

EIR Feature

Washington traitors to kill the SDI on orders from Moscow

by Criton Zoakos

Between May 23 and June 20, the day that both Senate and House Armed Services panels voted drastic reductions in the funding of President Ronald Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, an ominous sequence of maneuvers, coordinated among the Kremlin, the State Department, and the U.S. Congress, has produced the greatest national security disaster for the United States since Pearl Harbor.

To reverse this Pearl Harbor's effects now, it will be necessary to purge the Reagan administration of all persons—including Secretary of State George Shultz, his arms-control adviser Paul Nitze, and chief arms-control negotiator Max Kampelman—who knowingly and willfully contributed to this debacle, and to sweep from Congress all those elected officials—such as Sens. Joseph Biden (D-Del.), Patrick Leahy (D-Va.), Bennett Johnston (D-La.), Sam Nunn (D-Ga.), and Reps. Dante Fascell (D-Fla.), Les Aspin (D-Wisc.), and Norman Dicks (D-Wash.), among others—who provided “aid and comfort” to the Soviet strategists who orchestrated this operation.

What happened?

The Strategic Defense Initiative, in the words of Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and SDI Director Lt.-Gen. James Abrahamson, has been “strangled in its cradle,” as a result of the extraordinary budget cuts voted by the Senate and House Armed Services Committees on June 20. If these votes are not reversed before October, then the principal Soviet objective at the Geneva arms-control negotiations, the “elimination of Star Wars,” will have been fully achieved. By October of this year, the Soviet Union will have no further reason to continue attending the Geneva sessions.

How did this happen?

The first public indication of collusion between Soviet officials and the State Department to kill the SDI emerged on Sunday, June 1, when Weinberger, on the television news program “Face the Nation,” said flatly that he had not been briefed on the—by then notorious—“new Soviet arms control proposals” made at Geneva during the May 29 session. Three days later, on June 4, Weinberger, now briefed on the Soviet proposals, appeared on the TV news show “Nightwatch” and stated



The rogues who are sabotaging SDI: from left, Sen Cranston, Rep. Les Aspin.

that the Soviet proposals are “against the national interests of the United States,” and “an attempt to kill the SDI by the side door.”

It turned out that the “new Soviet offer” consisted of two parts: first, a stipulation that the United States abide by the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty until the year 2000 and restrict SDI research to “laboratory-only” levels; second, a promise that, with the SDI killed, Moscow would promise to look into “drastic reductions of strategic offensive weapons.” Weinberger pointed out that the Soviet request to extend the duration of the ABM treaty was aimed at eliminating the possibility that Congress would fund the deployment of the SDI. “The Soviets know you can’t get funding for a program if you’ve said you are not going to use it for 10 years,” the defense secretary said.

Kampelman and ‘The Trust’

Even though the official legend was developed that this “new Soviet offer” was made on May 29, sources in Geneva close to the talks told *EIR* that, in fact, the idea of extending the ABM treaty had been discussed between Max Kampelman and Victor Karpov, the two chief negotiators, for “quite a while.” Not surprising: Max Kampelman is publicly associated with the idea that the SDI is useful only as a bargaining chip. During December 1984, shortly before he was named chief arms-control negotiator, Kampelman co-authored with Zbigniew Brzezinski an essay, published by the *New York Times Sunday Magazine*, which has become the “bible” for the entire arms-control mafia which, since March 23, 1983, has been committed to “whittling away” the Strategic De-

fense Initiative into a mere bargaining chip, never to be deployed.

At the time of Kampelman’s appointment as U.S. chief arms-control negotiator, and on repeated occasions ever since, this publication has warned that Kampelman ought not to be trusted with the fate of the SDI, or with anything to do with arms control. Kampelman’s political pedigree, like that of former U.N. ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick and Paul Nitze—all three hail from the bowels of Jay Lovestone’s “right-wing Social Democracy”—places him squarely in the murky area known, in intelligence parlance, as “The Trust.” Famous among the previous generation’s Trust operatives were the notorious tycoon Alexander Helphand (Parvus), the spiritual father of both the theory of “permanent revolution” and the idea of the “Pan-European Union,” now espoused by Lord Carrington, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, Giulio Andreotti, and the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). Other Trust operatives were Leon Trotsky, Nikolai Bukharin, and other associates of Jay Lovestone, who were eventually turned away by Soviet dictator Josef Stalin during the 1930s. The influential apparatus of the American right-wing Social Democracy later emerged out of the spurned Jay Lovestone’s political family. This group succeeded, with help from Sen. Joe McCarthy, in presenting its very special dispute with Stalin as some kind of genuine “anti-communism,” i.e., a set of fake credentials which bought a ticket of influence in the U.S. foreign policy and national security policy Establishment. This is what eventually gave us Max Kampelman, Paul Nitze, and the betrayal of the Strategic Defense Initiative.

The "new Soviet offer" at Geneva, though in the works for months, was made public exactly two days after President Reagan announced that the United States, in light of Soviet violations, will no longer abide by the SALT II treaty. To counter the impact of President Reagan's May 27 announcement that the SALT II treaty was dead, as a result of Soviet violations, the State Department, jointly with the major news media, launched a phony campaign to present the standard Soviet demand to scrap the SDI as "new," "surprising," and "unexpected." Moreover, Shultz sent his chief arms-control adviser, Paul Nitze, to the House Armed Services Committee on June 11, to give testimony which virtually amounted to coaching the Democrat-dominated committee on how to go about killing the President's Strategic Defense Initiative and why.

"The Soviets appear recently to have given some greater indications of potential movement in their position," Nitze told the committee. "Our negotiators in Geneva are attempting to determine whether there is any substance to these indications," he continued, referring to his colleague Kampelman's efforts to sell out the SDI in exchange for some imagined reductions in Soviet offensive weapons.

'Budgetary Constraints'

As for President Reagan's termination of compliance with the SALT treaty, Nitze ventured his own interpretation of events to the congressmen, pointing out that *under existing budget constraints*, he expects the President to continue, in the future, complying with the SALT II limits. Even after refitting more than 130 B-52s with nuclear-tipped cruise missiles, the United States might remain within SALT II limits, according to Nitze, because "the United States might dismantle another Poseidon submarine," scheduled for overhaul by June 1987, with the administration then invoking, again, reasons of cost, rather than adherence to the treaty for its own sake. According to Nitze, even though the administration may have renounced the treaty, it would still remain within its limits for "budgetary reasons."

Nitze's June 11 testimony catalyzed congressional forces into action, using budget authority to destroy the SDI, exactly as Weinberger had warned, on June 4, was the intent of the Soviet proposals.

To the applause of Soviet newspapers and television programs, a group of senators, led by Bennett Johnston, Joseph Biden, William Cohen (R-Maine), fee (R-R.I.), Ark.), cut funding for the SDI. On the day of Nitze's testimony, Senator Biden took to the floor of the Senate to intone in more or less hysterical tones: "President Reagan's arms-control policy has fallen under the influence of right-wing advisers who want to destroy SALT II and the whole framework of nuclear arms limitations. . . . We face the functional equiv-

alent of a national emergency in the conduct of our strategic policy. . . . [Reagan's] arms control advisers are well on the way to implementing a perverse policy that could inflict severe damage on the national security interests of the United States," Biden said, surprising everyone who knew his voting record, and his total past disregard for "national security interests."

On the same day, while Nitze and Biden were speaking in Washington, the Soviet news agency TASS announced the following: "On June 11 the U.S.S.R. delegation presented at Geneva an interim variant of a solution to problems connected with non-militarization of space and with reducing strategic weapons. It was proposed to reach an accord between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. on staying within the ABM treaty for at least 15 years and to restrict work in the field of the SDI to the level of laboratory research, that is, the threshold which the U.S.A. has already in practice reached."

On June 16, Senator Leahy of the Senate Intelligence Committee announced that he was introducing a bill to force the United States to remain within SALT limits. "People are genuinely concerned by the abandonment of SALT," he said, "and that will affect the Strategic Defense Initiative."

On June 20, both the House and the Senate Armed Services committees voted to cut the requested SDI budget by some \$1.8 billion for fiscal 1987. Four days later, the U.S. and Soviet negotiating teams had their final meeting in Geneva, before recessing for the summer. Chief U.S. negotiator Kampelman announced, most pleased with himself: "The fifth round of negotiations on nuclear and space arms has just ended. We hope it has in some areas opened the way to a serious dialogue which will narrow our differences and lead to agreement. I do not want to minimize the very real and important substantive differences that remain between us. But at least in some areas, we may now have fresh opportunities for serious and constructive discussion."

Mr. Kampelman's dream of negotiating the SDI down the drain has almost come true. The relevant congressional committees have voted to limit its funding to levels of "laboratory research," already pronounced acceptable by the Soviet Union. These committee recommendations are to be voted by Congress into law, some time around Sept. 18, the day the Geneva talks resume, and certainly before Oct. 1, for the next fiscal year. If this happens, the SDI will be dead, as the Soviet Union intended. With this defeat, the United States at Geneva will have no other practical choice but affix its signature to whatever piece of paper the Soviets choose to present. What had once started as an "arms-reduction" negotiation, will have become the negotiated surrender of the United States.

Oust the traitors!

This can be reversed by events intervening between now and Oct. 1, only if such events lead to full restoration of the

SDI budget. The May 23 to June 20 developments demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that the "arms-control mafia" is too deeply entrenched both inside the administration and in Congress, to permit any serious development of the SDI.

Responsible policymakers must therefore examine three sets of considerations: First, are the national security estimates which led to the decision to go with the SDI still valid? Second, are the national interests involved so overriding as to make it worthwhile to attempt to dislodge this "arms control mafia?" Third, what is really this political entity called the "arms control mafia?"

Those in the U.S. intelligence community who agree with the analysis of *EIR*, agree that the United States is menaced by an ongoing pre-general-war assault by the Soviet Union, whose leadership is bent on unchallenged world domination by the 1988-90 period. They also agree that the Soviet Union has achieved such an absolutely overwhelming superiority in offensive strategic weapons, that the only two choices allowed to the United States are: 1) an immediate crash effort to deploy a multi-layered system of strategic defenses as outlined by the SDI perspective, or 2) capitulation to Soviet dictates.

Rivaling this evaluation, the adherents of the "arms-control process" argue that no aggressive Soviet intentions exist; that the acknowledged Soviet violations are "militarily insignificant"; and that—following identically formulated Soviet arguments—the SDI is both unfeasible and destabilizing. These arguments have been refuted time and again. A review of the public record by any rational person will show that the "arms-control mafia" has abandoned any pretense to reasoned argument. This is not the place to repeat these arguments and refutations. Suffice it to say, that the "arms-control mafia," having abandoned all hope of winning by reasoned argument, has now resorted to the employment of crude force: Cut funding for the SDI and permit the military and diplomatic consequences of the cuts to take their effect.

If our evaluation is correct, that the Soviet Union is in a classical state of war against the United States, a state of war which, though undeclared, is nonetheless fully in effect according to the Soviets' own textbook definitions of what constitutes war in the era of nuclear weapons, then, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, all those officials in the Reagan administration, from Shultz on down, and all those members of the Senate and the House, who voted for the SDI budget cuts, are, technically, traitors for "providing aid and comfort" to the enemies of the United States in time of war.

Respecting the employment of the term "arms-control mafia": No such political entity exists in reality. Many well-meaning persons have employed the term in an effort to understand why some of their colleagues in government and elsewhere in policy making, are so obstinately committed to "arms control," an exercise whose sole and exclusive product

has been, so far, the emergence of the Soviet Union as the world's most awesome, unchallenged thermonuclear offensive power, rather than the control of arms in any sense. The myth was developed that these partisans of "arms control" are blinded to the harsh strategic realities of Soviet strategic ruthlessness, simply because such partisans have grown up and been educated, and had their careers shaped by the philosophy of arms control of the late 1950s and the 1960s, and that to abandon such deeply engrained habits of thought, would be both psychologically traumatic and perceived as a threat to careers whose advancement always depended on an arrangement of "arms control" regulating relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

This is a wrong way of looking at the phenomenon. The real cancer in the American political body is what, in specialist circles, has been known as The Trust—the general strategic orientation of the leading, financially powerful families of the U.S. Establishment, which include among their leading elements the Harrimans, the Rockefellers of the Trilateral Commission, the Mellons, the Bundy brothers, the Lodges, et al. For reasons of their own, this group had, in 1917 and during the early 1920s, played a critical role in assisting the Bolshevik Revolution in taking and consolidating power. With Josef Stalin's Russian chauvinist/nationalist turn, they experienced a falling-out which they repeatedly tried to mend, but did not succeed in mending, until, after Stalin's death, Lord Bertrand Russell and his World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government created, in 1955, the Pugwash Conference for World Peace, the principal agency for implementation of the "arms-control process," as it began, with certain final decisions adopted during 1958, at the New York Council on Foreign Relations, under the direction of McGeorge Bundy.

The modern form of the old Trust of the 1920s and 1930s—of which Jay Lovestone, the political granddad of Kampelman and Nitze, was a founding member—today, is these leading financial families which, under the spell of Lord Russell, created and nurtured the World Parliamentarians and Pugwash movements. Should some qualified U.S. national security/intelligence entity decide to develop a career profile of any of the senators and representatives who, from May 23 to June 20, participated in orchestrating the Soviet-ordered assault against the Strategic Defense Initiative, they will, without doubt, be able to situate the origins of these careers in some patronage by, association with, or dependency on the World Parliamentarians movement or the Pugwash movement, or the powerful financial families which, over the years, have cultivated these movements.

It is the power of this Establishment which must be curbed before the reconvening of the Geneva talks on Sept. 18, if the United States of America is to avoid the bitter fate of signing, at Geneva, a fateful instrument of surrender to Moscow's new czars.