

The United States shifts toward 'Fortress America'

by Nicholas F. Benton

On the eve of the reconvening of the 100th Congress and President Reagan's final State of the Union message, the most important and deadly shift in U.S. military and strategic policy since the end of World War II has been signaled by the administration. In essence, the administration has said that America's allies around the world may no longer count on America's "nuclear umbrella" to shield them from Soviet aggression. With that follow-up to the "zero option" treaty with the Soviet Union, the administration is preparing to hand most of the world to the Russians, and, at least at the State Department, they know that is what they are doing.

NATO reaction has been a swift call for a summit of heads of state, now scheduled to occur in Brussels, Belgium, March 2-3.

Admittedly, this strategic shift did not come out of the blue. The fears of patriots in the NATO countries were first provoked by President Reagan's evident willingness to undermine the alliance with the deals nearly consummated at Reykjavik in 1986.

First, the President accepted a long-term regime of cuts in U.S. defense budgets, which has assured a significant reduction of U.S. military presence abroad and brought the Strategic Defense Initiative to a virtual standstill. Then, the President signed the disastrous Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) treaty with Soviet General Secretary Gorbachov in December. Now, the President has mandated his negotiators in Geneva to complete a sweeping strategic arms reduction pact in time for a Moscow summit by early May.

And finally, the administration issued two national strategy documents in January. The report of the Commission on Integrated Long-Term Strategy released at the Pentagon Jan.

13 was followed by the President's annual report to Congress entitled, "National Security Strategy of the U.S.," released at the White House Jan. 20. They confirm that the administration is engaged in a calculated shift in U.S. strategic posture which will concede Western Europe, first, to the Soviet empire.

The documents dispense with the basis of U.S. strategic posture in the postwar period, toward a neo-isolationist, "Fortress America" posture. The basis of U.S. strategic posture in the postwar period is summed up in Article V of the NATO Compact, "An attack on one is an attack on all." The defense of the alliance is indispensable to the national security of the United States.

The treasonous intention to abandon European (and other) allies is stated clearly in the Integrated Long-Term Strategy report, "Discriminate Deterrence," known as the Iklé-Wohlstetter report. Assistant Secretary of Defense Fred Iklé and Prof. Albert Wohlstetter co-chaired the commission, which includes Henry Kissinger, Anne Armstrong, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Samuel Huntington, John Vessey, and William Clark. The same treasonous intention is more subtly, but also more significantly, present in the President's own report to Congress.

Some in the administration, including, according to reliable sources, National Security Adviser Lt. Gen. Colin Powell, were red-faced over the blatant call in the Iklé-Wohlstetter report for a removal of the U.S. nuclear umbrella from Europe. They distanced themselves by insisting, as White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater put it, that that report was only a "private study, taken under advisement by the administration, but not policy."

But then, Navy Secretary James Webb delivered a speech at the National Press Club Jan. 13 that sounded like it was lifted directly from the Iklé-Wohlstetter report, and this was followed by the President's report to Congress, which included praise for the Iklé-Wohlstetter report.

Of course, the President's report insists that the United States retains the nuclear doctrine of "flexible response" and that a "Fortress America" posture is unacceptable. But, after such lip-service, it tips its hand in a section analyzing U.S. military strategy region-by-region. There, it refers to the defense of North America as "the nation's most fundamental security concern." The security of Western Europe is merely "a vital component" of U.S. strategy.

A focus on such subtleties of wording might be criticized as "splitting hairs," especially given the vociferous denials of senior administration officials when confronted by *EIR* on this during a background briefing at the White House Jan. 20. But, it comes in the wake of the Iklé-Wohlstetter bombshell, which was properly characterized as a "recipe for decoupling the NATO alliance" by a leading European analyst.

In fact, a private exchange following the White House briefing revealed the real link between the two reports, as perceived by administration officials themselves. *EIR*'s correspondent challenged the senior administration official: "If you say the administration remains committed to ensuring that the full force of the U.S. nuclear arsenal is at the disposal of NATO, and the Iklé-Wohlstetter report calls for removing this, then why don't you clarify your position to all those nervous Europeans by simply repudiating the Iklé-Wohlstetter report?"

Replied the official, "I will not repudiate it, because the two reports deal with different things. The President's report says what our policy is today. The Iklé-Wohlstetter report concerns what people should begin now to think about how the world might look a decade from now."

So, those worried that the INF accord will lead to a decoupling of the NATO alliance now see their worst fears confirmed. It is one deliberate step in a conscious strategic shift.

The same shift is evident in President Reagan's renewed preoccupation with aid to the Nicaraguan rebels in Central America. According to the design of the "decouplers," the United States is supposed to withdraw forces from Europe, shifting its military emphasis "south of the border." In the two weeks surrounding the reconvening of Congress, President Reagan scheduled over a half-dozen major addresses focused on support for the Nicaraguan Contras, including an address to the Reserve Officers Association Jan. 27, and remarks to at least two large groups of private citizens herded into the Old Executive Office Building adjacent to the White House for special briefings on the Contras. Is this different than the operation by which Lt. Col. Oliver North and his shady associate, Spitz Channel, raised huge sums of private money for the Contra resupply effort, using the lure of a meeting with the President as a fundraising pitch?

A ratification fight

Now, the administration is gearing up its campaign to railroad a swift ratification of the INF treaty through the U.S. Senate, recruiting former Sen. John Tower (R-Texas) to its cause. However, despite bravado to the contrary, there is considerable nervousness in the White House over the vote. Knowing that only 34 votes are required to kill the treaty, they fear the growing campaign against the treaty, spearheaded by the Schiller Institute and the Ad Hoc Committee Against the INF Treaty.

The Schiller Institute is scheduled to bring a leading West German opponent of the INF treaty to Washington Jan. 26 to brief senators on the dangers of the accord. Brig. Gen. (ret.) Paul Albert Scherer was the chief of the Military Internal Service of the West German Armed Forces in the 1970s.

In addition, Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) announced Jan. 20 his intention to introduce "killer amendments" aimed at blocking ratification of the INF treaty. Helms cited the 3-to-1 Soviet conventional force advantage in Europe that will remain after the treaty which, he said, "could tempt them to start a war in Europe. It will unquestionably give them the ability to bully our European allies."

This provoked Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.), chairman of the Armed Services subcommittee on conventional forces, to release a 67-page report later the same day, containing the wild assertion that "an uneasy conventional military balance exists today in Europe."

Still, the White House is worried that if the Senate gets bogged down in a debate on counting conventional forces—which some experts insist shows the Soviets with a 6-to-1 advantage—prior to voting on ratifying the INF treaty, then the treaty may never come to a vote at all.

Whither SDI?

While the battle lines are being drawn on the INF ratification fight, the fate of the Strategic Defense Initiative remains in deep doubt. Many analysts believe the program is effectively dead in the water. Henry Kissinger, of all people, who never wanted the program to be more than a bargaining chip, speaking to the Heritage Foundation Jan. 14, forecast the "atrophying" of the program. With its funding for FY88 cut almost 40% from the requested \$5.2 billion to \$3.2 billion, about 75 SDI programs have been terminated, and the free-electron laser, one of the most promising programs, has been cut by 35%.

Fiscally strangled, the SDI has been targeted by such anti-NATO figures as Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) and Rep. Les Aspin (D-Wisc.). They have proposed a restructuring of the program toward the highly restricted objective of defense against a single accidental launch with a series of ground-based, point-defense systems.

Using the same approach advocated in the Iklé-Wohlstetter report, Nunn and Aspin ignore the emergence of the Soviets' nationwide ABM system in their support of the U.S. strategic shift toward "Fortress America."