

## Reagan administration stiffens its resolve

by Lonnie Wolfe

The Reagan White House is full of surprises. Just when the Eastern Establishment enemies of President Reagan thought they were gaining the upper hand, the White House has stiffened its backbone on some crucial policy questions. Our sources report that the President and his advisers have drawn up a list of three priority policies on which they are not willing to compromise:

- the ongoing strategic rearmament program;
- the development of a beam-weapon defense against nuclear missiles;
- the military defense of Europe with U.S. strategic forces against any Soviet threat.

The President affirmed these commitments in several recent public statements; particularly significant was the President's interview with the French *Le Figaro Magazine*, which was scarcely reported by the U.S. news media. In it he vowed that America unshakeable, and he reaffirmed the importance of his anti-ballistic-missile defense policy to maintain world peace.

At the same time, the White House appears to have forced a political consensus that will, for the time being, prevent any change in the deployment of U.S. forces in Lebanon and a collapse of policy there. Statements by Sens. John Tower (R-Tex.) and John Warner (R-Va.), terming a congressionally forced U.S. pullout from Lebanon a strategic disaster, buttressed this effort.

While the commitments in these areas are "non-negotiable," the White House appears ready to make pragmatic compromises with the crowd around Henry Kissinger on a number of other issues. Most importantly, the President grants

Kissinger and company maneuvering room for back-channel dealing with their Soviet counterparts. This threatens to undermine *all* Reagan policy initiatives.

### Strategic rearmament

Following meetings with his advisers, President Reagan has reaffirmed his total commitment to the strategic rearmament program proposed by Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger. A strong feature of that program is that the United States must be prepared to fight and win a nuclear war, as Weinberger has stated several times over the past three years—and for which he has been assaulted by the various media mouthpieces of the Eastern Establishment.

Weinberger's people know that the United States remains strategically vulnerable to superior Soviet forces, though they underestimate the immediacy of the Soviet threat. Sources close to the White House say that the President is therefore unwilling to make any significant compromises on the spending recommendations proposed by Weinberger, no matter how many times various bipartisan phony coalitions demand that the defense budget be slashed.

The White House has told anyone who will listen that it is not going to back down on the spending program, privately repeating that message to congressional allies. The President has thus rejected the advice of White House chief of Staff James Baker III, a Kissinger ally, that he "soften" his defense posture to avoid "unnecessary fights" with Congress during an election year. The fight is necessary, Reagan is reported to have told Baker.

According to leaks from the Defense Department, the



President Reagan has announced that the American military commitment to Europe and to strategic defense is unshakeable.

latest Strategic Guidance issued by Secretary Weinberger, and fully endorsed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President, makes it clear that the United States is preparing to develop extended in-depth war-fighting capabilities. The Jan. 11 *Philadelphia Inquirer* sarcastically referred to this as "planning for World War IV." But the message gets out for anyone who cares to notice it: this is a dramatic change in U.S. defense planning, which was previously characterized by Robert McNamara's senseless doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction—the refusal to think about strategic war fighting.

The Guidance calls for preparing and protecting reserves of nuclear weapons and delivery systems. Missile-launching submarines, bombers, and land-based missiles are to be held in secret reserve while communications are being hardened to enable them to survive nuclear strikes. Such measures are necessary steps to prevent the Soviets from moving toward a pre-emptive strike against the United States.

Weinberger, in tough statements to supposed factional allies at a National Conservative Foundation luncheon Jan. 11, argued that the United States must make itself ready to defend against a growing Soviet strategic threat. He pointed out that it was not only the self-described liberals who attack essential defense measures, but also the conservatives who contrive arguments in a vacuum and mobilize against needed programs. The administration doesn't need such "friends," Weinberger bluntly told his audience.

### Beam-weapon defense

The President remains totally committed to U.S. devel-

opment of beam-weapons defense systems against nuclear missile attack. This program, first discussed publicly by the White House in the President's dramatic March 23 address to the nation, is not viewed as a secondary feature of the nation's defense posture, but as a primary component to be developed as rapidly as possible.

Reagan's aides are prepared to spend \$30-\$50 billion on the initial stages of beam weapon development, though the totality of this commitment may not be publicly announced soon. Yet sources close to the White House report that a scientific task force has been put together within the White House Science Adviser's office to coordinate beam-weapon research programs that are already far advanced.

The President and his top aides have been quiet about the program for months, as if they thought that by doing so they might dampen potential opposition. But the opposition has scarcely died down—from the hysterical defenders of Mutually Assured Destruction around McGeorge Bundy and Robert McNamara or from their friends in the Soviet leadership.

Now, in the space of three weeks, President Reagan himself, Science Adviser George Keyworth and Defense Secretary Weinberger have prominently declared that the building of a defense against nuclear missiles is Reagan administration policy. The President, in his interview in *Le Figaro Magazine*, repeated his offer to the Soviets to accept this as fact and negotiate a new strategic doctrine not based on the nuclear balance of terror.

### The defense of Europe

The Soviets, their assets in Western Europe, and Henry Kissinger all argue that the United States will never risk the nuclear destruction of the U.S. mainland to defend Europe from attack. President Reagan sent Weinberger to Europe in December in part with orders to dispel that lie. Weinberger stated emphatically in an interview in the West German newspaper *Neue Osnabrücker Zeitung* at that time that the United States was unconditionally committed to the defense of Europe, by whatever means necessary.

Now President Reagan himself has spoken out in that same interview with *Le Figaro Magazine*. The United States will treat any attack on its European allies as an attack on itself, the President stated. This is the "cornerstone" of U.S. foreign policy and must not be misunderstood.

But Reagan and his advisers have left the barnyard wide open, and that old fox of foreign policy Henry Kissinger is prepared to move back inside.

The problem is pragmatism. Having defined the above three points as clear objectives, the Reagan people feel that they can make deals on other "less essential" areas of foreign policy with their worst enemies, the Kissinger crowd of the Eastern Establishment. In that way, the Reagan team thinks that it can keep them quiet during the election campaign or—in a wilder fantasy—turn Kissinger into an asset.

## LaRouche declares a national emergency

*EIR founder Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. has announced that his campaign organization for the Democratic presidential nomination will purchase a half-hour of prime national network television time on Jan. 21, which the candidate will use to inform the American population of the growing danger of a pre-emptive nuclear strike from the Soviet Union. LaRouche's announcement of the Jan. 21 television address is being mass-distributed in all 50 states. It reads as follows:*

Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. will use a half hour of nationwide television time to inform you of what any President of the United States should be telling you right now.

Since Soviet President Yuri Andropov dropped from sight, nearly five months ago, a military junta has taken full charge in Moscow. They are using their growing military superiority over the United States to take control of large chunks of Western Europe and the Middle East. They are moving rapidly toward a nuclear showdown with President Reagan—bigger and far worse than 1962. Moscow is confident that President Reagan, under pressure from “Neville Chamberlains” like Averell Harriman, Walter Mondale, and the *New York Times*, will be forced to back down to Soviet demands.

You and your grandchildren do not necessarily have to be slaves of a Russian Empire. We can defend ourselves, prevent our allies from being gobbled up, and probably force Moscow to negotiate on the basis of President Reagan's March 1983 anti-missile defense doctrine, if Democrats would rise up now and shout loud and clear, “Democrats are patriots, too!”

If we mobilize our sick economy as President Roosevelt began to do in 1939, and unleash an “Apollo”-style buildup of weapons to destroy missiles fired against the United States, we have a very good chance of surviving. Hear Democratic statesman LaRouche. If you agree with what he says, then call the White House and your congressman and tell them so.

Kissinger's crowd has taken advantage of this stupidity to move to reestablish themselves at the center of “back channels” maneuvering with the East. The Kissinger networks arranged, through their private channels, the upcoming meeting between Secretary of State George Shultz and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko at the Stockholm conference on European security. The idea was sold to the White House as “good politics”—it would quell fears of a new cold war developing out of the cutoff of all arms control negotiations.

Similarly Shultz, Baker, and indirectly Kissinger have convinced Reagan to make a “conciliatory” speech on Soviet relations prior to the Jan. 18 Shultz-Gromyko meeting. Reagan is not expected to change any significant policy or make any Kissingerian offers—no matter what *The New York Times* says. He hasn't changed his views on the Soviet Union. Just say it a different way, say Shultz and Baker, drop the “evil empire” descriptions of the Soviets, treat them as “counterparts.”

To the extent that Reagan is convinced to do such things—even if the substance of his policy doesn't change—a signal will be sent to the Soviets that Kissinger has some clout within the administration, and his “back channel” to the White House will tend to become the preferred route of communication from Moscow. By Reagan giving a very little, Kissinger will get an awful lot.

But an even worse error is the ceding of political ground to Kissinger and the Pugwash arms control crowd in West Germany. The United States, recognizing the vulnerability of Germany to Soviet attack, earlier this year offered to place neutron weapons on German soil to reduce the chances of the Soviets overwhelming NATO's defenses. The Kohl government refused the offer.

Now the attitude in circles close to Weinberger is that the political situation in the Federal Republic is bordering on hopeless. Having no idea of what to do, they rely on Ambassador Arthur Burns, who, as we document elsewhere in this issue (see articles, page 4 and 31) is a key controller of the operation to decouple Europe from the United States.

Kissinger, Burns's good friend, delivered the keynote speech Jan. 13 at a meeting on “the future of NATO” held near the Brussels NATO headquarters under the auspices of Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies. Kissinger, who is using his Commission on Central America as the stepping stone toward gaining control over U.S. foreign policy, attempted to present himself in Brussels as a virtual spokesman for the Reagan administration. He recommended the formation of a high-level international arms control group, to be headed by his business partner, Britain's Peter Lord Carrington.

### **Moscow's ‘Kissinger card’**

If the Soviets are angered by Reagan's commitment to defend the United States and its allies, they are amused by

Kissinger's persistence as a "back channel." They will no doubt offer a few carrots here and there to strengthen Kissinger's hand. There is talk around Washington about a "warming trend" in U.S.-Soviet relations, based mostly on things of lesser diplomatic consequence—improvements of the "hot line," oil drilling rights in the Bering Sea. The Soviets will also restrain the Syrians in the Middle East, provided they are cut in on any settlement.

But these are atmospherics. The Soviets continue on their track towards a nuclear confrontation with the United States—a showdown that they feel confident that they can win, with the help of Kissinger. So far, the measures that President Reagan and his advisers have taken are inadequate to force the Soviets to back off and negotiate on matters of real substance, like the beam weapon offer.

If President Reagan is to win the fight for the survival of his administration and the nation, he will have to shut down the Kissinger-Pugwash operations. That would give real substance to his three non-negotiable policy imperatives because it would make the Soviets believe that he is serious about carrying them out.

## Reagan reaffirms ABM offer to the Soviet Union

*President Reagan's interview with Robert Lacontre of Le Figaro Magazine, excerpted here, was conducted on Dec. 22 and released by the White House on Jan. 7.*

**Q:** The Romans used to say: "If you want peace, prepare for war." How do you explain the fact that the U.S.S.R., a poor country, has such great military powers, whereas the wealthy United States remains so far back?

**President Reagan:** No one is more conscious than I that the Soviet Union devotes more than twice as much of its economic resources to the military as the U.S. does, and has been doing so over the past two decades, despite relative restraint on the part of the West. Other sectors of the Soviet economy, particularly those devoted to consumer production, suffer as a result. If the Soviet people had a voice in the matter, the Soviet defense budget would probably be a lot smaller. But the people have no voice in the allocation of national resources. We in the West face the more demanding task of maintaining adequate military strength with the consent of our free peoples.

I would add that, while the continuing Soviet military buildup is of course a concern and requires a substantial U.S. and Allied response, talk of the United States being "far back" suggests an alarming state of military weakness in the West that the facts do not warrant. While more still needs to

be done, we and our Allies have made important strides in the last few years toward restoring the military balance.

**Q:** For example, Gen. Rogers told me recently that NATO had acquired 400 of the latest tanks whereas the Russian Army had got 1,000 that very same year. Is the free world incapable of arming itself?

**President Reagan:** I am confident that the Atlantic Alliance has the resources necessary to maintain an effective deterrent if they wish. The Warsaw Pact's continuing buildup of both nuclear and conventional forces is of major concern to the Alliance. We are responding. The deployment of INF missiles is part of our coordinated response to that threat. The modernization of America's strategic deterrent is another element of our response.

The improvement of NATO's conventional forces is extremely important. In the face of the Soviet Union's relentless military buildup all of us must do more to strengthen our conventional forces. America's conventional force modernization program is in high gear, and involves equipment modernization and improvements in organization and training. America cannot do the job alone, and it is very important for each Alliance partner to make every effort to strengthen their own forces.

**Q:** You have begun construction of MX super powerful rockets but the Russians are also coming out with rockets as powerful. How are you planning to catch up with the USSR's military power or even talking of leaving them behind?

**President Reagan:** Our policy is to create a more stable international balance and, through negotiations with the Soviets, reduce the numbers of arms—especially nuclear weapons—on both sides. Now for many years, throughout the 1970s, the Soviets pursued a massive arms buildup at a time when the United States was exercising restraint. It became clear that the only way to get the Soviets to exercise restraint was to demonstrate that we would restore the balance. The increases in military procurement which this Administration has undertaken are meant to restore and preserve an East-West arms balance as we pursue the other half of our policy—to seek deep reductions of arms on both sides through negotiations.

**Q:** Can you comment on the ultra-secret project known as High Frontier, that is, your preparation for a future space war?

**President Reagan:** Well, without restricting myself to that particular approach, I have asked for a complete study and for research into trying to develop a defense weapon against nuclear weapons. But again, I am proposing that in the interest of hopefully being able to eliminate those weapons. If we could succeed and bring about a realistic defensive weapon against them, then my next step would be to inform the Soviet Union that we have this, and now we were prepared to join them in eliminating all such weapons in the world.

**Q:** In February 1981, you declared to *Le Figaro Magazine* that the American people would consider any attack on Europe as an attack on the United States. But since [then] we have often heard from across the Atlantic statements that America would not risk in any way its survival in a war against Russia just to help European troublemakers. What is your opinion on this today?

**President Reagan:** My opinion remains completely unchanged. The United States would consider any attack on its NATO allies as an attack on itself. This is a commitment enshrined in the North Atlantic Treaty. It is a commitment which the United States has reiterated many times and enjoys broad support in the Congress and among the American people. We share common values, a common heritage, and parallel dreams. Europe's security is indivisible from our own. I can hardly think of another aspect of U.S. foreign policy on which there is broader consensus than our commitment to defend our NATO allies against attack.

**Q:** I will insist if I may that Europe is becoming more and more "pinkish," i.e., more and more socialist or more and more socialo-communist; don't you think that a new American President would be inclined to leave Europeans to themselves in order to look toward more promising areas such as Asia, Latin America, and let Russia paddle in Europe?

**President Reagan:** I can only speak for myself. But in my view, there is no possibility of America's reducing its ties to Western Europe or its commitment to its NATO allies, let alone abandoning its European friends. We know that our security and that of Europe are bound together. Our friendships and alliances in other parts of the world are also very important—to our European friends as well as to ourselves. These ties are not in any way incompatible with our relationship with Europe. . . .

**Q:** How are you going to deal with the Middle East question? Don't you consider it "immoral" to allow tiny Lebanon to be destroyed by foreign forces with impunity at the same time GIs and French paratroopers get killed, apparently for nothing?

**President Reagan:** The policy objectives of this administration have remained consistent. It is a policy we share with the Government of Lebanon. We seek the re-establishment of a stable, representative and fully sovereign Lebanese government, committed to national reconciliation, which can control all Lebanese territory. We also seek arrangements that will assure the security of Israel's northern border. If Lebanon is to have a chance, all external forces must leave.

The Multinational Force is in Lebanon because its presence has been requested by the Lebanese Government to support that government's efforts to consolidate that authority. The MNF helps provide the support and confidence the Government of Lebanon needs in moving forward to strengthen the fragile cease fire, to achieve political reconciliation, and to secure the withdrawal of foreign forces. . . .

## Weinberger calls beam defense a vital American goal

U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger stated in Washington, D.C. on Jan. 11 that a "working ability to defend against ballistic missiles" is one of the "most important" components of the United States defense program. Weinberger was addressing a meeting of the National Conservative Foundation. "Defense against ballistic missiles is a vital goal of the United States," Weinberger said. "The Soviets are working hard in this area and have for a long time. One can imagine the consequences if the Soviet Union developed this capability and other nations have not."

Weinberger added that he expected this to be a "long, expensive, and difficult task but we can do it with the resolve to spend the money and spend the time to accomplish it."

"It is not only the liberals who want to cut the defense budget," Weinberger said. "It is also conservatives who are unwilling to face the cost, who use one example of wasteful spending as an excuse to justify cutting the entire defense budget. . . . You will be tempted many times with arguments that you don't need to spend all this money on defense, that we're too technologically sophisticated, that we could use cheaper equipment . . . but these arguments are in a vacuum. They don't look at the Soviet threat. Soviet equipment is not unsophisticated. Soviet equipment is not inexpensive . . . there must be discussion of things gone wrong, and it will require enormous efforts on our part to correct them."

Weinberger said that these conservative critics have yet to "reconcile their belief in the need for [budget] cuts with the need for increased defense spending in the face of an extremely ominous Soviet military buildup and their clear willingness to use that force." The major problem facing the United States, he stated, is "the enormous growth of Soviet military power" since 1960, to which the United States failed to respond. "This gave the Soviets new opportunities for blackmail."

Weinberger singled out the 1970s, when "We cut our defense spending and hoped détente would cover the balance. . . . When this administration came in we had to double duty . . . with a major need for strategic modernization . . . and conventionally where we had planes that couldn't fly, lack of spare parts, fuel, not enough money for adequate training, and many talking about the need for the draft again because of manpower problems. . . . We had to replace equipment that was built in the 1960s. . . . For example,

we've brought in the M-1 tank. I just think what it would be like sending men into combat with equipment that we know will be inferior to what the other side has. . . .

"Some suggest that there is a discrepancy between our strategy and the resources that we have to carry it out," Weinberger said. "But I ask them, what do you want us to give up? NATO? Japan and Korea? The Caribbean? Continental defense of the United States? Yet some keep looking at the cost rather than the threat."

## Keyworth upholds policy against press distortions

*Dr. George Keyworth II, President Reagan's science adviser, attacked the media and the arms-control apparatus in the United States on Jan. 10 for their attempt to sabotage the President's March 23 strategic defense initiative. Keyworth was speaking to the Hoover Institute Board of Overseers.*

The 1970s were years in which we downplayed the importance of national defense. . . . When President Reagan took office he found a situation in which the Soviet Union had made startling progress—let me repeat, *startling* progress—through the 1980s, while we had very much sat on our hands. I think it's true that we did enter the 1970s far in front militarily because of our superior technology. But we emerged from the 1970s with the military technologies of the two countries much closer to even—and we were generally far outnumbered to boot. . . . You don't have to be an expert in defense issues to sense the bleak future of relying indefinitely on a doctrine of massive retaliation to deter your enemy from attacking you with nuclear weapons. I believe the millions of Americans who are attracted to the nuclear freeze movement are responding in large part to that perception. . . .

As you remember, [President Reagan's March 23 speech] caused an almost-apoplectic reaction in some quarters. The unfortunate result was that what was an extremely clear and logical message was obscured in the noise that followed. . . . When the President's announcement was first made, we heard vehement reactions from some of the traditional arms-control activists. I watched with some amazement while a few dozen of them marshalled largely irrelevant technical arguments against the President's proposal for strategic defense. At the same time, they embraced as the preferred alternative the strategy of deterrence through massive retaliation—the nuclear balance of terror that I thought they had abhorred up until March 23. . . .

[Among the broader scientific community the attitude initially was skeptical.] Now, 10 months later, their attitudes have changed. In a totally different technology, we've also seen *very* recent advances that permit us to compensate for atmospheric break-up of laser beams; that's been a major obstacle to the possible use of long-range laser weapons. . . .

The Fletcher panel concluded that we can now project the technology—even though it hasn't been demonstrated yet—to develop a defense system that could drastically reduce the threat of attack by ballistic missiles. . . .

My feeling is that it's likely to take five or six years of research and development to bring us to the point where we can *make* the critical decisions about developing and deploying actual systems. . . . My own preference is to plan for a number of demonstrations of the evolving technology—some periodic visible proof of progress. . . . Such a demonstration would pressure the Soviets to take our arms reduction proposals much more seriously than they do now. . . .

## Warner, Tower warn against a U.S. pullout from Lebanon

*Following a seven-day tour of Lebanon, Israel, Syria, Jordan, and Egypt, Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman John Tower and Sen. John Warner issued a statement Jan. 11, warning of the "disastrous" consequences of a U.S. troop pullout from Lebanon.*

Based on our meetings with officials in the region, it is absolutely clear that a withdrawal of the U.S. forces from Lebanon, particularly a Congressionally mandated withdrawal, without substantial evidence of diplomatic success, would have a disastrous effect upon continued U.S. influence throughout the vitally important Middle East and perhaps elsewhere. This judgment was stressed by every official with whom we met, with the exception of officials of the Syrian government. One senior official with whom we visited put it this way, "The U.S. would be seen as a 'paper tiger' were it to withdraw in the face of domestic political pressure resulting from sporadic terrorist activity." In addition, Middle East leaders believe that Syria's position of influence in the region will be greatly enhanced by a precipitous withdrawal of U.S. Marines, as she will be perceived to have successfully resisted the United States, while moderate Arab states friendly to the United States will be weakened.

In our view, a U.S. withdrawal would almost certainly lead to the withdrawal of the other MNF [multi-national force] contingents. Regardless, there is no substitute for the presence of the U.S. force in Lebanon. Most officials warned that the withdrawal of the MNF could undermine the Gemayel government and any prospects for achieving what all parties hope to achieve—namely, political reconciliation in Lebanon. . . . Moreover, officials in the region believe that there is no real difference between setting a time limit of six months on the U.S. military presence in Lebanon, and an immediate withdrawal; in their view, the effects will be the same, in that Syria and other opposing forces will patiently await their departure and refuse to negotiate seriously on political and security issues.