

---

An Analysis by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

---

# Mistakes in Moscow and Washington behind dynamic toward World War III

by Gabriele Liebig

During the 1980s, there emerged twice the chance to place the East-West relationship on an improved basis. The fact that both times these chances were aborted, is responsible for the renewed fateful dynamic toward a strategic showdown between Russia and the West. In two recent interviews and a policy memorandum dated Feb. 23, Lyndon LaRouche explains that the first chance was in 1982-83, the East-West collaboration in what became the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), as LaRouche had outlined it and Reagan adopted it. This was aborted, when Soviet party boss Yuri Andropov rejected Reagan's offer.

The second chance was the East-West collaboration in rebuilding the ravaged economies in eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union following the shift of 1989, as LaRouche outlined in his "Productive Triangle" program of December 1989. This was sabotaged by the Anglo-Americans, who instead enforced a disastrous International Monetary Fund "shock therapy" on the former communist economies. LaRouche warned that the dynamic toward a new East-West confrontation could only be broken, if these two major mistakes and failures are admitted, and reversed.

Lyndon LaRouche himself, the author of both the SDI and the Triangle program, became a political prisoner in this process. His political prosecution entered a serious stage in 1986, when, only days prior to the Reykjavik summit, the U.S. government ordered a 400-man paramilitary raid against the Leesburg, Virginia offices of LaRouche-linked companies and organizations. After two political trials, LaRouche was sentenced in January 1989 to 15 years in jail and has been incarcerated for more than four years.

## Back-channel negotiations with the Soviets

In an interview on Feb. 18, LaRouche told about the back-channel discussions he was conducting with the Soviets about beam-weapons defense in 1982-83, that had led up to Reagan's televised SDI speech of March 23, 1983.

"In late 1981, representatives of the weekly intelligence news magazine *Executive Intelligence Review*, with which I

am associated, were approached at the United Nations by a very high-level Soviet intelligence official. Certain questions and suggestions were made by this official to this representative of the *Executive Intelligence Review*. This was reported to me promptly at that time, and I asked the individual who had been contacted to write a memorandum of the exchange, and I forwarded an accompanying covering memorandum to relevant places in the U.S. government, giving my opinion on this matter.

"As a result, about a month later, the decision of the U.S. government communicated to me, was to ask me, under the National Security Act provisions, to undertake, on behalf of the Reagan administration, a back-channel discussion with Soviet high-level channels—to open up a new back-channel with Moscow.

"The agreement was, with my discussion of the clarification of this with the U.S. government, that what we would do, is that we would as a trial float, with full discussion with Moscow, what I was proposing, which later became known as the SDI. And that I would select, by probing, which channel in the U.S. we would use, for this back-channel exchange, which eventually was taken over by the National Security Council, to Moscow's top leadership. I picked a man in Washington who was approved, and we began discussions in February.

"As some will recall, there was a three-day conference in Washington in the middle of February [1982] where I publicly surfaced the same material that I was discussing with the gentleman from Moscow.

"So we fully explored all the features of my proposal for what became known as the SDI with Moscow. In about the beginning of February 1983, I had a clarification from Moscow, from Yuri Andropov, or his immediate circles. Yuri Andropov was then the General Secretary of the Soviet Union. The clarification was that they agreed with me that what was called the SDI the way I designed it would work as a ballistic-missile defense system. They agreed that the technological spin-offs of this for the economy would be

highly beneficial; but they said that they would not agree to this policy under any circumstances, because the United States and the West would have an advantage in this kind of program. Therefore, they were very interested in the other things we were talking about, they wanted to continue the back channel, but they assured me that their decision at that point not only was that Moscow would not accept it, but Moscow had a fix in with the top leadership of the Democratic Party to make sure it would not be adopted in the United States.

“Then [President] Reagan announced on March 23, in the concluding portion segment of his televised speech that night, the exact terms which I had previously indicated to the Moscow channel, saying that if the President were to offer this package, how would you react. The President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, on March 23 offered to Moscow publicly, by way of national television, exactly the proposal which I had presented to Moscow as the tentative trial-balloon proposal earlier. At that point, from the highest level, my back channel said, ‘We are shutting down the back channel. From the highest level, we are cutting you off.’ ”

### **Moscow demanded LaRouche’s imprisonment**

“And immediately, I was attacked by the Soviets, first not by name, that is, not in print, but in May of 1983,” when Soviet agents were privately circulating slanders against LaRouche internationally. Not long afterward, “[Fyodor] Burlatsky, who is a KGB man, a top adviser to Andropov, in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, which is a KGB publication, denounced the operation,” the SDI, as a *casus belli*.

This occurred in August 1983; for an annotated chronology of Soviet attacks on LaRouche and his movement, see *EIR*, Vol. 16, No. 4, Jan. 20, 1989 p. 50 ff.

“Meanwhile, all kinds of KGB operations against me were set into place around the world. In the fall of 1983, the Soviet government officially, through Burlatsky, identified me as a *casus belli*, saying that the existence of my personality and my position of influence in the U.S. government, would be a potential cause for a general thermonuclear war between the two superpowers. And that continued more or less; it quieted down under [Andropov’s short-lived successor] Chernenko, but when Gorbachov came in, the heat on me increased, and this led to the heavy demand on the U.S. government by Moscow, to the effect that there would be no agreement.

“The reason for this heat was, that I had warned them in 1982 and 1983, that if they did not enter into such an agreement to revive their economy and reorient this strategic situation, that their continued commitment to try to achieve a first-strike war-winning capability, would result in the collapse of the Soviet economy within about five years, that is, about 1988. They hated me for it, and saw me as being the evil genius who understood them and their problems and their economy all too well.

“Since then, I have had a lot of trouble. The Soviet intelligence services, in collaboration with the ADL and others including the prosecution team in Boston, promulgated the false reports that I had been the intellectual author of the assassination of Olof Palme. Following that, during the summer and early autumn of 1986, from July through October 1986, the featured articles in the leading Soviet press on the subject of me, echoed what was being said to the United States and others from behind the scenes through diplomatic and other channels. Moscow demanded of the United States government, that the United States government demonstrate a commitment to my elimination—and they used the word imprisonment—as a condition for the summit negotiations, which were then tentatively scheduled for October.

“Under the pressure of these pressures from Moscow, an agreement was reached between the Gorbachov government and the Reagan-Bush administration. And the British establishment as well. As a result of that, a raid was conducted against the headquarters of publishing organizations associated with me in Leesburg, Virginia, and elsewhere—a demonstrative raid, which was to signal to Moscow a commitment on the part of the Reagan-Bush administration to put me in prison and show the Russians they meant business on this thing, which assured the success of the Reykjavik Summit.”

LaRouche continued, “I was thrown into jail, and then kept there by Bush as a result of that New Yalta type of agreement between Gorbachov and the Reagan-Bush administrations.”

### **Long-term relationships among nations**

In another interview on Feb. 22, LaRouche elaborated another crucial feature, of what he had discussed with the Soviet in those negotiations that lasted 13 months from February 1982 to the end of March 1983.

“The crucial feature in these exploratory discussions was something which was not much discussed, however, in the major media. That is, I pointed out to the Soviets that there was a long history of a relationship between the United States and Russia prior to the Bolshevik phenomenon, and that at various times in our history, especially during the middle of the 19th century, Russia, under, say, Alexander II, the Czar of Russia, had been an ally of the United States and had intervened on behalf of the United States during a crucial part of our history, the Civil War, to prevent Britain and France from invading the United States. That is what Russia did for us at that time. Czar Alexander II stopped the British plan to invade the United States on behalf of the Confederacy or if not invade at least to break the naval blockade of the Confederacy and to use British and French combined naval power to crush the United States.”

LaRouche said he told the Russians that “we had to look at things from a higher standpoint of national interest, not these ideological questions; that the Russian economy was in deep trouble, that is, the Soviet economy at that time,

1982-1983; and that the U.S. economy was in trouble—not as acute, but in trouble. Unless something was done, on the one hand we had the danger of first-strike thermonuclear war almost by accident, that is, where short-range missiles were so close to each other that a U.S. President, for example, had about two or three minutes' warning time before he had to push the button for full-scale nuclear war in case the missiles started coming at us. A very dangerous situation; as a matter of fact, the first-strike condition was maintained on the Soviet side into 1989. There was always a continuing danger of a first strike from the Soviet side into 1989, just before the collapse of East Germany occurred.

“So I proposed that, first of all, since an effective ballistic missile defense system could only be accomplished by aid of what are called new physical principles in the diplomatic language, and since those principles were now at the point of readiness or near-readiness of development to be deployed, I proposed that both the Soviets and the United States, with others, agree to ballistic missile defense based on new physical principles as a counterweight to the danger of first strike, and secondly, that we agree to share this technology for peaceful purposes, and to foster a general global economic development based on these new technologies.

“At the same time, I warned the Soviets, that if they rejected my policy as I proposed would become Reagan's policy, and if they continued with their alternative to my policy proposal, then within about five years or say the five year half-life of their capital cycle, the Russian and Soviet economies would break down beginning with an inevitable breakdown in eastern Europe, the Warsaw pact countries, which would start a chain reaction leading to the collapse of the Russian economy. It didn't happen quite in 1988, but it did happen in 1989.”

### **Eurasian development was sabotaged**

“In response to the collapse that then occurred, I proposed the *Dreieck* proposal, i.e., the Productive Triangle proposal, which was blocked by the Anglo-Americans and others strenuously. If that had not been blocked, we would have rescued and bailed out the situation at that time. Instead, we went with IMF conditionalities and atrocities such as the so-called Sachs shock therapy plan. This aggravated the situation beyond belief, not only for the Russians but brought a situation in which the total collapse of the U.S. economy and the British economy became almost inevitable as long as the rejection of my alternative was maintained.

“What Bush did and what the British and others did, beginning in 1989 or 1990 with the fall of the [Berlin] Wall, was the worst possible thing. They said: Okay, the Russians are weak, they have to accept our diktat to some degree. We are going to destroy eastern Europe and its economy. We are going to destroy the former Soviet economy by these kinds of pressures.

“What they should have done—which they thought was

being too generous—was to cooperate in developing eastern Europe, especially Poland. But the United States and Britain have *wrecked* Poland, almost to an irrecoverable level.

“The Polish leadership, despite the fact that what the United States has demanded of them has wrecked the Polish economy (the Poles today are under far worse economic conditions than they ever suffered under communism), is clinging to the idea that the United States is their friend against the big Russian monster, and therefore, they must follow faithfully and with full belief whatever the Americans suggest to them on economic policy. That is causing a lot of Poles to starve.

“In Russia, there is a different attitude. Only a few people, most of whom are making money on swindles involving the U.S., Britain, and so forth, actually believe any of the hogwash which is coming by way of people like Jeffrey Sachs or the International Monetary Fund [IMF] or Washington. But the Russians believe, that in order to maintain a political-strategic balance, they must at least appear to accept the so-called free trade, deregulation reforms which Washington and London demand.

“The Russians actually do not believe in these reforms. They think the Polish model is insane. But they do not want to have a confrontation with the United States at this point, at least some of them. That is what Yeltsin represents.

“At the same time, other forces and most of the forces inside the Russian government—not just the military—are saying, ‘Yeltsin, if you continue this policy, you have got to go. Because we have reached the point that Russia will begin to disintegrate unless we dump these policies which your American friends have induced you to accept. That is the breaking point.’

“So instead of going into the post-Wall Europe and saying, let's go ahead with a science-driver/infrastructure development program, which would have opened the whole area up to a peaceful cooperation with the West for decades or longer to come, what we did was to go in with a short-term program, which was very destructive, and turned what had become a nation willing to cooperate with us—i.e., the former Soviet Union—into what is now becoming a bitter adversary again. It is one of the greatest follies in human history, this particular nonsense which was put into effect under the influence of the leadership of Bush and Thatcher.

“What is building up now in Russia in the so-called return of the hard-liners, is that a bunch of people are saying, ‘Okay. The United States and Britain are going to collapse’—and they are right. They are going to collapse at the present time. They say, ‘We have to wait. And we are going to be a superpower again.’

“That is the strategic threat. There is no possibility of an actual policy bailing the planet out of the mess to which it has found itself unless we look at the policy decisions which were the turning points, the crossroads decisions which led to this disaster.”