

Shultz gets his orders: No concessions on beam defense

by Kathy Klenetsky

As we go to press, the Jan. 7-8 talks between Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz have not yet taken place. But events immediately leading up to the meeting indicate that for the time being, President Reagan, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, and other supporters of the Strategic Defense Initiative have gained the upper hand in the fierce faction fight which has been raging over the issue of whether the United States will pursue the beam-defense program or abandon it to appease Moscow.

In the week before Geneva, Reagan sent out a series of unmistakable signals that he would not acquiesce to Soviet demands to bargain away the SDI. He also took measures to reassure Western Europe of U.S. support. The President sent a telegram to the residents of Berlin reaffirming that the United States and its allies are unshakably committed to defending the city from takeover.

On another equally important front, the President announced on Jan. 2 that the United States would increase its aid for famine relief for eight African countries, including Ethiopia. Reagan also unveiled a new program, Food for Progress, to address the real cause of starvation, underdevelopment, by introducing capitalist methods of agriculture to Africa.

These are key steps in the right direction, but they don't mean that the battle for the SDI is won. Beam-defense foes are gathering their forces for a fresh offensive, concentrating on getting Congress to heed Henry Kissinger's injunction to "whittle away" funding for the program. The Jan. 2 resignation of long-time Reagan loyalist and SDI supporter William Clark may be just the latest manifestation of how ferociously Kissinger and the rest of the anti-SDI mob is battling to make Reagan give up his vision of rendering nuclear missiles "im-potent and obsolete."

Reagan: no concessions

Reagan underscored his "no concessions" stance for Geneva by issuing a formal statement on Jan. 3 in which he flatly asserted that the Soviets should have no objections to the SDI program. "We must seek another means of deterring war," Reagan said. "Certainly there should be a better way to strengthen peace and stability, a way to move away from a future that relies so heavily on the prospect of rapid and massive nuclear retaliation and toward greater reliance on defensive systems which threaten no one."

National Security Adviser Robert McFarlane made a similar point in a press briefing the same day, stating that Reagan wants to move away from the concept of the "mutual balance of terror. . . . The notion that a country is better off in a circumstance in which it is unable to defend itself, I think, is subject to question on its face." McFarlane also said, in response to a question, that the SDI "is not a bargaining chip."

Shultz in the doghouse

The President's decision to proceed full steam ahead with the SDI represents a devastating blow to the Eastern Establishment, which had entertained great hopes that the Geneva talks would serve as the means to trap Reagan into negotiating away the beam-defense program.

Reagan sent their hopes up the chimney when he deployed Shultz off to Geneva with a set of strict orders to make absolutely no concessions on the SDI. Reagan's instructions to Shultz, hammered out at a series of meetings over the New Year's holiday, included the following major elements:

- Shultz shall inform Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko of America's willingness to engage them in two sets of arms-control talks, one on offensive weapons and the other on defensive forces, including the SDI. But Shultz is to make it

absolutely clear that the United States will spurn any attempts to curb the SDI program, and will enter talks on defensive weapons with the sole objective of convincing the Russians that research into space defense could sharply reduce the threat of war.

- Shultz shall tell Gromyko that the United States will not agree to a moratorium on ASAT testing as a precondition for arms talks—which the Soviets have been vociferously demanding with State Department backing.

- Shultz shall also confront Gromyko with Soviet violations of the ABM treaty, citing in particular the Soviet radar station at Krasnoyarsk, Siberia, “almost certainly” a violation of the ABM accord.

Shultz up the tree

This must have been a particularly hard pill for Shultz to swallow, not only because his political allegiance resides with the opponents of the President’s program, but because he had been deployed into the administration for the express purpose of steering Reagan down the same primrose path of arms-control which his buddy Kissinger led Nixon. Reagan has deftly turned the tables—turning Shultz into a messenger-boy taking orders from a President he privately considers his inferior. Whether Shultz will put up with the humiliation and remain in the administration, waiting for outside pressures to create the circumstances in which Reagan can be pressured into significant concessions on the SDI, is an open question.

Reagan is not simply reining in Shultz and other administration enemies of the SDI; he’s also preparing a public offensive on behalf of his program. Anticipating howls of outrage from the Russians over the U.S. refusal to put the SDI on ice, Reagan has instructed the Pentagon to devise an international educational campaign about the Soviets’ vast research-and-development program in advanced-technology defensive systems—something which the Establishment media has covered up.

As reported in the Jan. 3 *New York Times*, the administration plans to step up its briefings and public statements with the objective of showing that the Soviet ABM program is much more comprehensive than any undertaken by the United States since Kissinger’s ABM Treaty.

NSC head McFarlane kicked off the effort in his pre-Geneva press briefing, where he stressed that Soviet spending on defensive systems *equals* their spending on offensive forces. The Soviets, he said, have “gone beyond equality to establish a superior position in measurable areas of greatest importance during crisis,” specifically referring to the Soviet mobile ABM system and the upgrading of the ABM system around Moscow.

The administration made a simultaneous intervention into Western Europe, via an article by Edward Teller, an architect of the beam-defense program, in the Jan. 2 edition of the Italian conservative daily *Il Tempo*. Clearly directed at the Vatican and other Catholic circles, Teller denounced Mutually Assured Destruction as “a moral failure” and argued

that the SDI is the only military doctrine compatible with Judeo-Christian morality (see excerpts, p 54).

The strong push which Reagan, Weinberger, and a few other administration-connected individuals are putting behind the SDI is encouraging, but it would be extremely foolish to see these positive developments as a cause for complacency. The enemies of the beam-defense program aren’t about to lay down and die; indeed, they’re busily sharpening their knives.

Traitors in Congress

A key battleground will be the U.S. Congress, where a cabal led by Kissinger’s pals, Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) and Sen. Larry Pressler (R-S.D.) have already worked out a strategy to stall the U.S. ASAT program and reduce SDI funding by 75%! They’ve been joined by other Congressional traitors, including Sens. Charles Mathias (R-Md.), Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.), William Proxmire (D.-Wisc.), and Dale Bumpers (D-Ark.), and Reps. Les Aspin (D-Wisc.), George Brown (D-Calif.), Larry Coughlin (R-Pa.), and Joe Moakley (D-Mass.)

According to Senator Mathias’s aide John Hess, there will be “substantive activity” against the SDI on the Hill. “We’re going to target various individual components of the SDI budget. That way, we won’t be attacking the SDI in general, but we’ll be able to get rid of certain key parts.” Hess also remarked that Kissinger’s strategy for “whittling down” the SDI “sounds real good.”

Reliable sources report that this gang’s strategy involves eliminating funding for the most important element of the SDI research program—prototype development—and slashing its funding from an expected Pentagon request of \$3.8 billion in fiscal year 1986 to a mere \$1 billion. That’s half a million *less* than the \$1.4 billion that Congress allocated to the SDI in FY 1985.

To make sure Congress does this, a number of nuclear-freeze and “public interest” groups have recently set up a coalition for the express purpose of lobbying Congress to reduce the SDI budget. Comprised of Physicians for Social Responsibility, Common Cause, SANE, the Union of Concerned Scientists, the League of Women Vultures, and assorted other pro-Moscow groups, the coalition works closely with the Space Working Group, an informal Capitol Hill outfit which presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche exposed on national television in May as a vehicle used by the Soviet Embassy in Washington to get anti-SDI legislation introduced in Congress.

Further conspiracies against the SDI will be hatched at a meeting of the United Nations Association in New York Jan. 14-15, which will bring together top Soviet representatives and the upper echelons of the U.S. arms-control mafia, including Kissinger associates Brent Scowcroft and Helmut Sonnenfeldt. UNA sources have told this news service that the behind-closed-doors confab will be devoted almost entirely to mapping out a strategy for derailing the SDI.