

Documentation

**'We're behind 'til 1990
no matter what happens'**

The following assessment of the U.S. strategic position was granted to EIR by a strategist at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy who requested that his name be withheld.

'We're no. 2'

**The strategists react
to the Soviet advance**

Strategic thinkers in the United States have responded to the report that the Soviet Union has reached the stage of deploying advanced E-beam antiballistic missile weapons with immediate proposals for military buildup and a reemphasis on scientific research and development. Unfortunately, the only commentary to point out that the key to military strength is a strong civilian economy did not appear in the United States, but in *East Germany* (see box).

The first thing we must do is get rid of Jimmy Carter. Carter is an unmitigated disaster. After he's out, we must concentrate on the strategic area, on making our command-and-control invulnerable to the Soviets and on showing the Europeans that we are consistent.

On the military side of things, the problem is easy to identify. Even with Carter out, we will lack sufficient military strength for years. We'll have to add \$50-\$60 billion per year in additional defense spending. The replacement costs alone for existing materiel will start running us \$60 billion, whereas now we only spend \$40 billion. To keep things moving, we'll have to up our spending each year by another \$20 billion. We have to upgrade our personnel, our navy, our conventional forces, our Rapid Deployment force in the Indian Ocean.

There's no underestimating how profound the crisis is

**'Does Brzezinski
not know?'**

The following is the analysis of Carter administration military policy, as embodied by National Security advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, published by Gustav Hertzfeld in the current issue of the foreign affairs monthly of East Germany, Deutsche Aussenpolitik (German Foreign Affairs).

Does Mr. Brzezinski not know that military strength today cannot be measured by the number of infantrymen, or horses for the cavalry, or number of guns, bayonets and pistols a country has? Can a country be militarily strong, if it is not strong economically, scientifically and technologically. . . not strong in those branches of industry which are in the lead of science and technology: nuclear energy, aerospace, shipbuilding, electronics? Does Mr. Brzezinski not know all of this, or does he not want to know it? If he doesn't know, then beware of a President who is advised by such an advisor and even takes decisions on the basis of such advice. Beware of the allies of a power which is acting according to such decisions. Beware of a world whose peace depends only on such advice and such decisions.



we are now facing. I don't know if we can ever re-achieve parity. We're number two right now, and the gap is widening. Given the fact that there is an 8-9 year lead time on weapons systems, and we've already had a 6-year delay on the MX missile, some of my colleagues think it's already too late.

If we do everything we have to do for the next 3-4 years, we can by 1985-86 *at the earliest* start re-establishing parity. Between now and then, things will be very precarious, but at least we won't be going downhill any longer.

We have no choice but to do this. The Soviets are producing E-beam breakthroughs toward new weapons systems. This is very frightening. So we must build up our military capabilities, and in the interim learn how to shut up and stop drawing lines. We have no capability of stopping the Soviets right now. We can't do anything militarily at the moment. Carter is just bluffing; if any moron in his administration were to think that we could use our nuclear capability as a way of stopping the Soviets in the Indian Ocean, they should be rapidly disabused of this idea: the Backfires (Soviet bombers—ed.) in Baku would blow our fleet to smithereens!

So we should keep our mouths shut for five years, restore the draft, do the spending we have to do. We'll be number two till 1990, no matter what happens.

'We're not matching the Soviets at all'

The following interview was granted to EIR by a retired U.S. military officer who is now advising the Reagan campaign. He requested that his name be withheld.

Q: What concrete solutions are you proposing for the policy problems that we now find ourselves in?

A: We have to focus public opinion on the rapid decline of the American military. The decline has been very dramatic.

Q: Are you aware of the breakthroughs made by the Soviet Union in new E-Beam research? What kind of response should the U.S. have to such a development?

A: I'm aware of what the Soviets are doing. They are developing several exotic forms of long-range destructive weapons. To counteract this, the first step is to build up our Research and Development capabilities. The Soviets have succeeded by simultaneously investigating 8-10 different exotic systems, and then choosing 2-3 systems of choice. We have to do the same; we must match them in R&D. This must mean a stronger commitment on our part to the development of science and technology than has been going on in the past few years. We can't just try to match the Soviets in *one* field, that won't work.

Q: What else must be done?

A: We must as a second step build up our vertical silos around each of our Minuteman missiles, to regain the survivability factor we've lost through recent treaties with the Soviets. This will take a couple of years with a crash program. We must also get going on the MX system, which won't be ready in any case till 1986, and there won't be enough of them till 1987.

Q: What is the cost of all this?

A: An intelligent program will cost \$22 billion additional to the current budget for this fiscal year; \$45 billion added to the figure for 1981, and \$50 billion added for each year after that. This will mean, necessarily, reduction in expenditures elsewhere in the economy in the short term.

Q: How do you evaluate the current administration's military strategy approach?

A: What Carter is doing is a lot of declamatory posturing with nothing to back it up. He's bluffing, and he's going to get us into a war that we're going to lose.

Broken planes, and tank-killers

The U.S. press, government officials and military spokesmen have reacted to the news of Soviet breakthroughs in antiballistic missile E-beam systems with some irrelevant bluster and a good measure of plain fear. Two recent articles in the Washington Post on America's military position looked like this:

March 17, "Shortages of Parts Hamstring Warplanes": About half the nation's first-line warplanes cannot fly because over the years the Pentagon has concentrated on buying new ones rather than fixing up the old ones.

This policy has forced mechanics to take the parts off one plane and put them on another, a constant process of cannibalization that the Navy figures takes up the equivalent of 610 men doing nothing else for one year.

Besides not being able to go to war, the high percentage of broken planes means that Air Force and Navy pilots must fly fewer hours, prompting many of them to quit in disgust.

...Only 53 percent of the Air Force's hottest fighter, the F15 Eagle, were ready for combat at any one time last year, and only 53 percent of the Navy's F14 Tomcat fighter. The percentages for forward-deployed aircraft, such as F15s based in Europe, were not much better...

March 22, "U.S. Builds Tank-Killer for Europe": The Pentagon's research chief said yesterday that the United States has developed a new family of weapons lethal enough eventually to offset the Soviet advantage in armor along the NATO front.