

# Whose goose is Ceausescu cooking?

Top NATO leaders convened Nov. 25 in Lisbon to plan "the evolution of dissidence among Warsaw Pact members" and "the defense of human rights and the tension between East and West in view of human rights," the Portuguese daily *Express* revealed this week.

As this meeting began, the story broke in the international press of disagreements at the Nov. 22-23 Warsaw Pact head-of-state level consultation. Returning from this meeting, Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu made world headlines for his refusal to condemn the Camp David accords and the nation that Britain fervently advocates arming — the People's Republic of China. Ceausescu has also declared his dissidence within the Warsaw Pact by announcing Romania's refusal to ever obey an order from a "foreign" commander.

To whose benefit is this escalation of southern European and Balkan tension? Last week's failed push by the British in NATO for a pro-NATO coup in Spain provides a lead. That country was not jolted out of its support for the new European Monetary System. The growing, openly stated "Atlantic to the Urals vista" of Soviet-European cooperation for the new world monetary system is horrifying the British, as their press reports.

Last week alone, Soviet President Brezhnev's policy commitment to continentwide economic and political detente was reflected in several Politburo appointments and demotions as well as in the Final Declaration of the Warsaw Pact. This declaration called for the development of nuclear energy in conjunction with key disarmament measures. The call for nuclear energy cooperation on a worldwide basis, made frequently by the Soviets, has been accompanied recently by direct offers to the U.S. for increased trade. The Soviet commitment to draw the U.S.

into the EMS as a vehicle for these objectives is indicated most recently in their public support for EMS-initiators West Germany and France.

In 1968, a similar scale of cooperation between President Brezhnev and French President Charles DeGaulle led to the deployment of Zbigniew Brzezinski against Czechoslovakia, the "Prague Spring." Only this summer, Brzezinski confided to high-level sources that he still considers the "dissident card" his ace-in-the-hole against the Warsaw Pact. (This is no doubt the origin of exmental patient Vladimir Bukovsky's recent London protests equating, as Hitler did, "human rights" with "nationalities' rights.") The British press is hopefully egging on a "Bucharest Winter." The London *Guardian* claimed Nov. 30 that Moscow is faced with a "Prague Spring" every 10 years, and this year it will be in Romania!

Ceausescu's refusal to join the Warsaw Pact condemnation of Camp David — the "Munich Pact" as these nations have called it — is not a mystery. The British-deployed Israeli intelligence services have maintained this separate diplomacy as an option of Mideast destabilization since the Kissinger "shuttle diplomacy" ended. But has the Mossad promised to put Ceausescu under the nuclear umbrella Israel gained through espionage against the United States in return for his public support?

Despite press predictions that Warsaw Pact troops will soon be marching into the Romanian capital, the Kremlin is actually carrying out a policy of "restraint within and with reason." The Soviet leadership has chosen to garner support for its economic development-centered detente policy by appealing to appropriate sources. Thus, this year's Warsaw Pact Final Declaration included in

it for the first time a call for ecumenical cooperation amongst "socialists, social democrats, Christian democrats, and religious organizations." At the same time, Pope John Paul II has moved to head off possible Brzezinski-type destabilizations in Poland by praising the atmosphere of growth provided for the Catholic Church in his home country.

---

## No limit on insanity

In the Nov. 29 *New York Times* Richard Burt reported that the U.S. "is moving toward a vast revision of its strategy on nuclear warfare."

Burt, who served as the assistant director to London's International Institute of Strategic Studies, wrote that National Security Director Zbigniew Brzezinski was clearly coming to dominate the Defense Department and the Carter Administration on such strategic questions. "Aides in the Defense Department and National Security Council, see 'a revolution' in nuclear strategy," wrote Burt. "The purpose of their initiatives is to give the United States an enhanced ability to wage a limited nuclear conflict."

This is the wildest insanity — to be specific, London's insanity. While the IISS seeks to convince the U.S. to face off against the Soviets in a "limited war" showdown, the Soviets are saying again and again that if there is war, it will be all-out war — thermonuclear world war.

Moreover, Burt's hopes for a strategic U.S. shift to mass suicide were dampened when, at his Nov. 30 press conference, President Carter disavowed the limited nuclear war concept. Asked by a reporter about the strategy shift Carter replied there "was no change in our basic policy of deterrence."