

Moscow could still decide to crush the revolution

by Konstantin George and John Sigerson

By as early as two weeks after the Dec. 2-3 floating summit between U.S. President George Bush and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachov, a point of no return could be reached, defining a global strategic crisis on a level not seen since the late 1930s, centered around the maelstrom in Europe.

The danger is posed not by the upheaval in the Soviet bloc as such, but by two further factors. First, both Great Britain and the U.S. administration of George Bush have responded to the economic breakdown and political earthquakes rocking the Soviet Empire, with a dangerous policy of appeasement—typified by U.S. refusal to act decisively against Fidel Castro's military operations in El Salvador. Second, France and West Germany have been footdragging on the implementation of a workable alternative: a grand-scale aid package for modernizing the infrastructure, agriculture, and industry of Poland and East Germany, coupled with emergency food aid for the hungry inhabitants of the U.S.S.R.

The mixture of mass ferment in the East and leadership failure in the West is explosive indeed, notes U.S. congressional candidate and political strategist Lyndon LaRouche. "If we look back to the case of Hungary in 1956 and Prague in 1968 and other related precedents," LaRouche said from his federal prison cell in Rochester, Minnesota, "and if we look also at the rather idiotic way in which members of Congress fell into the Castro-El Salvador trap recently, in suggesting a backoff from the government of El Salvador in the ongoing civil war there, then we must read all the signs to say that it's not certain, but it should not be overlooked, that the Soviets might move in a crushing pattern in Eastern Europe and elsewhere any time from about Dec. 15 onward.

"Where and how this might occur is unknown," he continued, "but the factors which point in the direction of the

possibility of such a development are known, and it is also indicated that the United States, which has been suffering an intelligence functioning breakdown increasingly during the course of the second Reagan administration, and accelerating after the demise of former Director of Central Intelligence Casey, that the United States is running largely blindfolded into a future history."

The candidate remarked that despite the popular ferment in Eastern Europe which is toppling one government after another—most recently in Czechoslovakia—the Soviet military forces and those of their satraps are quite intact in Hungary, Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria. "The repressive interior ministry-secret police apparatus is intact. The political command to take over in a coup is intact. At any time, physically, any time Moscow should order it, there could be a coup in any or all of the nations—Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary—on Moscow's orders. Everything is ready to go, except—to our knowledge, at least—the orders to conduct the operation."

There are currently 380,000 Soviet troops stationed in East Germany, and another 75,000 in Czechoslovakia, and reinforcements are ready for deployment from their bases in the western Soviet Union.

Fidel's 'Tet offensive'

"The key thing to look at is El Salvador and its implications," LaRouche continued. "Fidel Castro's faction in Central America, after eliminating bloodily the people who might have killed Fidel for Gorbachov, have moved in a prepared operation to unleash what looks like an echo of the 'Tet offensive' in Vietnam. This operation reflects an international factional alignment among Castro, Kim Il Sung of North Korea, the present hardliners in the Beijing Communist lead-

ership, Ceausescu of Romania, and so forth. . . . Fidel has lit a spark which clearly has the implicit intent to set off the anti-Gorbachov reaction inside Moscow."

Contrary to the lunatic assurances of Great Britain's Margaret Thatcher that Gorbachov has never been more secure, the anti-Gorbachov reaction has become so violent that 20,000 Russians gathered in Leningrad on Nov. 24 in order to hear Communist boss Gidasov call for Gorbachov to resign and for the Soviet Communist Party leadership to "justify itself." Commented the West German daily *Bild Zeitung*, "Never has the Kremlin chief been so close to failure as he is now." With polls in the Soviet Union now indicating that 57% of the population has lost faith in their leader, *Bild* asks: "Will Gorby fall this winter?"

On top of this are strong signals that, far from reducing its war-fighting potential, the Soviet military is pressing ahead with preparations for an offensive war. The most telling signs are the promotions of two protégés of Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov, the architect of the Soviet war plan. An ultra-secret Soviet Politburo session on Nov. 15 promoted Gen. Col Mahmoud Gareyev, currently deputy chief of staff, to be general of the Soviet army, while Politburo member and war economy expert Lev Zaikov has been advanced to be first deputy chairman of the Soviet Defense Council. Zaikov is a specialist in directing high-technology Soviet production, such as for Moscow's new crop of electromagnetic beam weapons.

But for all the pressure on Gorbachov, replacing him will not be an easy decision for the Soviet ruling elite. "It's easy for the Soviets to dump a Soviet leader," commented LaRouche, "but it's more difficult to replace him, and sometimes the difficulty in agreeing upon a replacement for the leader they wish to drop, is the force which keeps the old leader in place. This is to a large degree true of Gorbachov at the present time.

"However," LaRouche added, "we are coming up to a point of no return from the standpoint of some of these fellows in Moscow. Even without toppling Gorbachov—because Gorbachov's group is a bunch of gangsters, a bunch of pragmatists—they might force these pragmatists to accept a hard-line reaction from military-Chekest forces—and Castro, knowing this, is attempting to light the fuse to such a development."

When could Castro light that fuse? LaRouche estimates that "the time for him to do it probably comes to a peak between the middle of December and Epiphany [Jan. 6]. That's about the time this would tend to happen if it's going to happen either under the present Gorbachov regime, or in the process of dumping Gorbachov." In the meantime, LaRouche advised, the United States would do well to harden its stance on Castro's El Salvador operations, and to stop all the blather about the "historic significance" of President Bush's impending non-summit meeting with Gorbachov.

The extremely rapid pace of events in Eastern Europe is

bearing out this assessment. Following the opening of the Berlin Wall on Nov. 9, Czechoslovakia has also become the scene of daily mass demonstrations by hundreds of thousands in the capital, Prague, and by tens of thousands in the Slovakian capital of Bratislava, and all provincial centers, including Brno, Olmutz, and Liberec. The immediate trigger of the mass explosion was the bloody suppression of student demonstrations by security forces on Nov. 17. Students then fanned out throughout the country to organize working people to join in their demand for freedom.

On Nov. 25, the crisis came to a head when Czechoslovakia's ruling Communist Party, faced with the threat of a general strike and still more demonstrations, dismissed seven members of its leadership, including party leader Milos Jakes, the person who ran the purge following the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. The news caused jubilation among the 300,000 demonstrators in Prague's Wenceslas Square, who were addressed by none other than Alexander Dubcek, now 67, whose "Prague Spring" was crushed by Soviet tanks 21 years ago. "Long live Dubcek!" the demonstrators were heard crying.

Moscow's apparent "flexibility" so far in the face of these developments, should not be overrated. Gorbachov has actually gone no further than Stalin did from 1945-48 in allowing "coalition governments," including non-communist regimes (such as Benes and Masaryk in Czechoslovakia) in his satellites, under conditions of security forces totally and exclusively under Moscow's control. But in short order, during late 1947 and early 1948, these coalition and non-communist-led governments fell one after the other in a wave of Stalin-ordered coups.

The West's responsibility

The best course for the Western governments under these circumstances, would be to offer and quickly implement a "grand design" economic aid package, coupled, of course, with an abrupt end to Thatcher's and Bush's worse-than-Munich appeasement policy.

As Lyndon LaRouche indicated in his proposal to that effect last year, such a proposal, if put forward now in a non-nonsense manner, would be difficult for the Soviet Union to reject. Moscow would very likely even agree in exchange to grant major political concessions, above all allowing the permanent stability of non-Communist rule in Poland, and paving the way for a non-Communist regime in East Germany, that would form the bridge to German reunification in the foreseeable future.

This perspective has nothing to do with any "nice side" to the Soviet beast. Moscow would prefer to devote its military energies to attaining undisputed strategic superiority through development of military space systems and the next generation of radio-frequency and other new weapons of mass destruction—rather than to become embroiled in the risky business of simultaneous bloody repressions in Eastern Europe.

Unrest in Eastern Europe and European U.S.S.R., November 1988-November 1989



← refugees labor strikes ▽ mass demonstrations ⚡ terrorism and sabotage ✕ ethnic conflicts ■ armed repression