



What The Socialist Sector Is Really Saying

June 12 (NSIPS) — The three translations printed under this heading, as well as the Soviet Government Statement on the Mideast crisis and the Soviet Economic Journal commentary on the capitalist monetary crisis printed elsewhere in this issue provide the reader with a clear and fairly comprehensive picture of how Soviet and Comecon sector leaders view the current world situation. It is not surprising that the Atlanticist-controlled press has chosen to either ignore or significantly downplay such statements.

This is particularly striking in the case of the Soviet Government Statement on the Mideast (reprinted in full with our Mideast newsletter). While the New York Times and other papers acknowledged that the Soviets had issued such a statement, instead of reporting its contents as a clear warning on the Lebanese situation and the significance of its attack on the Syrian invasion, such Western "journals of record" reported that the Soviets are want to make such statements at the drop of a hat and that they don't really mean very much.

It is quite clear where this line was coming from. NSIPS contacted a Mr. Arthur Houten, the National Security Council staffer in charge of their Mideast desk, for comment on the Soviet statement "It doesn't mean a damn thing," he stated, "It's no warning... the Soviets don't really mean what they are saying..." A similar statement was made by the Pentagon's Defense Intelligence Agency analyst for Mideast affairs. Such insanity continues to this moment to be peddled through the Atlanticist press.

Soviet Party Leader Brezhnev's Speech Welcoming Indira Gandhi

June 11 (NSIPS) — The following are excerpts from a speech delivered at the Kremlin dinner June 9 in honor of visiting Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi.

....Esteemed Madam Prime Minister,

Not much time has passed since our last meeting in Delhi. But political time, as is known, is measured not by the number of leaves in the calendar, but by the events filling it. The past years were very eventful. Big positive changes took place both in the international arena and in relations between our countries....

As to the prospects of Soviet—Indian cooperation, it can be boldly stated that all possibilities exist for its further deepening and perfection. Precisely this is being discussed at the current talks.

The relaxation of tension now is a tangible reality. Without doubt, it has struck deep roots. Preconditions exist for the relaxation of tension to acquire a really irreversible nature. But we cannot fail to see another thing: lately there has been a noticeable increase in the activity of the opponents of the relaxation of tension. They appear to have sprung to activity on seeing that their game is up. In an attempt to frustrate the relaxation of tension they slander in every way the policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. They are using such charges as aggressive intentions, striving for hegemony, etc. That has been worn thin already during the times of the cold war.

Our answer to them is simple: we do not strive for hegemony, we do not need it. It is precisely those who struggle so zealously against the strengthening of peace and the deepening of the relaxation of tension that strive for hegemony and interfere into the affairs of other countries and peoples, attempting to impose their will on them. Is it not known who are rejecting our persistent proposals to really limit the arms race, who are inflating military budgets and stepping up the development of ever more destructive types of weapons. All this is well known.

We clearly see these negative phenomena and are fully determined to oppose them. The development and deepening of the relaxation of tension is the call of the time, this is a demand of all peoples prompted by their vital interests in durable peace. And those, who connive at the campaign of the opponents of the relaxation of tension and those who succumb to their pressure for these or those temporary considerations, assume a heavy responsibility.

Adherence to peace is being measured now in concrete deeds more than ever before, by the daily work for the sake of that lofty goal. At its 25th Congress our party put forward a clearcut, realistic programme of the further struggle for peace and international cooperation, for the freedom and independence of the peoples. We note with satisfaction that it has been met with broad support of the world public...

In our view, good prerequisites toward relaxation of tension are emerging here (Asia) too. Guns become silent in Indo-China, and the political arena is witnessing the emergence of such a peace force as united Vietnam. Certain positive changes are taking place in Southern Asia. We have learned with satisfaction about the results of the recent Indo-Pakistan talks which will, in our opinion, contribute to the further normalization of the situation in that region.

At the same time we realize that the situation in Asia still remains complex enough. There are forces in Asia, which, ignoring the rights and sovereignty of the states, are striving

to subordinate other peoples to their rule. They sabotage the efforts aimed at ensuring peace and security of Asian peoples on a bilateral and collective basis. Acting in alliance with the internal reaction, imperialism does not abandon its attempts to set off one against the other the countries of that continent.

Let us take, for instance, the problem of the Indian ocean. As is known, certain powers, despite their remote location from that region, are building up their military forces here, and are building new military bases. The question arises — why do they act so? All this arouses well-founded concern of the coastal countries. They justly see in such a policy a threat to their independence and security. This also causes concern for us.

The Soviet Union is far from being indifferent whether the Indian ocean will be a zone of peace or whether the existing foreign military bases will remain here or and will be built. Our position is clear. We have unambiguously stated that the Soviet Union has not had and does not have intentions to build military bases in the Indian ocean. We have called upon the United States to act likewise and expect its clear answer.

The Soviet Union intends to further actively participate in searching for the ways to solve the urgent problems of the Asian continent. We will support any proposals prompted by the ensurance through the joint efforts of Asian states.

The Soviet Union welcomes the growing role of the developing countries in world politics, steadily supports their struggle for equal political and economic relations, for social progress. Already today they are making a tangible contribution to the normalization of the international climate. In this context we give our due to the positive role of the non-alignment movement in which the Republic of India occupies an outstanding place. The principles, on which this movement rests — strengthening peace and peaceful coexistence, independence of states, struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism — have successfully withstood the test of time. We wish every success to the forthcoming conference of the non-aligned countries in Colombo.

Life confirms the farsightedness of the course of the Indian National Congress Party led by You, Esteemed Mrs. Gandhi, the course aimed at industrialization of the country, construction of independent economy and creation of a strong public sector. It is thanks to that course that India has emerged as a powerful state, playing an important role in world politics. And today the prophetic words of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the founder of the Soviet State, who predicted the great future for a free India, come true.

Soviet people realise what efforts are required for advance along the road of progress by such a huge country as India with her complex and diverse problems. The more so that new India remains a target of attacks by external forces which to this day cannot reconcile themselves with the independent and progressive course of this great state.

Your government's actions against internal and external reaction met full understanding in the USSR. The reaction's attempts to launch an offensive encountered a resolute rebuff by all democratic forces of India.

We wish Your government, the entire industrious and talented people of India new successes. In this connection may I repeat again: the Soviet Union was, is and remains a reliable friend of India and the Indian peoples...

Moscow June 8, 1976.

DDR on Unstable U.S. Presidency

June 11 (NSIPS) — The following article by Major Heinz Rabe was run in the latest issue of the German Democratic Republic military magazine, Volksarmee:

It has been 15 years, since the summer of 1961, when war-like statements by NATO politicians clustered around the idea that they would "risk atomic war" in order to continue to use West Gerlin as a NATO bridgehead to conquer the German Democratic Republic. This special piece of territory had already been described as the "cheapest atomic bomb in the world." August 13, 1961 prevented the world from experiencing unforeseeable consequences.

Since then, imperialism's field of action in the entire world has been seriously reduced. The principles of peaceful coexistence now must also be recognized by imperialistic states. "Nevertheless, this has brought about no change in the essence of imperialism, not in its adventuresomeness or its rapacity," as the Socialist Unity Party (the SED, the ruling party in the German Democratic Republic — ed.) program emphasizes: "It is still applying all of the power that it still has available for its dangerous aggressive plans. Imperialism's goal remains as it always was, to guard and expand its positions, and to undermine and destroy socialist order."

This means that we can continue to reckon on the adventuresomeness and the aggressiveness of a class enemy, who since the 1950s has armed himself systematically and chiefly for a nuclear war against the Soviet Union and the socialist states allied with it.

It becomes visible from a book that has recently appeared in the U.S. to what degree in the past certain representatives of imperialism played with this risk. The book is called "The Last Days" and has, according to U.S. News and World Report of April 12, 1976, "a detailed description of what went on in the White House from April 1973 to August 9, 1974, the day on which Mr. Nixon resigned his office."

The former U.S. president was put under the magnifying glass by those very same two journalists who had previously gotten the Watergate scandal that was associated with his name underway. According to credible reports by witnesses, he appeared as a man who increasingly turned to alcohol, who cried often, and who spoke of suicide as the Watergate Affair reached its end, and with it, he reached his fall.

What makes these statements interesting for the whole world, is Nixon's social and military stands, as well as his position on the questions of war and peace. An eyewitness reports about this: "If the president had his way, we'd have a nuclear war every week." ...

Here is a remarkable statement about imperialistic unpredictability. The triggering moments of a political intensification of a situation become evident, NATO adventuresomeness becomes personified. And at what positions! As is well known, the U.S. President has complete control over the nuclear potential of imperialism's major power, and over the release of nuclear weapons by the West German general officers. But above all it would be unjust to put aggressiveness and adventuresomeness only on an individual person such as Mr. Nixon, who no longer has the war-triggering "Red Phone" in his grasp. This characteristic is bound to the

system. It is rooted in the power of imperialistic monopoly, which has not given up the goal of driving socialism out of existence.

Nixon had to go, because he had lost face. But one year after his departure, (James) Schlesinger, the U.S. Defense Secretary at that time, threatened the Soviet Union with a first strike by nuclear weapons, and he did not have to wait long for this to be echoed by his friend Leber (West German Defense Minister). His theory of "limited strategic nuclear war" against socialism, which is based on more flexible use of the strategic nuclear potential of the

U.S., has already been acclaimed the "Schlesinger Doctrine" on the other side of the Atlantic.

Adventuresome politics are never delayed by false pretences. Revelations about this characterize imperialism as the only source of danger for war in the world, a danger, which is considered, as well as successfully met, by true socialism. And only because of this can democratically-inclined Americans write in peace today about Nixon, the war god who was thwarted, whom we want to forget just as little as the NATO dance around the "cheapest atom bombs" in the tension-burdened summer of 1961.

A Lawful Question

Where Is The 'Expanded Security Zone' Doctrine Taking France?

June 12 (NSIPS) — The following is the full translation of an article appearing in the June 9 Pravda, the official newspaper of the Soviet Communist Party, under the byline "I. Aleksandrov."

Since Tuesday, June 1, this question, brought up by the statement of French Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces General Guy Mery concerning a "new form of strategy," has been hotly debated both in Paris and in New York, London and other Western capitals. Naturally, this statement could not go unnoticed.

What is the essence of this "new form (and we should add: not only form but also substance! — Pravda Ed.) of strategy" of the French command? The statement of General Mery, who has been Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of France since April, 1975, and before that was chief of the personal staff of the (French) President, published in the semi-official journal "Revue de Defense Nationale," leaves no doubt but that at issue is a definite revision of the basis of French defense policy, which were established by General Charles DeGaulle, and affirmed by his successor (Georges) Pompidou and subsequently the current president Giscard D'Estaing.

In the course of the ten years since France broke with the aggressive military organization, NATO, secured the departure of American subordination to the "Atlanticist" generals, it has consistently implemented a policy independent from that of other states. Contrary to NATO, which is an aggressive bloc oriented against the peace-loving socialist states, France built its detente under the formula "in all directions," developed by the late General Ailleret, who was Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces under DeGaulle. This formula meant that the armed forces of France would be used for defense against **any** aggressor, no matter where he came from.

Rejecting participation in NATO activity, France repeatedly stated that its military units which have been stationed in Pfalz and Schwarzwald — in the Western area of the Federal Republic of Germany — since World War I should by no means be considered by NATO staffs as their

troops, and that these units have a single purpose: to ensure the interests of the national defense of France, which suffered so terribly in the war years from Hitler's invasion.

So what do we hear now?

As is clear from the statement of General Mery, this "new form of strategy," which is based on the concept of an "expanded security zone," provides for the French armed forces to be immediately sent into battle against the socialist countries of Europe. "**It is by no means excluded,**" says the Chief of Staff of the French Armed Forces, "**that we will take part in this battle in the advance line of defense.**"

First of all the question arises: what, all of nine months after the signing of the Final Act of the All-European conference in Helsinki, where the principles of inviolability of borders, restraint from application of force and even the threat of force, inspires the Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of France to launch into discussion of the possibility and even plans for such a battle?

Now — what about the essence of the "expanded security zone" doctrine itself? The French, English and American press and a whole array of responsible politicians have understood it as a rejection of the defense policy based on national independence.

"A full break with the doctrine of General Ailleret (on "defense in all directions") has taken place," writes the Paris paper, Le Monde.

It is clear that a rather close collaboration with the Atlantic alliance is quite logically written into this prospectus," specifies Le Figaro.

In the words of the newspaper L'Echo, what is at issue is "very Atlantist theses," since "our allies" — this paper writes — "have for a long time been demanding our presence in a certain area ... The gradual return to NATO will consequently be on the agenda more than ever before, both for the opposition and for the Gaullists,"

The New York Times spoke out in the same spirit, stating baldly: "The Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of France, Army General Guy Mery has given official blessing (!) to French participation in the front line of NATO troops in the event of war."

On June 2 French Foreign Minister Jean Sauvagnargues, evidently trying somehow to mitigate the impression left by the sensational statement of the Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of France, said in a government radio interview that the statement supposedly "contains no new elements, unless (unless! — Pravda Ed.) you count the fact that we will try, through the strengthening of our armed forces, to fulfill our obligations."

And then followed the already traditional affirmation: "We left the united organization of the Atlantic alliance in 1966, in order to preserve our independence in taking decisions. We excluded any return to the united organization."

Lovely. But the what need for the above-cited phrase — unless you count the fact that we will try," etc? This question naturally arises in the mind of many French, and not only French, politicians.

This, for example, is what former Defense Minister and former Prime Minister General Pierre Messmer said — and he is someone who certainly knows what he's talking about on military questions: "This presumes that our armed forces will from now on be deployed under NATO command New ties between NATO and the French staff will undoubtedly be created This is a leap backwards. This is not progress. This is a retreat."

And Messmer, emphasizing that this is a matter of "a fundamental change in French doctrine," recalled that "for 10 years the French armed forces were no longer slated for taking up some section of a front against Czechoslovakia or the German Democratic Republic, but were rather held in reserve, in a fashion."

The French Socialist Party figure Chevenement said: "The military policy of the government is leading to a return to NATO. This policy ignores the interests of France. It gives priority to the hypothesis of conventional conflict in Europe between the two blocs. It ignores the special characteristics

of our geographical location.... In brief, it is a bread with the policy of independence and sovereignty which was conducted by General DeGaulle."

The statement of the Politburo of the French Communist Party, states that General Mery has asserted the inclusion of the country's military means into the NATO system. This, says the statement, betrays an intention "to turn our army into an auxiliary force of the West German army on the borders of the socialist countries." The authors of the new doctrine refer "to the Soviet Union and other socialist states of Europe as enemies" of France. Such a policy, notes the statement, "runs counter to international relaxation of tensions and peaceful coexistence."

Such are the outcries evoked by the statement of the Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of France on the new strategy. To this it remains to add that, as *Le Monde* reported on June 3, "the explications given by General Mery were not improvised. They were first communicated in March, to the Higher Research Institute of National Defense.... There is no basis to suppose that the Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces made his statement without the approval of the highest governmental authorities."

All the more urgently and acutely, then, do broad circles of the French public now pose the lawful question: where can this new military doctrine lead France?

We think that the fundamental national interests of France lie not in playing up to the interests of the aggressive NATO bloc, but in ensuring all-European security and cooperation on the basis of strict observance of the Final Act of the all-European (Helsinki) conference and the Principles of Relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the French Republic, signed at the summit level.

The vital interests of all the peoples of Europe demand strict and consistent implementation of the extremely important tenets of those documents.

The Hidden Story of Rocky's Nuclear Machine

Nelson Rockefeller and Henry Kissinger:

The History of Their Attempts to Blow Up the World .

June 11 (NSIPS) — The Rockefeller family, directed by Nelson Rockefeller, has over the last 30 years built up a political faction of nuclear madmen — known in official circles as "Utopians." The insane strategy of the Utopians for "winning" World War III against the Soviet Union by nuclear warfare terror descends directly from the theory of Fascist Italy's Commissioner of Aviation General Giulio Douhet for "command of the air" and the Nazis' strategy of massive bombing of civilian population centers known as "Terrorangriff."

The Rockefeller Utopian faction organized their fascist private nuclear war plotting apparatus directly out of their World War II Strategic Bombing Survey and British-linked Operations Research groups. After the war these were

constituted as the Rand Corporation, the Hudson Institute, the MITRE Corporation, and later in the 1960s, the Institute for Policy Studies — an apparatus that is now completely interfaced with such key Rockefeller-controlled government and military agencies as the National Security Council, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the U.S. Air Force, the Energy Research and Development Agency (formerly the Atomic Energy Commission), and the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This private machine constitutes Rockefeller and his Utopians' own command and control apparatus for nuclear war and is the vehicle for their relentless, insurrectional drive for the button.

Rockefeller and his Utopians have held the world hostage for more than 30 years to their insane nuclear warfare terror