

“European Community leaders have sent him (Carter) a message warning that he may be seriously endangering détente by the way he has been dealing with the Soviet Union....Washington’s most serious problem is with its strongest ally, West Germany.”

“U.S.-Soviet relations are at their lowest point in years....The Administration, says veteran Kremlin-watcher George Kennan, ‘made just about every mistake it could make in these Moscow talks and has defied all the lessons we have learned in dealing with the Soviets since the last World War’.”

“Warns Ian Smart, director of studies at London’s Royal Institute of International Affairs: ‘There is a pronounced inclination for Europeans to interpret Carter’s mistakes as inadvertent. Thus there is a potential credit balance for him to exploit. But there is also a limit to it’.”

“Observes an Asia-based senior U.S. diplomat: ‘The U.S keeps saying, ‘We’ll live up to our commitments. We’re an Asian power.’ A lot of Asians are now saying, ‘If you mean it, why the hell are you pulling your troops out of South Korea?’”

Harvard’s John K. Fairbank, the doyen of U.S. China scholars, charges: ‘We don’t have a China policy...One of these days we may be asking, What the hell hit us? We could be in for some unpleasant surprises’.”

Observes Pierre Hassner, senior research associate at Paris’ Centre d’Étude des Relations Internationales: ‘The Carter Administration started shooting in every direction at once without having really sorted out their priorities. They put too much stress on big principles and not enough on actual bargaining. They have some grand view of how the world should look, but they don’t have intermediate priorities’.”

Notes former senior U.S. diplomat George Ball: ‘I think the Administration is pursuing the human rights business without fully taking all implications into account. To some extent it’s become a stuck needle, getting in the way of a lot of things which might be more important in the long term’.”

*Time* magazine adds in conclusion:

“Perhaps the world, given the pull of American power no matter who is President, may yet accommodate itself to Jimmy Carter. But Carter will also have to accommodate himself to the world.”

## Kissinger Sets Up Brzezinski By Calculated Leak, Setting Off Storm of Protest

An Aug. 3 article by syndicated columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak reporting that the U.S. would concede the loss of one-third of West Germany to the USSR in the event of war has touched off a storm of protest in the U.S. and Europe, and prompted senior Administration officials to frantically deny the contents of the column. According to the columnists, who are generally known to be mouthpieces for former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, Carter’s national security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski personally endorsed ceding West German territory to the Soviet Union at meetings of the National Security Council’s Senior Coordinating Council called on July 28 and 29 to discuss PRM-10, the Administration’s overall strategic policy review prepared by the NSC. At the meetings, Brzezinski allegedly argued that given the “current political climate,” the Administration would be unable to mobilize sufficient NATO conventional forces in Europe to keep Warsaw Pact invaders out of Central Europe, and should therefore adopt the fallback position of allowing the Soviets to occupy West Germany.

The Kissinger-inspired column has unleashed a sharp attack against Brzezinski in the West German press and the U.S. Congress. The Aug. 4 *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, a West German daily, decries Brzezinski’s policy and speculates that the Evans and Novak “leak” was designed as a personal attack on Carter’s national security adviser. The same day, Senate Minority Leader Howard Baker (R-Tenn) introduced the Evans and Novak piece into the Congressional Record, declaring that Brzezinski’s was an “intolerable policy” which was

“alienating our allies.” Capitol Hill sources meanwhile reported that House Armed Services Committee conservatives are preparing a major attack against Brzezinski and his entire strategic policy. A close Kissinger associate currently in residence at Georgetown’s Center for Strategic and International Studies simultaneously told a reporter, “If you have any criticisms of Brzezinski, get them to me and I’ll shoot them right up to Henry.”

The two-continent outcry against Brzezinski forced desperate White House and NSC spokesman to castigate the Evans and Novak report, without being able to categorically deny the statements attributed to Brzezinski. While avoiding a direct denial of Brzezinski’s

### Tass Declines U.S. Offer Of BRD Territory

In a swift response to Zbigniew Brzezinski’s offer to “surrender” one third of West German territory to the Soviet Union in the event of war in Europe, the Soviet news agency Tass observed that the U.S. has promised to donate a country it does not own in the first place. “What generosity!” exclaimed Tass. The USSR has plenty of land already, Tass explained, and “does not need more from anybody else.”

Tass attributed this and other features of Brzezinski’s Presidential Review Memorandum-10 to the twisted fantasies of the document’s authors.

alleged statements, White House press secretary Jody Powell described the report as another "in a series of 'Oh my God, they're caving into the Commies' column. Under questioning from reporters, Powell attempted to use the "leak" to blackmail West Germany into increasing its own defense contributions to NATO by saying, "It is our policy to regain any territory... However, it is important for NATO to take certain steps to maintain that ability."

NSC press spokesman Jerrold Schechter said the statements attributed to Brzezinski were "partial, inaccurate and deal only with one aspect of the overall defense strategy that might be applied in the event of an attack on Western Europe."

Defense Secretary Harold Brown tried to reassure the Senate Armed Services Committee that U.S. policy is still to contain any Soviet attack near the West German border. "I do not advocate and will not support a policy which called for the United States to accept a loss or defeat in Europe," Brown said Aug. 3.

### Excerpts from Aug. 3 Rowland Evans And Robert Novak Article

President Carter late this week will be presented by his national security advisers with a new defense strategy that secretly concedes one-third of West Germany to a Soviet invasion rather than seek increased defense spending, which these advisers say would provoke Moscow and divide Washington.

PRM-10, the Carter Administration's top-secret strategic study, suggested that this policy could be made palatable to Western Europe by simply not admitting its implications. This course was wholly adopted in high-level meetings July 28 and 29 by Zbigniew Brzezinski, the

President's national security adviser...

According to verbatim notes taken by one of the participants, Brzezinski declared: "It is not possible in the current political environment to gain support in the United States for procurement of the conventional forces required to assure that NATO could maintain territorial integrity if deterrence fails. Therefore, we should adopt a 'stalemate' strategy. That is, a strategy of falling back and leaving the Soviets to face the political consequences of their aggression..."

There was no dissent from those present, including Vice President Mondale, CIA Director Stanfield Turner, Chief Disarmament Negotiator Paul Warnke, Deputy Defense Secretary Charles Duncan and Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman General George Brown.

Brzezinski continued: "We agree there must be a gap between our declared strategy and actual capability. We cannot for political reasons announce our strategy." Again, there was no dissent, though some officials voiced the opinion there would be hell to pay if the Germans learned what was happening.

All this follows the script of the June 20 draft of PRM-10, which lists four options... Each would stop a Soviet offensive at a line formed by the Weser and Lech Rivers, surrendering about one-third of West Germany (including Saxony and most of Bavaria).

These four options, according to PRM-10, do not "plan" to stop "a determined Warsaw Pact conventional attack... If the Soviets persist in their attack, a U.S.-NATO conventional defeat in Central Europe is likely"...

Many of the adverse political implications... of the options... probably could be avoided if the U.S. continued to publicly support present strategy. Adverse reactions by Western Europe could be significantly softened... if the U.S. were to avoid any statements to the effect that a loss of NATO territory would be acceptable.

## Will Congress Use Maritime Scandal For Cartergate

The Republican national leadership announced last week that they are going to use the developing scandal surrounding suspicious payments by maritime interests to the Carter campaign to begin "Cartergate" investigations of the President and his Administration. Charging that the scandal is "more damaging and explosive than the Nixon milk payoff charges," Senate Minority leader Howard Baker, House Minority leader John Rhodes and Republican National Committee Chairman William Brock told a press conference Aug. 1 that there is now sufficient evidence of Administration criminal activity to warrant a Congressional investigation.

The key issue in the scandal is that President Carter's personal actions in the affair prove conclusively that his strident demands for U.S. "energy independence" are a fraud designed only to cover for the Rockefeller interests' drive to bust up OPEC and loot their petrodollar reserves to keep the New York banks afloat. Carter, in

maritime interests, has supported the Cargo Equity Bill, which would require nearly ten percent of U.S. oil imports to be shipped in American flag ships by 1982. The mandatory flag preference provision would *raise the cost of oil by \$2 billion.*

Although the Republican Party leaders pointed out this fact at their press conference, it remains to be seen whether they will use the threat of an investigation merely as a "bargaining chip," or fully exploit the issue to turn around the current Congressional capitulation on the Administration's industry-killing energy program. Amid much anti-administration talk last week — including a filibuster which successfully forced Carter to withdraw his bill to allow the Federal Election Commission to expand its power to harass political candidates on Carter's "enemies lists" — Congress okayed the pro-