Hyde cites European support for beams

In dissenting remarks to the House Foreign Affairs Committee's May 18 report attacking anti-satellite and directed-energy defensive beam weapons, Rep. Henry Hyde (R-Ill.), a senior member of the committee, reported to the Congress for the first time on European support for the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Hyde acknowledged that “although some West European defense ministers, including German Defense Minister Manfred Wörner, have expressed concerns” about the beam-weapon program, “France has recently expressed interest in moving beyond nuclear weapons and is worried over the possible deployment of a Soviet strategic defensive system.” Hyde also criticized the committee, both for ignoring “a discussion of United States and Soviet strategic doctrine,” and for failing to “more fully recognize the advantages of moving towards a doctrine of Mutually Assured Survival and away from the increasingly unacceptable doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction.”

Hyde noted that the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) report, which the committee used as evidence of technical unfeasibility of beam weapons, had been “criticized by one of the top engineers at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.” The OTA report is also alleged to contain classified information; Hyde said that he would seek an investigation.

A ridiculously shoddy piece of work even by Congressional standards, the Democratic majority on the committee reached their conclusions after only three days of hearings which, excepting a couple of administration witnesses, heard testimony from only the opponents of the program such as Dr. Kurt Gottfried who represented the Union of Concerned Scientists. In the Senate, the KGB-manipulated Larry Pressler (R-S.D.) held a press conference on May 23, at which he released a new Congressional Budget Office study (CBO) which charged that the administration’s current Strategic Defense Initiative is redirecting money away from hard- and into long-term research and development. According to the CBO, “it could delay—though not foreclose—the option of deploying in the relatively near term a BMD system to defend hardened missile silos or other strategic assets in the event of a Soviet BMD deployment, which some analysts fear.” This new attack on the President’s program mirrors the criticisms of retired Gen. Danny Graham and the High Frontier grouping, whose work with left-wing, anti-“Star Wars” forces is under investigation by this journal.

A counter amendment was put forward by Rep. Beverly Byron (D-Md.), a member of the House Armed Services Committee, who pointed out that the Soviets have already conducted extensive testing of an operational ASAT capability; a ban placed on the United States at the present time puts the United States at a disadvantage. Her amendment would have allowed testing up to the level of previous Soviet tests. It was defeated by a nearly identical margin of votes.

Representative Robert Badham (R-Calif.), an outspoken opponent of the Brown-Coughlin amendment, came closest to the truth in this matter. He motivated support for the Byron alternative by saying, “What is asked here is simply that we be allowed to test to the extent that the Soviets have already tested. Now, I do not think that is too much to ask at all, considering the fact that it is really too bad that we have to discuss on this floor the fact that the Soviet Union is naming our weapons policy. It is the Soviet Union that allows us to test, the Soviet Union that allows us to develop weapons systems... All of a sudden the Soviets tell us what we can test and what we cannot.”

In the U.S. Senate, on the same day as the House ASAT vote, Sen. Charles Percy (R-Ill.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, introduced an amendment to S.J.R. 129, the Pressler ASAT resolution, which Percy says is cosponsored by nearly one-third of the Senate. The amendment seeks to update the Pressler resolution in the wake of the March 31, 1984 administration report on antisatellite weapons, which argued that problems of verification make the possibility of an effective ASAT treaty very remote. Percy states, “the amendment that we are offering today...
mirching the character of a visiting chief of state.”

Downey boasts of Pugwash caucus in House
Representative Tom Downey, the U.S. chairman of Parliamentarians for World Order—an outgrowth of Bertrand Russell’s Pugwash conference backchannel to the Soviet Union—took the floor of the House of Representatives on May 22 to reveal the extent of congressional activity behind the May 22 release of the “Four Continental Peace Initiative,” the call for Western appeasement put forward by various leaders in the Third World.

Downey states that he and the following Congressmen were active in the work of the WPO: Berkley Bedell (D-Iowa), Leach (R-Iowa), Calif.), Barney Frank (D-Mass.).

Gonzalez defends de la Madrid, Mexico
Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez (D-Tex.), outspoken critic of Henry Kissinger, introduced a resolution into the House of Representatives on May 21 condemning syndicated columnist Jack Anderson’s recent attacks on the integrity of Mexican President Miguel de la Madrid, and apologizing to the government of Mexico and its President. The resolution states, in part: “The President of Mexico has been improperly and unduly impugned by a deliberate, malicious and anonymous attack, inspired by a misguided policy, and that this calculated attack is unworthy of the United States, and more an embarrassment to the United States than to the government of Mexico; the government of the United States should apologize forthwith to the government of Mexico for the anonymous, malicious and wholly undocumented rumors it has spread against the President and government of Mexico.”

Gonzalez charges that the Anderson columns were inspired by the U.S. government in an effort “to let Mr. de la Madrid know of its displeasure through more than official channels.” Gonzalez concluded that “no matter how irritated Washington might be, however, it is clearly improper and offensive to resort to the tactic of bes-

Congressmen choose sides in anti-drug fight
The efforts by the FBI to undermine the anti-drug efforts of the special task force set up under Vice-President Bush have spilled over onto Capitol Hill. Following the attack by Drug Enforcement Administration head and FBI Deputy Director Francis “Bud” Mullen on the Vice-President’s National Narcotics Bureau Interdiction System (NNBIS), Hughes (D-N.J.) jumped into the fray on the side of Mullen.

In a floor statement on May 21, Hughes declared, “Bud Mullen is to be commended for honestly raising these issues within the administration. For too long this administration’s drug policy has been steered with an eye on the press releases and not with an eye on the results. . . . One of Bud Mullen’s points is that the administration public relations campaign surrounding the creation of NNBIS has undermined the morale of the DEA agents, the customs agents, the FBI agents, the BATF agents and the Coast Guard personnel who actually make the investigations, the seizures, and the arrests, because the NNBIS bureaucracy at the White House takes credit for their hard work. The lesson from this flap is that until our drug enforcement policies are developed and directed with unity and coherence, the separate fiefdoms will continue.”

Hughes is one of the chief sponsors, along with 33 other House members, of H.R. 4028 calling for the new creation of a cabinet-level drug director.