

## Eye on Washington by Nicholas F. Benton

### Arbatov: 'LaRouche invokes nationalism'

Soviet spokesman Georgii Arkadievich Arbatov, on his 40th trip to the United States, to address the American Society of Newspaper Publishers here April 11, became visibly unsettled at the mention of the name Lyndon H. LaRouche. He was particular distressed that LaRouche is invoking a mood of "nationalism" in the U.S. population.

Arbatov is a member of the Communist Party's Central Committee and head of the U.S.A.-Canada a KGB front that monitors U.S. political affairs.

Right after his address to the publishers, Arbatov was approached by this reporter. This was the exchange:

**EIR:** Mr. Arbatov, what do the Soviets think of Lyndon LaRouche and the victory of his candidates in Illinois?

**Arbatov:** I think LaRouche is a fascist.

**EIR:** But what about the popular support for his candidates? Do you see that as a trend within the population of the United States?

**Arbatov:** Yes, it does reflect a certain trend. It is a very disturbing thing to see a population motivated by racial intolerance and nationalism. . . .

**EIR:** Is this a cause for serious concern to the Soviets?

**Arbatov:** This is an event which should not be overlooked, it could be very serious.

When I then stated that deploy-

ment of the Soviets' new SS-25 missile was a violation of the SALT II accord, he wanted to know which publication I represented, and when I told him, his eyebrows rose, and he gasped, "LaRouche!" Turning 180 degrees, he walked about as fast as the laws of physics would allow a mass of his particular aerodynamic design.

Otherwise, Arbatov had such gems to throw out to his audience as 1) the lack of a free press in the Soviet Union is "a self-delusion of the Americans," and 2) there are "only a tiny handful of political prisoners in the Soviet Union."

Arbatov did state that charges by American journalists of media censorship in the Soviet Union were a case of "the pot calling the kettle black." "You [addressing the 400 publishers] are just more sophisticated than we are. You are masters of public relations," he said. Other than his candid expression of concern over LaRouche, this was the closest thing to the truth he had to say all day.

Arbatov shared the podium with Mark Palmer, deputy assistant secretary of state for European affairs, a young Kissinger clone. Palmer stated: "Miscalculation, rather than any calculated intent, is the greatest danger of war." Therefore, he concluded, agreeing to and signing a treaty, any treaty, is better than signing no treaty at all.

This is directly contrary to the assessment of the Pentagon, expressed in its recently-released *Soviet Military Power, 1986*, and verbally confirmed by Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, that the Soviets are operating on a doctrine that a nuclear war can be fought and won. Hence, calculated actions by the Soviets over the coming period represent the greatest threat to world peace, and the United States has to be prepared to respond to that before signing any treaties.

### Texas governor calls oil security issue

Texas Gov. Mark White came to Washington April 10 to warn that continued low oil prices represent a national security threat to the United States. He renewed his call for an oil import tariff at \$15 (Lyndon LaRouche, speaking at the National Press Club the day before, endorsed White's call, but said the tariff should be \$20,

Speaking to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, White said, "The national security risk of allowing foreign governments to dictate the flow of energy supplies into this country is unnecessary and should be unacceptable to every American.

"This is not just a Texas position, it is not an oil state position, it is not an industry position. National security is a national interest, and I would pray that is our position as a nation. Our nation cannot afford to wait until a shortage arrives before taking steps to encourage cost-effective production. . . . We have the ability in the United States, if the administration would only exercise the will—to stabilize oil prices, strengthen domestic energy production, enhance America's independence, and secure our national defense with a few strokes of the President's pen. Why not a temporary, variable tariff?"

Is Reagan listening? At his nationally televised press conference April 9, Reagan hinted that national security considerations might snap him out of the hypnotic spell of the "free market" and "invisible hand." "The market in oil is not completely free. . . . There are some major producers of oil who are governments, not private corporations or business people. . . . and we must keep our eyes open to see that no one starts playing tricks for some kind of illicit future gain. . . . We would have to keep our options open."