

## Administration losing steam on strategic defense policy?

by Richard Cohen

Sources at the White House who most strongly promoted President Reagan's strategic policy announcement of March 23 have confided to me that, beyond blatant factional moves within the administration and on Capitol Hill, "there are many other conspiracies" aimed at cancelling the President's anti-ballistic missiles beam weapon defense program and, as a result, the possibility for a highly independent White House strategic agenda.

The sources were responding to reports about the mid-April Trilateral Commission meeting in Rome, where former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger publicly attacked the President's ABM policy, and a combination of Kissinger intimates, including the former head of the U.S. delegation to the SALT talks, Gerard C. Smith, clamorously appealed to the President to "reanalyze" his March 23 commitment and reject space-based defense systems. These Trilateral Commission recommendations were hailed in the newspaper of the Italian Communist Party, *L'Unità*, and by Radio Moscow. This Trilateral gathering was clustered about what was probably the most intensive series of Anglo-Soviet high level policy deliberations in recent memory (see International section).

### White House miscalculations

These forces are in the process of seizing upon serious vulnerabilities within the Reagan administration. Conditioned by existing legislative and electoral time tables, my White House source expressed astonishment at the current wave of Anglo-American attacks on the President's new stra-

tegic doctrine. "Why are they openly opposing it now? Why not wait until the implementation phase—when it goes up to Congress?"

Only two and a half weeks following the March 23 address, the White House had already demonstrated a blurry understanding of the short-term implications of its new doctrine. Seeking to buy time, they entered into a deal with close associates of Kissinger and long-time Soviet handler W. Averell Harriman, and endorsed the findings of the White House Commission on Strategic Forces (the "MX Commission"), headed by former Kissinger assistant Brent Scowcroft and former Carter Defense Secretary Harold Brown, who over the years had done his utmost to sabotage advanced ABM commitments.

While White House insiders suggested to me that the new MX arrangements were compelled by congressional rejection of the original MX missile proposals, the deal stipulates that the White House project strategic arms expenditures and strategic arms control agreements within a format that *excludes* the newly enunciated strategic defense doctrine. Then, on April 20, the White House stepped down from Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger's strategy of bypassing the congressional budget process, a strategy which would have avoided temporarily severe compromises.

White House sources report that neither they nor the President view these deals as "compromises in principle," but these concessions have decidedly slowed down White House momentum following March 23, sending signals domestically and internationally that the March announcement

of a quest for "Mutually Assured Survival" may not be cast in iron.

### **The defense budget**

While Paul Volcker has been busy denouncing Reagan's "excessive" defense spending and tax cut policies as disastrous for the U.S. economy at the Trilateral Commission meeting, Republican forces in the Senate on April 21, allied with the Fed chairman since December 1981—including Senate Budget Committee Chairman Pete Domenici (N.M.), Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker (Tenn.) and Senate Finance Committee Chairman Robert Dole (Kan.)—endorsed moves by Republican Budget Committee members Domenici, Kassebaum (Kan.), Andrews (N.D.), and Gorton (Wash.) to vote up a Democratic leadership sponsored budget resolution already passed by the Democratic controlled House.

The resolution would cut the proposed FY84 defense budget increase from the 10 percent proposed by Reagan to 5 percent, and increase taxes by \$30 billion in FY84. This move followed a flurry of attacks on Weinberger, inaugurated after March 23 by both Kissinger and Harriman agents on the Hill and in the media.

Weinberger, who along with National Security Adviser William Clark has been identified to me by sources close to the President as committed to "letting Reagan be Reagan," is more than the public point-man for the President's beam weapon policy. Weinberger had sought a "radical policy" of bypassing Domenici's Budget Committee, thereby taking the defense budget to the better-disposed Appropriations Committee and then directly to the Senate floor.

On April 20 the House Democrats, operating under the guidance of House Speaker Tip O'Neill, Democratic national chairman Charles Manatt, and Harriman, openly assailed Weinberger. "We urge the President to reject his advice. Failure to approve a budget resolution would send budget deficits and interest through the ceiling." They then accused Weinberger of "trying to scuttle the budget process altogether."

Weinberger's visible willingness to challenge the long-operative Trilateral budget blackmail game and rank national security as a higher priority than closing the budget deficits provoked Trilateral Commission Executive Board member Joseph Kraft to relay the order through his syndicated column that Weinberger keep quiet or risk total congressional alienation. On April 28, Kraft went further, demanding that Volcker, the mastermind of the budget blackmail game, be reappointed by Reagan in August when the Fed chairman's term expires.

On April 20, this mounting pressure had succeeded in securing an important presidential concession. In a foolish attempt to buy time, Reagan allowed White House Chief of Staff James Baker and the latter's ally, OMB Director Stockman, to come to a meeting on Capitol Hill with Budget

Committee Republicans chaperoned by Clark-Weinberger ally, White House Counselor Edwin Meese.

Astonishingly, Stockman was said to have proposed at the meeting that the White House would accept a Senate budget compromise of a mere 7.5 percent defense budget increase, and would agree to a three-year \$150 billion tax increase starting in 1986. Then the Domenici-Baker-Dole cabal immediately rejected the compromise offer on April 21.

### **'No new technologies'**

On April 25, leading spokesmen from the Kissinger wing of the Republican Party and the Harriman wing of the Democratic Party initiated an open challenge to the President's March 23 doctrine in two major reports. One was issued from the Center for Strategic and International Studies at Jesuit-run Georgetown University; among its prominent authors are former Carter National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski and former Carter Energy Secretary James Schlesinger. The other is a similar report from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, co-authored by MX commission director Scowcroft and former Kissinger Soviet expert, William Hyland.

In their long-term strategic estimates, both reports attack the implications of Reagan's March 23 beam weapons development announcement. Indeed, the CSIS report endorses a long term U.S. military strategy based on direct action and logistical support for low-intensity wars over natural resources in the Third World as the primary strategic concern. The authors explicitly claim that nuclear war and world financial collapse are impossible—the which the Harriman-Kissinger faction knows to be on the agenda for 1983.

In addition, the Georgetown report states that no new technologies can possibly be developed over the next 20 years which could give either side strategic superiority, the very line that Yuri Andropov and his associates have been trumpeting throughout Europe and through the press over the past week. Is it any wonder that Brzezinski, who also attacked the President at the Trilateral Commission meeting, will be meeting between April 22 and May 2 with arch-Andropov lieutenant Georgi Arbatov, as will Kissinger intimate and State Department adviser Helmut Sonnenfeldt? Andropov mouthpiece Arbatov will also meet with none other than Bent Scowcroft and William Hyland during this very same period.

Such unashamed collaboration between Kissinger-Harriman agents and Andropov's "best and brightest" to formulate assaults on presidential policies reached a high point on April 26, when leading Democratic presidential candidate Walter Mondale, appearing before the American Newspaper Publishers Association meeting in New York, championed a "mutual verifiable nuclear freeze," attacked President Reagan's defense spending program, and urged a regular U.S.-

Soviet summit meeting while stating that the MX missile is not needed. The former Vice-President is closely associated with the Minnesota firm, Control Data, where Arbatov spent the day on April 22.

Finally, on April 28, the chief public defenders of Harriman and Kissinger, the *New York Times*, wrote a slanderous frontpage story attacking longtime Reagan friend and collaborator Dr. Edward Teller on bogus conflict-of-interest charges, which the *Times* had probably spent the period since March 23 concocting. Teller is, of course, understood to have been a major influence on the President's new Mutually Assured Survival defense doctrine.

### Manipulated by the 'recovery'

The basic reason for the administration's disorientation in the face of all this is that the President has for the present been wishfully taken in by the short-term economic forecast of the Treasury Department, the Office of Management and Budget, and the State Department.

White House economic sources say this new consensus within the administration is based on the argument that the "recovery," which several months ago was acknowledged to be "weak," has recently bloomed and will be able to absorb any mid-year financial shock from the imminent global debt crisis.

In fact, under the influence of Secretary of State Shultz's mentor, Undersecretary of State for Economic Affairs W. Allen Wallis, who is operating with the support of Treasury, OMB, and the Fed, the administration has beaten back alarmed warnings issuing from the National Security Council and Central Intelligence Agency on the debt crisis. The phony "recovery" line will thus dominate the upcoming Williamsburg summit of Western leaders in late May.

As *EIR* founder Lyndon H. LaRouche emphasized repeatedly both publicly and privately during a recent stay in Washington, reversal of the March 23 Reagan doctrine is deemed essential by the British, the Trilateral group, and their Kissinger and Harriman controlled domestic political operatives.

As noted above, the Harriman-Kissinger group privately acknowledges that two unprecedented crises are on the verge of breaking in the United States and thus globally in 1983—a ferocious economic crisis and a Euromissile crisis that could erupt in the form of a Cuban missile-style confrontation by late summer, precipitated by Soviet preemptive moves against the Preshing II installation in Western Europe. LaRouche pointed out in Washington that Reagan's March 23 pronouncement provided for administration access to independent and effective solutions to both crises (see *EIR*, April 26), through a World War II-style mobilization of industrial and scientific resources.

The mission of Kissinger and Harriman forces operating under the broader strategic control of the British and the Soviets is now to forbid this access to the administration at all costs.

## States endorse the beam weapons policy

by Anita Gallagher

The overwhelming passage of a state assembly resolution urging Congress to support President Reagan's defensive beam weapon program in New Jersey—a state which voted up a nuclear freeze referendum lemming-style in November—illustrates that support for the nuclear freeze espoused by the Harriman wing of the Democratic Party is evaporating. Similar memorials, with bipartisan support in most cases, have been introduced in California, Minnesota, Tennessee, Colorado, Illinois, Nebraska, New Hampshire, and Washington State.

The ready support from both sides of the aisle for these resolutions has underscored how out of step the current Congress's reported support for the freeze is with the mood in its districts. Though House Speaker Tip O'Neill (D-Mass.) predicted that the freeze would pass by 100 votes on April 28, the House on that day voted once again to postpone the freeze vote—to the week of May 2, "if ever." The freeze is now more vulnerable to the defensive beam political weapon, and leaders of *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche's National Democratic Policy Committee, are requesting the introduction of beam resolutions in legislatures and city councils.

The record of the freeze during the past year has not lived up to its marketing. Democratic Party chairman Charles Manatt was among the first to tail the freeze when it was launched in April 1982, and declared that it would be a major issue that Democrats would ride to victory in the November 1982 elections. Though the freeze won narrowly in California and seven other states where it was put on the ballot as a referendum, even in California, the freeze's flagship state, anti-technology kook Jerry Brown was solidly defeated. Now the freeze itself is following in Brown's footsteps.

On April 11, the New Jersey Assembly overwhelmingly passed a resolution in support of the President's new strategic policy of defensive beam weapons development. The resolution enjoyed bipartisan support and direct support from labor. Its Assembly sponsors included Chris Jackman (D-Hudson), the former Speaker of the New Jersey Assembly and a vice-president of the state AFL-CIO, and Thomas Cowan (D-Jersey City), the legislative director of Operating Engineers.

Other Democratic sponsors were Eugene Thompson (D-Newark), Richard Visotcki (D-Bergen Co.), Thomas Pankov (D-Salem Co.), and Garebed Haytian (R-Sussex). A companion Senate resolution, S.R.3003, is sponsored by three Republicans and one Democrat.