

Defense plan repeats Acheson's blunders

by Kathleen Klenetsky

A new national defense guidance, signed by Defense Secretary Richard Cheney and intended to shape American strategic policy from 1992-97, brings the United States perilously close to repeating the insanity which led to the Korean War.

No one will soon forget the infamous pronouncement, delivered by Secretary of State Dean Acheson in January 1950, that excluded Korea and Formosa from the American "defense perimeter" in Asia. This statement was interpreted to mean that the United States would not come to these countries' defense in the event they were attacked by communist powers. Six months later, the North Koreans accepted Acheson's invitation, launching the war against the South, which was eventually to cost 2.5 million lives, increase the political and military clout of the People's Republic of China, and leave the United States with a strategic black eye.

Yet the new defense guidance shows that the Bush administration has decided to ignore the lessons of Korea, or worse, to draw the wrong ones.

As reported by news leaks in the *Washington Post* and other news outlets in early February, the 28-page classified document draws the U.S. defense perimeter so narrowly, that areas of absolutely crucial strategic significance are to be totally abandoned. The guidance attempts to justify this, by invoking the now-standard Bush administration line that the Soviet Union no longer represents a significant military threat, and, thus, the United States no longer needs to project its military power to anywhere near the same extent that it has since the end of World War II.

The Defense Policy Guidance goes hand-in-glove with the defense budget which Cheney presented to Congress in January. The first budget prepared entirely by the Bush administration projects a continuous decline in defense spending through 1994, at which point there will have been a full 25% reduction in the size of U.S. military forces and spending from the levels reached in 1985. The budget represents a cut of \$231 billion from the spending levels envisaged for 1990 by the Reagan administration.

Handing Iran to Moscow

One of the document's most startling features, is its instructions to U.S. military leaders to drop longstanding U.S.

contingency plans to defend Iran in the event of a Soviet invasion. The guidance states that the United States would continue to "consider the contingency of the Soviet attack into Iran," but would no longer make the "large investments to support forces in Iran."

A senior defense official quoted in the press explained this decision, on the grounds that Iran's intensely anti-American regime makes it unrealistic to assume U.S. forces would deploy there in a U.S.-Soviet crisis. Further, the official revealed that Pentagon experts had concluded that the threat of a Soviet drive through the Persian Gulf oilfields was "not credible."

The guidance's treatment of Iran graphically underscores the fundamental lunacy of its overall approach. With the violent eruptions in the Baku region over the past two months, and the collapse of the Soviet economy, it has become increasingly apparent to observers—at least those not blinded by the need to toe the Bush line about a diminished Soviet threat—that the danger of a Soviet invasion of Iran is actually greater now than perhaps at any point in the past.

Iran and its oilfields are not the only areas to be handed over, under the new strategic outlook. The guidance concludes that the United States might have to give up its bases in the Philippines, and reportedly instructs the military to start considering Singapore and other places for new Pacific bases, and to plan for forces of greater range to compensate for withdrawal from the Philippines.

The document also lays the basis for the withdrawal of at least some American forces from South Korea and Japan, stating that it assumes these two countries would take greater responsibility for their own defense, implying at least a partial withdrawal of U.S. forces from these areas as well. A separate Pacific strategy plan under preparation at the Pentagon, reportedly recommends that the United States pull out 10-12% of its military forces from the Philippines, Japan, and South Korea over the next three years.

Western Europe, too, finds itself outside the U.S. defense perimeter under the new planning document. Assuming the successful negotiation and implementation of a conventional arms reduction treaty, the guidance directs the services to draw up plans through 1997 for significant reductions in U.S. military deployments in Europe.

Again, the document chooses to believe that the economic and political crises in the Soviet Union will negate military adventurism, ignoring the historical evidence that crises more often than not impel empires to loot their neighbors to stave off collapse. The United States can afford to reduce its conventional arms in Europe, at "acceptable level of risk," because of the "fundamental transformation of the Warsaw Pact," the document insists, arguing further that "non-Soviet elements of the Warsaw Pact would cease to have very much offensive military capability against Western Europe" because of political developments in the bloc.

One of the most egregious aspects of the report lies in its treatment of the Strategic Defense Initiative. Contrary to media hype that the *relatively* large budget allocated to the Strategic Defense Initiative in the FY1991 military spending plan proves that the Bush administration is committed to the program, the Cheney guidance calls for the SDI to be seen primarily as a defense against the development of nuclear weapons by Third World countries, and not as the single-most important element in the U.S.-Soviet strategic equation. This view conforms entirely with the ALPS (Accidental Launch Protection System) proposal cooked up by Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) as a means of deemphasizing and downgrading the SDI, and favored by key administration officials, including National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft.

Trotskyite defense

The Cheney document not only reflects the continued commitment on the part of the Bush administration to the global condominium with Moscow. It also illustrates the extent to which "Chekist" elements have penetrated the U.S. defense establishment.

The guidance de facto implements the recommendations of the "Discriminate Deterrence" report, issued in January 1988. It is the product of a high-level policy planning task force headed by then-Undersecretary of Defense Fred Iklé, and outside consultant Albert Wohlstetter, a "former" Trotskyist who has wielded great influence over the shaping of U.S. strategic doctrine during the past three decades.

The Iklé-Wohlstetter report foreshadowed Cheney's Defense Policy Guidance in its insistence that the United States should reorient its strategic posture away from facing down possible Soviet military strikes, toward fighting regional wars in Third World hot-spots. A key recommendation of the Cheney document is that the United States put major emphasis on beefing up special operations forces for use in Third World conflicts.

Iklé recently acknowledged to a journalist that the defense guidance mirrors "Discriminate Deterrence" in many important respects. "The entire concept of downgrading the threat from the Warsaw Pact that is being implemented through arms control negotiations and Secretary Cheney's new Defense Policy Guidance, can be traced back to the 'Discriminate Deterrence' report," he said. "Every element of that report with regard to diminishing the priority for the defense of Western Europe has been true.

"Another aspect of the report that is being implemented has been the necessity to prepare for wars in the Third World."

Asked whether the recent invasion of Panama was the sort of war envisioned by the report, Dr. Iklé said: "Yes, the question of the need to prepare for war in the Third World was elaborated in follow-on reports to 'Discriminate Deterrence' that were prepared by the same team. Panama is an example of what we were talking about."

CIA-KGB in 'New Age' of collaboration

In mid-January, John Marks, the guru of the New Age outfit Search for Common Ground, showed up in Moscow to push a pet project: KGB-CIA collusion.

Marks, a former State Department intelligence aide to ex-CIA figure Ray Cline, has gone through more changes in identity than Liz Taylor has husbands. After co-authoring one scathingly anti-CIA book with Victor Marchetti, Marks penned his own exposé of CIA brainwashing experiments, *The Search for the Manchurian Candidate*. According to former associates, Marks then went through a mind conversion and became a devotee of Werner Erhart's New Age psychoanalytic sect, est. He no longer likes to talk about his research into the CIA's mind control efforts. Some ex-colleagues speculate that he now works for the Agency.

During a Jan. 31 Radio Moscow broadcast, Marks said his efforts at bringing the CIA and the KGB together have a "two-year history with the blessings of the two governments." His January visit, like earlier treks to Moscow, was sponsored by Search for Common Ground, a New Age outfit founded by Marks himself which enjoys the financial backing of the Esalen Institute and an Esalen spinoff called Soviet-American Dialogue. The latter group, housed in Bellevue, Washington, publishes a quarterly journal called *Glasnost* and has more or less supplanted the Communist Party U.S.A. in sponsoring "anniversary tours" of the Soviet Union.

In February 1988, Soviet-American Dialogue hosted over 100 Soviet citizens for a conference in Alexandria, Virginia at which Marks's Search for Common Ground was prominently featured. One Soviet participant, the head of the Soviet Peace Council and the brother-in-law of KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov, carried with him a personal message of greeting from Mikhail Gorbachov.

According to one of its founders, the Soviet-American Dialogue grew out of the Soviet government's efforts to thwart President Ronald Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, announced on March 23, 1983. Not two months later, 24 top Soviet propagandists led by *Literaturnaya Gazeta* editor and Yuri Andropov publicist Fyodor Burlatsky came to Minneapolis, to join with an equal number of American pacifists and New Age activists led by Bishop Paul Moore of the Episcopal Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York to plot out the anti-SDI campaign.

Marks told Radio Moscow: "We are looking for ways for the U.S. and Soviets to cooperate, particularly in areas where there have been a lot of adversarial relationships. Terrorism is one of the prime areas. While it can't be prevented, ways should be found to turn terrorism into a 'shared problem' between the two superpowers."—*Jeffrey Steinberg*