

# Behind Conflicting Strategic Assessments: War Buildup and Intelligence Reorganization

The current avalanche of conflicting leaks, news, and editorial opinion respecting the annual U.S. National Intelligence Estimate of the USSR's warfighting capability and intentions — the so-called Team A-Team B flap — is itself an attempt to mobilize the United States behind a commitment to a thermonuclear "show of force" against the Soviet Union. Although this past week has seen public opposition to the Rockefeller-Trilateral "show of force" policy within traditionalist layers in the CIA, and even within the utopian monetarist circles which dominate the Carter Administration, if the "debate" over U.S. military strategic policy is allowed to continue on its present terms the United States will remain on course toward national suicide in a thermonuclear holocaust sometime in the first six to nine months of the Carter Administration.

The "facts" of the matter ostensibly in dispute — whether the USSR has achieved a decisive military-strategic superiority over the USA and is prepared to use it — have been known in informed U.S. military, intelligence, and policy-making circles for months, perhaps even years. As this news service and its affiliates have repeatedly pointed out since the MC 14-4 controversy in the spring of 1975, the Soviet Union would respond to any U.S.-provoked conflict premised (from the U.S. side) on the Schlesinger "calculated bluffing" strategy of step-by-step escalation to "limited nuclear war" by launching a full-scale thermonuclear attack on the United States at the first point its strategic interest was directly threatened. Since at least the summer of 1976 (Cf., Lyndon LaRouche, *The Danger of General War*), it has been clear that the USSR would probably win a thermonuclear war, obliterating 160 million U.S. citizens within hours and leaving the Warsaw Pact nations damaged, but with 80 per cent of the USSR's population alive and its economic and political institutions substantially intact.

The decision to make such information on the Soviet warfighting capability public — by the very circles associated with Schlesinger and his co-thinkers on the Committee on the Present Danger and Team B — has two interrelated purposes: First, to create a war psychosis in the U.S. population by replaying the "missile gap" scenario of the Kennedy years to justify a U.S. war buildup; second, to facilitate the "reorganization" of the CIA, the U.S. intelligence community, and more broadly, the federal bureaucracy and U.S. institutions generally, to put those forces committed to a showdown with the USSR in total control.

Their factional opponents on this issue within the monetarist camp, represented by intelligence community insiders like Victor Zorza, and by the Wall Street firm Lazard Frères and their spokesmen at the Washington Post, argue correctly that the USSR will not be "bluffed out" if confronted with a U.S. war buildup. Moreover, they point out, the Committee on the Present Danger crowd is guilty of a galloping lunacy in misrepresenting Soviet military capability as *prima facie* evidence of "Soviet imperialist intentions." As the Post editorial below put it, "Menace is in the eye of the beholder."

Nevertheless the monetarist opposition to Rockefeller is foredoomed to defeat because of its continued commitment to the Carter program of global deindustrialization, debt collection, and "little wars" of destabilization to enforce continued looting of the developing sector nations. Without a new world monetary system based on dollar debt moratoria and treaty commitments to creating expanding production and trade, there is no path to "national security" for the United States, as the USSR will not permit the U.S. to gain a military strategic stranglehold by militarizing the Third World. A third, far less public factional grouping exists in U.S. ruling circles opposed to war and implicitly favorable to the necessary economic policy. It is not represented in the Carter Administration, which is actively trying to clear such people out of the federal government, and particularly the intelligence and defense establishments, through such devices as the Team B report.

The problem faced by those who seek to avert war, but remain committed to the Carter economic program or parallel versions of global Schachtian austerity, is that such policies must now rapidly lead to war. The Hitler-Schacht debate of 1936-38 over whether Nazi Germany should go to war is being replicated in the present situation. Hitler's Finance Minister Schacht perceived, just as opponents of a U.S. bluff and "blitzkrieg" buildup today, that his country did not have military-economic capacity to wage an offensive war. Hitler — or more accurately, the Krupps, I.G. Farben, and German industrialists for whom Hitler and Goering were the factional spokesmen on this issue — realize that Schacht's "successful" looting policies against the German population were reaching a point of no return, and that only a policy of military conquest could avert a German economic collapse. Hitler launched his massive military buildup in preparation for war, remilitarized the Rhineland, seized

Austria, and invaded Czechoslovakia, seeking new areas for looting and slave labor. Once those looting policies became insufficient, Hitler moved further east against the Soviet Union. Without the war policy, Schacht's policies would have lawfully failed.

Like Carter's team, Hitler, in order to prepare the way for his war effort, had to remove any vestige of opposition within the German General Staff. The generals opposing Hitler were treated to a series of "watergating" operations involving scandals remarkably similar to the Wayne Hays affair. Even Schacht fell out of favor with Hitler and was relegated to the background, his reputation as an "economic genius" saved by his Anglo-American masters. It is the same monetarist financial and intelligence networks who brought Hitler to power who have made Jimmy Carter President-elect.

There are essentially two levels to the attempts at military and intelligence reorganization now going on in the U.S. On the first level is the entire intelligence evaluation system of the CIA and the Pentagon. Presently, a majority of the individuals located within these specific operations are basically opposed to any reorganization scheme which leads to the war buildup. Thus the Washington Post has attacked any scheme which leads to this end. In the Defense Department, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, who reflects traditionalist layers, has created a somewhat independent military intelligence apparatus which is a bastion of anti-Rockefeller sentiment. The Defense Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency, along with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. George Brown, has resisted efforts to replace key people and has kept intact the traditional strategic evaluation system.

In terms of the CIA, the recent battleground between Teams A and B, Rockefeller has openly moved to take over. To directly oversee the surgical removal of the opposition forces, Carter has appointed Ted Sorensen as the next director of the CIA. The Sorensen appointment was engineered by the architects of the Bay of Pigs, the Cuban Missile Crisis, and Vietnam — William and McGeorge Bundy. William, a former deputy director of the CIA, has been operating behind the scenes handpicking a whole new round of intelligence operatives. McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation and the key policymaker behind the Operation Phoenix program in Vietnam, has also been instrumental in preparing various of Rockefeller's private networks to be reintegrated into the various government and intelligence sections. Sorensen himself was Kennedy's chief confidant and speechwriter, who participated in the Bay of Pigs operations. Both the Post and traditional intelligence layers have attacked the Sorensen appointment!

As for covert and clandestine operations, the Carter Administration and its press organs have consistently watergated such CIA personnel, and are now trying to

buy them out off by calling for maintenance of covert operations under a whole series of new covers. (See National Report.) This operation is strategically important from the Rockefellers' standpoint because it will maintain their control over terrorism and sabotage against all opposition.

The reorganization of the intelligence community is already underway. However, the six-month plan proposed by Ray Cline, former CIA deputy director of intelligence and director of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, is currently awaiting implementation. Cline's plan calls for the elimination of the CIA as it is presently constituted. In its place, a Central Institute for Foreign Affairs Research would subsume the entire function of the CIA and undertake the creation of new functions within the various spheres of intelligence analysis. The purpose of the reorganization is to eliminate any entrenched opposition to this new super-agency, and to give the appearance of "objective analysis" for running Rockefeller policy. Cline, a member of the Committee on the Present Danger, has been organizing the various factions into accepting this reorganization. To facilitate his role in this factional warfare, Cline has come out against the Team B report, stating that "it would ruin the integrity of the intelligence analysis system."

Nonetheless, his actual role is to try to create a consensus of opinion for restructuring the agency. Within that process Cline also proposes the incorporation of the academic community into the process of intelligence analysis on an open and expanded scale.

While proposing no changes in the role of intelligence analysis and recruiting operations, Cline stresses the need to place clandestine and covert operations outside the analytical section. The *raison d'être*, according to Cline, is to permit greater covert activity; covert actions will be less vulnerable to exposure if their cover is not tied to the central agency. In effect, Cline proposes the dispersion of covert operations throughout the entire government bureaucracy, a process that Rockefeller and the Trilateral Commission set into motion a few years ago under Schlesinger's tenure at the CIA. Under the reconsolidation, Rockefeller and his Trilateral Commission would be able to combine the resources and effectiveness of the private and official intelligence operations.

Domestically, this will mean the top-down control of each facet of intelligence gathering and enforcement, thereby creating a total Gestapo and criminal justice system. With the FBI thoroughly watergated into running its formerly semi-independent operations under the control of the Attorney General, and the rest of domestic enforcement — the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Drug Enforcement Administration, U.S. Attorneys, etc. — controlled through an expanded functioning of the Deputy Attorney General, Carter and the Trilateral cabinet will be able to destroy any political opposition.