

## CSIS 'conservatives' propose sell out to Soviet Union

by Nicholas F. Benton

Henry Kissinger's Georgetown University Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) held its annual leadership conference in Washington, D.C. June 9-11 on the theme of "The Future of U.S. Security: Strategy, Resources, and Technology." Here, the braintrust of the Eastern Liberal Establishment charted out its approach to forcing the Reagan administration to accept as inevitable a massive geopolitical shift in favor of the Soviet Union over the next 12 months—the so-called "New Yalta."

Although this Liberal Establishment crowd has been advancing this strategic objective for years—which they fantasize will bring about a bi-polar "one-world oligarchic order" at the expense of autonomous national governments, most specifically the United States—this time the conference agenda made it clear that Gramm-Rudman budget cuts and the Packard Commission reorganization of the Defense Department are considered major new assets for implementing the plan. As global events are now unfolding, their objectives will be carried out within a year, handing virtually the entire Eurasian land mass and Africa over to the Soviet sphere of influence, unless some massive changes occur in the thinking of key leaders of the Western Alliance in the meantime.

Acting to shape the course of world events above the level of any government, the Eastern Liberal Establishment, together with its European oligarchic counterparts, uses the CSIS as one of its important institutions to compel governments, including that of the United States, to comply with its strategic objectives. While the likes of Kissinger, former Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger, former National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Sen. Sam ("Pull the Troops Out of Europe") Nunn (D-Ga.) direct the CSIS operation, influential government policy makers and captains of industry compose the participants at the annual "leadership

conferences."

Their task, in this conference, was defined by the fact that two key leaders in the United States, President Ronald Reagan and Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, are men who reflect a commitment to national U.S. interests inherently opposed to any "New Yalta." The conference's purpose, therefore, was not only to clarify objectives, but also the methods by which Reagan and Weinberger will, in the coming months, be increasingly hamstrung by the pressure of events into accepting the "inevitability" of policies they would otherwise oppose. In addition to the fiscal pressures of Gramm-Rudman and the Packard Commission reforms, anti-defense and anti-SDI pressures from Congress, Soviet low-intensity warfare in Europe, and other surrogate operations, fabricated crises in Central America, and actions by the Soviet leadership, itself, are designed to work together to achieve this end.

### How it will work

How do the CSIS gamemasters project this will work? Three examples from the conference make the point:

- 1) the speech by Zbigniew Brzezinski;
- 2) a "crisis management" strategic-confrontation psychodrama that was performed; and
- 3) the role which Reagan and Weinberger were drawn into playing, themselves, at the conference.

The message from former Carter adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski, based on his soon-to-be-released new book, *Gameplan: Managing the U.S.-Soviet Contest*, was "let the Russians have the Eurasian land mass, and the United States can survive."

Brzezinski called for undercutting Reagan's original vision of the Strategic Defense Initiative as a "long-term com-

mitment to the defense of populations,” instead turning it into a short-term “point defense” of U.S. strategic military sites. In this speech, he pursued the following line of thought:

1) The real basis of U.S.-Soviet conflict is ideological and geopolitical, and the strategic arms race is a secondary consequence of this.

2) The geopolitical conflict is over control of the Eurasian land mass; namely, that the Soviets want to control it entirely, believing the United States has no business whatsoever in Europe, Asia, and Africa, which they covet as “their turf.”

3) On the basis of expanding their control over this area, Russia has been growing at the rate of “about one Vermont, or Belgium if you prefer, a year for the last 250 years.”

4) Because of this continuing geopolitical tension, the Soviets are also engaged in massive, preemptive nuclear first-strike preparations, which if they continue at their present rate of growth will give them 16,000 to 24,000 nuclear warheads by the mid-1990s, half of which will be capable of being used in a preemptive first strike.

5) Faced with this reality, President Reagan has to “bite the bullet” and make some “critical choices.” He must either:

a) Launch a massive missile build-up of MX and Midgeman missiles to match the Soviets, a pathway which the Congress will never allow, or,

b) He must re-direct the SDI “from a long-term, total population defense [to] a limited strategic defense of our missile sites and national command authority,” which would offset the Soviets’ first strike capability.

Thus, confronted with this scenario and these options, the inevitable if unspoken conclusion Brzezinski arrived at is: In exchange for ensuring our survival by this redeployment of the SDI, the United States must be willing to “negotiate away” the Eurasian land mass into the hands of the Soviets, giving them what they really want most, anyway. Thus, global tensions are reduced, and our survival is secure.

Voilà, the “New Yalta!”

Of course, as many experts have stressed, redirecting the SDI to point defense, thereby abandoning its role as an umbrella protecting the entire West—an umbrella, as Defense Secretary Weinberger has put it, not over the West, but over the Soviet Union, aimed at preventing any Soviet missile from moving out farther than its boost stage without being destroyed—would effectively abandon Eurasia to the Russians in and of itself.

The strategic-crisis psychodrama game cast in the role of President of the United States Carter administration undersecretary of the Navy James Woosey. Democratic chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee Les Aspin played White House chief of staff; Eugene Rostow, undersecretary of state in the Johnson administration, was secretary of state; Robert McFarlane, former Reagan national security adviser, was secretary of defense, and Ford administration National Security Adviser Gen. Brent Scowcroft (ret.) played national security adviser.

They were confronted with a terrorist scenario in which they committed themselves to massive retaliation against the Libyans, but then were forced to publicly acknowledge that Syria was instead the guilty party. The psychodrama—close enough to the kind of pressures the Reagan administration faces in the real world—forced them to risk direct military confrontation with the Soviets, who were prepared to defend Syria.

Their conclusion: impotent economic sanctions against Syria. The message: When push comes to shove, you cannot risk war with the Soviets to stop Soviet-inspired terrorism. Apply that to the Middle East, Africa, Asia, or Europe, and, behold, the “New Yalta!”

### **A philosophical flaw**

Finally, although they both are on record vehemently opposing components of the “New Yalta” framework, both President Reagan and Weinberger were, in a sense, deceived into supporting the framework for that scenario by, themselves, participating in the CSIS conference. So was SDI director Lt. Gen. James Abrahamson, who took part in a panel on the impact of budget constraints on national defense.

The CSIS achieved this by asking both Reagan and Weinberger to limit their speech topics to Central American issues, which they did. Thus, although neither would agree with any scenario for handing over the Eurasian land mass to the Russians, they both reinforced the “structural framework” of exactly this scenario by allowing themselves to be fit in, in a very restricted way, to point out the “importance” of conflict points within our own hemisphere.

Weinberger, during his speech, exposed a philosophical flaw in his concept of “democracy” which proved so appealing to the New Yalta crowd that the Moonie-run *Washington Times* reprinted the speech in full the week of June 9. In short, it reflected the very “defeatist” mentality pervading the West over the last 20 years that Lyndon LaRouche’s recent document, *The Essential Role of the Concept of Victory in Defining ‘Grand Strategy’ of Our Alliance*, was written to correct. Weinberger did this by counterposing communism as an “unreachable utopian ideal based on the perfectibility of man” to democracies, which, as he put it, “have no illusion that man can be perfected, so it has no desire to eradicate all evil.” In reality, as LaRouche asserts, democracy as defined by the U.S. Constitution, is counterposed to all oligarchic tyrannies, including communism, by offering the best pathway toward fully realizing the “divine spark,” the perfectibility, if you will, of mankind, and the eradication of evil.

Thus, the sinister machinations of the gamemasters controlling the CSIS successfully wove a deceptive, self-constraining web around both the President and Weinberger at the conference, a foretaste of how the gamemasters intend to cause world events in the coming months to compel them to conform to the “New Yalta” as an “inevitability” on the stage of the real world.”