

A new salvo by the arms control mafia

by Kathleen Klenetsky

A new salvo in the arms-control mafia's war against the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) was fired March 27 when the National Committee to Save the ABM Treaty held a Washington press conference to release its latest report on the SDI's impact on the treaty.

Stripped of its verbiage, the report demands that the United States abandon the beam-defense program launched in 1983 to preserve the sanctity of the accord Henry Kissinger negotiated with the Soviets in 1972. That treaty has robbed the United States not only of a defense against nuclear missiles, but of a comprehensive air defense, too.

"For over a decade," the report claims, "the ABM Treaty has enhanced our national security by preventing a costly and dangerous arms race in anti-missile weapons. Abandoning its prohibitions on large ABM systems would eliminate any possibility of significant limits on offensive nuclear forces," spur an arms race in space, and cause significant instability in superpower relations.

Committee of scoundrels

Formed last June with the specific goal of derailing the SDI, the National Committee boasts some of the top the arms-control figures. Former National Security adviser McGeorge Bundy, ex-Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, and John Kenneth Galbraith sit on its board.

The Committee directly interfaces Soviet operations against the SDI via John Pike of the Federation of American Scientists. Pike runs the Space Policy Working Group on Capitol Hill which *EIR* exposed last May as a conduit into Congress for the Soviet embassy, which was literally drafting some anti-"Star Wars" legislation.

Pike presided over the Committee's press conference along with the group's chairman, Gerard Smith, and other key members including John Rhineland (who spent the first 10 days of March in Moscow) and Thomas Longstreth.

The report's basic message is that, as Smith put it, "We are on a collision course with the [ABM] Treaty. . . . It's just a matter of time." Smith et al. charged that beginning in 1988, the SDI will start "encroaching" on the treaty, and by 1993, will come into "massive collision with the treaty."

The report mentions the Soviets' ABM program, only to insist that theirs is a "low-tech" program "no more advanced" than the U.S. Safeguard system of the 1960s.

"The near term issue presented by SDI," the report states,

"is *not* whether the United States should progress from *re-search* (which is permitted under the ABM Treaty) to *de-ployment* of space-based ABM systems (which is prohibited). Rather, it is whether the United States should structure its research to lead to *advanced development* and *testing* of space-based systems (which is prohibited). This is the crucial issue the Executive and Congress must first address. . . . [emphases in original]."

This paragraph contains the crux of the anti-SDI cabal's case. But the truth is, the text of the treaty makes no reference whatsoever to these technologies. The only place where such advanced technologies are mentioned is in Section D of the Agreed Statements on the treaty (not in the treaty *per se*). This section states: "In the event ABM systems based on other physical principles . . . are created in the future, such systems and their components would be subject to discussion in accordance with Article XIII and agreement in accordance with Article XIV of the Treaty."

Surely, the arms-control gang knows that the development and testing of such systems is thus *not* prohibited. Of course they do. They're lying.

The report advocates specific measures to prevent the SDI from ever reaching that point, including: a treaty banning the further development, testing, and deployment of ASAT systems; a ban on testing of exoatmospheric interceptors; a ban on the development of mobile sensor components; a ban or "severe limits" on the testing and deployment in space of particle beam accelerators; a prohibition on testing in space or deploying any ground-based, sea-based, or air-based directed-energy system which has an "aggregate mirror aperture in excess of . . . five square meters"; and a general limitation on the "brightness" of directed-energy systems.

The report also calls for improving the "decision-making process" in the U.S. government in dealing with the SDI, complaining that "only an internal Defense Department review team . . . appears to have access to information allowing informed judgment as to the exact nature of individual SDI programs."

Smith, former chief U.S. SALT I negotiator, told the press conference, "We are relying on the press and Congress, which has come over to our viewpoint significantly in the last year," to put the program on ice.

One of the more significant lines that emerged at the press conference no doubt reflects the lies being told in Europe by these SDI foes. Pike and Smith ridiculed the idea that the United States was truly interested in European participation. They averred that the administration would refuse to allow the allies to share equally in the results of the program. "How eager will our European friends be to participate in a program of research where they won't get access to any of the technology actually developed?" asked Smith.

As for the lies told in America, Pike said: "Congress is unlikely to subsidize European participation in the SDI because most of the technology that will result will be in competition with U.S. high-tech goods."