

# INF treaty to ban futuristic weapons

by Kathleen Klenetsky

The Reagan administration confirmed in late March that the INF Treaty, signed by President Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachov at last December's Pearl Harbor summit, will outlaw a whole new range of weapons, utilizing such advanced technologies as microwaves and lasers.

According to congressional sources, the agreement, now in the final stages of the ratification process, will not only prohibit U.S. Pershing IIs and ground-launched cruise missiles, but will also ban the flight-testing, construction, and deployment of all "futuristic" arms which meet the definition of an intermediate-range weapon set out in the treaty: i.e., are ground-launched by either cruise or ballistic missiles; can kill targets; and have a range between 500 and 5,500 kilometers.

Chief INF negotiator Maynard Glitman confirmed in testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee March 30, that the treaty does indeed pertain to these weapons. Despite widespread reports that it opposes including such weapons under the treaty, the Defense Department subsequently issued a statement giving its unqualified endorsement to Glitman's testimony.

## More suicide

Under the interpretation of the treaty now being put forward by the administration, the United States will deny to itself a number of sophisticated weapons now in the planning stages, and many more not yet even on the drawing boards, which fall within the category of INF weapons as defined by the accord. Several Senate offices are pulling together a list of American capabilities, present and planned, which would be knocked out by the treaty, including ones which would use radiation to kill enemy radar.

"This whole episode is a total disaster," one Senate defense aide bitterly complained to *EIR*. "As if pulling out the Pershings weren't bad enough, we're now getting ready to cut our throats in a slew of new ways."

The aide pointed out that the treaty will "kill the chances of any serious modernization of NATO defense capabilities . . . and will also doom" the deployment of a European theater version of the SDI, known as the TDI (Tactical De-

fense Initiative), which has been under consideration for several years, and which could have compensated in part for the loss of the Pershings and ground-launched cruise missiles under INF.

The aide stressed that the treaty, as it presently stands, does not refer to "futuristic weapons" as such, and blamed Senate Armed Services Committee chairman Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) and Sen. Dan Quayle (R-Ind.) for forcing the issue to the point that the agreement will now almost certainly be amended to explicitly ban them.

"A few of the more conservative senators went to Quayle and told him to shut up," the aide reported, "because they feared that if he and Nunn kept raising the issue, then either the State Department or the Soviets would say, 'Hey, here's another American capability we can get rid of. Let's draw up some new language prohibiting these weapons.'"

"Well, that's exactly what's happened. I can't believe these guys. Nunn and Quayle would drown their first-born, if they thought that would make the Russians happy."

Congressional sources have disclosed to *EIR* that Moscow and Washington will soon engage in an exchange of letters, which will list the specific systems and categories of "futuristic" weapon systems which the INF treaty disallows. The White House has so far refused to confirm or deny this report, saying only that exactly how it will proceed "is still being decided."

Nunn, however, indicated March 30 that he's prepared to add a proviso to the treaty, when it comes up on the Senate floor later in April, dealing with the issue, if the administration hasn't worked out a detailed understanding with the Soviets by that time.

## Implications for SDI

The "clarification" of the INF offered by the administration will not only have damaging consequences for the development of advanced theater capabilities for the West, but also for the Strategic Defense Initiative, Pentagon and other sources have stressed to *EIR*. For the past two-and-a-half years, Nunn and his coterie have been trying to straitjacket the SDI by forcing it to comply with the so-called "narrow" interpretation of the 1972 ABM Treaty favored by Moscow.

Nunn et al. have charged that the administration, in announcing back in 1985 that the treaty should be interpreted much more broadly, was attempting to apply an interpretation retroactively, and that this was impermissible. (In fact, the Nunn gang's claim is pure hogwash: The ABM pact's Agreed Statement D, adopted at Soviet insistence, clearly states that defensive systems based on "new physical principles" do not fall within the treaty's purview.)

But, sources say, now that the administration, by announcing that the INF treaty bans futuristic weapons, has adopted a "narrow" reading of that agreement, Nunn plans to exploit that concession to get the White House to agree to the "narrow" reading of the ABM Treaty.