

don't want." Their argument is in effect: "We've tried the Russell arms control approach; we've supported Robert McNamara's 'cost-effectiveness' degrading of U.S. military capabilities; but there is no proof that Fabianism is triumphing in the U.S.S.R. Therefore, we must now save our position by appropriating military technologies for ourselves while continuing our New Dark Age drive full speed ahead around the globe. But, no more arms control appeasement, please."

The technology question is just one of the key issues in what is an *internal liberal* debate within the Anglo-American establishment breaking down now into pro- and anti-SALT camps. But it is the technology question that gets to the heart of the matter and serves to demonstrate that there is no disagreement *in principle* between what are in fact *complementary* "pro-" and "anti-"SALT factions. Once this is grasped, it becomes obvious that the present debate over the ratification of the SALT treaty is a dangerous fraud, a game rigged by the British oligarchy through the Council on Foreign Relations.

Senators Jake Garn, Barry Goldwater, Jesse Helms, et al. are foolishly conforming to their anticommunist, cold-war bullet-head profile, while George McGovern, Adlai Stevenson and others act out their pacifist, antimilitary profile—both duped groups simply playing into the CFR's hands with their anti-SALT postures.

So Cyrus Vance, a representative of the CFR-British Ditchley Foundation, organizes his "pro-SALT" Dr. Jekylls, while CFR General Alexander Haig moves out front mobilizing the Mr. Hydes of the American branch of the Queen's inner elite at the American Security Council (ASC) and the Committee on the Present Danger to lead the "anti-SALT" campaign throughout the country. If conditions demand, the CFR scenario calls for the "Jekylls" to turn into "Hydes" at moment's notice and follow Haig on his white horse on a hypothesized ride into the White House, as the CFR flips into its "no SALT" policy mode, the "fantastic situation" unfolds, and the CFR opts for nuclear confrontation with the U.S.S.R.

CFR against détente

SALT or no SALT, for the CFR *détente is over*. This point was driven home recently by a pro-SALT Senator who remarked that Carter administration policy was "SALT without détente" (the complement of Haig's "no SALT, no détente" line). In fact, under the banner headline "SALT hearings underway," the Rothschild-Meyer family controlled *Washington Post* openly boasted July 10: "In their joint appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the two secretaries Vance and Brown never mentioned détente with the Soviet Union, nor did they predict any secondary benefits in improved Soviet-American relations if SALT were ap-

Gromyko warns amendments

The following statements are excerpted from the press conference of Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko on the subject of SALT.

The process of finding an appropriate compromise, a balance of interests, was very difficult. But finally the sides reached what is called an acceptable balance of interests. Perhaps at first glance it is not a very clear formula, but it clearly and precisely expresses the situation....

It may be asked: good—the SALT II treaty is signed and there is an agreement on holding talks on the possibility of concluding a new treaty; but how do things stand with the arms race? Does the treaty now signed put an end to the arms race? I must say definitively: no, it does not. First of all, if only because it covers only strategic arms, while it is well known that there also exist other types of weapons.... Furthermore, every rational person who looks at the world situation, sees indicators of the arms race like military budgets. Are they being reduced? Unfortunately not.

Q: *If the American Senate does not ratify the treaty, do you consider it possible to renew the talks in order to revise the treaty? What will happen if the treaty is not ratified?*

Gromyko: The possibility of renewing the negotiations is excluded. If the treaty is not ratified, the situation will be difficult. There will not be the restraint and limitation of the strategic arms race provided for by the treaty, and the bridges leading from the second treaty ... to the third treaty will be destroyed.

Those who have not decided their position as well as those who have decided in the wrong direction ought to think about that.

Q: *If the Senate makes some amendments to this treaty, will you agree to discuss them? With what amendments could you agree?*

Gromyko: I will say frankly that it would be impossible to reopen the negotiations. This would put an end to negotiations. Regardless of what amendments were made, it would be impossible to renew the negotiations. The situation created would be incredible....

Q: *Could you expand in more detail on the basic lines the SALT III negotiations will take?*

will kill SALT treaty

Gromyko: I must say that there was not a detailed discussion of the SALT III negotiations (at the Vienna summit). Therefore, were I to go into detail, this would be a presentation of the Soviet position or something close to the Soviet position. Only the most basic lines of the future talks were mentioned. But I would like to draw your attention to several aspects.

Success in the coming talks on concluding a third strategic arms limitation treaty is possible only if all the factors which influence the world strategic situation, including in Europe, are taken into account. To interpret this and switch from algebraic into more simple language, it can be put as follows: success is possible only if the talks include discussion of the American forward-based systems, that is, the American military bases, of which there are plenty both in Europe and outside of Europe, and which have, as is well known, a military-strategic orientation vis-à-vis the Soviet Union. The American side knows this well.

... There are other international questions currently under discussion....

The situation in the Middle East was also discussed in Vienna.... In short, the positions of the Soviet Union and the U.S. are different on this. The American side tried to argue that the Soviet Union would do better to support the separate treaty between Egypt and Israel and act so that the United Nations would adhere to that treaty in one way or another....

It goes without saying that the Soviet Union could not agree with a such a point of view. L.I. Brezhnev ... stated clearly that there would be no question of the Soviet Union supporting the anti-Arab treaty and any mechanism created for the purpose of discussing that treaty. We had the impression that President J. Carter did not expect a different answer from the USSR.

The principled position of the Soviet Union on Middle Eastern matters remains what was formulated many years ago. This is that all the lands seized by Israel from the Arabs ought to be returned; the Arab people of Palestine ought to be able to create their own—even small—-independent state. This is not difficult to do. History knows many analogous but more difficult problems that were solved.

All the countries of that region, including Israel—and here there can be no doubt on anyone's part—should have the chance to exist and develop as independent sovereign states in the Middle East.

proved." The decision by the Carter administration to extend most-favored-nation trade status to China but *not* to the U.S.S.R. is further confirmation of this policy.

As seen through the eyes of Zbigniew Brzezinski, Harold Brown, Cyrus Vance, and other CFR controllers of the Carter administration, the SALT treaty—besides keeping open the possibility of conning the Soviets into cooperation with the Carter administration and London against technological and industrial development, also provides a smokescreen of peace and “progressiveness” behind which they hope to pursue with impunity their New Dark Ages strategy for a “controlled disintegration” of the world economy under the dictate of International Monetary Fund conditionalities and World Bank “appropriate technologies”; genocide and regional wars in the Third World on the Cambodian and Nicaraguan models; “unilateral” special strike forces for intervention in “hot spots”; and Nazi-style autarky at home around the Third Reich’s old concentration-camp synthetic fuels program. The CFR is hoping that all this will go down because those leaders like Helmut Schmidt and Leonid Brezhnev who are committed to real détente-cooperation for global progress, war avoidance, and arms control, will be mesmerized by the SALT carrot (and frightened by the threat of the Haig, “Mr. Hyde” stick) into the fantasy that if SALT is ratified by the Senate, “détente in our times will be assured.”

At the same time, the Carter administration is quite worried that Senate failure to ratify SALT and the concomitant exposé of their policy of “phony détente” might well lead Europe, in the tradition of Charles de Gaulle and France, to break with the outmoded Anglo-American led NATO alliance to form an independent “third superpower”—a fear that has now become a repetitive theme in Cyrus Vance’s speeches and in Senator Byrd’s reports on the Italian and French defense ministries’ policies, used as a key “selling point” for the treaty. Haig, Nitze, and the “Wells faction” may believe that Europe will swallow a new cold war, but evidently the neo-Russellites do not and are hesitant to run the risk.

The Carter administration and the Soviet leadership clearly hold very different views on SALT and détente.

The message of the Vienna summit

The two diametrically opposed views of SALT and détente, the war-avoidance, pro-progress hopes entertained by the Soviets—with considerable agreement and cooperation from France and West Germany—and the war-inducing antidevelopment perspective of the CFR, were on dramatic display at the Vienna summit.

In his June 17 speech opening the summit, President Carter sounded the same strident, confrontationalist