

British and Soviets hold talks to reverse Reagan's ABM policy

by Edith Vitali

The Kissinger-Carrington crowd and their associates in Moscow have now joined hands in an unprecedented assault on President Reagan and his policy of replacing the doctrine of "mutually assured destruction" with a doctrine of "mutually assured survival." As is known, the President and Defense

Minister Caspar Weinberger have made an offer to the Soviet leadership for parallel cooperation on an anti-missile beam weapon defense system. This new system has been flatly turned down by Andropov spokesmen like Aleksandr Bovin and Georgii Arbatov. Bovin told a British Broadcasting Corporation television audience April 20 that "he saw no constructive dialogue with the United States while President Reagan remains in office."

At the same time, London, which was more shocked than Moscow by the prospect of direct super-power collaboration, is maneuvering to regain its position of arbiter between the two great powers. First adding fuel to the upcoming "Euro-missile" confrontation, London will then present itself as the mediator, as during the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962.

Lord Peter Carrington, speaking April 21 at the International Institute of Strategic Studies (IISS) in London, key-noted this design in his first major policy declaration since resigning as British foreign secretary a year ago. Carrington rejected American policy as mere "megaphone diplomacy," which he said should be replaced by a "new dialogue" with the U.S.S.R. Carrington, architect of plans for a "new Yalta" arrangement with Moscow in the Middle East and for an independent European "third force" for preserving British power at the expense of the United States, insisted that this "new dialogue" be linked to a "bigger defense role" for Europe featuring the British Royal Navy.

The *Times* of London drew out Carrington's main point: "Britain has a particularly important role to play in the East-West dialogue, being firmly of Western Europe, yet having a 'special relationship' with the United States." A European friend of Carrington and Henry Kissinger who attended the IISS event commented: "The whole Carrington plan is an antithesis to the Reagan approach on East-West trade and other issues."

Andropov against beams

Soviet party General Secretary Yuri Andropov reiterated his full-scale rejection of defensive beam weapons, in his first widely publicized interview with a Western publication, West Germany's *Der Spiegel*. He used the same arguments published in the Tory magazine *The Spectator* by Lord Solly

Is Yuri Andropov a Haushofer pupil?

The following statement was issued by a spokesman for Lyndon LaRouche April 25 from Wiesbaden, West Germany.

Adopting the language of Professor General Karl Haushofer, Adolf Hitler's geopolitics mentor, Soviet Party chief Yuri Andropov told the Hamburg-based magazine *Der Spiegel* that the United States is a "sea power," while the U.S.S.R. is a "continental power," which determines the qualitative differences in their arms potentials.

The Soviet presence in Afghanistan he explained in terms of the long land-border between the two countries, and the fact that it cannot be a matter of indifference to the Soviet Union which kind of government rules in Kabul, just as it could not be "indifferent to the United States which kind of government exists in Nicaragua."

Spiegel concludes that it is natural for both super powers to dominate smaller countries, if that corresponds to their "national interests." Andropov's background as long-term KGB boss shines through when he is being asked about the expulsion of nearly 50 Soviet diplomats from Paris recently: Is the "collection of information . . . a forbidden activity?" he innocently asks. "As far as I understand it, this belongs to the functions of the diplomatic service and other services of each country. . . ."

Zuckerman, a prominent representative of the "peace movement." Both the British lord and the Communist Party chief smeared beam weapons as part of alleged U.S. aggressive preparations for a "first nuclear strike." These weapons have been researched and have been developed in the Soviet Union since at least the late 1960s. Britain fears that with both superpowers deploying defensive beam weapons, its own nuclear deterrent and thus its political negotiating power will be gone with the wind. The inconsistency of how beam weapons can be "impossible," as Zuckerman claims, and at the same time "highly destabilizing," is never explained.

The Anglo-Soviet Roundtable reconvened in the vicinity of London in mid-April, after an early spring meeting in Suzdal, the center of old "Holy Russia," and a Moscow meeting chaired by Dzhermen Gvishiani, co-founder with Zuckerman of the International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis located near Vienna. The Soviet delegation in London was headed by Alexandr Bovin, a prominent *Izvestia* commentator who is close to Andropov.

Bovin anticipated the autumn 1983 missile crisis in an article written for the Sunday *Times* of London April 23: "To forecast the possible reaction of the Soviet Union [to the placement of Pershing II rockets in Europe] one must remember how the Americans greeted the installation of Soviet missiles in Cuba in 1962." Writing in *Izvestia* April 21 before he left Moscow, Bovin explicitly attacked Reagan's beam weapons policy—the very shift away from the Mutually Assured Destruction doctrine that could defuse the missile confrontation—as an attempt to reach "absolute security," which must create "absolute insecurity" for the U.S.S.R.

This tipped a whole series of denunciations by *Izvestia's* Washington correspondent, Melor Sturua, and a collaborator of Arbatov's U.S.A./Canada Institute, L. Semeiko, on the pages of the Soviet army paper *Red Star*. One of the British participants in the Roundtable, Michael Kaser of St. Anthony's College, Oxford, told a caller that "there is a complementarity of interests between London and Moscow concerning the Reagan administration," meaning that both want to contain Reagan and/or get rid of him and his current beam-weapons policy.

Gvishiani was in Vienna together with Club of Rome chief Aurelio Peccei the weekend of April 16, to participate in a conference of the "Council for New Initiatives in East-West Trade." The delegation of the Great Britain-U.S.S.R. Association, led by former Prime Minister Harold Wilson, who is close to Henry Kissinger, visited Moscow and Tashkent in mid-April. One of the delegation members, Sir John Lawrence, is a friend of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Lawrence recently told a caller that "Mother Russia will take care of the beam weapons." Another member of the delegation, top British Secret Intelligence Services spook Fitzroy MacLean, recently authored a letter to the *Times* of London calling for a new era of "secret diplomacy" to get discussions on "disarmament" onto a new track.

The British government also announced in early April,

that Malcolm Rifkind, the Foreign Office undersecretary responsible for relations with the Soviet Union, will soon arrive in Moscow for a series of high-level meetings. The architect of this visit, insiders say, is none other than Kissinger Associate Lord Carrington, who recently told an audience at the International Institute for Strategic Studies that a "new dialogue" must be opened with Moscow under the leadership of Britain, since Reagan's policy had failed miserably.

Georgii Arbatov, a Central Committee member who is Moscow's expert on the United States, arrived in the United States April 18 for meetings with beam weapons opponents. Before participating in a "task force" meeting of the Dartmouth Conference (which meets every two to three years), in Denver on April 27, Arbatov visited the Control Data Corporation in Minneapolis, on whose board sits Democratic Party presidential contender Walter Mondale, a key spokesman for the "nuclear freeze" movement. The April 27 meeting of the Dartmouth Conference group of Russians and Americans will include only five participants from each side. The Moscow group is headed by Arbatov, accompanied by four officials from his U.S.A./Canada Institute, including KGB General Milshtein, who also sits with Arbatov and Cyrus Vance on the Palme commission on disarmament. The American group is headed by Kissinger underlings William Hyland, a former aide to Kissinger on the NSC, and Brent Scowcroft, whose commission on strategy just presented an alternative to President Reagan's beam-weapons policy.

Arbatov told a Radio Moscow Program on April 13 that beam weapons look "defensive only to inexperienced people," but are in reality a key component of a first-strike potential. "All of this was discussed at length in a very heated way at the end of the 1960s and beginning of the 1970s. This naive concept, shared by many people on different continents (maybe even some people on our side at the beginning), was that defensive weapons are not dangerous." Besides repeating the Andropov line that strategic defensive weapons would be a cover for a first strike offensive doctrine, Arbatov pronounced it "technically impossible" for there to be "such an ABM system which would really defend [against] a massive attack of missiles from the other country."

'Anti-missile defense is adventurist and dangerous'

The following are excerpts from Soviet Communist Party General Secretary Yuri Andropov's interview in the April 24 issue of the West German weekly Der Spiegel.

The current situation is complicated and dangerous because the arms race, which is forced upon us by the West, threatens to overtake the negotiations. In order to avoid this, and create favorable conditions for leading negotiations, it is necessary, on the basis of healthy common sense, to freeze the nuclear

arsenals of both sides. This would be especially reasonable as long as other solutions have not been found. We have proposed to freeze medium-range weapons as well as strategic weapons.

In our opinion, this would only be the first step. The reply to us is: Why would we need to freeze weapons, when we should reduce them? This may sound fine, but unfortunately the arms race continues, while these statements are being made. The result is neither freeze nor reduction. . . .

Recently, it has become a fashion among the members of the Reagan administration to take the pose of the insulted when being caught in the act of militarist, aggressive strivings. Maybe this pose can impress people who are not knowledgeable in politics. That is apparently the aim. But in such cases, it is best to stick to the facts. And the facts state that the U.S. has entered the path of an unprecedented arms race in every field, that they are pushing international tension to the utmost limit.

Concretely, among other things, I mean the plans proclaimed by Washington to develop a broad-based, efficient, anti-missile defense. The adventurism and danger of this whole plan lies in the calculation that it is possible to emerge unscathed—that a nuclear first strike can be launched on the assumption one is safe from counterattack.

This is not far removed from the attempt to place a finger on the launch button. That is where the danger of the new U.S. military concept lies. It can only bring the world closer to the nuclear precipice. This demonstrates that while speaking about defense, in reality a mine is put under the whole process of strategic arms limitation.

Prominent scientists of the world testify to the effect that this is the case. We propose to the government of the U.S.A.: Let's bring together the Soviet and American scientists and experts on this field and discuss possible dangerous consequences of a broad-based missile system [anti-missile system]. Let science say its ponderable word.

It becomes more and more obvious that the U.S.A. will include the development of space weapons in their military preparations. They want to threaten humanity with these weapons from space. This must not be permitted. Space must remain peaceful.

We have proposed an international treaty against stationing weapons of any kind in space. We are convinced that we should go even further—to agree on banning the use of force in space as well as from space against the earth; not to start the arms race where it is not yet taking place, and to stop it where it is already happening. This is the essence of our position, this is our guidance during negotiations. The Soviet Union will also in future search for a common language with the American side, [and] she will try to arrive there. Our earlier introduced proposals remain in force.

Should the American administration make proposals on this or that problem, which aim at a solution of these issues in the spirit of equal security, we will definitely examine them positively.

'Agreed with Soviets on military policy'

Another participant in the most recent Anglo-Soviet Roundtable is Philip Hanson, Sovietologist at Birmingham University, who worked on the Soviet technology assessment program together with Ron Amann and others at Birmingham. Some of his remarks on the Roundtable were provided to EIR:

Q: I'm working on the possibilities for a new Europe-centered East-West dialogue. . . . Weren't the Soviets very upset about the Reagan administration?

Hanson: Well, despite everything, I found that the Soviets have a very strong desire to talk in a businesslike way with us.

One of their major concerns was credit. They want to return to normal credit arrangements with the West. They insisted that this was a political move. The Soviets pointed out that the United States anyway is no major supplier of machines for them, and they also want to diversify their sources of food imports, as well as reduce food imports altogether. I brought up in the discussion that increasing trade with Western Europe would be a way for them to increase the divergencies inside the Western alliance. The Soviets replied that it would be "unrealistic to decouple" Western Europe from the United States, but it is hard to know what they really mean.

Q: Did you discuss the "Star Wars" prospect?

Hanson: Yes, the Soviet side brought this up as an example for Reagan's excessively ideological, theological approach. The British side assured them that this particular policy is more a matter of rhetoric than of practical policy. Such an ABM system is extremely expensive and not very effective. Also, it is difficult to believe that this would go through three presidencies, which is the time it takes to realize that. The Soviets shared our skepticism, and they didn't seem to be too worried about it.

Q: What about the Euromissiles?

Hanson: Well, on this point there was no agreement. The British side told them that they should accept the fact that the Pershing missiles will be deployed, and that negotiations should continue thereafter. Anyway, for me it was striking in what a constructive way we were able to discuss developments elsewhere.

Q: Elsewhere? In the Middle East?

Hanson: Yes, the evaluation of the Middle East situation was remarkably constructive, also of the Far East. There were

many points both groups agreed upon: Iran-Iraq, China. I must say that it was a fairly promising meeting.

'The world doesn't need Ronald Reagan'

The following are excerpts from an article headlined "Nuclear Storm Warning" by Lord Solly Zuckerman in the London weekly The Spectator April 9.

Zuckerman was the British Defense Minister's chief scientific advisor from 1960 to 1966 and H.M.'s government's chief science adviser 1964-71. He was a close associate of the late Lord Louis Mountbatten, and the Western founder of the International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) in Vienna.

"President Reagan's call for a national scientific commitment is going to fare no better than Nixon's 1971 call for a 'total national commitment' to find a cure for cancer.

"Whether or not a space defense is technically realisable in a way that makes political sense, which it is not, I suspect that it will add considerably to the power of the anti-nuclear movement not only in Europe itself but also in the United States, where Congress has already all but endorsed a resolution calling for a nuclear 'freeze.' " Beam weapons mean a desire to acquire "a first-strike capability," Lord Zuckerman goes on, and the Soviets might well be impressed: "Talk of protracted nuclear war and the enormous increases now projected in the U.S. defense budget are hardly likely to make the Russians any less suspicious of and hostile to the United States than they usually are.

"Like [British pacifist demonstrators at] Greenham Common, the recent protest march of a million people in New York, the emergence of the Greens in Germany, the anti-nuclear voices of the Catholic Church in America and the Protestant in the U.K., are now political facts with which Western leaders have to reckon. . . .

"But while in theory feasible, in practice, the idea of significant anti-ballistic missile [defense] systems has proved impossible in spite of the expenditure of billions of dollars. Unfortunately, the fear that one or the other side might one day nonetheless succeed"—note this extraordinary feat of rhetoric whereby something which is impossible becomes destabilizing—"is not only a spur to the nuclear arms race but also 'destabilizes' the existing state of mutual deterrence.

"Reagan's new call for a defense which would destroy ballistic missiles and warheads in space is even greater strategic and technical nonsense.

"When President Reagan spoke about space ABM systems, of lasers and particle-beam weapons, he probably knew no more than did his Defence Secretary about the scientific, engineering, military, and economic considerations that were involved or about the strategic futility to which they added

up. He should have known that his words would not only encourage the Russians along the same path . . . but that he would also be giving a false sense of hope, while plunging others into despair as they came to realize that the idea of war in space not only opens up the ridiculous notion of destroying thousands of incoming nuclear warheads and decoys, but, worse, of destroying those very reconnaissance satellites that now reassure each side that it knows what the other side is doing.

"The world does not need President Reagan to call for a 'national resolve' to destroy nuclear warheads in space. What it wants is a statesman who knows that while he cannot rid the world of the nuclear secret, there is no point in provoking the final nuclear storm."

'The administration is too hard to control'

The following interview with David Watt, director of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), conducted in Europe April 25, was made available to EIR.

Q: At the Trilateral meeting in Rome, the discussion rage was the post-Reagan era.

A: That'll be the day!

Q: What does that mean?

A: I suspect that we're in for another four years of Reagan.

Q: But the mechanism is being set up, as [former British foreign minister and Kissinger Associates member Lord] Carrington indicated and as was discussed in Rome, for setting up an international crisis mechanism. . . .

A: Maybe so, maybe not; but in any case I'm all for it. The problem is that the American administration is a law unto itself; it's difficult to control, there are not too many levers if the American government doesn't wish to be influenced. We could always be exercising some *force majeure*, like on this IMF question.

But otherwise our leverage is slim. We have a bit of leverage with the RDF [the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force], since there are the staging posts, the bases, that we either can supply or not supply. I think that since the Orlando speech [in which Reagan called the Soviet Union an "evil empire"], even before the Star Wars speech [Reagan's March 23 speech calling for the development of anti-missile beam-weapons], the attempts to surpass the Soviet Union in military strength are hardening up again.

Q: The Central America situation is evolving into a Cuban missile kind of thing. . . .

A: This is a conventional affair, where the administration is going to get bogged down on the ground. The administration people can see the danger of Vietnam, it is written on their

hearts. There won't be the protests until the coffins start coming home, then there will be serious trouble, but there are many gradations of trouble before you get to the real crisis point, until Americans get killed in large numbers, and that triggers something.

Q: Who can we work through as part of the crisis set-up that Carrington alluded to?

A: To bring European pressure to bear we would have to look toward Shultz on Central America, Weinberger on the Mideast; lower down, there is not much clout. Richard Burt [Director of Politico-Military Affairs at the State Department] may be susceptible if he is approached.

Q: What's going on with [*Izvestia* journalist Aleksandr Bovin and his crowd [the Anglo-Soviet Roundtable at RIIA]?

A: They've been at Cambridge all weekend sightseeing. Don't look for deep political angles. He's the only one who matters in the delegation. He's close to Andropov.

Q: He told the BBC that the Soviets saw no hope for dialogue with the United States while Reagan was in power.

A: He reiterated that in private meetings. But they're realists, they do business as they can, they just think it's not possible with Reagan. They think he'll be around for another four years, like we do. They seemed pretty despairing about the whole thing, and they really laid it on, because they know we're fed up too.

Q: So, RIIA and the Soviets are on the same wavelength on the Reagan question?

A: Yes, indeed. Of course, we couldn't say so. We can't give the Soviets aid and comfort, but the Soviets were able to read between the lines. They could see that the British side was not as protective of American policy as we sometimes are. The formulation would be, "We disagree with Mr. Reagan, but. . . ." They understood, they could see we were unhappy with what's going. Probably that's why they played things so cool, the line of the party is very moderate, it's a very intelligent tactic. I'd do the same if I were in their shoes.

Q: Moscow and London have a lot to offer each other in the current situation, to play off Reagan.

A: In Central America, we don't have much standing. But in the Mideast maybe a bit more. We have a lot of contacts on the Arab side, expertise, and so on.

Q: One last thing. We discussed at the Trilateral meeting the idea of Kissinger being made Secretary General of NATO. . . .

A: That's been brought up before. Carrington is another name that's been present, but I can't see him leaving business, although he would have done it months ago if he had been asked by the French and Germans. The Americans don't want him there, he's too powerful and too independent.

Trilaterals plot the era' at their Rome

by Paolo Raimondi in Rome

Protected by several hundred policemen and in almost absolute secrecy, the Trilateral Commission held its 14th plenary session at the Rome Hotel Hilton April 17 to 19. More than 320 bankers, financiers, politicians (mostly Socialists), and

Italy's Trilaterals call for coup d'état

"To change a political leadership like the one we have in Italy, in other countries they have resorted to carrying out a coup d'état. We cannot go on waiting without doing anything."

This was a public statement made by Italian industrialist Giancarlo Lombardi to a meeting of Confindustria on April 13, a few days before the beginning of the Trilateral conference in Rome. Lombardi is the head of the textile industrialists' group inside Confindustria, the Italian confederation of big industrialists dominated by Trilateral Commission member and Fiat magnate Gianni Agnelli.

The newsweekly *Panorama* reported on the Confindustria meeting under the headline, "Tears and Blood, but with the PCI." Opening the conference, the president of Confindustria, Vittorio Merloni, stated: "We must overcome the stalemate. From now on we must act as if the government did not exist." It was at this point that his right-hand man Lombardi intervened with the suggestion that "other countries" had solved their problems with a coup. Merloni then asked the general manager of Olivetti Corporation, Carlo De Benedetti, "Why don't you consider something like a manifesto of the industrialists to present ourselves as independent from the parties?"

Commented *Panorama*'s correspondent: "Never had the party of the industrialists spoken so openly, demanding early elections and even threatening a coup d'état." A few days later the Socialist Party boss Bettino Craxi provoked a crisis