

The debacle of New Yalta after the INF treaty

by Webster G. Tarpley

The cold war is over, said British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher as 1988 drew to a close. In his self-serving valedictory on the foreign policy achievements of his administrations, President Reagan spoke at Charlottesville, Virginia on Dec. 16 of "Americans and Russians making common cause as we once made common cause against another terrible enemy 44 years ago," while praising the INF treaty and the Afghan, Cambodia, and Brazzaville accords. In retrospect, 1988 is likely to have marked the high tide of these delusions.

Perhaps the apex of New Yalta madness may turn out to have been Gorbachov's demagogic U.N. performance of Dec. 7, with his announcement of Red Army cuts of 500,000 and troop pullouts of 50,000 from East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, plus some from Outer Mongolia—all of them integral features of the Red Army's modernization program designed to facilitate an attack on NATO Europe. Then he rushed back to Moscow to direct the slaughter of the Armenian resistance.

By next year at this time, this Gorbachov-induced mirage of "peace breaking out all over," as well as the Stavropol deceiver himself, are likely to have joined such chimeras as "this is my last territorial demand in Europe" in the receptacle of history's Big Lies.

1988 has been a banner year for the New Yalta, bracketed between two Gorbachov visits to the United States, and punctuated at mid-year by Reagan's trip to Moscow to exchange the ratification instruments for the INF treaty. There have been the April Geneva accords on Afghanistan, the December Brazzaville deal on Angola and Namibia, the superpower haggling over the cessation of Iran-Iraq hostilities, and related dealings over Cambodia. To say nothing of such figures as Mitterrand and Helmut Kohl trooping off to Moscow.

The permanent value of these pieces of paper and secret

protocols is about as great as that of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact by late 1940. The Kremlin has used the illusion of the New Yalta to paralyze the West at the precise time that the Soviet Empire is gripped by its greatest internal convulsion in recent history, a kind of development that would make the Soviets very vulnerable to a well-designed political counter-offensive—if anyone were interested in assailing them. The Kremlin is hoping to ride out the storms of ethnic protest and food riots over the coming several years, using the New Yalta to bridge its current phase of internal exhaustion, until about 1992, when the war machine stipulated by the Ogarkov doctrine is now scheduled to be "ready."

The gullible Reagan has helped out the Russians by providing the indispensable ingredient of a near-fatal internal crisis of NATO with his sellout at Reykjavik, followed by the debacle of the INF treaty itself. The INF was voted up by the U.S. Senate on May 27, by a vote of 93-5, with Republicans Helms, Humphrey, Symms, and Wallop joined by Democrat Hollings on the honor roll of those senators casting the negative votes.

The destructive impact of the INF treaty in Western Europe was much magnified by the issuance, on Jan. 12, of the report of the Commission on Integrated Long-Term Strategy, known as the Iklé-Wohlstetter report. This document, bearing the title of *Discriminate Deterrence*, effectively proposed to destroy the foundation of the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 by refusing to commit U.S. strategic nuclear forces in case of a Soviet attack on Western Europe.

According to Iklé, at the time the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Policy, the threat of using such strategic nuclear arsenals to stop the Soviets on the Elbe is "no longer appropriate or believable." The report itself stated: "To help defend our allies and to defend our interests abroad, we cannot rely

on threats expected to provoke our own annihilation if carried out.”

The meaning of this cowardly appeasement was not lost on prominent Europeans: Alfred Dregger told the CDU faction in the federal German Bundestag, “Now the U.S. will use its strategic arsenals only if the U.S. sanctuary itself is attacked.” Besides removing the U.S. nuclear umbrella from Western Europe, the report called for pulling out U.S. troops as well. It was proposed to place the emphasis on attacking developing countries in the Third World under the familiar “brushfire war” rationale.

To the extent that this view becomes official policy, Article V of the North Atlantic Pact (the “attack on one is an attack on all” clause) becomes a dead letter, and Soviet world domination a foregone conclusion. The Reagan administration argued that Iklé-Wohlstetter did not represent current policy, but rather an attempt to deal with problems that might arise in the future. This fooled no one, since the *Discriminate Deterrence* abomination had been signed not just by Iklé and Wohlstetter, but also by such luminaries as Kissinger, Brzezinski, Judge Clark, General Vessey, Samuel P. Huntington, Anne Armstrong, and other spokesmen of the Washington elite which, under most circumstances, is more important than the wishes of the President himself in foreign policy.

Stench of doom and defeat

The Iklé-Wohlstetter document expresses the cowardice and historical-cultural pessimism that is pervasive in the degenerate U.S. foreign policy elite. Its basic idea had already been expounded in Brzezinski’s 1986 book, *Gameplan*, where Carter’s national security adviser argued that since frictions between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. are unavoidable if the former insists on maintaining a presence anywhere on the Eurasian land mass, the smart thing to do would be to pull back to a posture of de facto hemispheric or virtual “Fortress America” defense. Similar themes were developed in a report from CSIS towards the end of 1988. The stench of defeat issuing from *Discriminate Deterrence* is otherwise coherent with the trendy “School of Decline” of historiographical studies predicated on the collapse of the American Empire.

The Iklé-Wohlstetter Commission continued to spew out its poisons during the course of the year. The January report was followed by such titles as *Supporting U.S. Strategy for Third World Conflict*, *Commitment to Freedom: Security Assistance as a U.S. Policy Instrument in the Third World*, and *Sources of Change in the Future Security Environment*, all coherent with the original line of appeasement in Europe, and aggressive hostility to the developing nations.

No sooner had the INF treaty text been initialed at the White House, Soviet spokesmen began to flaunt an arrogant triumphalism in their dealings with Western Europe. Foreign Minister (and KGB General) Shevardnadze came to London in January to bluster about the “danger of compensatory rearmament in Europe” in the wake of INF, including the threat

that nuclear modernization by France, Britain, or by NATO as a whole “cannot be tolerated.” The British press noted the “bullying” and “insolence” of the new Moscow line, but Thatcher failed to learn her lesson. Other Russian spokesmen began to expound the need to diminish the gap in living standards between Western and Eastern Europe through the coerced transfer of excess wealth into the Soviet empire.

Under the impact of U.S. betrayal and Soviet arrogance, disarray in NATO increased. Denmark was shortly gripped by a political crisis around the issue of NATO nuclear defense. According to European experts, fear of Moscow has grown so large in Denmark that a large question mark has been placed over the country’s effective role in the alliance.

After the INF had gone through, a palliative was to proceed to modernize short-range or battlefield nuclear weapons with ranges below those proscribed by the treaty. Such measures involved the predictable, structural difficulty of concentrating an unacceptably large share of nuclear risk on German territory alone, since this is where the warheads would land. The pro-Moscow Social Democracy (SPD) was ready at once with a “third zero,” banning the battlefield weapons as well. It was German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher who then ruled out modernization of the battlefield weapons, a position he has reiterated with more vehemence in the wake of Gorbachov’s United Nations disarmament demagoguery.

Federal Germany is increasingly under direct Soviet irregular warfare attack. The deepest suspicion of Soviet involvement and tampering attaches to the August crash of Italian air force fliers at the annual open house airshow of Ramstein air base in the F.R.G. This tragic incident, together with the numerous crashes of military aircraft in Western Europe, is being systematically exploited by the declared enemies of the NATO alliance in the campaign to outlaw low-level flight training over German terrain. Such combat training, conducted over the territory where hostilities would actually occur, is of course indispensable to a credible defense. Social Democratic and Green spokesmen are receptive to the various trial balloons the Soviets have floated, including proposals to barter cuts in Soviet tanks on the central European front against the liquidation of NATO forward based air systems, now just about the only ones that have even the theoretical ability to strike behind the Warsaw Pact lines and perhaps reach Soviet territory.

In the wake of the Uwe Barschel affair of late 1987, German politics has been subjected to repeated upheavals. For pro-NATO forces, the greatest has been the death of Bavarian Minister President Franz Josef Strauss, the head of the Christian Social Union for the past three decades. A week later, the Soviet KGB, availing itself of the services of Green and SPD members of the Bundestag, as well as of media and journalistic networks, carried out a partial coup d’état in Bonn by forcing the resignation of the President of the German Bundestag, Philipp Jenninger. Jenninger had been one

of the very few remaining confidants of Kohl, and his departure has weakened the executive in Bonn, to the advantage of Soviet agents of influence like Foreign Minister Genscher.

Gorbachov's Asia policy

The ongoing liquidation of the Euromissiles deployed under the December 1979 NATO modernization decision has in effect implemented a key part of the Soviet Ogarkov doctrine: the Soviet desire to avoid any war in Europe, and to be able to fight the United States alone, without allies. A corollary of this part of the Ogarkov doctrine is that if there is no war between the U.S.S.R. and NATO Europe, then the danger that the People's Republic of China will fall upon the Russian rear, while the bulk of the Red Army is engaged in central Europe, is diminished.

In Asia, accordingly, Gorbachov has pursued an aggressive diplomacy along the lines suggested in his September 1986 Vladivostok speech, in which he demanded the recognition of sweeping imperial rights for the U.S.S.R. in Asia. The current phase is dominated by the follow-up to Gorbachov's late November 1987 call for a communist superpower summit between himself and Beijing's paramount leader, Deng Xiao-Ping. In October, Deng told a Finnish delegation in effect that there could be a summit with Gorbachov if Deng got his way on Cambodia and a series of other Chinese strategic concerns. That "if" has now been confirmed by the first trip of a Beijing foreign minister to Moscow in over 30 years. Gorbachov's recent visit to New Delhi and Rajiv Gandhi's imminent visit to Beijing (the first such trip by an Indian Prime Minister since before the 1962 Sino-Indian border war) indicate that Gorbachov's Asian strategic deception also prominently includes India.

Gorbachov is thus playing one game with the United States and NATO Europe, and another game with Beijing and New Delhi. An integral part of this strategic constellation is the collapse of Beijing's economy, a breakdown so catastrophic that it threatens to destroy the central authority and bring on a new "war lord" epoch of the type seen after 1911 and repeatedly during China's millennial history. According to well informed European sources, Gorbachov has concluded that Beijing will not be able to play the role of a true world superpower for the next 30-40 years, if at all. These sources say that he evoked for his Indian hosts the glittering vision of India, with Soviet aid, becoming the third superpower empire in alternative to China, a vision he cunningly formulated to appeal to the vanity of certain Brahmin chauvinist circles.

There is no sign, however, that Soviet KGB-inspired ethnic destabilization operations against India have been limited in conformity with this vision. What Gorbachov wanted in concrete seems to have been an Indian attack on Pakistan, a country whose head of state, President Zia, was murdered by the Soviets. At the same time, Gorbachov's December U.N. speech was a tacit admission that the highly-touted Geneva accords on Afghanistan are a dead letter, and that the Red Army will not leave the country by Feb. 15, 1989.

Gorbachov's basic card is therefore a new Indo-Pakistani war, followed by the partition of both Afghanistan and Pakistan, with the Soviets retaining northern Afghanistan, the Wakkan corridor, and also securing predominant influence in the new entity of Baluchistan that they would hope to precipitate out of these events. The Soviet puppet state of Baluchistan would realize the Kremlin's centuries-old dream of access to the warm waters of the Arabian Sea and the Indian Ocean.

Eastern Europe

The Millennium of the Russian Orthodox Church celebrated at mid-year has been accompanied by the opening of what could easily become the terminal crisis of the Russian Empire, caused by food shortages and the exhaustion of resources for looting. In February, the upheavals began in Armenia, Azerbaijan, and the rest of the Transcaucasus. In April-May, Poland began to boil over once again, with the biggest strikes and protests since the imposition of martial law in December 1981. The Baltic Republics and, more importantly, 50 million Ukrainians have been in continuous ferment, watching and waiting for the chance of an effective rebellion. In the fall there were momentary indications that the Red Army was massing to roll over Romania as a prelude to an invasion of Yugoslavia in support of the Serbians against their opponents in the looming Yugoslavian civil war. Indeed, some knowledgeable observers were of the opinion that one key motive for Gorbachov's Dec. 7 visit to New York City was to ask Reagan and Bush for a free hand in Yugoslavia, including the seizure of Yugoslav Adriatic ports by the Red Army—a move which in reality would set the stage for World War III. The outbreak of a civil war in Yugoslavia is seen as a virtual certainty for 1989, with Slovenes, Croats, Kossovo Albanians, and Montenegrins lining up against the Russian-backed greater Serbians, and with Albania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Greece tempted to join the carving in an anti-Serbian mode.

The entire Soviet empire would now be vulnerable to the political-organization penetration described by General Wego Chiang in a recent speech as "the mellow offensive"—the building of an anti-communist political combat organization behind the enemy's lines. The ideological integument of the CPSU and its puppet parties has been destroyed, and after being told that Stalin was a butcher and Brezhnev was a crook, Russians do not know what to believe in.

U.S. strategic opinion remains split among Dukakis-Shultz appeasers, traditionalist and military layers around Lyndon LaRouche, and a middle group including Henry Kissinger. As 1988 waned, CIA Deputy Director Robert Gates, NATO Supreme Commander Gen. John Galvin, Kissinger, and others issued warnings about Soviet intentions. As for Gorbachov, he told the Armenians on Dec. 11, "One more step and it's the abyss." LaRouche's international anti-Bolshevik strategy of people's war remains the key to reversing the New Yalta.