Editorial

'Good conservatives,' evil policies

Any "good conservative" who tolerates the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings budget-cutting amendment, is simply no good. He or she is a traitor, and specifically, is helping to reduce the United States to being a helpless prey to Soviet aggression.

Therefore, no one has the right to be "shocked" if a citizen-candidate, such as a member of LaRouche's wing of the Democratic Party or a like-minded patriotic Republican, challenges the professional politicians by running for office, when those professional politicians sanctimoniously sell out the country in the name of "budget cutting."

The Gramm-Rudman swindle is not new. Early in the past century Swiss banker Albert Gallatin cut America's defenses to suit the demands of the banks. That "Gramm-Rudman" led to the burning of Washington, D.C. by the British in the War of 1812.

Gramm-Rudman treats all debts to the Wall Street banks as sacred obligations, but mandates axing the life-and-death needs of national security, economic infrastructure, and public health from the budget to meet arbitrary criteria of reducing the deficit.

This would be stupid enough in times of peace, and also contrary to every principle that built America as the greatest industrial power in world history, under George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin Roosevelt's 1939-43 mobilization.

But today, we are not at peace. The Soviet Union is waging an undeclared war on the United States.

The shooting war began in 1983, when the Soviets coldbloodedly shot down KAL-007, killing the nearly 300 civilian passengers on board. It has escalated in West Germany, where Soviet "special forces" are deployed in the midst of the terrorist-sympathizing Greens, in guerrilla actions against the West German institutions. The intended effect is to destroy the Western alliance by driving Germany out of it.

A similar scenario is far advanced in South Korea, which, like West Germany, borders on one of Moscow's most hard-line and brutal communist satrapies.

How are our "good conservatives" responding to

this unprecedented national security emergency? Forty-six senators, including some "good conservatives," have written to the President demanding that the SDI budget be cut to ribbons. That would set the United States further back in the most critical military area, where recent testimony to the Senate by leading scientists shows the Soviets are far ahead.

As far as we know, not one of the "good conservatives" who is applauding the President's long-overdue abandonment of SALT, has stood up to say, "It is now clear that we made a mistake; we must junk Gramm-Rudman."

As long as Gramm-Rudman is in effect, the United States simply cannot afford to do what President Reagan has announced, that is, "base decision regarding its strategic forces on the nature and magnitude of the threat posed by the Soviet Union."

Moreover, by this fall, if Gramm-Rudman remains law, a major portion of U.S. ground forces in West Germany will begin to be withdrawn. Henry Kissinger proposes that the U.S. troops be brought back to the United States to be ready for deployments into the developing sector.

Such "conservatives" as Senators Jesse Helms and Phil Gramm are actively aiding the sellout of Western Europe and the NATO alliance, by fanning a propaganda campaign to send those U.S. troops to Mexico, to collect the debt for the same Wall Street banks the Gramm-Rudman law so religiously protects.

(We've noticed that many of our citizens like to quote some irrelevant passage of Scripture when they are about to act in a particularly swinish and un-Christian manner. Likewise, the "conservative" is particularly self-righteous when obeying the dictates of Wall Street—or Mammon, in the Biblical term.)

In West Germany, where the iron fist of Soviet military power is a palpable presence, candidates of the Patriots for Germany party have challenged the ruling "conservatives" on just such issues. The way for a "good conservative" to prove he is good, is to respond positively to that moral challenge