SALT Ratification Requires White House Organizing

With 90 percent of the crucial issues for an agreement already worked out, according to the chief U.S. arms negotiator Paul Warnke, the completion of a SALT (Strategic Arms Limitation Talks) agreement rests on the Administration's political determination to complete

FOREIGN POLICY

the agreement and see it through the Senate. Washington observors are concerned that the Administration has not already begun to prepare the climate for acceptance of the SALT treaty, by making clear to Americans that SALT is to our benefit, as it will mean the reduction of international tensions, and open the way for better U.S.-Soviet economic relations. An interview with a source close to one of Capitol Hill's strongest supporters of a SALT treaty exemplifies this concern.

- Q: Isn't it true that the Administration must begin organizing for a SALT agreement now, explaining to the Senate the advantages of it?
- A: Yes, without that a SALT agreement is in trouble.
- Q: How does the Administration have to organize for the agreement?
- A: The Administration should go public, the President, his advisors and supporters. They have to stress that there are two options, that there were worse agreements than this one, that in 1974 when Ford negotiated it was worse, and we have moved away from that. We cannot get a better treaty than the one we have.

We don't have forever to get an agreement as the technology keeps moving forward. Therefore, it has to be made clear that it is a choice between this agreement and no agreement. I think the American people want us

to put a lid on this agreement. This agrument has to be repeated whenever technical questions are raised. The Administration could get into these technicalities if they act too gingerly on this. They could end up responding to the nitpicking, like on the verification issue. It is possible for someone to say that a particular part is not verifiable, but the question is if the Soviets could get away with any significant violation of an agreement. The Administration will lose the treaty if they get into nitpicking with Senator Jackson.

- Q: Do you believe the American population wants a SALT agreement?
- A: Yes. There is a difference between this issue and the Panama Canal treaty question. There was really no constituency supporting the Panama Canal treaty. But with the arms control issue it is very different. The polls say that 80 percent very strong.
- Q: What is the best way to organize support for the treaty. Should the fact that it opens the way for economic deals be stressed?
- A: There is some danger in this as Nixon oversold detente. It is better to confine ourselves to a description of the significance of the agreement, that detente can proceed in areas of mutual benefit—in arms control, in trade. SALT should be sold on the basis that it reduces the burden of fear and the cost spent for the arms race.
- Q: Are you happy with the way the Administration has proceeded to explain SALT to Congress?
- A: The Administration doesn't know what to do. They should learn that they should be lobbying already. It gets them behind if Paul Nitze can blast it and the Administration doesn't answer.

London Plans Spring Terrorist Offensive Against USA

A weeks-long investigation that included interviews with several leading British Secret Intelligence Service (SIS) control agents stationed in the United States confirms that an effort is now underway to launch a wave of terrorism against the U.S. during the spring months.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

That effort was publicly announced on April 10 by the London *Economist's* Robert Moss in a *Daily Telegraph* column. He proclaimed that nothing can be done to stop

terrorism and that no nation in the advanced sector can consider itself immune to "Soviet-backed" terrorist violence. Within a week of the Moss piece, virtually every London-connected journalist and political spokesman in the U.S. was mouthing the same line.

At a speech in Princeton, N.J. on April 17, Carter Administration energy czar James Rodney Schlesinger announced his open collaboration with the Institute for Policy Studies' environmentalist terrorists around planned disruption of energy installations on "Sun Day" In a speech that included a direct attack on the U.S. Constitution as a "formulation for frustration,"

EXECUTIVE INTELLIGENCE REVIEW

U.S. REPORT 3