

The new military posture of Moscow

by Criton Zoakos and Mark Burdman

The Soviet Union's public posture has undergone a dramatic qualitative transformation since the Sept. 1 KAL massacre in both international and domestic politics. The single most striking feature of this transformation is the catapulting of Russia's military chiefs into unprecedented public prominence.

The EIR's strategic analysis team has good reasons to argue that as of Sept. 1, 1983, the most important areas of Soviet decision making have been placed on military footing. In this sense, diplomatic and political events occurring in Europe, the Middle East, Africa, the Pacific rim, and elsewhere have a significance quite different than one might impute to them had they occurred in the pre-September 1 world political "geometry." Note that President Yuri Andropov has made no public appearance since that date. Also note that President Reagan's charges against the Soviet government respecting the KAL massacre were answered by Marshal Nikolai V. Ogarkov, Russia's chief of the General Staff, her senior uniformed soldier. Other senior military officers have been sharing the public limelight with Ogarkov, among them the Chief of Staff of the country's Air Defense organization, General S.F. Romanov, Ogarkov's own Deputy Chief of the General Staff Marshal Akhrameyev, and others.

Most alarming of all is the yet unverified but highly credible report that Army General Vladimir *Govorov* was included in the chain of command which ordered the shooting of the Korean Airliner. The significance of General *Govorov* confirming his order to shoot with Defense Minister Marshal Ustinov is the following: General *Govorov* heads up a very unusual military command: the Far Eastern Theater of Operations. This command structure is different than the Far Eastern Military District and the Transbaikalian Military Dis-

trict, both of which are its subordinates. According to the Table of Organization of the Soviet Armed Forces, the "Military Districts" are the form of command structure applicable for peacetime operations. A parallel command structure exists, that of "Theaters of Operations," which replaces the "Military District" form of organization for *wartime deployment*. Military Districts and Theaters of Operations are not in any sense equivalent either geographically or in terms of assigned missions. Military Districts are geographical subdivisions of the territory of the U.S.S.R. The designated Theaters of Operations subdivide the entire surface of the planet, with the Commands of different Theaters of Operations assigned different geographic areas of responsibility. The Commands of these Theaters of Operations exist in passive operational form during peacetime. Active command responsibility is supposed to pass to them from the peacetime Military District commands only in time of war.

If the order to shoot the Korean airliner did not come from either the Commander of the Transbaikalian Military District or from the Commander of the Far Eastern Military District but, as has been reported, from General *Govorov* of the Far Eastern Theater of Operations, we are obliged to conclude that some dramatic changes of command have taken place in the U.S.S.R. at the same time as the KAL Flight 007 was being coldbloodedly shot down.

As a result, experienced military observers and intelligence analysts around the world are studying Moscow's post-Sept. 1 moves from a military-strategic standpoint: If the Soviet Union deliberately used the KAL massacre in order to put itself on a military war-command basis and thus launch a countdown toward a thermonuclear strategic confrontation, then the question arises: where will the "other shoe" fall?

“What the Soviets are doing is reminiscent of the Nazis’ 1938-39 irrationality,” a British Conservative insider told *EIR* Sept. 14. “It is the policy of ‘Schrecklichkeit’, calculated insanity,” he declared. A senior defense correspondent in Israel told *EIR* Sept. 13: “The Soviets have a new aggressive global posture, and this might soon affect us directly, in Lebanon. The feeling here, on the unofficial level, is that there was no mistake when the Soviets shot down that plane; it was done intentionally, from the top, in Moscow. They knew it wasn’t a spy plane, they knew it was a passenger plane, and they didn’t even try to force the plane down. For sure, there was no mistake. It signals that Soviet policy is becoming very aggressive against the West.” An Egyptian official, commenting on the first-ever crackdown by Cairo authorities inside Egypt of a ring of terrorists of the Abu Nidal terrorist gang, told *EIR* the same day: “We know Abu Nidal is now in East Germany. This is all being run by the Soviets directly. It is part of a Soviet global plan to destabilize our country, part of the same plan which is now destroying Lebanon.”

Flashpoints

As Lyndon LaRouche has stressed repeatedly since he first warned in April-May of this year that Moscow’s strategy was defined by an irrationalist “Third Rome” imperial push, the Soviet leadership’s fundamental strategy will be to launch new points of confrontation with the United States, up to the point of initiating an actual “Cuban Missile Crisis” showdown at some point in the near-term future, possibly triggering a thermonuclear world war in the process. The past months’ Swedish sub affair, the deployment of Soviet Druze and Islamic-fundamentalist assets in Lebanon and Africa, and the Sept. 1-13 pattern of provocations in the Asian theatre have all been components of this strategy, with the KAL incident being the initiation-point into a vastly more dangerous strategic era.

Intelligence analysts at various monitoring points are on alert to anticipated Soviet moves in any or all of the following points over the next period:

- West Germany: A strategic provocation around West Berlin, or some major provocation launched in the direction of Munich or Hamburg, is considered “more than likely” over the concluding weeks of 1983. This would be linked to KGB deployment of the overtly terrorist wings of the “Greenie”-Peace Movement aimed against American military installations and other targets.

- Central Asia: The presence of upwards of 105,000 Soviet troops in Afghanistan represents the forward edge of a potential Soviet military thrust into Central Asia, including moves for the balkanization and disintegration of Pakistan and/or destabilization efforts in the Gulf oil-producing regions. The U.S.S.R. is in full operational coordination with the Switzerland-based Nazi International assets and with the British policy-making group around Lords Caradon and Carington to create a crisis in Saudi Arabia, to interrupt the oil

flow into Western Europe and Japan. Soviet-backed efforts to block the Straits of Hormuz in the days or weeks immediately ahead are being viewed as increasingly likely in the post-Sept. 1 strategic context.

- The Far East: As an insightful commentary in France’s *Quotidien de Paris* by commentator Beylau pointed out Sept. 13, the effect of Soviet actions around Kamchatka has been to propel Asia into the center of the world-strategic fight, potentially superseding Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America as the point where the Soviets will challenge America’s global power position. Unconfirmed reports that the Soviets have installed SS-20 intermediate range ballistic missiles are one signpost to a new crisis on the Thai-Vietnam front, but other flashpoints may develop out of KGB-related efforts by the Society of Jesus and Libya’s Colonel Qaddafi to support the destabilization of the Philippines, Indonesia, and other ASEAN countries. In anticipation of expanded Soviet regional moves, the Peking leaders are playing a delicate balancing act, opening channels to Moscow through the visit of Soviet envoy Kapitsa beginning Sept. 7, but also wooing the U.S.A. in the days leading up to the late-September visit to Peking by Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger.

In the Far East, the relatively strong historical commitment of the United States to development in the region, in comparison to the past 100 years’ American policy toward other regions, might mitigate against Soviet destabilization and confrontation efforts, *if* the policy of President Reagan in his planned tour of Asia in November is vectored toward a strong technological, scientific and economic development policy.

- Africa: The failure of Paris and Washington to oppose the aggression of Colonel Qaddafi in Chad opens broader areas of Africa (Sudan, Cameroon, and others) to the challenge of the KGB’s legions, *unless* the Sept. 12-16 visit by U.S. Vice President George Bush to Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia signals the start of a new development-oriented American policy toward Africa. British sources are expecting a significant Soviet strategic move in southern Africa, most likely in Angola.

Lebanon and the Kissinger Problem

Of all the above options available to the Soviet Command, it appears that the Middle East region is the most tempting, especially in combination with a certain type of a “Berlin crisis.” Note that all of Syria’s Surface-to-Air Missile sites within Syria and Lebanon are hard-wired to be directly integrated into the PVO Strany (Air Defense) headquarters in Moscow. This transfer of command of Syrian Air Defense was carried out in late July during a visit of a large military delegation led by a senior Soviet military man to Damascus. The Soviets also have over 8,000 troops in Syria and a reported 500 uniformed personnel inside Lebanon. Soviet military presence in the region is complemented by several full-strength mobile armored divisions in Afghanistan, the Tran-

scaucasus and other borders with Iran. Thirdly, the Soviet military capability in the area is complemented by an impressive insurgency/destabilization capability now directly threatening Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Sudan and all the other Gulf countries. This complement includes, in the words of Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr, "The most important single instrument behind the destruction of nations, the powerful Nazi International, centered in Switzerland around old Swiss Nazi bankers such as François Genoud of Lausanne. This Nazi International coordinates every known separatist movement—and associated terrorist gangs—known to this writer throughout the world, and is the leading, controlling agency behind 'Islamic fundamentalist' insurgency today." LaRouche traced this network to the Nazis' RSHA and Abwehr "minorities division" intelligence services and, further back in time, to the "gnostic" cult operations of the type cultivated during the Byzantine Empire. This complement, as elaborated elsewhere, includes Qaddafi's terrorist teams, Ayatollah Khomeini's propaganda and combat units throughout the region, Abu Nidal's and others' terror networks, most of Lebanon's factious military gangs, and the Syrian Army under its present command.

This is the Soviet command's basic on-the-ground capability. It is further aided by a unique type of political backup, namely the political support given to the nation-busting efforts of Islamic fundamentalist insurgents from powerful factions in the West historically associated with the Bertrand Russell school of politics and currently identified with Henry Kissinger and Lord Carrington's influential circles. Incidentally, it is these Kissinger/Carrington circles in the West which now hysterically deny that anything at all changed in the U.S.S.R. since the KAL massacre.

American response?

Be that as it may, after President Reagan committed the United States to the preservation of the Lebanese nation-state and to firepower backup for the embattled national Lebanese Army, the Syrian government, at the prompting of Moscow, announced that such a U.S. policy would lead into a thermonuclear confrontation between the two superpowers: Syria's minister of state for foreign affairs Farouk Share said that a "military solution" by the United States in Lebanon would be "fraught with dangers and might go beyond the Middle East borders."

It may well be that the Soviet command is thinking along a confrontation scenario similar to the sequence: 1960—the crisis around the U-2 plane; 1961—Berlin Crisis; 1962—Cuba Missile Crisis. The alteration to this sequence might be a) a drastic condensation of the time-frame and b) the location for the actual thermonuclear confrontation to be not in Washington's but in Moscow's "backyard": the Middle East. Whatever the case may prove to be in future, one thing is certain: the KAL massacre is most certainly being used as the same kind of political pivot that the U-2 incident was for Khrushchev.

In the global context of President Reagan's maintaining a firm commitment to his March 23 policy of crash development of anti-ballistic missile systems in space to reinvigorate the U.S. military and technological capability, it may become increasingly possible for the United States to meet specific regional threats from the U.S.S.R. by a policy of support for sovereignty of nations and technology transfer to the developing sector.

It is noteworthy that the fighting in Lebanon tapered off during the Sept. 14-15 period, immediately following the President's statement, as U.S. Commander-in-Chief, authorizing U.S. Marine Commanders on the spot to use aircraft against invading Syrian-Druze forces when perceived necessary. Although the U.S.S.R.'s Tass news agency bellowed Sept. 13 that the United States was "preparing a new war in the Middle East" by "invading Lebanon," the firm commitment by the United States to deploy the close-to-14,000 Marines in the Lebanon war theatre to defend the sovereignty of the country may be forcing Moscow to think twice about pushing this situation too far too soon. The United States has also begun upgraded support for the Lebanese national army and air force, and on Sept. 15, the Lebanese Air Force was deployed for the first time over the strategically crucial town of Souk el-Gharb in the contested Chouf mountain region, as a warning to the Syrian-Druze-Iranian allied forces there that further provocations from them, toward attempted conquest of Lebanon's capital Beirut would be met with surgical strikes from the air against their artillery positions.

The biggest pogrom in history?

Sanity inside Lebanon will in large part depend on Israel disassociating itself from the policy course dictated by former Defense Minister Ariel Sharon and by his Mossad allies, and instead subordinating its regional strategy to an American-backed approach for defending the sovereignty and development of nations in that region.

Regional dynamics in and of themselves would not likely change Israeli policy. What might instead is the shifting perception of danger from the Soviet "Third Rome" imperialists in a *global* sense. It has not been unnoticed, for example, that, two weeks prior to the Sept. 1 Kamchatka incident, the Soviet military journal *Red Star* ran a diatribe against "international Jewish financial capital" as the "strike-force of American imperialism."

What has particularly struck Jewish-Zionist observers is not only this repetition of traditional "Black Hundreds" Russian 19th century anti-Semitism, but that the *Red Star* piece was the sounding-board for a gratuitous violent attack on the World Jewish Congress, founded by the late Nahum Goldmann and headed by magnate Edgar Bronfman. Since Bronfman has been the conduit for numerous western factions to arrange contacts and deals with Moscow, this attack signals that many of the bets of the past are off. The thought occurring to some astute individuals in Israel is that the Russians may be preparing the greatest anti-Jewish pogrom in history.