

America will conserve itself into energy abundance. Such a program to "accentuate the negative" may appease those who want cheap energy while it lasts, or the radical environmentalists who prefer no energy, but it continues to ignore the legitimate energy needs of our Nation, its economic growth, its military strength, and the basic energy demands of its people for jobs and a good standard of living...

And yet, our policies with regard to the four resources — oil, gas, coal, and nuclear energy, continue to discourage rather than stimulate increased development of these resources. In the days ahead I intend to comment in detail on the policies being formulated regarding these resources, and how these policies together form a blueprint for energy disaster in this country...

So it is very important that Congress look at the existing parts of the administration's energy program and assess them; and I believe Congress will come to the

conclusion that, with the positions taken by the administration and the measures supported by the administration, we are not going to be able to realize the potential coal production we could otherwise, with no action; that we will not be able to have the nuclear energy that we desperately need, that we otherwise would have with existing programs permitted to continue, particularly in the breeder reactor area; that with the Outer Continental Shelf bill, if it passes as it is now submitted to Congress, we will *not* have sufficient drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf and development of those resources to fill the need we have for more domestic oil and gas...

So I tell my colleagues that I will continue analyzing the various aspects of the administration energy program as time goes on and as more parts of it are made known to all of us. But I think it is vital that Members of the Senate pay very close attention to all facets, so that we can develop a sensible program that will do the job for every American.

## Congress, Press Blast SALT Debacle

Over the April 2-3 weekend, the Carter Administration's "hang tough" and "rally round the flag" strategy for minimizing the outcry over the failure of the SALT talks in Moscow collapsed as completely as SALT itself. Domestic as well as foreign anger at the Imperial Presidency's psychological "testing" of the Soviets, to which SALT fell victim, grew so intense that a sheepish Secretary of State Cyrus Vance admitted April 3 that the U.S. had "miscalculated" in Moscow.

The next day, the House International Relations Committee grilled the chief U.S. SALT negotiator, Paul Warnke, on the Moscow fiasco. "Was the human rights campaign responsible for the U.S. failure in Moscow?" asked Rep. Broomfield (D-Mich.). "What were the miscalculations that led to the Soviet rejection?" Rep. Larry Winn demanded. "What do you mean by 'hang tough'?", "What do you mean by 'human rights'?" "What kind of proposal asks Moscow to concede more than the U.S.?" "Why did you introduce a 'new technique' in the midst of ongoing long-term negotiations?" the rest of the Committee chorused.

The Congress was shaken out of its normal Monday morning stupor by the strident howl of protest emanating from the legendary titans of Wall Street's press corps and foreign policy establishment, from C.L. Sulzberger to Joseph Kraft, from former U.S. Ambassador to Moscow George Kennan to the lowliest career diplomat in the State Department. "Not since Napoleon has there been a more disorderly retreat from Moscow than that conducted by Secretary of State Vance last weekend," the Washington Post editorial board decided April 5.

Despite all the fireworks, Warnke and the rest of the Administration walked away from their tongue-lashing without a mortal wound. The failure of Carter's critics to put forward an alternative policy for world peace, based on East-West agreements for global industrial and technological development, leaves the Carterites free to

pursue their confrontation course on behalf of New York's bankrupt banks.

Twisting and squirming, Carter and his associates are trying to regroup and refocus public ire on the Pentagon as the unlikely author of the Administration's SALT package. While Congressional insiders report this is a preposterous allegation — demonstrated by the Pentagon's deafening silence in the wake of the Moscow debate — the President is busily scheduling a series of heart-to-heart talks with Congressional leaders "to bring them around." The White House is also mobilizing its die-hard supporters, like Sen. Scoop Jackson (D-Wash), to proclaim that while Carter's style in presenting the U.S. SALT proposals left something to be desired, the substance of those proposals is basically sound.

Attempting to turn their losses into a strident escalation of the big bluff ploy, Carter advisors are now describing the Moscow fiasco as a "blessing in disguise" which will provide the Administration with time to reassess its strategic posture and opt for a "first-strike" strategy. "A comprehensive re-examination of policies that presently underpin U.S. nuclear force posture," should be undertaken concluded an analysis prepared for Congress by the Library of Congress for release April 6. Until now, the report continued, the U.S. has been committed to a "second-strike strategy." The shift in strategic doctrine should be accomplished by a military build-up, one of the authors of the report, John Collins, said "Instead of matching the Soviets, we should come up with initiatives of our own that would change the game."

The same day the report was released, Admiral Stansfield Turner, Director of Central Intelligence, suggested that the Soviet "impression of power" must be matched with a U.S. "aura of power" with which the U.S. could bluff its way to "victory" in the international arena.

Carter's claim that SALT negotiations have just begun was unmasked as fantasy by reports from knowledgeable Western observers that the Soviet Union has made no commitment to discuss the nuclear issue at a May meeting between the two superpowers. At a press conference Soviet Communist Party chairman Leonid Brezhnev accused the U.S. of abandoning a previously "constructive approach" to nuclear arms control and adopting a "one-sided position" in negotiations with Moscow.

Brezhnev's statement followed Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko's March 31 denunciation of Carter's SALT proposals as a bid to institutionalize limited nuclear war games between the powers.

Visibly shaken by the critical reviews from Moscow and Washington, Vance refused to rule out the possibility that U.S. "miscalculations" prompted Soviet rejection of

his SALT package. "No one can say that one never makes any miscalculations," Vance nervously twittered at an impromptu press conference April 3 called to explain why the USSR's leadership refused to react according to their Rand profile.

The total disintegration of the "hang tough" Carter Administration posture of last week was betrayed by the bizarre activities of the presidential press secretary early this week. At 6 a.m. on April 4, Jody Powell telephoned Associated Press reporter Richard Meyer with a denial "that the Administration, including the Secretary of State, made miscalculations that played any role in the initial Soviet reaction of the proposals." Throughout the day Powell and State Department spokesman bombarded other journalists with the same "denials."

## Carter Threatens 'Dissolution Of Detente,' GOP House Leader Charges

*The remarks on Carter's foreign policy are excerpted from a speech given by Rep. John J. Rhodes, House Minority Leader, at the Lincoln Day Dinner held in Jacksonville, Florida on March 31, 1977.*

... After just two months, many of us in Congress are quite concerned about the spray-shot foreign policy that already seems to have developed. His diplomatic appointments have *not* sparkled, nor inspired confidence in their competence.

So far he has managed to antagonize several of our allies, threaten dissolution of détente, and to compromise the effectiveness of our policies, by making rash statements, and then trying to confuse the issue with partial denials.

You know that this is a perilous world. Relationships are fragile, tenuous, and fraught with perils to peace. If a mistake is made in domestic policy, some money is wasted, and laws can be passed to repair the damage. Foreign policy is another matter. In this nuclear age, we cannot afford faulty decisions. Misunderstandings can

escalate too quickly — to confrontations and conflict. Also, we are in an economically interdependent world. No nation must be depend more on good relations with our world neighbors than the United States. We must import and export billions of dollars worth of goods to keep our economy going and growing.

Our people pay for the decisions made in Washington. *I believe that the "let it fly, then clarify" foreign policy now in effect is dangerous hip-shooting, out of place in the world today...*

... Mr. Carter seems to believe that bombast, bluster and campaign style rhetoric can be carried over into the intricacies of foreign affairs. He must learn that he is dealing with masters of the craft of diplomacy, which has been defined as lie and deny. He *cannot* substitute a play to the galleries — and ploys for the media — for skill, patience, timing, and firmness expressed through action.

Carter was elected by 27 percent of the eligible voters in the United States. This does not authorize him to become the oracle of the universe — or the moral policeman for the world. *His actions to date have damaged, not helped the cause of human rights around the globe...*