

# A 'new idea' for military reform: taking America back to the crossbow

by Susan Kokinda and Kathleen Klenetsky

Gary Hart has based his campaign on the contention that he is the candidate of "the future," the man armed with "new ideas." But one of Hart's most widely touted "new ideas"—his proposals for military reform—would actually turn the clock back on efforts to improve U.S. military capabilities. For all intents and purposes, Hart is proposing that the United States rely on the equivalent of semiconductor-driven crossbows—in the face of a massive Soviet military buildup.

An active member of the Armed Services Committee, Hart has emphasized defense matters since entering the Senate in 1974. But his main work in this area has been done through a little-known group called the Military Reform Caucus, which he co-founded with Sen. Sam Nunn (D.-Ga.)

Established in 1981 as a joint project of the Jesuit-run Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS)—Henry Kissinger's base of operations—and the KGB-tainted "conservative" Heritage Foundation, the Military Reform Caucus has consistently advocated measures which, while clothed in pro-defense garb, would sabotage U.S. military capabilities. Hart has emerged as a key spokesman for the caucus, and many of its recommendations and proposals have found their way into his presidential platform.

## Simple is beautiful

The Military Reform Caucus's basic premise is straightforward: Since the United States has no hope of contesting Soviet superiority in manpower and materiel, caucus members maintain, it should abandon any further attempts to develop sophisticated technology and instead opt for greater quantities of less complex weapons systems. Hart himself has written that "only simple weapons" are likely to work in combat situations, and therefore the United States should "buy simpler, more effective weapons in larger quantities."

Based on this absurd argument, the caucus has spun out a series of recommendations which include:

- Stressing U.S. and NATO reliance on conventional weaponry at the expense of strategic modernization—an approach favored by Henry Kissinger and incoming NATO Secretary-General Lord Peter Carrington as part of their broader "New Yalta" deal with the Soviet Union.

- Reforming the military procurement process through open competitive bidding and other means. This "anti-cor-

ruption" issue, which all the establishment-approved Democratic presidential candidates have avidly seized upon, is being used to watergate both the Pentagon and military contractors and bankrupt defense contractors essential to U.S. national security.

- "Downsizing" U.S. strategic deployments to "fit" dwindling U.S. resources.

- Substituting small, simple ships for the U.S. large-carrier-based naval fleet, on the spurious grounds that a larger fleet of smaller and less technologically advanced ships would give the United States "naval superiority."

- Eliminating a variety of weapons systems ranging from the B-1 bomber to the MX missile. Hart, in fact, appeared at a press conference last May with former CIA directors William Colby and Stansfield Turner—to announce a "national mobilization" to stop the MX missile.

Together with his colleagues, Hart has lined up against U.S. efforts to develop a beam-weapon defense system, in spite of massive evidence that the Soviets are on their way to deploying one. In the February 1984 issue of *Arms Control Today*, Hart blasted the Reagan administration's anti-missile proposals as "Star Wars . . . technically unworkable . . . strategically unsound" and "a cruel hoax" and has hit on this issue consistently during his campaign.

## Reducing U.S. power

Hart's defense reforms are simply the military component of his overall foreign policy, one which proposes to slash the United States's global power and influence. Hart was the first senator to introduce a resolution calling for a U.S. troop withdrawal from Grenada when President Reagan sent in troops after a Soviet-backed coup; he rabidly opposed the U.S. troop presence in Lebanon—even though the U.S. withdrawal has increased the sway of Soviet surrogate Syria.

Hart has also called for the United States to remove its troops from Western Europe. In his 1983 tome, *A New Democracy: A Democratic Vision for the 1980s and Beyond*, the candidate argues that there should be a "division of labor within NATO" in which the United States would take over the defense of the "West's lifelines in the Atlantic and Pacific" while European NATO members "would have to assume

a proportionately greater share of the land defense of the Continent itself" since the United States would have to withdraw a significant number of its troops in Europe.

Hart's proposal markedly resembles Henry Kissinger's controversial March 5 *Time* magazine essay, in which he called for a "decoupling" of Europe from the United States under the guise of "reshaping" NATO. Kissinger's proposals are now being put into legislative form by Sen. Ted Stevens (R-Alaska), one of Hart's close colleagues on the Military Reform Caucus.

This is hardly the only area where Hart and Kissinger find themselves in close agreement. Hart is a big booster of the so-called "build-down" proposal (under which old missile systems would be replaced by smaller-scale, one-warhead missiles) which Henry Kissinger and his epigones on the Scowcroft Commission managed to foist on Reagan last fall.

That Hart and Kissinger share the same approach on crucial national security questions is understandable, given CSIS's role in setting up the Colorado Senator's military reform group. In 1981, CSIS formed a Congressional Outreach program which, under the leadership of Sam Nunn and Rep. Richard Cheney (R-Wyo.), and with the participation of Gary Hart, began a wide-ranging exploration of national defense and strategic matters. Henry Kissinger keynoted the group's first meeting, immediately after which Nunn, Hart, and Cheney set up the Military Reform Caucus. Other Reform Caucus members were involved in the CSIS program, including Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.), a top Harriman Democrat, nuclear-freeze supporter, member of the genocidal Club of Rome, and one of the last Americans to be granted an audience with Yuri Andropov.

Hart sits on CSIS's advisory board together with KGB asset Armand Hammer and William Rogers of Kissinger Associates.

CSIS spokesmen Dr. Michael Feeney reported that the Washington, D.C.-based think tank "has worked very closely with the reform caucus." In fact, Bill Lind, Hart's key military aide and a co-author with him of a Feb. 14, 1982 *New York Times Magazine* piece called "What's Wrong With The Military?" has, according to Feeney, "spent a lot of time over here." Feeney also disclosed that the caucus's key point man on the CSIS staff is Barry Blechman, who was most recently found strenuously advocating the proposal for a "nuclear-free zone" in Europe, shortly before it was revealed that the proposal was written by KGB super-spy Arne Treholt (see *EIR*, Feb. 14, 1984).

A shared determination to sabotage President Reagan's new strategic doctrine of March 23, 1983 has put Hart and the Military Reform Caucus in bed with the "ultraconservative" Heritage Foundation, backers of Gen. Daniel Graham's "High Frontier." In March 1983, Hart spoke to the Senate on the need for "A Military Reform Defense Budget for Fiscal Year 1984," and praised the Heritage Foundation's Agenda 1983, which complained about the Pentagon's "overemphasis on long-shot technology."

## Hart's economics: 'fascism with a human face'

by Graham Lowry

In the area of economic policy, Gary Hart's self-styled "new ideas for the 1980s" are Aquarian versions of Mussolini's program. The proposal Hart outlines in his *A New Democracy* first emerged in the mid-1970s under the label "fascism with a human face."

Hart writes of the need to reverse "porkbarrel" politics, to "weigh competing claims on the federal treasury . . . and to allocate scarce resources." Hart demands "worker retraining" for the post-industrial "Age of Information" and proposes the creation of "a small council capable of providing long-range vision into the industrial future." This is the language, and these are the plans, of the Harrimanites who propose to eliminate 2 billion people from the earth by the turn of the century.

In the fall of 1982, Hart cosponsored a bill that would remove all policy-initiating authority for "public improvements" from the hands of Congress and assign it to an independent commission to be chaired by a non-elected "budget expert" from the private sector. The bill, dubbed the Rebuilding of America Act, was filed by Sen. Daniel Moynihan (D-N.Y.), a pet of the Averell Harriman who was a public supporter of Hitler and Mussolini into the 1930s.

Hart hailed the bill as a testament that "we cannot continue the failed 'porkbarrel' politics of the past. Rather, we must spend our limited resources on those projects that will provide the greatest benefit to the public." As Hart's public support for the proposals of the Carter administration's *Global 2000 Report* confirms, this is a plan for enforced scarcity. Among the planners Hart pays tribute to in *A New Democracy* is Jay Forrester, co-author of the Club of Rome fraud *Limits to Growth*.

Dictated by the New York investment bankers and Federal Reserve Board officials who have worked for years to crush the U.S. economy, the solution proposed for America's rotting infrastructure amounts to a strategic bombing run on its remains. Funding for facilities to be "saved" would be placed under state or regional authorities similar to the financial dictatorship established over New York City by Lazard Frères banker Felix Rohatyn's "Big MAC" Municipal Assistance Corporation.