

## Mr. Bush, Mr. Shultz, and the gutting of U.S. defense

by Criton Zoakos

Vice President George Bush's current tour of Western Europe has as its principal purpose to obtain an arms control breakthrough with the Soviet Union which might allow the Reagan administration to announce massive defense budget cuts some time in late March or April of this year. Prior to his departure, the Vice President went through a series of briefings focused on the imperative of cutting the U.S. government budget to levels way below those indicated by the President's Budget Message, and even below the cuts which anti-defense congressmen are publicly demanding at this time.

The cutting of the U.S. budget, especially the defense budget, below levels that this nation's national security could tolerate, is now the principal demand of the British, Swiss and Venetian financial oligarchy currently in control of the policies of the International Monetary Fund, the Bank for International Settlements and the World Bank. George Bush and Secretary of State George Shultz are acting directly under orders of these gentlemen, and contrary to the most rudimentary national security interests of the United States.

As Mr. Bush arrived in Europe, the Executive Director of the IMF's Interim Committee, Mr. Geoffrey Howe, addressed the House of Commons in London on the subject of managing the world economy during the present depression. Mr. Howe's and the IMF's official position is that in addition to drastically increased levels of austerity throughout the Third World, the single most important task of the world economy is to reduce the United States budget deficit—essentially meaning the defense budget deficit.

On the same day, in Davos, Switzerland, at an annual gathering of prominent political and financial leaders under the watchful eye of the ever-present chief of the Bank for International Settlements, Mr. Fritz Leutwiler, a similar consensus was expressed demanding the reduction of the United States budget. The sentiment of the Swiss financiers was best articulated by Herr Helmut Schmidt, the former Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, who appealed to President Reagan to further cut the U.S. budget as a "service to humanity as a whole." Leutwiler himself and the leading central bankers of Western Europe are all known to agree that the American defense budget must be cut way below currently discussed reduction levels.

### The hand of Venice

On Tuesday, Feb. 1, three simultaneous press conferences in London, Bonn, and Washington provided the context of policy on arms control within which George Bush will attempt his ill-conceived deal with old acquaintance Yuri V. Andropov. The three simultaneous press conferences were held under the auspices of the Union of Concerned Scientists, a Cambridge, Massachusetts based front for the Council on Foreign Relations and the ESECS (European Security Study) Group of the civilian branch of NATO.

The Washington press conference was presided over by Robert Strange McNamara, the butcher of Vietnam and currently the leading peace activist of the United States. The Bonn press conference was presided over by McGeorge Bundy, National Security Adviser during the Vietnam War. In

London, the "concerned scientists" in question were Field Marshal Lord Carver, Lord Solly Zuckerman (Lord Mountbatten's erstwhile scientific adviser), Lord Flowers, and Lord Gladwyn. The subject of these three press conferences was how to lower NATO defense spending from the current levels of 3 percent per year for Europe and 7 percent per year for the United States down to 2 percent per year, as demanded by the IMF and the Bank for International Settlements.

How such a reduction might be achieved was the subject of a lengthy study by Vice-Admiral John Marshall Lee (a conventional buildup scheme close to what is known as the Bernard Rogers Plan) and its overall political principle was explained in an interview by Robert Strange McNamara, published in the *New York Times* of the following day. The article, titled "No Second Use," called for the United States and NATO to unilaterally renounce the right to retaliate to a nuclear first strike, to subsequently call on the Soviet Union to do likewise, and to then proceed into a massive conventional buildup to ensure "adequate conventional deterrence."

This scheme has a decidedly Venetian flavor, having its origins in the Club of Rome wing of NATO civilian intelligence, a grouping of oligarchical European families organized around the Société Européen du Culture, a known strategic intelligence outfit of old Venetian outlook as well as pedigree. Prince Raimondo Torre e Tasso (or Thurn und Taxis in the German appellation) is an associate of both Lord Zuckerman and the Club of Rome's Alexander King, thus defining the core of strategic gamemasters who dominate the policy-making of the ESECS group on behalf of the NATO civilian oligarchy.

This group's financial power of the IMF, BIS, the World Bank, the central banks of England, Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium, Holland, et al., is the power engine of influence which has compelled the Reagan administration to its present course of suicidal economic policy, with main emphasis on budget cutting at all costs. As of the present time, these gentlemen's influence has imposed upon the Reagan administration the irrational policy of judging

## A falling out among East and West 'peacenik' allies

Shouldn't Yuri Zhukov, chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, be pleased? The Movement for European Nuclear Disarmament (END), the continent-wide extension of Bertrand Russell's Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, is picking up steam under the direction of ex-communist E. P. Thompson. It is preparing to convene its second large conference in May. END supporter Rudi Bahro, an East German citizen said to have "ties in the upper ranks" in East Berlin even though he emigrated as a dissident, has ascended to the leadership of the Green Party in West Germany, which is campaigning to go into a government with the Social Democrats there, a government that would wreak havoc in NATO and dismantle West German industry. Thompson holds that END's appeal for "a European nuclear-free zone" is a top priority for the movement, just as Moscow has revived a plan for denuclearization of a large area in Central Europe.

But Yuri Zhukov is not pleased. In December he dispatched to 1,500 peace activists in West Germany and Britain a denunciation of END and the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation. Zhukov, *Pravda's* senior foreign affairs commentator and a participant in Moscow's disar-

mament campaigns since the late 1940s, accused them of acting so as eventually "to split the anti-war movement . . . and to infiltrate 'cold war' elements into it." Since then, dozens of column inches in the British weekly *New Statesman* have been the arena for civilized mud-slinging between Zhukov and the END.

Zhukov's objections were two: the injection of "ideological struggle" into East-West peace movement discussions and a plan "to bring a so-called 'German question' into discussions at the convention" in May, which is slated to be held in West Berlin. The first refers to "human rights" debates launched by Thompson's people when he visited Hungary last year.

The second gets to something fundamental in European politics, especially since various circles, both socialist and royalist, have been talking in ever louder whispers about schemes for "neutralization," not to say reunification, of the two Germanies. Those who assess Yuri Andropov as a reincarnation of the KGB chief Lavrentii Beria, who would succeed in the takeover Beria failed to accomplish in 1953, recall that Beria was charged for having been prepared to sacrifice East German in a strategic deal with the West, particularly Britain. The memory of that, and today's whispers, are the cause of nervousness in East Germany.

The vitriol against Thompson's END this time came not from East Berlin, but from Moscow, and here it should be noted that the U.S.S.R. makes arrangements with friends in British intelligence, but for its own purposes. Sometimes the word comes back, as from Zhukov to his peace friends—keep off our turf!

this nation's national security needs from the standpoint of the need to cut the budget. Paul Volcker, George Shultz, and George Bush are the principal actors disseminating this policy within the administration. Swiss influences within the administration such as C. Fred Iklé's and others' played a contributing role.

It is these gentlemen's influence which determined that the principal objective of Bush's trip to Europe would be to secretly conclude a hasty arms control deal with the Soviet Union. This deal, if concluded, will occur in the context of an imminent cut in U.S. spending on sophisticated weapons systems development, especially space-based defensive high-energy beam weapons. Moscow cannot fail to notice either this, or the general orgy of defense budget cutting now dominating the U.S. Congress.

No breakthrough will necessarily be announced when the Vice-President returns to Washington. It may be announced some time in March, or at some appropriate point of the congressional calendar at the height of the budget fight. In announcing the arms control deal, the administration may then proceed to triumphantly announce cuts in the defense budget according to Robert McNamara's formula. Moscow, with both its nuclear and conventional powder dry, will rejoice in seeing the United States committing itself to a career of a conventionally-only credible military power, content to deploy its troops for the sole purpose of collecting Third World debt on behalf of the European financial oligarchy.

### **A chaos scenario for the United States**

Senator Alan Cranston's announcement for the Democratic presidential race for 1984 is significant in its implications for the strategic maneuvers of 1983. In his Feb. 2 opening campaign speech, Cranston defined his policy as "ensuring economic recovery by means of an arms control deal with the Soviet Union. . . . The only way to recovery," the Senator from California intoned, "goes through an arms control deal with Moscow." It was intended as a signal to Mr. Andropov while Bush is in Europe.

A second Democratic presidential hopeful, Sen. Gary Hart, representing the Aspen Institute, flanked Cranston's signal with his own statement: "Defense Secretary Weinberger is courting world economic depression with his insistence on high defense spending." As the Democratic National Committee gathered on Feb. 3 for a four-day strategy meeting on how to mobilize the population against the Reagan budget, the signal to Mr. Andropov is clear: We are prepared to orchestrate a riot situation worse than 1968 in order to get the kinds of defense cuts required to persuade you, sir, to join us in a serious arms control deal.

Yuri V. Andropov is watching all this with a quiet smile. His motionless poise reminds one of a royal cobra before it strikes. Is the victim, Vice-President Bush, hypnotized? We shall know when the West German election returns come in on the evening of March 6, 1983. If Hans-Jochen Vogel is the winner, the cobra will have struck.

## **Indira Gandhi shuffles and tackles problems in**

by Paul Zykofsky in New Delhi

In the aftermath of the ruling Congress Party's losses in the two recent state elections, India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi has begun the most comprehensive political clean-up operation at the national, state, and party levels since she took office three years ago. The first phase started Jan. 25 with the abrupt resignation of one of the government's ministers active in party affairs. This was quickly followed by the appointment of a veteran leader, Kamalapati Tripathi, to run the day-to-day affairs of the Congress Party, and the resignation of the party's five general secretaries. On the same day, all 60 members of the Cabinet submitted letters of resignation to Prime Minister Gandhi.

In the ensuing reshuffle, Mrs. Gandhi forced out some corrupt and inefficient ministers and appointed three new Cabinet ministers and nine ministers of state—who are generally known to be honest and able administrators. Further changes, however, are expected in the days ahead.

In the background of the shake-up, observers here point out, is Prime Minister Gandhi's determination to fight back against the systematic destabilization of her government on the eve of the Non-Aligned Heads of State summit scheduled to take place in New Delhi for March 7-11. The summit—which will bring together over 70 heads of state and of government of developing sector nations—is expected to take concrete initiatives to reverse the present rapid decline of the world economy.

While Mrs. Gandhi has remained silent, her views were conveyed in a letter she wrote to an "admirer," which was mysteriously released to the press on Jan. 27. In it she warned that "there are forces abroad which would like the Indian government to be more pliable. They encourage or mislead certain elements from within the country to take steps which could weaken us."

Only a few days earlier, the New Delhi daily newspaper *Patriot* had published an exclusive report that the government had received "stunning proof" of a plan "to destabilize and balkanize India." The article went on to cite a report prepared by U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Jeane Kirkpatrick, in which she outlined how India could be destabilized through "a noticeable growth of separatist movements," and that the result would be the destruction of India's "influence in the Third World and elsewhere."