

Capitol Hill shaken up by LaRouche television exposé

by Ronald Kokinda

The exposure of direct involvement of officials of the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D.C., in shaping the language of anti-defense legislation before the Congress, by Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. on ABC-TV on May 31, is threatening to unravel 25 years of Pugwash Conference control over U.S. strategic policy-making. Interest in official Washington circles in Soviet participation in the U.S. legislative process is growing rapidly. Any major media coverage or investigation of charges will thoroughly discredit today's Neville Chamberlains and halt the demolition of the U.S. defense budget currently going on in Congress.

And not a moment too soon. The House completed its Soviet-directed rampage against the defense budget on May 31, taking action that will deal a severe blow to the MX missile, halt the testing of our current anti-satellite systems (ASATs) and the development of more advanced ASATs, and stop deployment of our sea-launched cruise missiles (SLCMs). This is just in action on the major weapons systems alone. The House also rubber-stamped the House Armed Services Committee decision to cut \$480 million from the administration's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) request. If such a cut is sustained in the Senate, it almost assures an eventual Soviet victory in the race to develop and deploy beam weapon defenses against intercontinental ballistic missiles.

To Moscow's delight, however, the House attacks against defense were not only on the basis of dollars and cents. Rather—shaped largely by Representative Les Aspin (D-Wisc.)—the cutbacks were doctrinally designed to keep the United States within the confines of the Mutually Assured Destruction doctrine. They were all fully in accordance with the Pugwash agreements, worked out between Bertrand Russell and the Soviets in the late 1950s to impose the self-

emasculating process of arms control and the MAD doctrine on the United States.

Indeed, the Pugwash circuit has become so institutionalized, that the negotiations between the United States and the Soviets are no longer "back channel" as they were in the 1950s and 1960s. During the House debate on the defense budget, no fewer than three delegations of leading Soviet officials visited Washington, D.C., and were in intimate discussion on stopping ASATs, the SDI, and other defense programs. Earlier, as *EIR* exposed in its June 5 issue, the Soviet embassy had actually helped revise the bill banning ASATs, via the good offices of Carol Rosin—the Joan Collins of the space arms-control lobby.

Now the Defense Authorization bill will be taken up in the Republican-controlled Senate. Sources had been reporting that the Senate could sustain the ASAT testing moratorium imposed by the House, make similar cuts in the funding for the SDI, and would not likely retake enough ground on the MX procurement question or on SLCMs to effectively reverse the House damage to these programs.

But by exposing the Soviet hand in the efforts to cut the U.S. defense budget, the LaRouche broadcast has put this Moscow-run assault on U.S. national security in jeopardy.

Mathias on the defensive

How much the charges of Soviet interference into U.S. lawmaking can shake up even the most impassioned arms-control proponent was highlighted at a Capitol Hill press conference on June 7. Sen. Charles Mathias (R-Md.), a co-sponsor of the Soviet-revised SJ Res. 129 banning ASAT testing, was asked by *EIR* if he felt "comfortable" co-sponsoring such legislation. Mathias appeared stunned and said "it would be improper for any foreign power, friendly or

otherwise, to participate in the legislative process of this nation," and that he would "strongly condemn any such action." Would he drop co-sponsorship of SJ Res. 129? Mathias sidestepped, declaring that he had "not seen this statement until you called it to our attention." His press aide later said they "plan to investigate" the charge. Mathias is the chief sponsor of the Senate amendment to ban the U.S. deployment of SLCMs and is reportedly going to be the chief sponsor of the amendment to cut funding for the Strategic Defense Initiative; he would do well to investigate Soviet complicity in developing that legislation as well.

Pro-defense circles in the capital are already unofficially advocating an investigation. Various sources report that elements in the Pentagon are pushing for one.

The LaRouche broadcast's impact was seen in an across-the-board strengthening of the posture of President Reagan, Defense Secretary Weinberger, and pro-defense layers on Capitol Hill. Both Reagan and Weinberger gave unusually strong statements in commemoration of the anniversary of D-Day on June 6. Speaking on Omaha Beach in Normandy, President Reagan departed from his recent election-year motivated tendency to soft-pedal the strategic dangers facing the United States to state, "We in America have learned bitter lessons from two world wars: It is better to be here, ready to protect peace, than to take blind shelter across the sea and rushing to respond only after freedom is lost." The President also identified the morality of a national commitment to mobilize for war for a just cause, noting that the D-Day invasion was motivated by "the deep knowledge, and pray God we have not lost it, that there is a profound moral difference between the use of force for liberation and the use of force for conquest."

Speaking in Washington before a U.S. Army group, Weinberger attacked "isolationism" as the easy rationalization for appeasement and "for not doing anything that may be unpleasant or unpopular that [Winston] Churchill had to fight against in his lonely battle to save freedom 45 years ago." Weinberger attacked the opponents of a strong national defense for the U.S. as representing "faint-hearted and siren calls."

That some of the Soviet-directed momentum against Western defense has slowed slightly was evidenced in the first day of Senate debate on the defense budget. The Senate rejected 76 to 16 an amendment to the Defense Authorization bill which would have prevented U.S. spending increases for NATO unless European nations followed suit. However, while rejecting that overt attempt to decouple from Europe, the Senate did engage in dangerous "Europe-bashing" by voting 91 to 3 to "urge" NATO nations to increase their military spending.

The actual spending cut amendment had been offered by Sen. Larry Pressler (R-S.D.), chief author of the notorious Soviet-revised SJ Res. 129 for a space weapons ban. Pressler also introduced another NATO-related amendment, which—at press time—had not yet been voted on. It would reduce

U.S. troop strength in Europe and demand that Europe bolster its own conventional defenses—in what would be an impossible effort to match Soviet conventional capabilities.

The lineup against defense

Senate sources report that some of the momentum against ASATs and the SDI has been curbed and chances of withstanding the ASAT moratorium amendment are "now about even." Nonetheless, the Soviet-orchestrated lineup in the Senate is formidable. Taking the point for the Politburo in the Senate will be some of the senior members of the "arms-control club": Senators Charles Percy (R-Ill.), Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.), William Proxmire (D-Wisc.) and Charles Mathias (R-Md.)—all devoted neo-Malthusians.

As of this writing, the deployment against the defensive beam weapons and ASATs is as follows:

Senators Mathias and Proxmire will introduce the amendment to cut funding for the beam-weapons program back from the \$1.68 billion proposed by the Senate Armed Services Committee to the House-approved level of \$1.4 billion or below. The administration's original request was an already-inadequate \$1.8 billion for fiscal 1985.

Senator Pressler has introduced an amendment which calls for a "report" on the Strategic Defense Initiative. The purpose of the report will be to draw a target around all government funding for the SDI (much of which is dispersed throughout government agencies other than the SDI office itself) and to prematurely force the administration to identify exactly which defensive-weapons systems it intends to develop. A standard "arms-control mafia" tactic, such reports are used as a jumping off point to kill a program. Sen. Paul Tsongas (D-Mass.) will spearhead the effort to impose a moratorium on U.S. ASAT testing—as already passed by the House.

Most importantly, Senator Percy, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has taken over direction of the notorious Moscow-drafted SJ Res. 129, whose ultimate purpose in banning space-based or space-directed defensive weapons is to maintain the thermonuclear offensive weapon balance of terror. On May 23, Percy announced that, in consultation with Pressler, he was amending SJ Res. 129 with some technical language relating to ASAT verification, and taking over the floor fight. In his floor speech Percy made clear why he, a 20-year veteran in the fight against ballistic missile defenses, was taking charge. After perfunctory remarks about ASATs, Percy said, "Even more disturbing, administration officials have formalized a so-called strategic defense initiative that raises grave questions as to its cost, goals, technological feasibility, effect on crisis stability and consistency with long-standing U.S. arms control policy."

This is the fight to be surfaced during the Senate debate—the fight by the Soviets and their fellow travelers to maintain the United States in the arms-control straitjacket which, over the last 20 years, has destroyed U.S. strategic superiority and put the Soviet Union on the verge of superpower dominance.