

Those close to the State Department report that if Haig had the responsibility for arms-control negotiations, he would shoot for an overall agreement along the lines of the SALT II treaty.

Indeed, the Haig position is represented in **Joint Resolution 171**, sponsored by CFR Republicans Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Charles Percy (Ill.), along with Senators Mathias (Md.), Danforth (Mo.), and Cohen (Me.). This resolution proposes the immediate initiation of START (Strategic Arms Reduction Talks), while "preserving present limitations and controls on current nuclear weapons and nuclear delivery systems," and "achieving substantial equitable and verifiable reductions on nuclear weapons."

The Pentagon position

In his implicit rejection of arms-control negotiations at his March 31 press conference, President Reagan stopped short of full endorsement of the Jackson-Warner **Joint Resolution 177** calling for "a major verifiable reduction of Soviet and U.S. nuclear weapons to equal force levels." Sources close to the White House report that the President's objection to this proposal is that it does not require a sizable U.S. strategic defense buildup prior to arms reduction negotiations. The Jackson-Warner Resolution—co-signed by 57 Senators, including a couple who also signed the Kennedy-Hatfield freeze resolution—proposes the same arms-control position that former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance took on his ill-fated mission to Moscow in early 1977. At that time it was reported that the basic outlines of this proposal for "deep cuts" in U.S. and Soviet strategic deployments had been drafted by the office of Senator Jackson. Then-assistant to Jackson and now Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Richard Perle, along with Undersecretary of Defense Fred Iklé, is reported to be the principal proponent of this proposal. Sources at the State Department also report that this "Pentagon" position is shared by ACDA head Eugene Rostow and the U.S. negotiator at the Intermediate Nuclear Force talks, Paul Nitze. This ACDA-Pentagon position has been carried forward earnestly on Capitol Hill by Sen. John Tower (R-Tex.), Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Strategic planners close to the President were astonished when on April 1 the Senate Armed Services Committee under Tower's direction seriously cut presidential requests for a long-term civil defense program. That program is slated to be directed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), whose leadership, along with that of another Reagan favorite, the Bureau of Mines, has traditional ties to the military apparatus of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Another aspect of in-depth war-fighting requirements long advocated by the MacArthurites, the purchase and stockpiling of

strategic mining reserves, a program administered jointly by FEMA and the Bureau of Mines, has also recently had its funding request significantly increased by the President.

The Armed Services Committee had also refused to approve \$715 million that Reagan had requested for preparing Minutemen ballistic missile silos to hold the proposed MX missile, and \$1.4 billion to buy the first nine MX missiles. Sources close to the Committee suggest that Tower, reflecting a growing sentiment at the Pentagon, is urging a multiple-deceptive basing mode for at least a proportion of the proposed MX's with a layer of protective antiballistic missiles (ABMs). These sources suggest that the Tower approach is consistent with both the Iklé-ACDA approach to negotiations and the Jackson-Warner resolution. The threat of a multiply based, ABM-protected new missile cutting into Soviet counterforce capability, while not the optimum, nevertheless could be provocatively put on the auction block in exchange for deep Soviet cuts.

In addition, there are those who believe that this alternative will scuttle the U.S.-Soviet ABM treaty, up for renegotiation this year. Yet on April 2 the House Armed Services Committee, directed by Chairman Melvin Price (D-Ill.), turned around and denied \$467 million for ABM research and only partially approved the President's MX request.

All three of the major resolutions circulating on Capitol Hill and sponsored by various forces in the administration—not including the President—and in the Democratic Party, stress limitations on the testing and deployment of new and "destabilizing" nuclear weapons: that is, weapons based on new or more advanced technologies.

Why the U.S. 'peace movement' is a hoax

by Lonnie Wolfe

"Peace movement? There is no such thing as a peace movement, not here, not in Europe." With these words, a former official of the Carter administration who is today a prominent spokesman for the nuclear freeze campaign, revealed that the peace movement is a hoax. "I get annoyed when people call this a peace movement," he said. "It makes it sound like we are trying to eliminate

war and that is totally impossible. We are an anti-nuclear weapons technology movement. . . . We are not opposed to conventional weapons or wars."

The official, a member of the New York Council on Foreign Relations and of the Trilateral Commission, said that the mass protests of the peace movement will be used to bring down governments in Europe and weaken the government of U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

Interviews made available to *EIR* with NATO ambassador Harlan Cleveland and Eric Molander, the executive director of the Ground Zero organization, amplified these plans. Molander laid out a 12 to 18 month perspective for the peace movement. At first, the movement will focus primarily on nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons technology and will steer clear of unilateral disarmament proposals. In the transitional phase, "the peace movement will not come to power," said Molander. "There will be a right-wing reaction. These governments will be anti-Soviet, but they will also make concessions to anti-nuclear feeling in Europe. They will promote a moderate conventional arms build-up to confront the Soviets."

In the interim, Molander states, the Reagan administration will make a proposal for deep cuts in nuclear arsenals and control of new weapons technology at which the Soviet Union will balk. "The Soviets can easily be demonstrated to be the main enemy of real disarmament," said Molander, who predicted that an anti-Soviet

peace movement would be in line with "right-wing character of governments in Europe in 1983."

Former Ambassador Harlan Cleveland, also a former director of programs at Robert O. Anderson's Aspen Institute which created the environmentalist movement, concurred. "If you combine an anti-Soviet peace movement in the West with unrest in the East bloc," he said, "we might get a mutual withdrawal of troops—the U.S. out of Europe and the Soviets out of the Warsaw Pact." This could lead to an unraveling of Soviet control over its allies. It is feasible to propose a "nuclear-free Europe—both East and West," and have NATO meanwhile build up its conventional forces.

The objective of arms control is an agreement for non-first use of nuclear weapons. Cleveland believes that enforcing depopulation in the developing sector, a policy he advocates, will lead to conflicts. *If the threat of nuclear war were removed, genocide could proceed without risk.* "We have created a movement against the nuclear capabilities of both the superpowers," the former official quoted above observed. "What would have happened in 1977 if we had such movements when we made our deep cuts proposal and the Soviets rejected it? They would have screamed against the Soviets. That is what will happen now. . . . The Soviets can be had right now for an arms deal, and we will make sure of that by building a movement here and in the East bloc."

EIR

U.S., Canada and Mexico only

3 months \$125
6 months \$225
1 year \$396

Foreign Rates

Central America, West Indies, Venezuela and Colombia:
3 mo. \$135, 6 mo. \$245, 1 yr. \$450
Western Europe, South America, Mediterranean, and
North Africa: 3 mo. \$140, 6 mo. \$255, 1 yr. \$470
All other countries: 3 mo. \$145, 6 mo. \$265, 1 yr. \$490

I would like to subscribe to the *Executive Intelligence Review* for

3 months 6 months 1 year

Please charge my

Master Charge No. _____ Visa No. _____

Interbank No. _____ Signature _____

Expiration date _____

I enclose \$ _____ check or money order

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Make checks payable to *Executive Intelligence Review* and mail to *EIR*, 304 W. 58th Street, 5th Floor, New York, NY 10019. For more information call (212) 247-8820.