

## Harrimanites move to regain military policy control

by Graham Lowry

The command levels of the British oligarchy, working through the U.S. circles of Averell Harriman and Henry Kissinger, are mounting a furious counteroffensive against the new strategic defense doctrine announced by President Reagan on March 23. In concert with Soviet leader Yuri Andropov, the British and their allies in the United States are employing every available means to sabotage, delay, and ultimately overturn the President's policy.

The opposition is fully aware that the President's decision both repudiates the deadly Kissingerian crisis-management under the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD), and mandates a dramatic reindustrialization of America's economic power through revolutionary directed-energy and plasma technologies. In the face of that threatened defeat of Britain's long war of attrition and subversion against the power of the American nation-state, London has simply "gone bonkers."

*EIR* has uncovered some of the details of a secret meeting held in Britain the weekend of April 9 to plot out a multi-pronged attack against Reagan's decision to develop space-based beam weapons for missile defense. According to one source who attended the meeting, organized under the auspices of Britain's International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), the British marching orders were delivered to a group of U.S. think tankers, journalists, and congressional staff members all committed to maintaining the MAD doctrine and nuclear terror.

Participants at the meeting adopted a four-point strategy:

- The full array of congressional networks associated with anglophile Averell Harriman, the former New York governor, will be activated to delay the shift of strategic

doctrine away from MAD, obstruct passage of the Reagan defense budget and any significant funding for beam weapons development, and push through resolutions banning the development and deployment of beam-weapon missile-defense systems.

- Debate around the shift in doctrine, to the extent any is permitted, will be manipulated to show that the President's program is unworkable unless its supporters can prove that the defensive system is foolproof, and not even one missile could sneak through.

- The opponents of beam weapons will continue to lie that the President's program is "Star Wars, 21st-century stuff," the source who attended reported. The opposition will only accept "a small R&D budget for beam weapons research, provided everybody agrees that the program won't be implemented until the 21st century." Meanwhile, the media are to continue to promote Gen. Daniel Graham's conventional-technology "High Frontier" ABM program, because "everybody knows that his program will not work. It weakens Reagan's arguments to have him running around."

- President Reagan is to be branded a "warmonger" by the Harriman-controlled media. The *Washington Post* has already used that description in a headline, for a story charging that Reagan's continuing demand for an increase in the defense budget and his plan for "nuclear war in space" justify such vilification. More seriously, the President is threatened by U.S. entrapment in a "no-win" war in Central America, an operation emphasized at the IISS meeting (see article, page 38).

Following the IISS meeting, columnist Flora Lewis, a foreign policy scribbler for the Harrimanite *New York Times*



Christian Curtis/New Solidarity

"We've expanded our military policy department."

and a participant at the secret meeting, referred to the week-end "discussion" and summarized the general strategy against the beam weapons policy—stall implementation, insist on the MAD doctrine in the meantime, and seek a ban on space-based defensive systems. Lewis lied that "the space-based laser . . . that Mr. Reagan has in mind . . . is 20 to 30 years away, if it ever proves feasible. . . . But . . . the effort must not be allowed to become a race and the need for a negotiated agreement is more urgent than ever." Lewis called for Senate passage of a resolution "prohibiting all space-based and space-directed systems."

Less than a week after the IISS meeting, Oxford-educated Larry Pressler, Republican senator from South Dakota, held rigged hearings on anti-missile systems in his arms control subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee. The center of attention was a resolution sponsored by Pressler and Sen. Charles Percy (R-Ill.) any weapons, including defensive systems, in space. The hearings, which featured Gen. Daniel Graham peddling his conventional weapons ABM system as a fraudulent version of President Reagan's policy, were organized by subcommittee staff director Alex Glicksman, another participant at the IISS meeting.

The Kissinger networks inside the administration, who unsuccessfully tried to prevent Reagan from announcing his beam weapons defensive policy to the American people on March 23, have waged as bold a campaign as they dare to deny that any repudiation of MAD has taken place. Despite the President's public confirmation that his decision meant precisely that, and that he has committed the United States to the doctrine of Mutually Assured Survival, the State De-

partment's Richard Burt told an Overseas Writers Club luncheon on April 5, "We do not have a new strategic doctrine." Responding to a question from *EIR*, the former *New York Times* correspondent, recently under Senate investigation for possibly treasonous disclosure of classified secrets during the Carter administration, insisted that "what President Reagan is talking about is exploring a new opportunity. . . . We have certainly not altered our strategic doctrine."

At the same time, the Kissinger crowd has worked to draw President Reagan back into an arms control process premised exclusively on the offensive deterrence equations of MAD. Late last year, when preparations for the new beam weapons defensive strategy were already underway, the President was persuaded to appoint a "bipartisan" commission to resolve the impasse with Congress on how to deploy the MX missile. Dubbed the Scowcroft Commission, for its chairman Brent Scowcroft, Kissinger's former National Security Council flunky, it quickly took broader authority for reviewing the entire U.S. strategic force posture.

Then on April 11, right after the IISS meeting, the twice-delayed report of the Scowcroft Commission was released, conceding the vulnerability of the MX missile in any land-based deployment, but arguing at the same time that no effective ABM defense systems could be developed in the foreseeable future. White House sources close to the President recognized the trap thus set for Reagan, who was expected to accept the recommendations of the Scowcroft Commission, by having to follow his new defensive strategy decision with an endorsement of a report denying any significance to ABM systems.

For the moment, the President has chosen to simply sidestep the contradiction, though his enemies will attempt to make the most of it. In his public response April 19 to the Scowcroft Commission report, Reagan reiterated, "On the 23rd of March, I spoke to the American people about our program for strengthening this nation's security and that of our allies and announced a long-term research effort to reduce, some day, the threat posed by nuclear ballistic missiles." He endorsed the commission's recommendation that 100 MX missiles be deployed in existing Minuteman silos, and that a new small, mobile missile (the "Midgetman" advocated by Henry Kissinger and the Harriman Democrats) developed to reduce future "vulnerability." In a background briefing, a senior Defense Department official could only report that the President endorsed those two recommendations, "but he doesn't necessarily endorse the narrative of the report."

The British made no effort to disguise their hand in promoting the Scowcroft Commission report as the alternative to President Reagan's decision to develop defensive beam weapons. The *Financial Times* of London launched a wild, half-page attack on the President's policy April 18, raving on about this "dangerous Star Wars" provocation against Moscow—in terms identical to those of an article published in *Izvestia* April 15.

Instead, the British journal insisted, the United States must follow the dictates of the Scowcroft Commission. The same day, the April 25 issue of *Newsweek* was released, with a commentary by New York Council on Foreign Relations president Winston Lord denouncing “lustly swings” in American foreign policy and demanding that “the next administration, whether Democratic or Republican, should pursue a balanced policy from the beginning . . . appoint some members of the opposition; selectively use the Scowcroft Commission model, and strive for inter-agency coherence.”

The British are especially enraged that President Reagan decided upon such an historic reversal of America’s long decline into strategic and economic ruin *despite* the fact that he is virtually surrounded by lieutenants of Henry Kissinger and Averell Harriman. In the face of opposition from the stable of Kissingerians presided over by Secretary of State George Shultz, from Harriman-linked White House Chief of Staff James A. Baker III, and from such clones of anglophile Elliot Richardson as Baker’s deputy Richard Darman, President Reagan acted out of a deep commitment to ending the reign of thermonuclear terror. His strongest support came from his National Security Adviser, William Clark, whom he designated to oversee implementation of the beam weapons program. For the British-led counter-offensive, the IISS meeting singled out Clark as the primary target, along with Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, who has publicly championed the President’s decision.

On April 11 Weinberger called reporters to the Pentagon to counter frenzied repetitions in the U.S. press of the British-KGB “Star Wars” line against defensive beam weapons. Consistent with the IISS marching orders to the media, not one of the major wire services or dailies reported what the Defense Secretary had to say. “It is not a Star Wars fantasy,” Weinberger declared. “Before announcing this proposal, the President held lengthy meetings with his top advisers, both civilian and military, on technical and policy matters.” Summarizing those discussions, Weinberger said, “We all recognized that the search for strategic defense is so eminently desirable that we can and will find solutions to any problems that might develop along the way.”

Weinberger reiterated the President’s determination to end the built-in trigger for nuclear war in the MAD doctrine. “A truly stable superpower relationship would be one in which both sides were protected from attack,” the Secretary said. “Deterrence would be strengthened because we would remove from an aggressor the capability to attack us, rather than merely threaten retaliation after an attack had taken place.”

Also blacked out by most dailies was NASA’s April 11 announcement that President Reagan has requested the space agency to prepare a full set of options for the development of space stations, including fully functional manned operations on a permanent basis.

During little more than a week following the IISS meeting, in-place Harrimanite opposition to the defense budget

backed by Weinberger and President Reagan escalated with an open revolt by Kissinger Republicans on Capitol Hill, led by Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker, Budget Committee chairman Pete Domenici, and Finance Committee chairman Robert Dole. Domenici publicly attacked the “faction” in the administration that was refusing to compromise on the defense budget, leaving no doubt that his primary target was Weinberger. On April 7 Domenici’s Senate Budget Committee voted 17 to 4 to cut the administration’s proposed defense budget increase from 10 percent to 5 percent.

The IISS counteroffensive against the President’s policy has been unrestrained in its attacks on National Security Adviser William Clark. The issues of *Time* and *Newsweek* that hit the stands April 18 both ran major stories denouncing Clark’s role in the administration, insinuating the “warmonger” theme. Contrasting Clark “with intellectually forceful predecessors like Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski,” *Time* attacked Clark for his determination “to let Reagan be Reagan” and blamed him for the President’s hard line on the defense budget and on Central America. *Newsweek* added, “What many find worrisome is Clark’s knack for bringing out the deepest strains of Reagan’s innate conservatism, untempered by congressional or geopolitical realities.”

But amidst all the clamor over the “dangers” of having so much power in the hands of “an amateur” and blunt calls for Clark’s removal, *Time* made clear the primary motive for the attack: “And last month Clark encouraged Reagan to make his Star Wars missile defense speech, despite the worries of other Reagan aides that it would reinforce the President’s reputation for hawkish loose talk.”

So the battle for America’s future—whether its military and economic survival can be won through the President’s decision to develop beam-weapons missile defense systems—is escalating rapidly. It is an openly declared international battle, as preliminary reports from the Trilateral Commission meeting in Rome the week of April 18 confirm. Presentations from Henry Kissinger, Robert McNamara, and a host of international oligarchical figures made it clear that the destruction of President Reagan is their top strategic priority.

As the Italian Communist Party newspaper *Unità* gleefully reported April 20, “The present policy of the U.S. administration yesterday received the most violent and biggest blow by a Trilateral meeting that day by day proves to be the center in which the post-Reagan era is being prepared. What is under attack is the whole range of Reagan’s options, including security and armaments, financial policy, North-South and East-West relationships, and Euro-American relations. The protagonists of so large an offensive are the managers of the biggest multinational corporations, financiers from all over the world, intellectuals of the American democratic area, representatives of the European political world. . . . In other words, what is shaping up is a powerful block of economic and political forces of America, Europe, and Japan that are unequivocally opposed to Reagan.”