

Aspen's New Yalta Project targets beam weaponry

by Kathleen Klenetsky

During the last two weeks of January, a group—including Henry Kissinger and his business partner, incoming NATO Secretary-General Lord Peter Carrington—plans to hold a series of closed-door meetings in Paris, London, and West Berlin. Their aim: to work out the final details of a deal that will effectively deliver West Germany into the Soviet orbit, and destroy what remains of the post-World War II Atlantic Alliance.

Should these meetings be allowed to proceed as scheduled, they will further convince the Kremlin leadership that the West is overripe for strategic capitulation, and may well speed up the timetable of the East bloc's contingency plan to invade West Germany.

The January conferences—which have reportedly received the blessings of Arthur Burns, the U.S. ambassador to Bonn who has been quietly spreading the word throughout Europe that a West German decoupling from NATO is “inevitable” and that the United States is not committed to defending Europe from a Soviet attack—are part of a project inaugurated by the Aspen Institute in early 1983, in response to President Reagan's increasing disinclination to try to conciliate the Soviet leadership.

What is Aspen?

Since its founding in the late 1940s by Robert Hutchins of the University of Chicago, the Aspen Institute has sponsored environmentalism, population reduction, anti-nuclear movements, and the spread of Islamic fundamentalism—all against the national interests of the United States, but in the perceived interests of the West's “resource-control” oligarchy, and in the long-term interests of the Soviet Union.

During World War II, as Hutchins, Joseph Paepcke, Elisabeth Mann Borghese, and others gathered to create the Aspen Institute, they insisted that the torments being inflicted on the world were due to overpopulation and excess technology. Aspen founder Hutchins, a former director of the London School of Economics, was closely associated with Bertrand Russell, the advocate of extermination of darker-skinned peoples, and brought Russell to the University of Chicago.

In the 1960s and 1970s, Aspen chairman Robert O. Anderson of Atlantic Richfield helped set up the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and the Friends of the Earth; his vast oil, coal, and gas holdings have been enhanced in value by the environmentalists' successes in locking up resource-rich Alaskan lands and shutting down nuclear energy projects. Anderson, who is hailed in the GOP as an entrepreneur, fundraiser, and former Republican National Committee member, also participated in the establishment of the U.S. Association for the Club of Rome, a propaganda force on behalf of the Global 2000 advocates of reducing the world's population by billions.

Trustees of the institute include, along with various Seven Sisters oil executives, Robert S. McNamara, the former Defense Secretary and World Bank president who advocates “no retaliation” against a Soviet first strike; Cyrus R. Vance, who as Secretary of State helped turn Iran over to the Khomeini forces; Frank Cary of IBM; and Howard W. Johnson of MIT. Arms-controller Paul Nitze is a trustee emeritus, and Henry Kissinger is a senior fellow. Two “special advisers” are former Mexican Ambassador to the Soviet Union Antonio Carrillo Flores, a former employee of Nelson Rockefeller and a United Nations operative on behalf of population re-



Britain's Peter Lord Carrington

duction, and U.S. Senator Charles Mathias, an opponent of Reagan's beam-weapons policy.

Redrawing the imperial map

Entitled "East-West Relations: Past, Present and Future," the latest Aspen project has brought together influential individuals from Japan, Western Europe and America, who share the delusion that the Soviets are not interested in global domination, but want a more equitable division of the world, one that enlarges their sphere of influence through the addition of a "reunified" Germany and other territories such as the Mideast. According to Aspen sources, the project is being coordinated with several other strategic policy initiatives being undertaken by various think tanks, including an in-house review of U.S.-European relations now proceeding at the New York Council on Foreign Relations under the direction of Andrew Pierre.

Robert McNamara, Cyrus Vance, former British ambassador to the United States Nicholas Henderson, former Austrian Chancellor Bruno Kreisky, former Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany, and other participants in the Aspen "East-West Relations" program have been working since last spring to come up with a specific package proposal for this "New Yalta," which they intend to wrap up with the Soviets as soon as possible. Project spokesmen say that they will soon be contacting "people in the Gromyko circle" in the Soviet Union to "get their input into our proceedings." An Aspen official confided that while the project is cultivating a nonpartisan veneer, "You can be sure that Walter Mondale's advisers are being kept well informed of what we're doing."

An indication of the mentality pervading the Aspen proj-

ect can be found in its executive summary, which cautions against "unreasonable fears" about the Soviets on the part of the Western powers!

According to secret planning papers obtained by this news service, the Aspen group is considering such recommendations for "improving East-West relations" as a total integration of East-West monetary, trade, and credit structures; greater ideological and cultural convergence; various arms control schemes; elimination of existing constraints on the transfer of sophisticated Western technology to the Soviet bloc; and "constructive steps toward curbing the technological impulses that drive the arms race."

The ABM question

Sources at the project's Washington headquarters reveal that their immediate objective is to defeat President Reagan's attempts to beef up U.S. defenses, and especially his commitment to give the United States an advanced beam-weapon defense against nuclear attack. That plan has been the target of an alliance between the Soviet leadership and the "New Yalta" circles in the West since the President unveiled the plan in his March 23 speech to the nation.

Martin McCusker, top aide to former U.S. ambassador and arms-control negotiator James Leonard who is overseeing the day-to-day functions of the project, told reporters this month that sabotaging Reagan's beam-weapons program is one of the project's top priorities. Denouncing the proposal as "folly," "inherently destabilizing," and "typical of the American attitude that there are solutions to everything," McCusker stressed that "some of us in the project think this is the major obstacle to improved East-West relations." Demanding that the U.S. media produce a steady stream of anti-beam propaganda, McCusker declared that "it is the responsibility of intelligent and rational Americans, scientists and others, to convince the people in the Administration [who favor the program] that it would be destabilizing."

German 'decoupling'

The idea is to convey the message that Reagan's "intransigence" in dealing with the Soviets has caused such unease in Europe that unless he makes significant concessions—above all, by backtracking on the beam-weapons commitment—Europe, led by West Germany, will split from NATO.

"The split between Europe and the U.S. is happening now," McCusker said with satisfaction. "Reagan isn't interested in making arms control proposals. . . . He's going around insisting that the Russians are the source of all evil and this is causing tremendous unease in Europe. Even the elites in Europe have a different conception of how to deal with the Soviet Union." Outlining a scenario predicated on a "growing disenchantment" between Americans and Europeans leading to an eventual withdrawal of U.S. troops in Europe, McCusker concluded that a German pullout from NATO, leading to reunification, is definitely in the works.

Although McCusker, presumably expressing the Aspen

consensus, indicated that he wants "anybody but Reagan," and preferably Walter Mondale, to win the Presidency in November, it is evident that the Aspen group is not counting on a Reagan defeat but intends to use the upcoming presidential campaign to exert maximum political pressure on the President to capitulate to the "New Yalta" gameplan.

The project's timetable is precise. Project spokesmen have told investigators that, while they "want absolutely no public attention at this time," they intend to get "a tremendous amount of publicity" when they go public with their recommendations later this year. A first draft of the project's proposals, which will be hammered out at a wind-up conference scheduled for late March at Aspen's Wye Plantation center in Maryland, will be publicly released in June. A final version will follow some time in late summer or early fall, just in time for the final weeks of the election campaign. All indications are that these will be packaged to make Reagan look like an incompetent, irresponsible Neanderthal, whose outdated hardline ideology and profligate defense spending has alienated Europe, bankrupted the United States, and brought the country to the brink of a thermonuclear war with the peace-loving Soviets.

'The Soviets must not think we're frightening'

Excerpts from the confidential Executive Summary of the Aspen Institute's project on "East-West Relations; Past, Present and Future":

... The Aspen Institute has established the Preparatory Group on East-West Relations: Past, Present and Future to attempt to develop a basic concept and to identify practical steps to reduce significantly the military dangers and social and economic costs of confrontation. . . .

The Project. . . proposes to develop answers to the following overarching question: "What do experienced leaders (and those of the newer generation) believe should be the guiding concepts to achieve peace and security with the Soviet Union and its allies in the mid- and long-term, and what are the practical steps that might be taken to that end?" . . .

Our vision of a "better case" [view of the future] is also based on effective management of the Western and Japanese side of the relationship. One of our major objectives in the project is to develop guidelines and criteria for this effective management. . . .

[There follows a list of guideline questions:]

1) What can be done about the overall tone of our relations with the Soviet Union? Can there be significant contributions to an improved tone from increased commercial exchanges,

from scientific and cultural exchanges, from improvements in both the gathering and the dissemination of news, from increased Eastern participation in international life? . . . Need we worry about Soviet subversion of our democratic political systems? How can we ensure that they do not perceive the West as organized to undermine their institutions?

2) What sort of a structure of trade and commercial relations should exist between the Soviet Union and its allies and the industrial democracies?

3) What pattern and structure of credits would be appropriate to the trade arrangements we envision?

4) What sort of attitude and involvement should the West seek to elicit from the East regarding the international trade and monetary institutions which we have in place (e.g., GATT and IMF) or may evolve over coming decades. . . ? Do we want to encourage the U.S.S.R. to move toward [currency] convertibility and to participate in the institutions it has previously rejected?

5) What sort of long-term constraints should we impose on our economic relations out of military security considerations? . . .

6) What sort of . . . security arrangements can we envision developing with the Soviets 10 or 20 years hence? How far can arms control contribute to reducing tensions and costs? What political and ideological developments must we work for in the East, in the West, and between East and West in order to make possible more far-reaching security arrangements? What constructive steps can be taken towards curbing the technological impulses that drive the arms race? How do we best configure our force structures in the future, and influence the Soviet Union to do likewise, so as to mitigate the temptation to pre-empt in times of great crisis?

7) What can we do when we must "do something" in response to Soviet actions in the Third World, Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union itself?

8) How do we respond to inevitable developmental change in the Third World while at the same time seeking to minimize the potential for superpower confrontation?

9) What kind of cultural, scientific and educational relationships can we look to develop with the East? . . .

10) . . . Will more frequent, even routine meetings of political leaders [from East and West] help? Can commercial, cultural, political and other contacts serve to diminish unreasonable Soviet fears? Unreasonable fears on our side?

Project membership

Participants in the Aspen project are divided into two groups:

Preparatory Group:

Austria: **Bruno Kreisky**, former chancellor.

Belgium: **Leo Tindemans**, foreign minister.

Canada: **Mitchell Sharp**, former foreign minister.

Federal Republic of Germany: **Helmut Schmidt**, former chancellor; **Berndt von Staden**, state secretary, foreign ministry; **Richard von Weizsäcker**, mayor of West Berlin.

France: **François de Rose**, former ambassador; **Edgar Faure**, former prime minister; **Jean François-Poncet**, former foreign minister.

Great Britain: **James Callaghan**, former prime minister; **Lord Carrington**, former foreign minister; **Lord Weinstock**, managing director, General Electric Company; **Shirley Williams**, president, Social Democratic Party.

Italy: **Emilio Colombo**, former foreign minister; **Umberto Colombo**, president, ENEA; **Gianni De Michelis**, minister for labor and social welfare; **Giorgio La Malfa**, chairman of parliamentary committee on foreign affairs.

Japan: **Yoshizo Ikeda**, chairman, Mitsui; **Kiichi Miyazawa**, former foreign minister; **Saburo Okita**, former foreign minister.

Sweden: **Pehr Gyllenhammar**, chairman, Volvo.

United States: **Robert O. Anderson**, chairman, Arco; **Donald M. Kendall**, chairman, PepsiCo; **Henry A. Kissinger**, former Secretary of State; **John J. McCloy**, former chairman, Chase Manhattan bank; **Robert McNamara**, former Secretary of Defense; **Elliot Richardson**, former Secretary of Defense; **Cyrus Vance**, former Secretary of State.

Advisory Council members:

Canada: **Ivan Head**, President, International Development Research Centre.

Great Britain: **Sir Nicholas Henderson**, former Ambassador to the United States.

Federal Republic of Germany: **Countess Marion Dönhoff**, publisher, *Die Zeit*; **Jürgen W. Moellmann**, member of parliament and minister of state, foreign ministry.

Italy: **Sergio Berlinguer**, Minister at the Foreign Office.

Japan: **Masamichi Inoki**, president, Research Institute for Peace and Security; **Hisahiko Okazaki**, Director of Planning, Foreign Office; **Seizaburo Sato**, Professor, University of Tokyo.

Korea: **Lee Hahn-Been**, professor, Yonsei University.

Sweden: **Sverker Astrom**, former ambassador.

United States: **Fr. Theodore Hesburgh**, president, Notre Dame; **George Kennan**, former ambassador to U.S.S.R.

'Western ABM systems in space would be folly'

Martin McCusker, a senior aide to Aspen East-West project's director, described the decoupling of West Germany from the United States as inevitable and attacked President Reagan's beam program in a discussion this month with a West German journalist:

Q: What is your perception of U.S.-European relations?

A: Things are getting worse. Over the last 8 to 10 years, the U.S. and Western Europe have been diverging. . . the elites

in Western Europe have a different conception of how to deal with the Soviets. That has profound implications. . . . You are going to get simultaneous disenchantment—Europeans who are very upset with the U.S. military attitude and Americans who see Europeans as appeasers. Some Americans will start calling for the U.S. troops to be brought home from Europe. . . . It's rather sad what has been happening in the INF and START negotiations, partly because there are elements in the Reagan administration interested in arms control. Shultz is interested in easing the situation with the Soviet Union, but I don't think that the secretary is totally in command of the subject matter. There are a few very powerful individuals who will effectively determine what U.S. arms-control policy will be, including Richard Burt at State and Richard Perle in the Pentagon.

Q: Is the Aspen group in discussions with these people?

A: I know some of these people. . . . I think the deployment of cruise and Pershings is exacting a terrible toll on the alliance. . . . With the correct political will it is conceivable that a deal could be struck with the Soviet Union, such as the "walk in the woods" proposal [of July 1982], but I don't think it will happen in an election year. . . . Reagan is as popular now as he has ever been. Reagan is blaming the Soviets for every evil in the world. And in that sort of atmosphere, there is unease in Europe. I don't think there'll be war in Europe, but I think that there will be a profoundly unstable situation. . . .

Q: In this context, what do you think about Schmidt's and Lord Carrington's statements about the need for a New Yalta?

A: I think it's all symptomatic of this deterioration in U.S.-Soviet and U.S.-European which has been in place 35 years, is now being questioned by new generations. . . .

Q: What do you think about calls for German "neutralization" and "reunification"?

A: There has to be dialogue between the superpowers before such a thing can be realized. The structures which exist now cannot be dismantled overnight, much though they might have outlived their usefulness. The management of this issue has to be done by the Europeans as a whole, together with the Americans and Russians. It cannot be done by Europeans alone, certainly not by Germany alone.

Q: What about Reagan's beam-weapons

A: I'm extremely anxious about that. It is the responsibility of intelligent and rational Americans, scientists and others, to convince the people in the administration who believe that the U.S. can build a space-based system, that this would be very destabilizing. Even thinking along these lines is destabilizing because it reconfirms to the Soviets that the U.S. is seeking superiority. It confirms to the Kremlin that the U.S. is destined to try to destroy the revolution through pre-emptive nuclear strikes.

Q: What can be done to stop it?

A: If you are an American, you vote against Reagan. . . . Experts know that you should not say such ridiculous nonsense—that you can build an antiballistic-missile system in space capable of making the U.S. immune from nuclear attack. Everybody knows that you can have the cruise missiles on submarines or in the air which can hit the United States. In every way it is folly, folly. It could only come from the U.S., the kind of thinking that there are solutions to everything. There has to be great pressure on Reagan from Europe to sit down with the Soviets and talk about areas of common interest, such as reducing arms and confidence-building in central Europe. Germany is a crucial country in this respect.

Q: Who are your favorite U.S. presidential candidates?

A: I prefer anybody but Reagan. It would be so much easier for the Democrats to deliver arms-control agreements. . . .

Q: Does Mondale have a chance?

A: I don't think he can win, but he is the best in the Democratic camp. . . . The only way you can beat Reagan is to stand up and tell him the truth—that he is disastrous for peace and security, that his policy is likely to lead to more confrontation. . . . Reagan might decide on the 29th of January that he is not running again. Then you might get a compromise candidate, like Sen. Howard Baker, who would probably be a good President and engage in a dialogue with the Soviets.

Q: What about a potential new Berlin crisis?

A: I think the Russians will do their best to intimidate the Europeans. The only way they can do that is in West Germany. The only way they can respond to what they perceive as a Western offensive against them is to strike back, and to strike back means to run into West Berlin. There would be great appeals from Europe to the Americans to cool down.

Q: Which people are capable of realizing your perspective in Germany?

A: That's half the problem. You have had men of such stature like the last three chancellors, who understood how the world worked. Today, you have a younger generation like Carsten Voigt and Iris Steiger of the SPD who are very able. . . . I know who is *not* capable of leading Germany—the present chancellor!

Q: What about the possibility that the Kohl government will fall?

A: It seems to me that the economy is not showing any signs of improvement, and it is possible that you have to go back to a grand coalition [between the CDU and SPD].

Q: On the CDU side, who would join the grand coalition?

A: I know who I would like to see—our next [Aspen] president, Richard von Weizsäcker. He knows what needs to be done, he is smart, and he is in the right wing.

Socialist International

Willy Brandt exposed as

by Umberto Pascali

Only a few weeks before a joint meeting in Rome of the Brandt Commission on "North-South Issues," and the Palme Commission on "East-West issues," scandals have exploded into the Italian press exposing the chief protagonist of the upcoming meeting, Willy Brandt, as an asset of the Soviet intelligence services. The joint meeting, to open on Jan. 20 in the Italian capital, will be attended by the director of the U.S.A.-Canada Institute in Moscow, Henry Kissinger's well known friend Georgii Arbatov; former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance (of Iranian hostage infamy); and the queen of the pro-KGB U.S. establishment media, *Washington Post* publisher Katharine Graham.

But things have gotten so hot for Willy Brandt that, as of ten days before the meeting, no location in Rome has been announced for it.

The charges against Brandt have come from a number of sources, including a large faction in the London-headquartered Socialist International of which Brandt is the chairman. They come at the same time as a Europeanwide press blitz portraying the 70-year-old Brandt—recently remarried to a young leftist in the German Social Democratic Party (SPD), which he also chairs—as the "symbol of East-West dialogue," the leader who could re-create the conditions for a West German ruling coalition between the SPD and the Free Democratic Party of Hans-Dietrich Genscher. The revival of the SPD-FDP coalition, toppled in 1982 when Genscher pulled his Free Democrats out to continue as foreign minister in partnership with the Christian Union parties, would almost automatically mean abandonment of NATO by West Germany for a Soviet-dominated "neutrality."

Brandt, the 'Nazi-Communist'

On Jan. 2 the Italian weekly *Il Borghese* published a long story on Brandt, "The Soviet Agent Inside the Socialist International," citing documents compiled by the wartime American intelligence service, the OSS, which proved close links between Brandt and the Soviets in Stockholm during the secret separate-peace negotiations between the Nazis and the U.S.S.R. Among the Soviet delegation there during the war was the current ambassador to Bonn, Vladimir Semyonov. The OSS documents partially came to light in the 1974 "Guillaume Affair," when Brandt's personal secretary was arrested as an East German spy, and Brandt was ousted as chancellor.

In the archives of the U.S. State Department, a document