

most recent set of budget revisions mandated by the Office of Management, carry out the same strategy the OMB tried to do on the whole budget of the United States, namely cut research and development. We see \$2 billion cut from Navy research and development, for example; \$2 billion out of \$9 billion is the suggested cut. That's where they see "slack," in research and development.

To the extent that the United States has a dying or dead nuclear industry, it is incapable of supporting the kind of progressive broad-based nuclear research that's required for military capacity. This is a fact of industrial life. The same thing is true of more advanced energy sources, like magnetohydrodynamics and the breeder reactor, two other advanced technologies which impinge directly on military capabilities. This is most devastating, though, in the nuclear-fusion program and in the space-research program, two areas where the present expenditures by the United States are significantly less than the Soviet Union, and the momentum is on their side in both of these areas. I think today if you took a snapshot, you'd have to say, well, roughly equal capabilities in space and advanced-plasma and nuclear technologies you need, for example, for beam weapons, which come out of the nuclear fusion program—we're roughly equal today. However, the momentum is unquestionably on their side.

I have seen no one dispute the Soviets' own schedule for the deployment of a permanently manned, orbiting space-station. The Soviets say that they will have by 1985 a permanently manned orbiting space-station with 12 cosmonauts on board—that's in three to four years.

The United States has no plans today for what NASA calls a space operations center. In spite of the Space Shuttle, and as brilliant a technological achievement as that is, it has nowhere to go.

The most recent budget projections put out by the Office of Management and the Budget show the United States cutting our space research project even further. The nuclear-fusion budget is under the same kind of attack. At this point, the Office of Management and Budget is suggesting a 12 to 13 percent cut, which would delay indefinitely the development of that technology, as well as the corollary technologies of electron beams, lasers, and the things whose scientific spinoffs are directed energy beam weapons.

The United States faces an adversary who has, at least in some approximation, adopted that military strategy that I described at the beginning—one committed to at least the possibility of total nuclear war and the necessity of marshalling one's whole economy toward a national effort of economic development. That has ceased to be the case for the United States; and once this *Global 2000* doctrine became the stated mission of the American military, there was a systematic disruption of American economic, manpower, and scientific capacities.



Criton Zoakos indicts American strategic policy

Below are excerpts from the luncheon address at the conference by EIR's Editor-in-Chief, Criton Zoakos.

... Why *are* we pained and why are we angry, either at the speaker [Asia Editor Daniel Sneider on Cambodia] or at the picture painted by the speaker? We are conducting something which is akin to judgment of our common life, of our national life, and when, after long stretches of time, nations find it necessary to pass judgment on themselves, on their lives, that is painful because we do not merely pass judgment on our nation, we pass judgment upon our individual lives as they have been lived within the national life. . . .

The moral flaw that we have found in ourselves is that we have accepted, unconsciously and unquestioningly, the Global 2000 doctrine. Global 2000 is the mistake. The story begins in 1964-65, when a few very smart little academics thought that the NASA program had gone a bit too far, so they sat down to scheme up the "post-industrial society." Zbigniew Brzezinski was one of them; he wrote *The Technetronic Era*, one of the founding documents of the post-industrial society. And they started chiseling away and sawing away against the scientific and technological and industrial traditions of this country.

The way to understand military doctrine is that you are dealing with three simultaneously connected concentric, nested situations, or manifolds. One is your actual shooting military capability at hand. Above it, that which determines it, is the technology, the technological might and the industrial might which produces this fighting edge, this combat edge, military capability. And military capability taken as a whole is logistics in depth—industrial, technological, scientific logistics in depth, with that shooting edge out front.

Now the post-industrial society has an effect to whack

our logistics in depth as an industrial nation. But the third most significant, most determining context within which the logistical capability and its military edge occur, are made possible, is the scientific outlook—that which produces new technologies, the scientific tradition and practice of a society. You cannot discuss competent military doctrine, competent strategy, unless you begin from the scientific outlook of the society. And our record has been pretty bad. We have allowed young people to get into the habit of believing that jazzed-up technology is science.

The Western allies

Policy-makers of key nations throughout the world are very well aware, and very painfully aware, of the fact that the United States is somehow captive, it is gripped by the Global 2000 policy. They knew America as something else, and all of a sudden they find this wretched, self-torturing thing going around inflicting pain and destruction, upon itself primarily, and all they have to do is look at the 20 percent interest rates imposed over this economy for the last two years, which have so far produced approximately 25 percent decline in industrial output between October 1979 and now. And then they also see us as attempting to inflict a similar post-industrial population-control pain upon the rest of the world. It does not take a genius to understand that this policy spells the decline of American power.

So what's happening in the Western European theater? Well, we have some friends there that we could have done without: the British.

Lord Carrington is preparing Western Europe—to the best of his ability as Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom and as Chairman of the EEC Council—he is preparing Europe for a very interesting reaction when the United States goes into its next phase of decline. He is preparing a Third Force kind of alignment of Western Europe to mediate between a United States, which is getting into further decline and further anger with the rest of the world for its own decline, and the Soviet Union, which is getting more aggressive. NATO may or may not survive December of 1983. The gameplan on the basis of which Carrington is working is: well, France has gotten into the Socialist International through Mitterrand—that's good for him; we want to have Bettino Craxi, the head of the Socialist Party of Italy, take over in Italy with the assistance of political forces clustered around Mitterrand; Greece, which just had elections on Oct. 18, is slated by the Foreign Office to go to the Socialist Party, to Papandreou's party, which is collaborating both with Lord Carrington and with the Social Democratic Party of Great Britain.

And then we squash Helmut Schmidt in Germany; we get rid of him. We put an alternate situation in there: either a raving Willy Brandt-controlled regime, or a

Franz-Josef Strauss-dominated Christian Democratic rendition. We put West Germany through a Thatcher program of economic self-destruction. . . .

Let me tell you what's happening with the AWACS. Lord Carrington has promised some Russians that the AWACS are not going to deploy in the Persian Gulf. Alexander Haig, and to a lesser extent Richard Allen, are doing their best to make sure that the AWACS vote goes against the President in the Senate, in cooperation with Menachem Begin. There was a meeting about one week before Begin came to Washington; there was a meeting with himself, Edgar Bronfman, and Israel Singer [both of the World Jewish Congress], in which Begin was coached how to handle himself vis-à-vis the President to make sure that the AWACS do not go to Saudi Arabia. In a confidential conversation, Edgar Bronfman stated that the reason that they undertook this mission with Begin, to coach him appropriately to have the desired effect, was because they are attempting to intervene in the internal succession fight, so-called, in the Soviet leadership; and they want to be in the good graces, they want to capture, they want to influence, a presumed faction in the Soviet leadership which is preparing to move in. . . .

The Soviet outlook

So Carrington is putting himself in the position to do favors for the Soviets. The whole thing is based on an erroneous assumption that the Soviet empire is in decline, a thesis which you've heard numerous times in numerous bureaucratic inter-office memos, editorials, op-eds, all over the place in the last eight months.

Russians, ordinary Soviet citizens, are stirred by issues of national significance. They are genuinely stirred; they don't fake it, they don't do it by pre-arranged mass rallies, they just simply get stirred. There is such a thing as Soviet nationalism. So that's a factor that is completely dismissed, completely misread, completely misunderstood. To the extent that the Soviet Union is a rival of ours, or a potential rival of ours, or a potential adversary, would only be to the extent that its national objectives might conflict with our national objectives. It is *not* because their ideology might conflict with ours; although that might be the case, that would not be the policy-determining factor.

I'll tell you the immediate, primary strategic objective of the U.S.S.R. as a national power: it is the achievement of commercially utilizable thermonuclear fusion energy by 1984 or 1985. They've bestowed military ranks upon their chief research directors, they've drafted the whole scientific capability of the U.S.S.R. Why? Why did they shift in December 1978? Well, you have to go back to April 1977, when Cyrus Vance went to Moscow and he proposed the underpinnings for SALT III. The Soviet reply was complete repudiation of all premises

for SALT III. Which was what? Which was the leading edge for getting the U.S.S.R. to accept the same overall policy as the United States had gotten themselves stuck with: Global 2000, decline of scientific development, and population control.

So SALT III was off. What did our wise guys think we could do to coerce the Soviets into coming back and negotiating this type of SALT III? Create an aggravated situation, they thought, by means of installing the so-called Euromissiles in continental Western Europe. What did the Soviets do in response? They smashed through Afghanistan. This was a move designed to be a strategic warning. The Soviets perceive that the Euromissiles, if deployed in Europe, will be principally targeting the civilian and military command of their nations, for the purpose of knocking them out in the first four minutes before any other aspect of military engagement takes place.

I have strong, convincing reasons to doubt that the Soviets are going to permit the deployment of those weapons there. Not because any Soviet told me, but because I have watched the reactions of responsible West European governments. The world is racing, there is a deadline for the deployment, the end of 1983 or sometime in 1984. All diplomacy in the Chancellor's and the executive offices throughout the significant countries of the world, is working from this timetable.

The alternatives

They know that between now and late 1983, either the United States will back down from the decision to deploy the Euromissiles, or the United States will not back down from the decision to deploy the Euromissiles. In the first case, the world is going to experience a massive collapse of American foreign influence, which is going to leave a tremendous vacuum in the world to be filled by whoever is capable of filling it; in the latter possibility, there shall be a general thermonuclear confrontation, with all of Western Europe playing the role that Cuba played in 1962.

Now, the British Foreign Office is coming in with a third alternative, which is, why don't we form ourselves as a third little mushy, mediating camp between the United States and the Soviet Union? This way, we are going to create the preconditions—diplomatic, economic, ideological, and so forth—for the disintegration of the Soviet empire in the next 20 to 30 years. . . .

Lord Carrington has no basis in fact for assuming that he is going to outfox the Soviet Union in the late 1980s, which is in a significantly improved position internationally than it was in 1933.

So, what is happening? We are marching obliviously into national destruction with our little Global 2000. We're not even aware of how much it is costing us. . . .

And the rest of the world is adapting and accom-

modating; we have an era of little tyrants, and a general political crisis throughout the world. Little tyrants: François Mitterrand in France is a little tyrant; Menachem Begin is acting like a little tyrant. We have little tyrants in various East bloc countries. There is a massive internal crisis in China.

The Chinese have one standard game: to ignite a nuclear exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union. The Chinese know that, the Soviets know that, but Haig doesn't know it. Haig sincerely believes that he's got the brains to outfox the Chinese leadership and use them as a pawn, as part of his anti-Soviet deployments. It's not going to work.

The guy is a pretty bad bet for the country. He is identical to Henry Kissinger in a psychological sense: Haig is a narcissist. Imagine Haig propositioning Kissinger: "With my looks and your brains. . . ."

So that's our situation: it's laughable, it's tragic.

Now, the Soviet Union knows what we're doing to ourselves. Their strategy is to let us do to ourselves that which we want to do to ourselves as much as possible. That is the gameplan of the Soviet Union.

What they care about is that while we're doing this thing to ourselves, they want to make sure that we don't go berserk and start bombing them; so they want to make sure that they're going to have overwhelming military advantages over us so that we're not tempted to do such a thing as we pursue the course of national self-destruction.

There are two alternatives: either all of these unpredictable non-linear situations are going to cause some gross strategic miscalculation, at which point the world is blown up in a general thermonuclear war between the two camps; or, if that does not occur, second alternative, the West goes into a pitiful decline; or, third, we shake our heads and we look around the world—because some people *do* shake their heads and look around the world—and realize what has to be done; and you're going to see a revival of classical nation-states attempting to solve world problems. . . .

The self-examination, passing judgment upon ourselves and upon our nation, is necessary for us to reach a conclusion as to what our purpose is. What shall our contribution be to the rest of the world which will be such that our having lived—as individuals, as a nation—shall have a permanent, indelible mark on the destiny of mankind? Unless we have such a positive conception as a nation, we cannot understand how to run ourselves; we cannot understand what the next frontiers of science and technology, exploration, and development shall be for us. Unless we conquer and define these concepts and these objectives, we shall be sitting down, fat and flatulent, satisfying ourselves with the fantasies of controlling world population growth, with the destructive fantasies of Global 2000.