

Bundy dictates bottom-line agenda for Mr. Reagan

by Vin Berg

McGeorge Bundy, "chairman" of the U.S. Eastern Establishment, announced this week the terms on which the Establishment might permit Ronald Reagan to remain in the Oval Office for a second term: Destroy Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger and the program for defensive beam-weapon development Weinberger champions in the Reagan administration. With this perspective, outlined in the March 10 *New York Times Book Review*, Bundy made public the policy-agenda behind Henry Kissinger's return to dominant influence in the U.S. government, and potentially, to the secretary of state's job.

Weinberger is the alternative candidate most discussed for the top foreign policy post, were Reagan to be elected to a second term. (Rumors are flying through U.S. policy-making circles that the present secretary of state, Kissinger crony George Shultz, will step aside, after the fiasco he has made of U.S. policy in Lebanon and the Middle East.) So it is hardly coincidental that Bundy's *Times* book review is filled with vituperative attacks on Weinberger, and favorable quotations from the lies of Yuri Andropov concerning President Reagan's March 23, 1983 beam-weapon speech ("a first strike weapon").

Bundy's book-review essay amounts to an Establishment policy-paper: Unless the program to develop anti-missile beam weapons is kept to long-term ineffectual "research only," an unbridled outburst of technological progress will occur as a by-product of the "interlocking competition that any deployment of defensive systems would inexorably entail." This would mean a restoration of American economic as well as military might—what Bundy's banking circles fear most. Therefore, Bundy's circle—and so Kissinger—will now mobilize in aid of Russian efforts to sabotage the U.S. program.

As part of this, Undersecretary of Defense for Research

and Engineering, Richard DeLauer, who had last week downplayed and distorted the nature of the beam-weapon program before the Senate Armed Services Committee, told a subcommittee March 12 that the U.S. government had reopened a "back-channel" negotiation on the subject with the Soviet Union. "Back-channel" is a term studiously avoided by the administration in the past because of its associations with Kissinger's preferred method in negotiating the terms of the SALT I and II treaties which seduced the United States into a regime of military-strategic inferiority.

DeLauer and Undersecretary of State for Policy Fred Iklé testified on March 8 that the U.S.S.R. was spending more on defensive weapons alone than the United States was on all strategic systems; yet they stressed the line pushed by Bundy & Co., that beam weapons are a "futuristic" system which can't be made operational until the 21st century. Testifying with Iklé and DeLauer, Robert Cooper, head of the Pentagon's Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) pooh-poohed the idea that beam weapons defense could protect U.S. population centers from a Soviet missile strike: "I see nothing in our current technology-basket to say that at some time-certain we could have a perfect system, with no leaks. I don't see the combination which could guarantee that."

With the Kissinger return to government capped by his appointment to the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board March 2, on cue, one "KGB Democrat" or Republican after another has arisen on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives during the past two weeks, to demand that President Reagan give up the beam-weapon program, as too costly, too fantastic, or too unnecessary—although the Russians are developing the technology at breakneck speed. The job of Henry Kissinger in control of U.S. foreign policy will be

to force Weinberger into the background or out of the administration altogether, and negotiate the beam program away in dealings with the Russians. He will be aided by a Congress demanding massive defense spending cuts.

How much in control Kissinger will be was speculated on by London's *Daily Telegraph* newspaper, on the day of Bundy's *New York Times* essay: "Kissinger is positioning himself for a possible comeback as Secretary of State after the retirement of George Shultz."

It was left to Bundy to explain the policy-course Kissinger will pursue in his March 10 *Times* article.

Stopping a 'technology race'

Bundy, a descendant of the powerful Lowell family of usurers of New England, was national security adviser to the President from 1961 to 1966, thereafter heading the Ford Foundation. He first brought Kissinger into government in 1961 as a national security council analyst. President Kennedy later reportedly fired Kissinger over Bundy's objections, with the words, "Get that lunatic out of here."

It is noteworthy that the policy-package of arms control and enforced technological obsolescence later implemented by Kissinger during his term as Nixon's National Security adviser, secretary of state, and ultimately "Acting President," was designed by McGeorge Bundy, and introduced after the convenient (for Bundy and the Establishment) assassination of President John F. Kennedy. Perhaps Kissinger does not phone Bundy for daily marching orders; in every significant sense, however, McGeorge Bundy is Kissinger's boss.

In his March 10 *Times* essay, Bundy praises highly the *Nuclear Weapons Databook* produced by the Natural Resources Defense Council, which he contends proves that Weinberger is always lying when he talks about relative Russian strategic superiority. The NRDC is an institution that fanatically attacks all Western industrial technology—and is therefore funded by Bundy's Ford Foundation. Bundy also praises highly the Brookings Institution production, *Ballistic Missile Defense*, especially those points in which Brookings lies, first, that "invulnerability is not an available option," second, that no such systems will be deployed for at least 10 years, and third, that such systems violate Kissinger's 1972 ABM treaty. (On the contrary, systems "based on new physical principles" are not prohibited, of which first-generation systems within three years and a layered area- and point-defense network within five to eight years, assuring near-total protection, are the agreed estimates of scientists working in the field, if not working for Bundy.)

He comes to the real motive for destroying the program: It threatens to prompt an industrial resurgence of the U.S. economy by producing a "technological arms race"—with unmentioned but massive spill-over effects in terms of civilian technology. "The SALT I treaty has spared us an intense and interlocking competition that any deployment of defensive systems would inexorably force on both sides. There would be competition in defensive weapons, in new twists to

help the offensive weapons get through, in new killers of the defensive killers (or of their space-based eyes and ears) and counterkillers of those killers. Mr. Weinberger's report inadvertently demonstrates the strength of the forces that would operate in such a contest. Again and again, it insists we must that fear can find."

An anti-beam mobilization

Bundy has been wielding what is politely termed influence on the floor of the Congress. On March 7, one Congressman after another stood up to attack the administration's defense budget, never failing to vituperate against the President's defensive-systems program. George Brown of California (D) declared, "I am not against research—we have been conducting research on ballistic missile defense for over 20 years and should continue to do so. However, the accelerated research program the President is calling for is beyond what is needed to protect U.S. national security requirements. Furthermore, we will spend billions of dollars for the unique privilege of abrogating the best and only arms control treaty we have. I am referring to [Kissinger's] 1972 antiballistic missile treaty. . . ."

Brown announced that he and others would organize a special session of Congress later in March for attacks on the program.

Rep. John Seiberling (D-Ohio) attacked beam-weapons as a "tremendous threat to the stability of the nuclear balance. It also represents a technological arms race that is going to get rapidly out of hand. . . . When we get to the 'Star Wars' technology, I have seen scientists' estimates that the cost of that will range as high as \$2 trillion in 1984 dollars, and for a program that scientists tell us cannot possibly give us a fail-safe defense." Somehow, he came to the conclusion that protection against a nuclear-missile attack "will only accelerate our dangers and aggravate our condition."

Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wisc.) a day earlier had asked: "Why not build defensive nuclear strength?" and answered: "Because so will the Russians! 'The first victim of this policy is deterrence. . . . A successful antiballistic system would threaten, maybe destroy, the deterrent. . . . Whatever technological breakthroughs we might make will be followed by Soviet breakthroughs shortly afterwards. . . . They would not protect us against further technological advances. . . .'"

The Russians, of course, couldn't agree more with Proxmire, Kissinger, and Bundy. That is why the March 12 edition of *Izvestia* carried as its lead item on the international page a lengthy attack on Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche, whom the U.S.S.R. credits for the inspiration of the President's March 23, 1983 decision to proceed with beam weapons development, and on the administration, for listening to LaRouche. The candidate immediately charged *Izvestia* was delivering an ultimatum to Reagan: Cut all ties with LaRouche, continue to deny him Secret Service protection, scrap the beam weapons program and stick with Kissinger "or else."