

How will Reagan respond to Soviet war moves?

by Mark Burdman

"The silence in this town is deafening," a well-informed Capitol Hill source commented to *EIR* on July 6 when asked what kind of response was developing in Washington, D.C. in response to the extraordinary pattern of Soviet military maneuvers that had been taking place in Central Europe during the week of June 28-July 5.

Although these maneuvers were occurring during the week that most Americans were involved in celebrations of the July 4 anniversary of American independence, the "deafening silence" referred to by this source cannot be attributed to a mood of vacationing in high places in the nation's capital. The lack of publicity and public discussion about the Soviet strategic threat belies two intensive processes going on behind-the-scenes in and around the Reagan administration and among leading American strategic planners.

On the one hand, in the view of numerous conservative and traditionalist military-related sources concerned about the trend, a faction of "pragmatists" and friends of Henry Kissinger in the orbit of the President's White House domestic political advisory staff has been working overtime to convince President Ronald Reagan to back off from honest and firm reactions to Soviet provocations, on the basis that the President, in order to get re-elected, must "counter" the appeasement policies of Walter Mondale and Co. by taking an appeasement approach himself!

This faction, most visibly centered around White House advisers Michael Deaver and James A. Baker III, "may create a terrible strategic mistake," a Washington insider reported. "We may start seeing an arms-control mentality entering in precisely after four years of a firm approach toward Moscow. This, ironically, may politically boomerang against the President by showing him to be inconsistent."

In the view of such observers, the Soviets may be upping

the military-strategic pressure on Europe to create a "war of nerves" in which the administration in Washington is induced, in part through efforts of European appeasers like NATO Secretary-General Lord Carrington and West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, to enter a no-win "arms control negotiations process." Thus, although the President, in the diplomatic back-and-forth between Moscow and Washington around space-weapons negotiations that began on June 28 and peaked with Reagan's two-hour meeting with Soviet Ambassador to the United States Anatoly Dobrynin on July 3, has stood firm in insisting that he will make no *substantive* concessions to Moscow, the fear is that the President may become emotionally locked into a *process* of summitry that will blind him to the monstrous realities of Soviet strategic provocations.

This is described among Washington insiders as the "slippery slope" problem, of the same sort that Henry Kissinger induced in Richard Nixon with Kissinger's Rasputin-like hypnosis of Nixon on the matter of superpower "summitry."

Some pockets of strategic sanity

On the other hand, a very different mentality is discernible among planners and analysts associated with traditional circles in the Pentagon and the Washington national security community. Our sources report intense concern and monitoring of Soviet moves in Europe by these circles, especially insofar as these maneuvers occur in the wake of the gigantic Soviet naval maneuvers of the March-April period.

Aside from growing concern over the situation confronting Germany itself, especially the potential of the Soviets mounting a provocation in and around Berlin, our sources report two other geographical areas arousing grave concern among Pentagon and national security planners.

One of these is Yugoslavia. Not being a NATO country, Yugoslavia is vulnerable to Soviet provocations in a way that West Germany is not, these planners estimate. There are reports being reviewed of growing Soviet military pressure towards Yugoslavia and of growing patterns of internal unrest and economic dislocation within Yugoslavia.

A second, and possibly even more dangerous area, in the view of these sources, is the theatre of the Iran-Iraq war. According to one contingency being actively reviewed, the hard-pressed Iranian military may turn against Ayatollah Khomeini's religious fundamentalists, and the Soviets might use that eventuality as a pretext to drive into northern Iran, especially given the enormous superiority of their armed forces strength relative to that of the United States. U.S. contingency actions under such a situation are being reviewed.

Concern over a strategic unraveling intersects growing fears among the President's backers opposed to the Deaver-Baker-Kissinger faction that the world is on the brink of a severe economic depression, to break out at some point within the next weeks or months. Such an economic crisis would create a morass of difficulties from which the United States would find it almost impossible to extricate itself, even were the President to secure re-election by a wide margin.

As *EIR* founder-editor Lyndon LaRouche stressed in a statement before the historic founding conference of the Schiller Institute in Arlington, Virginia on July 3, it is impossible to judge how the President would actually react were the Soviets to go beyond provocative maneuvers to an attack on Europe. At that point, the command-sense that manifested itself when the President launched the American beam-weapon development on March 23, 1983 might reassert itself, LaRouche pointed out, if the President avoided counsel from "flight-forward cowards" in his entourage.

Short of that moment of conjunctural decision defining the President's actions, the single tangible sign of active intervention by the White House into the ominous European situation is the scheduled trip of Strategic Defense Initiative director General James Abrahamson to Europe beginning on or about July 9. Sources close to Abrahamson report growing urgent concern over the on-the-ground political and military situation in Western Europe.

It is too early to tell if that urgent concern will lead to an increasing convergence of approaches toward European-American relations of administration defense planners and the speakers at the July 3-4 Schiller Institute meeting (see article, page 34).

Appeasers on the move

While there may be a sense of ambiguity over what to expect from the White House in the coming days, there is no ambiguity at all over what can be expected from the leading Kissinger-connected appeasers in the United States. They are on a state of mobilization unseen in years.

From the period of July 7-16, the period intersecting the most intensive pattern of Soviet threats to Europe in postwar

history, the continent of Europe will be invaded by hordes of KGB agents from the United States, to try to weaken the will of Western Europeans to resist Soviet blackmail and to try to negotiate the surrender of the United States through various "back-channels" into the U.S.S.R.

The kickoff for this post-July 4 explosion of treason is a conference against beam weapons being held at the University of Goettingen in West Germany on July 7-8, featuring the KGB's favorite Congressman, George Brown of California. Soviet watchers in West Germany have told *EIR* that the Soviets intend to use their agents in Congress in a massive way during the July-November period to pressure the President into compromising on his beam weapons policy.

On July 9, both the Pugwash Conference and the Club of Rome, the two main organizational tools of the KGB in undermining the Western world, will be beginning their annual get-togethers in northern Sweden and in Helsinki, Finland, respectively. An array of America's worst Aaron Burrs, typified by the scurrilous head of the Pugwash Conference in Geneva, Dr. Martin Kaplan, will be meeting with Soviet interlocutors from the Soviet Academy of Sciences, the Moscow U.S.A.-Canada Institute and other Soviet institutes.

Days later, on July 14, at the Cini Foundation in Venice, the Aspen Institute will be holding a hush-hush three-day meeting to finish up the past two years' Aspen "East-West Project," under which auspices leading friends of Henry Kissinger have been working out the concretes of handing over the continent of Europe to Moscow's Byzantine imperialists, including down to the details of expanded patterns of East-West trade grids.

Attendees at this meeting will include former U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations James Leonard, former Yale Divinity School head and current Aspen Institute Middle East Affairs director Colin Williams, and former West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt.

The Aspen meetings will help make Henry Kissinger's pockets even fatter than they now are. In the last days of June, Kissinger was spotted in Italy cavorting with Italian magnate Gianni Agnelli of Turin-Fiat, making himself rich with a new business group called Euroventures, which is creating the infrastructure for an "independent European arms industry," to expedite the decoupling of Europe from the United States.

The United States itself will not be spared such conclaves of treason. From July 9-11, the Harvard Law School is coordinating a "joint crisis-management seminar" with Soviet officials, including Msrs. Lukov and Sergeyev from Moscow, and Rogov from the Soviet Embassy in Washington. According to a Harvard insider, "we will discuss the *process* of crisis-management, not the concretes of any particular situation."

More correctly stated, such meetings are discussing the process of surrendering the United States to Soviet global hegemony.