

is in progress now is a rapid escalation toward a brutish, bestial test of national wills, thermonuclear eyeball to thermonuclear eyeball. . . .

Even among the President's supporters, Nervous Nellies among political advisers are cautioning that no divisive issues, especially no abrupt decisions, be made between now and the November 1984 elections.

There is little doubt that were he reelected in November 1984, or on the wild chance that I were to win the Democratic presidential nomination this coming summer, President Reagan would immediately launch the equivalent of a war-emergency powers order, and full-scale 1939-43-style economic mobilization at the instant I were nominated or he reelected, whichever came first. At that point the calculable margin of Soviet advantage in launching a global confrontation would begin to disappear. Therefore, we must estimate that Moscow will escalate to full-scale thermonuclear confrontation before the end of the first six months of 1984—unless something happens very quickly to persuade Moscow to call off this lunacy. . . .

Our problem is to demonstrate to the President and the Congress that there exists a patriotic bipartisan constituency which will support whatever measures are necessary to defend the United States against the present, monstrous Soviet aggression. My goal is to persuade the President to implement a war-emergency powers order now, to place our security forces on full alert-status, and to launch a 1939-43 economic mobilization of our nation. These measures are necessary to attempt to persuade the maddened Soviet leadership that a nuclear confrontation with the United States is unwise at this time. At present, such action is the only possible way of preventing a probable thermonuclear war. Unless we convince Moscow that we will not submit to a thermonuclear confrontation, we are headed quickly toward a condition under which we face the choice between submitting to Soviet military world-hegemony or shooting-back under assault by a full-scale Soviet first-strike.

It's ugly, it is almost unthinkable, but that is the horrifying reality to which the bungling of our government over the 1970s has led us.

At present, liberal Republicans and Democratic Chairman Charles T. Manatt are exerting the utmost pressure to prevent the President from taking the kinds of needed measures I have proposed. Manatt, like Walter Mondale, is an avowed supporter of the Soviet-directed Nuclear Freeze movement. If you—enough of you—were to openly defy Nuclear Freezeniks Manatt and Mondale, by visibly supporting my candidacy, such actions by a large minority of our citizens would tip the balance in Washington in the direction needed.

Such a dramatic development in the election-campaign would shift the political situation in the United States as almost nothing else would. If President Reagan is convinced that I have significant and growing support, I believe that evidence will influence his decisions to exactly the right effect.

Soviet diplomat's lies are denounced

On the CBS Sunday interview program Face the Nation Nov. 27, Soviet deputy U.N. delegate Richard Ovinnikov tried to lay the blame for the breakdown of the Geneva talks at the United States's door and paint President Reagan as a "reckless warmonger." In a statement released that day, EIR editor-in-chief Criton Zoakos, an associate of candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., accused Mr. Ovinnikov of having outperformed Nazi war propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels.

Ovinnikov threatened that the Soviets would not return to the negotiating table "until the status quo ante" (the situation before the deployment of the Pershing missile deployment) was restored. In a news conference in New York Nov. 25, the Soviet envoy had said that Moscow would be prepared to resume negotiations "as soon as the American measures are rescinded, as soon as the situation before the deployment is restored, as soon as common sense prevails in this country [the United States]."

"The Americans are putting first strike weapons on our doorstep," Ovinnikov said, explaining why the Soviets had recently announced an increased build-up of SS-20s. "Our actions are serious. The situation is serious. If the administration treats it as child's play, this is a reckless approach."

When asked by CBS Washington correspondent Lesley Stahl "Weren't the Soviets going to deploy these weapons anyway?" Ovinnikov replied, "No, not at all." The Soviet U.N. delegate said that the Soviets' aim was "stabilization," but that the United States had upset the strategic balance. The Reagan administration, he added, had undertaken a "reckless warmongering act . . . we cannot negotiate in earnest under current circumstances." Mr. Zoakos's reply:

Mr. Ovinnikov lied throughout the program, but he lied with a specific purpose in mind. It is the alarming character of this purpose behind the lying which obliges me to respond.

Ovinnikov's statement that his country decided to deploy SS-20s in Europe because "the Americans are putting first strike weapons at our doorstep," is lie number one and Ovin-

nikov knows it. The SS-20s started being deployed in Europe in the late 1970s because the Soviet command then had decided to develop the means of destroying the American missile submarine force. The Soviet command used the SALT II treaty to render America's land-based ICBM force totally impotent to a Soviet first strike. It deployed its SS-20s to do the same thing to our submarine deterrent force. To the extent that the Soviet SS-20s have the assigned mission of doing to our submarine deterrent what the SALT II treaty did to our land-based deterrent, it is the Soviet SS-20s which are a first-strike weapon.

Lie number two is Ovinnikov's claim that his government was not planning to deploy its SS-20s had it not been for the "reckless approach" of the U.S. government. It was astounding to watch him on television make this claim while everyone knows that back in 1979, before there ever was a decision to deploy American Pershing II and cruise missiles, there were 140 Soviet SS-20s. This type of reckless lying through his teeth was designed to have a particular psychological effect on the viewing audience, to carry the idea across that "the Russians don't give a damn" and thus induce fear.

The third lie, of the Big Lie category, was Ovinnikov's claim that the United States "has upset the strategic parity." The fact of the matter on this score is that the Soviet Union itself upset the strategic parity a while back in such a way that even the eventual full deployment of Euromissiles cannot restore. The Soviet Union has succeeded in accomplishing this by means of a long string of violations of the SALT I and SALT II Treaties and of the ABM Treaty too extensive to document here. Suffice it to say that they have deployed at least two types of intercontinental missiles not permitted by the treaties, they are testing at least two new types in violation of the treaties, and they have violated the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in at least five provable instances.

Finally, Ovinnikov's assertion that the Soviet Union will not go back to the negotiating table until the *status quo ante* is restored, is a special type of lie. Here is how this matter stands as Richard Ovinnikov knows it: That the Soviet Union is not interested in negotiations is true. That it is seeking to restore the situation as it was before Nov. 22, 1983 is a lie. However, Ovinnikov's government would return to the negotiating table if the subject were to be the abandonment, by the United States, of any effort to manufacture anti-missile defense systems of the type promised by President Reagan on March 23 of this year. As Marshal Dimitri Ustinov, the Soviet defense minister, has made it clear in *Pravda*, the Soviets are not in the least worried about Pershing II and cruise missiles. Their policy, rather, is to prevent the United States from developing anti-missile defenses even if it means going to war. The Soviets, however, have reserved their right to develop such systems and have exercised that right to the point of being ahead of the United States in this crucial field by at least two years.

Here is the secret behind Ovinnikov's outrageous, pro-

vocative lying. The intended purpose of this outrageous lying is to induce fear and terror in Western populations in exactly the same way that Nazi war propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels employed a combination of military acts and threats and outrageous propaganda claims for the purpose of inducing paralyzing fear among the populations of intended victims right before actual military or military/diplomatic moves. This was Goebbels' strategy of *Schrecklichkeit*, and this now is the policy of Ovinnikov's government.

Unless the Soviet command is already on the timetable of a thermonuclear countdown, which is a very distinct possibility given the current status of launch-on-warning, the immediate short term objective of Moscow's *Schrecklichkeit* posture is:

- 1) By means of psychological terror bring the appeaser faction of NATO, identified with Lord Peter Carrington, to a position of control in the European councils of the alliance.

- 2) Once Carrington is brought forward, have the European appeaser faction issue an ultimatum to Washington: "Either abandon the strategic defense policy of Reagan's March 23 speech, or Europe splits with the United States and sides with the U.S.S.R.

- 3) If Washington capitulates to the Carrington appeasers, Moscow wins. If Washington doesn't capitulate, Moscow, with the aid of a betrayed Europe, moves militarily to stop the United States. We have World War Three.

- 4) If the *Schrecklichkeit* policy fails and Europe rebuffs the Carrington appeasers, Moscow moves militarily to stop the United States missile defense program. We have World War Three.

But Ovinnikov's greatest lie, his claim that the Reagan administration is pursuing a "reckless warmongering course," is designed to deliberately conceal the only available path that humanity now has for avoiding World War Three. It happens to be the case that the Reagan administration publicly and otherwise has made repeated offers to the Soviet Union for the two nations to sit down and mutually agree to develop and deploy these anti-missile strategic defense systems in a parallel and cooperative way so that both the two nations as well as the rest of the planet can be protected from either intentional or accidental nuclear missile attacks. Ovinnikov's government has cynically rejected these repeated and generous offers, while it is accelerating its drive to deploy its own monopoly of strategic anti-missile systems before the United States has a chance of developing its own.

Rather than see the United States catch up with their own effort in laser weapon systems for anti-missile defense, the Soviets are pursuing a course of nuclear war threat to force a capitulation of the United States. Ovinnikov and his government are acting like the murderous axe-wielding madman who gets increasingly more enraged as his victim is resisting his murderous assaults. "Stop resisting my efforts to kill you," Ovinnikov screams, "or else you'll make me really mad and I'll kill you."