

leading to a third world war. Nevertheless, the underlying reason why the West has allowed things to reach this point of crisis, lies mainly in the current moral crisis in the West.

The most gentle thing which might be said about our own era, is that our society has fallen into such miserable depths of banality that the thoughtful person begins to imagine himself squashed flat onto a two-dimensional plane. Truly great thoughts are virtually non-existent, but this is not even perceived as a loss, due to the broad availability of cheap, degraded forms of amusement. And many of us are indeed degraded: just consider our so-called culture, with the brutality of its films, the giant size of the black market in videotapes flaunting perverse acts, the problem of child pornography, etc., and no one can doubt that we are in a dying civilization. A society dominated by the strength of one's elbows, careerism and conformity, status-seeking, pragmatism, sentimentalism, and irrationality on the one hand, but which is no longer capable of even a trace of human feeling for the children dying of hunger in Africa and all the other misery and suffering on this planet, is a society which has lost its moral fitness to survive.

The Schiller Institute has set out to alter this situation. Its call for a return to the ideals of the American Revolution, of the German Classical period and of those historical epochs in other countries which have reflected the same ideals, is therefore the Institute's central conception. Human reason is always capable of finding an answer to every problem confronting it; this is what distinguishes us from mere beasts. Yet within ourselves, we must never destroy that which renders us capable of reason.

That is why the great examples of the classical and renaissance periods in our past are so indispensable for us today. They show us how much more refined and differentiated were the thoughts and feelings of those great humanists, how much more they took for granted a respect for the inalienable rights of their fellow men. Yes, if humankind is to survive, then it will only be possible if human beings—concrete, real, individual men and women—take it upon themselves to put an end to their own degeneration and to change themselves in practice. Unless people today learn to make it their most important aim to perfect within themselves their own potential humanity—to develop a higher quality of human soul—then they have failed in the mission for which they have been placed upon this earth.

The Schiller Institute intends to draft many concepts for all areas of foreign policy. But its most important aim will always be for people to respect within themselves that which makes them human. Only in this way will they learn to love and respect that same humanity within others. And what holds true for our relations with our fellow man, is a thousand times truer for our relationship with other nations.

And that is also why the task of educating mankind to comprehend the poetic beauty of Schiller's works, is the world's most political issue.

Western Europe

Alliance hanging on, despite pressures

by Vivian Freyre Zoakos

From the standpoint of Western Europe, 1984 was characterized by a most dramatic combined Soviet and Western oligarchical attempt to break the alliance between the United States and Europe—as dramatic as it could have been short of an outright Soviet use of military force to conquer European territory. Given the enormity of the forces set into motion to bring about a decoupling of Europe and particularly West Germany from the United States, the fact that the Alliance survived the year appears almost startling in hindsight.

The most important defeat for the Soviets and their Western allies was their lack of success in “the German theater.” Not only did the stationing of the American Euromissiles in West Germany proceed as planned despite enormous pressures, but the government of Chancellor Helmut Kohl did a crucial about-turn on the more overriding question of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). The same German government, which in the first half of 1984 vowed to lead a European campaign to defeat President Reagan's “Star Wars” program, was by the end of the year issuing categorical statements in its support.

Yet the fact that a Sovietized version of George Orwell's 1984 nightmare failed to surface on schedule does not mean that the battle has been won or Western Europe secured from Moscow's clutches. The brilliant achievements of this past year—and so they were, given the odds—have only bought time, hopefully sufficient time for those committed to rationality to succeed in tilting the momentum of events in their direction.

The governments of Great Britain and France closed out the year with announcements that they were for sale to Moscow and the New Yalta traitors in the West. Having been, at least for the present, stymied in the European heartland, Moscow is aggressively recruiting allies along the peripheries. Principally targeted have been Britain, France, and Italy. Greece, under the premiership of Andreas Papandreu, has, of course, already left NATO “in all but name,” as the Turks

have rightly claimed.

Thus it was not accidental that Moscow chose Britain as the podium from which to hurl its war ultimatum to Washington. In the course of a visit to Britain the third week of December, Soviet beam-weapons expert Yevgenii Velikhov warned the United States: Either halt the SDI program within three months, "or else."

The "or else," as Washington is fully aware, is the activation of the Ogarkov Plan for a conventional and nuclear strike against Western Europe and the American Eastern seaboard. In short: total war.

And if the United States but flinch, and at least the core of the European allies not remain firmly in the Western camp, Moscow will pick up the spoils and surely gain its ambition of becoming *the* hegemonic world power.

For those aware of what took place in front of and behind the scenes during this period, only two interrelated causes can be adduced for Moscow's relative failure in its Western European campaign, and particularly the all-important "German theater" of battle.

First, President Reagan and Defense Secretary Ger, as the leaders of the SDI project, stuck firm by their commitment. Throughout the year, repeated delegations have been sent from the United States to brief the Europeans on the SDI, variously headed by Weinberger, SDI director Lt. Gen. James Abrahamson, or the President's Science Adviser George Keyworth. President Reagan, on the occasion of the June celebrations of the Normandy invasion, issued a statement again reassuring Europe of America's categorical commitment to its defense. Weinberger gave numerous closed-door briefings, at the NATO Nuclear Planning Group meeting in April, and more recently at the December defense ministers' meeting, detailing for the Europeans the American program together with extensive intelligence on the Soviets' advanced work in the field.

These briefings were imperative for allaying the Europeans' fears, fanned by the Soviets and the lying anti-SDI press, that U.S. adoption of the program would lead to the abandonment of Europe by America. Just as decisively, Weinberger's briefings convinced the allies that the United States was irrevocably committed to the SDI. As German Defense Minister Manfred Wörner put it following the December Weinberger briefing: Since the Americans are going ahead with the SDI anyway, Europeans have to get in on the project now, or risk losing out on the technological and scientific benefits which the United States alone would otherwise reap from it.

The second crucial factor was the activities of Lyndon and Helga LaRouche, particularly through the founding of the Schiller Institute (see article, p. 34), which took the up-front international role in educating the elites and increasingly the masses of American, European, and Third World citizens on the SDI's irreplaceable role in their future strategic

and economic security. It was the combination of the efforts of the *minority* in the Reagan administration committed to the SDI, together with the forces grouped around the Schiller Institute, which jointly succeeded this past year in seizing a marginal victory against what otherwise appears as an overwhelming array of forces.

Kissinger and the Soviet offensive

The year dawned with the first public announcement ever by a ranking U.S. administration official that the future of the United States lay not in Europe but in the Pacific. This statement, delivered in Washington on Jan. 31 by Undersecretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger—since seconded to head Kissinger Associates—created a furor in Europe which was fanned by Kissinger's personal restatement of the decoupling doctrine in a notorious March 5 article for *Time* magazine. Under the guise of strengthening the "European pillar" of the Atlantic Alliance, Kissinger called for a withdrawal of one-third of U.S. troops from Europe, to be replaced by additional European troops as part of a package of increased European defense spending. The true content of the proposal, a U.S. disengagement from the continent, was, of course, the signal that Europeans perceived.

In June, another asset of this clique, Georgia Democratic Sen. Sam Nunn, took the Kissinger plan and turned it into legislation. Only the strenuous efforts of the administration succeeded in defeating a bill which would have mandated the withdrawal of nearly 100,000 U.S. troops from Europe if the Europeans did not immediately increase their defense spending—a fact Nunn knew to be politically, as well as economically, nearly impossible to accomplish in the short run.

Had this bill passed, Europe would most certainly now be outside of the Atlantic Alliance, either *de facto* or *de jure* converted into a Soviet satrapy.

For their part, the Soviets conducted a combined military and propaganda campaign, coupled increasingly with spetsnaz-sabotage deployments, to force a terrorized Europe and especially Germany to capitulate to their demands *to break with the United States*. Let there be no doubt that this was indeed their demand. An unending and escalating series of giant Soviet and Warsaw Pact maneuvers was begun in January, counterposed to a lying propaganda campaign which accused West Germany of nurturing an alleged "Nazi revival."

By September, Yugoslavia and Austria were warning of the potential for a Soviet invasion of their countries. On July 23, in response to the Soviet June 28-July 5 Shield '84 maneuvers and other signals, West German Defense Minister Wörner warned that the Russians were making plans for a blitzkrieg invasion. The daily *Die Welt* three days earlier did the same.

The "pincer" movement from Moscow and U.S. State Department and think-tank circles was further backed up by the transformation of the German Social Democratic Party

(SPD) into a pro-Moscow appeasement mass force. At its May national congress, the second party in West Germany joined the Soviet-funded Greenies in adopting an anti-American platform, complete with attacks on the SDI and a call for creating a Central European nuclear free zone. The new platform also called for "an international treaty to ban anti-satellite and antiballistic-missile systems from outer space." The SPD-Green Party alliance became consolidated in three German states, preparing a model for a national coalition to replace the increasingly weak government of Chancellor Kohl. Writing in *Der Spiegel* magazine March 26, SPD General-Manager Peter Glotz said the U.S. nuclear umbrella "no longer exists." Therefore, Germany should pursue "common security with the U.S.S.R."

The relative victories

The above indicates only a small portion of the pressures which led Chancellor Kohl temporarily last summer to become a spokesman for the anti-SDI, anti-American faction. Repeated assurances from President Reagan personally, Weinberger, and a few others already cited, together with the educational work of the Schiller Institute, were what created the small margin of rationality that began prying loose German political leaders from a seemingly inescapable flight into Moscow's arms. Christian Social Union head and prime minister of the state of Bavaria, Franz-Josef Strauss, in November was the first to publicly suggest German participation in the SDI. In early December, he was echoed by Defense Minister Wörner. For the moment, the German government remains a relatively solid member of the Alliance.

Alongside this victory, 1984 saw other successes for the pro-American forces in the vulnerable northern flank. In Denmark, the Radical Party and the Social Democratic opposition were unsuccessful—but just barely—in blocking agreement to deploy American Euromissiles. The importance of this defeat can be seen by the fact that the full scope of the Radicals' demands, made to the minority government coalition, was that Denmark leave NATO outright.

In Sweden, the Schiller Institute and LaRouche forces succeeded in sparking a furious debate, for the first time in postwar history, over the issue of the country's official policy of military neutrality. Notwithstanding the attempt by Swedish Prime Minister and Soviet agent Olof Palme to use the cover of Swedish neutrality to "Finlandize" the country, a serious public discussion of the need for Swedish entry into NATO erupted domestically this past August. Exemplary of the shift was the booklet entitled *Outdated Neutrality Policy?* published in the fall by Sweden's psychological defense establishment. Although this production of the Palme circles predictably argued in favor of neutrality, it was nonetheless forced to respond to critics by admitting 1) the danger of a Soviet surprise strike on Sweden, and 2) the fact that "strict neutrality is no guarantee against attack."

Finally, the Spanish government of Prime Minister Felipe González is managing to hang on to its NATO commitment . . . if only by its teeth. González's success in forcing the British to agree to negotiate the emotional issue of returning Gibraltar to Spain—almost certainly achieved with a little help from Uncle Sam—gave him the maneuvering room in his party congress in December to force through the NATO membership issue.

The dangerous setbacks

French President François Mitterrand, the man whom Alexander Haig advertised as the staunchest ally of the United States in Europe, became the most abject imitator of the national sell-out politics of Vichy. For the present, he is playing Marshal Pétain to Moscow's Hitler. Mitterrand is opening the southern flank of NATO to the Soviets through a series of deals with the Soviet-owned dictator of Libya, Qaddafi, mediated at least in part by that other renowned second-generation Soviet asset, Prime Minister Papandreou of Greece.

Starting in the latter part of 1984, Mitterrand also began the practice of meeting on an almost weekly basis with either Henry Kissinger or his crony, State Department roving envoy Vernon Walters. Correspondingly, he has made a 180° turn, from establishing joint working links with the United States on the beam-defense research project, as was the case earlier in the year, to expressing full commitment to stop the crucial program and calling for the "demilitarization of space."

In November, Mitterrand met with Papandreou and Qaddafi on the island of Crete. The deal negotiated included French abandonment of Africa to Qaddafi. Two weeks later, at a meeting with the French-speaking African states, Mitterrand reversed French policy by saying that France has no commitment *or responsibility* for defending Chad against foreign military encroachments. In the case of Latin America, his government encourages and finances the radical tendencies of the Nicaraguan Sandinistas, threatening to provoke an American intervention in the region.

To cap the turn, in December French foreign policy was put into the hands of a new foreign minister, Roland Dumas. Historically a controller of the international terrorist networks which Moscow has co-deployed against the West, Dumas has since the 1950s had a career as a defender of terrorist criminals, including providing the legal defense for the commander of the 1972 Munich Olympics massacre, Abu Daud. Dumas has particularly friendly relations with Qaddafi.

In Britain, the so-called "Churchillian reflex" faction that had been squashed with the autumn 1983 cabinet reshuffle continued to rear its head this year as Soviet intentions became more inescapably clear. This is the faction that mistrusts the Soviet offer of negotiating a recarving of the world into new spheres of influence ("New Yalta"). Articles have appeared in the elite London *Times* in November and December endorsing the SDI, and such military leaders as Sir Nigel

Bagnall, commanding general of the British Army on the Rhine, have warned of Soviet plans for a surprise attack on Germany.

For the moment, however, the government of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher remains under the control of the faction best identified with NATO Secretary-General Lord Peter Carrington, who took office in June. This is the grouping responsible for the disgustingly warm reception given to the Soviet delegation to London this December, even as the visit was used to issue ultimatums and threats of war to the United States. Thatcher went so far as to willingly undertake the role of coming to the United States to relay the Soviet threats herself.

A word must be said in conclusion about the dangerous if still undecided situation of Italy. With Greece effectively gone over to the Warsaw Pact, Italy remains, with Turkey, NATO's indispensable strategic asset in the Mediterranean, the guardian of the southern flank.

The government of Premier Bettino Craxi is currently besieged by the combined forces of the Italian Communist Party (PCI) and the enormously powerful Italian, particularly Venetian, "black" oligarchy. The PCI has formed an open alliance with the leading representative of the Venetian oligarchs, Finance Minister Bruno Visentini, the purpose of which is to use the country's rapid economic collapse to destroy what remains of Italian constituency politics. As Communist trade union leader Luciano Lama told the Dec. 16 issue of *l'Espresso* magazine, the PCI has become a "reformist" party allied to the Republican (Visentini's) Party. The Craxi government must be replaced with a "technocratic" regime of financial experts.

This is the so-called Visentini plan which, with PCI backing, would put Italy under "receivership" much like any bankrupt corporation. The country would cease to exist as even a semblance of a nation. Constituency politics thus destroyed, Italy would be the personally-managed fiefdom of the oligarchical elite, which is quite willing to ally itself to a Soviet regime that has more in common with it ideologically than a republic-based West. Symbolic of the rapid convergence of "left" and "right" anti-Western forces in Italian society is the fact that the Communist Mayor of Rome, Ugo Vetere, sent a telegram of greetings to the party congress of the MSI, Italy's notorious neo-fascist party, which is making a bid for mass support, particularly from the social layers Visentini's "tax reforms" have immediately targeted.

The Communists and the spokesmen of the oligarchy, such as Visentini or Foreign Minister Giulio Andreotti, are attempting to provoke a collapse of the present government. It was Andreotti who had the ignominy, on April 23, of being the first Western government leader to visit Moscow in order to sign a joint document with the Soviets denouncing the SDI. "The two sides," the document read, "agree on the necessity . . . of the prevention of an arms race in outer space."

Russia goes back to

by Criton Zoakos

Whereas 1983 was the year in which the leading policy-making bodies of the Russian state shed their last pretensions of "Soviet," i.e., communist-ideological, rationales for policy, and surfaced fully as the executive instruments of the idea of "Moscow, the Third and Final Rome," during the year which followed, 1984, the leading elite of the Russian state was observed undergoing a dramatic change in the style in which it conducts its business of empire building. Moscow's "new style" is consciously akin to that of the old Court of Catherine the Great with strong echoes of Nesselrode, Shuvarov, and Gorchakov—figures associated with the previous periods of territorial expansion of the Russian Empire.

A student of history, in reviewing the dramatic changes of Russian society during 1984, would be struck by the similarity of "instruments of foreign policy" employed by the Russia of today and that of Catherine, and the late-19th century Romanovs: ethnic conflicts, supranational ideological movements, "national liberation movements," religious fanaticism, financial warfare, economic and resource warfare, promotion to power of foreign political pawns, dependents and petty controlled satraps and, lastly, raw military power.

Were one to compare Ogarkov's 1984 with Shuvarov's 1875, or Alexei Orlov's 1774, one would be struck by one alarming difference: the sheer, awesome military might backing up Russian imperial objectives. The imperial ambition, having been planted by Philotheos of Pskov during the 15th century had remained alive but dormant during the 16th century; during the 17th century, the settlement of certain Venetian families in Russia helped form a sophisticated imperial policy-making center which viewed itself as the rival of Peter the Great's nation building designs. After Peter the Great's death, this Venetian-shaped imperial tradition of the Third Rome came fully in control in the court of Catherine the Great and her heirs. It was during this era of the 18th century that the great imperial design began moving. It was also the period of the Russian Empire's most breathtaking territorial expansion, and the period in which Russia's imperial intelligentsia learned the art of managing and manipulating the many nationalities and religions populating its empire—let us say the period in which Josef Stalin's "nationalities policy" was born.

The brief slowdown in expansion during the Napoleonic Wars was followed by the era of the Holy Alliance after the Congress of Vienna. During the 1850s, the then expanding British Empire checkmated Russian imperial expansion by