

Carter's way out: SALT

Late reports of progress in the U.S.-USSR arms limitation talks, and emphatic support for an early SALT treaty from the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, are providing a critical opening for the Carter Administration to supersede its vacillation and weakness at the Camp David Summit.

The alternative raised by the SALT talks is for the U.S. to join in the war-avoidance policy enunciated by the organizers of the European Monetary Fund: East-West collaboration and economic development.

On Sept. 15 Paul Warnke, chief SALT negotiator just back from a round of talks in Moscow, told a Washington, D.C. audience that an agreement on SALT may well be reached before the end of the year. Newspaper reports that President Carter will postpone signing an agreement for fear of Senate rejections before the elections are untrue, Warnke told the Federal Bar Convention.

Three days before, a spokesman for the Joint Chiefs of Staff declared, "We are firmly behind a SALT treaty." "It is critical that a SALT treaty go through,"

he added, "because our ability to work things out in other areas hinges on SALT."

This unqualified support from the U.S. military will be a powerful ace in Carter's hand in getting SALT through Congress. Moreover, both pro- and anti-treaty congressional leaders confirm that there is no groundswell of sentiment against a SALT accord either in Congress or in the general population. "Jackson and Moynihan will be isolated against SALT," said one aide about two of the Senate's hardest-line Zionist lobby warhawks.

Another Senate staffer noted that the shift by the Joint Chiefs to support of SALT will help Warnke reach an agreement with the Soviets soon.

Such an agreement would open the door for a meeting between Carter and Soviet President Brezhnev, which the Soviets have repeatedly said depends on a SALT accord. European leaders have made it clear that they hope such a summit between the U.S. and Soviet heads of state will follow the lines of the historic meeting between West German Chancellor Schmidt and Brezhnev — the summit that laid the basis for the European-Japanese drive for a new world monetary system — and bring the United States into this "Grand Design."

Kissinger's executive seminars disorganize U.S. business leaders

A lavishly publicized and appointed executive seminar series being run by the Georgetown University Center for Strategic and International Studies under the direction of Henry Kissinger, which began the week of Sept. 11, has as its goal the brainwashing of top U.S. corporate executives into accepting the Bank of England's scenario for collapse of the U.S. economy.

Starting in Washington, the seminar, the Georgetown-Oxford Executive Training Seminar under the auspices of CSIS's "Future Business Program," will fly 18 top corporate executives to Oxford University in England for extended "sessions" with leading British bankers Sept. 17 to Sept. 25, and will conclude with five days at NATO headquarters in Brussels.

Details of the seminar's purpose were obtained following a secret planning meeting for the series, and have since been confirmed in both interviews and the press.

According to information gleaned by *EIR* following the planning meeting, the seminar will seek to convince American business leaders that the only

solution to the dollar problem and America's domestic economic difficulties is extreme cuts in the federal budget. This is precisely the scenario for collapse of the U.S. economy spelled out in a secret Bank of England memorandum obtained and exposed by this publication two weeks ago.

Confirmation that the seminars have as their other primary objective the undermining of U.S. support for the European monetary system, also as per the Bank of England report, came in an article in the Sept. 13 London *Guardian* by the paper's Washington editor, John Palmer. "Senior Administration officials" at the seminars, Palmer reported, including Henry Owen, formerly of the Brookings Institution and currently President Carter's Assistant on Economic Affairs, "gave polite, if very general, support to the current moves within the Common Market to erect a European Monetary System. But in private many of them express the fear that such an initiative could be taken to reflect a lack of long-term European confidence in America's ability to keep a strong dollar at the heart of the present world monetary system."

Owen, he said, saw "potential dangers to Western