

CIA's Webster joins 'I love Gorby' club

by Herbert Quinde

If CIA Director William Webster's declarations in an interview with *USA Today* are indicative of the Bush administration's policy orientation on combating international terrorism, we have already lost the war.

In the *USA Today* interview, published Jan. 12, 1989, Webster was asked if he believed Soviet intelligence would share with the U.S. any information it might develop concerning the authors of the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103, which crashed near Lockerbie, Scotland, in December. Webster said, "I would guess they would. It's a view that I have held that conflicts with many who have thought that the Soviet Union was monolithically responsible for most of the terrorism around the world, particularly a decade ago. To whatever extent their involvement in training and supplying and shielding terrorists a decade ago may have been true, there have been a number of things that have happened in the world to change that."

According to Webster, "Mikhail Gorbachov's increased interest in having the Soviets play a significant foreign policy role as leaders in the world, works against their sheltering or encouraging, or harboring terrorists. We've had intimations of a desire of the Soviets to work in the world arena to reduce the threat of terrorism."

Webster's answer

Director Webster's answer would have been considered outrageous in early 1981; but in today's world of 'détente II,' it is praised as enlightened.

His view is not unique, but reflects the increasing influence of the "multi-polar world" strategists who are selling Gorbachov as "our man in the Kremlin." Asked if his assessment is that Gorbachov's "noble" experiment is doomed to failure, Webster said: "It's easy to say it's going to fail, because there are so many obstacles that he has to overcome. But it would be a great mistake if we just declared him lost. He's an extraordinary leader. He's demonstrated cleverness and boldness, and he has moved aggressively to obtain the sinews of power, to reorganize the Soviet government so that it will not be blocked by bureaucracy. He has opened up with glasnost. . . ."

Has the director of the CIA been taken in by a Soviet strategic deception? Yes and no.

Webster indicates his awareness that the Kremlin chief is playing us. Gorbachov, he says, "has kept us at times off

balance by his surprise foreign policy initiatives. We're always reacting to him, and that all works in his favor."

So the United States should "play" Gorbachov to extract concessions and stall for time to upgrade our strategic position. "We are not naive. We know the Soviet Union has not changed fundamentally. But the Russian Empire is crumbling and we must exploit the weaknesses," argues a former senior intelligence official. Besides, there might be some counterintelligence benefits.

Exemplary is the recent reunion in Moscow of U.S. and Soviet officials who had squared off during the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, for a "historical review" of the affair. The U.S. delegation was led by the "Dean of the Establishment," McGeorge Bundy, and occultist Robert Strange McNamara. The several days of meetings were in fact policy discussions aimed at reviving the old Kissingerian idea an American-Soviet condominium.

U.S. stumbles

While the United States continues to stumble about for a coherent counterterrorism policy, the recently reorganized and upgraded agencies of Soviet intelligence are effectively deploying their perfected knowledge of modern irregular warfare: Phony unilateral disarmament involving obsolete conventional forces and tactical nuclear weapons; phony troop pullouts from Afghanistan and Angola; phony human rights concessions.

The Nomenklatura, the Soviet Establishment, has an able public relations manager in its front office who is skillfully maneuvering the U.S. Establishment into outsmarting itself. The Soviets know modern irregular warfare is 99% cultural, political, and economic. Yet, terrorism and national insurgencies against our allies will continue to be a "tar-baby" so long as the U.S. treats the 1% of modern warfare that is lethal, as an isolated sociological phenomenon.

Lest we leave the impression that we have unfairly singled out CIA Director Webster for criticism, witness the "new thinking" of the U.S. elite on how to respond to the problem of drug trafficking. Last week's *EIR* reported that the Inter-American Dialogue (IAD), a hemispheric policy group modeled on the Trilateral Commission, basically stated of the drug mafia. If you can't beat 'em, join 'em.

In its latest report, presented to the incoming Bush administration Jan. 17, the Inter-American Dialogue (whose members include Sol Linowitz, McGeorge Bundy, Robert McNamara, and the new head of the New York Federal Reserve, Cyrus Vance) argues that a war on drugs is *as dangerous as drug-trafficking itself*; that narco-terrorism does not exist; and proposes that the Medellín Cartel should be tapped as an ally against the "guerrillas." According to the press release accompanying the IAD report, "incoming Bush National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft called the report 'significant' and said it should receive 'careful study.' "

Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad.