
Documentation

Goldwater, Helms speak against Burt

The following remarks have been excerpted from the Congressional Record of July 15, 1985, reporting the Senate session on Department of State nominations, under the sub-head, "Nomination of Richard R. Burt." The speakers are Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.) and Jesse Helms (R-N.C.)

Mr. Goldwater: Mr. President, . . . my colleagues might recall that when Mr. Burt was first suggested as being a member of the State Department I objected. I objected basically at that time on the grounds that when he was a reporter for the *New York Times* he had made disclosures of very highly classified material that nearly disrupted the relations between Norway and our country.

. . . I have received, and this is something that has never happened to me in the 30-odd years I have served in this body, as of maybe a half hour ago 26 telephone calls from Germany saying that they oppose the appointment of Mr. Burt to be ambassador. As I say, that has never happened before. I do not know if it was engineered by someone in this country. I do not know what the source is.

I merely think the Senate should be interested in that fact.

Mr. Helms: . . . I am opposed to the nomination of Mr. Richard Burt. I opposed Mr. Burt's nomination when he was chosen to be Assistant Secretary for European Affairs. I pointed out at that time that Mr. Burt's action, in publishing sensitive classified data while a reporter for the *New York Times* compromised his ability to serve the U.S. government.

At that time Mr. Burt published information about the Chalet satellite system, a system which he said was used by the United States for detecting violations of the arms control treaties by the Soviet Union. For some reason, many of my colleagues, in their eagerness to confirm Mr. Burt, did not think it significant that Mr. Burt, as a journalist, had compromised our intelligence data.

But now, after Mr. Burt's performance as Assistant Secretary, we see how, ironically, the Chalet story episode was a perfect prelude to the philosophy which he pursued within the administration. For Mr. Burt became the prime exponent in the councils of the administration of the doctrine that the United States should unilaterally observe the arms constraints

of the SALT II Treaty, even though that treaty was never ratified by the U.S. Senate, and even though the Soviets themselves have committed massive violations of the levels proposed in that treaty.

. . . I attempted to question him about his performance as Assistant Secretary. But Mr. Burt was extremely reticent to discuss his record. . . . Indeed, Mr. Burt stated that if his actions and advice were subject to become public knowledge that he could not serve effectively. . . . It is very strange that Mr. Burt had no inhibitions about publishing sensitive, classified information that affected the security of the United States when he was a journalist; but now that he is a public servant he declines to disclose even information that is nonclassified.

. . . It is well known that Mr. Burt has consistently opposed any significant change from the arms control philosophy of the Carter administration. Perhaps that is why he is so well regarded by partisans of that administration. While he claims that there is a philosophical difference between himself and the Carter policy-makers—while he claims that he does not believe that increased security will flow from arms control—his policies are basically the same. The only difference is that he rationalizes these policies in terms of keeping the Atlantic alliance going, rather than on the basis of arms control per se; but the politics are fundamentally the same.

. . . We also know what his position has been on observance of the SALT II treaties. His preferred position for START would have been SALT II with cosmetic changes. His second preference would be for a "Vladivostock" style agreement—that is the observance of unilateral declarations by both sides, without any verification. He has always opposed limits on throw-weight although at the beginning he was only against direct limits on throw-weight. Since our START position was announced in May 1982, he has been attempting to get the administration to raise the limit on warheads, thereby undercutting its effectiveness.

Mr. Burt says that he favors the SDI. But he would like to trade away the SDI for an agreement that would permit an increase in Soviet missile RV warheads. For him it is a mere bargaining chip. Indeed, until the President clearly vetoed the idea personally, Mr. Burt called for a three-year moratorium on SDI testing.

. . . Finally, Mr. Burt has been the principal architect of the interim restraint theory, that is, that we should observe the unratified SALT II Treaty even though it was never ratified and even though both President Reagan and the Senate Armed Services Committee pronounced it fatally flawed. It is not surprising, then, that he has been the main opponent within the administration of reporting to Congress on Soviet SALT violations. He has refused to find any Soviet SALT violations; when the violations were pointed out to him, he refused to call the violations violations. Clearly, he did not want any public announcement about Soviet violations, or do anything concrete to require the Soviets to correct those

violations—and he supports continued compliance with all of SALT II, despite the Soviet violations.

Mr. Burt may take umbrage at this recital, for when his record is made public one might get the impression that he is more anxious to find excuses for Soviet imperialism and oppression than he is to develop coherent policies for the administration to rectify the situation. But the record is there to see. If Mr. Burt wants to challenge it, then let him drop his advocacy of the Armacost doctrine; let him come and testify under oath. I think there may be some others who would be happy to testify at the same time.

Telegrams from around the world oppose Burt

A sampling of many telegrams sent from both sides of the Atlantic on July 10-16, urging the Senate to oppose the appointment of Richard Burt as U.S. ambassador to West Germany:

France

In the name of the European-American alliance, I support your fight against the nomination of Richard Burt. I am personally very worried about West Germany and I believe it is the next Soviet card to fall if we do not act together against the pacifists preparing the “New Yalta”—**Gen. Marcel Bigeard**, Member of the French Parliament and the UDF party, former State Secretary of Defense, Paris; telegram sent to Senators Goldwater, Helms, Wallop, Warner, Hefflin, Deconcini, Long, Stennis, Johnston, Zorinski, Exxon, Hollings.

As a former French senator, I want to affirm to you, that I do not consider Mr. Richard Burt an appropriate choice as U.S. ambassador to serve in Bonn, because I consider him incapable of defending the Western alliance—**Sen. Georges Repiquet**, former vice-president of the Armed Forces and Defense Committee of the French Senate Foreign Affairs Commission; to Sen. Russell Long.

Federal Republic of Germany

Please accept this expression of my concern over the appointment of Mr. Richard Burt as ambassador to Bonn. I believe that Mr. Burt's closest friends in my country are ready to pursue a policy of appeasement in a time of considerable danger and challenge to the Western alliance. I respectfully urge that you and your distinguished colleagues of the United States Senate oppose Mr. Burt as Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany—**Vice-Adm. (ret.) Karl Adolf Zenker**, Bonn; to Senator Helms.

It would certainly be against the interests of the Western Alliance to entrust a man like Richard Burt with the respon-

sibilities of a U.S. ambassador to Germany—**Dr. Hans Kiskalt**, former chief of police, Frankfurt; to Senator Helms.

We support your fight against the nomination of Richard Burt. We need an American patriot and a man who can keep secrets—**Gen. (ret.) Paul-Albert Scherer**, former head, military intelligence service, Saarbrücken; to Senator Hollings.

We, the undersigned leading members of anti-Hitler resistance “Reichsbanner” that fought and fights both Nazis and communists, urge you to prevent the nomination of Richard Burt as ambassador to Germany. This nomination threatens the existence of the Western alliance—**R. Becker, F. Hron, M. Mann-Kauert, K. Muehling, M. Mletzko**; to Senator Hollings.

As an American long resident in Germany, I am seriously disturbed at the prospect of Mr. Burt's being appointed American ambassador in Bonn. I urge you in the interest of existing healthy U.S.-German relations to oppose his confirmation—**Col. (U.S.A., ret.) James Bradley**; to Senators Helms, Symms, McClure, Hatch, Thurmond, and Hollings.

Your concern that an appointment of Mr. R. Burt as American ambassador will have grave consequences for the U.S. position in the F.R.G and Europe has been reported here, and is welcomed, for especially those of Willy Brandt's political conviction against the Western alliance publicly welcome Mr. Burt. Encouraged by your actions in this matter, I and the majority of the German population that welcomed your President in our country recently pray that the U.S. Senate will have the wisdom to confirm a new ambassador about whom there is no doubt that he will personify the policies of President Ronald Reagan—**Lt.-Col. (ret.) Arnold Boldt**; to Senators Helms, Symms, and McClure.

It is encouraging to know that a number of distinguished U.S. senators have voiced concern that the possible appointment of Mr. R. Burt as American ambassador in Bonn may have grave consequences for our alliance and each of our countries. I can confidently say that a majority of the German population shares these concerns. I sincerely hope that it will be possible for those senators with the necessary insight and knowledge to make clear to their colleagues that it would be a serious mistake to appoint Mr. Burt ambassador in Bonn—**Prof. Dr. Günther Rohrmoser**, Stuttgart; to Senators McClure, Symms, and Helms.

In times that try men's souls, it is heartening that senators like yourself have the courage to insist on the fundamentals upon which our alliance rests. May I congratulate you, and add that your objections to the appointment of Mr. R. Burt as U.S. Ambassador in Bonn encourages those of us who know the challenges we must jointly meet, and strongly irritates those like Willy Brandt, who like to lean on American spokesmen for their anti-Western policies. May your courage be steadfast, and may your colleagues show the wisdom to confirm a person to the vital post of U.S. ambassador who truly represents the President of the United States—**Dr.**