

Nicholson's murder an 'Act of War'

"No. It was not a random act. It was deliberate, as indicated by the fact that there was more than one Soviet soldier involved. It reflects the nature of their system."

This was the response of Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger to a question concerning the cold-blooded murder of U.S. Major Arthur D. Nicholson by a Soviet soldier on March 27, at an international press conference held to announce the release of the Pentagon publication, *Soviet Military Power IV*.

Major Nicholson, a member of the U.S. Military Mission stationed in Potsdam, East Germany, was fatally wounded while carrying out an unarmed assignment in the company of a staff sergeant near the East German town of Ludwigslust. Such military missions are part of a sanctioned arrangement between the Soviet Union and the Western nations, worked out as part of the Four Power Agreements on Occupied Germany in the aftermath of World War II. That arrangement, which has been described as "licensed espionage," allows each side several

outposts, that is, Military Missions, and travel rights in the other side's occupied zones.

The Soviets have three such missions in West Germany and constantly engage in missions like that of Major Nicholson—over 2,500 such missions in 1984, sources say.

According to information made available to *EIR*, Major Nicholson was *not* "inside a Soviet military warehouse" when he was shot, as reported in the press. On the contrary: The major had simply arrived in the general vicinity of the warehouse *while on his way to a prearranged meeting with a Soviet counterpart*.

Nor was Major Nicholson killed in a flurry of gunfire by a Soviet soldier. He was assassinated by means of a *shot to his head*. Simply put, the unsuspecting Major was lured to a prearranged location by Soviet intelligence, and then murdered.

According to U.S. intelligence sources, there are to be four more such killings carried out in Western Europe within the next 90 days. The targets will include field-grade officers of at least the rank of major, as well as one U.S. general officer.

In these cases, the assassin will not necessarily be a Soviet soldier, but could as easily be drawn from the ranks of the numerous terrorist groups, or the drug networks who are in close collaboration with the Soviets.

this is some brand new American initiative which is an interesting pursuit of some kind of very improbable fantasy weapon. The problem is that it is a very necessary thing to do, and a prudent thing to do, as the NATO Defense ministers unanimously agreed last week at Luxembourg, in view of the Soviet activities. Now we have other ideas in mind besides that. We do think that it could offer a great deal more hope, ultimately, to the world, but the two forces are there and require it.

We are publishing now, after a lot of discussion, as I say, with the intelligence community, a part of what we know about the Soviet efforts in this field, and they are very substantial. They've gone on for a long time and they're very clearly pointed toward acquiring the precise kind of capability that they not only deride but argue is so terribly destabilizing and dangerous, and from their point of view it probably is because it would break their monopoly.

Q: There has been a lot of talk about spokesmen saying that the federal deficit is the greatest threat to the stability of the world economy right now, and specifically from that standpoint saying the defense budget must be cut. The International Monetary Fund at its interim meeting coming up here in Washington later this month is reportedly going to try to seek oversight on the U.S. federal deficit. Don't you think that

represents a threat to the sovereign interest of the United States defense budget if they were to obtain oversight capacity and seek—

Weinberger: We're one of the largest contributors to the IMF. I'm a little surprised if our representatives agree to anything of that kind. I've not heard that proposal made before. I would agree that it would be a serious infringement on our own sovereignty.

Everybody would like to reduce the deficit, and we have to ask whether sharp reductions in the defense budget would do that, and we don't think they would. We also have to ask whether or not the priorities are straight, because we need to have the kind of defense that guarantees us the ability to pursue all of our interests, and particularly to maintain peace and freedom. We need that and our allies need it.

So it's vital that we make sure that we do have the defensive strength that is needed, particularly when we're up against a system that doesn't have any restraints of any kind on the amount that they put into the military. They don't worry about their civilian economy, they don't worry about the quality of life for their people which we do and must do and should do, and so we have to keep all of these things in perspective. Reductions in the deficit are possible, but we should not feel that reductions in the deficit take precedence over absolutely every other policy and issue in the world.