

A two-pronged attack on U.S. military strength

by Graham Lowry

While the “conventional warriors” of Robert McNamara’s and Cyrus Vance’s nuclear freeze movement press their campaign to dismantle U.S. strategic forces, self-professed British agent Henry A. Kissinger is directing a two-pronged attack against U.S. technological capabilities intended to permanently reduce the United States to a minor power.

On his most public track, Kissinger is demanding that the United States adopt a radical strategy of unilateral disarmament, keyed to knocking out existing advanced strategic weapons systems. At the same time, Kissinger is deploying his extensive networks both inside and outside the Reagan administration to “Watergate” key government and military figures committed to developing new generations of high-technology systems for the defense of the United States.

The special target of Kissinger’s rage is the prospect of U.S. development of space-based defensive beam weapons, which would not only give America the ability to destroy incoming ICBMs in a nuclear attack, but revolutionize U.S. technological capabilities for massive economic growth.

In an essay in the March 21 issue of *Time* magazine, Kissinger demands that the United States scrap its multiple warhead or MIRV missiles, even if the Soviets retain theirs, in order to eliminate the “complex technology” Kissinger pretends is the cause of strategic instability.

Stripped of its warhead equations and Kissingerian rhetoric, Kissinger’s proposed alternative of a limited number of single-warhead missiles is not an arms control strategy, but an attempt to ban any further advances in technology that could permit the United States to maintain a superpower role

in world affairs. And, like his counterparts in the nuclear freeze movement, Kissinger extols the joys of unrestrained conventional warfare—to be waged as depopulation wars against the nations of the developing sector.

The “strategic stability” that would result from his unilateral disarmament scheme, Kissinger writes, “would bring to the fore the pressing need to build up conventional forces to deter non-nuclear challenges.” The most critical of those “challenges,” as his top collaborator Secretary of State George Shultz has repeatedly told Congress in the last month, is the “excess population” of the developing sector.

Pressure is mounting on President Reagan to put forward a new disarmament proposal to the Soviet Union for an “interim agreement” on U.S.-Soviet nuclear weapons deployments in Europe. Toward the broader objective of forcing the United States into surrendering its military power, Kissinger is working in alliance with Vance and McNamara for an arms control agreement with Moscow. Vance is a leading member of the Palme Commission on disarmament, which published a series of policy recommendations last year stressing the need to end the “technological arms race.” The Palme Commission, which includes Soviet academician Georgii Arbatov, head of the U.S.A.-Canada Institute, is constituted as the “third channel” to hammer out a deal between the Soviets and the anglophiles typified by Averell Harriman in the West.

Attack on beam weapons

The Palme Commission’s disarmament package would ban all anti-ballistic missile systems, including space-based



Stuart Lewis/NSRFS

Arms-control pundit Henry Kissinger.

beam weapons, as “destabilizing.” Kissinger proudly recounts in his *Time* essay his success in the SALT I negotiations in securing provisions that “severely limited anti-ballistic missile defenses to discourage an aggressor from believing he could launch a surprise attack and then defend against a counterblow.”

In the face of the current efforts by Dr. Edward Teller and elements within the Reagan administration, and an intense campaign by Lyndon LaRouche’s National Democratic Policy Committee to secure development of space-based beam weapons, Kissinger and Harriman’s networks are on a Watergating rampage against supporters of further development in defense technology.

The latest such assault, launched March 16 on the front page of the Harrimanite *New York Times*, is aimed at a group of former Boeing executives currently overseeing much of the most advanced weapons systems at the Department of Defense, including Deputy Undersecretary T. K. Jones, an advocate of beam-weapons development. Jones, the deputy undersecretary for Strategic Theater Nuclear Forces, Herbert Reynolds, the deputy director of the Office of Intelligence and Space Policy, and Melvin Paisley, the assistant secretary of the Navy for research, systems, and engineering, allegedly received a total of more than \$400,000 in severance pay upon leaving Boeing in 1981, and omitted in several instances to report their complete income in financial disclosure statements.

Washington sources report that the attempt to Watergate these key Defense Department officials is part of the Kissin-

ger crowd’s drive to lock U.S. defense policy into a rejection of advanced weapons systems in favor of a stripped-down conventional capability designed for regional wars.

The attack on three of the Defense Department’s advanced-technology advocates follows a rapidly blown-up financial scandal in the pages of the *Washington Post* against former Air Force Secretary Thomas Reed, now a consultant at the National Security Council (NSC) and a member of the Scowcroft Commission, which is currently reviewing U.S. strategic forces. Reed announced that he would resign from the administration on April 1, the date his commission with the NSC was slated to end.

Since January, Reed, who served as the Secretary of the Air Force during the Gerald Ford administration, has been the vice-chairman of the National Commission on Strategic Forces, a body studying the outline of strategic force structure in the United States. Initially formed to take charge of the deadlocked planning efforts to determine a basing mode for the MX missile, the commission broadened its mandate to review the entire U.S. strategic military posture.

The commission is chaired by Brent Scowcroft, a Kissinger protégé who is now executive director of Kissinger Associates, Henry’s “consulting firm” featuring Britain’s Lord Carrington as one of its major partners. Scowcroft is known to favor small mobile missiles over advanced weapons like the MX, just as Kissinger proposes in his *Time* essay. Reed was considered one of the proponents of high technology weapons development, including space-based beam weapons technology on the Scowcroft commission.

The scandal around Reed’s finances aired by *Washington Post* reporter Patrick Tyler is far from news. The information that Reed had been investigated in 1981 by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) for stock trading violations had been first exposed in December 1982, by Common Cause, a liberal lobby organization, just before Reed was appointed to the NSC commission. Common Cause, which is headed by John Gardner, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, is closely linked to the Democratic Party circles that are orchestrating the ongoing efforts to vote up a nuclear freeze resolution in Congress.

The only new development in the Reed affair since December is the fact that over the week of March 14, information was leaked from the Justice Department that U.S. Attorney John Martin of the New York Southern District had convened a grand jury to investigate charges of “preferential treatment” by the SEC in the 1981 investigation of Reed’s financial affairs.

Highly reliable sources report that the Reed leak is only the first of a series of contrived scandals intended to embarrass the administration. These sources also report that these opposition forces are being aided by a section of the Justice Department who oppose the Reagan administration and who are reviewing the personal records of every Reagan appointee with a “fine-tooth comb,” for use in the future.

Sources close to the *Washington Post* recently added, “The White House thinks they are in the clear because Reed

resigned. They are mistaken. There is a lot to investigate further in this matter.”

World Federalist campaign

The overall thrust of the Kissinger-Vance-McNamara disarmament drive is to eliminate the technology needed for in-depth U.S. warfighting capabilities, *including* advanced conventional weapons. Disarming the United States is the long-cherished goal of the oligarchy's World Federalists, and is a common objective of Kissinger and the Vance-McNamara nuclear freeze movement, which has backed the World Federalist scheme for global dictatorship as part of the nuclear freeze resolution which is now in Congress (see *EIR*, March 22).

Toward eliminating the ability of the United States to defend its sovereignty, Vance and McNamara recently proposed a \$168 billion reduction in U.S. defense spending over five years targeting for elimination virtually all top-of-the-line, technologically-advanced equipment. The targets include the proposed new Nimitz-class nuclear-powered aircraft carriers, the B-1 bomber, and the F-18 fighter. Argued on grounds of budget-cutting necessity and “excessive technology” for simple little genocidal wars in the developing sector, such proposals constitute an overall “force restructuring” of the U.S. military to the level of a minor power.

To be enforced by continuing the deliberate collapse of the U.S. economy, the plans for dismantling of the U.S. military now include proposals to reduce even the size of its standing army. Senator John Warner (R-Va.) is leading a Senate inquiry into the feasibility of saving money by cutting back active military forces in favor of heavier reliance on National Guard and other reserve units for “emergencies.” The Pentagon is studying whether the current two-to-one ratio of active to reserve soldiers should be revised.

Solidly behind this “rationalizing” of the U.S. military is the leadership of the nuclear freeze movement. A top aide to leading freeze sponsor Rep. Jim Leach (R-Iowa), who recently joined Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) in a Capitol Hill press conference boosting the freeze resolution, told a reporter March 15 that “the leadership of the nuclear freeze movement is sympathetic to rationalizing U.S. force posture,” but doesn't make it a “grass-roots issue” because “the American people wouldn't understand its complexities.” But the freeze backers expect the whole process of taking apart the U.S. military to accelerate should their resolution pass the House the week of March 14.

“No one looks at the freeze resolution as the end. It's just the beginning,” the aide declared. “We don't like to put it too up front, but implicit in the resolution is a process leading to total disarmament.” Included as a preamble to the resolution, introduced by Leach in committee, is the 1961 McCloy-Zorin resolution, which would make the United Nations a global police force to ensure total disarmament of the sovereign nation-states of the world, including the abolition of their standing armies.

What U.S. x-ray laser declassification means

by Paul Gallagher

The Reagan White House and Department of Energy have begun a process of relaxation of national security secrecy on advanced nuclear and laser technologies, as an apparent eleventh-hour countermove against the Council on Foreign Relations' “nuclear freeze” campaign. This is not the sort of declassification likely to please sanctimonious “freedom of research” campus presidents. It concerns the most advanced research and development programs for beam-weapon anti-ballistic missile systems, and threatens to unleash a “nuclear technology breakout” of the most revolutionary and hitherto most secret technologies on the horizon for electrification, optics, diagnostics, and electronics.

The development had been forecast early in January by Dr. Edward Teller. It is a major victory for Teller's campaign for beam-weapon development for strategic defense against nuclear ICBMs, and for the campaign launched by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. last February for a public “beam-weapon technology race” between the United States and the Soviet Union.

In a speech to 125 professors and students at the University of Miami Feb. 23, Teller introduced to his audience “a concept I could not have mentioned to you two weeks ago,” the x-ray laser for long-range strategic defense against incoming ICBMs. X-ray laser systems, because they will generate powerful and coherent electromagnetic radiation at very high frequencies, above the visible-light spectrum of ordinary lasers, will “kill” ICBMs with a punch-like shock even at distances of thousands of kilometers.

They can also revolutionize optical diagnostics for chemistry, biology, energy processes, and microchip printing, as Fusion Energy Foundation analyst Charles Stevens has shown (see *EIR*, March 22). But until last month, those U.S. scientists who know the most about such advanced laser- and energy-beams, and about the power-pulse technologies crucial to generating powerful particle beams, were not allowed to mention them in public, nor to respond to questions about