

British invade Washington again to torpedo the SDI

by Warren J. Hamerman

In the foreground of news attention on strategic defense questions from Washington since March 18 have been the victory of President Reagan in getting the funding of the 21 MX missiles passed through the Senate, the President's short trip to Canada affirming his commitment to extending the Strategic Defense Initiative into an alliance-wide program, and the preparations for Secretary of Defense Weinberger's current trip to Western Europe.

In the background of events, the British, complementing the open violent attacks on the SDI by Sir Geoffrey Howe, Edward Heath, and Denis Healey in England, deployed in Washington, D.C. their considerable capability in the foreign affairs establishment to unleash a full-scale assault on the SDI program. In addition to the out-front attacks, **Lord Carrington** maligned the SDI on March 18 before the London Foreign Press Association when he labeled the U.S. program "still only a theoretical system" and warned the U.S. not to suffer from a "lack of patience" at Geneva.

On Wednesday, March 13, **Lord Solly Zuckerman**, the former science adviser to Lord Mountbatten and the top science policy controller for the British Royal household, flew to Washington and had a secret confrontation ("a polemical exchange," according to one British source) with Secretary of Defense Weinberger, on the same day that Prime Minister Thatcher was having her celebrated tête à tête with Gorbachov in Moscow. The myth circulating among British strategic circles is that Zuckerman felt that Weinberger's position could be subtly "played" against the position of President Reagan's policy in the historic March 23, 1983 speech: "We detect an increasing trend toward stressing point defense by Weinberger, while there is absolutely none of this from the

White House, which continues to stress the defense of population centers."

While in Washington, Zuckerman had dinner with his longstanding contact **Spurgeon Keeney**, the head of the arms control crowd. In fact, on March 26 **Gerard Smith**, **John Rhinelander**, and others have scheduled a press conference of the National Coalition to Save the ABM Treaty, the outfit led by Zuckerman's "contact," Keeney.

Even more ominous for the patriotic faction in Washington, was the takeover at the *Washington Times* by **Arnaud de Borchgrave**, a close colleague of and co-author with **Robert Moss** at the London *Economist* intelligence section. The *Washington Times* had been the newspaper favored by the conservatives in the administration over the KGB propaganda sheet published by Katharine Graham. One year ago de Borchgrave issued wild slanders against Lyndon LaRouche, the conceptual author of the Strategic Defense Initiative, at a meeting of the Reserve Officers of America in Washington. The Belgian Arnaud de Borchgrave, the personal representative of the **Saxe-Coburg-Gotha** oligarchy, as new head of the *Washington Times*, represents a high-level threat to the national security of the United States.

Friends of Chatham House

On the same day that Zuckerman met Weinberger, none other than **Henry Kissinger**, who has publicly confessed that when he was Secretary of State he made a practice of briefing Chatham House and the British Foreign Policy elite on strategic matters *before* he informed American officials, had his regular luncheon with President Reagan at the White House. Kissinger emerged from the meeting and in his typical high-

profile fashion proclaimed to the CBS news and the *Washington Post* that he forecast a dramatic change in U.S.-Soviet relations since the ascension of Gorbachov. When Secretary of State Shultz, who functions as a sort of less flamboyant version of Henry Kissinger for the same policies, returned from Moscow after meeting Gorbachov he presented an assessment of the situation with precisely the same formulations as Kissinger had. Kissinger's policy, he admitted to a reporter last November, is to "whittle down" the SDI through cosmetically supporting "research" while blocking all possibilities for the system to be deployed. His attitude is also identical to that of a top spokesman for the evil **Benedictine Order** who articulated the question by predicting that the SDI program would go through, but that is not the issue since prohibitive costs in the long run will undermine the program; the real issue is "outlasting Reagan."

At virtually the same time that Kissinger and Zuckerman were running their operations in Washington, **David Watt**, the former research director of the Royal Institute for International Affairs, was also in Washington. When he returned to London he wrote a commentary in the London *Times* promoting the idea that there was "a change in mood" in the United States not favorable to Ronald Reagan, and threatening that sooner or later, President Reagan would become an impotent "lame duck President," unable to accomplish anything of importance. David Watt's atmospheric analysis of Washington is part of a major Chatham House project to pull the rug out from under the President's Strategic Defense Initiative from inside Washington itself. An entire institution has just been created out of whole cloth for this purpose—the **Friends of Chatham House** headed by such long-standing Tories as **Averell Harriman** and **Elliot Richardson**.

The MX vote

It was within the context of the massive effort of the British and their Soviet allies to scuttle the SDI program from without and within Washington that the MX votes in the Senate took place, and the House of Representatives floor votes will occur. The House debate will be much bloodier than that in the Senate; already the House Appropriations Committee voted against the MX in a very close vote.

Though significant, the MX package in actual fact will give the U.S. only 21 missiles several years down the road. Soviet military chieftain Marshal Ogarkov is getting two new SS-20s per week, and unconfirmed reports would add to that total one new SS-25 per day. In other words, in the two-week period that the mere MX vote will take to unfold before the Senate and House—let alone the production time—the Soviet military will get 18 new missiles for deployment. Thus, it is not surprising that at the end of January Ogarkov compared the situation to 1939-40, with the Soviets needing to "buy time" and rely on the economic crisis in the West.

In fact, the passage of the MX through the Senate came with a price tag. **Les Aspin** (D-Wisc.), the Oxford-trained Fabian who formerly worked for Robert McNamara, and

Sam Nunn (D-Ga.), Mr. "Decoupler from Western Europe," switched to support the MX on condition that President Reagan make a "good faith showing" at Geneva. Aspin, who represented an entire grouping of liberals such as Specter (D-Pa.) and Mathias (R-Md.) who switched to voted for the 21 MXs, revealed his true aims on "Meet the Press" on March 17. Aspin said he voted for the MX "mostly as a bargaining chip" for Geneva and he forecast an overall *cut* by Congress in Department of Defense spending because Weinberger had "overplayed his hand." He concluded: "I don't think people realize just how bad the Defense Department's position has eroded in Congress recently."

On cue, the head of the House of Representatives' Budget Committee, **Bill Gray III** (D-Pa.), is jointly working with his Senate counterparts to formally issue what they call a "rebuke" to the President and a demand for a one-year "freeze" on Pentagon spending.

The real target of the KGB Democrats and liberal Republicans is to allow some concessions on 21 MX missiles so that they can concentrate their firepower against the SDI directly. Sen. John Warner (R-Va.) warned that the SDI "has already become a target for the budget-cutters." Another conservative Republican senator predicted that the \$3.7 billion SDI program would be cut by at least \$1 billion, with some Democrats and Republicans looking for even deeper cuts, down to \$2.2 billion.

In its commentary on the situation, always a key indicator of the KGB assessment of the Washington situation, the *Washington Post* on March 17 wrote: "There have been strong bipartisan signals that the President's request for \$3.7 billion for the SDI could be cut \$1 billion or more. Reductions of that magnitude would affect planned research programs and delay any decision on whether a space-based defense is practical until many years after the administration has left office [emphasis added]."

In other words, the key opponents of the SDI program, the British operatives, the Soviets, and their mouthpieces, who will stop at nothing, even attempting the murder of the President, are all focused on the President "leaving" office.

There are signs that the patriots behind the SDI are prepared to escalate combat. In London on March 20, Assistant U.S. Secretary of Defense Richard Perle blasted Sir Geoffrey Howe for questioning Reagan's SDI program. Perle stated that Howe's speech "proved again an old axiom of geometry, that length is no substitute for depth. In a mere 27 pages Howe succeeded in rewriting the recent history of the Soviet-American relationship, rendering it unrecognizable to anyone who has charted its course." Perle accused Howe of a "tendentious and obliquely declaratory manner."

Furthermore, the Pentagon has opened an offensive by accusing the Soviets of violating SALT-II with their preparations for deployments of SS-24s and SS-25s. Thus, a very big spotlight is focused on Secretary of Defense Weinberger's trip to France and elsewhere in Western Europe in the last days of March.