

HELGA ZEPP-LAROCHE

## Only a Paradigm-Shift Can Avert World War III

*Helga Zepp-LaRouche gave the following keynote speech Feb. 12 to a private luncheon in Washington, D.C. She was introduced by EIR Washington Bureau Chief Bill Jones.*

Hello, good day. I would like to start with a prognosis of my husband, Mr. [Lyndon] LaRouche. And for those of you who know of him or who know him, I can say that Mr. LaRouche is differentiated from other economists and statesmen through the fact that his prognoses have never been wrong, both in terms of the prediction of the systemic collapse of the financial system, and many other occasions. And he has recently issued the warning that if the present policy in Ukraine by the United States, by the EU, and by NATO, is continued, that we may have a thermonuclear war by the end of February or the beginning of March.

Now, for some of you, this may sound dramatic, but the situation *is* dramatic. And just yesterday, two relevant Russian groupings, or in one case, a person, and in another one, a grouping, confirmed their absolute concern that there *is* a Nazi coup in Ukraine underway. One was Gen. Leonid Ivashov, who is now with the Geopolitical Institute, who basically accused the West of using Goebbels' propaganda; that he says that he hopes the Foreign Ministry of Russia is already aware of the fact that a war has started, and that the first phase of this war is an information war by basically lying.

Now, there are a lot of lies going on: One lie is that the West—and in the United States, to my knowledge, there

has not been one single newspaper article pointing to the fact that the so-called opposition in Ukraine is made of, largely, and dominated in terms of its violent aspects, by Nazi groups, people who openly refer to Stepan Bandera, the Nazi collaborator in the '40s, who helped to prepare the invasion of Ukraine, and such people as the Svoboda party and other groupings, right-wing extremist groupings, who openly follow this tradition.

Why is it that the West, at least in the United States, is portraying this opposition as something completely different, a freedom-loving people, who want to join democracy, who want to join the European Union, and where an “evil dictator,” [Ukrainian President] Yanukovich, who is sympathetic to an even more “evil dictator,” [Russian President] Putin, are trying to prevent these peace-loving people from joining democracy and the West? That is the picture which you get.

Why are they not telling the truth? That these people have committed violence, they have thrown molotov cocktails, they have occupied a ministry, they have organized violent takeovers throughout the whole country, they are wearing openly Nazi symbols, they have swastikas in their logo. I wrote recently an article, where I said, if the same thing would happen in Berlin, and the NPD, which is the neo-Nazi party there, would occupy a ministry, would have violent demonstrations in front of the Chancellor's office, organize militant takeovers throughout the whole country, what would the police do? They would smash it, and try to calm it down. So why is there such a lying presentation of this?



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

*In her keynote address to a private luncheon in Washington, Helga Zepp-LaRouche presented a stark picture of the danger of global war, with special emphasis on the U.S.-NATO-backed attempted fascist coup in Ukraine.*

## NATO Expansion Aimed at Russia

Now, this has to be seen in the context of the effort to continue the NATO eastward expansion which started immediately after the collapse of the Soviet Union. When the Soviet Union collapsed, between 1989 and '91, there was an agreement probably between Mr. [Soviet President] Gorbachov and Mr. [German Chancellor] Kohl and Mr. [Vice Chancellor] Genscher, that there would never be an eastward expansion of NATO, and there would never be foreign troops east of the Elbe.

Then, in 1994, there was another agreement, the Budapest Memorandum, signed between the United States, Great Britain, and Russia, that the territory of Ukraine would be guaranteed by these three nations, and that if there would be a threat to the security of the country, they would come and protect it, *and* there would be no economic coercion.

Well, all of these have clearly been violated.

Now, how was this recent development triggered? When, at the end of November, at the EU summit in Vilnius, all of a sudden, Yanukovich, at the last minute, refused to sign the EU Association Agreement. It is very likely, almost certain, that one part of that agreement included a military part, whereby, in the medium term, NATO would have had access to the territory of

Ukraine; and that was one of the reasons why it became very clear that for Ukraine to sign the EU Association Agreement would have been practically suicide: First of all, it would have destroyed the Ukraine economy and turned Ukraine very quickly into the new Greece, eastward, west of the Russian border; because contrary to the mythologies, the EU is not in tremendous condition. The EU is disintegrating. There is a very great likelihood that the EU may not outlive this present year of 2014.

What then happened was a provocation, where these [right-wing] elements, which according to President Putin had been prepared for the [Ukrainian] Presidential election in 2015, were activated. And you know, this is not just a sudden eruption, but one has to see that the whole eastward extension of NATO really started with the collapse of the Soviet Union, when you had in the United States, existing in power, the neocons around Bush Sr.; and the neocons had the

New American Century doctrine, instead of using the historic opportunity which the collapse of communism had represented, because there was no more enemy, and it would have been very easy to establish a peace order for the 21st Century.

Instead, Bush Sr., and [British Prime Minister] Margaret Thatcher, and also [French President] Mitterrand decided to go in a different direction, and especially between Bush Sr. and Margaret Thatcher—they decided to build a new empire based on the special relationship between the United States and Great Britain, and go for a policy of regime change, against practically every country which would oppose that.

## On the Edge of World War

In that context, in Ukraine, there developed 2,200 NGOs, who built networks of anti-Russian conviction, people who would in part be activists and get paid, like in Maidan, most people get paid \$50 a day plus food for their demonstrations, and others who are just full of illusion. Naturally, if you have young people who are hedonistic and you promise them freedom, then you can build up networks.

So over 22 years, these anti-Russian networks have been built up, and at the same time, you had the eastward extension of NATO, and also the EU, which have

become more and more integrated and identical.

And you have to see what is now the danger: You have a situation where Ukraine, as a result of this, is almost at civil war, and there can be a debate if the civil war has already erupted.

Now, the Izborsk Club, which is a group of influential Russian intellectuals, just issued yesterday, a memorandum (see *Documentation*) where they said that the aim is very clearly, to get rid of Yanukovich, to put [Yulia] Tymoshenko<sup>1</sup> or [Vitali] Klitschko<sup>2</sup> into office, based on a right-wing extremist coalition, drive out the Russians from Sevastopol, deny them access to the Black Sea, and basically have then a continuation of that: Destroy the industry in the eastern parts of Ukraine which are linked to the military-industry complex of Russia, and then carry out the Maidan tactic in Russian cities, and eventually get rid of Putin.

Now, it is very clear that this is an unacceptable situation for Russia, because you have to see that this is part of the military deployments. The U.S. missile defense system in Poland, in Romania, and two days ago, the deployment of the *USS Donald Cook* Aegis destroyer, are part of a missile defense system, where Russia has declared many times that it is *not* acceptable for them, because the aim is obviously not some missiles in Iran, but the very position where this missile defense system is, is aimed to take out the second-strike capability of Russia. And they have declared they will not allow that this U.S. missile defense system is being built beyond a certain point, because Russia would become indefensible after that.

So therefore, we are looking at a situation in the short term of a Russian counter-reaction. There are some people in military circles in Western Europe who think that you may be looking at a replay of what happened during the Beijing Olympic Games: that after the Sochi Olympic Games are over, that a Russian reaction could be like in South Ossetia in 2008.<sup>3</sup> I would not count on such timetables, because we are on the verge of World War III, right now, and it could happen much, much earlier.

---

1. Ex-Prime Minister, poster-girl of the 2004 Orange Revolution, currently serving a jail term on a conviction of exceeding her authority while in office.

2. Ex-champion heavyweight boxer, long based in Germany, promoted in European circles as the charismatic leader Ukraine needs.

3. Georgia attacked the capital of its autonomous province, South Ossetia, as well as Russian peacekeeping forces there, on Aug. 8, 2008, the opening day of the Beijing Olympics. Russia quickly bolstered its forces and drove the Georgians out of South Ossetia, which subsequently declared its independence.

In addition to the U.S. missile defense system, is the Prompt Global Strike doctrine, which is a doctrine which is basically using traditional ICBM missiles, but with non-nuclear weapons, also supposedly to be able to take out the second-strike capability. And you have to also take into account that the “Asia pivot” policy, the so-called Air-Sea Battle doctrine against China, is characterized by the same illusion, and utopian idea, that you can take out the second-strike capability of China.

Now, China has made very clear that they will not capitulate. In October, on one Monday, all the Chinese publications published maps where they pointed to the fact that they have 70 strategic submarines in the Pacific off the West Coast of the United States, and they could hit the entire West Coast with nuclear weapons as a second strike. And they have maps where you can see the radioactive fallout going all the way to Chicago, and then, how you would have a second line going over the North Pole, hitting the East Coast.

Similarly, the Russian joint chiefs of staff had a conference in Moscow—I think it was almost two years ago—where they showed video animations, showing that the U.S. missile defense system is targeting Russian capabilities, and why they can not accept that. And even the Chief of Staff General Makarov, at that point, said that the Russians may be forced to go into a first strike, when it becomes clear that if they wait any longer their position becomes indefensible.

So therefore, when my husband says that we are looking at a short-term confrontation and that we must change the agenda, all the evidence points to the fact that this is underway. And the fortunate publication of the YouTube discussion between Assistant Secretary of State Victoria Nuland and Ambassador [Geoffrey] Pyatt, there was a big hoopla about it, naturally, and the Western media immediately tried to play it down and say, “Oh, she’s used this profane language.” Now, I’m not interested in the sexual preferences of Mrs. Nuland, but what I’m very interested in, is what it really refers to, namely, that this is a total interference into the internal affairs of Ukraine; it shows that they are managing, *by the minute*, how this process goes, and it is a total, total violation of every form of international treaty and diplomacy.

And it is not a surprise, because, if you look at the career of Mrs. Nuland: First of all, she is married to Robert Kagan, who is an arch-neocon. He was in the old Bush Administration, and one of the authors designing this idea of NATO eastward extension and encirclement

FIGURE 1  
**U.S./NATO Encirclement of Russia and China**



of Russia and China. So that she would then be in Kiev, or wherever this phone call was made, and was caught, and then, there was a complete cover-up, and that there is absolutely *no* mentioning of the true Nazi character of coup in Ukraine, is really absolutely incredible.

I think that the immediate danger is not just in this long-term preparation, but it has to do with the fact that the Western trans-Atlantic financial system is about to blow. I think that the only reason why, after the collapse of Lehman Brothers in 2008, the system didn't go bankrupt, was because all the major central banks decided to go for quantitative easing, to print money, to do what the Reichsbank did between 1919 and 1923, just to print money; and at the same time, to go for bailouts. And they realize this is now not enough, so they have the mechanism of "bail-in," which we have seen in the Cyprus model, which means the expropriation of people

who have savings accounts above EU100,000. But if it comes to a crash, it would be even worse.

Now, all this money-printing, naturally, has the danger of hyperinflation, which is already building up in a gigantic bubble. And that is why there has been since a long time, a debate in the Fed and other places, about the need to reverse that. And there was a general recognition that you cannot reverse it, because if you start to take the liquidity out of this bubble, the danger is that it bursts.

Now, in the recent period, Mr. Bernanke decided to go for the so-called "tapering," meaning to reduce the liquidity injection from \$85 billion a month, to first, \$75 billion, and now \$65 billion, but, exactly as was to be expected, this has already shown tremendous reactions by the collapse of the currencies of the so-called "emerging markets," and capital flight out of these countries. And the BIS [Bank for International Settlements]

ments] recently put out a statement that they are totally against this “tapering” by the Fed, because it involves the danger of a catastrophic development, meaning a blowout of the system.

Now, we are on the verge of such a blowout, and that collapse of the financial system is what decides the speed of this adventure towards Russia.

## Hell on Earth

So, I think what we need to do, is, first of all—and one of the reasons why we are having this luncheon; we have also prepared written materials for you—I think it is *extremely* important that the character of the coup in Ukraine is made known. Fortunately, there were some papers in Germany by now, and the *Guardian*, also *Time* magazine, *Stern*, and others, that published the Nazi character, even though in much too mild fashion. But it must become known: This is a Nazi coup, and this is the danger to world peace!

Then, in addition to that, we are working very hard, my husband in particular, to try every possible way to get patriots of the United States to return the United States back to its Constitution. And that is not for me to comment on, but there is a big effort by American patriots to do exactly that.

But I think internationally, it is extremely clear: If we continue on the present course of action—you know, the extreme financial free-market economy which has led to a situation where the gap between rich and poor has become intolerable. Recently a report was published that 85 individuals own as much as 3.5 *billion* people! Entire regions of the world are dying; Africa is dying; many other places are in a terrible condition.

If you take the entire region from Afghanistan, Pakistan, to Syria, to North Africa, to Central Africa—this is a region which is in *total* chaos. The policy of regime-change in Iraq, in Libya, in Syria, has created Hell on Earth: This area is dominated by terrorists, by people who are receiving their money from the money-laundering from the drug production in Afghanistan, which has increased by 40 times since NATO moved into Afghanistan 12 years ago. This is what sponsors the terrorism; this was what was responsible for the terrorism in Volgograd.

So I can give you many more aspects, but one thing is very clear: If we continue on the present course, the likelihood that human civilization will not exist beyond next month is very high. And we must have a dramatic, dramatic change of the paradigm: There is *no reason* why

we cannot have an international security agreement, including Russia, including China, in which the United States would cooperate in joint missile defense, with Russia, China, the Europeans, where we would concentrate on the common aims of mankind, such as defense of the planet against asteroids, comets, and other objects.

There are many issues where mankind *must work together*, if we are not going to make ourselves extinct, and it is the question: Do we have enough people who have the intelligence and the morality to recognize that in time, so that we can avoid a human catastrophe, and possibly the extinction of civilization?

---

## Documentation

---

# Izborsk Club: Stop Nazi Coup in Ukraine

by Rachel Douglas

Feb. 11—A memorandum titled “Save Ukraine!” will appear in tomorrow’s edition of the Russian weekly *Zavtra*. Written by experts for the Izborsk Club, an influential intellectual group accorded prominence by President Vladimir Putin in recent months, the statement defines a “fascist and Nazi creeping coup” in Ukraine as a strategic threat to the Russian Federation. While holding the United States and the EU responsible for the regime-change project in Ukraine, the memorandum calls for summoning the USA to crisis-avoidance consultations under the 1994 Budapest Memorandum on Ukraine’s sovereignty or, if Budapest Memorandum signers Ukraine or Britain refuse such a conference, undertaking emergency Russian-American diplomacy based on the precedent of the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis—when the world went to the brink of nuclear war.

Several of the evaluations and ideas in the memorandum coincide with last week’s interviews and articles by Presidential advisor Academician Sergei Glazyev (“Glazyev Exposes U.S. Hand in Ukraine,” *EIR*, Feb. 14, 2014), and retired Gen. Leonid Ivashov, who are Izborsk Club participants and were among the co-authors of the club’s early 2013 military strategic white paper (see “U.S. Moves toward Nuclear First Strike Capability,” *EIR*, March 15, 2013).

The “Save Ukraine!” memorandum states that the situation in that country “is approaching a boundary limit, beyond which lies the danger of Ukraine’s going fascist.” This development leads, it continues, toward “transformation of Ukraine from a non-aligned, neutral and non-nuclear state into a new ‘hot spot’ for Europe and the entire world, and into a hotbed of instability and chaos on Russia’s borders.”

Detailing the recent concessions by Ukrainian President Victor Yanukovich and the actions of the EU and the USA, including those revealed in the leaked phone conversation between U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Victoria Nuland and Ambassador in Kiev Geoffrey Pyatt, the memorandum says that these events are “creating the conditions for an illegitimate seizure of power by a coalition of political forces that do not represent the interests of the majority of the people of Ukraine.” Charging that “the U.S. leadership group on top of Operation Ukraine is comprised of high-ranking intelligence and diplomatic operatives,” the statement suggests that “Washington is most worried of all that Moscow, which has enormous reserves among the Ukrainian population, will suddenly wake up and become more active, wrecking the almost completed plan of establishing a totally anti-Russian government, up to and including the broad use of the fascistized followers of [Nazi collaborator Stepan] Bandera.”

The report outlines possible political scenarios for regime-change in Ukraine, either by the abrupt ouster of Yanukovich or through a “coalition government” process that would also end in his ouster. A new leader, possibly former Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko, released from prison, would “take over the leadership of Ukraine, on the radical nationalist platform of [Oleh] Tyahnybok and other right-wing fascist groups. An ideological turn of events of that sort . . . would be a way of forming an anti-Russian state on the Russian Federation’s border, as well as disrupting any comprehensive integration processes in the former Soviet area.”

### **‘Strategic Interests of the Russian Federation’**

Under the subhead, “Consequences of the coup for Russia’s strategic interests,” the Memorandum outlines what “a new political and ideological regime in Ukraine, . . . based on an extreme nationalist ideology, as the only available mechanism for suppressing social tensions,” can be expected to do: “decisions which directly affect the strategic interests of the Russian Federation.” The list includes military expansion by the United States

and NATO that is unacceptable for Russia:

“—Rejection of the presence of the Russian Armed Forces in Crimea, including at Sevastopol as the base of the Russian Federation’s Black Sea Fleet. The time frame will be set at six to ten months, which is insufficient for an orderly relocation of the military facilities to Russian territory in the vicinity of Novorossiysk.

“—Purges of pro-Russian forces in eastern and southern Ukraine, leading to a flood of refugees into the Russian Federation.

“—Annihilation of manufacturing capacities in Kiev, Dnepropetrovsk, Kharkov, and other Ukrainian cities, which do contract work for the Russian military-industrial complex.

“—Stepped-up forcible Ukrainianization of the population on the left bank of the Dnieper [where there are large Russian ethnic and/or Russian-speaking populations].

“—Expanded partnership of Ukraine with NATO and the appearance of U.S. and NATO bases in Ukraine, including Crimea.

“—Establishment in eastern Ukraine of bases for training terrorists, who will begin to operate both in the Caucasus and in the Volga Basin, and possibly also Siberia.

“—Extension of ‘Euromaidan’ techniques into major Russian cities, especially in ethnically defined constituent territories of the Russian Federation.

“—Expulsion of the Russian Orthodox Church from Ukraine, accompanied by forcible seizure of churches and monasteries, resulting in a further decline of the authority of both the ROC and the executive branch of government within Russian society.

“—Launching of prosecutions against Gazprom, Rosneft, and their executives, with the new Ukrainian government also suing Russia in Western-sponsored international courts under various pretexts.”

### **‘Catastrophic for the Future of Russia’**

In the final section, “What is Russia to do?”, the authors state: “We consider the situation taking shape in Ukraine to be catastrophic for the future of Russia and the entire post-Soviet area.” Among the measures they propose that Russian political leaders take, “within the framework of international law,” are the following:

“—an official ideological evaluation of the creeping coup as fascist and Nazi, infringing the rights of all peoples and ethnic groups living in Ukraine;

“—an appeal to the Russian and Ukrainian peoples

to resist with all their might the fascist plague that is seizing power in Kiev, and to bring broad layers of the public into the political process;

“—direct social and economic assistance to all the regions of southern and eastern Ukraine, through launching bilateral programs and keeping low gas prices for Ukrainian customers, while withholding additional direct loans to the government of Ukraine;

“—calling on all Russian citizens to contact their relatives and friends in Ukraine, to mobilize them to join an overt political process against the Maidan, which is leading to a future fratricidal war; . . .

“—launch of a broad campaign on national TV channels to support the Ukrainian public and expose the fascist content of the coup that is under way, as well as the adverse economic consequences for Ukraine, especially its eastern and southern regions;

“—an open declaration to the world community on the unacceptability for Russia of the creation of a fascist, anti-Semitic state close to our borders, as well as making such statements at the UN and other international organizations;

“—an appeal by the Government of the Russian Federation, under the currently valid Budapest Memorandum on the Sovereignty of Ukraine, dated Dec. 5, 1994 (Article 6), to the governments of Ukraine, the USA, and Great Britain, with a decisive protest against U.S. interference in the internal affairs of Ukraine and a demand to convene a conference of the parties to the Budapest Memorandum in connection with the situation involving political aggression and measures of ‘economic coercion designed to subordinate to their own interest the exercise by Ukraine of the rights inherent in its sovereignty’;

“—in the event of refusal of one of the parties to take part in such a conference, the said memorandum should be declared temporarily invalid, with Russia entering into direct talks with Washington, citing the situation with the Caribbean Crisis [Cuban Missile Crisis] of 1962 as a precedent for the current events in Ukraine, and proposing to the USA to hold negotiations on developing joint monitoring of the political process and elections in Ukraine, as well as joint mediation of a settlement of the developing political crisis;

“—a proposal to the People’s Republic of China and other BRICS countries [Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa] to develop economic assistance plans for Ukraine and joint work in the entire post-Soviet area, in order to rein in any attempts at unilateral U.S. hegemony.”

In conclusion, they write: “Only such actions by the

Russian state and sane forces in the Russian and international community, together with the executive bodies of our two countries, can stabilize the social and economic situation in Ukraine and prevent social and political catastrophe in that country.”

## Ukraine: The Budapest Memorandum of 1994

*The following is the text of the Memorandum on Security Assurances, known as the Budapest Memorandum, in connection with Ukraine’s accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, signed Dec. 5, 1994.*

The United States of America, the Russian Federation, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

Welcoming the accession of Ukraine to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear-weapon State,

Taking into account the commitment of Ukraine to eliminate all nuclear weapons from its territory within a specified period of time,

Noting the changes in the world-wide security situation, including the end of the Cold War, which have brought about conditions for deep reductions in nuclear forces.

Confirm the following:

1. The United States of America, the Russian Federation, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, reaffirm their commitment to Ukraine, in accordance with the principles of the CSCE [Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe] Final Act, to respect the Independence and Sovereignty and the existing borders of Ukraine.

2. The United States of America, the Russian Federation, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, reaffirm their obligation to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of Ukraine, and that none of their weapons will ever be used against Ukraine except in self-defense or otherwise in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

3. The United States of America, the Russian Federation, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, reaffirm their commitment to Ukraine, in accordance with the principles of the CSCE

Final Act, to refrain from economic coercion designed to subordinate to their own interest the exercise by Ukraine of the rights inherent in its sovereignty and thus to secure advantages of any kind.

4. The United States of America, the Russian Federation, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, reaffirm their commitment to seek immediate United Nations Security Council action to provide assistance to Ukraine, as a non-nuclear-weapon State Party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, if Ukraine should become a victim of an act of aggression or an object of a threat of aggression in which nuclear weapons are used.

5. The United States of America, the Russian Federation, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, reaffirm, in the case of the Ukraine, their commitment not to use nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon State Party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, except in the case of an attack on themselves, their territories or dependent territories, their armed forces, or their allies, by such a state in association or alliance with a nuclear weapon state.

6. The United States of America, the Russian Federation, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland will consult in the event a situation arises which raises a question concerning these commitments.

This Memorandum will become applicable upon signature.

Signed in four copies having equal validity in the English, Russian and Ukrainian languages.

## Russian Ambassador to NATO: BMD Discussions ‘Exhausted’

Feb. 11—In a timely restatement of long-standing Russian policy on the U.S.-NATO Ballistic Missile Defense system, which is being deployed to encircle Russia and impose their strategic capitulation to the British monarchy’s policies, Russia’s ambassador to NATO, Alexander Grushko, told Russia 24 TV channel Feb. 10:

“We can go around in circles, convene meetings, but if we fail to resolve the fundamental issue of providing reliable legal guarantees of non-direction of the U.S. and NATO missile system against Russian forces of nuclear deterrence, we can expect no improvements” in the BMD discussion. RIA Novosti reported that

Grushko added: “If our partners are not ready to give us this information, then we have no chance to come to an agreement. I do not see any possibility of doing this.”

Both current President Vladimir Putin and former President (when the discussions were initiated) Dmitri Medvedev have stated in no uncertain terms that the unilateral deployment of the U.S.-NATO BMD is strategically unacceptable to Russia, and that they *will* take necessary countermeasures before the system is fully deployed.

---

## Allen Dulles and OUN-B

---

# CIA/MI6 Use of Nazis In Ukraine Ongoing?

by William F. Wertz, Jr.

Feb. 14—According to *Hitler’s Shadow: Nazi War Criminals, U.S. Intelligence, and the Cold War* (2012), by Richard Breitman and Norman Goda, U.S. intelligence documents released in 2010 reveal that on May 5, 1952, the Deputy Director of the CIA, Allen Dulles, well-known for running the Nazi Ratlines after World War II, which facilitated the escape of Nazi war criminals, wrote a letter to the U.S. Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization on the subject of Mykola Lebed, the chief of the secret police organization of Stepan Bandera’s OUN-B (Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists).

In the letter, Dulles wrote that Lebed was of “inestimable value to this Agency in its operations. In connection with future Agency operations of the first importance, it is urgently necessary that subject be able to travel in Western Europe. Before subject undertakes such travel, however, this Agency must be in a position to assure his reentry into the United States without investigation or incident which would attract undue attention to his activities. Your Service has indicated that it cannot give such assurance because of the fact that subject was convicted in 1936 of complicity in the 1934 assassination of the Polish Minister of the Interior and sentenced to death, later commuted to life imprisonment. . . . Your Service has indicated that, if the subject reenters the United States on a reentry permit, an inves-

tigation must then be conducted. . . . In order to remove the obstacles to the fulfillment of this Agency's projected operations and pursuant to the authority granted under Section 8 of the CIA Act of 1949, I approve and recommend for your approval, the entrance of this subject into the United States for permanent residence under the above Act because such entry is essential to the furtherance of the national intelligence mission and is in the interest of national security."

Both Bandera, who was also convicted for assassinating the Polish Interior Minister, and Lebed escaped prison in Poland when the Nazis invaded in 1939. Then, when the Nazis invaded the USSR on June 22, 1941, Bandera and Lebed declared a sovereign and united Ukrainian state in East Galicia. Lebed, having trained at a Gestapo center in Zakopane, was to be the new minister for security.

A Banderist proclamation in April 1941 claimed that "Jews in the USSR constitute the most faithful support of the ruling Bolshevik regime and the Muscovite imperialism in the Ukraine." Pogroms in East Galicia in the war's first days killed perhaps 12,000 Jews. In April 1943, Lebed proposed to "cleanse the entire revolutionary territory of the Polish population." On a single day, July 11, 1943, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) attacked some 80 localities, killing perhaps 10,000 Poles.

Dulles's letter makes no mention of Lebed's training by the Gestapo, nor his and Bandera's ethnic cleansing of Jews and Poles in Ukraine.

As documented by Breitman and Goda, the mission referred to by Dulles was, like today's, to wage war against Russia (then the Soviet Union) on Ukrainian soil, employing known Nazis. Their account raises serious questions as to whether this program was ever stopped as claimed.

Bandera himself was employed not by the CIA but by Britain's MI6, which worked with him until at least 1954. He was picked up in 1959 by the West German intelligence service BND, headed by Gen. Reinhardt Gehlen, who was the head of German military intelligence on the Eastern Front during World War II. Bandera's personal contact in West German intelligence was Heinz Danko Herre, Gehlen's one-time deputy. Herre admitted that West German use of Bandera was a "closely held" secret even within the BND, and that the relationship was "not cleared with Bonn due to political overtones."

Bandera had been trying to obtain a U.S. visa since 1955. Despite refusing to work with him, in October 1959, the CIA recommended that he obtain the visa. Ten

days later, he was assassinated, reportedly by the KGB.

While the MI6 and BND worked with Bandera, the CIA worked instead with Lebed, from 1950, until the so-called end of the Cold War in 1990, despite the fact that a U.S. Army Counterintelligence Corps (CIC) report from July 1947 had called Lebed a "well-known sadist and collaborator of the Germans." Lebed was initially moved by the Army from Rome to Munich after the war. He later relocated to New York and acquired permanent resident status, then U.S. citizenship, thanks to Allen Dulles.

Once in the United States, he became the CIA's chief contact for Operation Aerodynamic, which was the successor to the earlier Operation Cartel. These operations were for "the support, development and exploitation of the Ukrainian underground movement for resistance and intelligence purposes."

Beginning in 1953, Aerodynamic began to operate through a Ukrainian study group under Lebed's leadership in New York under CIA auspices. In 1956, this group was incorporated as the non-profit Prolog Research and Publishing Association. In 1956 alone, with CIA support, Prolog broadcast 1,200 radio programs totaling 70 hours per month, and distributed 200,000 newspapers and 5,000 pamphlets. Beginning in 1960, Prolog also employed a CIA-trained Ukrainian named Anatol Kaminsky. By 1966, Kaminsky was Prolog's chief operations officer, while Lebed provided overall management.

Lebed retired in 1975, but remained an advisor and consultant to Prolog. In the 1980s, Aerodynamic's name was changed to Qrdynamic, Pddynamic, and then Qrplumb. In the 1980s, Prolog expanded its operations to reach other Soviet nationalities. Allegedly, Qrplumb was terminated in 1990. Prolog, however, was allowed to continue its activities, but it was allegedly on its own financially, which raises questions as to whether this entire operation has continued through today.

In June 1985, the Office of Special Investigations (OSI) in the Department of Justice began investigating Lebed. The CIA, worried that an investigation of Lebed would compromise Qrplumb, protected him once again, by denying any connection between Lebed and the Nazis. As late as 1991, the CIA tried to dissuade the OSI from obtaining wartime records related to OUN-B from the German, Polish, and Soviet governments. Lebed died in 1998. He is buried in New Jersey.

What we are seeing in Ukraine today, is the same fascist policy pursued by Allen Dulles, this time under Barack Obama.