

LaRouche was right on Soviet strategy

by the Editors

As of May 10, it was clear beyond doubt, that former presidential and current congressional candidate Lyndon LaRouche was right, and the Bush administration—the Bush Central Intelligence Agency, Defense Intelligence Agency, and White House—have been all wrong, on the subject of Soviet strategy.

This has been made clear in two ways: first, by an address which Soviet President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachov delivered in support of the policies of Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov as Soviet strategic doctrines. This occurred on May 9, during a military parade staged in Moscow's Red Square commemorating the 45th anniversary of the Soviet Union's victory over Nazi Germany. This event followed a series of Gorbachov initiatives, including his first public appearance with Marshal Ogarkov on May 7 in an address to the All-Union War and Labor Veterans organization, of which Ogarkov was named the head on March 16, 1990.

Second, the Anglo-American press reacted to the speech of Gorbachov by trying to pretend, with headlines and in other ways, that this was an attack on the Soviet Red Army, when in point of fact, Gorbachov's speech was directly the opposite. Analysts, supplementing the clear text of Gorbachov's actual address in support of the Ogarkov doctrine, have noted the precise similarities of choice of language of the Gorbachov speech of May 9 and Ogarkov statements on the same subject given approximately a year earlier in an interview to the twice-monthly publication of the Soviet Armed Forces, *Kommunist Vooruzhennykh Sil*, (*Communist of the Armed Forces*, No. 11, of the first half of June 1989.) The Ogarkov interview was covered exclusively in the West

by *EIR*, (Sept. 8, 1989, "Ogarkov on how to fight the 'next war' "). Also noted is the consistency of the Ogarkov, Gorbachov, and Andropov doctrines, to abandon the worn out, out-lived Bolshevik communist forms of Soviet institutions, in order to return to a new form of old pre-Bolshevik Russian imperial perspectives.

This was the LaRouche analysis, first published in May and June 1983. This was reemphasized in the *EIR* "Global Showdown" publication of July 1985. This was also outlined in a number of published statements by LaRouche beginning March 1985, immediately prior to Gorbachov's appointment to the position of General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and of course, was the theme of a major half-hour nationwide television broadcast by presidential candidate LaRouche on the subject of recent changes in the Soviet hierarchy at the end of the 1988 presidential campaign. Since then, the CIA, the DIA, and the White House have been all running in the opposite direction, saying we've entered a period of détente, that the Cold War is over, that peace has broken out, that the peace dividend is going to save everything.

In point of fact, there is no peace dividend; peace has not broken out, and the economic policies on which the Bush administration has premised itself, have proven to be absolute disasters, with the world just waiting for the time that the entire financial structure collapses, a collapse viewed widely as long overdue.

So this creates a new situation, in which it has been made obvious in the clearest way, that the recent policies of the first months of the Bush administration, and the last months

of the Reagan administration, are completely bankrupt, both in the area of strategy, and in the area of financial and economic policy. All of these things have got to change, and change rapidly. Those who don't wish to change, will, if they succeed, bring nothing but disaster upon themselves, as well as everyone else.

Documentation

Ogarkov attacks Stalin's blunders

From EIR, Sept. 8, 1989:

Ogarkov, 71, retired to join the "Group of Inspectors" in April, after seven and a half years as chief of the General Staff and four years as Western Theater commander-in-chief. He is the author of the Soviet war plan of the 1980s, and developed the plan for a military-industrial reorganization of the economy which Mikhail Gorbachov later adopted and called perestroika.

The interview was published in issue No. 11 of the Soviet military bi-monthly journal *Kommunist Vooruzhonnykh Sil* (*Communist of the Armed Forces*). Articles and interviews by Ogarkov are extremely rare, his last published writing having been in 1985.

Ogarkov declared in the interview that the crucial mistake of the 1939-41 period, both pre-war and during the critical opening phase of what Moscow calls the Great Patriotic War, was the "mistake" of those commanders who prepared to fight the "next war" like past wars. This same problem, he said, "can be observed among us to a certain degree even now."

The short interview—about one page—centered on the theme of the Soviet military errors that were made during the 1939-41 pre-war period by the *political* leadership, which caused the catastrophic defeats in the opening phase of the war with Nazi Germany. These errors included Stalin's massive purge of the military command, as well as devastating mistakes in strategy and tactics.

Ogarkov praised the development by the Soviet High Command during the 1930s, of the theory of the "deep operation," and the formation of combined arms, tank, and mechanized corps, acting in conjunction with airborne forces to carry out the offensive military doctrine. He stressed that a "great mistake" was made when these tank and mechanized corps were dissolved in 1939.

He attributed the mistakes to "the mass repressions of military cadres" that had occurred in the late 1930s. This was the first time that Ogarkov had brought up this theme in writing. It was a clear reference to the 1939-41 disaster that developed because of the execution of strategist Marshal M.N. Tukhachevsky, author of the "theory of the offensive"; his demise led to the imposition of military insanities by an incompetent military coterie around Stalin, centered on

Defense Minister Marshal K. Y. Voroshilov. . . .

Another major blunder of 1939-41, relevant to any pre-war period, was the politically caused failure of Soviet industry to retool in time and produce in sufficient numbers the newest, most modern tanks and aircraft, and to integrate them into the armed forces before war began. While this theme as such did not appear in the Ogarkov interview, the theme of ridding the Soviet armed forces of obsolete equipment, and incorporating the latest technology at the fastest rate possible, has been a central focus of his past writings.

Gorbachov echoes Ogarkov attack on Stalin

From EIR, May 18, 1990:

Gorbachov's speech was one that could have been given by any Soviet military leader, especially when he blasted the pre-war "blunders" and crimes of Josef Stalin. The attack on Stalin has been reported in the Western media, but not the detailed formulations, which were identical to the attacks of the Soviet military command over the past two years. Gorbachov declared that Stalin had made "the most flagrant strategic blunders . . . which in the opening phase of the war, cost millions of lives." He listed the blunders, singling out precisely those which have been most stressed by Soviet military figures, including the former chief of the Soviet General Staff, Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov: 1) The pre-war terror purges killed or imprisoned "40,000 officers," which caused "the decapitation" of the military command. 2) Stalin had blundered by overruling the military and not accelerating the pre-war buildup of the most modern tanks and aircraft. 3) What Stalin had gained through the 1939 Hitler-Stalin Pact—time to prepare for war, and territorial gains—"at the price of enormous political and moral cost," was "lost" through his blunders in ignoring the intelligence provided by the U.S.S.R.'s intelligence services (including military intelligence, or GRU), who had informed him of the coming invasion.

Gorbachov's speech is of extreme importance. The Soviet President was declaring on television to the nation that the common denominator of Stalin's blunders and crimes was that Stalin had decimated the officers' corps, repeatedly refused to listen to the military, ignored their advice and warnings, and refused to give them a say in determining policy. The message could not be clearer. He, Gorbachov, *will* listen to the military, *will* grant them a say on policy, and *will* grant their demands in the interest of Russia.

Since his March 15 election to the U.S.S.R. presidency, giving him dictatorial powers, Gorbachov has gone out of his way to cultivate a close, high-publicity relationship with the Soviet military leadership. The post-March 15 record of events has been, for the most part, meticulously censored by Western media to create the grounds for the Bush administration's "we must save the endangered Gorbachov" pre-summit appeasement stance.

Andropov's 'Third Rome'

From EIR, June 14, 1983, "Yuri Andropov: 'Czar of Holy Mother Russia'?" by Lyndon LaRouche:

Soviet reactions to President Ronald Reagan's televised address of March 23, 1983 [announcing the Strategic Defense Initiative—ed.], have provided two sets of indisputable facts about the present foreign policy and political composition of the Soviet leadership.

1) Soviet foreign policy under General Secretary Yuri Andropov is not operating on the basis of either "Communist" or "Soviet National Interest" criteria. Soviet foreign policy is presently shaped by a dominant influence of the 500-year-old mystical prophecy, that the Czar of Holy Rus shall become the ruler of the Third, and Final, Roman Empire.

2) This "paradigm-shift" in Soviet foreign policy is efficiently correlated with the rise to power within the command of the Soviet KGB of Patriarch Pimen's circles within the hierarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Although this shift within the Soviet leadership reflects an uneven rise of the Russian Orthodox Church, since Josef Stalin's pact with Moscow's St. Basil's in 1943, the present development would not have been possible, in its present form, but for a long process of successful manipulation of Soviet foreign-policy through "back-channel" operations run through Britain, Switzerland, Vienna, Venice, and the monastery at Mount Athos ("Holy Mountain"), Greece.

Religious scholars working with deep knowledge of the Russian personality's innermost cultural potentials, at Mount Athos, at Saint George Major in Venice, in Rome, Vienna, Geneva, and Britain, used this knowledge most efficiently, to inform the way in which back-channel operations were conducted. What they created, most successfully, is a "Frankenstein's Monster" which is now preparing itself to gobble up its creators.

The variety of "Russian Soul" which these scholarly gentlemen have brought to the surface in Soviet foreign policy, is of the stuff of which a Czar Ivan the Terrible or Rasputin was made in the past. It is a sly, dissimulating, religious-fanatical beast. It can be clever, intelligent in matters of technique, and to that extent appear urbane and civilized. It is at the same time a monster obsessed, beyond all reach of reason, with mystical faith in the magical powers of the Holy Russian Soil and People. It is a Dostoevskian beast, or *Pravda* propagandist Ilya Ehrenberg writing against all of Western Europe during the last war.

There is only one way to deal with such a beast, to offer it peace and Russian survival from a standpoint of overwhelming raw power and manifest determination to use that power if necessary. As long as we refuse to present Moscow such a clear set of alternatives of this exact type, Andropov will alternately hiss and smile—like a cobra—until he strikes. . . .

The pagan-religious matrix used for this concoction is

the most easily recognized by classical scholars as the "Great Mother" cult, of the type associated with Cybele and Dionysius—or with an early form of the Isis-Ishtar cult, the Shakti-Siva phallus cult of pre-Vedic India. It is of the same general character as the "blood and soil" cult adopted by the Nazis.

There is a very elementary, but not necessarily simple strategy for defeating the Third Rome thrust. The crux of the matter is a 1939-43 style mobilization of the economy of the United States, emphasizing the explosion of the civilian economy resulting from spill-over of directed-beam and similar technologies from military to civilian applications. The success of this depends upon reviving high-technology capital investment in developing nations as well as Western Europe. The inherent superiority, a system of technologically progressive sovereign nation-states, over an "empire," affords us all the material and human potential required to assemble overwhelming defense against imperial designs.

The emergence of such a thrust "from the West," would force upon the Soviet leadership a reversal of the Third Rome paradigm-shift. The only self-interested policy available to the Soviet Union would be compacting to accept the terms of being another sovereign nation-state, enjoying the benefits of growing world trade such a thrust portends.

This paradigm-shift would not by itself uproot the Mother Russia syndrome from Russian culture, but it would create the conditions under which the Russian people would gradually accomplish that themselves. . . ."

Ogarkov's War Plan

From EIR, May 31, 1983, "Moscow's unveiled war plan against the United States":

Congressmen's offices around Washington will be numbed with shock after reading the top Soviet military commander's description of Soviet war-plans against the United States published in Moscow's *Izvestia* this past May 9. It has been a long time since any major power announced in the press that it has a definite war-plan against another power, especially a war-plan implied to be made ready to go into operation as early as this year. That is exactly what the author of the article, Soviet Chief of Staff Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov, did.

The outline of the Soviet war-policy against the United States by Marshal Ogarkov contained nothing really new concerning Soviet military strategy as such. What Ogarkov wrote is only an update of the same strategic policy Moscow has maintained since Marshal V.D. Sokolovskii's *Soviet Military Strategy* was issued back in 1962. Since 1962, Soviet military policy for future war against the United States has been based on development and deployment of strategic anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defense systems, to knock out a large portion of attacking NATO missiles, and to follow a massive thermonuclear barrage against the United States with a full-

scale “conventional” assault against Western Europe, with aid of supporting nuclear weapons. Basically, Ogarkov simply restated the Sokolovskii doctrine, which has been continuous Soviet strategy for at least the past 20 years. The Soviets have been preparing to fight a full-scale thermonuclear war, to survive it, and to win it. . . .

Their [Soviet leadership] absolute objections to the President’s [Reagan’s] proposed negotiations-agenda [for ending the doctrine of Mutually Assured Survival and shifting into Strategic Defense Initiative-era defense doctrines—ed.] can only be the following.

1) They are committed to ensuring that the United States does not cease its drift into qualitative strategic inferiority by no later than the 1990s; and are determined to prevent the U.S.A. from following any strategic policy which would ensure its strategic parity into the 1990s.

2) Lest the United States react thermonuclearly to the threatened blinking-out of its strategic parity during the years immediately ahead, Moscow was determined, even well before March 1983, to break the will of the United States now, to force the U.S.A. into a strategic doctrine and pattern of capabilities which would ensure that the U.S.A. peacefully passes through the “point of no return” into qualitative strategic inferiority.

3) That Secretary Andropov intends to dodge all serious negotiations, except de facto capitulation to his unilateral doctrine, until the peak of the missiles crisis has either been touched, or is clearly in sight to both parties. . . .

The ‘Global Showdown’ thesis

In the summer of 1985, when the first wave of disinformation about Mikhail Gorbachov as a Soviet leader of a new type was sweeping the Western world, EIR released the first of a series of reports under the title of “Global Showdown.” It was designed and co-authored by LaRouche.

“Global Showdown” identified the new Gorbachov leadership team as the “Andropov Dynasty,” selected and elevated to power for the purpose of sustaining strategic superiority and securing for Moscow its status as the “Third Rome.” In a chapter on the “Soviet Doctrine on the War-Economy,” the report said:

In Ogarkov’s most extensive public version of his war strategy, a 1982 booklet entitled *Always Ready to Defend the Fatherland*, he identified the following dilemma for the Soviet planners of offensive nuclear war. In World War II, only a tiny fraction—perhaps as little as 10%—of all of the economic resources expended in combat had been produced *before* the war started. The other 90% were produced in the enormous economic mobilization carried on *during the course of the war*.

But that was World War II. Today, argue the Soviet military planners, a world war will almost certainly be much, much shorter. With thermonuclear weapons of mass destruction, and intercontinental missiles as delivery vehicles, the

war may be decided in the first few minutes or hours of war. If so, there will be no time to make up for what is lacking, for what is not already in place and deployable *before* the war ever breaks out.

It is obvious, then, that the side which is capable of the maximum pre-war economic mobilization will have enormous advantages over its adversary. However, here is where the problem arises. A maximum war mobilization is a state that cannot be maintained indefinitely. The maximum war mobilization is like that at the height of World War II: In Soviet terminology, it is when “the entire country has been transformed into a single camp of war, where everything and everybody goes for victory.” And in the case of total, global war, the shorter it is, the more intense the mobilization must be. Nothing that might contribute to a margin of victory dare be left outside the mobilization, “kept in reserve” for some future that will never come unless victory is won.

In other words, the dilemma is how to mobilize as much and as far as possible in peacetime, without overextending the mobilization so as to undermine the very basis of the economy and society.

‘The winter of our discontent’

From an Oct. 31, 1988 NBC television broadcast by Independent Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche:

What happened at that weekend [Sept. 30-Oct. 2, 1988] shake-up in Moscow? The short answer is that the Soviet military and KGB moved in to grab more power than they have had since Stalin’s time. All of the key promotions during that weekend were given to members of one very tight group. All of those promoted had been top associates of former KGB chief Yuri Andropov and Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov since as early, in some cases, as the Leningrad front during World War II. . . .

Contrary to most Western commentary, the extraordinary plenary sessions were not a personal victory for Mikhail Gorbachov. It was a victory for the Andropov-Ogarkov “kindergarten” of which Gorbachov is just one member. This Andropov-Ogarkov “kindergarten” is the political machine which has taken over the Soviet military and KGB machines, which both increased their grip on Soviet imperial power during that extraordinary weekend. This is not the last such political coup in Moscow. There will be more to come soon enough. Individual members of this clique may be promoted or demoted in coming shake-ups, but, whatever happens to individual personalities, the Andropov-Ogarkov machine is rapidly tightening its grip on the Soviet Union to a degree not seen since the days of Josef Stalin.

In one sense, there were no surprises in those promotions. A consistent power-grab by the members of the Andropov-Ogarkov kindergarten was what I predicted during the weeks just before Gorbachov was made general secretary back in early 1985. . . .