

RADIO TV REPORTS, INC.

4701 WILLARD AVENUE, CHEVY CHASE, MARYLAND 20815 (301) 656-4068

FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

PROGRAM Paid Political Program

STATION WDVM-TV
CBS Network

DATE January 21, 1984 11:30 P.M. CITY Washington, D.C.

SUBJECT LaRouche Campaign

ANNOUNCER: The following political broadcast is paid for by the LaRouche Campaign.

From his living room not far from Washington, we bring you the economist, editor, strategic analyst, and candidate for the presidential nomination of the Democratic Party, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

LYNDON LAROUCHE: Nearly two years ago, during a two-day seminar in Washington, D.C., I proposed a new strategic doctrine for the United States to an audience which included Soviet officials as well as representatives of our own government agencies. I proposed that we dump Kissinger's and McNamara's flexible response doctrine and end the age of thermonuclear terror through deploying the kinds of anti-missile defenses which science had made possible.

My proposals caught fire immediately among influential circles. With the knowledge of our government, I conducted exploratory discussions privately with Soviet representatives for a period of over 12 months.

When Dr. Teller announced similar proposals in the fall of 1982, our news media was no longer able to suppress information about the fact of this discussion of a new doctrine from the American public.

On March the 23rd our President not only announced such a new strategic doctrine for the United States itself, but in that same nationwide television broadcast he offered to negotiate with Moscow to bring the age of thermonuclear revenge weapons to an end. If the Soviet leaders had accepted the President's offer

OFFICES IN: WASHINGTON D.C. • NEW YORK • LOS ANGELES • CHICAGO • DETROIT • AND OTHER PRINCIPAL CITIES

at that time, tonight you and your family could sleep in knowledge that the age of thermonuclear terror was being brought to an end.

But the Soviet Union did not wish peace. They rejected our President's offer with a violence we have not seen from there since Nikita Khrushchev was kicked out. Soviet leader Yuri Andropov dropped out of sight in August and he has remained so for nearly five months. During the meantime, a Soviet military junta has come to power over there. Since August, beginning with incidents including the shooting down of a Korean civilian airliner on September 1st, the Soviet rulers are moving step-by-step toward a global thermonuclear showdown with us in Europe, in the Middle East, and elsewhere. At the same time, the Soviet KGB's First Directorate is deploying scads of terrorists into the United States itself.

The situation today, in general, is far worse than it was at the outbreak of the Berlin Crisis or the Cuba Crisis under President John Kennedy.

Soviet leaders are very good in military planning. While Henry Kissinger and Robert McNamara have been brainwashing politicians and newspaper editors into the delusion that thermonuclear war is impossible, since 1962 Soviet leaders have been steadily and carefully and competently planning building up Soviet forces to the point that Moscow could survive and win a thermonuclear war against the United States.

My military advisers tell me that Moscow has not yet reached the level that it could actually guarantee itself a victory in a thermonuclear war against us. But Moscow believes that its military superiority has grown so large that our President would have to back down to a thermonuclear confrontation if this occurred during 1984 or 1985.

Moscow believes the time has come, and has believed this since June 1981, that it no longer needs to negotiate on terms proposed by our government. At present, they have deployed military units designed to take over Scandinavia. At the same time, in East Germany, they have deployed units trained and equipped for the special task of taking over West Germany. Soviet puppets such as Syria and Iran are being used against us. Right on our Southern borders, the Soviet KGB controls the leadership of an opposition political party in Mexico called the Pon (?). And through the Pon's circles, drug-link circles, the Soviet KGB is deploying terrorism directly into the United States.

Moscow's policy at present can be fairly described as "We do as we please. There's nothing you can do about it except submit to our unconditional terms."

Generals in Moscow dream the old Russian dream of Moscow as the world capital of a new Roman Empire.

We must change this picture. As President Franklin Roosevelt said, so I say again to you today. We have nothing so much to fear as fear itself.

I must show you first the dark side, so that you understand what we must do and why we must do it. What we'll do is we'll go through five successive charts, three charts, a map and another chart. And in this we'll look at, briefly, the overall balance in strategic missile capability between the United States and the Soviet Union today, as reported by agencies such as the London International Institute for Strategic Studies.

Now, look first at this present chart. On the left we see a comparison of the number of launchers which the United States, the blue bar, and the Soviet Union has. And you see that the Soviet Union is slightly superior to the United States in the number of land-based and submarine-based launchers.

The picture looks somewhat better as you go to the right set of bars. You see that the blue bar is almost as high as the red bar, which means that we have almost as many warheads in service, ready for deployment, as the Soviet Union. And you also see that our strategic strength is concentrated presently in our submarine-based missile systems. Whereas the Soviet capability is concentrated largely in the land-based missile systems, though their naval capability is rapidly increasing.

Now let's look at the second chart. Now you see, in the second chart, that the situation begins to look rather disastrous. On the left side you're comparing the number of millions of pounds of throw weight of the two superpowers. And you see that we're outnumbered on that by an order of magnitude of more than three-to-one.

Now you look over to the right to compare the amount of megatonnage, effective megatons which the Soviet Union and the United States, respectively, can deploy against the other. And you see here, for instance, that we have less throw weight, in megatons, than the Soviet Union does in even the submarine fleet. And the Soviet Union way outclasses us in megatons.

The significance of this we'll come to in a moment as we come to the map. But let's proceed first to the next chart, which takes into consideration another factor which is not much discussed, but very important in the long run.

Now, this third chart is not a mistake. There is no blue bar. This refers to the reserve missiles in the possession

of the two superpowers. The United States has none. And you see that the Soviet reserve is in the same order of magnitude as a major component of their regular first-line deployed missile capability.

Now let's look at the map and we'll discuss what this begins to mean. I show you this map to indicate a very particular problem. These deployments mainly indicate the position of the Soviet land-based missile force, the strategic missile force. Now, our strategic submarine system, based in large part under the Arctic ice, has the assignment to reach and destroy these missiles, particularly, with counterforce weapons.

Now, the point is that without rearming our submarine fleet, number one, with the Trident system of submarine-launched ballistic missiles, we're in a little bit of trouble in trying to reach these Soviet targets if we had to.

Number two, if we for some reason should have most of our submarines in the ports, naval ports in the United States, or off station otherwise, or if the Soviets could knock out our submarines, then we'd be in very tough shape and the Soviets would have a preponderance over us, as I'll indicate to you in just a moment what the problem is there.

The point is that we must have an upgrading of our Trident submarine system, or we lose most of our strategic capability; and we must have, very quickly, hunter-killer attack submarines, both to hunt down Soviet submarines, but, more importantly, to get rid of Soviet attack submarines which are trying track, trail and kill our submarines.

We can go with that and we go to the next point.

The purpose here -- this, by itself, has no significance. But I just want to prepare you for what I'm about to show you. What I'm going to show you is the calculations made by my military advisers of what it would look like in terms of weapons systems capabilities after a first strike against the United States by the Soviet forces with presently known capabilities and what the losses would be to the Soviet Union by our immediate response.

Let's go now to the next picture on the same chart.

Now let's look at the percentile of the U.S. capabilities destroyed, and then after that the Soviet capabilities destroyed, under condition that the Soviets launch a preemptive first strike against the United States.

In the even of a Soviet first strike of this type, my

experts calculate that 90 percent of our land-based ICBMs would be destroyed by the Soviet Union in the first strike, plus 70 percent of our submarine missile capability, plus, as you see, 80 percent of our strategic bomber capability.

In this case, we see that the Soviet Union has expended only 15 percent of its land-based missile fleet to do this first strike and has expended, we see, only 40 percent of its missile -- submarine-based missile launch capability to do the first strike.

This leaves us guess where.

Now, on this point, let's quote two sources as to why the United States was permitted to drift into this condition against the Soviet Union. First we'll quote from Henry Kissinger, a passage from a press conference he delivered in Moscow in July 1974, and I quote Henry Kissinger. "What in the name of God," said Kissinger, "is strategic superiority? What is the significance," he said, "politically, militarily, operationally, at these levels of numbers? What do you do with it?" So much for Kissinger.

Now let's go to the Carter Administration, to a National Security Council official of the Carter Administration in 1979, and I quote. "Even if the United States could attain strategic superiority, it would not be desirable," he said, "because I suspect we would occasionally use it in some very risky ways. It is in the United States' interest to allow the few remaining areas of strategic advantage to fade away."

I suspect this is not really fading away tha this man is talking about. He's talking about letting us fall into strategic inferiority.

The situation reminds us of the year 1938, when Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain returned from his pact with Adolf Hitler.

[Film clip of Chamberlain statement]

LAROCHE: Today there are many Neville Chamberlains in Europe and the United States. Moscow is bragging that these nuclear freeze sympathizers will pull out our President's teeth and will drive Caspar Weinberger out of the Defense Department. This is Moscow's political fifth column in our news media and in our political parties. These Neville Chamberlains call our President a warmonger. Soviet agents around the world whisper and lie that our President is a new Hitler and worse than Attila the Hun. Soviet newspapers and stooges say that I am more dangerous than our President.

Moscow hates me because of the generous offer the President made to them on March 23rd and because Moscow is afraid that I might rally you, the patriotic sons and daughters of our Democratic Party, to support the policies I shall propose to you now.

One. The President must use his powers under our Constitution and statutes to declare a national defense emergency mobilization. We must mobilize as President Franklin Roosevelt led us between 1939 and 1943.

[Clip of statement by President Franklin Roosevelt]

LAROUCHE: Our Federal Reserve should be federalized under Article I, Sections 8 and 9 of our Constitution. Its power to print money and to operate the inflationary Keynesian multiplier must be suspended for the duration.

Congress must authorize an initial \$500 billion in Treasury gold reserve money at \$750 per ounce of gold. These gold reserve currency notes must be loaned at between two percent and four percent discount, through our private banks, for investments to put our idle farms, factories, and unemployed to work producing needed physical goods.

Second, the President must launch a \$200 billion crash program, like President Kennedy's successful Apollo space program, to give our nation a first-generation anti-missile shield by 1988.

Third, the Congress must support a crash program to fill up the gaping holes in our 1984-1985 defenses. The patriotic citizens of this country must force the members of the Congress to support this.

Fourth, we must change our policies toward our friends in Latin American and elsewhere immediately. We must negotiate a sensible reorganization of their debt payments at between two percent and four percent interest. We must pour in the needed capital goods in exports for their economies to development so they can meet these requirements and so that we can increase industrial employment in the United States by about three million new jobs producing capital goods for exports.

During the recent years we have been ruining and losing our friends in Europe, in Asia, Africa and Latin America, at the same time that many politicians have been lying to you by saying that we were giving away gigantic charitable contributions to these countries, most of which never arrived.

If we do not change this policy, Moscow will take over

the world piece-by-piece, and we will have no one to blame but ourselves.

For just a moment forget the election campaign. My duty, election or no election, is to be the leader of the patriots of the Democratic Party, to free this party of ours from the grip of Neville Chamberlains like Charlie Manatt and Walter Mondale. My duty is to mobilize you to help save our nation in a moment of its greatest danger.

It is true that the Reagan Administration has disagreed with me on the economy. I see our farms, factories, unemployed minorities, and national defense as suffering from Paul Volcker's Federal Reserve policies. I ask you to support me to change that.

I disagree angrily with the policies of Henry Kissinger and our State Department toward Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America. I ask you to support me in changing these policies.

Above all, I ask you to help me bring the friends of --and patriots of both parties into support of a bipartisan defense policy and to rally our nation against the growing menace of international terrorism.

I hope that we can force Moscow to reconsider the foolish rejection of my own and the President's offer to end the age of thermonuclear terror. We must mobilize, yes, to convince Russia to abandon its mad nuclear adventures. And we must also continue to offer peace within the framework of the President's March 23rd offer.

To those top Soviet official who will be studying copies of this broadcast within the next days, I say this: In my quest for peace between our countries, I have proved myself consistently forthright and honest with you. I have warned you, accurately, of the consequences of the events you have permitted to occur. If the Kremlin's hierarchy chooses to punish or to ignore those who have borne these discussions with me, you Soviet leaders do so at your own peril. By now, you know, as my government knows, that I do not deal from the bottom of the deck, and I'm always open to honest dialogue.

To you, my fellow citizens, I say, for the sake of our country and everyone's grandchildren everywhere, help me now. If you are one of that majority which still cares about our country, telephone or write our President tonight. Tell him and the Congress that there are many, many patriots around this country who will support a national defense emergency mobilization. Do that tonight and help to save this nation and the world from thermonuclear war.

Thank you and bless you all.

ANNOUNCER: To contact the President, call the following number. Call 202-456-7639. Or write: The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest, Washington, D.C. 20500.

PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN: But isn't it worth every investment necessary to free the world from the threat of nuclear war?

I clearly recognize that defensive systems have limitations and raise certain problems and ambiguities. If paired with offensive systems, they can be viewed as fostering an aggressive policy, and no one wants that. But with these considerations firmly in mind, I call upon the scientific community in our country, those who gave us nuclear weapons, to turn their great talents now to the cause of mankind and world peace, to give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

LAROCHE [making speech]: The problem is the Soviet Union is committed to a -- and manifests its commitment as of April this year -- to reject any of the kinds of negotiations which the President had indicated were offered and to commit itself to immediate thermonuclear crisis. The Soviet Union is preparing to risk thermonuclear war now. And the Soviet Union will not be deterred by what we can do three to five years from now. It will only be deterred by what we do now.

The only way to stop war is to increase the risks and penalties to the point that that bunch of scoundrels who have only one element of rationality in them, and have proven that, that bunch of scoundrels is able to calculate risks and penalties of warfare. It's the only rationality and morality they have.

And I will do whatever is necessary in the short run to increase those risks and penalties to the point they say, "No confrontation." And they're not going to negotiate until then.

If anyone told you that the Soviet Union is interested in negotiating with the United States, they lied to you. The Soviet Union has had a policy of not negotiating on any substantive questions with the Reagan Administration in power since July 1982.

What happened is the President's address of March 23rd of this year did two things. It terrified the Soviets because it implied to them that we had more clout in the United States than they thought we had. Secondly, this took the mask off their issue of the so-called Euromissiles. They immediately demonstrated they didn't care about the Euromissiles all along. Who can

blame them? They've got the SS-20s, SS-21s, SS-22s, SS-23s coming out all over the place. It is not the U.S. planting of Euromissiles in Europe which has enraged the Soviets. They don't give a damn about it. They just don't care.

We face, actually, a genuine war. They are perfectly capable of launching war. There are certain rules, there are certain principles involved, there are certain conditions under which they won't, certain they will. But we're in the area where if I were President of the United States at this moment, I would have to crank this thing up and say, "I may be fighting a war as of March. I hope I won't be, but I'm going to be prepared."

And when you're dealing with this crowd -- you've got a military dictatorship in the Soviet Union now. They're rational in military policy. Therefore I can only deal with them as realists. I've got to convince them that the United States will destroy them if they continue in this direction. But if they want to negotiate, we have a basis for negotiation. Just as Machiavelli specified the fundamental principle of strategy in his "Critiques of the Ten Books of Livy."

Give them an out. They've got a very beautiful out. The President gave it to them, essentially, on March 23rd. They turned it down. The best offer they'd ever had from the United States, they turned it down because they wanted war. Okay. They turned it down because they thought they could win. Okay.

Now we have to get them back to the negotiating table. How? I didn't push them into this. I tried to stop it. And we succeeded in influencing the environment to the point that the President made the offer. The President of the United States made the offer and they turned it down. When they turned it down they chose war. And when they chose war, they demonstrated their moral character. And you cannot assume that their moral character is other than they demonstrated it to have been when they chose war.

ANNOUNCER: To support the LaRouche campaign, call for a national defense emergency mobilization. Call 212-246-1130 or 247-8820.... Or write: The LaRouche Campaign, P.O. Box 2150, GPO, New York, New York 10116....