

# Why our treaties with Russia are not what they seem

By J. Michael Waller

Sen. Majority Leader Bob Dole is preparing to hand the Clinton administration a second major foreign policy and defense victory this month. On the heels of his support for sending American troops to Bosnia, Mr. Dole is about to bring the seriously flawed second Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START II) to a vote, just as Congress is beginning to learn about secret deals between the administration and the Kremlin that would destroy prospects for U.S. defenses against the nuclear missiles both START agreements leave in place.

To make matters worse, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has failed to call a single witness to testify specifically about the fatal flaws in START, and address what former National Security Council Director for Arms Control Sven Kraemer describes as "fatal flaws."

*J. Michael Waller is vice president of the American Foreign Policy Council and author of "Secret Empire: The KGB in Russia Today" (Westview, 1994).*

START does not require Moscow to destroy any nuclear warheads and Moscow's interpretation of the treaties commits the United States not to build effective defenses against long-range ballistic missiles.

The Clinton administration has been pushing the Senate to ratify START II before the Russian people vote Dec. 17 for a new State Duma, the lower house of parliament that is virtually certain to be dominated by Communists and anti-Western ultranationalists. At the same time, the administration has been hiding crucial detailed information from Congress and the public on a range of arms control-related issues including:

■ **Russian strategic modernization.** Cash-strapped Moscow has been channeling its diminished resources into developing new generations of modern strategic weapons. Its new military "doctrine" unveiled in 1993 emphasizes reliance on nuclear weapons more heavily than ever. While the United States has decided not to modernize its strategic forces significantly, Russia is building a new-generation strategic bomber, the Sukhoi T-60s; is upgrading its Typhoon strategic ballistic

missile submarines and has laid the keels of a new-generation missile sub class, and three months ago test-launched a new mobile intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM), the TOPOL-M. Russia-watchers know about these developments because the Russian military



announced them all this year. But the Clinton administration has been silent. It has abandoned public reports on Moscow's strategic modernization, dismissing it as long as it remains within the limits allowed by START. Meanwhile, Russia's hard-line General Staff has praised START II as "almost like manna" because it allows the strategic modernization — including replacing old silo-based ICBMs with mobile

ICBMs — to take place. U.S. aid has literally facilitated this modernization process.

■ **Chemical weapons proliferation.** The administration has been lobbying the Senate to ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention, but did not notify lawmakers that Lt. Gen. Anatoly Kunitshevich, one of the most influential Russian negotiators, "may have conspired to negotiate significant loopholes in the agreement with the obvious intent of enabling him and others to engage in chemical weapons trafficking with impunity — and possibly to permit Russia to evade its obligations," as Mr. Helms wrote in an October letter to President Clinton.

Mr. Helms renewed interest was raised by a recent report that Gen. Kunitshevich had been under house arrest on suspicion of sending chemical weapons components to Syria. The report didn't come from the administration; it came from a Russian official a year and a half after the fact. In his letter to Mr. Clinton, the senator asked, "Were you aware of his activities, and his arrest, while you were urging the Congress to move forward on ratification of the CWC?" Nearly two

months have gone by and the White House has not responded.

■ **Strategic missile proliferation.** In a major twisting of START, the administration made a secret concession on Sept. 28 that would allow Moscow to move its mobile SS-ICBMs anywhere in the world — or sell them to countries like China, Cuba, Libya, North Korea and Syria as long as they were reclassified as "space launchers" and accompanied by Russian personnel. The Senate was alerted to the secret deal not by the Clinton administration but by The Washington Times' national security correspondent Bill Gertz.

■ **Anti-ballistic missile defense.** The administration has also been cutting secret deals with Moscow to cripple America's ability to protect its own territory from missiles of third countries and Russia's new high-tech missiles permitted under START — while prodding the Senate to ratify. These secret deals run directly counter to votes by both houses of Congress to deploy ballistic missile defenses within a decade. Again, the administration did not report these concessions to the Senate; Mr. Gertz got the story and made it public.

■ **Continued systematic arms control violations.** Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) reports describe several of Russia's "non-compliance" problems, but they obfuscate the degree of these problems, taking pains not to find Russia in "violation." Part of this is due to ACDA's bureaucratic mentality and part is due to the ideological worldview of the agency's leadership as caricatured by Director John Holm, a former top foreign policy adviser to Sen. George McGovern.

Until recently relenting, Mr. Helms was the only major obstacle to ratification of the treaties. An internal ACDA document urged President Clinton to persuade Mr. Dole to circumvent Mr. Helms and ratify the CWC quickly. ACDA is just as fervent in trying to get the majority leader to do its work for START II. Reuters reports that in public, ACDA officials blame "right-wing Republicans" in the Senate, even though internally they acknowledged that Moscow "is the major reason START II is in trouble."

With the McGovernites running American arms control policy, it is understandable why the administration is doing what it is doing. What boggles the mind is why most Senate Republicans are going along with it.