

After Shevardnadze: the truth about the Soviet internal shift

by Carol White

The announcement by Eduard Shevardnadze on Dec. 20, 1990, of his resignation as foreign minister of the U.S.S.R., should be viewed in tandem with the resignation of British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, barely one month before. Despite the feverish quality of the apparent love fest between Thatcher and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachov, it is Shevardnadze who has been most consistently identified with the pro-West phase of Soviet policy.

Since meeting him in 1984, Thatcher was an ardent defender of Gorbachov, a man—she assured President Reagan—whom she, and presumably the West as a whole, “could do business with.” In April 1989, Mrs. Thatcher was interviewed by *Izvestia* correspondents, and she restated there the premises underlying the condominium policy for a New Yalta, two-empire accord. She said then of Soviet reforms: “Sometimes it seems to me that you are trying to do in five to ten years what it took more than a century for us to do.”

Even as late as Nov. 24, 1989, in an interview in the London *Times*, Thatcher was almost rhapsodic about the Soviet dictator, a man whom she claimed had “fantastic vision” and “personality and largeness of mind.”

This miscalculation is typical of the failure of Anglo-American policymaking circles to understand what is really going on in the Soviet Union. Obsessed with their own plans for world disarmament, they continue to underestimate the threat which the Soviets will pose to a new Anglo-American imperialist design.

As Lyndon LaRouche commented in a strategic evaluation issued Dec. 16, “The entirety of Anglo-American policy toward Moscow since November 1983 . . . is now exposed as one of the most colossal strategic errors.” Shevardnadze’s resignation, LaRouche added on Dec. 20, “must be seen essentially as a conformation of what I have forecast as the essential characteristic of emerging Soviet developments beginning the spring of 1983.”

LaRouche’s warning

From 1983 on, LaRouche had been issuing a consistent series of warnings regarding the danger of miscalculating the significance of the end of the Bolshevik era. As he pointed

out, and as is being borne out today, Bolshevik rule was merely another variant of czarism, with all of the included features of military-vectored imperial policy.

On Oct. 31, in a half-hour Washington, D.C. area television broadcast, LaRouche said: “What happened at that weekend [Sept. 30-Oct. 2, 1988] shakeup in Moscow? The short answer is that the Soviet military and KGB moved in to grab more power than they have since Stalin’s time. All of the key promotions during that weekend were given to members of one very tight group. All of those promoted had been top associates of former KGB chief Yuri Andropov and Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov since as early, in some cases, as the Leningrad front during World War II.”

The precision of that analysis has been borne out during the just-concluded Congress of People’s Deputies. True, in the interim the Soviets have relinquished control over the eastern sector of Germany, and within the East bloc, and they have had to recognize a semi-independent status for the Baltic republics, and to deal with significant liberation movements in Georgia and Ukraine. But at present, it appears that Gorbachov is using his new dictatorial emergency powers to reverse this and reinstitute military control in Latvia, to be followed in Estonia and Lithuania.

While Western commentaries on the recent Soviet Congress have stressed the fact that Gorbachov received the reorganization of government which he had demanded, the significance of the Shevardnadze resignation cannot have escaped any thoughtful individual. This is particularly so as Shevardnadze has continued to reiterate his warning, that the Soviets are engaged in a turn away from the West in international policy, and toward dictatorial rule domestically.

No doubt, part of the motivation for the shift has been the obviously perceived threat by them, of the U.S. deployment of 450,000 troops and 1,000 nuclear weapons on their back doorstep in the Persian Gulf. Yet the major problem facing the Soviets is the depth of their economic crisis.

Of relevance here, is LaRouche’s evaluation of the so-called Soviet liberalization, with regard to policy toward the East bloc and East Germany: “The Soviets,” he said, “have thrown away, not the primitive accumulation, they’ve dis-

carded some of the countries, which are no longer manageable after being depleted.”

One crucial element in the magnitude of the present Soviet crisis, despite the longer-term problems associated with a bureaucratic communist regime, has been Soviet overdeployment into military investment. This is a point which *EIR* has stressed repeatedly in articles and reports, especially in the 1985 and 1988 editions of *EIR's Global Showdown* reports.

Ironically enough, the Soviets refused LaRouche's proposal for joint development of Soviet and U.S. anti-missile defense systems. In the United States, the Strategic Defense Initiative became policy, but was rapidly diverted from LaRouche's initial conception of an SDI based upon advanced physical principles. The Soviets pursued a high-technology capability but at tremendous cost, due to the inability of their backward economy to assimilate the spin-off technologies from automated laser machining and the like. Unlike the West, the Soviets will never sacrifice their military capability to bolster consumerism. This defines their most recent hard-line turn.

Shevardnadze: 'Dictatorship is coming'

On Dec. 20, Shevardnadze resigned his post, complaining of the insults to which he had been subjected by those within the Soviet Union who opposed his alliance with Margaret Thatcher and the Anglo-Americans as a whole. Indeed, his loyalty to the Soviet regime had been questioned. He said then: "Things went as far as personal insults. I endured that, too. Comrades, a hounding is taking place. I will not name the publications, all manner of publications, the Pamyat society—I add the Pamyat society to these publications—what expressions: Down with the Gorbachov clique!

"They also add Shevardnadze and several other names. Who are they, the so-called reformers? I will put it bluntly, comrades: I was shaken; I was shaken by the events of the first day, the start of the work of our Congress. By pressing of a button, the fate not only of the President, of perestroika, and democratization was decided. Is that normal? Democrats, I will put it bluntly: Comrade democrats, in the widest meaning of this word, you have scattered. The reformers have gone to seed. Dictatorship is coming. I state this with complete responsibility. No one knows what kind of dictatorship this will be and who will come—what kind of dictator—and what the regime will be like."

The Congress, of course, ratified the reorganization of the government demanded by Gorbachov. However, although he has remained in office and with apparently strengthened powers, it would be a major blunder to see in him the creature of Margaret Thatcher's dreams. This Gorbachov is a creature of a KGB-military dictatorship, as the election of Gennadi Yanayev as U.S.S.R. vice president indicates. This congress finalized the reassertion of Russian hegemony in the Soviet Union, and the turn away from liberalization. Yanayev is a member of the Russian Communist

Party Politburo. In his acceptance speech he declared: "I am a convinced communist, down to the depth of my heart."

Another ominous sign of the Soviet turn away from the West and possibly back to police-state rule like the Stalinist period, was the statement on Dec. 22 by Soviet KGB head Gen. Vladimir Kryuchkov, who warned that deputies of Western intelligence agencies were seeking to destabilize the Soviet Union. This was a clear threat to liberalizers that they could be considered as traitors. Articles of a more extreme nature have also begun appearing in the Soviet press, warning that the West is exporting poisonous materials to the U.S.S.R. Such xenophobic propaganda must be seen as a step in mobilizing the population to accept the possibility of war—to protect Holy Mother Russia.

One should not overlook the fact that while the United States and Britain have refused to answer Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis's call for support to the Captive Nations of the Soviet Union, they are perfectly capable of sowing discord in the U.S.S.R. in order to distract the Soviets, as they suppose, from opposing Anglo-American adventures in the Gulf. This is also the significance of the new International Monetary Fund hard line against giving aid to the Soviets, as the Germans have been doing. The Anglo-American establishment is now cherishing the secret delusion that there is only one superpower, which we might perhaps rename Angloamerica. This miscalculation, as LaRouche has warned repeatedly, may be taking us to World War III.

Precisely because LaRouche had recognized the underlying dynamic operative in the Soviet Union since the beginning of the 1980s, he made a series of policy proposals which would have offered the Soviets a viable alternative to either communism or an Anglo-American-run bankers' dictatorship. This was the significance of LaRouche's SDI proposal in 1980-82, his 1988 call for the use of Food for Peace as the means to achieve the reunification of Germany, and lastly his 1989-90 proposal for a major infrastructure development project centered in the high-technology Triangle encompassing Germany, France, and Austria, which would connect Western Europe to the former East bloc.

The German initiatives toward the Soviets offer a certain hope toward stabilizing the situation. Yet they are insufficient, precisely because the government of Chancellor Helmut Kohl has been unwilling to make a clean break with the Anglo-Americans on issues such as Gulf policy, and on the question of a free market in Eastern Europe. Rather than a policy vectored toward major infrastructure investment financed by public credit, and low-interest credit (at 2% interest rates) to the private sector, they have relied upon private initiatives.

There is still time to alter the situation, but not by trading on illusions. Without the kind of policy thrust implicit in LaRouche's Triangle proposal, the Soviet Union *will* disintegrate into chaos, but this will make it more—not less—of a military threat.