

Elite spokesmen warn against trusting Soviets

by Nicholas F. Benton

The top national security adviser to the campaign of Vice President George Bush, in a recent interview with *EIR*, expressed concern about Soviet plans to exploit the transition period immediately following the U.S. presidential election. The same concern has been reflected in a spate of warnings by spokesmen for what might be termed a "center" faction of the U.S. elite, who fear the impulse of a U.S. President-elect to leap into Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachov's open arms.

Remarks by NATO Supreme Commander Gen. John Galvin in Bonn Nov. 3, by West German Defense Minister Rupert Scholz in Mainz a day earlier, by former NATO official Luigi Caligaris in the Italian daily *Corriere della Serra* Oct. 31, and by former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger in Washington Oct. 26, all echoed the same theme, warning against appeasement tendencies.

Their caveats on Gorbachov's intentions came as both U.S. presidential candidates, in the days leading up to the election, expressed their eagerness to meet with the Soviet leader as soon as possible, which was received with immediate enthusiasm by Soviet spokesman Gennadi Gerassimov.

In unusually candid comments to *EIR* Oct. 19 (see "Eye on Washington," Oct. 28, 1988), former U.S. National Security Adviser Gen. Brent Scowcroft, rumored to be first in line to replace William Webster at CIA if Bush is elected, told *EIR* that he expected Gorbachov to test the Western alliance with, at minimum, a major "diplomatic offensive" immediately after the U.S. election.

He said that the test would probably take the form of a generous-sounding proposal for an asymmetric reduction of conventional forces in Europe. "He will offer to remove two Warsaw Pact soldiers for every one removed by NATO, and this will be made to look very good to the average European citizen," Scowcroft predicted.

"But," he noted, "this will only be a ploy, because in reality, the asymmetry is not two-to-one, but four or even six-to-one." Nonetheless, Scowcroft lamented, "NATO does

not have its act together" to counter such a Soviet move, and responsibility to remedy that falls directly on the President-elect of the United States immediately after the election. Speaking of Bush, Scowcroft said, "But it is not going to happen. Now, he is thinking about nothing but the election. . . . I don't know that after the election, either. I doubt if anything will happen before the inauguration in January."

Scowcroft should know. During the campaign, he has headed Bush's National Security Task Force.

Therefore, the barrage of warnings from Galvin, Scholz, Caligaris, and Kissinger, which began with an even more severe analysis of the Soviets by CIA Deputy Director Robert Gates in a Washington, D.C. speech Oct. 14, is an attempt to stiffen Western resolve in the face of the expected post-election Soviet "surprise."

But while each warning has focused on the continued Soviet threat to the West despite Gorbachov's feints toward peace, none of these individuals proposed any concrete policy toward the explosive tensions emerging in the East bloc that would be the trigger for Soviet aggression.

That task was left solely to independent presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche, who in a half-hour paid political advertisement telecast nationally on NBC Oct. 31, spelled out a "food for peace" approach to alleviating the economic debacle facing the East bloc, a fundamental cause of the Soviet impetus toward war.

LaRouche, identifying himself as the leading spokesman for the "traditionalist" faction in the foolish thinking of elite circles in the West who view the disintegrating economic conditions in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe with glee. Instead, LaRouche said, the key to a war-avoidance strategy requires that "we heed the lesson taught us by a great military scientist nearly four centuries ago, Niccolò Machiavelli: We must always provide an adversary with a safe route of escape."

This means, LaRouche said, that “at the same time we discourage Moscow from dangerous military and similar adventures . . . we must rebuild our economies to the level at which we can provide the nations of the Soviet bloc an escape from the terrible effects of their economic suffering.”

Otherwise, LaRouche warned, the ruling military and KGB faction in the Soviet Union that consolidated power during the extraordinary leadership meeting Sept. 30 is fully prepared to solve its problems by military means. Far from being a peace-loving advocate of “détente,” Gorbachov is a ruthless product of former KGB chief Yuri Andropov and Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov’s “kindergarten,” which includes other Soviet hardliners like Viktor Chebrikov, Vadim Medvedev, and Vladimir Kryuchkov, all of whom were promoted on Sept. 30.

LaRouche’s telecast created shockwaves internationally. The U.S. Public Broadcasting System (PBS) agreed to make the show available to all its affiliates for re-airing, under equal-time provisions, before the election.

Other warnings

While none of them echoed LaRouche’s policy approach toward cooling out East-West tensions, the recent warnings on the continuing Soviet danger all reflected some themes touched on by LaRouche:

● **Gen. James Galvin**, NATO Supreme Commander, speaking to the Konrad Adenauer Foundation in Bonn Nov. 3, said that “the West must not allow wishful thinking or idle illusions” to color its thinking about defense, or to delay the modernization of NATO military forces. He said that the “process in the Soviet Union is open-ended, and could change overnight.”

He advised the audience to read Gorbachov’s book, entitled *Perestroika*, which calls for the denuclearization of Western Europe, the removal of all U.S. forces, and the dissolution of NATO. “The method may have changed,” he said, “but the goals have not. . . . The Soviet military is sticking to its old practices. They are modernizing their tanks and aircraft carriers, and building thousands of new T-80 tanks.”

● **Rupert Scholz**, West German defense minister, in Mainz Nov. 2 to report on his talks with the Soviet leadership in Moscow the previous week, said, “When looking at Gorbachov’s reform program, one should not close one’s eyes to the fact that with a superiority of 32,000 battle tanks over NATO, the Warsaw Pact has an invasion capability.” He said that Soviet Defense Minister Dimitri Yazov told him that all Soviet arms control policy is run directly out of the Soviet Defense Ministry, as a subsumed feature of Soviet military policy.

He noted that economic reform efforts in the Soviet Union “have been confined to the military sector so far,” with “no functioning consumer goods sector.” Furthermore, he said,

“*Perestroika* and *glasnost* have not altered the basic state ideology of the Soviet Union, which is incompatible with a pluralistic, democratic society.”

● **Luigi Caligaris**, former high-level NATO officer, wrote from Moscow for the Italian daily *Corriere della Sera* Oct. 31, that his interviews with Soviet military leaders, including General Chervov, and tours of different branches of the armed forces there, revealed that “Marshal Ogarkov is considered the hidden inspirer of military *perestroika* since 1982.”

It was then, Caligaris pointed out, that Ogarkov wrote, “The dialectics of transformation from quantity to quality demand changes in armaments, structures, and proportions among the different branches of the armed forces . . . elimination of the old, which blocks progress.” “In these words,” wrote Caligaris, “written six years ago, there is the essence of the military reform wanted today by the Communist Party.”

The premier role of Ogarkov was pointed out to him, he said, by Soviet military men during his discussions. Ogarkov was described as “the head of the school of great reform, whose writings help in the verification of the convergences or the dissonances between the political *nomenklatura* and the military.”

Two of Ogarkov’s main ideas, Caligaris wrote, are “initiatives and autonomy of decision and command,” adding, “They are essential ideas and also the aims of the general *perestroika*. Ogarkov, in fact, not only demands changes in the military’s approach, but demands more intervention into the military by the party, by the Komsomol, and by the Soviets. . . . This is in fact what *perestroika* wants to achieve: to overcome the differences between the military and the politicians by promoting better cooperation.”

● **Henry Kissinger**, the former U.S. Secretary of State and National Security Adviser, speaking at the National Press Club on Oct. 26, warned against “the whole world becoming mesmerized by Gorbachov,” adding, “I can’t predict Gorbachov’s intentions. He probably doesn’t know himself what he is going to do.”

Kissinger emphasized, “It is dangerous to make the foreign policy of a nation dependent on the good will of one individual.” He said, “We will have to take into account the possibility that the Soviet Union goes through a new crisis. . . . We must remember that, when talking about the Soviet Union, we are dealing with 70-years of Communist ideology and a history of Russian security concerns. After every century, the Russian borders have expanded in all directions. . . . To rely passively on the evolution of the Soviet system would be mortgaging the future. We need some conception of the kind of world we want to create.”

Kissinger did not elaborate on any such conception, himself. That, together with the equally important “how to get there,” was left to LaRouche.