

Moscow's program for the U.S. elections

by Rachel Douglas

In installments on the pages of *Pravda* and *Izvestia*, Soviet officials have been publishing their platform—for the American presidential elections.

The defense plank in the Soviet program for the United States provides for the elimination of the Strategic Defense Initiative, the effort to create directed-energy beam defense against missile attack. In foreign policy, the Kremlin spokesmen make clear that nothing less than the total dismemberment of NATO and the strategic humiliation of the United States will do.

These goals lead Moscow to a resounding endorsement of presidential candidates Walter Mondale and Gary Hart and of the Democratic National Committee's platform.

In the June 2 *Izvestia*, a sector head at Moscow's think-tank, the Institute of the World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), G. Zhukov, raised an alarm about the U.S. beam-weapons program and hailed the rejection of it by Democratic Party officials. "One has to see that the U.S. policy for creating a space-based anti-missile system will mean a radical change of military-political strategy," Zhukov wrote, echoing the recent statement of Soviet Chief of Staff Marshal N. Ogarkov. "The Democratic Party has paid attention to the growing alarm of broad layers of the American public in connection with Washington's policy to put weapons into space; in its draft election platform, it included the demand for the U.S. to immediately stop all testing and developing of anti-satellite weapons, and to refrain from putting any type of weapon into space."

Each concession made to the U.S.S.R. by traitors and appeasers in the Western nations is evoking Soviet demands for more. The Soviets applauded when the U.S. Congress killed the MX missile program on May 31, and the next day gloated over the decision by the Netherlands not to station any U.S. cruise missiles until 1988, if ever.

"Cracks in the Western alliance are starting to show," said the Soviet news agency TASS of the recently concluded NATO foreign ministers meeting in Washington. TASS described the Dutch government as "appeasing the peace movement," but in the way typical of aggressors confronted with appeasers, termed the Dutch move "ambiguous" and demanded further concessions. On June 2, TASS denounced NATO for planning to deploy anti-ballistic missiles, for allegedly fostering a Nazi revival in West Germany, and a score

of other faults. The Soviet news agency was "empowered by the Soviet leadership to state that the Soviet Union regards the results of the NATO session in Washington as proof of the bloc's intention to continue its militaristic course. . . ."

In Madrid on June 3, the Spanish Communist Party and left-wing trade union leaders held a huge demonstration to demand Spain leave NATO. The communist leader, Ignacio Gallego, had met with Soviet officials to plan a new push to get Spain out of NATO and shut the U.S. bases there.

Genrykh Trofimenko of Moscow's Institute of the U.S.A. and Canada told a "Euromissiles and Pacifism" Conference in Segovia, Spain in early June, that Europe should break from the United States and align with Russia. In a full-page commentary in the Spanish daily *El Pais* entitled "Europe for the Europeans," Trofimenko said, "The United States is economically disassociating itself from Europe" and the problem now is to end U.S.-European military ties in favor of "an authentic European unity . . . from the Atlantic to the Urals. . . ."

'Non-Use of Force'

The ferocity with which the Soviets, thanks to their agents of influence in NATO parliaments and governments, are gouging into Western defense capabilities shows the folly of going by Henry Kissinger's prescriptions for strategic arms talks and deals with the U.S.S.R.

Speaking to the Irish Parliament on June 4, President Ronald Reagan declared his willingness to discuss the "non-use of force" with the Soviet Union, if that would expedite superpower discussions in other areas. The Soviet idea of pledging "non-use of force" has never before been given legitimacy by any administration.

U.S. National Security Council head Robert McFarlane hailed the Reagan speech as portending a breakthrough in U.S.-Soviet negotiations. But the Kremlin crowd again spat in Reagan's face.

"At first glance," hissed Novosti Press Agency commentator Vladimir Alekseyev, "Mr. Reagan seemed to have spoken out for better contacts with the Soviet Union, for rapport on the medium-range nuclear arms issue. But only at first glance. In essence, he said nothing that was new. . . . There is nothing in this statement to indicate that the United States is ready to halt and reverse the deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles now to facilitate agreement at Geneva."

Soviet President Chernenko, in a June 4 speech, dismissed Reagan's proposals for resuming arms limitation talks. There will be no such talks until the United States pulls its missiles out of Europe, he said, since "talks under conditions of the deployment of American missiles would only generate in people an illusion of security. . . ." Security for anybody not firmly under the thumb of Mother Russia is not on Moscow's list of offerings. With military maneuvers and outright provocations in the vicinity of NATO air space and with diplomatic overtures where the U.S.S.R. sets the agenda, the Soviets are keeping the heat on the Western alliance.