
A Rogues' Gallery

Who's who in the assault on the Strategic Defense Initiative

We present here political profiles of some of the ringleaders of the congressional offensive against U.S. national-security interests.

Sen. Claiborne Pell

The senior senator from Rhode Island, Pell (D) is one of the bluest of the bluebloods on Capitol Hill. He has openly boasted that his Brahmin forebears were diehard Tory sympathizers during the Revolutionary War; judging by his career, he seems bent on living up to his anti-American heritage.

Pell claims two other distinctions: He is "very proud" to be the only elected public office holder in the Club of Rome, the international oligarchical organization devoted to killing off billions of the world's "useless eaters" on grounds that the Earth's resources cannot support current population levels. In addition, Pell is one of the few members of Congress to attend meetings of International Pugwash, the Bertrand Russell-Leo Szilard movement which wants to supplant sovereign nation-states with One-World government.

Thus it is hardly surprising to find Pell in the midst of all sorts of operations against U.S. national interests, especially those aimed at undermining America's ability to defend itself and its allies.

Pell's hostility to America's well-being is strikingly illustrated by his involvement with the Washington-based Institute for Security and Cooperation in Outer Space (ISCOS). Headed by an aspiring Mata Hari named Carol Rosin, ISCOS was exposed by *EIR* two years ago (June 5, 1984) as a virtual KGB nest. By Rosin's own testimony, ISCOS transmitted anti-SDI and anti-ASAT legislation drafted by the Soviet embassy in Washington to congressmen associated with the Space Policy Working Group, an informal congressional caucus, who then introduced it as legislation.

Pell not only sits on ISCOS's board; he frequently hosts ISCOS functions and helps develop ISCOS policy, which, naturally, opposes U.S. development of a strategic defense system.

In May 1984, right at the time that Congress was preparing to vote on defense-spending legislation and related measures, Pell threw a reception on Capitol Hill for a visiting Soviet delegation, led by Georgii Arbatov and top laser sci-

entist, E. P. Velikhov. Key members of Congress and their aides participated, and discussion reportedly centered on how to derail President Reagan's SDI initiative.

Pell has historically had close relations with Moscow bigwigs. He was the last American to meet with Yuri Andropov before the former KGB chief's death in 1983.

Pell continues to work against all elements of U.S. military strength. Most recently, he joined 47 of his fellow senators in demanding that SDI budget increases be capped at a maximum 3% per year. He also signed a June 18 letter, along with 12 of his colleagues, which called on President Reagan to adhere to a "strict interpretation" of the ABM treaty. Released by the National Campaign to Save the ABM Treaty, a coalition which coordinates anti-SDI strategy, the letter claimed that the treaty bans all space-based defense systems, including those using new technologies such as lasers and directed energy, now being developed under the rubric of the SDI.

Pell also opposes Reagan's decision to break out of SALT II, supports a nuclear freeze and a ban on ASATs, and has recommended that the United States agree to bargain away the SDI for an arms-control agreement with Moscow.

Rep. Les Aspin

A former "whiz kid" in Robert Strange McNamara's Defense Department, Aspin (D-Wisc.) has singlemindedly pursued his patron's program for wrecking America's defenses and appeasing Moscow, since he was first elected to represent Wisconsin's first congressional district in 1970.

In his 15 years on the Hill, the Yale- and Oxford-educated Aspin has made a name for himself as a "defense maven," knowledgeable about arcane military matters. That carefully built reputation bore fruit in late 1984, when Aspin made a successful bid to oust Rep. Mel Price (D-Ill.) as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and then grabbed that powerful post for himself, leapfrogging over five more senior—and conservative—Democrats in the process.

Among Aspin's major claims to fame is the pivotal role he played in forging a "compromise" on the MX missile, which put major obstacles in the way of producing and deploying this desperately needed replacement for America's aging Minuteman ICBM force. In this, Aspin functioned in

tandem with the recommendations of the Scowcroft Commission, headed by Kissinger Associates partner Brent Scowcroft. Aspin has promoted two other key Scowcroft Commission recommendations: production of the single-warhead Midgetman missile, and a slowdown in implementation of the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Aspin greatly admires Kissinger. In a *Wall Street Journal* profile published last April—which accurately described Aspin as “one of the most crucial players in setting the course that will reshape the nation’s defense budget” in this period of Gramm-Rudman “retrenchment”—Aspin’s longtime working relationship with Kissinger was stressed as a key factor in his approach to defense and strategic issues. Foreign policy during the Kissinger-Nixon administration was “the best run in my experience in Washington,” Aspin told the *Journal*. Kissinger “knew how to make the system work. He knew how to make things happen.”

Aspin, too, appears to know how to make things happen: the wrong things. For example, Aspin took the point this spring in fashioning a House budget proposal for FY1987 that cut President Reagan’s defense request from \$320 billion, to \$285 billion.

Among Aspin’s major current projects is so-called military reform. A leading member of the Military Reform Caucus in Congress, Aspin helped shape and usher through Congress legislation that would provide for the most sweeping overhaul of the Pentagon since World War II.

Befitting his ties to Kissinger, Aspin has also emerged recently as a major force behind the “decoupling” of Europe and the United States. A top Aspin aide confirmed earlier this year, that Aspin is working closely with Norm Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) to develop a plan for the withdrawal of American troops stationed in Western Europe. Ornstein, in a *Washington Post* commentary last January, proposed that the United States withdraw and demobilize 90,000-100,000 of its troops from Europe, in order to meet the defense cutbacks mandated by the Gramm-Rudman bill. In a speech to the Washington World Affairs Council Feb. 13, Nunn stated that the search for defense budget cuts in Congress may lead to a “fundamental reexamination” of U.S. defense strategy and relations with the allies. In May, one of Aspin’s chief assistants privately charged that the number of troops which the United States has committed to the defense of Europe is “asinine.”

Aspin maintains close links to Georgetown’s Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS)—home to Kissinger, and a decoupling nest. He sits on the European Policy Group as well as the Strategy and Arms Control Group, where he rubs elbows with Scowcroft and former Mondale defense-adviser Walter Slocombe. Aspin also belongs to AEI’s National Defense Policy Studies Advisory Council, and to the Council on Foreign Relations. He frequently attends seminars sponsored by the Aspen Institute, a center for

the “New Yalta” faction.

Aspin has his share of chutzpah. Claiming to want to give the Democrats a “pro-defense” image, he recently helped author a House Democratic “defense blueprint,” which calls for eliminating the MX, sharply curtailing the SDI, banning ASAT tests in space, adhering to SALT II, strengthening the ABM treaty, and drastically cutting defense spending. According to Aspin, the proposals “ought to make Moscow sit up and take notice—notice that . . . if they’re willing to cooperate, we’ll hammer out arms control agreements that will leave the world safer and more secure.”

Sen. Sam Nunn

The Democratic senator from Georgia is a carbon copy of Les Aspin. He too is known as a whiz on defense matters, and this has allowed him to become possibly the major influence in the Senate Armed Services Committee, where he is now ranking Democrat. He could become chairman, if the Republicans lose control of the Senate in November.

In part, Nunn’s pro-defense image stems from his family background. His great-uncle was Carl Vinson, who headed the House Armed Services Committee for decades. But Vinson—who helped Nunn obtain a seat on the Senate Armed Services panel when he came to Washington in 1972—would probably turn over in his grave at the policies that Nunn is promoting under the guise of a “strong defense.”

Nunn is perhaps best known as the sponsor of the infamous “Nunn amendment.” Introduced as an amendment to the FY1985 defense bill, and only narrowly defeated, the bill would have mandated a phased pull-out of U.S. troops from Western Europe.

Sources in Nunn’s office admitted that the measure was partly inspired by Henry Kissinger’s March 4, 1984 *Time* magazine article proposing a restructuring of NATO which would have eventually dismembered the alliance.

If anything, Nunn’s support for decoupling has intensified since then. In an interview with Reuters on June 5, Nunn said he is seriously considering re-introducing his 1984 troop-withdrawal amendment, if NATO does not increase defense spending. A source at the Institute for East-West Security Studies predicts that Nunn will “lead the charge” on the Hill this year for a sharp reduction in the American troop presence in Western Europe, a view shared by AEI’s Norm Ornstein.

In the same Reuters interview, Nunn rapped President Reagan’s decision to abandon SALT II, calling it “counterproductive from the point of view of America’s relationship with the allies” and a move that “will give the Soviets a field day in terms of propaganda.”

Shortly thereafter, Nunn joined a new “study group” at CSIS, initiated by former Reagan national security adviser Robert McFarlane, aimed at designing a new “arms control regime” to replace SALT II.

Nunn also told Reuters his stand on SDI, claiming to back

vigorous research into defensive systems, but criticizing the Reagan administration for overemphasizing the SDI and other strategic programs, at the expense of conventional weaponry.

Nunn subsequently played a pivotal role in Senate attacks on the SDI budget. Together with Sen. Bill Cohen (R-Maine), one of the few Trilateral Commission members in the Congress, Nunn introduced an amendment, adopted by the Senate Armed Services Committee on June 20, that pared \$1.4 billion from the SDI budget, shifting some of the monies to conventional weapons technologies. Worse, the two announced they would fight to shift the entire structure and orientation of the program, away from the administration's concept of a multi-layered population defense, to a defense of missile sites only.

Nunn's supposedly "pro-defense" outlook is further discredited by his position on military spending overall. Nunn has been a promoter of the "realists" in Congress, who claim that budget constraints and other factors make it impossible for the United States to increase defense spending at the present time. When Reagan submitted his \$320 billion Pentagon budget to Congress in February, Nunn railed that the plan was "not in tune with fiscal reality," and asserted there was "no way" Congress would give Reagan what he asked.

Like Aspin, Nunn is a promoter of "military reform." Together with Armed Services chairman Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.), Nunn secured unanimous Senate approval for a radical Pentagon reform bill this year, which some have dubbed the "McNamara Memorial Bill" because it would vastly extend the systems-accounting methodology through which McNamara nearly destroyed the U.S. military in the 1960s.

Every uniformed and civilian service head has violently objected to the Nunn-Goldwater bill, charging that it would reduce the services' role in strategic planning, and make a "hash" of the defense structure. Marine Corps Commandant Gen. P. X. Kelley reportedly is especially incensed, asserting that it would cause "significant degradation in the efficiency and effectiveness of the defense establishment—to the point where I have deep concerns for the future of the United States."

But Nunn, who has insisted that national strategy must be tailored to budgetary considerations, claims the bill would help remedy problems "that have plagued our national defense for decades."

Nunn's record in other areas vitally affecting U.S. national security is no better. For instance, Nunn lent his voice in February to the drive to force Philippines President Marcos out of office. On Feb. 13, while near-civil war conditions raged in the Philippines, following Marcos's re-election, Nunn fired off a letter to President Reagan declaring that "the Philippine people want President Marcos out and they have elected Corazon Aquino." Nunn urged Reagan to take several

measures aimed at forcing Marcos to step down, including cutting off all U.S. aid to the country, if Marcos did not hand over the government to the Aquino forces.

Where does Nunn get his "pro-defense" notions? From many of the same places Aspin does. He belongs to CSIS's European Policy Group, chairs the institute's Grand Strategy Forum, and sits on AEI's National Defense Policy Studies Advisory Council.

Nunn also was a major force behind the formation of the Democratic Leadership Council, another Democratic Party policy-group groping for ways to eliminate the party's richly deserved "better red than dead" image. Nunn has written a position paper on defense policy, which the DLC is scheduled to issue in July.

Rep. Dante Fascell

Fascell (D-Fla.) has adroitly exploited his position as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to promote every key item of the "New Yalta" agenda. He has particularly focused on arms control and military matters.

Fascell has been in the forefront of the effort to force the administration to negotiate a nuclear test ban with the Soviet Union. This would fit Moscow's purposes to a tee, since it would, among other things, prevent the testing of the x-ray laser, one of the most promising SDI-related technologies.

Fascell took up this and other issues when he led a congressional delegation to meet with Mikhail Gorbachov in early April.

A week and half a later, Fascell and Les Aspin drafted a letter to Reagan, which was signed by more than 140 congressmen, urging the President to continue to abide by the unratified SALT II treaty. If the United States were to renounce it, they claimed, the Soviet Union would be able to "spurt out ahead of us in strategic power" because it has "hot production lines" for adding new nuclear weapons. Fascell and friends failed to add that this was a problem only because they have insisted in taking so much money out of the U.S. defense budget.

When Reagan failed to take this advice, Fascell took the lead in promoting several measures aimed at forcing Reagan to change his mind, including a non-binding resolution calling on Reagan to abide by SALT II's sublimits, which Fascell rushed through the House Armed Services Committee and onto the House floor in June.

Fascell has also distinguished himself by being one of the few members of Congress who objected to Reagan's operations against Libya in the Gulf of Sidra last March. Fascell shot off a letter to Reagan charging that the President had contravened the War Powers Act, by failing to consult sufficiently with Congress before ordering the strike.

Fascell has frequently spoken out against the SDI, claiming that the program won't work and doesn't merit the money being spent on it.