

## Weinberger gets tough on defense budget cutters

by Kathleen Klenetsky

Faced with one of the most concerted assaults on American military capabilities in recent history, Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger is throwing protocol to the winds in his battle to keep United States military spending at levels adequate to meet what anyone but liars and fools knows to be a prewar deployment on the part of the Soviet Union.

After weeks of listening to the media, Democrats, Wall Street bankers, and Kissinger's moles on Capitol Hill loudly insisting that the Pentagon budget be gouged, Weinberger has launched a public counterattack which threatens to expose the whole "we must cut defense spending in order to balance the budget" line for the unilateral disarmament policy that it is.

Although Weinberger's tough stand has caught the anti-defense zealots up short, they have by no means surrendered. Far from it. Capitol Hill sources report that congressional advocates of deep defense cuts are collaborating even more closely with the White House Palace Guard to come up with new tactics to force the President to slash military spending and put his Strategic Defense Initiative on ice. An aide to Sen. Charles Mathias (R-Md.), a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, confidently predicted on Dec. 14 that "no matter what Weinberger says, Congress is going to roll back military spending and take apart the SDI."

Exactly how to do this was the major focus of a high-level meeting at the Aspen Institute's Wye Plantation Dec. 14-16. There, *EIR* learned, a select group of Eastern Establishment policymakers, including Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.), Rep. Les Aspin (D-Wisc.), Kissinger clones William Hyland and Gen. Brent Scowcroft, and anti-beam weapon "scien-

tists" Paul Doty and Sidney Drell, conferred on how to deal with the "Weinberger problem."

The Pentagon chief took the gloves off shortly after returning to Washington from a trip to Europe and the Middle East earlier this month. Following a carefully orchestrated "leak" which appeared in most major media on Dec. 13—claiming that during a meeting on the defense budget the day before, he had proposed to the President that military pay hikes be frozen—an angry Weinberger called a press conference to denounce the report as "totally false." "There is no proposal for anything that was made by me that would in any way break the faith that we have with respect to adequate pay for the troops." He stressed that a pay freeze would have an intolerable effect on military morale.

Mincing no words, Weinberger went on to charge that the pay-freeze proposal had emanated from "others who are unenlightened." "The idea of being unfair to the troops is certainly no proposal of mine or no proposal of the President."

Weinberger's statement is by no means the last shot either side will fire in the current wrangle over defense spending—probably the most intensely fought battle in the history of the Reagan presidency. But it does indicate that the Defense Secretary—whose strong pro-defense policies in general and outspoken advocacy of the SDI in particular have made him a top target of the Eastern Establishment's arms-control mafia—is prepared to put up a heck of a fight to protect America's ability to deter an enemy attack. As UPI commented, "It is rare for Weinberger to go public with such criticism."

In fact, while Weinberger has hinted he may agree to minor reductions in the Pentagon's estimated \$324.8 billion

budget request for fiscal year 1986, he is also putting out the word that sharp increases in defense spending will be necessary over the next several years to match the Soviets' massive military buildup.

In an interview with the *Newhouse* newspaper chain Dec. 11 which must have provoked numerous behind-closed-door fits in various Washington power centers, Weinberger declared that previous projections indicating that U.S. defense spending could level off in 1987 no longer held. Instead, said Weinberger, earlier cuts in the defense budget and continued growth in Soviet military power, mean that hefty increases in the Pentagon budget will be required through the end of the decade. "The threat is going up," he said. "The Soviets have publicly increased their defense budget [by 12%—ed.] for the first time in nine years," and are involved in an unprecedented buildup of strategic and conventional weaponry. "I don't know how much time we have."

Weinberger insisted that implementing further defense cuts now would put the nation at risk, and would specifically endanger efforts to field new Trident ballistic missiles submarines, the B-1 bomber, the MX missile, and other strategic weapons systems. Those weapons, together with the administration's crash research program to develop space-based missile defenses, are the core of the American strategic modernization program, Weinberger stressed, and are essential to regain "the defensive, deterrent strength" that was eroded during the 1970s.

Weinberger also emphasized that delaying spending would actually be less efficient and ultimately more costly—a nice piece of table-turning against "cost-benefit" nuts like Stockman.

## Rallying the population

Weinberger made one other extremely crucial point in the interview—the role played by the American public in determining the future of the country's preparedness. "We've got the technology, we've got the means, we can afford it," he said. "But we can't do anything—one shouldn't do anything in a democracy—unless people are strongly supportive of it. And that support is hard to maintain." He also stressed that the Soviet Union is "doing everything it can" to undermine U.S. public support for defense spending, raising the possibility that "the Soviets can prevail simply by, in effect, talking us into reductions" in the military budget.

Weinberger's point is absolutely on target. Whether the Soviet Union actually decides to launch a showdown with the United States—a very live and immediate possibility—will in large part depend on who wins the fight for the mind of the American population: the appeasement gang, operating from the Council on Foreign Relations and other Eastern elite policymaking institutions through their minions in the media, in Congress and the administration, whose central focus right now is to force Reagan to abandon his Strategic

Defense Initiative; or the supporters of beam-defense and Mutually Assured Survival.

The former are using every trick in the book to win their objective. Secretary of State George Shultz, a longtime friend and political collaborator of Kissinger, is working overtime to sabotage the SDI. Although instructed by President Reagan in early December that the only negotiable aspect of the SDI is whether the Soviets will accept the American offer to share the fruits of its research on space defense, Shultz is reportedly planning to offer significant concessions when he meets with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko in Geneva Jan. 7-8. According to a State Department-leaked article in the Dec. 9 *Boston Globe*, the mouthpiece of the Boston Brahmin establishment, the U.S. delegation will be prepared to tell the Soviets that over the next three years, the United States will not test new "Star Wars" space-defense systems that in any way violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty negotiated by Henry Kissinger in 1972. This assurance, the *Globe* claims, will be stressed by Shultz at the Geneva talks.

This treasonous sentiment is being echoed and re-echoed by such leading Kissingerians as Gen. Brent Scowcroft, a director of Kissinger Associates, and the Council on Foreign Relations' William Hyland, formerly a Kissinger trainee on the National Security Council, who gave a series of background briefings in mid-December recommending "cosmetic agreements" be arranged with the U.S.S.R. on arms control to slow development of the SDI.

Kissinger himself, appearing on the Dec. 10 ABC-TV Nightline show together with Soviet envoy Georgii Arbatov of the U.S.A.-Canada Institute, called on the United States and Soviets to reduce "offensive and defensive systems."

Shultz, meanwhile, has sufficiently recovered from the broadside which Weinberger delivered against him and the State Department in late November (see *EIR*, Dec. 18, 1984) to take some personal potshots at the Defense Secretary. In London Dec. 11 for meetings with British Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe prior to the NATO Foreign Ministers meeting in Brussels, Shultz declared that the U.S. must launch a policy of "active defense" measures against terrorism, including "preventive action." Shultz's speech, a replay of one he had delivered a few days earlier in New York at an affair in honor of Israeli Foreign Minister Yitzhak Shamir, represented a direct challenge to Weinberger, who has repeatedly warned against adopting this kind of flight-forward, knee-jerk approach to terrorism.

Shultz's address was hailed by syndicated columnist Joe Kraft, a Kissinger mouthpiece, as a sure sign that the secretary of state "is on the offensive in the bureaucratic warfare that lies at the heart of the American government." Kraft went on to gloat that Shultz "plans to conduct most of the arms control negotiations [in Geneva] himself" and will delegate responsibility only to State Department underlings, thus freezing out the representatives from the Defense De-

partment, CIA, and Joint Chiefs of Staff whom Reagan has assigned to the negotiating team.

Signals like this can only reinforce the Soviets' determination to force Reagan to back off from "Star Wars." Indeed, on the same day the *Globe* leak appeared, the London Sunday Times reported that the Soviets have already indicated that short of a moratorium on the U.S. SDI, they will walk out of the Geneva talks—even if the Reagan administration offers joint beam-weapon development.

### Treachery on the Hill

Moscow's imperial ambitions are also fed by Shultz's and Kissinger's moles in Congress—particularly key Republicans—who have been deploying according to Kissinger's personal prescription for wrecking the SDI: getting Congress to "whittle it away" through cuts in the Pentagon budget.

Sen. Robert Dole (R-Kan.), who was elected to the powerful post of Senate Majority Leader with the backing of White House chief of staff Jim Baker and the rest of his Palace Guard, has organized an open revolt against the President and Weinberger over the military budget. Dole's latest public statement on the issue came in an interview on Dec. 9 on the Good Morning America television program, where he insisted that "substantial reductions" must be made in the Pentagon budget. "Defense spending's going to be right in the mix," Dole declared. "We're not going to be able to pass a spending restraint program without substantial reductions in defense spending."

Members of Kissinger's entourage on the Hill are employing other tactics to pressure the President. Appearing on national television Dec. 9, Indiana Republican Sen. Richard Lugar, the prospective new head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, announced he will conduct a sweeping review of American foreign policy to develop the framework for a "bipartisan foreign policy." The Senator plans to hold a series of highly publicized hearings this winter, with Henry Kissinger, Carter-era National Security Council head Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Carter-era U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance as key witnesses.

At the same time, four prominent senators—John Chafee (R-R.I.), John Heinz (R-Pa.), Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.), and Dale Bumpers (D-Ark.)—sent a letter to President Reagan Dec. 10 calling on him to adhere to a "policy of interim restraint," specifically by complying with the terms of all U.S.-Soviet arms control treaties, including the unratified SALT II.

"An early commitment by both sides to refrain from undercutting existing agreements could provide a positive atmosphere for subsequent talks," the letter said. "Undercutting existing agreements" is the key-and-code from Kissinger Associates to attack President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative as in violation of Kissinger's 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. An aide to Heinz told a caller today that this letter represents a "significant bipartisan effort on an impor-

tant issue."

Judging by their records, what Heinz and his co-signers mean by "bipartisan" is that the Soviet Communist Party should be given an equal say in determining U.S. strategic policy. Scion of the Pittsburgh Heinz family empire in the United States, famous for Heinz baked beans and ketchup, Heinz also heads the American branch of the elite, secretive Bilderberg Society, whose "bipartisan" membership roster includes both Henry Kissinger and Walter Mondale. Chafee is a representative of appeasers among Rhode Island's British-linked naval intelligence circles. Bumpers's wife is one of the leading organizers of the KGB-run "Peace Links" chapter of the Nuclear Freeze movement, and Leahy is a leading advocate of unilateral disarmament.

### Reagan holding firm

Despite this barrage, President Reagan has not buckled under to the Kissinger crowd, either on the SDI issue or on the question of military spending cuts. The West German conservative daily *Die Welt* reports from Washington Dec. 10: "Washington is drawing the line against concessions in talks with Moscow," particularly refusing to use the SDI as a "bargaining chip"—against the advice of George Shultz.

The President, after wavering on the Pentagon budget while Weinberger was out of the country, has now reverted to his original position, namely, that no final decisions have been taken on whether cuts will be made. NBC News reported Dec. 13 that White House budget cutters are convinced that Reagan has lined up with his Defense Secretary, and are "so discouraged they decided not to meet again with Reagan for the time being." And commenting on Weinberger's Dec. 13 briefing, Reagan spokesman Larry Speakes said that the White House had no disagreement with the Defense Secretary's statements.

Perhaps more significant is the fact that after a private meeting with Weinberger Dec. 12, President Reagan has started to personally twist congressional arms. Reagan held a 30-minute conference at the White House with conservative Sen. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.), the new Armed Services Committee chairman who had publicly declared last week that he opposes the MX missile and thinks the Pentagon budget should be frozen. Reagan reportedly told Goldwater that he has every intention of fighting tooth and nail for the MX, stressing that "the program is essential to U.S. national security."

According to administration sources, the President has persuaded Goldwater to reconsider his opposition to the MX. Goldwater told reporters that he "would think about" reversing his opposition to the MX.

Whether Reagan does stick to his guns will ultimately depend, as Weinberger suggested, on whether the American population can be mobilized into an effective, organized political force on behalf of the SDI, and against Kissinger and the other Neville Chamberlains.