

## Kennedy helps Gorbachov's drive to decouple Europe

by Kathleen Klenetsky

Under the guise of new, headline-grabbing arms-control proposals, the Soviet Union has embarked upon what it intends to be the final offensive in its battle to bring Western Europe under its boot.

The latest Soviet "peace offensive" began with Mikhail Gorbachov's Jan. 15 arms-control proposals, calling for the removal of all American and Soviet nuclear forces in Europe; it escalated dramatically in the first weeks in February. Moscow is employing every tool imaginable—from Sen. Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.), who has apparently taken it upon himself to become chief U.S. arms-control negotiator, to direct appeals by a leading Soviet military figure on West German television, to convince Europe that its best interests lie in looking East, not West, for allies.

The intensification of the Soviet operation was signaled by Ted Kennedy's widely publicized three-day trip to Moscow in early February. Soviet boss Mikhail Gorbachov used the trip to add a new fillip to his Jan. 15 disarmament scam, announcing, according to Kennedy and the official Soviet news agency TASS, that the Soviet leadership has dropped its insistence that the United States abandon the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) as a precondition for negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces.

This was praised forthwith by Kennedy as a breakthrough, in a pre-recorded message delivered over Soviet television on Feb. 7. First assuring his audience, "I believe that . . . Gorbachov is sincere in his desire to reduce nuclear arms," Kennedy then noted his own "reservations" on the SDI, and of his support for the Soviet position on the interpretation of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty. That treaty, he said, "must be maintained," and not "flouted" by research on SDI.

Gorbachov also used Kennedy's visit to deliver a threat to President Reagan: Unless "practical results" were sure to emerge from the next superpower summit, he told Kennedy, there would simply be no point in going ahead with the meeting. Gorbachov suggested an agreement to denuclearize Western Europe as an appropriate such "practical result."

The effect of Gorbachov's offer was instantaneous. West Germany's foreign minister and Soviet asset, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, issued a statement approving the intentions of the Soviet superpower. Washington must not allow such well-meant disarmament opportunities to pass by unheeded, he said.

The response of the British Foreign Office was similar. A complex series of negotiations is already under way in which Britain has agreed to discuss what it had until now refused even to consider: phasing-out of its own independent nuclear deterrent force.

The Soviets followed up this bit of propaganda with something even more spectacular. On Feb. 12, Col.-Gen. Nikolai Chervov appeared on West Berlin television, where he declared that the Soviet Union is ready to destroy all of its European-based SS-20 missiles, under the eyes of international inspectors, if NATO does the same with its intermediate-range nuclear missiles.

"We do not propose to move these SS-20 missiles somewhere else. They will be destroyed under painstaking and reliable national and international control, including inspections on site and on the spot," Chervov said. "The U.S.S.R. is ready to destroy all intermediate-range missiles targeted on Western Europe if NATO is ready to do the same."

West German defense analysts characterized Chervov's statements as the first detailed elaboration of Gorbachov's

latest disarmament and verification problems.

These and related Soviet maneuvers are designed to achieve one objective: to force the decoupling of the United States from Western Europe, a development which would put America's closest allies into the Soviet sphere of influence.

The Soviet proposals are clearly designed to increase the political pressure on President Reagan to strike a bargain with Moscow, which would strip Europe of an effective defense against Soviet forces. In view of the overwhelming Soviet conventional superiority in Europe, the only serious deterrent to Soviet aggression in Western Europe is the nuclear arsenal maintained by the United States, added to the independent deterrents of France and Britain. Remove this, and nothing could stop a Soviet march to the Atlantic.

But such a military act would probably not be required for the transformation of Western Europe into a Soviet satrapy. The withdrawal of American nuclear deterrence from Europe would send an unmistakable political signal to Europeans that they had been pushed out from under the American nuclear umbrella. Europe would be left with no alternative but to negotiate the best possible terms of surrender with Moscow.

This is the essence of the Gorbachov "negotiating proposal" carried back to Washington by Senator Kennedy, and endorsed by Kennedy's fellow appeasers in Europe.

### **Gramm-Rudman to force cuts**

Moscow's renewed "peace offensive" is tailored to maximize Western European fears that the United States is already preparing to decrease its military commitment to NATO. There is deep consternation among pro-NATO forces in Europe, that budgetary pressures in the United States, particularly those coming from the Gramm-Rudman law, will force Washington to cut, perhaps by as much as one-half, the American

Those fears are fully justified. *EIR* has learned that such key "pro-defense" senators and congressmen as House Armed Services chairman Rep. Les Aspin (R-Wisc.) and Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.), sponsor of the infamous Nunn amendment, plan to use the pretext of Gramm-Rudman-mandated defense cuts to initiate a "great debate" over strategic policy. A central focus of the debate will be the question of whether the United States can afford to maintain its existing military deployments abroad, especially in Western Europe.

According to one of Aspin's top aides, there is "serious talk" on the Hill that the United States will be forced to cut back its troop presence in Europe, in order to meet Gramm-Rudman's defense-cutback requirements.

"You have two choices under Gramm-Rudman," he explained. "You can either keep your force structure intact—but that would mean stopping procurement for an entire year, which is crazy; or you can cut back on your force structure. The question is: Do we cut back on troops in Europe or in Kansas?"

The staffer disclosed that Aspin plans a series of speeches and Congressional hearings, in which the question of a U.S. troop withdrawal from Europe would be discussed in the broader framework of America's relationship to NATO, "as raised by [Henry] Kissinger and [Zbigniew] Brzezinski." He also revealed that Aspin has been discussing these issues with Norman Ornstein, of the American Enterprise Institute, a Washington-based "conservative" think  
been lobbying for an American troop withdrawal from Europe, most recently in a Jan. 26 *Washington Post* commentary, in which he happily insisted that Congress will react to Gramm-Rudman's cost-cutting pressures "by finally cutting the number of American troops in Europe," from 360,000 to 90,000.

True to his aide's words, Aspin gave a speech to the Washington World Affairs Council Feb. 12, with a "decoupling" theme so pronounced that it must have brought tears of joy to Gorbachov and friends. Aspin said that the search for budget cuts will lead Congress to a "fundamental reexamination" of U.S. defense strategy and relations with the allies. Predicting that military spending in 1987 will be less than in 1986, probably significantly so, "This year it [budget cuts] may force Congress to take a look at policy. And what would come out of that, God only knows." Defense cuts "mean a fundamental reexamination of a whole host of things—defense policy, policy with allies, fundamental questions about what forces you need, what parts of the world do you want to defend," said Aspin. "You're talking about fundamental questions that have not been asked, certainly not by Congress. . . . Congress up till now has not questioned policy behind the budgets, not ever."

### **An appeasement government**

The way the Reagan administration has been functioning gives little basis for hope that Moscow's thrust to decouple Europe will be derailed. The U.S. government, executive and legislative branches alike, are undergoing a rapid transformation from constitutional bodies reflecting a certain amount of constituency input, into deformed entities capable only of meeting the demands of Moscow, and of the International Monetary Fund.

Ted Kennedy's antics in Moscow are just the latest example of a pervasive pattern in which the constitutional form of government is being abandoned, in favor of a more streamlined method of policymaking in which the objections of whatever patriots remain in the country can be overridden with relative ease.

Just as Kennedy took on functions in the foreign-policy arena normally reserved for the President, so did Sen. Richard Lugar (R-Ind.), who has been handed carte blanche by the administration to dictate U.S. policy toward the Philippines. At the White House, Chief of Staff Don Regan has been functioning as the de facto prime minister, while the President, elected with one of the great landslides in recent history, is more and more performing as a figurehead.