

Counterattack launched against beam-defense foes

by Kathleen Klenetsky

President Ronald Reagan and key administration supporters of the new strategic doctrine first announced by Mr. Reagan on March 23, 1983, have sent out unmistakable signals that while "space weaponization" may be on the agenda at the Shultz-Gromyko talks in January, the United States has no intention of granting any concessions that could impede its progress.

The administration's counterattack on behalf of the program now named the "Strategic Defense Initiative" clashes sharply with what McGeorge Bundy has described as an "extraordinary offensive" by America's self-appointed policy elite to defraud the U.S. electorate of the defense program for which it gave the President his historic mandate on Nov. 6, and wrench him away from the SDI. In the U.S. Senate, majority leaders nominally from Reagan's own Republican party are now leading the effort to blackmail the President with the threat of a Wall Street-engineered financial collapse if he does not gouge the defense budget by tens of billions of dollars.

The Senate rebellion against the Commander-in-Chief is intended to accomplish what Henry A. Kissinger, also a nominal Republican, promised in November to do to the President's Strategic Defense Initiative—make sure it never gets anywhere because the budget for it will be "whittled down" to nothing.

No concessions on strategic defense

If the President's directives are not sabotaged by George Shultz and the nest of traitors at the State Department, the American delegation to the Geneva talks will inform their Soviet counterparts that the only negotiable aspect of the SDI is whether the Soviets will accept Reagan's offer to share U.S. strategic defense technology with them.

That was the negotiating position which Reagan reportedly dictated Dec. 5 to the group of administration officials

now engaged in preparations for the Shultz-Gromyko meet. An account in the Dec. 7 *New York Times*, based on leaks from unnamed White House officials, reports that Reagan has instructed the American negotiating team to inform the Soviets that he is strongly committed to the SDI, that he believes strategic defense holds out the best possibility of avoiding war, and that he wants to share with the Russians any new defensive technology the United States develops.

The same article laments that while the State Department wants to use the SDI as a bargaining chip—i.e., the United States will drop it if the Soviets agree to reduce their land-based offensive nuclear forces—the Defense Department, and, presumably, the President himself, want to go ahead with the beam-defense program no matter what agreements may be reached on offensive weapons.

Reagan is apparently taking precautions to ensure that Shultz doesn't simply ignore his directives once he is in Geneva. This week, the White House announced that the President has assigned representatives of the Defense Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the CIA, and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) to accompany the Secretary of State to the Geneva talks. This will weigh the American delegation toward a no-concessions approach, since many of those involved, such as ACDA director Adelman and Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard Perle, oppose the State Department position.

In a related move, the President announced Dec. 5 that Paul Nitze has been appointed special adviser to Shultz for the Jan. 7-8 discussions, thus undercutting the mammoth lobbying campaign by Henry Kissinger and friends to get one of their own named as the administration's "arms-control czar." Although Nitze has kept his own counsel on the issue of strategic defense, he personally campaigned against the SALT II agreement on the grounds that it institutionalized American strategic inferiority.

Pro-SDI offensive

The administration's pro-SDI offensive is emphasizing Soviet advances in strategic defense. On Dec. 6, Vice-President George Bush delivered a major address to a symposium at the National Defense College, in which he advocated the SDI as a "positive adjunct" to arms negotiations with the Soviets, "compelled by logic and morality." Pointing to the Soviets' own advanced ABM program, the Vice-President asserted that "against the background of this vigorous Soviet effort . . . it is only prudent that we explore the possibilities of space efforts for active defense against nuclear weapons."

Bush's speech, which reiterated administration plans for full-blown development of a defense against nuclear annihilation, is being widely interpreted as evidence that the administration will not agree to Moscow's demand for a moratorium on anti-satellite testing, which various "back-channel" sources have described as the "absolute minimum" concession the Soviets want from the United States.

Bush's message was reinforced by a similar speech given the night before by ACDA head Kenneth Adelman, who told a meeting at the New York Academy of Sciences that all the talk emanating from the Soviets and other critics of the Reagan strategic-defense program about "preventing the militarization of space" is very misleading. "Space is *already* militarized" by the existence of ballistic missiles and command and communication satellites, he said, adding that "'militarization' should not be confused with hostility."

Adelman warned that accepting the Soviet line that the most urgent arms-control problem today is the militarization of space plays right into Moscow's gameplan. The Soviets "certainly want to inhibit our research efforts on strategic defenses, where we may develop a potential advantage as our programs go forward," Adelman said. "They have extensive defensive programs and research; they . . . may be moving toward a nationwide ABM capability, contrary to the ABM Treaty; and they are engaged in vigorous research on lasers and neutral particle beams for strategic defenses."

According to the Dec 6 West German daily *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, the U.S. Defense Department has released a study warning that the Soviets are in the midst of a crash space-military and space-based weapons program threatening to achieve military superiority. The study concludes that "the present conduct of the Soviet Union in disavowing the existence of any sort of military elements in its space program can only signify that the Soviet leadership is not only taking counter-measures against U.S. moves, but is actually striving for military superiority in space for offensive as well as defensive purposes."

Weinberger: 'Soviet hordes'

The administration is taking pains to win Western Europe over to the strategic defense program, with a campaign aimed at countering European fears about the implications of the SDI for NATO defense, fears which have been manipulated

and exploited by the KGB to whip up opposition to the program. Last month, *Die Welt* published a long interview with Caspar Weinberger in which the defense secretary explained how Germany and America's other European allies would benefit from "Star Wars."

Die Welt followed that up with another interview on the subject Dec. 1, this one with Gen. James Abrahamson, director of the SDI (see p. 58). He stressed that "national will" combined with "technological optimism" are the keys to achieving a workable SDI, and that the SDI in turn would reinvigorate the entire Western Alliance.

Like Adelman and Bush, Abrahamson also emphasized that the Soviets have been throwing every resource they can get into their own space defense program. "Just look at the Soviet research program that they've been running far longer than we have," he said. "They have been researching beams for a long time. . . . I have a Soviet article right here, written in 1982—very interesting. It describes the plan for the entire architecture that we are just now trying to draw up, and this was written long before the President's [March 23, 1983] speech."

Abrahamson then debunked the assertion that beam weapons would decouple the Western Alliance by providing security only for the United States and not for Western Europe. "The SDI program awakens new confidence that the U.S. will have additional options—to protect Europe, as well—and if there is a crisis, that the U.S. doesn't stand there in such a vulnerable position," he asserted, "We are saying good-bye to a conception [Mutually Assured Destruction, or MAD] that has been accepted for many, many years."

The key question, above all, he told the German paper, would be to "emphasize the national will to do it. . . . Technically, we can do anything, and in my opinion the West has always proved it, and there is one thing you should know: I am a technological optimist. So again, we can do it if only we want to do it, if we have the will to defend ourselves."

Abrahamson's warnings about Soviet ABM developments echoed on other fronts during the past days. Most surprising, and revealing, is the private report from a leading U.S. "peace movement" activist that a U.S. delegation of peaceniks visiting Moscow received a detailed, five-hour briefing from U.S. Ambassador Arthur Hartman, who normally swims in the circles around Henry A. Kissinger, on "the enormous extent of Soviet ABM development." It was an "extremely troublesome" briefing, said the peacenik. "I was shocked."

Abrahamson's superior, Weinberger, brought the same message to the early December meeting of NATO defense ministers in Brussels. The Pentagon chief, who launched a frontal assault against the State Department in a Nov. 27 speech laying out a war-winning military strategy for the United States, emerged at the conclusion of the two-day conference and announced to waiting reporters: "We in the United States could not live in a world that was overrun by

Soviet hordes.”

In response to a question about the administration's attitude toward moves on Capitol Hill to force a pullout of U.S. troops from Western Europe, Weinberger replied: "It is absolutely vital that NATO be strengthened because this strengthens the defense of the United States," and went on to say that the administration will fight tooth and nail against any future congressional efforts to "decouple" the Atlantic Alliance.

Weinberger coupled these statements with a briefing on the astounding rate of Soviet deployment and production of SS-20 intermediate-range missiles. He said that the U.S.S.R. has deployed 9 more SS-20 intermediate-range missiles capable of hitting targets in Western Europe, bringing the total of such missiles up to 387, each with three warheads. He added that many more SS-20 launchers and bases are under construction. "The rate of construction and the rate of activity have enormously increased," he warned.

Senate traitors

Though the administration has clearly broken out of its former "Let's downplay the SDI because it's too controversial" mode, that does not mean the battle has been won. If anything, the Kremlin and its oligarchical collaborators in the West can be expected to redouble their efforts against the beam-defense program.

One of their chief assets will be that bunch of spineless cowards known as the U.S. Congress. At the same time that the Supreme Soviet announced a 12% hike in Russian defense spending, their American counterparts were demanding massive reductions in U.S. military spending. Although the SDI hasn't publicly surfaced yet in the context of the fight over military spending levels for FY 1986, it is widely acknowledged that the beam-defense program is the number-one target of the budget cutters.

Ironically, the strongest pressure on Reagan to adopt a "Mondale" defense budget is coming from members of his own party. On Dec. 1, two key Senate Republican leaders—Robert Dole of Kansas and Robert Packwood of Oregon—went on national television to lay down the gauntlet to the President. Their message: Either Reagan agrees to gouge Pentagon spending in order to "balance the budget," or else his entire economic package for the coming year will be stopped dead in its tracks.

Interviewed on NBC-TV's "Meet the Press," Dole, the newly elected Senate Majority leader, declared: "If we're going to attack the budget deficit, we can't ignore defense." What's necessary, said Dole, is a "spending freeze that includes defense," even if this causes "heartburn in some areas, like the Defense Department." Asked for specific dollar figures, Dole replied that "\$30-40-50 billion" will have to be cut from the Pentagon budget over the next three years, "starting out with small reductions, and getting much bigger."

Similar sentiments were expressed by Packwood (R-

Oreg.), who is slated to replace Dole as chairman of the powerful finance committee. Appearing on ABC-TV's "David Brinkley Show, Packwood stated that "defense will have to be part of" an overall budget-cutting package, and that "\$8-15 billion" will have to be gouged from Pentagon budget program next year alone. Packwood said Reagan would have to agree to defense cuts, or else Congress would refuse to cooperate with him on anything.

Treasury Secretary Donald Regan, who has been working with Kissinger's clones in the White House Palace Guard against the Pentagon, sang the same treasonous tune in an interview on ABC-TV, stating that reductions in defense spending will have to be cut to "balance the budget." "I do feel the Defense Department has to be a part of this package," he added.

Conservative Sen. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.), the new chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has also jumped aboard the budget-cutting bandwagon. Goldwater told the Dec. 6 *Washington Post* that he is advising the President to accept a freeze in defense spending—and an end to the MX missile. "You can't keep pumping out money you don't have," Goldwater said. "I don't think [Reagan] can win [the MX missile fight], so why get your ass knocked off." Although Goldwater protested that "I'm not one of these freeze-the-nuke nuts," he's ended up in the same corner with them, because he's ideologically enslaved to the "balanced budget" cult of the "free enterprisers."

So far, Reagan has refused to give in, announcing that he is suspending any decision on defense spending until Weinberger—now in the Middle East—returns to Washington. Weinberger, who bitterly opposes any reduction in the Pentagon budget, is fighting a long-distance guerrilla war against the "slash and burn" faction. Interviewed from Brussels on American television Dec. 5, Weinberger came out strongly against any military cuts, and predicted that Reagan will agree to an "adequate" Pentagon budget.

But Reagan could still find himself abandoning his own best instincts and allowing big cuts in defense. The President is prone to the same free-enterprise nonsense which caused Goldwater to line up with the nuclear freezeniks. With the economy now taking a nosedive, it doesn't take too much imagination to conjure up a scenario in which Reagan lets the military budget go under David Stockman's axe.

Whether that happens ultimately depends on the fate of the SDI. As former independent Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. stressed in a national election-eve TV broadcast, a crash beam-weapon program is not only militarily necessary, but is also the key to sparking an in-depth economic recovery. Reagan's success in actually bringing the SDI into being will depend on whether he mobilizes the entire economy around the most advanced technologies to accomplish it, as President Franklin Roosevelt did in his 1939-43 war mobilization to defeat the Nazis. That is what LaRouche has advised.