

is that the new board would have much more clout than the already suspect FEMA operation, which was notorious for botching the crisis-management of various "emergencies" under the Carter administration. FEMA would remain, according to the current thinking, as a coordinating agency for the mobilization board.

There are two basic concepts that lie beneath Weinberger's emergency board plan. Despite what the gullible Reagan has been told, neither has anything really to do with an actual improvement in U.S. defense capabilities. Weinberger has no real intention of adding to the industrial base, or strengthening the economy. By supporting the Volcker policies, he is guaranteeing, in short order, a collapse of U.S. industry. In this context, what his proposal amounts to is the kind of military buildup that was carried out by Adolf Hitler—a buildup based upon the looting of the civilian base of the economy under conditions of austerity collapse.

What the currently proposed board would do is preside over the militarization of a shrunken, overall U.S. economy. This is confirmed by statements from a leading defense expert and consultant to the Defense Department, who spoke of the large amounts of idled capacity: "We do not need to open up new industry, but to get alternative suppliers. . . . The manpower question is the most important one. We could take people from the auto industry to defense. But we need a coordinated plan."

The only type of defense buildup possible under these conditions is the Hitler type of "quick fix." Hence the proposals in the Weinberger secret policy guidance that call for the development of first-strike capabilities and limited nuclear war-fighting.

That policy guidance, as described below, is based primarily on bluff, backed by the threat to take insane actions. From this standpoint, a mobilization board, with its near dictatorial powers can forward the bluff by expressing a determination to carry out a Nazi-type buildup.

But that is only one purpose of the plan. As Volcker's policies send the United States toward a depression collapse, the emergency board will serve as the seed crystal for the institutions that will be required to impose order by dictatorial decree. Weinberger's backing of the Volcker policies, under orders from the Bank for International Settlements, betrays his support for economic tyranny.

Because of the political considerations involved in the implementation of the emergency board scheme, there will be time between the carrying out of the first planning phases and creation of the board itself, and the invocation of the Defense Production Act: the reaction of the American population and its elected leaders to this threatened end of constitutional rule will be decisive in determining whether the plan succeeds.

DOD's gameplan for limited nuclear war

by Lonnie Wolfe

The military doctrine that stands behind the creation of the Emergency Mobilization Board is contained in the so-called secret policy guidance prepared by the Weinberger Defense Department and leaked to the *Washington Post* and other media last month. It has been augmented by annexes prepared by the chiefs of the military services and submitted Aug. 15.

Evaluation of available published materials on the guidance and interviews conducted with relevant officials informed of its contents, reveals that it is premised on two basic assumptions.

First, the *most likely* war-fighting situation to develop against the Soviet adversary will be a protracted conventional or limited nuclear war, probably confined to the European or Southwest Asian theater, e.g. Iran. Priority is therefore placed on the development of limited nuclear capacities to implement the Carter administration's war-fighting and targeting directive, PD-59.

To a competent military professional, a comparison of in-depth U.S. war-fighting strength with the Soviet/Warsaw Pact forces would show that there is currently *no* actual situation in which "our side" wins against the vastly superior in-depth Warsaw Pact capabilities. As we have stated in earlier installments of this series, the only effective remedy for this situation would be an in-depth buildup of U.S. military and NATO forces. There is no way to accomplish this, if the U.S. adheres to Bank of International Settlements (BIS) austerity dictates. But Weinberger and his policy planners, like the Swiss-born Fred Iklé, are working according to BIS guidelines.

Despite the attempts of the press to term what Weinberger has proposed in the guidance a "military buildup," it is in fact nothing more than an expensive quick fix, emphasizing limited nuclear war capabilities. The guidance, therefore gives highest priority for the deployment of the Pershing II and cruise missiles on European soil, while showing U.S. resolve to use them at the slightest provocation. Similar weapons systems, dubbed theater nuclear forces and more accurately identified as potential first-strike systems by the Soviets, are to be stationed in the Pacific and Southwest Asia.

The implicit threat behind all this is that the United States will use its nuclear weapons *first*. This has been confirmed by nervous Defense Department officials who report that there is a new official response to any queries about potential U.S. first use of nuclear weapons. Instead of the usual “no comment” or outright denial, the response is now to emphasize that the United States reserves the right to respond to any given situation as it sees fit and will not rule out first use of nuclear weapons.

Underlying the policy guidance is the idea that the Soviets can somehow be terrorized into not deploying and using their superior in-depth military capabilities.

The second emphasis in both the guidance and the policy annexes is a commitment to fight a series of wars below the nuclear threshold, specifically in the developing sector. These wars will be handled through the Rapid Deployment Force (RDF) or through heavily armed surrogates. This coheres with a vision of the U.S. military as an “umpire” for population wars of the type proposed by former Army Chief of Staff Gen. Maxwell Taylor. It is identical to the role of the British Colonial Army or

Hitler’s Waffen SS.

The Defense Department assumes that the most probable war-fighting situation will develop in the Third World—another correlative of subordinating U.S. policy interests to those of the BIS and International Monetary Fund, whose economic programs predetermine crisis situations in the developing sector. Again, this part of the Weinberger doctrine is premised on scenarios which deny that the Soviets *will ever* deploy their military capabilities to prevent population butchery.

Military professionals, who of late have a sickening feeling of *déjà vu*, say that the so-called RAND boys are in full control of the U.S. defense establishment. The thinking in the policy guidance, they say, is vintage Robert McNamara or James Schlesinger, the two defense secretaries who epitomized the worst aspects of what is properly called utopian thinking. Schlesinger in particular developed this flight from reality into a rigorous defense doctrine, based upon bluff and the projection of a mere “aura of power,” not real power. Weinberger, Iklé et al. are well along that same dangerous road.

A summary of the policy guidance

The following is excerpted from an article in the Aug. 8 issue of Aviation Week on the Weinberger policy guidance. Various sources, including those in the Defense Department, have attested to the accuracy of what is quoted below.

The [Weinberger] strategy sets specific defense policies that include:

- Establishing links among regions of the world, making it clear to the U.S.S.R., that initiating action in any one area or theater “may well lead to war elsewhere to their detriment.” This policy includes . . . greater involvement by individual allied nations in regions not necessarily on their own borders.
- Directing attention to regional threats—radical hostile threats influencing key areas such as the Caribbean, South America, and the Mediterranean littoral. While American forces may not be involved directly short of an all-out war, the policy guidance provides for the reduction and elimination of these threats to stability. . . .
- Providing access for the U.S. to minerals and other raw materials vital to the national interest

through the use of military forces if necessary. . . .

Modernization and force expansion also will be weighted against readiness and sustainability.

An important factor in the Reagan military strategy is to counter the Soviets’ strategy by attacking their vulnerabilities, “rather than attempting to match them tit-for-tat.” To accomplish this the Defense Department will identify and categorize the points of Soviet weakness and develop strategy and forces to take advantage of that weakness. . . .

The Reagan strategy calls for land- and sea-based theater nuclear forces to serve as the essential link between conventional and strategic forces. The Defense Department will integrate theater nuclear forces into U.S. strategy and “our resolve to employ these forces must be made readily apparent to make conventional aggression less likely—especially in light of the traditional Warsaw Pact preponderance of conventional forces,” the administration policy said. It calls for a theater nuclear force war-fighting capability in support of NATO, the Pacific and Southwest Asian areas sufficient to place at risk a wide range of Soviet theater forces and to allow the U.S. to escalate conflict deliberately to America’s advantage.

The defense strategy gives the highest priority to fully implementing the deployment of the Martin Marietta Pershing II and the General Dynamics ground-launched cruise missile weapons system with U.S. forces in NATO countries, beginning in 1983.