

Ortega levels missile threat at El Salvador

By Josette Shiner
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

SAN SALVADOR, El Salvador — Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega has threatened to supply El Salvador's guerrillas with surface-to-air missiles if Congress approves new aid to the Nicaraguan resistance, President Jose Napoleon Duarte said yesterday.

Mr. Duarte said the threat came during a "harsh argument" with Mr. Ortega at the San Jose meeting of Central American presidents two weeks ago to discuss the Esquipulas II peace accord.

Mr. Duarte said he accused Mr. Ortega of training 15 Salvadoran guerrillas on missile operations during October in Managua.

"It was at that moment he

threatened me with the missiles," Mr. Duarte said.

Mr. Duarte said Mr. Ortega then said that if the United States "approves one penny of any kind of aid, he would take Esquipulas II and break it into pieces . . . and we would have to take the consequences."

The upcoming vote in Congress for aid to the resistance is a "win-win proposition" for the Sandinistas, Mr. Duarte said.

If Congress votes against the aid, the resistance would be weakened, he said. And if Congress approves the aid, Mr. Ortega will launch a "world battle" against U.S. policy.

"He is going to make such a fuss to the world," Mr. Duarte said. "He'll take dramatic steps, like calling all the [Central American] presidents together and breaking up Es-

Salvador Suspects to Remain Jailed

■ SAN SALVADOR—Three suspects in the 1985 cafe massacre of 13 people will be kept in jail while the government prepares an appeal of the order to free them, an official spokeswoman said.

Six Americans were among those killed June 19, 1985, by men firing automatic weapons at outdoor cafes in the city's "Pink Zone" of restaurants and clubs. Four were Marine guards from the U.S. Embassy.

On Tuesday, the three-member Martial Court said the attack was a political act and the men should be freed under an amnesty for political prisoners passed in conjunction with the Central American peace plan. The United States protested.

quipulas II or giving the missiles to [rebels in] El Salvador."

Mr. Duarte and his staff said the weapons are two types of heat-seeking missiles. One is similar to the U.S. Redeye, and the other is like the more advanced Stinger.

Col. Reynaldo Lopez Nuila, now assistant to the president and a former vice minister of defense, said the missiles had never been used before by the Salvadoran guerrillas. The Salvadoran officials said they had information that 15 men were trained in the anti-aircraft school in front of the Camino Real hotel in Managua, Nicaragua, and that such training takes about 25 days.

Mr. Duarte was interviewed yesterday at the presidential palace by a group from the American Society

of Newspaper Editors. He spoke in English.

The Salvadoran government learned of the guerrillas' new missile capability during peace talks with the leadership of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN) in October, Mr. Duarte said.

"[FMLN leader] Leonel Gonzales personally told us they had trained their people and they were ready to receive the missiles," he said. "They said they were ready to have an escalation of the war."

Mr. Duarte said, "This is the same thing Ortega told me when we were yelling at each other."

Supplying guerrillas with the Soviet-made missiles would mean "a total change in the war," Mr. Duarte said.

He said the Salvadoran military now has the ability to respond quickly with helicopters to any attack, but if the guerrillas had missiles, "helicopters would become a secondary instrument."

Mr. Duarte said he has suspended all helicopter travel for himself.

After three years in office, Mr. Duarte said, his government has turned the tide in the war with the guerrillas and is clearly on the path toward peace.

"The FMLN has lost the political battle. They have lost the ideological battle," he said. "The democratic process keeps moving, and they want to stop it."

Mr. Duarte welcomed the return to El Salvador of the leader of the political wing of the FMLN, Ruben Zamora. He said that Mr. Zamora, if he participates in the electoral process, has the capability to woo some votes from the left away from Mr. Duarte's Christian Democrat Party.

"If we lose the election because we are getting a more democratic process, this is our goal," Mr. Duarte said. "My inheritance to my country is to leave an irreversible democracy. For this I'll pay a price."

Mr. Duarte said his efforts at land reform and his many negotiations with the FMLN guerrilla leaders had triggered strong opposition on the right.

"I am risking an election," he said.

ORTEGA . . . Pg. 12

After Sgt. Lonetree

IT CAME as a surprise to learn from Post reporter Don Oberdorfer's front-page story Jan. 17 that until a few weeks ago at least some officials of the Naval Investigative Service still believed that Marine guards at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow had opened the building to Soviet agents. After extensive interviews with Sgt. Clayton Lonetree in November, however, even these die-hards have conceded that the conspiracy never existed. The issue that remains unresolved, though, is how the wildly overblown charges were made and believed in the first place.

Sgt. Lonetree actually did have prohibited contacts with Soviet agents when he was stationed in Moscow in 1986. He has been court-martialed and found guilty of providing written and verbal information to them about embassy operations and personnel. But in an effort to determine the extent of the damage and examine the possibility that similar conduct had occurred at other embassies around the world, investigators clearly went off the track at an early stage of the inquiry and badly bungled the job. Innocent Marines were subjected to long and isolated interrogation and eventually signed statements—immediately repudiated—that had apparently been drafted by NIS agents. Cpl. Arnold Bracy was said to have conspired with Sgt. Lonetree in allowing Soviet agents entry into the embassy and access to secret documents and facili-

ties. Two other Marines affirmed that Cpl. Bracy had confessed to them. As a result, the embassy in Moscow was crippled for months, unfair accusations were made against the U.S. ambassador, expensive equipment was shipped home and replaced and relations between the two superpowers were severely strained. Thirty million dollars was spent pursuing this investigation, and the reputations of a number of young men and of the Marine Corps itself were unjustly tarnished.

It is not enough to dismiss this whole episode as an example of unfortunate but perhaps necessary overreaction. Important questions remain, chief among them, as former assistant secretary of state Patt Derian pointed out on the opposite page this week: How did these flawed and explosive confessions come to be made in the first place? Is the NIS a competent investigative force? Were the circumstances of the interrogation fair or designed to elicit sensational statements whether true or not? Were threats made or physical force used? Who was in charge of checking out details of the "confession"—it is now clear that they could not possibly have been true—before action was taken?

The NIS has recently investigated itself and, not surprisingly, come up clean. But none of the errors has been explained, no accountability accepted. The Navy must assign responsibility for this mess and produce the facts.

Sandinistas, resistance start talks in Costa Rica

By Glenn Garvin
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

SAN JOSE, Costa Rica — After six years of bloody combat, the two sides in Nicaragua's civil war finally sat down at the same table yesterday.

Cease-fire talks between delegations representing Nicaragua's Marxist Sandinista government and the U.S.-backed rebels began at a seminary here in mid-afternoon and were expected to last well into the night.

Both sides brought new cease-fire plans to the table. But their ideas about how to achieve peace in Nicaragua are poles apart. Neither side projected much real optimism about the outcome of the talks.

"I think we have to be optimistic in the sense that that's the only way to work very hard," said Victor Hugo Tinoco, head of the Sandinista government delegation.

"We'll see," shrugged a resistance official. "There hasn't been much success in the past, but at least we're sitting at the same table this time."

Three rounds of indirect cease-fire negotiations were scheduled between the Sandinistas and the rebels during December, but two of them were canceled over disputes about dates, sites, and composition of the negotiating teams.

The one session that was held collapsed after 10 hours of talks, and didn't produce a single point of agreement.

Even though both sides have modified their negotiating positions since the December meeting, they remain far apart.

The Sandinistas say that these talks only involve the technical details of a cease-fire, not internal political changes in Nicaragua. "A government is not the result of a

cease-fire," Mr. Tinoco said. "A government is the result of an election. That is the core of democracy."

The resistance, on the other hand, says that a cease-fire is merely part of a comprehensive political settlement that will guarantee full democracy in Nicaragua.

"Of course we are ready to exchange our rifles for ballots," said Jaime Morales, head of the rebel negotiating team. "We'll exchange them when there's a system, a process, verifiable and irreversible, of democracy — that leads to the people freely expressing themselves."

The insurgents' cease-fire plan calls for a 30-day, in-place, cease-fire. During that time, the Sandinistas would make 17 changes in the Nicaraguan constitution, end the draft, abolish their militia forces, and eject all foreign military advisers.

By contrast, the government plan calls for the rebels to withdraw into three cease-fire zones beginning March 1. But the insurgents would keep their weapons and ammunition until they are satisfied that the Sandinistas intend to keep their promises to democratize.

Eventually, under the Sandinista plan, the rebels would lay down their arms and accept an amnesty. To make sure that the amnesty is full and fair, Sandinista compliance would be monitored by an international commission that includes representatives of Latin America, Europe and the United States.

If the political distance between the two sides is vast, the personal distance is incalculable.

Both delegations attended a brief opening ceremony yesterday afternoon to provide newsmen a photo opportunity. The rebels entered first and stood at the back of

the room, chatting. When Mr. Tinoco and Claudio Chamorro, the Nicaraguan ambassador to Costa Rica, walked into the room, they kept their eyes straight ahead, refusing to even look at the rebels. Not so much as a word was exchanged between the two groups.

[Nicaragua's Roman Catholic primate, Cardinal Miguel Obando y Brava, briefed Pope John Paul II at the Vatican Wednesday as the pontiff prepared for talks today with Nicaragua's President Daniel Ortega, The Associated Press reported yesterday.]

[Vatican spokesman Joaquin Navarro said that the pope requested the meeting with Cardinal Obando, an Ortega critic who mediated earlier indirect peace talks between the Sandinista government and the Nicaraguan resistance.]

[Mr. Ortega arrived in Italy from Spain yesterday, a few hours before the cease-fire talks began in Costa Rica. He said he wanted to discuss Central American peace plans with the pope and Italian officials.]

["The very fact that there is a meeting" with the pope "is a positive sign," Mr. Ortega told reporters in Rome last night. It will be his first meeting with the pontiff since a tense papal visit to Nicaragua in March 1983.]

[La Stampa, a national Italian newspaper, said yesterday Mr. Ortega plans to offer the resignations of three priests in his government as a fence-mending gesture. The report from Spain cited unidentified Nicaraguan diplomatic sources.]

[The Vatican has condemned the priests' participation in the government. The three are Foreign Minister Miguel D'Escoto, who is traveling with the president; Education Minister Fernando Cardenal and

ORTEGA...from Pg. 1

"But I am risking it because I want to win a democracy."

The Christian Democrats face a serious challenge from the right in the March municipal elections and the 1989 presidential elections. Mr. Duarte said that unless conditions change in the next few weeks, "we will not get a majority vote in the National Assembly" in the March election.

"We are prepared for that," he said.

Speaking of the Central American peace plan, Mr. Duarte said the strategy is to "open a political door and close the military door."

He said that if he had tried to negotiate with the guerrillas when he first took office in 1984, it could have triggered a military coup. But he has gradually changed attitudes and has met with the guerrillas 17 times over the past three years, he said.

Nicaragua's compliance with the plan "is the first time in the world a communist government ever signed a document that clearly states a democratic process," he said.

Mr. Ortega "is fighting against himself," Mr. Duarte said.

"This is the reason why [in San Jose] I shook hands with him three times like St. Peter," Mr. Duarte said. "I asked him three times, 'Are you going to comply?' I was telling him I didn't trust him."

Culture Minister Ernesto Cardenal.

[Cardinal Obando said he didn't know what Mr. Ortega would say to the pope but that in five meetings he had had with the president, Mr. Ortega never mentioned the possibility of the priests' resigning from the government, the AP said.]

Taking aim at the ABM treaty

Having found few buyers for the notion that the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty is stretchable enough to accommodate the Strategic Defense Initiative, President Reagan's proposed anti-missile weapons system, the administration seems to be taking another approach. It's setting out to convince the Soviet Union to accept a new accord under which the ABM treaty apparently would be scrapped when Star Wars, as SDI is popularly known, was ready for deployment.

The ABM treaty, which was ratified by the U.S. Senate, permits laboratory research

on strategic defensive systems, but it plainly forbids field testing, development and deployment of key elements of a system like SDI. The treaty says that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union may "develop, test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based."

Despite the skepticism of leading U.S. scientists, the president remains committed to developing, testing and deploying Star Wars. But there are two obstacles: the treaty and the Soviets, who have indicated that Mr.

Reagan's insistence on pushing ahead with it threatens a proposed agreement on long-range nuclear weapons.

In an attempt to get around both obstacles, the Reagan administration offered a new treaty proposal in Geneva last week. Under its terms, the superpowers would promise to abide by the ABM treaty (presumably meaning its traditional, restrictive interpretation and not the permissive one Mr. Reagan favors), but reportedly only until 1994. From then on, according to an unidentified American official in Washington who was interviewed by the Associated Press, the United States would continue to obey the old treaty

ABM TREATY...Pg. 13

Former defense secretaries are not among Star War enthusiasts

Tom Teepen

The Star Wars issue is working its way back toward the front burner. Don't grab the pan by the handle.

President Reagan in his State of the Union Address again ballyhooed his Strategic Defense Initiative, and the technology is all muddled up in the U.S.-Soviet talks that aim to cut long-range nuclear missiles by 50 percent. Further, the administration continues to argue for, in effect, breaking the anti-ballistic missile treaty (ABM) of 1972, which limits Star Wars-like weapons.

Interestingly, however, when you look around for Star Wars enthusiasts, you look in vain among our former secretaries of defense.

The Southern Center for International Studies brought the seven together in Atlanta last September for a public chat. (Casper Weinberger had not yet retired.)

All agreed it is necessary to pursue research and development. But none saw any reason to rush toward deployment and none accepted Reagan's vision of Star Wars as a virtually impenetrable shield. Indeed, Donald Rumsfeld, one of President Ford's defense secretaries, called the very idea of a shield "silly."

James Schlesinger, defense secretary for Presidents Nixon and Ford, dismissed the president's "Astrodome version," as he called it. Schlesinger saw the probability of an eventually successful deployment as "very low."

Robert McNamara, who served Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, said flatly, "We cannot have SDI deployment and arms control." He added that "Technologically, it [SDI] has not reached the point to meet even a minimum defense requirement ... for deployment. Strategically, there has been no basis for it presented yet that would increase crisis stability."

Rumsfeld, too, remained uncertain SDI will be shown to contribute to stability. He would favor deployment, he said, "somewhere down the road" only if it is.

Elliot Richardson, one of Nixon's de-

fense secretaries, said, "I have not heard a single word to suggest that any contribution would be made to stability by introducing partial or limited ABM defense. ... I don't believe it makes any more sense than it did 10 years ago."

Clark Clifford, a secretary of defense for President Johnson, said, "All we are doing is ... protecting our Mutually Assured Destruction, and I assume the Soviets will do the same. We're off on another big arms race, and it doesn't bring us any more stability than we have now."

Melvin Laird, one of Nixon's secretaries of defense, spoke against the administration's effort to break the ABM treaty as, at best, premature and said the White House should defer to Sen. Sam Nunn's opposition to stretching ABM provisions so far the treaty would come apart.

President Carter's defense secretary, Harold Brown, called the Reagan program a "bait-and-switch" policy, promising a shield when it can deliver only a lesser technology. Brown saw some version of Star Wars as potentially useful in protecting retaliatory weapons and thus bolstering deterrence and as a defense against accidents. But even in those matters he said it isn't clear space-based weapons would be best, and he added, "Protecting the anti-ballistic treaty limits, which do protect U.S. security actually, is the right way to go."

President Reagan has a whopper of a bargaining chip in his Star Wars program. The Russians don't like it. They see it as an essentially aggressive weapon, not as a defense. They don't want to spend the megabucks it would take to keep up. (And it may be that they don't have the computer capacity and software ability to keep up no matter what they spend.)

Will Reagan risk queering a strategic arms deal by insisting on testing outside the ABM treaty limits? Will he refuse to play the bargaining chip for arms-control concessions, if it takes that to close a deal? In short, will he persist at all costs in a scientifically dubious technology that every former defense secretary sees as, at best, only a limited help to defense? □

Teepen is editor of *The Constitution's* editorial pages.

ABM TREATY...

from Pg. 12

provisions — as long as SDI wasn't ready for deployment.

The transparent objective of this ploy is to untie the U.S. government's hands, with Soviet acquiescence, and to allow final development and even deployment of Star Wars. Of course, nothing would prevent the Soviets from building their own version of SDI and deploying it when the United States did. But big anti-missile defenses are exactly what the ABM treaty was written to prevent.

The treaty's primary purpose is to discourage the growth of offensive nuclear weapons by making fewer of them necessary, owing to the lack of defenses. The treaty has done that. In fact, its effectiveness helps to explain the decision by Mr. Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail S. Gorbachev to try to deeply cut their nations' stockpiles of offensive arms. With no protection from nuclear weapons, the need to get rid of them is keenly felt.

President Reagan talks as if he wants to sign a treaty on long-range weapons when he meets with Mr. Gorbachev in Moscow in a few months. But he apparently is still so mesmerized by his fantastic vision of a strategic defensive system that he seems not to realize what his insistence on pursuing it is doing to the chances for attaining something that — unlike Star Wars — is within the realm of feasibility.

With less than a year remaining in office, Mr. Reagan is fast running out of negotiating time. It's beginning to look as though he will leave the presidency with neither a firm national commitment to Star Wars — it has few friends in Congress, and not many anywhere else — nor the spectacular triumph in arms control that's almost within his grasp.

Why not use an SDI laser to kill AIDS virus?

As the member of Congress who introduced the amendment to fund experiments that have found a way to kill the AIDS virus with a Strategic Defense Initiative laser, I am impelled to respond to the question posed by Charles Monfort of the Union of Concerned Scientists in his Jan. 21 letter.

Mr. Monfort asks, "Why is a program designed to destroy Soviet nuclear weapons funneling money into

medical research?" A better question is "Why not?" The goal of saving lives is a shared one and the results of the program speak for themselves.

Traditional medical research has thus far failed to yield a method to make the blood supply safe. Currently, donated blood is tested for the AIDS virus, but it remains possible for a donor to show no signs of AIDS for months after being exposed to

the disease. Therefore, it is still possible that a patient may get AIDS from a blood transfusion. "Photodynamic therapy," the procedure that Mr. Monfort refers to, has the potential to render the blood supply safe.

Mr. Monfort writes that the "spin-off" argument is weak because a relatively small amount of SDI money goes for medical research. He misunderstands the argument. Spinoff

EDITOR'S NOTE: Letter referred to was published in *Current News Early Bird*, 21 January 88, Pg. 16.

refers to the well-known phenomenon, which we experienced during the Apollo program, whereby new technology that is developed in pursuit of a major goal can be put to other uses.

LASER...Pg. 14

Giving peace process a chance in Central America, Mideast

By Joseph C. Harach

In world affairs this week, two events were worth particular notice: one touching the future in Central America and the other the future in the Middle East.

In the first case, President Reagan tempered his request for aid to the Nicaraguan contra rebels by enough to give Costa Rican President Oscar Arias Sanchez's peace plan another two months of time.

In the second case, enough criticism of recent Israeli behavior in the occupied territories developed in the American Jewish community to make it politically possible for the Reagan administration to think tentatively about trying to reopen the peace process between Arabs and Israelis. Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak came to Washington and urged such a step on the President.

The Arias peace plan for Central America had lost momentum. It would presumably be sunk decisively if President Reagan could continue to send more guns and ammunition to the contras. A suspension of such deliveries is one of the conditions in the Arias plan.

This week Mr. Reagan tempered his request to the United States Congress. He asks for only \$36 million for the contras. And he proposed that only \$3.6 million be earmarked for weaponry and that it be held in escrow at least until March 31.

Both figures are well below what the administration originally intended. The agreement to hold back on the lethal 10 percent of the whole at least until March 31 is tailored to the present mood of the Congress. It is the most that Congress is likely to be willing to provide. It means that Mr. Reagan will not be able to sink the Arias peace process.

Whether it revives is largely up to President Daniel Ortega Saavedra in Nicaragua. He will not be able to blame Washington for sinking it. He must continue to do those things that will advance the plan or be himself the palpable cause of its destruction.

It remains to be seen whether the other members of the ruling junta in Managua will permit Mr. Ortega to take the various steps away from political dictatorship — steps to which he has committed himself in his agreement with the other Central American Presidents. It is noted that when he was recently in Costa Rica other members of the junta rearrested several opposition political leaders. They were released, but the whole episode suggested a split in the Sandinistas.

Provided that there is further progress along the peace road in Central America itself, and provided that Congress does approve the \$36 million package, then US Secretary of State George Shultz may go there himself for further talks.

Peace in Nicaragua is not around the next corner. But

WIRE NEWS...from Pg. 2

involved in atomic weapons tests in the South Pacific and Australia during the 1950s have higher rates of blood cancer than a comparable control group, a survey ordered by the British Defense Ministry revealed yesterday. The survey was carried out by two British groups in response to increasing pressure for compensation from the servicemen involved. The 1,500-member British Nuclear Test Veterans' Association vowed to challenge the Def/Min survey regardless of the results, claiming the issue is moral, not statistical. (Reuter)

(Complete texts available from SAF/AAR, 4C881)

the Arias peace plan is still alive. Neither President Reagan nor Mr. Ortega has yet killed it, although both would probably like to do so. There is no reason to doubt that Mr. Reagan wants to bring down the Ortega regime. Nor is there room to doubt that Mr. Ortega would prefer to set up a long-term anti-American regime in Nicaragua based on Soviet aid.

Both wishes will be frustrated if the Arias peace plan works.

As for the Middle East, the killings and beatings of Palestinians by Israeli police and soldiers since Dec. 9 have produced a change in the political context of US policymaking.

Previous to Dec. 9, when the first outburst of Arab protest occurred in the Gaza Strip, it was axiomatic in Washington that nothing could be done to revive a peace process during 1988, because this is an election year in both Israel and the US.

Support for Israel is such a delicate subject in US politics that no politician of either party would dare propose any US initiative for fear of being accused of being unfriendly toward Israel.

But then the outburst occurred. Since then at least 38 Palestinians, some of them teen-aged children, have been killed. Television screens have shown Israeli po-

PEACE...Pg. 16

LASER...fm Pg. 13

The money that I asked be diverted from the SDI program to medical research was not used to develop the special virus-killing laser itself — that laser would be developed whether or not it were possible to use it for medical research. The money was to provide an opportunity for medical experts to explore the potential uses of this laser. And, in fact, the scientific community

sought their funding and convinced Congress of its merits. I, in turn, sought and obtained an amendment to the Defense Bill to include it. The Pentagon did not request the money as part of any public relations effort, as Mr. Monfort suggests.

It seems that Mr. Monfort's prejudices against SDI cloud his understanding of our nation's technical and economic history. Much of our technological progress has been the result of spinoff from programs

with defined goals, whether those goals were victory in World War II or landing a man on the moon. Among the potential spinoffs from SDI: cheap, clean and plentiful energy sources; methods to sterilize food; new technology to explore the planets and high-speed computers to do everything from accurately predicting climates of the future to making more, better and faster research possible.

SDI is the one most comprehen-

sive project that presents the greatest challenge to human understanding, taking us to the frontiers of knowledge and now pushing those frontiers forward. If the Union of Concerned Scientists thinks that is not a valid argument for supporting SDI, it has made itself even less relevant.

ROBERT E. BADHAM
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington

Canada Near Decision On Whether to Buy Nuclear-Powered Subs

OTTAWA — With the United States and European allies watching closely, Canada soon will decide whether to spend C\$8 billion (US\$6.2 billion) for its first fleet of nuclear-powered submarines.

Both Canadian opposition parties say they would scrap Conservative Prime Minister Brian Mulroney's plan to acquire 10 to 12 submarines in a defense buildup.

Washington and some NATO partners would like the extra money spent to reinforce Canada's rusty defenses elsewhere.

Despite criticism of the long-range plan unveiled last June by Defense Minister Perrin Beatty, the 27-year submarine acquisition program is still on course at National Defense Headquarters in Ottawa.

Naval brass are assessing the merits of two rival designs: the

British Trafalgar-class sub made by Vickers Shipbuilding of Barrow-in-Furness or the smaller, cheaper Rubis Amethyste-class sub made in Cherbourg, France.

"We've got two good competitors," Rear Adm. John Anderson, in charge of the project, told the Associated Press after conducting exercises on both boats. "We're looking at going to the government in late spring with a recommendation. Our aim is to have the first sub by late 1996."

Planners say the nuclear-powered boats are needed to replace Canada's paltry fleet of three, 30-year-old Oberon-class diesel subs, none of which operate in the Pacific. The entire Canadian navy has 26 combat vessels.

While the new subs would be armed conventionally in line with Ottawa's non-nuclear defense poli-

cy, nuclear propulsion would enable the Canadian navy to patrol under the Arctic ice for the first time.

The subs would deter, track and warn off Soviet and other intruders in Canada's three oceans — the Atlantic, Arctic and Pacific — and link up with NATO defenses in Europe.

But if a Soviet sub were found under the Canadian Arctic, "the last thing we're going to do is actually fire a weapon (in peacetime)," Adm. Anderson said.

In view of this passive intent, critics accuse Mr. Mulroney of petulantly taking the nuclear option because of his dispute with the United States over ownership of the icy Northwest Passage. Canada says the passage lies within its Arctic waters, while Washington argues it is an international strait.

Adm. Anderson said that while asserting sovereignty in the North is important, the Arctic dispute has overshadowed other reasons for going nuclear.

He said the cost ratio between nuclear-powered and conventional subs is 1.6 to 1, but nuclear subs are three times as effective, able to patrol longer and get on station quicker. (AP)

Conventional arms cut said harder to achieve

COPENHAGEN, Denmark — NATO Secretary-General Lord Carrington said yesterday that East-West negotiations on reducing conventional weapons would be far more difficult than nuclear disarmament talks. "If you think nuclear weapons are difficult, this is of a different dimension of difficulty," he told journalists after talks with Danish Defense Minister Bernt Johan Collet.



Carrington

Lord Carrington, in Denmark for a NATO regional meeting, said the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, gathered in Vienna, would set a framework for conventional arms talks. "The sort of approach that the [NATO] alliance will have, will concentrate on getting rid of or reducing the offensive weapons, which would be used in a surprise attack or which could cause an imbalance," he said, citing tanks and artillery.

Michel expects victory in vote on Contra aid

By Jennifer Spevacek
and Gene Grabowski
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

House Republican leader Robert Michel said yesterday that if no more than 11 GOP members vote against aid to the Nicaraguan resistance, the administration's \$36 million package will probably pass in the House.

"It will be close, but I believe we will win," Mr. Michel said after he and four other Republican House members met with President Reagan and Secretary of State George Shultz at the White House.

Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd told reporters he would vote against the administration bill and probably not support an alternative bill by House Democrats to provide humanitarian aid to the rebels but no military supplies.

"I'm unwilling to continue in this direction, putting all our eggs in one basket — the Contra aid basket," Mr. Byrd said.

Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, who formally introduced the president's bill yesterday, charged

House Democrats with trying to obscure the issues surrounding next week's vote.

"It is a vote we cannot duck, no matter how many fig leaves and smokescreens the House Democratic leadership dream up," Mr. Dole said in a speech on the Senate floor. "It is crucial vote, a vote we must win."

The president's aid package contains \$3.6 million in lethal aid, which would be held in escrow until the end of March and released if there is no cease-fire between the rebels and the Sandinistas.

House Speaker Jim Wright said he has asked Rep. Dante Fascell, Florida Democrat and chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to draw up an alternative package, without military aid, prior to Wednesday's vote on the president's bill.

Mr. Michel said the House Democratic leaders' offer of an alternative bill shows the strength of the pro-aid forces is growing and "suggests that the Democrats at least recognize there's some merit in support of the Contras."

"The momentum is on our side," said Rep. Mickey Edwards, Oklahoma Republican, who called the House Democrats' offer "a bit disingenuous. These are people who have no intention of ever voting for Contra aid."

"We've got somebody nervous that we may have the votes," said Rep. Charles Stenholm, a Texas Democrat who supports rebel aid. "When we come close, there is always another carrot out there to pick off some votes."

Rebel aid opponents and proponents are both seeking to sway about 30 House members still undecided about the new package of assistance to the forces battling Nicaragua's Marxist Sandinista regime.

While both houses will vote on the bill next week, the House vote on Wednesday is considered the crucial one because the more conservative Senate is likely to support any package that the House would approve.

Mr. Wright, who met with Mr. Reagan on Wednesday, told reporters he backs the plans to offer an alternative rebel aid bill.

"I think it's essential, if the administration plan should be rejected, that some positive package should be put together and brought up quite soon" for a vote, Mr. Wright said.

Other Republican congressmen who met for a half hour with Mr. Reagan and Mr. Shultz in the Cabinet Room were Willis Gradison of Ohio,

Joseph McDade of Pennsylvania, Clarence Miller of Ohio and Chalmers Wylie of Ohio, all rebel aid proponents.

Mr. Edwards noted that the restrictive conditions for consideration of the president's aid bill, which were signed into law as part of a massive spending bill last year, were set by Mr. Wright and the House Democratic leadership.

Under the terms of the agreement, the House must vote Feb. 3 and, if the bill passes, the Senate votes the next day. Time for debate is limited and no amendments or substitute bills are allowed.

Mr. Edwards said the House Democrats' plan is, in effect, an amendment or substitute bill. "I'm not sure I would characterize that as acting in good faith," he said.

Earlier in the day, White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater said Mr. Reagan is considering giving a televised evening address before the vote.

At yesterday's news briefing, Mr. Fitzwater again stressed the need for continued assistance to the Nicaraguan resistance, including military aid.

"It's the only plan that would keep the resistance alive in a way that would make them a viable force," Mr. Fitzwater said. "The [Democratic]

RADIO-TV NEWS HIGHLIGHTS

NICARAGUA: Nicaraguan Contra representatives met Sandinista government officials yesterday for the first time in the country's six-year civil war, ABC's John Quinones reports. The meeting was serious and somber, Quinones says, as the two sides each presented two peace proposals and agreed to a March cease-fire. The major

points of disagreement are reported to be Contra demands for continued US military aid and the formation of a provisional opposition government.

CBS and ABC report on Senate testimony against Panamanian Leader GEN Manuel Noriega. ABC and NBC report on the Iran/Contra affair. NBC reports on US policy toward Israel.

(Verbatim transcripts of summarized items available from SAF/AAR, 4C881. Other transcripts include: TR-73, CNN's "Prime News," 25 Jan 1988, report on Navy study linking coffee and cigarettes to pancreatic cancer; TR-76 and TR-77, National Public Radio's "Morning Edition," 27 Jan 1988, reports on DOD fraud charges against Rockwell International.)

WASHINGTON TIMES 29 JAN 1988 Pg. F-3

HARRY SUMMERS**Looking back at Tet**

Twenty years ago this Sunday — at 3 a.m. on Jan. 31, 1968 — began one of the most decisive battles in American military history: the Viet Cong's Tet Offensive, which marked the beginning of the end of American involvement in the Vietnam War.

It was a strategic surprise which would rank with the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on Dec. 7, 1941, which destroyed a major portion of the U.S. Pacific Fleet; the Nazi counterattack in the Ardennes on Dec. 16, 1944, which began the Battle of the Bulge; and the Chinese counterattacks north of the Ch'ongch'on River on Nov. 25, 1950, that signaled their intervention in the Korean war.

Winter would appear to be a time of especial American vulnerability. Indeed, it was in December 1776 that Thomas Paine warned of "the summer soldier and the sunshine patriot" who would, in time of crisis, "shrink from the service of their country." And it was this perceived American weakness that our enemies attempted to exploit. In each instance they sought to break America's will to fight.

But in every case, save one, the enemy miscalculated. A year after Paine's speech, during the terrible winter of 1777-1778, the American Army shook its "summer soldier" image at Valley Forge and went on to win the war for America's independence. Pearl Harbor, far from scaring America into submission, galvanized the American will and ultimately led to total victory over the Axis powers. Although American will wavered momentarily with the Battle of the Bulge and the Chinese intervention in Korea, the United States soon recovered its composure and went on to hand the enemy devastating battlefield defeats.

But the enemy did not miscalculate with the Tet Offensive of 1968, for this time America's will was broken. What makes this defeat so paradoxical is that American military forces performed better there than in earlier such crises. At Pearl Harbor they were caught flat-footed, and most of the Pacific Fleet was lost. At the Battle of the Bulge whole American units, including two regiments of the U.S. 106th Infantry Division, surrendered to the enemy. In Korea, the initial Chinese attack overwhelmed U.S. forces on the battlefield and drove them out of North Korea.

During Tet 1968, by comparison, American military forces not only were not defeated, they turned back and destroyed the Viet Cong guerrillas so completely — as the North Vietnamese now freely admit — that the Viet Cong ceased to be an effective military force. For the next seven years the war would be waged not by guerrillas but by the regular forces of the North Vietnamese army.

There have been many explanations for this paradox. One of the most enduring is that sensationalist media reporting turned battlefield victory into political defeat. But reporting of Tet 1968 did not differ materially from the initial doom-gloom-and-apocalypse headlines of earlier crises. The difference was that President Lyndon B. Johnson succumbed to them. Earlier presidents had countered such assessments and stiffened the public will with optimistic forecasts of their own. They knew that in wartime it is the president who sets the national mood.

Compare George Washington's reactions to the initial military reverses of the Revolutionary War, Franklin D. Roosevelt's to Pearl Harbor and the Battle of the Bulge, and Harry S. Truman's to the Chinese intervention in Korea with Mr. Johnson's reaction to Tet 1968. While the formers' will and determination — and thereby the resolve of the American people — were strengthened by adversity, Mr. Johnson was psychologically defeated.

The reason he was so easily defeated is that his heart was never in the war in the first place. It was in his Great Society programs, and to protect them Mr. Johnson had deliberately declined to mobilize the American people in support of American military operations in Vietnam.

But war is not a half-hearted affair. As Prussian general and military strategist Karl von Clausewitz explained 150 years ago, "When the motives and tensions of war are slight, we can imagine that the very faintest prospect of defeat might be enough to cause one side to yield." That is the real explanation of how an American military victory in Vietnam was turned into a political defeat here at home.

receive two prominent Palestinian Arabs: Hanna Siniora, editor of the East Jerusalem Arab newspaper Al-Fajr, and Fayed Abu Rahme, an attorney in Gaza. Both were scheduled to address Jewish gatherings after their meeting with the US secretary of state.

Before Dec. 9 there was no peace process in motion. It was assumed that somehow the Palestine status quo could survive. American government leaders hoped that things would remain so at least until after election day. But they didn't. The peace process, when active, at least gives the Arabs of Israel and the

occupied territories some hope that eventually the diplomats will do something to better their lot.

Events since Dec. 9 have dispelled the illusion. The Palestinian Arabs are not content. They took to the streets. Israel responded with the same kind of violent repression that the South Africans have so often applied to black unrest.

Now, just possibly, Mr. Shultz will move, slowly, cautiously, tentatively in the direction of the revival of a peace initiative. He might because he could expect some encouragement from within the Jewish community.

AID...from Pg. 15

humanitarian package that we have seen and other alternatives would not do that."

Mr. Reagan's proposal would give a total of \$36.2 million to the rebels to last them from March 1, when current aid runs out, until the end of June.

Of the total, roughly \$20 million would go for transportation of supplies to Contra troops in the field inside Nicaragua, and another \$12 million or so would buy such supplies as food, clothing, medicine and communications gear.

The \$3.6 million for lethal aid is for ammunition and Redeye anti-aircraft missiles. That ammunition, purchased from existing U.S. stock, would be set aside until March 31, when it would be up to Mr. Reagan to decide whether to release it to the rebels.

The decision would be based on whether a cease-fire is in place between the resistance and the Sandinista government, and whether the president believes the two sides have bargained in good faith. Mr. Reagan also promised to consult personally with the presidents of the region's four democracies — Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala — before letting the lethal aid flow.

Harry G. Summers Jr., a retired U.S. Army colonel, is a contributing editor for U.S. News & World Report and a nationally syndicated columnist. A combat infantry veteran of the Korean and Vietnam wars, he is editor of Vietnam magazine and author of "On Strategy" and the "Vietnam War Almanac."

PEACE...from Pg. 14

lice and soldiers deliberately breaking the bones of the Palestinian demonstrators. The beating has been declared officially to be a deliberate Israeli government policy.

This has produced a negative public reaction in the US. The negative reaction has surfaced inside the Jewish community. Important leaders of national Jewish organizations have expressed dismay and disapproval.

This in turn could make it politically possible for the US government to reenter the peace process. Mr. Shultz agreed to



RADIO — TV DEFENSE DIALOG



Radio & TV Reports, Washington, D.C. Summaries not to be quoted.
Friday, January 29, 1988 (Broadcasts of Thursday, Jan. 28, 1988)

SUMMARY OF NETWORK NEWS IN THIS ISSUE

NICARAGUAN DEVELOPMENTS: Representatives of the Nicaraguan government and the Contra rebels opened direct peace talks in Costa Rica. A major issue dividing the two sides is the continuation of U.S. assistance to the Contras. Reports by Juan Vasquez, CBS; John Quinones, ABC.

MORE PRESSURE ON NORIEGA: A Senate committee heard testimony that Panamanian strongman General Manuel Noriega was directly involved in illegal drug trafficking. The United States has been pressuring Noriega to step down. Reports by Rita Braver, CBS; John McWethy, ABC.

IRAN-CONTRA AFFAIR: The Iran-Contra special prosecutor reportedly has decided to indict Colonel Oliver North, John Poindexter, Richard Secord and Albert Hakim. The Democratic Chairman of the House Iran-Contra Committee said he finds it difficult to believe Vice President Bush's version of events. Reports by Peter Jennings, ABC; John Dancy, NBC.

U.S.-POLICY TOWARD ISRAEL: Egyptian President Mubarak urged President Reagan to take a more active role in resolving the Palestinian issue, but President Reagan is said to be reluctant to harshly criticize Israeli actions. Report by Andrea Mitchell, NBC.

Nicaraguan Developments

DAN RATHER: Nicaragua's Sandinista government and the U.S.-backed Contra rebels began their first direct peace talks today at a Roman Catholic seminary in Costa Rica. The meeting is seen as a prelude to next week's decisive vote in the U.S. Congress on Contra aid.

Juan Vasquez reports.

JUAN VASQUEZ: The mood today was one of reconciliation, a feeling that there will never be a better moment for these two warring sides to attain peace.

CMDR. "TONO" [Contra negotiator]: After six years of war in Nicaragua, maybe this is the best opportunity to have to make something positive for our country.

VASQUEZ: But it will take more than prayers. Before the talks began, the Contras proposed a cease-fire in exchange for the creation of a provisional government. The offer was quickly rejected by the Sandinistas.

VICTOR HUGO TINOCO: A government is not the result of a cease-fire. A government is the result of an election. That's the core of the Council for Democracy.

VASQUEZ: The negotiations represent a political skirmish that neither side wants to lose by appearing eager to continue the war. But both the Contras and the Sandinistas admit that the most important battlefield is in Washington.

Even as the Reagan Administration's Contra aid bill was read in Congress today, members

were expressing skepticism over the proposal.

REP. LES AUCCOIN: This is no time for America to invest more deficit money into this war. This is a time, instead, to give peace talks a chance.

VASQUEZ: While the Contras are lobbying Congress, Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega is lobbying for support in Europe with Spain's Prime Minister, and tomorrow with Pope John Paul in the Vatican.

Since the Contras and the Sandinistas have never held face-to-face meetings before, and their differences are so profound, no one knows what progress, if any, can be achieved.

Juan Vasquez, CBS News, San Jose.

More Pressure on Noriega

RATHER: More U.S. heat today on Panama's strongman. Amid reports of continuing U.S. pressure on Panama's military ruler, General Manuel Noriega, to quit, Noriega was publicly accused on Capitol Hill of being in the pocket of big-time drug smugglers.

Rita Braver reports the charges come from a man who says he personally paid the General off.

RITA BRAVER: A convicted drug smuggler gave sworn testimony that he paid millions of dollars to General Manuel Antonio Noriega in exchange for help in laundering illegal drug profits through Panamanian banks. Thirty-five-year-old Steven Kalish told a Senate committee how he greased the wheels during his first meeting with the General.

STEVEN KALISH: I placed \$300,000 cash in my briefcase. As the meeting broke up, I left

the briefcase in his office and began to exit the room. General Noriega called me back and told me that I had left my briefcase. I told him that it was for him. And he smiled.

BRAVER: The senators showed huge blowups of a record Kalish kept of his payments to Noriega. There was even a note, allegedly in Noriega's handwriting, to Kalish's wife Denise, who was at the hearing.

KALISH: Our relationship was not one-sided. Noriega provided me with military protection and favorable treatment while I was living in Panama. I was issued three Panamanian passports.

BRAVER: U.S. law enforcement officials say they believe Kalish's story. He has been testifying before a federal grand jury, one of many witnesses. In fact, government sources say one of Noriega's old allies, Jose Blandome (?), Panama's former Consul General in New York, is testifying about his personal knowledge of Noriega's drug dealings.

An indictment of Noriega is expected as early as next week.

But the drug charges are just part of mounting U.S. dissatisfaction with the military strongman who once had close ties to the Reagan Administration. After the hearings, Senator Sam Nunn summed it all up.

SENATOR SAM NUNN: I said even if he was the number one drug fighter in the world, we would still have big problems with General Noriega, based on human rights, aborting democratic process, many other charges.

BRAVER: Congress has already cut aid to Panama, and Administration officials have told Noriega he should step

aside. But so far, he is staying put.

ABC WORLD NEWS TONIGHT ABC-TV
6:30 P.M. JANUARY 28

Iran-Contra Affair

PETER JENNINGS: News tonight about the Iran-Contra affair. ABC's Bob Clark has learned that it is now virtually certain there will be indictments from the Iran-Contra special prosecutor and that they will probably come in March. Sources familiar with the legal proceedings say the indictments will be limited to four people: Colonel Oliver North, John Poindexter, Richard Secord and Albert Hakim.

Clark reports the special prosecutor, Lawrence Walsh, is still trying to build a conspiracy case, but that is proving difficult since none of the four have agreed to testify against one another.

Nicaraguan Developments

JENNINGS: A milestone today in the Central American peace process. For the first time, the Contras and the Nicaraguan government sat down together in Costa Rica to talk about ending the war.

ABC's John Quinones.

JOHN QUINONES: The historic moment came shortly after noon when the Contra rebel representatives gathered alongside their countrymen and enemies, Sandinista government officials, for the first time in six years of fighting. The mood was serious and somber, with the Contra comandantes standing behind the Sandinista

Deputy Foreign Minister.

"The eyes of the world are upon you," said the Costa Rican Archbishop. "Let us pray for the impossible, so that there will be no more widows, no more orphans in Nicaragua."

QUINONES: The Contras and the Sandinistas presented two new peace proposals. Both sides agree that a cease-fire should take effect in March and that the Contras should remain inside Nicaragua with their weapons while the peace talks continue.

The major point of disagreement? The Contras want more U.S. military aid, even if it's held in escrow. And the rebels want the Sandinistas to allow its internal political opponents to form a provisional government. The Sandinistas say no to continued U.S. military funding to the Contras and no to the creation of a provisional government.

VICTOR HUGO TONICO: A government is not the result of a cease-fire. A government is the result of an election. That's the core of the Council for Democracy.

VASQUEZ: The cease-fire talks are expected to continue into the night. Although basic differences remain, both sides say there's ample room for negotiation. If all goes well, they'll resume their peace talks tomorrow morning.

John Quinones, ABC News, San Jose, Costa Rica.

More Pressure on Noriega

JENNINGS: There were serious new charges today against Panama's military strongman, General Manuel Noriega. A congressional committee is investigating charges that Noriega has been letting drug smugglers and money launderers use his country as a base for their operations.

Here's ABC's John McWethy.

JOHN MCWETHY: For the first time, one of those accusing

General Noriega of involvement in drug trafficking emerged from the shadows to tell his story.

STEVEN KALISH: I am a convicted marijuana smuggler.

MCWETHY: Thirty-five-year-old Steven Kalish, who is now cooperating with the U.S. Government, told the Senate committee that Noriega was on the take from their first meeting. To that meeting, Kalish brought a briefcase filled with \$300,000 in cash and left it there when the meeting ended.

KALISH: General Noriega called me back and told me that I had left my briefcase. I told him that it was for him. And he smiled.

MCWETHY: According to Kalish, he began moving millions of dollars in drug money through Panama's banks.

KALISH: My relationship with General Noriega became closer, until he became a full-scale co-conspirator in my drug operations.

SENATOR NUNN: Is it your testimony you personally told General Noriega that you were engaged in drug trafficking?

KALISH: Yes, sir, it is.

SENATOR NUNN: Is it your testimony that you told him you were engaged in illegal drug trafficking?

KALISH: Yes, sir, it is.

SENATOR NUNN: No doubt that he knew that.

KALISH: No question in my mind.

MCWETHY: Though Noriega denies wrongdoing, many U.S. lawmakers don't believe him.

SENATOR JOHN KERRY: I believe General Noriega is a full-fledged co-conspirator, if not principal conspirator, in some cases, in this activity against our country.

MCWETHY: Two Florida grand juries are collecting evidence against Noriega. Another key witness testified today, making some believe the General could soon be indicted.

Because of the Panama Canal,

the U.S. has a vital stake in that country and has been pressing Noriega to step down. Today's Senate testimony is one more way to turn up the heat.

NBC NIGHTLY NEWS
7:00 P.M.

NBC-TV
JANUARY 28

U.S. Policy Toward Israel

TOM BROKAW: President Reagan finds himself between a rock and a hard place as a result of Israel's brutal tactics in dealing with the violence in the occupied territories. He doesn't approve, but he doesn't want to go too far in condemning Israel.

As NBC's Andrea Mitchell reports tonight, that was very clear when Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak brought a peace plan to the White House today.

ANDREA MITCHELL: At the formal White House ceremony, Mubarak was blunt, telling President Reagan that Israel's policies in the occupied territories are dealing a devastating blow to the peace process and to U.S. interests.

PRESIDENT MUBARAK: It is evident that the continuation of occupation and oppression would bring loss to and inflict damage on all the parties, without exception.

MITCHELL: Mr. Reagan is reluctant to criticize Israel, but did call for an end to the violence.

PRESIDENT REAGAN: The danger of allowing the Palestinian problem to fester is evident and reinforces the urgency of moving toward negotiations.

MITCHELL: In private, Mubarak made what U.S. officials describe as an impassioned plea for the President to take a more active role. He called for a six-month cooling-off period in the occupied territories, something

the U.S. welcomes.

But the Administration does not support the rest of his plan: a six-month halt in new settlements in the occupied lands, political rights and international protection for Palestinians in the territories, and an international peace conference with the Palestinians represented by the PLO. That is unacceptable to the United States. So Mubarak received little more encouragement than a warm handshake.

But the Administration is getting secret reports from its own diplomats harshly critical of Israel's tactics and frustrated that more is not being done. One cable written by a U.S. diplomat and obtained by NBC News is entitled "How to Terrorize a Neighborhood Without Shooting Anyone." The U.S. official describes how Palestinians were rounded up from their homes in occupied East Jerusalem one night, held outside for hours in weather barely above freezing, some clad only in their pajamas.

While sympathetic to Mubarak's plea, U.S. officials say that politicians, here and in Israel, are not going to take any initiatives this year, not with elections being held in both countries.

Iran-Contra Affair

BROKAW: For Vice President George Bush, his role in the Iran-Contra affair just won't go away. Today the Democratic head of the House committee which investigated the scandal challenged Bush's version of events.

Bush has said that he didn't learn until late 1986 that it was an arms-for-hostage deal. However, as NBC's John Dancy reports now, many of the questions are focusing on a meeting that Bush attended in Israel earlier that year.

JOHN DANCY: While Vice President Bush was in Israel in 1986, he held a meeting that

some say had to have made it clear to Bush that the U.S. was swapping arms for hostages. Bush has claimed he didn't learn that until six months later.

The meeting happened at the Vice President's hotel, the King David. Early in the morning of July 29th, he was visited for a half-hour by Amiram Nir, an Israeli anti-terrorism expert. Nir laid out details of negotiations between Israel, Iran, and the United States involving arms for American hostages. Nir told the Vice President an agreement was made on 4000 units, the agreement was made on the basis that we would get the group. Nir asked what he should do next. The Vice President gave him no advice.

CRAIG FULLER: It was unclear to me, in fact, what he meant by units. I had no knowledge....

DANCY: Craig Fuller, Bush's chief of staff, was the only other person in the room. The notes he took give specific details of the conversation. Fuller records that Nir told them, "We are dealing with the most radical elements in Iran."

And through it all, Fuller maintains, he and the Vice President were mystified by what they were hearing.

FULLER: The problem is that we know a lot now that we didn't know then when we sat there and met with Mr. Nir. We simply weren't familiar with the operational details that he was laying out in front of us. If we knew then what we know now, I'm sure some red flags would have gone up. The fact is, the way the process was handled, we just didn't have that information.

DANCY: On the campaign trail, Bush is now using that defense, that he didn't understand what he was hearing.

VICE PRESIDENT BUSH: I did not know all the details. When he started talking about details of it, some of them I

knew about, some I didn't. I didn't know what he was referring to when he was talking to radicals, nor did I ask.

DANCY: The head of the House Iran investigating committee, Congressman Lee Hamilton of Indiana, finds that defense by Bush shocking.

REP. LEE HAMILTON: Here was a plan laid out which makes remarkable concessions to terrorists in order to get the hostages out. Didn't that raise a question in his mind? It just seems to me that it should have.

DANCY: Earlier, Bush had said Nir was only discussing Israel's dealings with Iran. Now he concedes Nir was talking about a U.S. swap of arms for hostages, but says, at the time, he didn't understand that.

The following transcripts are available to read or reproduce on the premises, SAF-AAR 4C 881.

Navy Study Links Coffee and Cigarettes to Pancreatic Cancer
Prime News, CNN-TV
January 25, 8:00 P.M. TR-73

Reagan Will Seek Money for the Contras
CBS Radio News, WTOP Radio
January 26, 7:00 A.M. TR-74

INF Treaty Ratification Hearings
Monitor Radio, WETA Radio
January 26, 4:30 P.M. TR-75

Rockwell Charged with Fraud on Navstar Contract
Morning Edition, WAMU-FM
January 27, 6:20 A.M. TR-76

Rockwell Charged with Double-Billing
January 27, 7:00 A.M. TR-77

Testimony in Court-Martial of Marine Corporal Lindsay Scott
News, WTOP Radio
January 27, 2:10 P.M. TR-78



CURRENT NEWS EARLY BIRD EDITION



THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1988

WASHINGTON POST

28 JANUARY 1988

Pg. 4

INF Ignites Drive for 'Smart' Weapons

Unmanned Arms Could Be Launched From NATO Rear Areas

By George C. Wilson
Washington Post Staff Writer

The treaty to eliminate intermediate-range nuclear forces is fueling a high-level drive in the Pentagon to force the military to spend more of its budget on "smart" weapons that could be fired from NATO's rear areas, defense officials said yesterday.

Defense Secretary Frank C. Carlucci has commissioned a study on how far the Pentagon could go in this direction and is expected to decide within the next few days whether to order the services to restructure their budgets to accommodate additional spending for unmanned, standoff weapons at the expense of manned aircraft, tanks and ships. Traditionally, the armed services have strongly favored manned weapons over unmanned ones.

Carlucci in a NATO report sent to Congress yesterday said a "win

early" master plan for using advanced conventional munitions (ACM) to stop a Warsaw Pact invasion quickly by aiming smart weapons at weak points in Warsaw Pact forces should be ready for implementation by this April.

The Defense Department also is accelerating efforts to provide NATO partners with more U.S. technology to allow them to employ smart, unmanned weapons to defend Europe, officials said. The recent departures of Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger and his deputy, Richard N. Perle, have reduced Pentagon opposition to such technology transfers, they added.

Adm. William J. Crowe Jr., chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. John R. Galvin, NATO commander, are allied with Pentagon civilians pressing to reduce the time it now takes to get smart, unmanned, standoff weapons out of U.S. laboratories and into the European defense zones. The weapons

could have nuclear or conventional warheads, although the greater emphasis at the moment is on nonnuclear. Smart weapons can be launched from ships or aircraft without violating the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. Ground-launched weapons with ranges of less than 310 miles also are permitted.

In testimony endorsing the INF Treaty, Crowe told the Senate Armed Services Committee that to keep the alliance strong "at reasonable levels of investment . . . we must exploit key areas where we enjoy potential long-term technological advantages The United States did make certain that the INF Treaty would leave the door open for NATO to exploit fully emergent technologies in the modernization of strategic nuclear, theater nuclear and conventional forces It is imperative for the alliance to take stock of its military

INF . . . Pg. 3

WASHINGTON TIMES

28 JANUARY 1988

Pg. 1

Accident delays 'star wars' test

By Warren Strobel
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

A worker's mishap damaged a massive Strategic Defense Initiative laser facility in Southern California early this month, delaying a key test in one of its most promising anti-missile programs, Pentagon officials have confirmed.

The accident at a TRW Inc. proving ground near San Juan Capistrano came during a series of top-secret tests — the first of which was touted as a success — aimed at producing an energy beam with the 2 million-watt Alpha anti-missile laser.

The Reagan administration has said it hopes to see the Alpha launched as part of an early-1990s

experiment in space code-named "Zenith Star." But the accident involving the already controversial laser program could stir up further resistance from those who question whether space testing would violate the 1972 anti-ballistic missile treaty.

No personnel were injured in the mishap, and the laser unit itself was unharmed, according to J. Richard Garcia, spokesman for the Air Force Weapons Laboratory, which is managing the Alpha project for the Pentagon's Strategic Defense Initiative Organization.

Valves, control cables and some of the miles of pipes connected to the laser were damaged in the fire that broke out at the facility on the evening of Jan. 7, Mr. Garcia said in a

prepared statement. More importantly, he said, a vacuum chamber designed to simulate the conditions of outer space in which the laser will operate was contaminated by smoke and debris.

Alpha, which uses the combustion of hydrogen and fluorine gas to fuel the production of a laser beam, is the "star wars" program's prime candidate for a space-based weapon that would shoot down enemy nuclear missiles in the early stages of their flight.

The Alpha tests, which began Dec. 23, were initially given a high media profile despite their classified nature. At that time, testing was slated to run until the early spring. Information about the subsequent accident was not made immediately public, however.

Mr. Garcia said a news release about the accident was prepared in anticipation of press contacts. But it was not released until the laboratory

ACCIDENT . . . Pg. 8

NEW YORK TIMES
28 JANUARY 1988
Pg. 4

PRESIDENT PRESSES CONTRA AID PLAN

But Decision Not to Consult Congress Hurts Chances

By JULIE JOHNSON
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Jan. 27 — President Reagan began an intensive Administration lobbying effort today to win more than \$36.25 million in aid for the Nicaraguan rebels. But he provoked some lawmakers by apparently rejecting suggestions that Congress play a role in deciding whether to release \$3.6 million in military aid that would be held in escrow.

The money for weapons would be released if the rebels, known as contras, and the Sandinista Government failed to negotiate a cease-fire by March 31.

Democratic leaders in the House of Representatives said today that a decision to give Congress no role in freeing the military aid could be the decisive blow to the package's prospects when it comes to a House vote on Feb. 3.

"I think that effectively tips the balance against his package," said Representative Thomas R. Carper, Democrat of Delaware, who was uncommitted before today.

AID . . . Pg. 4

WASHINGTON POST
28 JAN 1988 Pg. 17

Perle's Replacement? . . .

The matter of the Richard Perle succession nears its final chapter.

President Reagan yesterday announced he is nominating Geneva arms control negotiator Ronald F. Lehman to be assistant secretary of defense for international security policy.

Perle resigned last May, and then-Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger wanted Frank J. Gaffney Jr., a hard-liner on the INF Treaty, to succeed Perle, for six years the architect of administration strategic arms policies. But Weinberger resigned, and Defense Secretary Frank C. Carlucci asked Lehman on Nov. 20 to take the job. Gaffney quit when Carlucci told him of his decision.