

Who is setting the East-West summit trap for President Reagan?

by Christopher White

Orders have now gone out from the White House, signed by the President himself, to prepare the ground for a resumption of arms talks between the United States and the Soviet Union this September in Vienna. Included is a parallel order to prepare for talks on anti-satellite weapons.

The signing of the orders was the culmination point in a set of activities coming from the White House which included the President's public meeting with Russian Ambassador and Pro-Consul in Washington D.C., Anatoly Dobrynin, on the weekend of July 4th, and Dobrynin's next-day breakfast meeting with Defense Secretary George Shultz. Dobrynin then returned to Moscow with messages and evaluations. In this flurry of activity, the Russians have ostensibly agreed to discuss the question of space weapons, without insisting on the inclusion in the talks of the Pershing and cruise-missile deployments in Europe. The United States, for its part, has proposed that if the Russians discuss the question of space weapons, it will then be prepared to discuss the missiles.

Both of these formulations appear to be shifts on the part of both parties concerned, all the more so since the missiles which the Russians have now dropped from the agenda have been, over the last months, the public *sine qua non* for any discussion of anything. However, this apparent reversal does not come as such a surprise to readers of this magazine.

Moscow's twofold concerns

We have insisted that despite all the noise about the stationing of the missiles in especially West Germany, the missile deployment was, from the Soviet side, only a cover for their real concerns. And, in turn, we have insisted that such concerns were twofold. First, their embittered opposition to President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, which is seen as threatening the millennialist quest of a resurgent Russian imperialism for world domination, reviving the decaying technological and economic potentials of the U.S. economy as a rallying point for Western—and thus global—progress. Secondly, Moscow's effort to reduce the United States to second-rank power status, by destroying the U.S. alliance in Europe, breaking West Germany, the core of the

alliance in Europe, out of the alliance of Western nations.

The conclusion we drew from this was that the Russians have embarked on a course of strategic confrontation to break the power of the United States.

The current discussion of, and lobbying for, the revival of superpower summitry does not change that evaluation in the least. During the very week in which the *Washington Post*-led propaganda campaign on behalf of such efforts was at its height, the Russians mobilized force maneuvers to test their developed capability to invade West Germany. Those maneuvers, and their purpose, were not reported by the U.S. press, which preferred to regale its readership with the so-called peace initiatives. The Russians have continued to make very clear what they think of the initiatives coming from the United States. "Completely irrelevant from the Soviet standpoint," was the report of a lobbyist on behalf of such negotiations for the liberal United Nations Association, upon returning from consultations with the Russians in Moscow.

But this same lobbyist, Tobi Gati, was working with the Russians on the kind of initiative which has now been presented, and which is reported to be considered by the Russians themselves to be "completely irrelevant."

Ms. Gati's strange behavior typifies the fact that internationally it is the category of political forces classed as "Soviet assets" or "Soviet agents of influence" which launched and promoted the push for summitry. These include prominently Lord Carrington (now NATO secretary general and a member of Henry Kissinger's corrupt international lobbying group, Kissinger Associates), along with Henry Kissinger himself. Also included are leading forces in the cultist Socialist International, including Olof Palme of Sweden, Andreas Papandreou of Greece, and their allies in the social democracies of Finland, Austria, and West Germany.

The drive to topple Reagan

It was this combination of political forces, inside and outside NATO, that insisted, over the objections of the professional military establishment, that the recent round of Russian maneuvers targeting West Germany represented

nothing new, or even unusual, and attempted to suppress all discussion of those maneuvers. Like the Russians, but not necessarily for the same reasons, they maintain a commitment to either defeat Ronald Reagan in the upcoming U.S. elections, or put a re-elected Reagan under the control of their principal U.S. stooge and enforcer, Henry Kissinger. Hence they push the idea of "summitry" as a political instrument on behalf of that objective.

This approach has most recently been put forward by the British newspaper the *Financial Times*, in evaluating the significance of the visit of Her Majesty's Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe to Moscow, and by the Swiss newspaper *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, which wrote: "To spoil the chances of victory of its hated opponent [Reagan], Moscow could still conduct a test of strength with Washington in which more than theatrical talent would be put to the test." The Swiss paper argues that "obviously the Soviet Union would like to prevent the deployment of a technologically highly developed American anti-missile system. . . . An added purpose is to split the West and try to stop Reagan."

For the Swiss, "the actual electoral political effects of an international crisis have to be, of course, reliably calculated, and the calculation of the American psychology has not been exactly Moscow's strong-point." In this view, shared by the circles in Britain associated with Kissinger's boss, Lord Carrington, Russian negotiating terms are in fact an agenda for the dictated surrender of U.S. world power under conditions of Soviet confrontation blackmail threat, or continued dominance of Henry Kissinger in the United States.

Thus in the press conference which concluded Geoffrey Howe's Moscow visit, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko pointedly illustrated that underlying commitment, and an accompanying fear, in stating that Western lobbyists for the Reagan Strategic Defense Initiative, "whether inside or outside the military," have to be pushed aside.

Gromyko was referring to the international forces associated with Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche, and was answering a challenge developed in LaRouche's recent national television broadcasts. LaRouche is the leader of those forces in the United States which view a process of capitulation to Soviet blackmail, glossed as "strategic negotiations," as unacceptable. He therefore authored a "Proposed Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union," which was published in this magazine on April 17, 1984, to provide a way for both nations out of the present slide into crisis. The content of this Memorandum had also been presented in LaRouche's national television broadcasts.

LaRouche proposed areas for U.S.- Soviet potential agreement and collaboration on the basis of the forced-march development of the advanced relativistic-physics-based technologies associated with the Strategic Defense Initiative, to render the threat posed by existing arsenals of ICBMs and

IRBMs obsolete, while simultaneously eliminating the causes of the slide into crisis and war by creating a new monetary system and embarking on great projects for industrializing the so-called developing sector.

Unlike the "negotiating proposals" that have been placed on the table by the Soviets and their Western assets, LaRouche's solutions address the crises in East-West relations and North-South relations by proposing a reassertion of the power of the republican institution of the nation state, based on the fostering of the development of science- and technology-vectored economic progress. The Russians' interest in continued development and the avoidance of war would be recognized, but they would to abandon the barbaric millenarianism that underlies the current drive for empire and world domination.

Gromyko's remarks, combined with continued Soviet propaganda against LaRouche and the organizations associated with him—as in the pages of Soviet-linked publications like *Deutsche Blätter für Internationale Politik*, where the LaRouche organizations are attacked as the "lobby" behind the adoption of Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative—demonstrate Moscow's fear that U.S. institutions might be mobilized on behalf of the kind of perspective identified in the LaRouche-proposed "Memorandum of Understanding."

But, on the other hand, the Russians are as well aware as anyone that the United States is in the middle of an election campaign, and that considerations based on world strategic realities are thus readily relegated from the forefront of judgment in favor of the quagmire of pragmatism and perception associated with U.S. election campaigns. And thus the Russians encourage the illusion that they will talk, as Khrushchev did with Eisenhower, to buy time to mobilize the forces which they think will resolve the crisis in their favor.

They are finding plenty of helpers in this effort in the West, especially among the ranks of those who, like James Baker III and Michael Deaver, argue that the "perception" to be cultivated in an election year is above all one of peaceful intentions. And thus initiatives like that promoted by the United Nations Association, through trips to Moscow and consultation with the Russian mission to the United Nations, find sympathetic ears, through such people as Richard Darman, a long-time associate of Elliott Richardson, who presented the lobbying effort to public view. Richardson is working closely with supporters of Walter Mondale like former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and Orville Freeman, the chairman of Business International.

Russian "calculation of American psychology," in building for a crisis, includes prominently the judgment of the degree to which the proposals associated with these kinds of moles influence the making and the presentation of administration policy. In that respect, their blather about "summits" and "strategic negotiations" is in fact disarming the United States for the crisis which is now building over Europe.