

Air Force General On ABM

Soviet Technology '20 Years Ahead Of U.S.'

In an impassioned speech to a group of Washington newsmen delivered under the auspices of the American Security Council, Major General George J. Keegan, Jr. (U.S. Air Force Ret.) gave an honest professional assessment of the present strategic situation: "The Soviets on a war-winning philosophy... are 20 years ahead of the United States in its development of a technology (e.g., fusion and laser — ed.) which they believe will soon neutralize the ballistic missile weapon... They are now testing this technology..."

"The intelligence community was consistently wrong in its estimate of the development of broad-based Soviet science..." Keegan continued. "When people talk about technological superiority in this country, they are talking about potential and futures that have not yet been bought and paid for, distributed and manufactured and deployed to our forces... I object to the failure to observe the normal checks and balances, of letting the public know, letting the leaders know, letting the press know, and letting the full range of uncertainties be in the open — lest we make the kind of mistakes that have gotten us into every war this country has ever been in."

General Keegan's remarks, which were reprinted in the defense industry-linked Aviation Week magazine on March 28, contrast utterly with the viewpoint publicized last week by spokesmen for the Committee on the Present Danger (CPD) — a Trilateral Commission front organized by the Rockefeller bankers for the purpose of containing and manipulating pro-development military professionals, industrialists, and labor leaders. CPD spokesmen, including banker-turned-arms negotiator Paul Nitze, monetarist professor Richard Pipes, Carter energy czar James Schlesinger (a CPD founder, though not an official member) and Rockefeller Admiral Elmo Zumwalt, all denied the existence of a U.S. strategic disadvantage vis-à-vis the Soviet Union, while defending the Carter Administration's "technological disarmament" SALT package, and enthusiastically boosting the Carter-Ford Foundation deindustrialization program that mandates the sabotage of the development of fusion technology as well as a ban on plutonium use.

In fact, Keegan's statement confirms that the CPD circle is cracking apart over just this issue. Nitze and Pipes — as well as Keegan — had been members of "Team B," a group of "outsiders" brought in by the CIA last year to make an allegedly independent analysis of America's strategic situation. Team B's subsequent warnings have been the basis for the CPD's propaganda for the need for a massive U.S. arms push and confrontation with the Warsaw Pact.

Keegan's report demonstrates that both Team B and the CPD were hybrids from the start, containing on one side Wall Street stalwarts ready to send the country on

the road to national suicide, and, on the other, professionals like Keegan who commonsensically understood that the Soviets were indeed pulling ahead and, therefore, confrontation meant the end of the U.S. The latter are now seeking forums outside the CPD.

CPD Monetarists Blow Cover

The collapse of the SALT talks and the announcement of the Carter Administration's de-energization program has forced the monetarist debt collectors who have been masquerading as patriots in the CPD and Team B to blow their cover. On April 3 the CPD Executive Committee — whose members include Chase Manhattan Corporation director David Packard, Goldman Sachs partner Henry H. Fowler, Warburg banking family lawyer Rita E. Hauser, former Rockefeller Foundation president Dean Rusk; Trilateral Commissioner and AFL-CIO Secretary Treasurer Lane Kirkland, Social Democrats-USA official Eugene V. Rostow, ex-officio Schlesinger, and others besides, Nitze, Pipes and Zumwalt — issued statements and an 11-page report revealing their commitment to a policy of technological disarmament and worldwide deindustrialization, preferably with Soviet cooperation, and their determination to continue on a nuclear confrontationist collision course.

The Executive Committee's psychotic pronouncements are in direct contradiction with the publicly stated pro-growth positions of many of its members including scientist Edward Teller and building trades official Martin J. Ward, as well as industrialists and military men associated with the American Security Council who have been within the CPD's orbit.

In presenting the report at a Washington news conference, "cheap trick" artist Paul Nitze telegraphed the fact that the CPD executive was involved in the formulation of Trilateraloid Zbigniew Brzezinski's and Cyrus Vance's insane "technological disarmament" SALT proposal to the Soviets. Nitze lied that the Soviet Union rejected the Carter Administration's arms limitation proposal in Moscow last week "because it is an equitable deal, and that's what they don't want." The Carter proposal, amongst other things, demanded a ban on the development of advanced technologies and an agreement to sabotage nuclear energy development for Europe and the Third World under the cover of "nuclear non-proliferation."

Black Propaganda

To manipulate industrialists, trade unionists, and military leaders into support for this "disarmament,"-covered end to technology, the CPD Executive report "warns" about a "grand strategy" by a Soviet "expansionist empire" to "reduce any potential opponent's abi-

lity to resist." The black propaganda report specifically assails "the multiplying and tightening of links connecting Western Europe to the Soviet Union and its dependencies," "the strengthening of the Soviet economy through a process of intensive modernization... achieved in part by heavy borrowing of capital and technology in the advanced 'capitalist' countries," and alleged Soviet "undercutting of the economic links connecting the 'capitalist' world, and especially the United States, from the countries of the Third World."

The CPD in its Executive report also denies the existence of a Soviet strategic military advantage — in telling contradiction with their claims of last year when the organization was first founded — sneakily asserting that "the experts disagree as to whether the Soviet Union is already ahead of the United States in military strength either overall or in particular theaters." This Rockefeller cover-up is designed to justify and prepare a possible "first-strike-from weakness" attack — a fact tipped off by the CPD's hysterical statement that "should the Soviets eventually succeed in isolating the United States from its allies in the Third World, the United States would be less likely, in a major crisis, to lash out with strategic nuclear weapons, in a desperate attempt to escape subjugation."

Council on Foreign Relations Admiral and CIA

Director Stansfield Turner echoed this nonsense line in an interview with the New York Times on April 6. Turner, after comparing the industrial-based USSR to 19th century Czarist Russia, observed that "he does not believe that the Russians have yet attained nuclear weapons parity with the United States..." but "sees a gradual erosion in the military balance between the United States and the Soviet Union," and "does not believe that the United States is required to institute a military (technological — ed.) program to meet the Soviet challenge, but should devote resources and attention to problems raised by Soviet military (economic and technological — ed.) expansion."

There are, however, strong indications that military Clausewitzians, committed to the defense of the U.S. national interests, are not going to accept a Trilateral commission "military analysis" which demands the end to industrial progress. General Keegan closed his recent speech with a blast against the technological disarmament and deindustrialization policies being pursued by the otherwise unnamed Trilateral Commission-Carter Administration. Sighting this country's "creative genius, great wealth, and its unmatched industrial know-how," Keegan rips into the philosophy underlying such policies as "an odious and foreign doctrine, ignorant of the traditions under which this country was built, and how its forests were cleared, and its industry set up."

Gen. Keegan: U.S. Underestimates Soviet Technology

The following are remarks made by Major General George J. Keegan, Jr. to a group of newsmen recently, under the auspices of the American Security Council, and subsequently printed in Aviation Week magazine. General Keegan's assessments of Soviet military strength are perhaps the most accurate which have been publicly issued from the U.S. intelligence community.

Maj. General Keegan retired as assistant chief of staff of U.S. Air Force intelligence on January 1, 1977, after a 34-year career in the military. He is currently executive vice-president of the United States Strategic Institute in Washington, D.C.

Today I speak as a private citizen expressing my own personal views regarding the Soviet threat and the evolving world power balance. It is very difficult for a member of the military establishment to serve that establishment for better than 30 years, to work in harness with it to weigh what has transpired on his watch and, upon retirement, render public judgment about the adequacy of the Establishment's perceptions of our most serious national security problems.

It has been my unbroken experience that the (intelligence) community has been wrong about assessing Soviet intentions — granted that that is a very elaborate, complex and Byzantine art. The (intelligence) community has consistently been wrong about its judgments

to the national leadership on whether the Soviets were pursuing superiority, whether they could afford to do so, or whether they could in fact pursue such superiority.

Now as to the unfortunate question of who is No. 1 and who is not, and the unfortunate use of the loose language associated with superiority, I think the United States is superior in only one major area, and that is in its ability to respond quickly and efficiently to a nuclear initiative by the Soviet Union. And that's where it stops.

What the Soviets have evolved today, in my judgment, is a set of forces structured to a totally different strategic philosophy than our own. All U.S. strategic forces, in contrast, have been premised on a view that nuclear war was so horrible that it could not be contemplated in any rational environment and, therefore, for 20 years or so our philosophy has been that we must deter.

Nuclear war must be avoided at all costs. I have no quarrel with that strategy except that I am unaware in 20 years of a serious-minded scholarly, in-depth attempt to determine what it requires to deter.

All you have to read is Soviet Marshall V.D. Sokolovsky's book *Military Strategy*, now in its third edition. It's all there. But when the first edition appeared, high officials of this government — and I know because I was there — went to considerable extremes to try to obscure the thrust of that book and the thrust of its impact on thinking people for fear that it might hurt the evolving American strategy — as conceived under Mr. Mc-

Namara and others in the Kennedy Administration. And I'm not going to make any more comments or answer any questions on that allegation, because I don't want to get into a "names-contest."

But I was there and it happened. And it goes on to this day....Now what do I believe about relative Soviet fighting capabilities? In my considered judgment, the Soviet Union today has a capability to initiate, wage, survive and emerge from a global conflict with a far greater effectiveness than the United States and its allies. That is not to say that if we retaliated in a timely fashion to a Soviet initiative, which I don't anticipate, certainly not now, there is no question that the Soviet cities would be burned to the ground. When you here the phrase "they would cease functioning as a viable society," I think that is an unstudied recalling of the language of the McNamara era. It is not based on an in-depth examination of the extraordinary changes which have taken place in the Soviet Union during the past decade.

...All I can say is that there is no way that you can conceivably come to grips with the Soviet Union and understand what is transpiring unless you do it from the Soviet point of view, and it was to break that unfortunate habit that Air Force intelligence moved to obtain the original Soviet writings, to translate and make them available to the American public.

...When you estimate today you estimate against a country that has reached our own industrial stature, that has now reached our level of scientific competence, but that is thought backward in turning out the quality of hardware.

Now what are the facts? Very simply, the Soviets upon their determination that a nation could be made survivable undertook the greatest war survival-civil defense program in history. Bear in mind this is a country that lost half of its cities in World War II, lost between 20 million and 40 million people killed or wounded, and whose leaders destroyed some 20 million to 42 million of their own people in a succession of purges. These are a very tough people.

The United States today lacks the firepower, lacks the accuracy and lacks the yields to overcome the enormous advantage in terms of neutralizing our retaliatory punch which the Soviets have engineered for themselves at great cost.

Now, on force levels, what concerns me most in the tactical area has been the continued assertion that we can defend NATO. I won't go into and belabor the psychological points there. I think I have devoted as much time as any individual in the government of the United States to the study of Soviet literature, in the study of their exercises and in the monitoring of the development and improvement of their Warsaw Pact forces.

I find that there was a very distinctive change in Soviet strategy which occurred prior to 1970 in the NATO-Warsaw Pact area.

Rather than bore you with the details, I'll just simply express my judgment: I think that a Soviet war planner today, in the Warsaw Pact, given the forces, the capabilities, the combined arms doctrines...would have every reason for believing that he could take Europe by force of arms, with a minimum of fighting, in 24-36 hours, with or without the use of nuclear weapons. That's the posture that they have been placing themselves in. But we have a mind set. We have a diplomacy. We have had a policy and our estimates have tended to lag along in the same mental context...

...I object to the failure to observe the normal checks and balances, of letting the public know, letting the leaders know, letting the press know and letting the full range of uncertainties be in the open — lest we make the kind of mistakes that have gotten us into every war this country has ever been in...

Finally, you're aware of something through some newspaper accounts of the last few weeks that I'm really not at liberty to expand upon. But let me lay it out for you. The Soviet Union, irrespective of what any scientist in this country tells you,...is 20 years ahead of the United States in its development of a technology which they believe will soon neutralize the ballistic missile weapon as a threat to the Soviet Union. It is my firm belief that they are now testing this technology. For five years the intelligence community has said: "No, Keegan, you're wrong. Our scientists say it isn't possible." Our scientists never really tried. Our scientist haven't done the basic research. It was left to my little organization to undertake the most advanced basic research, or sponsor it, since the development of the A-bomb, to prove to these people in our community that what the Soviets have been writing about for 15 years they are in fact able to do and are doing. And I submit that the Soviets, on the basis of what I have examined, have every expectation that well before 1980, if they don't blow themselves up — and they may — will perceive that they have technically and scientifically solved the problem of the ballistic missile threat.

My last word before you throw me out of here is I'd like to caution that we do have great strengths in this country and that we're not on the edge of the abyss. But because of the failure in our perceptions, I think that a global conflict is now in gestation. Sometime in the future such a conflict is more likely than not to occur. I think the Soviets believe that principally because of what they are doing. Now we don't have to stand this country on its head to avert another mindless and needless holocaust. We are dedicated to preventing that, but we are not doing what we should.