

Brzezinski-Shultz alliance to sell out Western Europe

by Kathleen Klenetsky

The Trilateral Commission, the private think-tank bankrolled by David Rockefeller in 1973 to propagate the Western oligarchy's "New Yalta" appeasement policy toward the Soviet Union, is mounting a major effort to seize control of the Reagan administration.

Operating primarily through Secretary of State George Shultz and White House Chief of Staff Don Regan, the Trilateraloids are attempting to turn the second Reagan administration into a Republican version of the Carter regime—even to the extent of elevating Zbigniew Brzezinski, the man who taught Jimmy Carter everything he didn't know about strategic and foreign policy.

The policy implications of this are ominous: First, the Trilateral Commission wants to get rid of the Strategic Defense Initiative, or to water it down to the point that it becomes militarily meaningless. This means shunting Secretary of Defense Weinberger to the sidelines, or, better yet, forcing his resignation.

Second, significant Trilateral influence within the administration means that the United States, under the impact of a growing economic crisis, will turn to the same kind of economic "solutions"—wage-gouging, skyhigh inflation, the elimination of social services—that has decimated the developing sector.

Third, it also ensures that the "decoupling" of Europe from the United States, which has long been a Trilateral goal, will soon go into final phase, sending Europe into the orbit of the Soviet Union, and turning the United States into an isolated, third-rate power. Brzezinski, mentor to new U.S. Ambassador to West Germany Richard Burt, is an outspoken proponent of the "Austrianization" of Europe.

According to Mark Albrecht, a spokesman for Sen. Pete Wilson (R-Calif.), Brzezinski, the Carter administration National Security Adviser, the author of the "Arc of Crisis" doctrine that handed Iran to the Ayatollah Khomeini, and the former North American executive director of the Trilateral Commission (he is still a Commission member), has been

named to a panel that has been charged with conducting a reassessment of United States strategic military doctrine.

Though the panel has yet to be officially announced, sources have told *EIR* it will consist of the following individuals: MIT Provost Jim Deutsch; Adm. James Woolsey (ret.); Gen. Jasper Welch (ret.); Gen. Bernie Schriever (ret.); Robert Evert, president of the Mitre Corp.; Charles Townes; Harry Rowen of Stanford University; Michael May of Lawrence Livermore; Daniel Fink; and Gen. Russell Dougherty (ret.) of the Air Force Association. With few exceptions, the board is heavily weighted against the SDI. Charles Townes, for example, was a key member of the Scowcroft Commission (headed by Kissinger Associates president Brent Scowcroft), which set the stage for the MX's scaling back. Townes also defended the 1984 Office of Technology Assessment's report assailing the SDI, even after its technical premises had been ripped to shreds.

The panel was mandated by an amendment to the FY 1986 defense budget bill sponsored by Sen. Wilson, a prominent member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. It orders the administration to name a panel of "experts" to review the U.S. strategic modernization program, and to make recommendations on the MX, the Midgetman, the SDI, and other key weapons systems. The panel must report to Congress by early February 1986.

Senate sources have disclosed that Wilson belongs to a small, but growing, group of "moderate-conservative" Republican Senators who claim that the United States lacks a coherent strategy, and that Weinberger has been "fixating on weapons systems, at the expense of strategy." The group's hardcore includes Sens. Warren Rudman (R-N.H.), Dan Quayle (R-Ind.), Phil Gramm (R-Tex.), Malcolm Wallop (R-Wyo.), and Wilson. For the past year, they have been meeting with such self-styled strategic experts as Brzezinski, former RAND Corp. analyst Albert Wohlstetter, and Jimmy Carter's Energy Secretary, James Schlesinger, to get advice on how to force a shift in strategic policy. These fools are

promoting Brzezinski as the “hard-line” counter to Shultz and McFarlane!

Albrecht confirmed an Aug. 5 syndicated column by Evans and Novak which reported that these Senate Republicans have been avidly boosting the former Carter adviser at every opportunity, and were instrumental in securing his appointment to the defense review panel. He also confirmed the columnists’ leak that the Senators met with Don Regan the first week of August to discuss the Brzezinski appointment, and to urge Regan to get more deeply involved in national security issues. Asked if it wasn’t strange that Regan, who conspired to freeze the defense budget and to cut off Weinberger’s access to the President, was now being looked to as a savior of America’s military, Albrecht replied: “No. What we’re talking about doing doesn’t mean more money. In fact, it might mean less money” for defense.

According to the column, “Rudman was so impressed with Brzezinski’s article on strategic defense in the July 8 *New Republic* that he sent copies to 200 key members of Congress and the administration. . . . Rudman and another Republican moderate, Sen. Pete Wilson of California, have led the call for at least parttime help from Brzezinski on overdue strategic planning.”

Assault on Mutually Assured Survival

The Brzezinski article is a frontal attack against President Reagan’s doctrine of Mutually Assured Survival. Brzezinski calls for limiting the Strategic Defense Initiative to a defense of America’s land-based strategic offensive missiles—a reinforcement of MAD—and to trade away the SDI altogether if the Soviets agree to limit their deployments of offensive nuclear missiles.

“The U.S. should drop or at least de-emphasize President Reagan’s idealistic hope for total nuclear defense for all our population,” writes Brzezinski. “We should also abandon our unwillingness to consider SDI in the bargaining process. If we implement that part of the SDI program which by the mid-1990s would enable us to disrupt a Soviet first strike, we would reinforce deterrence and promote nuclear stability. That means concentrating on terminal defense and boost phase interception. Once we establish our determination to act on the SDI, we are in a better position to strike a bargain. . . . In return for significant reductions in SS-24s, SS-25s, SS-18s, SS-19s, the United States would not deploy its strategic defense system.”

Aides to Senators involved in boosting Brzezinski have acknowledged that a key objective is to reshape the SDI, a goal which the new defense policy board is expected to achieve. “Sen. Wilson agrees with Zbig that the goal of the SDI shouldn’t be population defense,” said Wilson’s staffer. “He thinks SDI’s emphasis should be shifted from exotic technologies to near-term technologies for defending our missiles.” Henry Sokolski, a former Heritage Foundation fellow and now legislative assistant to Sen. Dan Quayle, spoke in the same vein: “Look, if you have a limited budget

for the SDI, doesn’t it make sense to emphasize technologies which can be brought on line right away,” even if they don’t provide population defense?

Finlandization of Europe

Brzezinski’s policies involve a much deeper betrayal of the Western Alliance than even the abandonment of the SDI, and indicate the policy content of the Trilateral coup-in-the-making. In a *New York Times* op-ed on Dec. 27, 1984, Brzezinski, citing the “positive experience of neutral Austria and Finland,” called for the neutralization of Western Europe, the withdrawal of U.S. ground troops, and the economic integration of the European Economic Community with Eastern Europe.

Cloaking his argument in anti-Soviet rhetoric, Brzezinski, like his fellow Trilateral Commissioner Henry Kissinger, wrote that the Soviet empire is in a state of terminal economic decay, fueled by the Russian military buildup, rendering Moscow open to a new strategic *modus vivendi* on the Eurasian continent. Such a new Yalta agreement, Brzezinski said, must be based on an independent European defense which “would represent a giant step towards a politically more vital Europe, yet a Europe that would be less at conflict with the Soviet Union than a Europe hosting a large American army. *A gradually reduced American ground presence would create pressure from even the existing Eastern European regimes for a commensurate Soviet redeployment, thereby gradually creating a more flexible political situation.*”

It is only appropriate that Brzezinski’s public unveiling as a White House “insider” came the same day Richard Burt was sworn in as the U.S. ambassador in Bonn. Burt’s credentials as a foreign policy “thinker” came largely as the result of a dozen or more Carter-era classified leaks he received from Brzezinski and published in the *New York Times*. When Burt landed a position with the Reagan transition team in December 1980, the *Washington Post* speculated, “Maybe Burt can hire Zbig for a job in the new administration.”

Last year, when President Reagan appointed a left-wing social-democrat and Brzezinski protégé, Max Kampelman, to head the U.S. delegation to the strategic arms talks in Geneva, conservatives in both the civilian and military ranks confidently claimed it was a Reagan administration “strategic deception” obscuring the President’s unflagging commitment to the SDI. When Kampelman and Brzezinski co-authored (with Reaganite Robert Jastrow) a *New York Times* magazine piece spelling out the abandonment of the SDI doctrine of Mutually Assured Survival, the same conservatives took a deep breath, but stuck to their Pollyanna forecasts.

With Richard Burt due to arrive in Bonn on Sept. 8, and with Brzezinski poised to become a top strategic adviser to the administration, one wonders how long it will be before it becomes utterly impossible for anyone to distinguish the administration of Ronald Reagan from the Trilateral administration of Jimmy Carter.