

What The Socialist Sector Is Really Saying

May 8(NSIPS)--New Solidarity International Press Service this week continues its regular feature of reprinting accurate translations of significant statements by representatives of the socialist sector—the only source of such accurate translations outside of that sector itself. The articles reprinted or excerpted here represent a clear unmistakable statement of Soviet military doctrine as well as the thinking of the leadership of the Warsaw Pact on the political implications of the capitalist crisis in the West.

Such information is being either ignored or deliberately misrepresented by the Atlanticist-controlled press. The Riatani article attacking Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission, the Atlanticist supranational planning apparatus, has been deliberately blocked out of the Western press for obvious reasons. Reached for comment this week on the article, Trilateral Commission member Samuel Huntington told NSIPS that he had heard "nothing about it" and then became hysterical, denying that such an article could possibly have been written: "Why would the Soviets say such things about David Rockefeller? Why would they say such things? Why?"

Military Thought Abroad

War Through The Eyes Of The Pentagon

May 28 (NSIPS) — The following article is translated from the May 27 Red Star, the leading military paper of the Soviet Union.

by Maj. Gen. R. Simonyan, Doctor of Military Science

As was noted at the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the enemies of detente and disarmament still possess great resources. The strategists of the Pentagon and NATO are occupying themselves in many different forms and different directions, with sharp increases in their military budgets, the creation of new weapons, and theoretical research in the preparation and waging of different forms of war.

In recent years the Pentagon has worked out a new classification system for wars. Judging by statements by the western press, all wars which can be unleashed by the imperialists under contemporary conditions are now divided by the American military leaders into four forms: strategic nuclear war, theater nuclear war (the western military theoreticians divided the globe into theaters of war, which in their terms are in turn divided into theaters of military action), conventional theater war, and conventional war in theaters of military action or in a limited region (local war.)

As regards NATO and the European countries — the members of this bloc continue to adhere to a division of war into two forms: general and limited. Comparing this with the new American classification, then, general war corresponds to strategic nuclear war, and the concept of limited war includes both nuclear and conventional wars in war theaters and conventional war in the theater of military action or in limited regions.

We must note right away that there are no principled

The Rude Pravocenterfold on renewed Atlanticist push for a cold war has similarly been blocked out of the Western media. The important statements on Soviet and Western military doctrine by Head of the Soviet Armed Forces Kulikov and Maj. General Simoyan have been misrepresented or ignored by the West's black propaganda specialists. In fact Kremlinologist Victor Zorza was called upon by his masters to interpret Kulikov's statements of the Soviet readiness and preparations to fight a war to mean that the Soviet military leadership has now accepted the regional nuclear warfare doctrine of the deposed U.S. Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger. We reprint excerpts from Zorza's syndicated ravings to provide our readers with clinical evidence of the current dimension of Atlanticist press lies about Soviet strategic military thinking.

As Maj. Gen. Simoyan points out, the pursuit of the Schlesinger doctrine will lead to a general thermonuclear war — despite Atlanticist protestations to the contrary. Such facts point out the vital character of the service that NSIPS is performing.

differences here in the evaluation of the essential character of possible wars, in the definition of their intensities and the direction military preparations take under conditions of the positive changes that are occurring in the world. The intention of the NATO bloc for the 1970s is expressed with maximum clarity in the pages of the NATO Journal, **NATO's 15 Nations:** "real detente with the East can only be achieved from a position of strength. The main goal is to achieve unconditional superiority in the military field."

Let us take a brief look at the essence and the content of war under the new American classification. This is of interest because in questions of military doctrine and strategic conceptions, the tone in the military-political leadership of the North Atlantic Alliance is always set by the Pentagon strategists.

Sooner or later the NATO bloc officially adopts that strategy for arming itself which has already been operative in the U.S. for a certain period.

Strategic Nuclear War: In the view of the Pentagon strategists, this can emerge only between the coalition of imperialist countries and the states of the Socialist Community and is conducted with unlimited application of all forces and means that the warring sides have at their disposal. It would therefore have a thoroughly intense destructive and annihilating character. In such a war devastating nuclear and thermonuclear strikes would be directed not only at military forces and military objectives, but also the whole territory of the two sides. Even neutral countries to one degree or another would inevitably experience the consequences of such a war. Radioactive fall-out sooner or later would also fall within the borders of their territory.

According to western military specialists, the U.S. would

bear the main role in the preparation and conduct of a strategic nuclear war in so far as it has the predominant part of the strategic nuclear potential of the capitalist world. Aside from the strategic offensive forces — the principal means of conducting such a war — operative tactical nuclear forces and general nuclear forces of the U.S. and its allies would also be used in the war. In the opinion of western military theoreticians, a strategic nuclear war must be of brief duration. But they do not exclude the possibility that under certain conditions it can also be of a more prolonged character.

The most effective method of unleashing a strategic (general) nuclear war is considered to be the surprise attack which, the leaders of the Pentagon and NATO think, can considerably weaken the strength of the nuclear strike response of the enemy, guarantee the capture of the strategic initiative, and sharply change the situation and the relation of forces to the advantage of the attacker. Such a war can emerge also as a result of the escalation of a limited war.

Theater Nuclear War: According to the Pentagon, this type of war is possible first of all in the European war theater, including three theaters of military action: Northern Europe, Central Europe, and Southern Europe. The idea is that the sides participating in it must use only operative tactical and tactical nuclear weapons (the Americans join these in one concept — tactical nuclear weapons, in which they include planes which carry tactical nuclear weapons, aircraft carrier and air base aviation, missile installations of the Pershing, Lens, Sergeant, and Honest John types, nuclear field artillery, Zenith missiles with nuclear warheads, nuclear land mines, and nuclear torpedo weapons).

The main difference between such a war and a strategic nuclear war is seen by the Pentagon and NATO in the political goals, which for theater war must be limited. That is, they must not call into question the very existence of the social order of the enemy. The political goals must be defined in such a way that they do not force the enemy to use all the forces and means at his disposal, and do not push him to expand the limits of the war. The most important condition for preventing a nuclear war from developing into a strategic general nuclear war is considered to be the application of nuclear weapons only in the zones of military action and only for military objectives.

Insofar as the European continent is considered the most probable region for the emergence of such a war, the basic responsibility for its preparation and conduct, in the opinion of the Pentagon, must be placed equally on the U.S. and its NATO allies.

Conventional War in War Theater: This is a military conflict with the use of only conventional weapons, which, as is noted in the American press, can be unleashed not only in Europe but also in Asia.

It is impossible not to note that such a war, under contemporary conditions, is fraught with constant danger of developing into a nuclear war, and it is mainly in this that the difference lies from past wars.

The most probable way such a war would be unleashed is considered to be the stepped-up escalation of a local armed conflict, emerging in any one of the theaters of military action, and spreading to all remaining theaters of military

action within this given war theater. Under these conditions, when the relation of forces is favorable for the alliance of the imperialist countries, it is proposed to carry out offensive actions, whereas when the correlation of forces is favorable to the enemy, defensive ones are emphasized.

The responsibility for preparing and conducting a conventional war in a war theater is divided between the U.S. and its allies in the imperialist bloc.

Conventional War in the Theater of Military Actions or in a Limited Region of a Theater of Military Action (Local War): This is viewed by the trans-oceanic strategists as a war in which the basic weight must be borne only by certain countries or by the regional alliances concerned, and not by the great powers. If the war is carried out in the name of goals which correspond to the aggressive plans of American imperialism, then Washington can give the allies economic, military, and technical aid, and in certain cases can even support them with U.S. armed forces, mainly air force and naval. The decision for open participation of the American forces in such wars is proposed to be made by taking into account the military, political, strategic and other interests of the U.S. and especially the capability of the allied countries to independently achieve the stated goals of the war.

By local wars are meant military activities which can unfold on the territory of one or two small states and also the military invasion by one country of another (for example the aggression of the racist South African Republic against Angola).

The possibility of the emergence of a conventional war in theater of military action is allowed in the European as well as the Asian theaters of war, and a local war is allowed in any region of the globe.

Such, in brief, are the official American views on the character and form of possible wars in the modern epoch. As has been noted in the western press, the new approach by Washington to the classification of wars, striving to detail them to a greater extent, has no small political goal — maintaining the dominant role of the U.S. in NATO and other imperialist blocs, while shifting a significant share of the burden and responsibility for preparing and conducting some form of war to the allied, and also, considering the bitter experience of the recent past, to avoid involvement in any more hopeless war adventures, which do not affect the immediate vital interests of the United States, not to get involved where vital interests are not at stake.

Basing itself in particular on its new classification of wars and on the strategy of realistic fear-provoking, Washington achieves a sharp increase of their military expenditures and more active participation in military preparations from its Western European allies.

As is noted in the foreign press, from a purely military standpoint the new American classification contains contradictory propositions, especially regarding the discussion of nuclear war in the war theater. On the one hand, the task is posed of reaching the stated military and political goals through quick, decisive action, and on the other hand, it speaks about the necessity to apply forces and means to such an extent that there is minimal danger of the war developing into a strategic (general) nuclear war. The experience of a great many wars obviously shows that the war conflagration

can hardly ever be contained in its pre-determined limits. Many foreign observers underline that there are no guarantees whatsoever that the use of nuclear weapons, even though for tactical goals, does not entail their immediate utilization in a strategic direction.

It is also impossible not to observe that the military-political leadership of the USA and NATO, this bourgeois military science as such, for the definition of the forms of war, proceeds only from the military-technical standpoint. They maintain silence on the question of the social-political nature and the content of war — the fundamental question of real military science. This is completely understandable. The military circles of the western states, the leaders of the imperialist military bloc, nurturing their aggressive expansionism and plans, are not in the slightest degree interested in revealing the true class character and political content of the military adventures they are planning.

Soviet Military Science Today

*May 28 (NSIPS) — The following are excerpts from an article appearing by V. Kulikov in the Soviet journal *Kommunist*. Kulikov, a General of the Army, is chief of General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces and First Deputy Minister of Defense of the USSR.*

For nearly a third of a century, since the last salvos of war in Europe, the Armed Forces of the USSR have been reliably defending the peaceful labor of Soviet people. They defend the cause of revolution, socialism and peace. In the history of humanity, there has never before been an army which served such truly human and great goals and ideas. The entire essence of our military doctrine comes down to the fact that by the very nature of the Soviet Union, aggressive and unjust wars are alien to us. The Soviet Union is not preparing to attack anyone. Our state does not need war. But that which the Soviet people has achieved must be reliably defended, and will be resolutely defended.

Giving due attention to the positive changes in international relations, the Communist Party simultaneously takes into account that the situation in several regions of the globe remains difficult and contradictory. There exist forces in the world which are hostile to detente. They reject the principles of peaceful coexistence as the basis of relations among states with different social systems. Although the opportunities for aggressive actions by imperialism have been significantly reduced, its nature remains the same. The fact that the military preparations of the imperialist powers are not stopping and that their military budgets are growing every year cannot be ignored... Huge means are being allocated to the further qualitative improvement of strategic and conventional arms. The NATO general staffs, with reference to an imaginary "Soviet threat," are working out new long-term military programs, actively modernizing their armies, and equipping them with more developed types of arms and military technology.

The feverish attempts by Peking to wreck detente and its striving to provoke a world war present a great danger to the cause of peace.

All this demands high vigilance and wariness, and the strengthening of military power and combat readiness of the Soviet Armed Forces, and consolidation of the military-political alliance of the fraternal countries of the socialist community.

The Communist Party, proceeding from the Leninist principles of reliably defending the achievements of socialism, directly guides all areas of military construction, keeps questions of the country's defense constantly in the center of its attention, vigilantly follows the development of the military-political situation in the world, and exposes the sources of military danger promptly. One object of special concern of the party and government — and this was stressed with new force at the 25th Congress of the CPSU — is equipping the Armed Forces with all necessary means for fulfilling their crucial task, which is to guard the peaceful labor of the Soviet people and be the bulwark of general peace....

Celebrating the 31st anniversary of the defeat of fascism — that monstrous offspring of imperialism — we take note with pride that the great Victory testified to the invincibility of socialism and its indisputable superiority over imperialism.

From the first days of the Great Fatherland war, the tasks of military science were subordinated to the interests of full and final victory over the aggressor. Its greatest achievement was the further development of methods of waging war as a whole, methods of organizing and implementing operations on a strategic scale.

In the initial period of the Great Fatherland War, which was the most difficult for us, Soviet military science successfully solved the problem of organizing strategic defense. An especially great contribution to the theory and practice of war was the development of flexible and effective forms and methods of organizing and conducting a strategic offensive. At first, the strategic offensive was combined with defense in several directions. It began with our troops going on a counterattack, which grew over into a general attack....

Along with improved methods of waging war, the principles of military art also developed and were enriched with new content. These were: the precise selection of the direction for a main strike, the decisive massing of forces and equipment at the most important points and lines, the ensuring of surprise in actions, and the organization and maintenance of continuous interaction. The correct application of these principles ensured the rapid and decisive defeat of the enemy....

In light of the resolutions of the 25th Congress of the CPSU, a major requirement for Soviet military science is to ensure complete correspondent of the theoretical problems it works on to the needs of the Armed Forces, and the all-around strengthening of the ties of military theory with practice. This means that scientific research work should be subordinated above all to the interests of the further strengthening of the army and navy. In this it is important to stress that under conditions of constant military development, it is necessary to solve again many questions of organizing the country's defense and to approach from new positions the analysis of the military-political situation and methods of action of the Armed Forces to repulse possible aggression. Scientific prediction of the probable contours of a war, its

strategic character, the conditions under which it would arise and the prospects of conducting military actions are becoming more complex. The most important thing in solving these problems is to counterpose to the aggressor's attempt at a sudden attack, not only the appropriate means and methods of defense, but also more perfect combat readiness of our Armed Forces, their capability at any moment to repulse the enemy's blow and inflict a decisive defeat on him. At the same time, the tasks of military construction should be carried out in such a way as to insure effective utilization of those means and resources which the state must allocate to the defense needs of the country....

Soviet military science, working through problems of strengthening the fighting strength and combat readiness of the Armed Forces, proceeds from the fact that this task is ensured by the general political and economic measures conducted in the country and closely tied up with the development of the economy, the preparation of the population, transport and communication, with the work of local party and soviet organs on all defense questions.

In repulsing possible aggression, it will be necessary not only to launch the many-millioned Armed Forces, but also to mobilize all the country's economic resources to achieve

victory. This poses heightened demands on the level of mobilization readiness of the national economy, to the preparation of the territory of the country, to the organization of civil defense and the entire system of mass defense work. Scientific resolution of all these crucial tasks demands closer connection of military theory and practice with the other sciences, with the activity of local party and soviet organs, and various agencies and social organizations.

In working on pressing military problems, it is also necessary to constantly pay attention to studying the experience of past wars, especially the rich experience of the Great Patriotic (Second World) War, which when creatively mastered serves as one of the most important sources of development of military theory and improvement of troop training. Another ripe task is broad research into the post-war construction of our army and navy, their operational, combat and political training. In this connection it must be borne in mind that military history not only makes it possible to uncover laws and tendencies of the development of military science, but also helps prevent groundless fantasizing and extremes. It contributes an element of practical experience to theoretical discussions and supplies rich material for theoretical conclusions.

The Kremlin Ponders New War Plan

May 28 (NSIPS) — The following are excerpts from a May 27 column by syndicated Kremlinologist Victor Zorza which first appeared in the Paris edition of the International Herald Tribune and has subsequently appeared in the Washington Post and other papers.

The Soviet general staff believes that the West is preparing to make a 'surprise attack' against the Soviet Union, and it has devised contingency plans for rapid and powerful counteraction. But Gen. Viktor Kulikov, the Soviet chief of staff, apparently believes that the plans need to be revised in the light of new developments.

The defense lobbies in both Moscow and Washington use the march of technology to justify their demand for new

weapons, but when James Schlesinger became U.S. Secretary of Defense he introduced a significant innovation. He also devised ways of using existing weapons, by re-targeting the intercontinental ballistic missiles, previously aimed largely at civilian population centers, to cover military objectives.... Now it is Gen. Kulikov who speaks of the need to develop 'new methods of repelling aggression and waging war'....

While both superpowers assume that nuclear deterrence will continue to work, their general staffs have to assume that it may break down — and that they therefore have to work out what Gen. Kulikov calls "new methods of waging war," and what Mr. Schlesinger called his 're-targeting doctrine.'

The Temptation Of The Doomed

May 28 (NSIPS) — The following is the full translation of an article appearing in the May 28 Pravda, the official newspaper of the Soviet Communist Party.

by Georgii Ratiani

On the background of the crisis of bourgeois economics, the political side of the crisis of capitalism is all the sharper — the crisis which was profoundly and exhaustively analyzed in Lenin's work on imperialism and for which bourgeois theoreticians and experts are continuing to diligently search for saving recipes. It is primarily a question of the crisis of power in bourgeois society.

The rich in the West, over the years, have carefully checked themselves out in the expensive clinics of Switzerland or California — they are tormented by the question of

whether they will be able to stop the illness and take the needed cure. And so they want to save capitalism — a social system which maintains the power of money.

After the end of the Vietnam war in 1973, a three-sided commission (North America, Western Europe and Japan) was formed at the initiative of American billionaire and president of Chase Manhattan Bank David Rockefeller, for study of the most important problems of the crisis of modern capitalism. The commission is composed of the presidents of the biggest banks and companies of these three major regions of monopoly capital (including American Coca Cola and Bank of America, the French Banque de Paris et de Pais-Bas and Saint-Gobain, the Italian FIAT, the English Barclay's Bank, the Japanese Mitsubishi and Nippon Steel). Political figures not in power (particularly James Carter,

one of the candidates for the office of President of the USA in **the Democratic Party**), as well as scientists (a particularly active role is played by "expert" on East-West problems Zbigniew Brzezinski). Not long ago the commission published a report on the modern capitalist state: "The crisis of Democracy: Report on the Problems of Managing Democratic Society."

The main point made by the authors of the report is that bourgeois democracy is undergoing a profound crisis in Northern America, Japan and especially in Western Europe — "the most vulnerable of the three regions." Here is how the canvas of their discussions looks: The bourgeois state was created so that the bourgeoisie could be in power, taking into account the interests of various of its groups. For a long time this was democracy for the rich, completely apart from the political life of the popular masses. "In recent years," says the report, "the functioning of this democracy has indisputably come to an end, with the collapse of traditional means of social control, the rejection of the legality of political power, the stream of demands from the lower social layers of the population." The crisis of power began in the last decade, with the activation of the struggle of workers, small peasantry, youth, repressed national minorities and other unfortunates, "who do not even begin to accept the rules of the game that are offered to them." This cannot continue, assert the authors of the report, It is necessary to establish boundaries defining which layers of society "must have democracy."

Criticizing the left forces, the compilers of the document consider those especially dangerous who show that "democratic governments are subordinate to capitalist monopolies." The authors come to the conclusion that any expansion of bourgeois democracy is dangerous; it just pours oil on the fire of the present crisis, increases the threat of "giving over power to the Communists."

The theme of the instability of power has not left the pages of the western press. Americans are now reading the book, *The Final Days*, about Watergate; they are standing in line for the film, *All the President's Men*, on the same theme. They think: the dramatic troubles of history of the USA — from the shooting in Dallas through the political scandals, from the skirmishes between Congress and the White House to the resignation under threat of trial of the Vice-President and then the president of the USA — lead one to think of some gigantic hidden forces which clash with one another in the struggle for power in this most developed capitalist country. The struggle is continuing in the current election campaign with its unexpected political zigzags. The boundaries created in the interests of power apparatus by the monopolistic groups have become too close for them, as have the limits of bourgeois legality and constitutional laws. They resolve their clan disputes through outright violence, plots, payoffs, illegal actions by intelligence and counterintelligence within the country. The same methods are carried over into imperialist policies. The very foundations of bourgeois democracy are shaken, the bases of power,

In various western European countries the political crisis is growing into a crisis of the regimes. A revolution has been made in Portugal, the military-fascist government in Greece has fallen, the regime in Spain is shakier than ever. In Italy

and France votes in the local elections have shown that the left parties have the majority. In England, the workers are resolutely opposing the policy of "austerity" as a way out of the crisis at their expense. This has deepened the disagreements in the (British) Labour Party, which is in power. The persecution of "dissidents" in West Germany, which the bourgeoisie carries out at the hands of the Social Democrats, shows the renunciation by the ruling circles of the elementary norms of bourgeois democracy.

Japan is being shaken by political scandals and corruption. These demonstrate the instability in the ruling circles of that second-strongest country in the capitalist economic system.

Several thunderous sensations have drawn the curtain on how politics is carried out, to what depths the morals of the capitalist system of power, of bourgeois democracy, have fallen. The monopolies buy off state figures and entire political parties. Of course corruption is not a new phenomenon in the capitalist world. What is new is the unprecedented global scale it has assumed. Multinational monopolies have given birth to multinational corruption. The present series of scandals began with the exposure of the operations of the gigantic American corporation ITT, which took an active part, together with the CIA and other state bodies of the USA, in the plot against the coming to power of a progressive regime in Chile, and subsequently in the fascist military coup which overthrew the Allende government.

Then came the Lockheed scandal, involving the USA military aircraft company which made enormous payoffs in the upper spheres of power in 30 capitalist countries from Japan to the FRG. Prime Ministers, ruling parties and opposition leaders were involved in the scandal. This sort of international activity is not the monopoly of American multinationals. The latest round of scandals involves similar practices by British, French and Dutch oil companies which, like Lockheed, made million-dollar payoffs into a 'special fund' for financing bourgeois political parties, as well as payoffs directly to officials.

These revelations indicate that what is involved is interference in the internal affairs of other countries with the aim of supporting those political parties which suit the monopolies and keeping out of power those that don't. Furthermore, the government apparatus actively participates in the companies' activity — here we see yet another side of the essence of state-monopoly capital.

At the Brookings Institution in Washington, a group of professors studying the problems of contemporary capitalism, is developing a theory that in the capitalist world the future belongs to the multinational monopolies. They will easily overcome national borders, and in several cases will turn out to be stronger than national states and will begin directly to rule first the capitalist world, and then the developing countries. Simon Brown lays out these ideas in his book *New Forces in World Politics*. Even the few scandalous examples which have accidentally come into the public domain in the recent period suffice to show the public in the capitalist countries what further strengthening of the role of multinational corporations in the capitalist world can lead to. In response, a protest movement is growing against the activity of multinational monopolies in all the bourgeois countries.

In his pamphlet, *The Temptation of Totalitarianism*, which has just come out in Paris, Jean François Revel rehearses these themes of contemporary American bourgeois theoreticians in his own way. This pamphlet has become the most fashionable work of militant anti-communism. Revel drew attention six years ago, when, frightened by the May 1968 events in France, he published the pamphlet, *Neither Marx Nor Christ*, in which he set about to prove that revolution need not take up questions of private property or effect a transfer of power from one social class to another. The task of revolution is merely to change mores, culture, science, to create a 'counter-society' and 'counterculture.'

In his new book, Revel asserts that the rule of the multinational monopolies, which is transforming the capitalist world, will lead it directly to something like a "socialist system" and do away with the obsolete concept of a state. There are evil "intellectuals" who slander capitalism, he says. The working man lives better today than the common folk did under French absolutism, and the aristocrats in Versailles drawing rooms were less slandered than today's manufacturers and company presidents. Revel hates writers who speak the truth about capitalism. He attacks Romain Rollan, Brecht, Aragon. He repeatedly asks: why are workers, the intelligentsia and progressive circles so drawn to the communists? "Why?" — like an echo, the question is repeated throughout the book.

How many times in the hundred and thirty years since the Communist Manifesto appeared have the lackeys of the bourgeoisie tried to topple scientific communism, which realizes all the hopes of working people? But the communist movement grows and expands. A significant part of humanity is already building socialism and communism.

Revel counterposes his own idea to the attraction of communism — American capitalism, which moves him to ecstasy with its nakedness, crudity, and capacity to make people into objects of material gain. The multinational corporations, grabbing the entire world with their little mits — this is the progress of humanity. He even tries to justify

the fascist coup in Chile.

Squalor, evil, poverty of spirit. Such works can become popular only in the climate of a deep political and ideological crisis, as spiritism and fortunetelling were in their time in the salons of high-class Petrogra.

With each step in the development of the world revolutionary process, imperialism changes, shuffles its arsenal of methods, trying at any cost to save the rule of monopoly capital and its political henchmen. One set of tools was put to use in Chile, and a different one is used in Portugal. Alarmed over the aggravation of class struggle in the other countries of Western Europe, official Washington has started an advance scare campaign. Besides frontal attack from the White House and State Department, spectres of a more delicate game have appeared. The hope is expressed that the communist parties of Western Europe will not be dangerous for capitalism and will be able to "intergrate themselves into the system."

A Rome article by Washington Post columnist Joseph Kraft is characteristic in this regard. "The prospect of communist parties entering the existing political systems of Western Europe," he writes, "opens up favorable possibilities. The Western communists can play a constructive role, restraining workers from strikes and from advancing unrealistic wage demands."

The literature on the political crisis of capitalism is augmented every day. The extreme rightist French journalist Alfred Fabre-Luce recently published a book called *The Crisis Teaches Us*. Here the present capitalist crisis is defined as follows: "The time has come when all the factors of social collapse meet and accumulate together ..."

And so, in the search for a way out of the capitalist crisis, some people see democracy only for the rich and submissive workers, others see the absolute rule of multinational corporations, and still others see communists "integrated" into the bourgeois system. All this recalls the temptation of Flaubert's St. Antoine, who hallucinated beautiful girls when he was in isolation, and they sinfully enticed him and disappeared as soon as he got near them.

Temptations of the doomed.

New Stab At An Old Trick

On Anti-Communist Tendencies In The Foreign Policy Strategy Of The USA

May 28 (NSIPS) — The following article is by commentator Ivan Broz from the May 22 Czechoslovak Communist Party daily, Rude Pravo.

by Ivan Broz

Anti-communism and anti-Sovietism are the most important intellectual weapons of American foreign policy strategy, as well as the background of its theoretical creations and its practical realization. The present international detente process does not change this fact in the least; the opposite is more the case....

The more the authority of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states rises in their persistent struggle for peace,

socialism and progress, the more the nervousness of imperialist political circles grows. The desperate effort for maximum containment of the positive influence of the Soviet Union constantly intensifies. And it is necessary to state at the outset that anti-communist and thus anti-Soviet impulses in today's USA are not merely the domain of such dogged anti-Communists as the Brzezinskis, Rostows, Goldwaters, Schlesingers, Reagans, Jacksons, and others, but on the contrary (these impulses) are increasingly used for the requirements of the foreign policy strategy of official American policy spokesmen.

This fact is one aspect of the general policy of adjustment to which American imperialism is impelled in the con-

frontation with the new correlation of class forces between socialism and capitalism. Imperialism has definitively lost the historical initiative. The emergence of domestic and foreign policy difficulties in the U.S. — above all in the recent period — confirms the truth that the strongest country in the capitalist world cannot set forth one positive demonstration of democracy, humanism or love of freedom in its social system. No doubt such U.S. domestic events as the economic crisis, a growth in unemployment previously unknown in the postwar period, the new sharpening of social conflicts, the shock of publicized facts concerning corruption and criminality in the highest spheres of state power and big business, the scandalous revelations about the background of the filthy activity of the CIA and FBI, are bringing about a situation in which a large section of world opinion, but also millions of average Americans, recognize that the economic, political and social system ruthlessly ruled by monopoly has rotted through and through.

A comparable situation exists concerning the place of the U.S. in international relations....The strategic goals of the U.S. toward liquidation of socialism are in bitter contradiction with the realities of the epoch we live in....The successes attained by the peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states...arouse, in connection with the factors cited above, an enormous alarm in American political life which manifests itself in the current eruption of anti-communism.

The Role of Anti-Communism in the Electoral Campaign

This is best confirmed by the present course of the electoral campaign, which is clearly a reliable seismograph registering the breadth of anti-communist and anti-Soviet explosions — and this is not only the case with the opposition candidates. And aggressive anti-communism is exhibited as well in the alliance of supporters of President Ford's reelection.... The anti-communist and anti-Soviet wave... is beginning to connect itself more and more, especially in the past few weeks, with phenomena strongly recalling the notorious policy of the "posture of strength." President Ford's measures toward permanent strengthening of military power, and above all in the direction of improving the quality of nuclear strategic potential, best corroborate this. It would be improper to excuse this as some sort of electoral tactic in which a harder stand is made to take the wind out of the sails of the most extreme right wing....

In mid-April another thrust — the so-called Sonnenfeldt doctrine — appeared in the bourgeois mass communications media with numerous favorable editorials, obviously in an anti-communist and anti-Soviet spirit. What is this about? Helmut Sonnenfeldt, a high U.S. State Department official and key advisor to Kissinger on Eastern European affairs and military questions, introduced the strategic viewpoint of the United States vis-a-vis the European socialist states at the December meeting of U.S. ambassadors in Europe last year. The fact that the speech was first published a little while ago confirms that this is a case of an action which is supposed to be embedded in a broad sweep of attacks on the Soviet Union and the other socialist states. The bourgeois press has profusely ballyhooed this... in order to denigrate socialism and guide public attention away from the actual dirt in the USA's domestic and foreign policy. Its main

feature is nothing but a rebirth of the American strategy of "buildup," or rather "bridge-building to the East," a policy unsuccessfully utilized by President Johnson.

The Export of Counterrevolution

The theoretical basis for such a thrust, namely, export of counterrevolution into the socialist countries by non-military means, was the work of John Kennedy, George Kennan, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Walt Rostow and also Henry Kissinger — the former Harvard University professor. These and other experts on anti-communist conceptions of American foreign policy had, at the end of the 1950's, already implemented the tactic of infiltrating the working class and the Marxist-Leninist parties in the socialist countries with the help of so-called national communism.... The actual conception was intended as a guide to the leadership of the U.S. and NATO towards practice of a tactic of differentiation toward the socialist states, in which the decisive element was supposed to be so-called steps toward the independence of a socialist country (obviously, the destruction of the alliance and friendship of the USSR was intended) and so-called liberalization (dissolution of socialism). Ten years ago, in 1966, one of the leading theoreticians of anti-communist ideology in U.S. foreign policy, Kurt London, characterized this thrust in the following way: at the present stage of relations with Eastern and Central Europe, the West must have a policy of softness, to awaken forces — above all through the coordinated exploitation of cultural exchanges, financial credits and diplomatic maneuvers — which are already working toward erosion.

After the experiences of counterrevolution in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and 1969, it is clear that behind the facade of carefully chosen and used words about an awakening or a soft loosening-up is in reality a far more dangerous guideline about the external safeguard of efforts to restore capitalist relations.... Reference was made to this in the documents of the Thirteenth Czechoslovak party congress.

...This generalization of the experience of our party and our people in the years of crisis has a lasting value, because imperialism has never given up its hopes of burying socialism from within. Precisely the cited proposal by Sonnenfeldt on American strategy toward the socialist states, the repeated return to the "bridge-building" thrust, is one of the best proofs. Both London in 1966 and Sonnenfeldt in 1976 aimed at a resurgence of domestic discontent in the socialist countries which was supposed to turn into the avant garde of a new counterrevolution. As usual, there was also supposed to be a Western-coordinated push into the areas of Soviet geopolitical influence....

Further differences exist for Sonnenfeldt from the original "bridge-building" concept. Relations between the socialist states and the USSR are supposedly "non-organic" and "unnatural," which for Sonnenfeldt can represent a source of a third world war. He literally says that these relations are a far greater danger for world peace than the East-West conflict. One finds it hard to believe that such nonsense can be uttered by a man who is generally considered an expert on international relations. However, it seems that everything is possible in America if in some way it serves anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.

Watchfulness Toward the Soviet Union

After the old-new concept of reviving the autonomy of individual socialist countries — also described as collapsed bridge-building — still another element appears. The attainment of the goals of the new American conception supposedly requires increased vigilance toward the USSR itself. Sonnenfeldt considers it necessary to give the USSR the most-favored (nation) clause rejected by Congress in November, 1974 — however, in no way with the goal of further deepening American-Soviet relationships, but on the contrary as the basis for an economic diversion, since at present a direct thermonuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union has no prospect of success. With the help of the alleged economic power of the U.S., it would supposedly be possible to destroy the autarchy of the Soviet Union and finally draw the Soviet Union into a series of dependencies and links with the West. The Soviet Union never needed any sort of dependency, and in this sense will need none in the future. On the contrary, the independence of the Soviet Union will be still further strengthened....

Sonnenfeldt's guidelines for foreign policy toward the socialist states at the cited confidential advisory session in London with American ambassadors was also supplemented by the U.S. Secretary of State, Kissinger, who said: "We need this kind of foreign policy, one we can hold to over a long period of time, and not the sort that only cushions vacillations and crisis-cycles." Signs of uneasiness concerning world developments were exhibited in his speech which do not correspond to American imperialist conceptions, and which very strongly muddle his vision of an American strategy, the strategy whose architect he had stepped forth as seven years ago and which he held up as a sober foreign policy conception for official policy. On the other hand, his speech also reflected the current trend of American anti-communism and anti-Sovietism — which very strongly colored his speech. From here on began a series of threats that it would be inimical to the USA if Communists entered a Western European government, even in a coalition with the other parties. According to Kissinger, as he himself said, policy toward the USSR should be implemented in the following way: ...offsetting the power of the Soviet Union throughout the world by means of a combination of political, military, and economic means. In this connection he openly stated that "... the Chinese People's Republic must be part of our political calculations."

And, if Kissinger on the other hand is to be considered an adherent of further normalization of Soviet-American relations, in no case can the refined anti-communism which he is attempting to inject into international relations with anti-communist purposes be tolerated. And now, on May 9, just two days after returning from his Africa trip, where he tried to regain the USA's lost positions under an anti-communist veil, Kissinger comes out and assures the

American public that the United States precisely now needs a strong military capacity to enable it to respond directly or indirectly to attempts to achieve unilateral advantage. These "unaddressed" statements were actually directed against the Soviet Union, as confirmed by the fact that (Kissinger) posed all these matters in connection with the developments in Angola, as well as in other regions where the anti-imperialist struggle has intensified.

Another well-known politician, Vice-President Nelson Rockefeller, made a call in a May 10 speech to journalists in Philadelphia for a strong alliance of the "free nations" against the "Communist threat" and against the growing influence of the "Soviet Empire." We could go on listing sharp anti-communist and anti-Soviet insults by American politicians, including official government representatives, and find more of the same sort. There is a striking comparison with the period of the greatest instigator of the Cold War, the U.S. Secretary of State from 1953 to 1959, John Foster Dulles. But a qualitative difference exists. Dulles was still able to develop a doctrine according to which Communism could be rolled back by military force alone, and the precondition for relaxation of international relations was the "liberation" of the Eastern European countries.

Since then, the correlation of forces has fundamentally changed in favor of socialism. The result is that Dulles' heirs have to pursue the same goals in reverse order — first a pretended attainment of detente in international relations and next a combination of economic, ideological and military pressure to weaken the unity of the socialist community and achieve a split with the Soviet Union.

The Shaky Position of American Policy

In this case, it is evident that the wish is father to the thought. We might well become aware once more that all the political somersaults of American politicians, as well as their muddled succession of anti-communist concepts, one refined, another with a new concept of the threat of force, testify once more to an unhealthy state of American society.... The roots of this remarkable behavior by American spokesmen lie totally apart from the Presidential election. American foreign policy is palpably beginning to lose its breath. Its effort to subvert socialism from within, even if they have a modernized form, will shatter on the unity and firmness of the countries of the socialist community, which stand on the secure foundation of socialist internationalism....

It must not be overlooked, however, that the fully manifest successes of the foreign policy of the USSR and its allies, as well as the gigantic offensive of the anti-imperialist struggles of an array of progressive forces, actually forces American foreign policy into a position in which its possibilities for maneuver become narrower and narrower. The logic of historical development shows that this situation can never again improve for it.