

Intelligence debacle in National Security Council

by Criton Zoakos

A crisis in national intelligence evaluations exists inside the U.S. government at this time, a crisis so big that it can best be characterized as a debacle. It has to do with what Washington believes is going on inside the Soviet Union over the last 12 months. To the thoughtful observer who is not blessed (or encumbered) with a "Top Secret" security clearance, this debacle has not gone over entirely unobserved.

It has registered in the public's attention in the form of a massive discrepancy between two sets of reported facts: on the one side, the facts of *growing Russian military might* in all directions, on the other, the evidence of internal political turns and twists in the East bloc to which our official intelligence agencies point to assure us that we are witnessing a fabled "*crumbling of the Soviet Empire*."

Are we to assume that this Soviet Empire is "crumbling" exactly at the height of its greatest military/strategic prosperity ever?

The National Security Council, the State Department, the CIA, the USIA, and the various think-tanks—Harvard, Columbia, Georgetown CSIS, the Hoover and Heritage Foundations, and the American Enterprise Institute—say, "Yes." *EIR* says, "No, not in the way you mean."

Inside the National Security Council (NSC), there is a group of analysts centered around the Soviet and East European desk who believe that, because communist ideological appeal within the Soviet bloc is crumbling, therefore the "Soviet Empire is crumbling." This group and its immediate collaborators include **Dr. John Lenczowski**, **Ambassador Jack Matlock**, a Kissinger appointee from the Foreign Service; NSC consultant **Jan Nowak**, a Brzezinski-era leftover; Constantine Menges; and **Robert C. McFarlane** himself. Allied to this grouping are persons from other government

agencies and services: **Richard Burt**, **Mark Palmer**, and, earlier, **Lawrence Eagleburger** at the State Department; **Fred Ikle** and **Richard Perle** at the Defense Department; **James Buckley** who runs Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe from Munich; and others. They and numerous others in government and academia insist that U.S. policy should proceed from the axiomatic assumption that the U.S.S.R. is "crumbling." All of them are associated with specific policy projects which are based on this assumption. One such is "Project Democracy," which involves **Lane Kirkland**, **Ben Wattenberg**, **Lawrence Eagleburger** (now from Kissinger Associates, Inc.), Sen. **Orrin Hatch** (D-Ga.), and others.

Project Democracy was initially conceived as an ideological offensive against communism and communist ideology per se, rather than as an offensive against the Soviet state per se. The original inspirers of "Project Democracy" argued that under the special circumstances of the nuclear era, more emphasis should be placed on the war of ideas rather than on military strength.

The original presentation of the "Project Democracy" approach was made out of Lawrence Eagleburger's State Department office in late 1981. An aide to Eagleburger at the time, Dr. John Lenczowski, wrote an article titled "A Foreign Policy For Reaganauts," published in *Policy Review*, the magazine of the **Heritage Foundation**. It appears that the ideas in that article were the fruit of Dr. Lenczowski's collaboration not only with Kissinger-ally Eagleburger but also with another Eagleburger aide at that time, **Mr. Mark Palmer**. Palmer today is deputy assistant secretary of state for European affairs, working under his old friend, Richard Burt, formerly of the *New York Times*. Lenczowski is the second ranking officer in the National Security Council Soviet desk

under Kissinger appointee Jack Matlock.

Project Democracy is now administration policy. As Lenczowski explained its purposes back in his 1981 article, both liberals and conservatives were wrong in their approach to the Soviets. The *liberals* because they are "intellectually incapable" of envisaging an "ideological offensive against the communists for our ideals of freedom, growth, social mobility, and popularly based legitimacy"; the *conservatives*, for giving primacy to building U.S. defenses, providing military and economic aid to anti-communist allies, and seeking more reciprocity in U.S.-Soviet relations. Thus, he proposed a third alternative: "In a dangerous world [of nuclear weapons], the ideological offensive is a non-military weapon which we can use to prevent ever having to use our military weapons."

Much more can be said about the flaws of the "Project Democracy" idea. Its principal and most strategically dangerous flaw is that it counterposes itself to the need for building U.S. defenses. The subsequent history of this proposal bears out the fact that it has been used as a palliative to cover up the neglect and undermining, even during the Reagan administration, of U.S. defenses.

Where the 'crumbling' thesis fails

The "crumbling empire" theorists at the NSC fail to address the fact that during the past year, the Soviet Union did not content itself with merely maintaining its earlier military growth rates.

Quite the contrary, in the past year, Moscow has: terminated all "arms control" talks; unilaterally suspended every meaningful restriction of the SALT agreements; proceeded with the development of three new, prohibited types of land-based strategic missiles, five new types of intermediate-range nuclear missiles, and two new types of cruise missiles; it has increased production and deployment of prohibited anti-missile missiles to nearly 100,000 per year; it has completed preparations for the launching of a mammoth space station, the "Cosmograd," to be used for military purposes, sometime during 1985; it has revealed a new ambitious program of naval construction which goes beyond the wildest fears of Western specialists; it has increased the annual rate of growth of production of conventional weapons systems to levels never before attained by any power in peacetime.

Moreover, in the last year, Moscow has increased dramatically the number of SS-20s threatening Western Europe; introduced SS-20s on a large scale into Asia; deployed into Eastern Europe additional short- and medium-range nuclear missiles; and covered both coasts of the continental United States with nuclear missile submarines about six minutes from their coastal targets and about eight minutes from their inland targets.

Since last year, Moscow has also deployed seasoned combat units into jump-off positions in East Germany, ready for a blitz assault against the Federal Republic of Germany either through the North German Plain, the Fulda Gap, or

points further south; it has positioned overwhelming forces opposite Norway ready to overwhelm that NATO ally's defenses within hours; it has trained and positioned forces capable of a rapid sweep of the entire Balkan Peninsula, including the territory of continental Greece and Turkey's Bosphorus and Dardanelles straits; it has doubled the number of its combatants in Afghanistan and has trained them against Pakistan; it has deployed combat-ready forces capable of making a quick sweep of northern Iran; it has significantly increased its military presence in Southeast Asia; it has pinned the United States down in an otherwise nonsensical diversion by creating apparently credible military challenges in Central America.

During these past 12 months, Moscow has also shown, by means of the most awesome naval maneuvers ever conducted, its capability of totally surprising and disrupting NATO's naval defenses in the North Atlantic and thereby cutting Europe off from the United States.

Compare this ominous global deployment of Russian military might today with what it was on Aug. 31, 1983, and there is no doubt that the KAL incident was indeed a "watershed," a dramatic signpost marking the beginning of a qualitatively distinct era in Russian strategic deployments. The principle which arrays these post-KAL deployments is no mere "projection of power."

If these Russian military deployments are studied together with the dramatic shifts in resource allocation within the Warsaw Pact economies, and if these two are correlated with the dramatic cumulative changes of domestic propaganda policies within the Warsaw Pact, the conclusion becomes evident: All the conceivable resources of the Russian empire have been compacted into a giant steel coil ready to spring into global military action.

All this is ignored by the National Security Council when it puts forward the operative intelligence estimate that Moscow is displaying symptoms of "crumbling empire." Moreover, this NSC estimate quietly omits the fact that despite great talk, the Reagan administration has spent about \$7 billion less on defense than the Carter administration had in the same period of time.

Historical illiteracy and the 'Great Game'

Ironically, the "brilliant idea" of a U.S.-led ideological offensive against communism was put forward and encouraged by Kissinger, Eagleburger, and the Heritage Foundation not only at a time in which communist ideology, within the Soviet bloc, had become the object of derision and ridicule even within government circles, but also at a time when the leading agencies of the Soviet government itself had been effecting changes to enable them to govern their populations without reliance on "communist ideology" per se.

As of early spring 1983, in all fundamental matters of state policy, the leading elite of the *nomenklatura*, or imperial civil-service list of the Russian Empire, had resolved to move forward as a Russian Imperial power rather than as an ideo-

logical communist movement. Arguably, the Soviet state, at least since the death of Lenin, has acted in world affairs more like the Empire of Holy Mother Rus than an ideological communist state, though the distinction between the two is much smaller than people imagine. After the secret 1936 pact between Stalin and the Russian Orthodox Metropolitan of Moscow, the trend became more evident. Stalin's 1941 open deal with Patriarch Alexii made matters more obvious. The collaboration between the Russian Orthodox Patriarchate and Marshal Zhukov's general staff opened up a new phase. The resurgence of the militant-chauvinist cult of Saint Sergii of Radonezh at Zagorsk outside Moscow during the late 1970s, accompanied the new preeminence of the Russian military establishment which emerged during that SALT period. One week before Leonid Brezhnev died, certain critical internal developments known to the NSC signaled the complete takeover of the Soviet state by an alliance between the military leaders and the non-uniformed *nomenklatura*, i.e., the Communist Party Central Committee organization. This alliance was led by Marshal Nikolai V. Ogarkov, chief of the General Staff.

By January 1982, it was becoming evident that the powerful men at the helm of the Soviet state, already at the apogee of their military power, were animated not by any idiotic ideological communist pap, but instead by a grandiose vision of world imperial dominance. A cult of power runs the Soviet state, which draws for inspiration from ancient Russian imperial traditions and legends: Filofei of Pskov, Saint Sergii of Radonezh, and, above all, Fyodor Dostoevski. The current rulers in the Kremlin believe themselves to be and are the heirs and executors of classical imperial statecraft as it was handed down to them from the Imperial Russia of Pobedonostsev and as it was handed to Moscow from its model and paradigm, the Byzantine Empire. The references are explicit and direct, and they abound in contemporary Soviet political and fictional literature. Beyond reasonable doubt, evidence shows that both the military elite under Marshal Ogarkov, which is leading the war mobilization in Russia, and the popular masses underneath, which are responding to this mobilization, are animated by the Russian-Byzantine cultural matrix and not by "communist ideology" per se.

When, amid such a shift in the cultural orientation of a large society, some of its institutions, practices, and personalities are changed, broken up, replaced, or discarded, what occurs is not a "crumbling empire" as the NSC contends, but merely "growing pains." This does not mean that "communist ideology" and its institutional props will be abandoned or smashed or hounded by the chauvinism of Holy Mother Rus. The cultural contents of "communism" and "Byzantine imperialism" are not basically very different.

This is a very important fact in modern political and strategic intelligence, and was first observed in 1925 by none other than Arnold Toynbee in his capacity as chief of the British Intelligence Service for the Balkans and the Middle East. By contrast to the gentlemen at the NSC, the CIA, and

the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, Toynbee was a true intelligence officer, albeit of the evil, imperial variety. He was an accomplished student of imperial practices and policies going back to the first Mesopotamian Empires, and had helped not only research and write, but also deliberately distort the writing of history before he assumed major intelligence tasks. In that capacity, Toynbee opined after Lenin's death that the Soviet state, in terms of its essential cultural and ideological outlook, was a direct continuation of its predecessor Russian-Byzantine state, albeit in a militant form. Toynbee arrived at this conclusion by arguing that the fundamental axiomatic assumptions respecting the nature of man and the universe which controlled social processes in Soviet society and in its imperial predecessor were identical, as the Marxist "material conception of man" is in no significant way distinguishable from the Eastern Orthodox denial of the *filioque*, i.e., denial of the theological form of the argument that man is primarily a creative intellect. In Byzantine imperial culture and in "communist society," individual men are soulless cattle, instruments and servants of the state. Moreover, as those who have perused the Dumbarton Oaks collection know, Byzantium, just like "communism," was based on "state ownership of the means of production." Only the Emperor and his oligarchical Senate, composed of the leading *families* of the empire, through decrees could grant to individual persons temporary grants of land ownership or commercial concessions. In the Byzantine Empire, as in the U.S.S.R., "socialist forms of property ownership" was the scheme of corporate organization of the oligarchy.

Toynbee argued, and his argument was accepted as state policy, that ultimately, sometime during this century, an imperial arrangement ought to be made between the "Eastern Empire," Russia, and the "Western Empire," the oligarchical faction within the West. Toynbee's scheme did not allow for the continuation of democratic-republican forms of self-government.

Where his planning went wrong is that the Russian Imperial impulse emerged during the 1980s fully armed with the most formidable thermonuclear and conventional military machine ever seen in world history. Not interested in "deals," it is pushing ahead for world conquest. "Communism" is only one, tertiary at that, instrument in the service of that conquest.

The NSC and other responsible agencies, by arguing that "communism" is crumbling, simply divert our attention from the more ominous enemy lurking beneath—and this to the peril of the United States and the democratic-republican political system for which it stands. However, the operative question is: Was Eagleburger's and Lane Kirkland's "Project Democracy" created in order to sustain an intelligence bureaucracy with a built-in career interest to argue the "crumbling Russian empire" thesis to the detriment of the U.S. military buildup? Let the plain military facts and figures of the last 12 months speak for themselves.