

government (of France) is key to a crucial package of tightly linked issues including SALT, the Middle East, "a European MBFR agreement, and key economic cooperation and mutual political security agreements between Western continental Europe and Eastern Europe" and is "performing a key role in negotiations among the United States, France, West Germany and the Soviet leadership" directed toward that end.

Not Solved Yet

The successful consummation of these foreign policy initiatives, however, remains anything but a foregone conclusion; forces grouped around Energy Secretary James Schlesinger and Treasury Secretary Werner Blumenthal in the Carter Cabinet and Sen. Henry Jackson and Jacob Javits in the Congress are acting to sabotage what is still — in the absence of any decisive global-strategic shift by the Administration on the anti-nuclear and hyper-inflationary economic austerity policies which have been bitterly resisted by France and West Germany in particular — only a significant opening toward a viable U.S. foreign policy.

Javits' astonishing and inflammatory remark last week that "There are circumstances which could compel Israel to stand against a Mideast peace policy of President Carter on grounds of Israel's overriding national interest in her own survival" illustrates the breadth and openness of wrecking operations conducted through the U.S. "Jewish Lobby" in particular. After a lengthy briefing from Vance on the Administration's Mideast policy late last week, Rabbi Alexander Schindler, the leading figure in the "Jewish Lobby," accused Vance of seeking to bring "the peace of death" for Israel.

The problem is further complicated by the repeated attacks on the President by spokesmen for the Republican National Committee on the grounds that the Soviet Union must be kept out of Middle East negotiations, including last week's attack by House Republican Minority Leader John Rhodes. In his statement, LaRouche charged that such attacks were contributing to the success of British economic warfare operations against the United States centered around a City of London grab for Arab petrodollars. "We are not suggesting that (such persons) are knowledgeably

aiding the United States' enemy, London," said LaRouche. "They are merely being very, very dumb, and very pliable," in the hands of such people as Schlesinger, Jackson, and the Humphrey-Fabian machine within the Democratic Party and the networks of William F. Buckley and his protégé Richard Viguerie in Republican and conservative circles.

The role of Schlesinger and Jackson in these wrecking operations is primary. Schlesinger's fury at Carter's Mideast initiative is an open secret in Washington, and on Oct. 27 syndicated columnists Evans and Novak reported that the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, organizationally coextensive with the notorious Committee on the Present Danger in which Schlesinger played a key "founding father" role during 1976, was being reconstituted under the leadership of Senators Jackson and Moynihan, with an executive board which constitutes a "who's who" of the CPD-Social Democrats USA apparatus, again, virtually identical with the "Jewish Lobby." An interview with an executive from the Coalition (see below) confirmed that Schlesinger is fully implicated in this operation against his own Administration.

As for Jackson, in addition to his chores for the Coalition, he is also positioning himself to prevent the ratification of any SALT treaty by the Senate. Jackson's effort was noted on the front page of the *Baltimore Sun* this week, in an article which warned the Administration that its failure to establish a credible Senate spokesman on the SALT issue could lead to a successful hatchet-job on the treaty by Jackson. (See box.) On Oct. 28, the *Washington Post*, closely linked to the British-connected investment bank Lazard Freres and now the established mouthpiece for assaults against Administration foreign policy, ballyhooed the coming Jackson assault on its front page.

Despite the general anti-Administration, pro-British tenor of the New York Times and Washington Post, support for the Mideast, SALT, and related initiatives in the USA Eastern Establishment was visible last week in several columns and articles, the most notable of these by syndicated columnist Joseph Kraft, advising "an end to Congressional foreign policy" conducted as a wrecking operation against the Presidency.

State Department Official:

Pinpoints U.S.-Soviet Common Interests

Excerpts from a statement by Marshall D. Shulman, Special Advisor to the Secretary of State on Soviet Affairs, before the House Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, Oct. 26, 1977.

...We start from a frank recognition that the Soviet-American relationship at this period in history is a competitive one, based upon quite different views of the world and conflicting long-term aims; at the same time, it is also true that these two countries, as inhabitants of the same planet, have many overlapping interests. Common sense dictates that we should, while advancing our own interests and purposes energetically, seek to

regulate the competitive aspects of the relationship to reduce the danger of war and at the same time to enlarge the area of cooperation where our interests are not in conflict....

Discussion of Current Issues

1. SALT...And yet, despite the complexity of the technical aspects of SALT, the basic policy questions involved come down to a matter of common sense and judgment, on which the President, the Congress, and an informed public can base their decisions....

Within the past month, during the visit of the Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr. Gromyko, to Washington, con-

siderable progress was made in breaking through issues that had been deadlocked for a long time....

...progress in SALT would represent not only a significant improvement in the most important single aspect of Soviet-American relations, but an advance in the most fundamental issue affecting international peace and security.

3. Areas of Political Competition.

...For thirty years, through four Arab-Israeli conflicts, Soviet and American interests have intersected in the Middle East. While Soviet influence in the area has had its ups and downs, it is obvious that the area is of considerable importance to the Soviet Union, and that a constructive rather than an obstructive role by the Soviet Union would be an important element in any effort to reduce the danger of another Middle Eastern war.

In the current situation, we have been able to work both with Israel and the Arab parties in starting the process toward a settlement, but to achieve a comprehensive and durable solution requires direct negotiations between the parties. This can best be achieved, we believe, under the auspices of a Geneva Conference, with the cooperation and support of its two co-chairmen, the United States and the Soviet Union.

It should be made clear beyond any doubt that it was this objective that was the sole motivation in our joining with the Soviets in the recent Soviet-American statement on the Middle East during the visit of Foreign Minister Gromyko to the United States. It would be an error to believe that the statement was inspired by any desire to use the Middle East as a vehicle for improving United States-Soviet relations....

4. Economic Relations. The development of economic relations is clearly an important component of the total relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. In recent years, the Soviet Union has indicated an active interest in expanding its importation of agricultural products, consumer goods, manufactured goods, and advanced technology. It would also like to expand its export of manufactured goods as well as raw materials to Western markets. The development of this trade with the United States and other advanced industrial nations can be a stabilizing factor in Soviet policy toward the world.

There are also areas in which Soviet and U.S. economic policies are affected by and have a critical impact on the rest of the world. Foremost among these are international grain trade and energy problems. The cooperation of the Soviet Union in the orderly allocation and

handling of food reserves as well as the supply and availability of oil will be increasingly important.

Questions have been raised about the balance of political risks and benefits to the United States that need to be weighed in determining a national policy on the expansion of economic relations with the Soviet Union. Clearly, a period of national discussion and consultations with the Congress lie before us as we seek to clarify such issues as the extension of Most Favored Nation status to the Soviet Union, what criteria should govern the extension of credits through the Export-Import Bank, what criteria should govern the transfer of technology, to what extent we should participate in energy and other resource development projects, etc. We shall also have to address the question of how the necessary degree of coordination can be achieved between the government and the private sector, and between the United States and its allies.

It has been the declared policy of this government that it looks toward an improvement in economic relations between the Soviet Union and the United States as conditions make this possible, and in my view it would be desirable to move in this direction by prompt and measured steps. The concrete measures by which this policy can be implemented will be determined on the basis of consultations with the Congress.

...6. Human Rights....

We do not see this objective as inconsistent with the desire to work toward reduced international tension and improved Soviet-American relations; on the contrary, we believe that in the long run the reduction of international tension can contribute to an easing of the internal pressures which restrict the fullest realization of the creative potential of men and women everywhere.

External Factors

Among other external factors, perhaps the most important for its influence on the Soviet-American relationship is the capability of the international community to absorb the thrust of the Soviet Union toward expanding its political influence and establishing itself as a global power. It is a characteristic mark of this period in history that the rise of the Soviet Union as a world power coincides with many other profound transformations in the international order. The Soviet Union seems not to have fully perceived how much the revolutionary transformations of this age have moved from the patterns of traditional Marxist-Leninist thought, and it is not clear how Soviet aspirations will adjust to the new patterns.