

Congressional Closeup by William Jones

Senators ask renunciation of Hitler-Stalin Pact

Almost one year after Lyndon LaRouche expressed the demand that Mikhail Gorbachov, to demonstrate his *glasnost* sincerity, renounce the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1940, a.k.a., the Hitler-Stalin Pact, which assigned the Baltic states and sections of what was then Poland to the Soviet Union, 28 senators have written a letter to Gorbachov, telling him to renounce the treaty.

More specifically, they urge Gorbachov to "use the occasion of the upcoming 49th anniversary of the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact to order the publication in all the major Soviet newspapers of the Pact's secret protocols, to repudiate those protocols officially and publicly, and to pledge the Soviet government's commitment to restore genuine sovereignty to the Baltic States."

Ironically enough, the letter is signed by very liberal Democrats as well as a handful of conservatives. They point out that the United States has consistently refused to recognize the forcible incorporation of the Baltic states into the U.S.S.R. "So long as your government continues to sanction the ongoing violation of international law and interference in the internal affairs of the Baltic people," the letter continues, "the United States will never abandon its policy of non-recognition."

Perhaps the senators have acted in the hope that Gorbachov will, in fact, make some concrete moves to grant the Baltic states—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—a bit more elbow-room, in order to deflect some of the stiffen-

ing opposition to Gorbachov's *glasnost* by Baltic refugees in this country—a not-inconsiderable lobby group. The letter is to be read at rallies in the three Baltic states on Aug. 23, the 49th anniversary of the Hitler-Stalin Pact, and will also be broadcast to them by the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe.

Senate bill a step in decoupling of NATO

Attached to the Defense Authorization Bill, which was passed on Aug. 11 by a vote of 90-4, was an amendment by Sen. J. Bennett Johnston (D-La.) which could be a major blow to the stability of the Western alliance. It has already been highly criticized by British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, one of strongest supporters of Reagan administration policy in Western Europe.

Under the rubric of "burden-sharing," and in an effort to cure what Senator Johnston, citing Prof. Paul Kennedy, calls "imperial overreach," the amendment seeks to limit the number of U.S. dependents (families of U.S. servicemen living abroad) to 413,020, that is, the number of such dependents residing with U.S. military personnel outside the United States on Sept. 30, 1987. As Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) pointed out in commenting on this section of the bill, "forcing the separation of young families just to save money is unfair to these people, who are serving their country overseas."

The Johnston amendment also imposes a ceiling of 94,450 on the number of troops assigned to permanent

duty ashore in Japan and Korea. That limitation could be removed only under the condition that the United States would be forced to remove or reduce its manpower in the Philippines.

The most controversial part of the bill, however, is that which limits the costs paid by the United States for U.S. personnel and forces serving abroad, at the level of costs incurred in fiscal year 1989. Any added costs incurred by a deterioration in the value of the dollar would have to be born by the countries in which the U.S. troops are stationed.

In the present situation, in which conservative governments face significant opposition from the socialist and communist parties every time they seek added funds for their military budgets, this could very well lead to parliamentary stalemates, which would lead to the United States withdrawing some of its troops from these countries.

That great friend of the NATO alliance, Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) did not waste an opportunity to bash the European allies, saying that the Europeans must "take on the principal role of providing heavy armored forces in Europe, necessary ammunition and equipment to sustain their own forces for NATO's 30-day requirement, effective reserves and shelters, and support facilities for U.S.-based aircraft which would be deployed to Europe in any confrontation."

The amendment was accepted and attached to the Appropriations Bill. Now it must go to conference committee to iron out the differences between the House and the Senate versions of the bill. Hopefully, the amendment will be withdrawn before it is allowed to become law and do

irreparable damage to the NATO alliance.

Noriega-bashers wave their magic wands

Sen. Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.) on Aug. 11 submitted a Senate Concurrent Resolution calling on the U.S. government to work with former Panamanian President Eric Delvalle to "achieve the early departure of Gen. Manuel Noriega from office and from Panama." Kennedy apparently hopes thereby to rekindle a resistance in Panama, which has by and large lost its steam. "We must tell them [the people of Panama] that their cause has not been forgotten or surrendered."

The U.S. Senate, especially its liberal Democratic wing, has developed an interesting habit of interfering in the internal affairs of other countries. But the stability of General Noriega's position in Panama and the widespread support he is receiving from Ibero-Americans, indicates that the Massachusetts Democrat's answer to Teddy Roosevelt is speaking much too loudly and carrying a very small stick.

Wirth bill calls for more nuclear energy

A bill introduced into the Senate by Colorado Democrat Tim Wirth, which is aimed at establishing a national energy policy to reduce global warming, calls for nuclear energy and the development of thermonuclear fusion as an electricity source.

The bill by the usually "environ-

mentalist" senator calls for radical measures to eliminate carbon dioxide emissions by 20% by the year 2000. The measure also calls for conserving fossil fuels and tapping "renewable" energy resources, such as wind, solar, geothermal, and hydroelectric power.

But in a section entitled "Advanced Civilian Reactor Programs," the bill states, "Congress finds that the use of energy generated from nuclear fission could potentially supplant economically the burning of fossil fuels and thereby contribute substantially to reducing the rate and scope of global climate change."

The bill calls on the Secretary of Energy to carry out a "comprehensive program of research and development of technologies" for generating electricity from nuclear fission. The criteria for such "nuclear technologies" are that they: 1) permit modular design; 2) exhibit passive safety; 3) be adaptable to standardized construction and licensing; 4) are cost-effective in comparison to other sources of energy; 5) minimize the volume of nuclear waste produced and the cost of nuclear waste disposal; and 6) prevent diversions of radioactive material for use in nuclear weapons.

All well and good, except, why allocate lots of money to develop a "safe" nuclear industry when the U.S. nuclear industry is already a safe one?

And, there is a catch. The bill stipulates, "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the conditions stipulated by the bill will be the sole criteria for the appropriation of funds for nuclear power plants." Does that mean that nuclear plants not of the design stipulated by the bill will be shut down? That would indeed be a strange way to

eliminate the supposed "greenhouse effect."

At any rate, nuclear energy is back on the table, and, if we want to avoid a catastrophe, we must keep it there.

House passes South Africa sanctions bill

By a vote of 244-132, the House passed the Anti-Apartheid Act Amendments, prohibiting investments in, and certain other activities with respect to, South Africa. Immediately after its passage, Rep. Jim Bunning (R-Ky.) called the legislation "nasty, mean-spirited, counterproductive, showboat morality," pointing out that it in fact tightens the screws on the blacks in South Africa it is supposed to be helping, while "we pat ourselves on our sanctimonious little backs and go home pretending that we have done a wise and noble thing."

And in truth, it is just one more demonstration that a liberal is a person who poses as the benefactor of those he has condemned to death—in this case, California Democrat Ron Delums.

The bill prohibits all investment, all imports—except strategic minerals and publications—and all exports, except disaster relief, to and from South Africa. It also prohibits intelligence agency collaboration. Rep. Timothy Penny (D-Minn.), who had voted twice to override a presidential veto of similar legislation, was also opposed to the amendments, since they would eliminate "our opportunity to monitor South African policies or to attempt to empower blacks through economic means."