

## Eye on Washington by Nicholas F. Benton

### Ogarkov promotion frightens Abshire

Repeated inquiries by this reporter in the first 10 days after the outbreak of a new Soviet-inspired Berlin crisis on May Day, found a consistent, deafening "official silence" from all the corridors of power in the nation's capital.

However, a major corollary of the crisis, the elevation of Soviet Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov to a newly created post of deputy commander-in-chief of all Soviet armed forces, has sent waves of alarm through the elite policymakers. The reaction of former U.S. ambassador to NATO, David Abshire, to my question put to him before a May 8 forum at the Heritage Foundation, was a tip-off.

"There are a number of far-seeing Soviet generals who are focused on the applications of new technologies for tactical deployments, and who are reorienting Soviet tactical capabilities toward quick movements." He said that this orientation toward the "blitzkrieg" mode of deployment "does not necessarily mean the Soviets intend to actually initiate a military action this way, but they see it as giving them military leverage against Western Europe."

However, he cautioned, "This mode of deployment significantly increases the possibility of war through miscalculation." Abshire said, "I am among those here in Washington who

believe that World War III could happen, and I paint a grim strategic assessment for the 1990s."

He said the "new Soviet generals . . . hope the Alliance will not wake up to the potentials of new technologies developed by the Strategic Defense Initiative program." He called the SDI "an information revolution," and added, "The Soviets fear the potentials of this aspect of it more than any particular SDI deployment. So far, the Soviets have been better at applying these potentials of SDI technologies than we have."

Abshire endorsed outgoing NATO Supreme Commander Gen. Bernard Rogers, who has been warning against the dangers of the Reagan administration's "zero-option" proposal for withdrawing missiles from Europe. Abshire said of Rogers that he "is willing to put NATO's weaknesses on the top of the table and demand action to correct them. He's been more forthright and honest than any Supreme Commander that NATO has had."

Abshire is currently affiliated with the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), apparently a center of the alarm over the threat of the administration's zero option to decouple the alliance and hand Europe over to the Soviet sphere. The CSIS is also the haunt of Henry Kissinger, who has become another opponent of the zero option.

### Ogarkov's 'dual-hatted' role conceded

All this fuss over Ogarkov is old news to readers of *EIR*, especially those who read the summer 1985 *Special Report*, "Global Showdown," which outlined Ogarkov's central role in developing the "Plan B" for reorganizing the entire Soviet economy under a massive military modernization program.

A Soviet analyst from Stanford University, on a fellowship currently to the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Pentagon, confirmed at a Committee for National Security Forum here May 11 that Ogarkov may have had a "dual-hatted role"—namely, that he could have been coordinating the Western theater while also operating as part of the Soviet high command.

Dr. Condolezza Rice, responding to my question on the Berlin crisis and Ogarkov, this time in front of nationwide C-SPAN TV cameras, was quick to affirm that the Soviets "have a conventional force posture on the borders of Western Europe that is offensive in nature," and that the Soviets "are now pushing the concept of the 'battlefield of the 1990s,' that would utilize micro-electronics, high-yield conventional weapons (with the equivalence in power of small-scale nuclear weapons), and an information processing revolution."

Dr. Rice was willing to draw out the implications of her assertions about Soviet conventional force posture, only after I raised the issue. She was speaking before a group of ultra-liberals (the Committee for National Security being organized by the likes of William Colby, Paul Warnke, and Richard Barnet), and appeared barely distinguishable in her remarks from the other speakers, including Soviet spokesman Sergei Kislyak, until she found there were more than just liberals there.

She subsequently insisted that it is not just Soviet conventional force numerical superiority which poses a threat to Europe, but the "offensive force posture" of those forces, based on a "military doctrine of the primacy of the offensive," which is based on "penetrating so far into NATO before any response could be organized, that NATO's options for response would be delimited and crippled."