
Defense Policy

Heritage wants to shrink armed forces

by Barbara Dreyfuss

The Heritage Foundation, a nominally conservative think tank, and a group of liberal Democrats are actively working to dismantle U.S. military capabilities in a decade when the question of U.S. or U.S.S.R. strategic military superiority will be decided. Claiming that the U.S. is not and will not be able to fight and win a war against the Soviet Union, Heritage is trying to turn the U.S. military into a police force for the geopolitical brinkmanship policies of Henry Kissinger. A key force behind this campaign is the British oligarchy, which seeks to use U.S. military capabilities to implement population reduction.

In early May the Heritage Foundation, which, as *EIR* has detailed has close ties to British intelligence, will issue a report titled *Reforming the Military*. It details how the U.S. military can be reshaped into an instrument to be used in local hotspots. The report is a compendium of articles by such diverse individuals as Bill Lind, the legislative assistant to liberal Democrat Sen. Gary Hart (D-Colo.); Edward Luttwak, who has been a policy adviser to Sen. Howard Baker (R-Tenn.); Norman Polmar, the former U.S. editor for the British intelligence-related *Jane's Fighting Ships*. Military analysts Steven Canby and Pierre Spray also contributed to the report. The group calls itself "the reformers" and their ideas are actively supported by Colorado's Sen. Gary Hart, the former campaign manager for George McGovern, as well as liberal Democratic Congressman Les Aspin of Wisconsin and people close to Ted Kennedy. Aspin has called for the primitivization of the military, with sophisticated equipment modified to match the illiteracy of troops who would operate it. British press reports have claimed that former Defense Secretary Harold Brown endorsed this view.

In an interview before he left for a military strategy conference in London, Jeff Barlow, the Heritage Foundation editor of the report, admitted that the report's authors believe that America will not be able to gear up its industry for a strong, in-depth military capability, and so the United States must try to force a Soviet backdown through bluff and regional confrontations. "I think that the idea of being ready for regional war is true. For too long we have been caught with the attempt to maintain

qualitative advantage rather than determining to maximize our advantages. For too long we have been caught with the idea of American industrial capacity letting us overcome the enemy. If there is a war in Europe, it will be a short war, and we may find that we are not capable of winning. We have to have maneuverability and smaller equipment."

In a period when applied ABM systems, fusion energy programs, and similar high-technology systems will decide the question of military superiority, these people are talking about primitivizing the American military. In the section on manpower written by Lind and Canby, the report declares, according to Barlow, that "the Soviets are superior in manpower and numbers of equipment, tanks, aircraft, so since we can't fight a war we have to move to a doctrine of maneuverability like the German Panzer Corps." To be able to rapidly maneuver, they propose much smaller army units. The RDF is strongly advocated by the report's authors, although Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman Gen. David Jones admitted March 12 that the RDF would not actually be useful in fighting against a Soviet invasion in the Third World because it would take 180 days for the U.S. to bring in an adequate number of troops.

In terms of U.S. naval capabilities, Polmar declared that his proposal is for "smaller and cheaper" equipment. He proposes much smaller aircraft carriers than the U.S. now uses, and much smaller submarines than the SSN-688 *Los Angeles* class. Barlow in fact goes so far as to propose that the U.S. scrap the Trident submarine program, an important arm of our strategic capabilities, and just develop small subs for regional areas instead.

Senator Gary Hart has been an outspoken advocate of such a small-is-beautiful approach to U.S. naval capability. In a Senate statement March 5, Hart proposed that the U.S. replace the SSN-688 class attack-submarines with diesel-electric subs—the technology of World War II and develop smaller, non-nuclear carriers and non-nuclear cruisers. Hart, along with Rep. Les Aspin, also opposes the Trident submarine.

The Heritage network thinks they have some allies in the new administration for their ideas. Barlow says that Bill Schneider, the OMB official responsible for military affairs, has read the material and "he is open to this approach." Polmar claims to be a good friend of Navy Secretary John Lehman, a protégé of Henry Kissinger. But he laments that Lehman is limited in what he can do to reverse U.S. military doctrine because of pressure from Congress and from the navy itself, much of which is opposed to the Heritage Foundation plans. "Lehman can't do things for political reasons." And the Heritage Foundation liberal Democratic network is going to find it difficult to sell their plans to the Reagan administration which was put into office by an electorate determined to restore U.S. industrial and military capability.