

***Izvestia*: Europeans On Safer Course Than Carter**

In an Aug. 26 article contrasting U.S. policy to that of key West European leaders, Izvestia's political commentator S. Kondrashov portrayed President Carter as a capitulator to, rather than an initiator of, antidétente moves. Kondrashov was formerly Izvestia's correspondent in Washington.

Kondrashov noted President Carter's restrictions on trade deals with the USSR, specifying the role played by Samuel Huntington, colleague of National Security advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, in getting them imposed. He continued:

In the case of the computer (whose sale to Moscow was banned by Carter — ed.), the Western European partners of the U.S. demonstrated a sensible approach, in refusing to follow the example of the U.S. President.

Of course the bases of their military-political alliance with the United States remain, but in foreign economic questions Western Europe is exhibiting increasing independence.... This is a case where it would be wrong to say that politics is politics and trade is trade. Yes, economic cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries has become a real and highly valued fruit for the Western European states. At the same time, this growing trade influences politics, and strengthens a more careful reaction than in the U.S. to the present and the future of détente. Western Europe does not want to repeat the American zigzags, which reflect both the fluctuations of the domestic political conjuncture in the U.S. and the inconsistency of the present Washington Administration's course....

The Ford Administration and later Carter tried to obtain a review of the (Jackson-Vanik) amendment in Congress, but not actively enough, for games with the devil of anti-Sovietism continued and even intensified in the White House itself.

3. China Seeks Allies Against Soviets

The leaders of the People's Republic of China are aggressively playing their part in the anti-Soviet gameplan, and many U.S. strategists of the Brzezinski factional stripe are pointing to the "Chinese card" as one guarantee of success for a U.S. confrontation course against the Soviet Union in the Middle East and globally.

What these strategic wizards have blinded themselves to is the stated goal of this Chinese policy: to provoke a thermonuclear war that will wipe out both "superpowers" and leave China ruling over the radioactive remains.

China's Hua Kuo-feng made the most demonstrative move against the Soviets with his tour last month of Romania, Yugoslavia, and Iran. The subversive, ultraprovocative purpose of Hua's trip to the two Eastern European countries was all too apparent. Part of a British-orchestrated gear-up toward large-scale destabilizations modeled on the 1956 Poznan and Budapest events, the Hua trip was openly intended to help saddle the Warsaw Pact with *casus belli* conditions. Only slightly less obvious was Hua's intent in Iran: to recruit that nation as an anchor in the Middle East Treaty Organization scheme publicly proposed by Zionist lobby leader Edgar Bronfman (for details, see the last issue of the *Executive Intelligence Review*). It is because Hua did not succeed that the Shah of Iran has been hit with massive destabilizations in retaliation.

The Brzezinski group's view is indicated by a recent *Christian Science Monitor* article by Joseph Harsch, which described the troika of NATO, China, and an

Iran-centered Mideast bloc as an unbeatable combination. The same lunatic "encirclement" strategy was expressed in an interview last week by strategist Marshall Goldman (see below). These and other public and private statements make it clear that the Brzezinski camp is fully committed to pursuit of an "encirclement" gameplan with China, together with the actual launching of Warsaw Pact member "defections" from the Soviet Union through a combination of insurrections and British-network coups in Eastern Europe.

What the Great Han chauvinists of China know, however, is that these policies mean inevitable thermonuclear war. In full accord with Chairman Hua's speech at the United Nations General Assembly last spring, the Chinese have once more restated — in even harsher terms — their perspective of a near-term U.S.-Soviet war, this time in the Aug. 11 issue of the *Peking Review*.

China's Plan for War

This article by Hsu Hsiang-chien, Defense Minister of the People's Republic of China, appeared in the Aug. 11 issue of the Peking Review.

... The Soviet revisionists babble that "detente is of a stable and irreversible nature" and that "conditions are now available to rule out the inevitability of war"...

The views of Marxists are diametrically opposed to this. In our opinion . . . war is a continuation of politics

and hence of peace. A new world war can only be postponed but not averted. . . .

Like untamed horses running amok, the Soviet new tsars are making every effort to step up arms expansion and war preparations. Someday their hands will itch and trigger off a war. This is something independent of man's will. . . .

. . . the Kremlin is stretching its tentacles farther and farther and has become a much more dangerous source of a world war than the United States.

So with a view to putting off the outbreak of war, we must work together with the people of the world to disrupt the worldwide strategic deployment of the two hegemonic powers and that of the Soviet Union in particular. Wherever the Soviet Union stirs up trouble, we support the people there in waging a resolute struggle against it. . . .

If social-imperialism and imperialism should impose a new world war on the people of the world, they will certainly arouse the world's people to rise in revolution. The result will be the inevitable doom of social imperialism and imperialism and worldwide victory for socialism and communism.

The Brzezinski Faction's View

This assessment of Chinese-U.S. relations was offered to the Executive Intelligence Review by Harvard think-tanker Marshall I. Goldman, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the American Jewish Congress. Goldman, who spent much of last year in the Soviet Union, and has just returned from a tour of China, has had many meetings with the top leaders of both nations. His remarks typify the mind-set of the Brzezinski camp.

I have concluded from my Asian tour that the Chinese card is far more advanced than anyone realizes. Because of that, I'm not at all worried over Soviet intervention in the Middle East. It will never happen. They are too tied up by the Chinese.

When I say Chinese, I mean Chinese operations, most definitely including the Hua tour of Romania and Yugoslavia. The Hua trip was the spearhead of efforts to expand Chinese influence in Eastern Europe. The Soviet Union fears China and Chinese influence in the bloc. The Soviet Union will not intervene in the Middle East. If the Soviet Union goes in, the Chinese will too. The Soviet Union won't be thrilled about that.

What you say about the threat of destabilization in Eastern Europe is fully coherent. Massive Chinese initiatives have been taken everywhere, everywhere the Soviet Union has, or has had, influence, including Eastern Europe. The Chinese are moving everywhere to counter Soviet influence.

Wherever the Soviets move, they run into China. They won't move into the Middle East, no matter what.

On Aug. 31 the Washington Post touted the use of the "China card" in an editorial titled "Treading Water on Vietnam."

. . . Vietnam, having moved swiftly (and rashly) from war with neighboring Cambodia to dangerous friction with Cambodia's powerful patrons in Peking, finds Soviet support ardent but inadequate and hopes that the United States can plug the gap . . . the Vietnamese need the sort of large-scale cooperation in reconstruction and development that the United States can best provide . . .

Yet the Carter Administration, which came to office promising early reconciliation with Vietnam is holding back . . . The substantive consideration is that it would complicate American relations with China.

. . . China's opening to Washington came under review in the struggle over (Mao's) succession. But during the summer the Chinese apparently decided to press the opening with a vengeance . . . Alert American diplomacy represented by Zbigniew Brzezinski in his trip to Peking last May, may also have played a role.

Certainly China needed no urging to rally other nations to stand up to the Kremlin . . . Party Chairman Hua Kuo-feng has demonstratively circled the Soviet frontier . . .

We do not happen to think the administration has gone too far with China. What is beyond cavil, though, is that the United States has no interests in Hanoi even faintly of an order with those it has in Peking.

On Sept. 3 the Baltimore Sun ran this analysis of China's diplomacy by Michael Parks.

China's views are listened to with new respect . . . including Washington, and increasingly it seems to be perceived — except by the Soviet Union and Vietnam — as a major force for peace and stability in the world.

This new status was strengthened by the unprecedented two-week trip of Chairman Hua Kuo-feng, the Chinese leader, to Iran, Romania and Yugoslavia last month, and the official news agency, Hsinhua, was able to hail it as a 'tremendous contribution to the enhancement of friendship between the Chinese people and the people of the whole world.'

But China's campaign is also injecting the bitter Sino-Soviet feud as a new and potentially disruptive element into many international questions, some for the first time.

Nations in the Middle East, Africa and Latin America, as well as Eastern Europe and Southeast Asia, soon may find themselves parties to that dispute as Peking and Moscow vie for allies. The Soviet leadership warned the United States last week that any American attempt to play "the China card" would effect their relations, including new arms-limitation agreements. . . .

Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Carter's national security adviser, visited Peking, and two Cabinet

members, James R. Schlesinger and Bob S. Bergland, are scheduled to go shortly. The United States helped on breaking the deadlock in the long-stalled Sino-Japanese treaty negotiations, according to diplomats involved, and Peking has been told the Carter administration will move early next year on Sino-American relations. . . .

The unpredictable character of Peking's rivalry with Moscow and now Hanoi could upset China's

recent gains and block future goals, according to a number of Asian and Western analysts.

"China miscalculated the effects of its policies with Vietnam for the result is the opposite of what Peking wanted — Hanoi has drawn much, much closer to Moscow as a result of China's hostility," an Asian diplomat commented, "This raises the very serious question of how carefully other policies have been plotted and their impact weighed"

What Is A 'Christian Science Monitor'?

Since striking pressmen shut down New York City's three major dailies last month a number of newspapers, ranging from the so-called interim strike papers through the Reverend Sun Myung Moon's *News World*, have proliferated on the city's newsstands. Among these, the *Christian Science Monitor* has risen to the challenge posed by the absence of London's usual conduits, Rupert Murdoch's *New York Post* and the Sulzberger family's *New York Times*, by increasing its circulation, diverting its normal distribution, and broadening its coverage.

The *Monitor* is now the primary source of press attacks on President Carter, repeating the same stale story day after day under slightly varying headlines — e.g., "A one-term presidency?" (Aug. 29) or "30 days that may make or break Carter" (Sept. 5) — despite the fact that no real news developments have occurred.

Jokingly referred to in policy-making circles skeptical of the Brzezinski-Schlesinger "China Card" option as the *Chinese Science Monitor*, the newspaper has doubly earned this epithet for its reporting on Chairman Hua Kuo-feng's just-concluded trip to Iran, Yugoslavia and Romania. Publicizing (anonymously) Brzezinski's own assessment of Hua's trip on the USSR (as the national security advisor communicated it to Carter shortly before the convening of Camp David), the *Monitor* portrayed it as a devastating setback for Soviet influence. "Soviets fume over Hua but unable to act," proclaimed David Willis in the *Monitor's* Aug. 29 issue. "Hua visit spotlights Iran's key role; China's latest satisfactions include ballistic advances and Kremlin setbacks; Iran promises further rewards," the paper crowed the next day. By Sept. 6, the *Monitor* was reporting that "China counts Hua's trip a huge success" because "it has got Moscow genuinely worried and considerably agitated."

Attempting to build a steamroller effect on behalf of this Brzezinski-Schlesinger fantasy, the *Monitor*

leaked Aug. 28 that the President had such an option under consideration. But the bulk of this report was devoted to publicizing a proposal for a Mideast Treaty Organization (METO), an anti-Soviet alliance among Israel and the moderate Arab nations, first put out by Zionist lobby bigwig Edgar Bronfman and fully supported by Brzezinski and Henry Kissinger.

The *Monitor*, established in 1908 by Mary Baker Eddy, founder of Christian Science, an synthetic religious cult loosely linked to the British-fostered "spiritualism" and "theosophy" movements which flourished at the turn of the century. Christian Science opposes doctors, medicine and hospitals even in life-and-death situations.

The *Monitor* itself was a project of the British Round Table which designated it as one of its chief propaganda conduits in the United States. Lord Lothian, an active Christian Scientist and original organizer of the Round Table, wrote extensively for the *Monitor* and reorganized its editorial board several times during his tenure as Britain's Ambassador to the U.S. (1925-39). Lord Lothian died because he refused to see a doctor.

Other prominent Christian Scientists have included Lady Nancy Astor, an American expatriate who became the doyenne of the pro-Hitler "Cliveden Set" in England; Lord Brand, managing director of Lazard Freres; Kissinger controller Fritz Kraemer; and Senator Charles Percy.

The *Monitor's* former editor, Erwin Canham, was a Rhodes scholar, a member of the Order of the British Empire and of the Order of Orange-Nassau. He was also the American correspondent for the Round Table's official journal. His present successor, John Hughes, was born and educated in Britain.

Little wonder that a spokesman for the newspaper proudly told a reporter recently: "The *Monitor* has always been the most Anglophile newspaper in the United States."

—Kathleen Murphy