

to withdrawal from the 1972 ABM Treaty]. We haven't agreed on the length of time of that non-withdrawal period."

Shevardnadze, in a simultaneously held press conference, was more specific on his SDI discussions: "The SDI program, which is called the Star Wars program, is what it is, yes. But it is probably impossible to persuade the U.S. administration. And therefore, we insist on a minimum solution, on a minimum option, and that is that the ABM Treaty should be complied with strictly, should be strictly observed for a minimum of 10 years. . . . If the ABM Treaty is destroyed, then no agreement on strategic offensive weapons is possible. We have now defined, identified a position that we accept and that is the position that at least the ABM Treaty has to be preserved, has to be observed for 10 years in its classic interpretation."

### Senate marches to Soviet beat

On the same day, the U.S. Senate, by a vote of 58 to 38, voted to agree with the Soviet foreign minister on the subject of restricting the SDI to within the so-called "narrow" interpretation of the ABM Treaty.

To all appearances, the United States has been sold out to the Soviet Union by none other than Ronald Reagan, the man who, in 1980, campaigned on a platform calling for the repudiation of the SALT treaties. Among strategic analysts and political observers, the remaining question is whether this capitulation will be carried out to the end. This will require two further steps. First, an actual treaty is yet to be signed, presumably in November of this year. Second, the 1988 presidential election would have to produce an administration committed to securing both the ratification and the enforcement of such a treaty.

Of all presidential candidates, only Democrat Lyndon LaRouche has unambiguously declared that he intends to nullify such a treaty on the very day of his inauguration. His Democratic rivals have been longstanding supporters of this treaty. The putative Republican front runner, Vice President Bush, announced his determination to implement the INF Treaty and also to move further with a Strategic and Space Arms Treaty.

Apart from LaRouche, the other opponents of the sell-out are the leading military commanders of the country, most vocal among them being Gen. Bernard Rogers and his successor in NATO, Gen. John Galvin. Defense Secretary Weinberger opposes the treaty, but, being a member of the Cabinet, he is not voicing his opposition publicly. The Soviet leadership is fully aware of the potential that the LaRouche campaign has for reversing their diplomatic triumph. The Sept. 18 issue of *Izvestia* wrote: "The history of Soviet-American relations teaches us that we should not fall into euphoria. Our policy is consistent, but the world of American politics is complicated and it is very difficult to predict it," admitting thereby that Moscow is not ruling out an election victory of the only opponent of the INF Treaty, Democrat Lyndon LaRouche.

## Shevardnadze ducks question from EIR

by Nicholas F. Benton

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Over the course of a marathon two-hour press conference held in the Soviet embassy here Sept. 18 by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze to crow about his triumph in pulling off the zero-option INF "agreement in principle," there was only one question from the over 100 reporters that was the slightest bit critical of what Shevardnadze was saying. That came from this reporter.

Otherwise, the entire conference, which followed three days of talks between Shevardnadze and Shultz and their respective teams of negotiators, was a "love fest" between the U.S. press and Shevardnadze.

One reporter asked, "Is this is the beginning of a new era of détente?" Shevardnadze, unable to repress the look of the cat who ate the canary throughout the briefing, said, "Yes, this is a substantive, material basis for that kind of period."

Another, quoting from a *New York Times* column by Tom Wicker that coincidentally appeared the same morning, "Do you want to go to a 'minimal sufficient defense' nuclear policy, creating a 150-kilometer corridor in Europe with no opposing forces in it?" "Yes," Shevardnadze beamed, "We are hopeful our agreement here will be an incentive toward that."

This reporter tried to interject some reality into the proceeding, and to test Shevardnadze in a way that would reveal his true motives.

Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadi Gerasimov was in charge of calling on the press for its questions. He gave the first question to the CBS Moscow correspondent, but then could not avoid my hand, as I was sitting in the front row, and pointed to me next. I announced my name, and my magazine. Recognizing *EIR*, Shevardnadze interjected, his voice dripping with sarcasm, "It is clear that Comrade Gerasimov likes to call on his favorite reporters first!"

The faces of all four Soviets at the head table—Shevardnadze, Gerasimov, Deputy Foreign Minister Alexandr Bessmertnykh, and Soviet Ambassador to the United States Yuri Dubinin—went through visible contortions while I asked my question.

Shevardnadze had, during his opening remarks, said that his country had invited U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger to meet with his Soviet counterpart to negotiate

their differences on interpretations of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty. The Soviets couched all references to their efforts to strangle the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) program in terms of "seeking to extend the 'traditional interpretation' of the ABM treaty for another 10 years."

So, I began by noting, "You say you have invited Weinberger to talk about the ABM treaty, but you have not answered the concern that Weinberger has repeatedly expressed about this: Namely, that you have not been willing to concede that you have been working on your own version of the SDI for 18 years, and that you have an operational anti-satellite system already in place.

"And in addition, what do you have to say to those in this country who are critical of the INF accord, saying that it will make Western Europe indefensible, not only because it will leave the Soviets with a massive conventional force advantage, but because you are developing a whole new array of exotic weapons even more lethal than nuclear weapons, such as electromagnetic pulse and radio frequency weapons?"

The fact that Shevardnadze refused to answer a single substantive part of that question should have been a clear signal to everyone there that all his talk of "love and peace" was a sham. He ignored all the references in the question to Soviet advanced military technology—their long-standing SDI program, their ASAT, and their exotic new weapons systems. Acknowledging the Soviets' aggressive programs in all these areas would have confirmed that when he said, during his opening remarks, that the INF accord would "begin to bring an end to the era of nuclear weapons," that he really meant that a new age of even more deadly weapons was replacing it.

He instead lied that Weinberger's "only real concern is about our radar at Krasnoyarsk."

He then expounded on the "openness" evidenced by the recent invitation by the Soviets for a U.S. congressional delegation to visit and examine the controversial radar (see *Feature*, and said he hoped the U.S. would now respond in kind, and allow a Soviet delegation to examine the U.S. radar at Thule, Greenland.

"At any rate, we are proposing that our two defense ministers now have a meeting to discuss these alleged violations and to remove any irritants on a continuation of the ABM treaty. I urge you to put some pressure on your Defense Department in this matter," he said to the assembled press.

As to the concern that Western Europe would be indefensible, he ignored the reference to the new weapons systems, and instead said only that "huge arsenals remain of nuclear and conventional weapons" which "guarantee the security" of Western Europe. He said that it was the job of future negotiations to reduce the remaining weapons to the "lowest possible level."

Based on the deluge of euphoric questions which followed from other reporters, the serious evasions in Shevardnadze's response seemed to be lost on most everyone.

## Swedish press links the FBI's hounding

There are direct links between the FBI's political persecution of 1988 Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche and the Soviet government, according to a five-part series appearing in the leading Swedish daily newspaper, *Svenska Dagbladet*. The Department of Justice's prosecutor of LaRouche, Boston Assistant U.S. Attorney John Markham, has avowed plausibly that his office directly authorized FBI collaboration with Soviet intelligence networks operating inside the Swedish foreign ministry's intelligence service, the Section for the Special Collection of Information (SSI).

According to Swedish sources, former Prime Minister Olof Palme was killed as part of the same Iranian gun-running operations in which Alexander Haig, "Bud" McFarlane, Admiral Poindexter, Oliver North, Roy Godson, and the FBI's Oliver "Buck" Revell were so deeply involved. This weapons-trafficking to Khomeini's terrorist regime was done in close cooperation with the governments of Israel and the Soviet Union, with billions of dollars of profits shared all around over the years 1979 to the present.

Immediately after Palme's assassination, on Feb. 28, 1986, Soviet intelligence, working together with the U.S. Anti-Defamation League (ADL), fingered Democrat Lyndon LaRouche as the author of the assassination. Now, it is exposed that this operation targeting LaRouche was coordinated by a Soviet national working inside the Swedish foreign intelligence service, Joel Haukka.

The Swedish legislative inquiry into the Haukka case, is concerned chiefly with the fact that Haukka used the targeting of LaRouche as a way of covering up for Palme's assassins. Every indication is, that it was Moscow's assets and partners in Iran weapons-trafficking who killed Palme.

From the U.S. side, the important fact is that Haukka was long known to the CIA and FBI foreign counterintelligence as a Soviet agent. Yet, it was the FBI foreign counterintelligence section, and the Boston and Alexandria U.S. Attorneys' offices, which cooperated directly with Haukka's Soviet ring, as part of the grand jury targeting of LaRouche et al. in Boston and Alexandria.

What brings the Palme assassination's connection to Ir-