no monk. . . . His Christianity will be no obstacle in adopting aggressive attitudes.