

## British Gloat Over 'Tougher U.S. Line On Africa'

The British are now heartily congratulating themselves on their overt manipulation of U.S. foreign policy following statements last weekend by National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski which ambiguously implied a "link" between the future of the SALT talks and Soviet behavior in Africa, especially the volatile Horn area.

For months, the British have been trying to foment a breakdown in U.S.-Soviet relations and a return to the "Kissinger view" of detente: that Soviet expansionism anywhere in the world should be fought to the point of military confrontation if necessary. To this end, British press outlets for the City of London have been spewing forth a steady stream of scare stories about the "Soviet threat" in Africa and the "spinelessness" of Western leaders in standing up to it.

It is no wonder then that the British welcomed with such "relief" the indications from the U.S. of a new "tougher" line on Africa and were so quick to escalate the pressure on the Carter Administration, calling for the idea of "linkage" to be applied "across the board," i.e. the Soviets would be prohibited from future access to Western technology, trade and credits unless they demonstrated "model" behavior in Africa and elsewhere.

*London Times, "The risks in the Horn of Africa," by Lord Chalfon (aka Alun Gwynn Jones), Feb. 20:*

If the "statesmen" of the West continue to behave with such extraordinary lack of courage and perception, within a year at most the Soviet Union will control not only Ethiopia but Somalia as well.... What we are faced with in Ethiopia is the latest phase in a carefully coordinated Russian plan. What happened in Angola is now happening in the Horn of Africa... The Horn of Africa, and much of the rest of the continent, is now a focal point of superpower politics and if we do not recognize the fact soon it will be too late....

They (the USSR) should understand that they cannot expect economic cooperation, arms control agreements, and brotherly love in one part of the world while in another they are singlemindedly engaged in damaging our economic interests, threatening our security and undermining our legitimate influence in the developing world.... The risks of intervening in the Horn of Africa may be considerable, but they are nothing compared with the risks of continuing to do nothing except make faint and spineless noises of protest.

*Daily Telegraph, "Painting Africa's Map Red," by Malcolm Rifkind, Feb. 23:*

"The policy and practice of the Russian Government has always been to push forward its encroachments as far and as fast as the apathy or want of firmness of other Governments would allow it to go, but always to stop and retire when it met with decided resistance."

One would like to be able to say that these words are the strong words of David Owen, the present Foreign Secretary. In fact, they were proclaimed by his per-

ceptive predecessor, Lord Palmerston, during the Crimean War.

(Palmerston's words) compare favorably with the pusillanimous attitude of the present British Government to Russian expansion. Dr. Owen and his colleagues are failing to understand the only response that has ever carried weight in Moscow....

Lord Palmerston prophesied that the Russians would always retire "if met with decided resistance." His belief was vindicated in our own time by the Cuban crisis in 1962. On that occasion the firmness of President Kennedy prevented the Caribbean from becoming a Soviet arsenal. Faced with a firm and courageous determination on the part of the West, the Soviet Union hesitated and retired.

Today's crisis is no less serious. The future of a continent is at issue and the British Government stands dumb in its impotence. Its weakness will win it no friends....

*Daily Telegraph, "Tougher U.S. Line on Africa," by Stephen Barber, Feb. 28:*

President Carter is in the midst of a tough reappraisal of American policy in Africa in the face of the escalating Russian and Cuban military effort in behalf of Ethiopia against Somalia in the Ogaden.... Officials denied reports that divergencies had developed between Mr. Young and Dr. Brzezinski... But it was clear that there is to be a shift away from relying on fuzzy idealism towards taking more positive steps to meet a clear and present danger.

Significantly and for the first time, the State Department over the weekend made the direct link between the future of nuclear disarmament talks between the superpowers and Russia's African adventures....

Officials now admit that America cannot afford to let Russia get away with a military intervention that poses obvious strategic threats to Middle East oil supplies and the sea lanes of the industrial democracies resulting from Russian control on the mouth of the Red Sea.

*Daily Telegraph editorial, "Carter Warns Russia," Feb. 28:*

In the statement issued over the weekend by the State Department on Russian activities in the Horn of Africa, there is discernible an important change in the Carter Administration's attitude. It established for the first time that in the American view there is a connection between Russia's military presence in Ethiopia, on the one hand, and detente in general, and the strategic nuclear arms talks in particular on the other. It marks a return—and a welcome one—to the theory of "linkage," whereby events in one field are seen as being affected by those in others. The Carter Administration is now proclaiming it, which is a relief.

Russia also needs from the West—and largely from America—trade, grain, advanced technology and the

"soft" loans with which to finance them.... The new policy (of linkage—ed.) should be long-term, determined and applied across the board.

The Guardian, "U.S. Concerned at Decline in Relations with Moscow" by Hella Pick, March 1:

Dr. Kissinger had argued that detente was indivisible and that Russian expansionism anywhere in the world should be fought. The Carter Administration initially set out to avoid Dr. Kissinger's conception, which was seen by his advisers more as a straightjacket than an instrument of progress. Yet Russian policy now seems to be forcing Mr. Carter back to Dr. Kissinger's view....

Conservative member of Parliament Winston Churchill III and Tory defense expert Julian Amery visited Somalia beginning Feb. 24 at the invitation and expense of the Somalia government. Amery pledged that if a Conservative Government came to power in Britain, it would immediately supply Somalia with the required weapons to ward off Soviet aggressors. Churchill topped this with the outrageous proposals that the United States take immediate action to boot the Soviets out of the Horn of Africa, adopting confrontationist tactics if necessary.

Said Mr. Churchill:

All it needs is for the Americans to put a (U.S. aircraft carrier) off the coast here and tell the Russians to stop interfering.

## SALT Was Ready To Be Signed — Till Brzezinski Wrecked It

### *Exclusive to the Executive Intelligence Review*

It is vital that three little-known aspects of the crucial Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) become public knowledge: 1) that as of the Feb. 8 negotiating session a viable settlement was in sight; 2) that the agreement was torpedoed prior to and during the session of Feb. 16; and 3) that the parties most responsible for this treachery are National Security Council Director Zbigniew Brzezinski, Secretary of Energy James Schlesinger, and Senator Henry Jackson. As things now stand, the SALT agreement is going down the tubes.

The collapse of the SALT negotiations without an agreement was "predicted" by Fabian *Christian Science Monitor* columnist Richard Strout in the Feb. 24 *Washington Star*. Two thirds of the Senate would not confirm the agreement, St consider the need for a treaty, he claimed, the Senate will heed former Defense Secretary Melvin Laird's warning against Soviet cheating and the recent barrage of charges that the Administration is selling out to Moscow, led by Jackson and Paul Nitze of the Committee on the Present Danger.

After citing that other impeccable British source, the *Washington Post* Moscow correspondent, to the effect that the Soviets are really upset and that only Richard Nixon could swing U.S. hawks behind a deal, Strout summed up the mind-set his faction wants to crystallize in the Administration: "I think the U.S. and Russia are heilbent on a nuclear confrontation. I agree with Jimmy Carter who said that the lack of a second SALT agreement would produce ultimate disaster and that heightening the arms race means increasing the chance of nuclear war."

In response to this onslaught against SALT, pro-detente forces in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), have delivered an unusual communication to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The message reveals that the U.S. and the Soviet Union have agreed to ban all mobile, land based in-

tercontinental missiles until at least 1980. These are by far the potentially most costly and destabilizing of strategic weapons. This significant countermove was further buttressed by the assurance that all relevant government agencies, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, agree that the major aspects of the Feb. 8 agreement would be adequately verifiable.

### *The Wrecking Operation*

On Feb. 24, Soviet President Brezhnev told the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet that forces in the U.S. are trying to block a SALT treaty. "The path to this cooperation is still blocked by all kinds of obstacles," Brezhnev warned, according to the *Washington Post*.

Those obstacles are the willful products of the Brzezinski, Schlesinger, and Jackson trio. Based on information provided by knowledgeable sources, the following picture of their wrecking operation can be constructed:

According to a leading U.S. scientist who is close to the talks, as of Feb. 8 all parties were confident that an equitable agreement which would be acceptable to the Senate was very close to being signed. A memorandum from this period on the talks prepared for the White House by intelligence officials, and leaked to press sources, corroborated this evaluation, and indicated that agreement had been reached on the precise numbers of allowed strategic weapons of different types.

Two other points in the White House memorandum proved to be of crucial significance. The first was that the Soviet backfire bomber had been eliminated as an issue by restricting its permitted deployment. The second was that the issue of "human rights" had "back-fired" on the U.S. by providing the Soviets with an aggressive psychological edge at the bargaining sessions.

### *Brzezinski's Edifice Complex*

These latter points triggered a counter-mobilization by the British-Utopian faction in the Administration when