

the tracks of their infamy, while escalating their hard-soft destabilization operations aimed at keeping the Soviet leadership off-balance. Fully cognizant of Soviet capabilities, veteran Cold Warriors associated with the Committee on the Present Danger, such as Eugene Rostow, are publicly agitating for a speedy arms agreement to halt further Soviet technological development. In a letter to the New York Times this week and in private conversation, Rostow admitted he was terrified by the Soviet laser capability, which is "operational," and confided that an early SALT is America's only hope.

Simultaneously, the octogenarian "soft-cop" globe-trotter of U.S. foreign policy, Averell Harriman, was invited out of retirement by the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy, an amalgam of peace groups clustered around the Carnegie Endowment for Peace, to join forces with Institute for Policy Studies founder Richard Barnet in a stirring defense of Warnke and his "quick SALT" policy. At a Congressional symposium Feb. 17 organized by the "dovish" Senator McGovern and Rep. Rosenthal, Harriman launched into an emotional plea for Warnke, predicated on the hysterical contention that the Soviet Union would never go to war, no matter what the stakes.

A Coalition spokesman reported that when Harriman

was invited to speak at the symposium on detente, he reacted like a fire horse leaving the station, yelling, "If there's anything I can do to support Warnke, I'll be there. I'll go anywhere." At the seminar, Harriman went so far as to identify Warnke's opposition as the "Emergency Coalition Against Unilateral Disarmament," mystifying his Coalition hosts and observers, who had never before heard of any such organization. It is not listed in the Washington, D.C. telephone directory.

Less honest than Rostow, and certainly more senile, Harriman and Barnet vigorously denied that the Soviets have a marginal technological edge, much less a war-winning strategy, to their symposium audience. Nonetheless, like Rostow, they strongly advocated a total test ban treaty to limit the development of qualitative new weapon systems.

Harriman's fantasies aside, the phony "soft" gang vs. "hard" countergang controversy over Warnke has been transformed into a substantive debate between the advocates of industrial progress and scientific development as the lynchpin of national security and peace and the apologists for deindustrialization and a foreign policy based on bluff, psychological warfare, and nuclear holocaust. The vehemence with which Harriman et al. denied the obvious is testament to that transformation.

## Eugene Rostow: Soviet Weapons Strides Make Total Nuclear Ban "Only Meaningful Negotiations"

*In an interview this week Eugene Rostow, a member of David Rockefeller's Council on Foreign Relations and a leader of the ultra-hardline Committee on the Present Danger, warned that the Soviet Union's work on developing weapons technologies means that "the only meaningful arms negotiations" now are those "to totally ban nuclear weapons." The text of the interview, made available to the Executive Intelligence Review, is excerpted here:*

**Q:** What is in store for SALT and arms negotiations that you would say will be meaningful?

**Rostow:** Apparently from what the administration is saying, we will institute the Vladivostock accords as the basis of the SALT agreement. Now this will be like hanging fire. If you remember, parts of the Vladivostock accord were withdrawn and never replaced. If anything, the result will be a formal agreement. Carter is using the same tactics of ignoring the most important issues as Kissinger did. The cruise missile and backfire are not even going to be discussed if they present any problem. Will the Russians buy the Carter policy? I don't really know. They tend to just be as greedy as can be in these kinds of things, and they'll take all they can get as long as they can get away with it. There won't be any real issues in the negotiations, however — the signing is going to be a purely cosmetic appearance.

**Q:** The substantial issues are being ignored, then, while the already surpassed Vladivostock numbers are going to be the question?

**Rostow:** Yes. This is a continuation of Kissinger's policies of ignoring Soviet military growth and their real intentions. You know, the Soviets are now mounting their ICBMs on trucks, on mobile platforms. This was one of four items which was to abrogate the Vladivostock and SALT I accords, but nothing was done about it. You remember when there were charges that the Soviets were not complying with the strict nature of the treaty numbers? Well, here you have — by their own admission — their use of mobile platforms, and there is no response from our government.

The same sort of thing took place in the Non-Proliferation Treaty talks. Back when I was in the government (as Undersecretary of state for political affairs, 1966-1969 — NSIPS), Rusk and Rogers tried to get this across and through the Senate. The Soviets simply didn't buy aspects of the treaty and didn't play the game. They do what they want and get no response. In terms of public opinion, I think the orientation there is to wage a campaign to say "no" to the SALT treaty as it now shapes up. We can only lose from it.

**Q:** What about these new weapons — lasers and rays and so on. If the Soviets have such things, would there be any way of getting these weapons into the treaty?

**Rostow:** I doubt it. This thing goes back to the McNamara days, when he believed that any significant progress on anti-ballistic missiles systems would wreck the "mutually assured destruction" posture. Now experts tell me that the Soviets have an operational system that could be damaging to our missiles. The problem is that

you can't repress the technology. The Soviets know this and have kept up their weapons development to the present day.

I think the only really effective way of concluding some meaningful arms negotiations — and this is the one thing of Carter's outlook that holds promise — is to totally ban nuclear weapons. Only total abolition, as Carter said it, could make that sort of thing work.

*Q:* What other issues will be tied to SALT? What about

the human rights issue?

*Rostow:* Well, trade will be involved, naturally. The Soviets are not too fazed by human rights announcements. They have the situation well under control. They are sensitive to it, though, as a result of 1968. They're a paranoid bunch, you know, and they see it from the standpoint: "once this stuff starts, how do you stop it?" But I think that this time they have the edge to head anything like that off.

## Korry Anticipates 'Carter's Watergate'

Speaking Wednesday night Feb. 16 at Harvard University, former U.S. Ambassador to Chile Edward Korry declared that "It will be Jimmy Carter's Watergate" if he intervenes to squelch the indictments of former ITT chief executive Howard Gennen and former Director of Central Intelligence Richard Helms, who are "implicated in murder in Chile." This charge was carried on an Associated Press national wire picked up on WNCN radio in New York City.

Korry declared that there was continuity of U.S. policy in Chile dating from collaboration between the Kennedy's and David Rockefeller in the early 1960s, and exploded what he termed the "morality fable" of U.S. foreign policy, that the Democrats were good and that Nixon and Ford were corrupt. In reality, said Korry, U.S. foreign policy as initiated under the Kennedy's continued unbroken through Henry Kissinger's National Security Council, involving Hubert Humphrey, Eugene Mc-

Carthy, George McGovern, Walter Mondale and "the bubble-headed liar, Church."

Korry told the audience that "It all began right here at Harvard University in 1963, with an extraordinary meeting of the Board of Overseers, where Bobby Kennedy enlisted David Rockefeller to form the Businessmen's Alliance for Latin America....Louis Oberdorfer, RFK's assistant attorney general was ITT's chief counsel, and Richard Goodwin was the man behind Kennedy."

Asked if U.S. policy on payment of the Chilean foreign debt during Allende's regime were not the same debt collection policy being followed by David Rockefeller and other New York bankers toward Third World nations today, Korry acknowledged that the poor countries could not repay their debts now. When a spokesman for a U.S. Maoist weekly attempted to question Korry's testimony, he informed the crowd that the Maoists in Italy had collected money for Chilean dictator Pinochet.

## Korry: Mission 'Truth Squad'

In an interview Feb. 18, following his call to "watergate" Jimmy Carter if he attempts to quash the indictments of Harold Geneen and Richard Helms, former U.S. ambassador to Chile Edward Korry explained that he views his recent outspoken role in U.S. foreign policy as that of a one-man "truth squad." Korry explained that he found the role thrust upon him in March, 1976, when he became disturbed that "leaks" emanating from Senator Frank Church's Senate Multinationals Subcommittee investigations were presenting a distorted view of U.S. foreign policy — one slanted to whitewash the very people who are behind the Carter Administration, such as David Rockefeller, Cyrus Vance, et. al.

Korry said that he called then-Director of Central Intelligence William Colby and asked to see Colby's secret testimony before the Church committee: Colby declined, but led Korry to believe that he shared Korry's belief that the Church "leaks" were

distorted. Based on this conversation, Korry committed himself publicly to the view he thought Colby shared, and was then shocked and angered to find not long afterwards — when the Colby testimony was leaked to the press — that Colby was the source of these very distorted leaks.

Korry decided at that point that the whole story had to come out, beginning his series of blockbuster revelations which have effectively confirmed charges that the CIA has become a tool for carrying out the policies of such private interests as David Rockefeller. For the present, Korry is determined to see that the Carter Administration does not quash the indictment of former CIA head Richard Helms — who guided the agency when so much of the Rockefeller-Vance-et.-al. policy making was going on. With Carter's close ties to David Rockefeller a matter of public record, Ambassador Korry's charges provide Carter foes with powerful ammunition to use against his administration.