

## Carter and Brzezinski's mad drive toward war

by Konstantin George

In a speech before the Philadelphia World Affairs Council May 9, President Carter announced, with insane disregard for the consequences, that the United States is committed to provoking a thermonuclear confrontation between the superpowers over the Persian Gulf.

Carter specifically enunciated this policy as the means of breaking the framework of Euro-Soviet economic collaboration established in the course of the last few years. And it is that collaboration which has spelled the difference between world peace and the outbreak of World War III.

In total disregard for the economic and trade revival policies embedded in the European Monetary System of the major European allies of the United States, Carter has issued an ultimatum to Europe to get in line with the United States behind a policy of confrontation and Nazi-like militarized economies. The text of that ultimatum reads as follows:

"The West must defend its strategic interests wherever they are threatened. ... There can be no business as usual in the face of aggression. The Soviets will not succeed in their efforts to divide the alliance or to lull us in the false belief that somehow Europe can be an island of detente while aggression is carried out elsewhere."

Carter's ultimatum was delivered just five days before the meetings of the NATO foreign and defense ministers in Brussels. On that date, May 14, the United States, as Defense Secretary Harold Brown and his deputy Robert Komer had already announced, demanded European compliance with new U.S. moves to intervene militarily into the Persian Gulf region.

Europe didn't exactly go along, but didn't reject the demands either. They tried to stall, in the main. A host of agreements on paper were reached in Brussels, but in particular, West Germany would not agree to any implication in the final communiqué that NATO could intervene in the Third World. Their troops, they said, are not leaving the continent (see International). But the Carter administration isn't finished, and the Soviet Union knows it. As Harold Brown, the U.S. defense secretary, expressed confidence that the "full program" of U.S. demands would eventually be implemented, Warsaw Pact communiqués spoke of a war in which "whole nations will burn."

### Warsaw pact warnings

May 14 was also the date of the Warsaw Pact Summit, one group of heads of state who have not and will not "play the game" according to the psychotic rules of the Carter crowd. Two weeks ago, the Soviet Union directly intervened to tell the United States to get its military forces out of Iran. This intervention swiftly aborted Carter's planned military action in Iran, which could have pushed the world over the brink of war.

Every governing elite in the Western world knows that to be the case. The Soviet Union has repeatedly *publicly* warned the Carter administration to reverse course before it's too late, as the following citations reveal:

- On May 8, Marshal Kulikov, Commander of the Warsaw Pact forces wrote in the East German newspaper *Neues Deutschland*, "American policy is reminiscent of

the pursuit of world domination by the German fascists. ... *At any moment various conflict situations could get out of control politically and lead to a major war.*" (emphasis added)

• On May 6, Radio Moscow described the Carter administration: "Insanity has become part and parcel of American policy ... the Iran raid was an action verging on madness ... so closely was the world brought to the brink of war."

The most chilling note of all is that the Warsaw Pact "brink of war" warnings cited occurred *before* Carter's Philadelphia speech.

### **Policy of provocation**

Carter's speech—a repeat performance of National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski's speech to the Baltimore World Affairs Council May 5—defines a confrontation course in language which supersedes even the height of the Cold War:

"Soviet aggression—unless checked—confronts all the world with the most serious long-term strategic challenge since the Cold War began...."

This was followed by the "extend NATO globally" demand of the "Carter Doctrine," announced on Jan. 23 and totally rejected by Western Europe at the time.

Carter's application of a policy of provocation for any and all "conflict areas" around the globe is no mere rhetoric. Beyond moving toward a confrontation in the Persian Gulf, the Carter administration is playing the China card to propel the Pacific Theater toward war. This month, China will conduct its first test of an ICBM. The Chinese defense minister will arrive in Washington on May 27 for three days of secret talks with Defense Secretary Harold Brown. The expected increase in the level of military technology assistance from the United States to China will push the Pacific situation even closer to the brink. Simultaneous with this "China card" lunacy, the Carter administration is upping its blackmail pressure on Japan to rearm and join in a de facto "U.S.-Japan-China" axis against the Soviet Union.

### **Orwellian newspeak**

If you depended for your news on any of the major newspapers in the United States, then you would not realize how close to war the Carter administration has pushed matters. As anyone familiar with the "standard" Orwellian controls governing the major U.S. media would expect, not only is there no mention of the Soviet warnings, but the Carter speech itself was blacked out of almost all the Saturday editions of the major metropolitan newspapers. Imagine John F. Kennedy's Cuban Missile Crisis speech going unreported and then learning days later that a nuclear showdown was already occurring.

The activities of the Carter administration and the

## ***'The Soviets have challenged our power'***

*The following excerpts are from a Baltimore Sun adaptation of National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski's May 5 inaugural address to the Baltimore Council on Foreign Relations*

On the one hand, the President has stressed the continuing importance of American power in a world of change. Without that power there is the genuine risk that global change would deteriorate into increasing fragmentation and anarchy to be exploited by our adversaries with the use of their power . . .

I submit to you that the last three years have seen continuity, consistency, and constancy in the effort to make America a positive force for stable change . . .

The President has felt from the very beginning that the use of American power is a means toward shaping a more secure, but also more decent world.

The second continuing goal of our foreign policy has been to improve our relations with the Third World, the world of new Asian and African and Latin American countries. . . . Today the United States has a healthier and better relationship with the new nations of these previously passive political entities.

Our third objective has been a substantive movement toward peace in the Middle East. We have done it because we feel that as a country we had a moral obligation to sustain and to insure the security of Israel. The consequence has been the first peace ever between Israel and an Arab country and the prospect eventually of a wider comprehensive treaty.

We have a strong view that in an age of change, credible American power is the source of assurance that global change will not be exploited by our adversaries to inimical ends. Today that problem, that challenge, is posed with special relief in Southwest Asia where, as the President said in his State of the Union message, the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan poses a potential threat to our long-range interests and to the interests of our friends in the Persian Gulf area.

This is why we have been gradually enhancing our capabilities there. This is why we have been engaging in consultations with our friends and allies on how best they can respond.

And finally our objective has been to sustain a stable and reciprocal detente with the Soviet Union

. . .

## 'Europe can't be an island of detente'

President Jimmy Carter made these comments to the World Affairs Council in Philadelphia on May 9, 1980.

Beyond the violence done to Afghanistan's independence and people, the Red Army troops consolidating their hold there are also taking positions from which Soviet imperialism could be extended more deeply and more dangerously in . . . this vital area.

This would threaten Pakistan and Iran, but not those nations alone. Soviet aggression in Afghanistan—unless checked—confronts all the world with the most serious long-term strategic challenge since the Cold War began. . . .

The Soviets must understand that they cannot recklessly threaten world peace—they cannot commit aggression—and still enjoy the benefits of cooperation . . .

We have not forgotten and will not forget the 53 Americans imprisoned in Iran.

We will continue to make every effort, using peaceful means if possible, and through collective action with our Allies, to obtain their release. . . .

Our first objectives—solidarity with our allies—is the touchstone of our foreign policy. Without such solidarity, the world economy and international politics will degenerate into disorder.

This is why we have led the North Atlantic Alliance in its program to upgrade its conventional forces. And last winter, in an historic decision, NATO agreed to strengthen its nuclear missiles in Europe

Since 1945, the United States has been committed to the defense of our hemisphere, and of Western Europe and then of the Far East. . . .

In recent years, it has become evident that the well-being of these vital regions depends on the peace, stability and independence of the Middle East and the Persian Gulf area. . . .

Let our position be absolutely clear: An attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force.

. . . The Soviets will not succeed in their efforts to divide the Alliance or to lull us into a false belief that somehow Europe can be an island of detente while aggression is carried on elsewhere.

total Orwellian controls placed on the news media both show that the ruling Anglo-American "Olympian Families" want to "have it both ways." These fools want to go for what they perceive to be a "managed confrontation" to break European resistance to Carter's fascist economic policy of giving free rein to looting both at home and in the Third World. But they also want to avoid the consequences of war that will sooner or later result from their "attaining their goals." This consensus shows and the events confirm that there exists now no point of even slight sanity within the Carter administration. Nothing could better illustrate this point than the fact that not one of the Anglo-American Olympians has yet publicly demanded the ouster of Carter and Brzezinski.

The full scope of the insanity gripping the administration is also carefully underplayed to lull the American population. The details of this level of insanity, once known, ought to produce a mass outrage sufficient to demand the immediate impeachment or resignation en masse of Carter and his policy-makers. To illustrate the depth of this lunacy, we quote the following news dispatch concerning the State Department and its new chief, Edmund Muskie.

### State Department 'consciousness raising'

"Secretary of State Edmund Muskie and his new colleagues at the State Department have had their first *consciousness-raising session*, discussing their likes and dislikes." Muskie then describes his favorite Secretary of State as Dean Acheson. Acheson's two notable claims to infamy were his setting up of the Korean War with his January 1950 speech ("Korea lies outside our defense perimeter") and his role in the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. At that time Acheson was the official U.S. liaison with Britain and shuttled between Washington and London to coordinate the crisis.

The UPI dispatch continues with Muskie speaking on foreign policy: "The United States must have a constructive presence in the world made up of an aggressive promotion of our ideas and values, an aggressive promotion of our interest in human rights, an aggressive promotion of our determination to deter aggression by every means available to a free people. And the best way to do this is to make the idea of freedom and liberty—associated with strength—live in this world."

George Orwell himself could not have crafted such Newspeak.

The continued existence of the Carter presidency is intolerable. It depends on European governments, the Soviets, and other forces to deliver a series of un concealable, humiliating shocks to the U.S. administration, to create an environment in which the Carter candidacy and presidency will collapse.