

# Carter Tries To Woo Peking Into Anti-Soviet Alliance

The barbarian President of the United States Jimmy Carter will send his envoy next month to the court of the Middle Kingdom in Peking and supplicate himself before the court in pursuit of an alliance with that heavenly body. That no doubt is how the Chinese are coming to view the now open efforts of the Carter Administration to "normalize relations" with Peking, abandoning helter-skelter all remaining U.S. relations and commitments to the Nationalist Chinese regime on Taiwan along the way.

A speech delivered June 29 by U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance in New York before John D. Rockefeller III's Asia Society announced the new Carter China policy. Vance, the envoy who will visit Peking August 22, declared that U.S. ties to China are "a central part of our foreign policy," he added, "Our policy toward China will continue to be guided by the principles of the Shanghai Communiqué, and on that basis we shall seek to move toward full normalization of relations. We acknowledge the view expressed in the Shanghai Communiqué that there is but one China. We also place importance on the peaceful settlement on the Taiwan question by the Chinese themselves."

The next day Carter himself reiterated the intention to dump Taiwan at his press conference. As a precedent he cited other nations who recognized Peking and maintain trade and other ties with Taiwan, like Japan — this of course conveniently ignoring the issue of U.S. military security ties with Taiwan that no other nation has.

## Opening Up The Second Front

The rapid reversal of the Carter Administration's previously cautious stance on this question is a direct product of its continuing foreign policy debacle in U.S. relations with the Soviet Union. The Soviets having called Carter's bluff on the attempt to force them into making major strategic concessions, Carter and his everpresent "advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski are opting for the even more provocative anti-Soviet policy of an alliance with Peking. The attempt, itself a rehash of Dr. Kissinger's old "Grand Alliance" strategy, is to create a de facto military axis in East Asia, including Japan — forming a much-vaunted "Second Front" (in addition to NATO) against the Soviets.

The war-provocation content of the Carter China policy is right out in the open. Last week *The New York Times* reported on a secret Presidential Policy Review Memorandum, prepared as part of the discussion on China and Vance's upcoming visit, which debates the question of selling arms and military-related technology to China.

As the *Times* and other journals have reported, debate is ongoing within the Administration on this issue, with State Department (and likely Pentagon) professionals opposing such a move because it would inalterably damage any hope for detente with the Soviet Union. On the other side are a ragtag bunch of National Security Council, CIA, Rand Corporation and other analysts who are pushing all out for such arms transfers, either directly or through Europe and Japan. It is known that James Schlesinger, who last year made a pilgrimage to China and fell in love with the Chinese Peoples Liberation Army, is in agreement with Zbigniew on this insane policy.

The idea of a military alliance with Peking is not new. Arms transfers have previously taken place under French, British and other auspices and, under Kissinger approval, the U.S. sale of technology such as computers which have military-related uses took place. Meanwhile a cabal of Rand Corporation specialists in Santa Monica, California has been pushing this insanity with great enthusiasm. It includes Michael Pillsbury, who more than a year ago floated this idea in the Brzezinski-run *Foreign Policy* and Richard Soloman, Kissinger's China specialist on the National Security Council and still NSC advisor.

## The Soviet Response

The "Second Front" should rank with the Maginot Line and the cruise missile as military, political and strategic disasters. The Soviet Union has made it completely clear during the past two months that any attempt to put such a military alliance with Peking together will be viewed in Moscow as a serious threat carrying the most dire consequences. On numerous occasions the USSR has also warned that those considering this option are being taken for a ride by the Chinese.

The Chinese government's intention, as it has made perfectly clear to all "barbarians," is to provoke a world war, destroying both the Soviet Union and the U.S., and leaving China and its many hundred millions relatively intact. The Soviet Union has pointed this out and asked whether those who supply arms to Peking, as Japan is considering doing, are sure those arms might not ultimately be used against the suppliers. While Vance declares that "China's role in maintaining world peace is vital," one can only wonder about what passes for sanity in the White House and its environs.

Even if the Chinese were willing to participate in an actual military front against the USSR, only the "cruising"

Whiz Kids of the Carter looney bin could view the Chinese military, even with more advanced technology from the U.S., as a credible threat to the Soviet Union forcing significant shifts in its military posture and deployment of forces. While James Schlesinger may be impressed with the "human waves" of the Peoples Liberation Army, there is no evidence the Soviets are. The only result of the Carter policy is to provoke the Soviet Union to hit *the United States*, out of its recognition that the U.S. is ruled by a bunch of maniacs who outstrip the Peking variety in their commitment to world conflagration.

## China Plays It Tough With Carter

So far the Chinese response to Carter has been to strengthen their hard line on the Taiwan issue. A current visitor to China, retired Admiral Elmo Zumwalt, another fan of the Chinese military, got this message in person from Chinese Vice-Premier Li Hsien-nien. Li told Zumwalt that the Chinese consider "their business" the question of how the Taiwan issue is settled, peacefully or forcefully. China would not accept any "preconditions" such as a guarantee of peaceful settlement, Zumwalt was told. His attempts to get the Chinese to soften this position, a concession the Carterites need to blunt U.S. opposition to the abandonment of Taiwan, were all rebuffed.

Li set out three conditions for normalization of relations: (1) severance of U.S. diplomatic ties to Taiwan, (2) removal of all U.S. military installations and troops from Taiwan, and (3) abrogation of the security and mutual defense treaty now existing between the U.S. and Taiwan.

There are reports that some of Li's conditions are already being met. The South Korean news agency Hapdong, in a dispatch from Tapei last week citing sources there, reports that the U.S. has already moved to dissolve its military command in Taiwan and its Military Advisory Group, and will shortly withdraw all supply depots. U.S. troop presence has already been drawn down to around 1,500 men, and these are slated to go soon.

Peking has been repeating its "no conditions" line for months now — especially on every occasion of contact with U.S. officials and political leaders. What now seems clear is that Carter and his advisors are ready to "go a long way," in the words of one China expert close to the Administration, to meet those demands. Leonard Woodcock, Carter's Ambassador to China, is about to depart for Peking and met July 7 with Carter, Vance and Brzezinski. Presumably his instructions on preparing for Vance's visit were gone over in detail.

## The Korea Policy

The commitment to the creation of a "Second Front" in East Asia is also the explanation for Administration policy toward Korea. The controversial policy of withdrawal of U.S. ground combat troops from South Korea can only be understood in this context. That policy has two interrelated objectives: First, it is the key to a "redeployment" of U.S. troops from that theater to the NATO front and their replacement with a revamped and re-armed Japan tied into a NATO-type structure

with the U.S. and in alliance with China. This composes the much-talked-about "Peking-Tokyo-Washington axis." Second, to clear the way for a U.S. deal with China on the Korean dispute in which China's position on the peninsula would be reinforced in order to keep Soviet influence out. The second aspect of the policy is what has made the government of South Korean President Pak Chung-hee an increasingly disposable "ally" for Carter.

The basis of Carter's Korea policy is made evident by several recent developments. In his Asia Society speech, Vance endorsed for the first time as policy the old Kissinger formula on Korea of a "four-power" agreement involving the two Koreas, China and the U.S. to replace the existing outdated armistice agreement reached at the end of the Korean War. From its inception under Kissinger, this formula was created to oppose an alternatively proposed "six-power" agreement in which the other two major powers concerned, the Soviet Union and Japan, would be involved from the start in guaranteeing a peaceful settlement and neutralization of the Korean dispute.

The aim of Kissinger and Vance is in the words of one East Asia expert, "to contain the Soviet Union." Just as Kissinger's Mideast diplomacy blocked a Geneva peace conference, the Soviets are to be kept out, while the U.S., with its buddy China, puts the region into place along "Second Front" lines.

Paralleling the Vance policy statement are covert moves by Carter to open up ties with North Korea. While the Administration consistently denies that contacts with North Korea have taken place, there is plenty of evidence to the contrary. One well-informed source reported the existence of direct communication between Jimmy Carter and Kim Il Sung, North Korea's undisputed leader, in which Carter opened up the prospect of better relations — none in fact exist — and avowed his good faith in withdrawing U.S. troops. In another case, widely reported in the Korean press, Assistant Secretary of State Holbrook, in a speech to magazine publishers and editors at the State Department, stated that: "The period of containment of Chinese communism, the period of opposition to *North Korean* and North Vietnamese efforts to expand their control, has clearly ended."

This surprising, and probably unintended, admission of U.S. openings toward North Korea is not unexpected. The South Koreans have suspected such activities for some time. Their reasoning, of course, is that North Korea, which leans toward Peking heavily in the Sino-Soviet dispute, will be a party to a deal with the U.S. which sacrifices South Korea on the altar of the alliance with Peking.

The inability of the Administration to admit the real rationale of their Korea policy is one explanation for their otherwise pitiful attempts to provide an explanation for why the troops are going out. On one occasion Holbrook appeared "off the record" before a Stanford Research Institute-sponsored symposium in Washington, D.C. on "Northeast Asian Security" and was bombarded with tough questions from a generally hostile audience of Koreans, Japanese, and Americans. Holbrook, by this writer's observation and that of others present, was totally incapable of providing a logical explanation for the policy, and reduced himself to saying things like:

"They (the troops) are no longer needed, so we're taking them out."

In this context it is usually said that China privately opposes U.S. troop withdrawal. This is usually cited by foolish U.S. conservatives as ammunition in opposing the Carter policy. In fact there is no evidence that this is the "real" Chinese position — especially if the U.S. withdrawal is part of an expanded, though not necessarily totally U.S. military front in East Asia.

The Chinese official opposition to a Korea deal is in fact a product of their Taiwan position. China will not be party to a four-power type agreement until Taiwan is settled, as that would set a bad precedent of accepting a divided Korea in some form while the "two Chinas" issue was still outstanding. Evidence that this is Chinese thinking can be found in a recent Peking *Peoples Daily* editorial on the anniversary of the Korean war. In the middle of the editorial's discussion of why Korea is one country and should be reunified, there is a paragraph (thrown in with no apparent reason) on Taiwan, the need to liberate it, and the existence of "one China."

Once Taiwan is dumped by Carter, the Chinese are free to complete the other part of the Second Front deal regarding Korea. More informed experts agree that the Chinese definitely want the U.S. troops out of Korea just as they continue to say publicly.

### The Redeployment Absurdity

On this basis the redeployment of U.S. ground troops from Korea makes sense as part and parcel of the Second Front strategy. For those who doubt this, we offer one last piece of evidence — culled from a recently released Congressional Budget Office (a Brookings Institute conduit) report on "Planning U.S. General Purpose Forces:

Forces Related to Asia." In the summary of the report the CBD puts forward this rationale and objective in redeployment of U.S. Forces from Asia to NATO:

The most demanding contingency against which U.S. general purpose forces, along with allied capabilities, are tested is a worldwide conventional war (sic) with the Soviet Union, centered in, but not limited to, the Western European-Atlantic theater. The planning for U.S. general purpose forces calls for them to be capable of dealing with not only that "major" war contingency but also with a "minor contingency" elsewhere.

The contingency of a major NATO-Warsaw Pact conflict has been treated in the public record in considerable detail by the Executive branch. In contrast no detailed rationale has been presented that attempts to derive much of the U.S. forward-force deployments in East Asia and the Western Pacific from threats and contingencies in that area.

That region could be a "second front" in a worldwide conventional conflict with the Soviet Union. Both the United States and the Soviet Union might hesitate to initiate hostilities in East Asia and the Western Pacific, but both might wish to "tie down" the other's forces in the region to constrain or prevent redeployment to the more demanding European-Atlantic conflict.

From this standpoint, the wizards of the CBO pose numerous options for "tying down" the Soviets while redeploying to Europe — such is the meandering nonsense from which "policy" is now being made.

## Military Coup Overthrows Bhutto In Pakistan

---

### PAKISTAN

---

The Pakistani military, led by army chief of staff Ziaul Haq, broke four months of national political and economic paralysis last week by removing Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's government from power. Haq carried out the bloodless coup d'etat and placed Bhutto and the opposition Pakistan National Alliance (PNA) leaders under "protective custody" at the point that both sides had given up hope that a civilian compromise on holding new elections could result from continued talks between them. In the hours before the coup, some PNA leaders, with close ties to the Carter Administration, announced their intention to take to the streets, to challenge the military to restore law and order by shooting civilians.

The ouster of Bhutto's six-year old government and the return of the military, classically the decisive political

force in Pakistan, represents a potential destabilization of a precarious balance of power and interests in both the Arab world and the Indian subcontinent. While the Carter Administration for months had picked up the PNA "human rights cause" in order to unseat Bhutto and bring in a cold-war military dictatorship in Pakistan, the Arab states, in particular Saudi Arabia, had worked with both Bhutto and the PNA to keep the civilian leaders in power. This effort became hopeless last weekend because of constant sabotage led by Air Marshal Asghar Khan, making military intervention a necessity. From that point, the issue was *how to prevent a pro-Carter coup* from destroying the fragile detente and development policies Bhutto had pursued toward neighboring countries.

Information out of Pakistan has been scarce since the coup, but there is speculation in many circles that Saudi Arabia may have played a role in bringing a moderate military faction to power temporarily, to preempt a bloodbath and a pro-U.S. military junta. Saudi King Khalid was the first foreign leader to communicate with