



E. R. ZUMWALT, JR.
ADMIRAL, U. S. NAVY (RET.)

3 October 1988

Mr. John Dodge
Springfield, VA

Dear Mr. Dodge:

Sometime ago I agreed to provide you with a 1300 word article. I attach, herewith, one of about that length, authored by my son and me, entitled "Glasnost: Ninety Percent Submerged."

As you requested I also attach a photograph and biography.

Sincerely,


E. R. Zumwalt, Jr.

1500 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 841-8961

Enclosures

GLASNOST: NINETY PERCENT SUBMERGED

by

ADM Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr. (USN-Ret) and LTCOL J.G. Zumwalt (USMCR)

For several years now we have had an apparent thawing of tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union under the guise of "glasnost." But is the world a safer place today as a result of this new openness by the Kremlin leadership or, like the iceberg one encounters at sea, are we really just seeing the 10% of reality above the surface while the bulk of the reality lies beneath it, unobserved by the West? We fear the latter. Let us examine a few areas of concern.

Human Rights: With the emergence of Mikhail Gorbachev on the scene as Secretary General of the Soviet Union, we have seen a push to create the appearance of an improved policy towards human rights. The 10% reality about human rights under Mr. Gorbachev is that big name dissidents--the Sakharovs, the Scharanskys, etc.--have been freed. The 90% reality that goes unnoticed is that thousands of other dissidents, whose names are unknown to the Free World press, remain imprisoned without hope of reparation.

Afghanistan: The 10% reality about Afghanistan is that the Soviet Union did sign an agreement which obligates it to withdraw its forces from the country it invaded nine years ago this December. It was important for Gorbachev to reduce Soviet

involvement in the fighting for the war there was an obvious drain on the Kremlin's defense budget--but it was equally important for him to do so in a manner that would save face. The 90% reality that goes unnoticed now, however, is that the killing in Afghanistan will not end with the implementation of this agreement.

Mr. Gorbachev realized the freedom fighters--or Mujaheddin--who had been battling the Soviet and Afghanistan government forces successfully would undoubtedly soon decimate the Afghanistan troops left behind by the withdrawing Soviet forces. The Gorbachev face-saving strategy, therefore, is to allow the Mujaheddin only a partial success by leaving behind a partitioned nation--one divided along north/south lines much like we have seen in Korea and, initially at least, in Vietnam. The Kremlin leadership envisions the following course of action emerging in the months and years ahead:

a) The Mujaheddin--long denied outright victory over the combined Soviet and Afghan forces--will seek a final victory against the Communist Afghan government. The fighting that ensues as a result of the removal of the Soviet forces will, in the eyes of the Western media, lose its noble image as a war against an invader and, instead, take on the label of a "civil" war.

b) The Communist Afghan forces will fight a purely defensive action against the Mujaheddin who will, with time, grow in strength as the government forces deteriorate.

c) The government forces will withdraw to the north where

they will re-organize and establish a new capital at Mazar-e-Sdarif. Soviet troops will linger in the region for the specific purpose of assisting the Communist Afghan forces during this critical consolidation phase. Soviet air power, operating from within the Soviet Union, will provide overwhelming Russian air superiority. A stalemate will evolve with the Communist Afghan forces and their Soviet protectors firmly entrenched in the north and the Mujaheddin likewise entrenched in the south.

As a result of all this activity, the Kremlin will be able to accomplish most of what it was unable to do during nine years of protracted fighting--all under the guise of having worked out a peaceful resolution to the matter.

Arms Control: Under Mr. Gorbachev we have seen, with the recent signing of the INF treaty, Soviet acceptance, for the first time, of an arms control agreement that does what such agreements are suppose to do--reduce nuclear weapons arsenals on both sides. The 10% reality of this particular treaty is an impressive one--actual destruction by both superpowers of their medium range nuclear missiles. But the 90% reality that we fail to focus on is that complete destruction of these missiles, while it may reduce the chances of nuclear war, may well increase the chances of a conventional one. Such an outcome is likely unless NATO endeavors to build up the conventional strength necessary to deter Soviet aggression, which will become much more likely in the face of the current overwhelming conventional force superiority enjoyed by the Kremlin. For the INF missiles served as an effective deterrent to keep Soviet conventional forces in

check.

Of serious concern too is the fact that Moscow has violated virtually every arms control agreement it has ever signed. History strongly suggests such conduct will continue under the INF treaty as well. History also suggests when violations occur, the US will have little--if any--success in getting the Kremlin to correct the violation. The end result is a situation in which the US limits its ability to match Soviet advantages obtained in this manner as Washington follows a policy of unilateral compliance to the treaty terms. If the Soviets adhere to this tradition, the 90% reality of the INF treaty will be a far more dangerous world with such an agreement than without one.

Central America: Through successful propaganda campaigns and a continuous stream of military aid to the Nicaraguan government, the Soviets have helped stem the tide against the Contra freedom fighters--their most recent success coming in the form of Congressional failure to approve aid for the Contras. As a result of the stability the Kremlin has brought to the Marxist government there, Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega continues to export revolution throughout the region--most notably in El Salvador.

Senator William Armstrong (R-Colo) has recently issued a well documented analysis of the cynical use of promise after promise by the Marxist government to accomplish its objectives during its nine years in power. The Senator is critical of others who have deluded themselves over what exactly has been

going on in Nicaragua.

Nicaragua is the linchpin in the Kremlin's master plan for the Western hemisphere--with a beachhead established in that country, the Kremlin plans that revolution will continue to be spread closer and closer to the US border until a Communist government takes control in Mexico. The Kremlin believes that such an evolution would require that US troops patrol our border with Mexico which would, in turn, force the US to reduce its NATO commitment, thus leaving Western Europe in the position of having to appease Moscow.

This inventory of the realities of glasnost "beneath the surface" could be augmented by similar discussions about what is going on in other regions of the world. Ironically, the 90% reality about Mr. Gorbachev's new openness policy is that it is allowing the Kremlin stealthfully to achieve its goals of domination--all under the guise of improving relations with the West. The Soviet leader has heeded well the lessons of a predecessor, Leonid Brezhnev, who used a similar tactic--detente--to achieve significant gains vis-a-vis the US in the strategic balance of forces. Notwithstanding Gorbachev's recent shake-up of Party and Government leadership, we would do well this time around to wait for substantive changes to emerge from the depths of the Soviet system rather than simply to content ourselves with the superficial changes, easily seen, that have historically evolved.