

London Uses Shcharansky Trials To Wreck World Economic Recovery

Press backlash on dissident trials targeted against East-West trade, SALT

The Moscow trials of Anatoly Shcharansky and Alexander B. Ginzburg are being used by the City of London and its allies as a pretext for wrecking operations against the Grand Design for economic recovery to be discussed at this weekend's Bonn summit. The leading objective of the London-centered forces is to drive the United States, Japan, and Western Europe into a posture of economic warfare against the Soviet Union and the CMEA (Comecon) nations, destroying capitalist markets in the socialist sector and dismantling channels for scientific and economic cooperation vital to raising global living standards and eliminating scenarios for a U.S.-Soviet confrontation over "scarce resources" in the developing sector nations.

Statements in the House of Commons last week by British Foreign Secretary David Owen on the "defining" quality of the Shcharansky trials for East-West relations, coupled with his openly expressed lust for a tighter anti-Soviet embrace with Maoist China are a clear signal. That signal ought to alert better-informed circles in the West that the same British financial circles who simultaneously created and backed the Zionist movement and Adolph Hitler are up to their old tricks. Recent developments in the USA around the Shcharansky affair demonstrate that British pawns in Washington, epitomized by former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and current Carter Administration National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, are carrying on in that incompetent tradition.

For months, Kissinger has been telling any audience that will listen, from Mexico City to Stockholm, that a Soviet oil shortage and foreign exchange crisis is coming up in the 1980s, and that the U.S. should use trade and technology as weapons to shape Soviet foreign and domestic policy. The use of those weapons by the U.S. would greatly please British merchant bankers and the International Monetary Fund.

Brzezinski Manipulating Carter, Congress

Last month, the *New York Times* and *Washington Post* reported in detail on a scheme by Brzezinski, one time protégé of the Brookings Institution's Henry Owen, to use trade as a "bargaining chip" to wrest specific concessions from the Soviets. Brzezinski's chum, National Security Council staffer Samuel Huntington, had been briefing diplomats and corporate officials on the plan as if it were Administration policy-in-the-making. At a recent press conference, however, President Carter denied knowledge of it and appeared to signal his disapproval.

The Shcharansky affair prompted a full mobilization by Brzezinski and his allies on Capitol Hill. Articles appeared asserting that "White House officials" were urging cancellation of previously negotiated sales to the

Soviets of oil drilling equipment from Dresser Industries and computer hardware from Sperry Rand. In neither case was it contended that the equipment had direct military applications, nor that it represented unique technology which the Soviets could not obtain elsewhere; the cancellation was to be understood by the USSR as a punitive act expressing U.S. displeasure over the Moscow trials.

On July 11, practically simultaneous with the appearance of the articles, Sens. Henry Jackson and Daniel Moynihan, well-known respectively as spokesmen for the Maoist China and Israel lobbies in Washington, loudly demanded at a joint press conference with Mrs. Alexander Solzhenitsyn, that the trade deals be halted.

Capitol Hill sources revealed that Brzezinski's NSC staff had been calling up Congressmen and Senators to get them to "demand" that Carter take such action or risk the political consequences of "perceived weakness." Said one unnamed Senator to the *Washington Post*, "It's beginning to be a scandal the way the National Security Council people call you up and say 'denounce the president,' or 'denounce the Secretary of State' for this or that."

Jackson, of course, hardly needed such encouragement; his notorious hostility to SALT and his authorship of the 1974 Jackson-Vanik amendment barring U.S. trade credits to the USSR until Soviet emigration practices receive a Presidential seal of approval have obviously had a long-term impact on Soviet thinking about the benefits available from "detente" while Jackson occupies a powerful Senate post.

A half-dozen other Senators chimed in with additional proposals for dismantling U.S.-Soviet collaboration across the board. Sen. Donald Riegle (D-Mich.) loudly suggested that he would oppose any SALT agreement with the USSR on the grounds that he could not countenance "a treaty I could support with a nation that terrorizes its own people." Riegle is heavily supported by the United Auto Workers, whose past president, Leonard Woodcock, is now the U.S. representative to Maoist China, hardly a byword among nations for political freedom.

Republican Sen. Howard Baker, always attentive to the ravings of Henry Kissinger, urged that Carter tell the Soviets "we ain't going to be pushed around And just so you know that it's all linked together we're going to suspend the SALT talks and any other talks we can lay our hands on" Sen. Bob Dole called for suspension of SALT and U.S. grain sales to the USSR, both tactics tried by Kissinger with no notable effect on Soviet foreign and internal policy. Sen. Robert Packwood, a favorite on the B'nai Brith circuit, went the Kissinger line one better by calling on Carter to declare the Helsinki security,

economic cooperation, and so-called human rights in Europe agreements "null and void." Such an action would be tantamount to declaring war on the USA's Western European allies, none of whom, with the exception of Britain, appear eager to reimpose the "Iron Curtain" conception on Europe.

U.S. Yielding to London's Geopolitics

The demands for trade war and suspension of SALT built to a crescendo after the Administration had already yielded substantial ground to a heavy blackmail campaign by London's geopolitical wizards. An initial State Department statement on the Shcharansky case July 7, reportedly cleared by the President, noted cautiously that the U.S. would observe the trials "with great concern" as "an important indicator . . . with regard to promoting a healthy atmosphere for the constructive development of U.S.-Soviet relations." The statement said that the U.S. would withhold further comment until the trials were concluded. At the same time, an Environmental Protection Agency mission to the USSR was cancelled as a signal of displeasure.

Within 24 hours, however, Secretary of State Cyrus Vance appeared in the press room to read a much tougher statement, saying the trials would "inevitably" worsen relations. Press reports asserted that Vance had come under heavy pressure from U.S. Ambassador to Moscow Malcolm Toon and Brzezinski to cancel his scheduled Geneva meeting with Soviet Foreign Minister

Gromyko on SALT. Vance also announced that a high-level scientific mission to the USSR led by presidential science advisor Frank Press had been cancelled. When the announcement was made, Press was in Peking with a similar U.S. delegation, avowing U.S. readiness to cooperate with the Chinese without reference to their "human rights" or emigration policies.

Later, it was announced that Vance would meet with Shcharansky's wife in Geneva as a "symbol of U.S. concern."

Meanwhile, it was reported that the U.S. was "reviewing" all scientific, cultural, and economic cooperation agreements with the USSR, and that outright cancellation of the agreements, in part or in their entirety, was being considered. Cancellation of the scientific agreement would relieve Brzezinski and Energy Secretary James Schlesinger of the embarrassment of their continuing coverup and sabotage of official proposals by the Soviet government for joint U.S.-Soviet fusion cooperation. The proposed project is designed to build a "breakeven" thermonuclear fusion experiment in a third country, a plan with the excellent promise, according to U.S. scientists, of dramatically demonstrating fusion to be the answer to world energy needs and a practical large-scale energy source for the world by the 1990s.

President Carter himself, while condemning the trials as a violation of the Helsinki accords, stressed in an

Did Shcharansky 'Fallout' Stop 1978 SALT Pact?

It may be coincidental that only one day after the trials of Shcharansky and Ginzburg were announced in Moscow, Washington heard reports that Secretary of State Vance would "inform" his Soviet counterpart Gromyko that the U.S. would insist on language in the SALT II treaty permitting the U.S. to "preserve the option" of deploying a land-based mobile missile in the early 1980s, apparently making preparations instrumental for deployment before the expiration of a protocol in the treaty banning new mobile missile testing for three years.

U.S. arms control experts have consistently regarded the mobile missile as a potentially very serious "destabilizing factor" in the U.S.-Soviet strategic weapons relationship. In their view it would force a higher level of military expenditures, raising complicated questions of verification (since the point of the mobile missile is to avoid detection and destruction prior to launching by enemy forces) and force the Soviets to deploy a similar system in an effort to maintain strategic parity.

Technically, it was said, Vance would reserve the U.S. right to pave the way for the mobile missile by excavating a series of holes in the ground; existing U.S. Minuteman missiles could purportedly be moved from one hole to another to avoid detection. No new mobile missile like the Ford Administration's MX

missile would thus actually be tested, it will be argued.

Press accounts of the decision emphasized that it was being made to counter the "clout" of SALT critics including Scoop Jackson and Paul Nitze of the Committee on the Present Danger, who have argued that the Soviets could by the early 1980s wipe out the U.S. land-based missile force in a first strike and then "blackmail" the U.S. out of retaliation.

Since thermonuclear war between the U.S. and USSR will begin, if it occurs, with an all out land-sea-air nuclear attack from both sides, and then "deescalate" toward conventional war with whatever second strike capabilities remain — rather than escalate from a "limited" nuclear war upwards — and since there is no question that the U.S. possesses a deterrent capacity sufficient to quell any Soviet fantasies of a "cheap victory," the Nitze "hardware-matching" exercise is nothing more than a demonstration of strategic military incompetence in leading U.S. circles.

The Carter Administration, however, is hoping to "buy off" the Nitze-Jackson opposition to SALT II by insisting on the right to dig itself a few hundred deeper holes. The Soviets are expected to object vigorously to the new proposal, further diminishing chances for a SALT agreement this year.

interview with West German newsmen that the U.S. had no right to interfere in the USSR's internal affairs and said the U.S. should look for ways to broaden, not to narrow, areas of U.S.-Soviet cooperation. He also denied any intention to follow the Brzezinski line of "using the China lever against the USSR," adding: "That would not be in our interest, and not in the interest of the Chinese or the Soviet peoples."

Some of Washington's more experienced and better informed observers, however, feel that the cumulative impact of the Carter Administration handling of both the Soviets and the Senate, during its 18 months in office, was coming to a head around the Shcharansky affair — in ways which might override the President's recently asserted desire to emphasize the "underlying stability" of the U.S.-Soviet relationship.

The NAACP Champions Development, Exports, And Nuclear Power

What the press didn't tell you about the NAACP convention

Exclusive to the Executive Intelligence Review

It went virtually unnoticed in the nation's press, but the 69th annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), held in Portland July 3-7, took a number of steps to establish the NAACP as an international spokesman for rapid nuclear

founded the NAACP in 1909 and played a revolutionary role in "transforming the fabric of America." To rebut the press slanders against her and the NAACP of the last six months — begun by the *New York Times* in a racist editorial in January, "Does Civil Rights Include Energy?" — Wilson departed from her prepared speech to underline: "Leadership does not have to be popular. It has to be correct."

Wilson also delivered an indictment of National Security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski's attempts to get a "superpower" confrontation going in Africa.

Wilson used her speech to shape the dominant anti-zero-growth theme of the convention, reaffirming in the strongest terms the organization's Energy Policy as the only alternative to zero-growth or slow-growth policies that "will never be in the best interests of black Americans."

Practically, the three most important developments of the convention, for which Wilson's policy speech set the framework, were the proceedings of the Energy Panel, including the decision to create a standing Energy Office in Washington, D.C.; the formation of an Economic Advisory Committee to be headed by former Federal Reserve Governor Dr. Andrew Brimmer; and the elaboration of the NAACP's Africa policy by members of the just-created Africa task force.

Energy Panel: No to Zero Growth

The Energy Panel was chaired by NAACP Energy Committee member James Stewart of Oklahoma City. Panelists included Keith Bodden of Allied Chemical in New Jersey, who will head up the NAACP permanent Energy Office, Rufus McKinney, a Vice President of Southern California Gas Company, Kenneth Guscott, a Federal Reserve board member in Boston and president of Kenneth Guscott Associates, and Clarke Watson, the head of the Denver-based American Association of Blacks in Energy and a longtime NAACP energy advisor.

McKinney began his remarks:

I think this energy policy is the most significant thing done by the NAACP The release of our policy has generated a huge national debate among members and others We have received invitations to speak from

LABOR & INDUSTRY

energy development and expanded American industrial production and exports.

Despite the fact that the *New York Times*, from which other press took their cue, covered only the convention's supposedly adverse reaction to the Supreme Court Bakke decision, and the NAACP's disappointing *formal* policy of economic sanctions against South Africa, that was not the news from Portland.

In a press conference on the convention's opening day, Executive Board Chairman Margaret Bush Wilson undercut media efforts to imply a split in the NAACP leadership over Bakke and other issues: "We will not get involved in pitting black against white. The Bakke decision reaffirmed affirmative action; Proposition 13 (the recent California "tax revolt" referendum — ed.) was not primarily racially motivated; people are fed up with tax increases."

Under the leadership of Wilson — who personally led the organizing drive which culminated in the NAACP's adoption last December of a pronuclear, progrowth official Energy Policy — the convention's 4,000 delegates, who represented 420,000 members, affirmed the NAACP's commitment to mobilize more broadly for that energy policy; formed an Economic Advisory Committee to put forward economic growth policies; and announced a decisive break with the zero-growth outlook of "our former allies, the liberals."

Wilson's keynote address to the convention (excerpts of which are reprinted here) called on NAACP members to trace their roots to 19th century black leader Frederick Douglass, who organized for the industrialization policies of the Lincoln Republicans, and to the "small group of intellectuals led by Dr. W.E.B. DuBois" who