

---

## Conference Report

---

# Conference shows how Sovietologists warp intelligence estimates

by Rachel Douglas

While Secretary of State George Shultz packed his bags for Moscow to prepare the Reagan-Gorbachov summit, the III World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies convened in Washington, Oct. 30-Nov. 4, 1985. Standing in for Shultz as the keynote speaker to open the conference, Deputy Secretary of State John C. Whitehead thanked the assembled multitude of professors and government experts for "your insights into Soviet and East European realities [which] illuminate what would otherwise be an impenetrable enigma to policy makers."

Looking into the sessions and byways of this conference, the largest such international gathering since the II World Congress held five years ago in Bavaria, *EIR* reconfirmed first-hand that the U.S. government and other NATO countries turn to highly dubious sources indeed, for advice and supposed illumination—the cast of characters known as the Sovietologists. Here was to be found everyone from the prophets of impending collapse of the Soviet empire, to the worshippers of an imaginary peace-loving Russian Soul that is opposed to Soviet armed might, to those who argue that Mikhail Gorbachov is a new, reasonable sort of Soviet leader, to a small minority who reported with some degree of accuracy on aspects of the Soviet military, economic, and cultural mobilization to dominate the world as the sole remaining superpower.

Thanks to the worldwide circulation since July of *EIR*'s Special Report, *Global Showdown: The Russian Imperial War Plan for 1988*, and to the ability of a few intelligence specialists in Europe and in defense-oriented circles in the United States to not entirely misinterpret the evidence before them, reality did surface at several points during the meeting.

A professor from a small American college, for instance, declared that a basic truth about Soviet policy is that the entire "Bolshevik mentality" derived from the traditions of Muscovy—above all, the belief that Moscow is destined to rule as the Third and Final Rome, capital of a world empire. The Communist International continued the expansionist traditions of the Russian empire, he said, and the Soviet state today, as did the Bolsheviks, employs the same arsenal of diplomacy, intrigue, and intervention abroad as did the Tsars.

That analysis is hardly startling to *EIR* readers, but it flies in the face of reams of findings by the Sovietologists.

Few even among the Sovietologists will question any more what *EIR*'s *Global Showdown* report amply demonstrated about the mysterious disappearance of Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov back in September 1984—that this top Soviet strategist was not demoted, but went behind the scenes to oversee the crucial, Western front of the Soviet command reorganization for global war-fighting.

Speakers specializing in military matters were nearly unanimous on this.

Prof. Martin McCauley of the University of London outlined Gorbachov's policies as essentially Ogarkov's for the total militarization of Soviet society. The relationship between party and military leadership in the U.S.S.R. today, McCauley acknowledged, is, "If I were Gorbachov, I'd be taking tutorials from Ogarkov." The sweeping reorganization of the Soviet military command structure, he added, bears Ogarkov's signature.

An American defense intelligence specialist concurred: It is wrong to talk about any "rehabilitation" of Ogarkov and his war doctrine, he said, because Ogarkov was not really eclipsed; there was and is nobody in the Soviet military establishment who disagrees with Marshal Ogarkov's vision of war-fighting.

Unfortunately, those who didn't yet grasp the point about Ogarkov numbered among them a gentleman identifying himself as an employee of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, who rose to tell McCauley he was "dubious of the idea that Ogarkov wasn't demoted" but offered no evidence to support a contrary view.

### No basket case

Another panel heard Prof. Steven Rosefielde of the University of North Carolina attack "the allegation that the Soviet economy is too much of a basket case to sustain a [military] build-up." Reviewing recent disputes over basic estimates of Soviet military industrial capability, Rosefielde pointed out that CIA estimates of Soviet weapons production and stocks require that we believe the Soviets have regressed in terms of technology and have experienced zero percent annual growth in weapons production from 1976 to 1983! These conclusions, he said, are then used to justify the analysis that Soviet arms are for deterrent purposes only. (Raymond Garthoff of

the Brookings Institution, ambassador to Bulgaria during the Carter administration, thereupon expressed regret that neither the CIA nor Sovietologists who say even the CIA's estimates are "excessive" were present on this particular panel.)

Despite the cited episodes of competence, hundreds of Sovietologists are stuck on the track of scenarios for the speedy crumbling of the Soviet empire. Several of the professors present at the III World Congress had had their heads stuffed with this line at Rev. Sun Myung Moon's conference on the topic, held in Geneva last August (*EIR*, Aug. 30, "Moon-led 'Kremlinologists' back Soviet military rule"). The two academic cliques most insistent on the imminence of Soviet collapse, in fact, are the self-styled super-conservatives attracted by Moon, and the British university Marxists. A group of the latter, well-fed, rosy-cheeked fellows from the University of Glasgow and *Critique* magazine, held an entire panel on their view that "the Soviet position in the world is declining," Soviet society is "pulling apart," and the regime has arrived at the point where it cannot control its labor force.

Another sort of soul-brother of the Glasgow crowd, Prof. Alexandre Bennigsen of the Sorbonne, failed to show up at the Washington conference, where he was supposed to speak twice. Godfather of the "Central Asian Studies" subdivision of Sovietology, responsible for the disastrous thesis that Islamic fundamentalism would not only be a bulwark against communism in the Middle East but would soon spark revolts in Soviet Central Asia, Bennigsen was off in Turkey. His followers, nevertheless, were present to sing his praises during three different panels.

### ***Dezinformatsiya***

The most pervasive source of erroneous evaluation of Soviet acts and intentions, evident at this conference as it is time and time again, is the Sovietologists' kow-towing to emigrés as carriers of "inside knowledge" about the Soviet Union. The obviously problematic matter of intelligence-community defectors only begins to indicate the scope of strategic miscalculation that comes from basing evaluations on the testimony of emigrés.

American intelligence officers are worse-positioned than most to see where they are going astray—for the root of the matter lies in the domain of culture, which is not the average American's strong suit.

It has been reported, for example, that President Reagan's advisers want him to view the sentimentalist Soviet movie, *Moscow Does Not Believe In Tears*, as part of preparations for meeting Mikhail Gorbachov, and to meet again with Suzanne Massie, author of *Land of the Firebird: The Beauty of Old Russia*, who holds that the bellicosity of the Russian empire was never anything but a paranoid reaction to the threat of foreign invasion.

The emigrés who most push the line about a beautiful, innocent Russian Soul, at odds with all of Muscovite militant

imperialism, at the same time mock Reagan as a typically ignorant American who just for that reason is unaware of this Russian Soul.

At the III World Congress, this cultural disinformation (*dezinformatsiya*, as the KGB would say) emerged dramatically at a panel on National Bolshevism. The documentation was extensive, the case was clear: The Bolshevik regime picked up the standard of the Third Rome. Its army was the Russian army restored. Stalin's foreign policy was the imperial geopolitics of Haushofer, who was a source also for the Nazis; hence the Hitler-Stalin pact was lawful. Russian imperialist publicist Ustryalov hailed the Bolsheviks as the force that could keep the "border areas" from falling away.

But the star of the panel, Russian emigré writer Lev Kopelev, said that none of this was the true Russia. Speaking through his long, white beard à la Lev Tolstoi, Kopelev attacked the "prejudices about my homeland" that beset American officials. He ridiculed President Reagan's recent

---

---

*Thanks to the worldwide circulation since July of EIR's Special Report Global Showdown: The Russian Imperial War Plan for 1988, and to the ability of a few intelligence specialists in Europe and in defense-oriented circles in the United States to not entirely misinterpret the evidence before them, reality did surface at several points during the meeting.*

---

---

assertion that the Russian language lacks a word for freedom—a blunder Reagan was led to, no doubt, by some Sovietologist's bowdlerized briefing on the mysteries of Russian culture.

Finally, Kopelev proclaimed, that, while the regime of Lenin, Stalin, Brezhnev, and Gorbachov is indeed the successor to Ivan the Terrible's, the true Russians like St. Sergei of Radonezh and the writer Dostoevsky have no heirs! For, "the spiritual development of Russia has always been in opposition to or independent of the state."

As *EIR* has documented as a matter of greatest strategic importance, Sergei of Radonezh was a 14th-century shaper of the Russian mystical-military cult of the state, and Dostoevsky preached the ugliest race-hatred of the Pan-Slav imperialists in 19th-century Russia. But the Sovietologists applauded Kopelev, as if a sage were speaking who could not be questioned.