

Opposition grows to 'Reagachev' arms deal

by Nicholas F. Benton

On the eve of "Pearl Harbor Day summit," when Reagan and Gorbachov were slated to sign a treaty to eliminate all Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) missiles, a groundswell of opposition to the treaty in the United States and the NATO alliance began to surface.

This first became apparent on Dec. 4, with the appearance of a full-page advertisement in the *Washington Times*, signed by the "Ad Hoc Committee to Stop the INF Treaty," which warned that "the political consequences of the proposed INF treaty are already shaking the foundations of the Western alliance." Signers included over 200 military, political, scientific, and community leaders of the United States, West Germany, England, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, and Bolivia. The ad also appeared in the *Manchester Union Leader* in New Hampshire, and is scheduled to run in the *Washington Post* and the *International Herald Tribune*.

Paid for by the Schiller Institute, headed by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, wife of U.S. Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche, the ad broke into a Washington environment already highly charged with the presence of a Soviet delegation and many of the 5,000 international press that had already arrived for the summit. Secretary Gorbachov's slick interview on NBC television on Nov. 30—which unleashed a new wave of what Washington pundits now call "gorbasm" in the media—was followed by an interview on Dec. 3 on all major U.S. networks with a halting, confused, and dangerously deluded President Reagan.

Conservative backlash

The "Ad Hoc Committee" ad had no sooner hit Washington, than a coalition of organizations formerly supportive of President Reagan, called the "Anti-Appeasement Alliance," followed with an explosive press conference at the National

Press Club, charging that Reagan appeared ready to sacrifice the security interests of the nation in favor of "commercial interests who wish to do business with the Soviets—represented by persons such as Armand Hammer, Dwayne Andreas, Donald Kendall, and William Verity."

Conservative Caucus chairman Howard Phillips, who is co-chairman of the "Anti-Appeasement Alliance," vowed to fight "the 'Reagachev' doctrine," and said that the President had become "a useful idiot in service to the Kremlin . . . an amiable simpleton, an Ed Wynn's 'perfect fool,' " under the control of a "triumvirate of appeasers: Howard Baker, George Shultz, and Frank Carlucci." Phillips called Reagan "a very weak man with a strong wife and a strong staff," adding, "He is little more than a speech-reader-in-chief for the pro-appeasement faction."

He pointed out that with the removal of all INF missiles from Europe, the West will have no more theater nuclear missiles that can effectively strike the interior of the Soviet Union, while the Soviets will retain 92% of their nuclear missiles capable of hitting Europe (and points beyond). As the "Ad Hoc Committee" ad also pointed out, new Russian mobile ICBM systems, the SS-24 and SS-25, and the short-range SS-21, will combine with exotic new weapons technologies, such as radio frequency weapons, to augment the 6-to-1 Soviet conventional force advantage and give the Soviets, without INF missiles, an insurmountable military advantage in Western Europe.

While weighing in against Reagan himself, Phillips also singled out Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci for attack, noting that he was originally "Walter Mondale's choice to be deputy director of the CIA during the Carter administration."

This is particularly relevant because, since taking over from Caspar Weinberger at the Pentagon in November, Carlucci has shown a willingness to accommodate to demands

by liberals in Congress to slash the defense budget, including a 33% cut in funding this year for the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Leading up to the Reagan-Gorbachov summit, Carlucci was in Europe, alluding to the need for the United States to cut its troop levels there.

Phillips pointed out that Carlucci "used U.S. tax dollars to subsidize radical Marxist activities as director of the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity in 1970-71 . . . and was close to Patrice Lumumba during his service in the Congo." He added that during Carlucci's stint as ambassador to Portugal, Communist control of the former Portuguese colonies of Angola and Mozambique was consolidated.

But Phillips saved his strongest verbiage for the President himself, saying that he "is depending on Gorbachov now the same way that Nixon depended upon Brezhnev in 1973-74." He said that Reagan "has already sunk more U.S. submarines than anyone since Hitler," in an effort to maintain a unilateral compliance with the never-ratified SALT II treaty for six years, and now, "with the final terms drawing to a close, Reagan is no longer in any way accountable to you or me or millions of others who recognize that we are in a deadly, strategic end-game with the Soviet Union, which is militarily the most powerful regime in world history."

The attacks on the President's policy were further fueled by the publication in the *Washington Times* on Dec. 4 of a report on a forthcoming book by former White House Chief of Staff Michael Deaver, which states that Deaver teamed up with Nancy Reagan to get the President "to soften his line on the Soviet Union, to reduce military spending, and not to push 'star wars' at the expense of the poor and dispossessed." According to Deaver's account, "It was Nancy who pushed everybody on the [November 1985] Geneva summit. She felt strongly that it was not only in the interest of world peace, but the correct move politically. She would buttonhole George Shultz, Bud McFarlane, and others to be sure that they were moving toward that goal."

Conservative mail-order fundraiser Richard Viguerie, the other co-chairman of the "Anti-Appeasement Alliance," charged that ratification of the treaty by the Senate will fracture the Republican Party and have disastrous consequences for the 1988 elections, by blurring the distinctions between the parties in the eyes of voters. He said that Vice President George Bush would have to ask for a delay in the ratification vote to avoid this.

Phillips added that Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole (R-Kan.), also a presidential candidate, would be key to whether or not the treaty were ratified by the Senate, but added, "Dole is not on our side. . . . He is a less-clumsy George Bush who is no threat to an Armand Hammer or Dwayne Andreas."

President Reagan, meanwhile, tried to pander to Senate Republicans whose votes he will need for ratification of the treaty by making some tough-sounding statements about the Soviets, and issuing a report on Soviet treaty violations on the eve of the summit. The report, despite its disturbing

revelations about ongoing Soviet preparations to prepare a nationwide anti-ballistic missile defense, did not deter the President from committing himself to sign the INF treaty on Dec. 8.

But the anti-INF momentum is only beginning. In a briefing at the Foreign Press Center in Washington Dec. 3, Steven Andragna of the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis confirmed that "the Soviets intend to gain an overwhelming advantage in their forward deployment at key points in Western Europe," as a result of the INF treaty, and that the Soviets have not abandoned the "theory of the offensive" as their strategic military doctrine.

In the effort to drive this point home, former NATO Supreme Commander Gen. Bernard Rogers and former U.S. Ambassador to France Evan Galbraith will redouble their fight against the treaty. Dan Casey, executive director of the American Conservative Union, said that a series of "killer amendments" will be added to the treaty when it reaches the Senate floor, including: 1) a requirement that the Soviets comply with existing arms control treaties prior to confirmation of the INF treaty; 2) pro-SDI and pro-tactical defense language in the treaty; and 3) conventional force reductions to parity levels, prior to confirmation of the INF treaty.

Soviets thrown off guard

Despite Gorbachov's best "Madison Avenue" efforts, others in the Soviet delegation contributed in their usual fashion to discrediting themselves in the eyes of the U.S. population, during a series of press briefings in Washington leading up to the summit, particularly when faced with tough questioning from *EIR*.

Soviet experts held three briefings before jammed audiences at the National Press Club Dec. 2-4, and each time were thrown onto the defensive by *EIR* because of their inability to adjust to Gorbachov's new admission, during his NBC-TV interview, that Moscow has an aggressive SDI research program of its own. Despite the fact that they have been spending, according to a CIA estimate, more than \$150 billion working on military applications of directed-energy systems for the last 20 years, the Soviets had categorically denied any such effort ever since Reagan launched the U.S. SDI program March 23, 1983.

When this reporter reminded Soviet Academician Yevgenii Velikhov of a heated debate between the two of us on this issue last year at the Reykjavik summit, and challenged Velikhov to explain why Gorbachov had now admitted what was denied before, Velikhov reacted defensively, shocking the audience by denying that Gorbachov had admitted to Soviet work on an SDI. Two days later, this reporter challenged Soviet Communist Party Central Committee member Albert Vlasov with the same question, asking why the Soviet "strategic deception" on its SDI work had been dropped. It was again denied, and it took three tries from this reporter to force Vlasov to concede that Gorbachov had, indeed, admitted to the Soviet SDI effort.