

EIR beam-weapons seminar in Vienna looks at *Mittleuropa*, Moscow, and the West

by Laurent Murawiec

The leading strata of Austria—a neutral nation whose capital Vienna lies just a few miles from the Eastern European borders once called the Iron Curtain, whose army numbers little more than 40,000, which was partly occupied by the Red Army until the 1955 State Treaty restored its sovereignty, which was historically governed by the Dual Monarchy of the House of Hapsburg, for centuries alternately an ally or an adversary of Russia, whose statesmen have a battle-tested, first-hand knowledge of the Russian soul and mind—should have very good reason to beware the appeasement of the Soviet Union so current among other Western European nations and be very interested in President Reagan's proposed strategic stabilizer, the development of defensive beam weapons.

This was apparently the reason that Austria was the first country in the Western world whose War College, the Landesverteidigungsakademie (LVAK), invited *EIR* to present a briefing on the science, the technology, the strategy, and the economics of the beam weapons to its staff, student body, and distinguished guests from the Austrian Foreign Office, defense ministry, interior ministry and army. An audience of 60 persons heard Fusion Energy Foundation director for Europe Dr. Jonathan Tennenbaum's description of beam weapons and *EIR* European executive director Anno Hellenbroich discuss the world strategic situation. What emerged in the animated debate which followed was the failure of the U.S. administration to make its policies known, the lack of comprehension due to having to depend on the media for information, and an eagerness to understand and support the policy.

As one of the conference participants, former LVAK commander Gen. (ret.) Wilhelm Kuntner, remarked in the course of the discussion, "After March 23, there were questions concerning the feasibility [of the program] and even its desirability. But since the Soviets are in full swing developing their own beam weapon program, the U.S. program is a necessity." His successor, current LVAK head General Brosch-Fohraheim, concluded the seminar by noting that purported experts had denied earlier in history the possibility of bringing fresh water to Vienna, and that their lineal descendants were now claiming that "an energy source of the size of the Castle of Schönbrunn would have to be boosted in space in order to power beam weapons." While "the scenario

that has been presented to us seems to be quite a fantastic one," he added, "We should realize that for 40 years, thermonuclear weapons have been in existence and have not been used. But there is no example in history of a major offensive weapon never being used. Now, the United States has taken a powerful step in the direction of beam weapons. . . . Let us hope that it can stop nuclear war."

Concluding the seminar, General Brosch-Fohraheim stated: "This conference has given us a glimpse of the world outside our small environment. Let us be clear that what we have heard is by no means in the realm of fairy tales but a hard reality. This is the world of the future—one that will very soon be accomplished." One wishes one heard such refreshing words from representatives of the same rank in supposedly more strategically enlightened nations.

Fear of the Soviets

The response of the Austrian military was all the more remarkable because the news that *EIR* representatives were coming to Vienna had started a wave of slanders that "the cold-warriors, the right-wing [*EIR* founder Lyndon] LaRouche spokesmen are coming to town," a slander espoused and propagated by representatives of the Austrian Foreign Office, who insistently told both Tennenbaum and Hellenbroich after the seminar: "You should not speak so rudely of the Soviets!"

Such fear of offending Austria's powerful neighbor might well be translated, "Don't offend our masters." There are several thousand Soviet citizens living in Vienna, and a new compound for 700 Soviet "diplomats" and their families is now being built which could aptly be described as the Soviet garrison. As a senior Austrian security official told *EIR*, 70 to 80 percent of the Soviet "diplomats" are KGB and GRU agents working under the cover of their assignments at international and supranational organizations such as the United Nations's UNIDO agency or the International Atomic Energy Association (IAEA), as well as through the many Soviet and Eastern European business links with Austria.

The effects of such immense Soviet pressure were evident. A leading spokesman of the Austrian opposition party, called the "Blacks," claimed: "The Soviets are not behaving in an irrational way. You are wrong. They are not seeking a

confrontation. They will not attack fortress Europe.” As a former senior official of the Oesterreichische Nationalbank, the Central Bank, explained, “Nobody really knows why the Soviets pulled out in 1955: They could as well have chosen to stay.” The inference is clear that the Soviets, who occupied a large zone of Austria and Vienna from 1945 through 1955, might as well come back—and that Austria must appease Russia at all costs. The banker was merely expressing the widespread willingness to accept virtually everything from Moscow, on time-tested principles that *Mittleuropa* and the czars could always find a *terrain d’entente*, or *terrain de détente*.

The 1955 State Treaty launched what then went under the name of “peaceful coexistence” and represented the institutional form of Moscow’s acceptance of Bertrand Russell’s Pugwash Conference strategic proposals. The treaty neutralized Austria and made it the meeting ground of East and West, and the site of such KGB penetration operations as the International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) at Laxenberg near Vienna.

The failure to denazify

The neutralization of Austria in 1955 was proposed by Dr. Bruno Kreisky, the Socialist International leader who started his long career as Social-Democratic foreign minister and was federal chancellor for the last 13 years.

A key to Kreisky’s power is the fact that, as a Jew, his holding political office ostensibly exculpated Austria somewhat from its guilt for the Nazi regime. Hitler’s *Anschluss* was certainly a forcible affair, but the April 10, 1938 referendum approving it went through with 4.4 million “ayes” to an incredible 12,000 “nays,” and an official Pastoral Letter of the all-powerful Austrian Catholic Bishops calling for a “Yes to the Führer”! Vienna Archbishop Cardinal Innitzer wrapped up his letters with a spirited “Heil Hitler” while the country gave an above-average rate of volunteers in the Waffen SS, many of whom resurfaced in the postwar period and hold important positions today. Kreisky’s presence served to offset most of what could have been said about the failure to denazify Austria. In fact, the operations of pro-détente Socialist Kreisky setting up East-West interfaces was the ideal cover for Moscow’s taking control of SS elements after the war.

As a result, Kreisky was built up by the Kremlin as one of the great men of détente, one of the indispensable mediators and brokers between East and West. Soviet Jews leaving Black Hundred country passed through Vienna, and sometimes remained for long periods. Kreisky was able to openly rebuild good relations with Hungary’s Communist chief János Kádár and the rest of the Eastern bloc. Trade blossomed, reaching 20 percent of Austria’s foreign trade. The traditional bridges dating back to the old Hapsburg Empire were rebuilt. In this land of détente, OPEC set up its headquarters, and the Mutual and Balanced Forces Reduction (MBFR) negotiations were established. Vienna was being rebuilt with its

“Pluralist Empire” tradition of world-federalism. Why fear the Soviets in such circumstances?

Professor Friedrich Levčik, head of the Institute for Comparative International Economics (WIIW) and an authority in East-West affairs, expressed this quite strongly to *EIR*: “The Soviets have no aggressive designs, they’re in fact on the defensive. They pose no strategic threat. They would be only too glad to reach an agreement.” But since Reagan “talks tough and with popular support, the Soviets are not going to sign on the dotted line even though they’re out for an agreement. The Soviets are merely trying to keep their own. They have no aspiration to world domination.” He echoed a representative of the country’s largest bank, Creditanstalt-Bankverein special adviser Dr. Philip Rieger, who stressed the “inferiority complex” of the Soviets and the fact that “their country has always been invaded throughout history. There are only two possibilities ahead of us: Either it is war, or it is peace. If it is war, forget it. If it is peace, we will have to trade and work with the East.”

A Soviet satrapy

In short, Austria is controlled not as a province in the Soviet Empire, as, say, Hungary is. It is a Soviet satrapy, following the strategic designs of Moscow without having to be subjugated or subjected to the most menial prescriptions of the current Five-Year Plan. Austria is a vassal state with some margin for autonomous action—its foreign policy is essentially a part of Moscow’s strategic game, while its domestic policy remains unfettered, so long as some business tribute is paid to the Eastern Empire.

This situation is nothing new to the bureaucracy of Vienna’s Hofburg, which played that very game with the Central European and Balkanic nationalities for several centuries on end. The current Archduke Otto von Hapsburg’s own intrigues with the Soviets’ provincial governors in Hungary and other countries center around the creation of a reorganized *Mittleuropa* bloc. The leading aristocratic families of the old Austro-Hungarian Empire are directly involved in the process. They still control the largest family fortunes in Austria, based on estates, forests, land, and urban real estate. A walk through Vienna’s Jesuit-Baroque architectural landmarks not only reveals layer upon layer of European history, but a promenade through the who’s who of the European Black Oligarchy: the Pallavicinis, the Lobkowitzes, and the Fürstenbergs have their family palaces there, from which they conduct active dialogue with Moscow, Sofia, Prague, Bucharest, Budapest, Belgrade, Pankow, and Kiev.

But there are some in Vienna who do not succumb to attractions of Moscow, and exhibit no desire to renew postwar experiences of direct Soviet domination and prewar and war-time experiences of subjugation to a totalitarian Reich. These Austrian leaders, such as those at the War College, reject what brought their country to be the first to fall prey to Hitler: Neville Chamberlain and Edouard Daladier’s cowardly appeasement.