

# What The Socialist Sector Is Really Saying

June 26 (NSIPS) — We resume our regular feature this week of publishing significant statements and commentaries from the Socialist sector press with four significant articles.

Both the Pravda article and the Rude Pravo piece by a Soviet commentator represent perhaps the strongest statement to date of how the Soviet Union views its interests in the current Lebanese crisis and what it thinks must be done to prevent the outbreak of a general war. The Western press has chosen to overlook the significance of these articles as it did with the official Soviet government statements published by TASS three weeks ago. Instead such Atlanticists sewage outlets as the New York Times have focussed on the naval movements in the Mediterranean and stories such as C.L. Sulzberger's Op-ed outburst yesterday about how the Soviets are seeking to destabilize the situation. Despite this deliberate and provocative obfuscation, the Soviet statements as reported in the Socialist sector press are a clear warning: we seek an overall Mideast peace settlement through a Geneva conference but are prepared to go to war should the crazed Atlanticists continue their efforts to liquidate the Lebanese left.

Similarly, the two Soviet commentaries on the NATO nuclear planning group meeting mock those in the West who continue to plan for a "limited or tactical" nuclear war against the socialist sector. The U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld is ridiculed for continuing to put forward the insane policies espoused by his deposed predecessor, James Schlesinger. The Atlanticist press has not dared print a word about these articles — just as they have chosen to ignore all similar warnings of the Warsaw Pact rejection of the so-called doctrine of "limited nuclear warfare." Given the outcome of the pursuit of such policies by NATO policies, the failure to inform the population of the West of the thinking of the Warsaw Pact leadership represents perhaps the greatest of the numerous Nuremberg crimes committed by Rockefeller's press whores.

## The 'Lebanese Drama'

June 25 (NSIPS) — The following is a translation of an article by Pavel Demchenko appearing in the June 23 Pravda, the official newspaper of the Soviet Communist Party. It is entitled "Lebanese Drama."

The severe crisis in Lebanon, which has gone on for over a year, became especially sharp in recent days. The senseless and essentially provocatory murder of two American diplomats served as a pretext for discussions in NATO circles of the possibility of their open military interference in Lebanese affairs. The same intention was expressed by France.

Let us recall, that the present crisis in Lebanon began in April of last year with attacks by units of the Kataib party (Christian fascist—ed.) on Palestinians. There were some attempts to characterize the subsequent clashes as religious. But the social essence of the developing events soon became clearer and clearer. Up front, was the aspiration of the poorest layers of Lebanese society to achieve social justice in the conditions in the country, where the gap between poverty and wealth was continuing to widen. In this struggle, the

Palestinians wound up on the side of the Lebanese workers.

In reality, a civil war had begun in the country, which paralyzed the state apparatus and led to ruin of the army and the economy. The situation was worsened day by day by the fact that Lebanon is the object of constant outside interference and Israeli armed provocations. Taking advantage of the fragmentation and motley nature of Lebanese political forces, the adherence of the Lebanese bourgeoisie to foreign monopolies, the existence of Western espionage centers in the country, and disagreements within the Palestinian movement, imperialist and Zionist secret services are attempting to drag out the bloody events in Lebanon and turn it into a center of intra-Arab contradictions.

The goal of this game, which has unfortunately been joined by certain Arab circles, is to distract the forces and attention of the Arabs from the struggle against imperialism and continuing aggression by Israel, which occupies large regions of Arab territory and refuses to satisfy the rights of the Palestinians to return to their native places and form their own state. Judging by statements in the foreign press and by the military activity which is observed in the immediate vicinity of Lebanon, there are in certain Western capitals and in Tel Aviv entirely serious deliberations over plans to introduce (if the necessity should arise) their troops into this Arab country.

Interference of this sort, if allowed, threatens the Mideast with the development of a broader international conflict. The main task now, as the progressive Arab press takes note, is to achieve a cease fire in Lebanon and then move on to the search for a political settlement of the crisis. Precisely this road leads to the restoration of normal life in Lebanon, and preservation of this country as a single state.

## 'Peace For Lebanon'

June 26 (NSIPS) — The following is an article by Soviet commentator Vladimir Simonov which appeared in the June 18 Rude Pravo, the official newspaper of the Czech Communist Party.

The bloodshed which continues to spill over the streets of Beirut are the traces which the policy of separate agreements according to the "step-by-step (diplomacy) plan have left behind. Washington was the advocate of this policy. Its cannon-boat diplomacy has not eased tensions in the explosive Mideast situation; instead, it has left behind numerous divisions in Arab unity.

This was exactly the goal which Washington pursued. The interests of Israel and its protectors are served precisely whenever certain countries are removed from the front of the struggle of the all-Arab cause, and consciously or objectively assumed the task of becoming a second imperialist bastion in this region. Through this situation, Tel Aviv gains the ability of wearing away Arab strength, and thereby achieving its goals which it has been unable to achieve through aggression. It is my opinion that Washington and its satrapies, are essentially striving for an "Arabization" of the Mideast conflict according to the model of the policy of "Vietnamization" which was tested in the laboratory of Indochina.

SPECIAL REPORT 29

Thus, Arabs become entwined in a struggle against Arabs. The most varying groupings, axes (to grind) and diversifying sympathies emerge from this, as signalled by the (recent) visit of the Finance Minister of the fascist Chilean Junta, Jorge Causo Lama, to Egypt.

In the recent period, the central target where foreign forces applied their "Arabization" tactic has been Lebanon. The aim of the imperialist conspiracy against this country was based on drowning in blood, or at least weakening the Palestinian Resistance movement, and tearing apart the national and patriotic forces of Lebanon. The attention of the Arabs that was diverted from the problem of the confrontation with Israel, and directed towards a murderous Lebanese feud was a key circumstance which played into the situation.

This is especially noticeable in the case of Syria. As noted by government chief Jahmud Ajubi, there was an effort to rip Syria away from the primary struggle against Israeli aggression. Damascus never even explained that the goal of deploying its troops into Lebanon is the halting of the blood shed in Beirut. Nevertheless, it must be conceded that this action, within the already quite complicated situation, brought no remedy. The official Soviet press agency TASS brought attention in its recently published declaration to the fact that an "even greater bloodletting" continues in Lebanon today.

That the Soviet Union is dissatisfied with the extension of the conflict beyond the Lebanese border must in no way be astonishing. All in all, the regime of the Mideast is much closer to the Soviet Union, than to those who, using the excuse of an analogous unrest, send units of aircraft carriers to the Lebanese coast, or disembark their troops on bases in the immediate neighborhood of the (Lebanese) events, (as is presently taking place in Cyprus).

We must assume that with the participation or the obvious agreement of Western circles, the flames in Lebanon could develop into a fire, in order to justify a direct imperialist intervention modeled after 1958. It is no accident that the official bourgeois commentators unanimously have begun to speak of an 'escalation' (heightening) of the risk of intervention. Among the possible candidates for a new aggressive move, they mention above all, Israel.

At the critical moment, in which the internalization of the Lebanese crisis apparently threatens, to become a reality, leading Soviet circles have demanded that all nations desist from any sorts of actions which are directed against the sovereignty and national integrity (of Lebanon—ed.). The Soviet Union stands on the side of all Lebanese forces which are striving for the maintenance of the integrity of the country, in order to solve the crisis by peaceful means. The Soviet Union calls upon all sides participating in the civil war to immediately cease fighting.

The Soviet Union is deeply concerned about the fate of the Palestinian peoples in Lebanon. These persecuted individuals, driven from their homeland, who have assumed a front-line position in the entire Arab struggle against Israeli aggression, are threatened by physical liquidation through this murderous civil war. What could be a more valuable gift then for the enemies of Arab unity than their liquidation?

Against this background of the entirely real danger of the collapse of the full Arab front, the determined and pressing efforts of the Soviet Union to assure the solidarity of those Arab states which are opposed to Israel, assumes an extraordinary importance. In this context, attention must be drawn once again to the results of the visit of (Soviet

Prime Minister) Alexei Kossygin to Iraq and Syria. Analysis of the two joint communiques demonstrates agreement of viewpoints of the participating sides on numerous international questions, and in particular, concerning the path for solving the situation in the Middle East. One of the most decisive conditions put forward by both documents for success in the struggle against Zionist aggression is the necessity of the unity of the Arab states around an anti-imperialist foundation, and the securing of their cooperation with those nations which share similar political views, above all the Soviet Union and its socialist partners. The entire tone and content of both communiques justify the conclusion that proximity to the Soviet Union is achieving an ever greater strategic value in the eyes of true Arab patriots.

In a situation in which the West is finally talking about atomic bombs which are stored somewhere in tunnels beneath Tel Aviv, neither the Soviet Union nor the two Arab capitals visited by Alexei Kossygin can underestimate the explosiveness of the Mideast situation. As emphasized in the joint documents, the only correct foundation for a peaceful solution in this region which has also attracted international recognition, crystalized out of the situation a long time ago. It is clear that no stability will be achieved in the Mideast, so long as the following three demands are not met: the return of the Israeli-occupied territories to the Arabs, an independent Palestinian state, and the guaranteeing of the security in the Mideast.

Any kind of divisiveness in achieving a just solution is *prima facie* impermissible, since for three years now, the appropriate mechanism — which unfortunately is not in operation — has existed — the Geneva Mideast Conference. The responsibility for this stagnation, for which Lebanon today is paying an enormous price every minute, falls upon those who continue to hold tenaciously to the 'step-by-step' diplomacy, which has not materialized. President Ford's declaration, (to postpone the ordering of a constructive solution until after the U.S. elections) has heavy consequences, similarly to the interview of (Egyptian President Anwar) Sadat with the London Times, where he stated de facto that the Geneva conference cannot be resumed during the course of this year.

Fortunately, there exist powerful Arab forces and socialist collaborators who will undertake everything necessary to assure the turn to a just and lasting peace in the Mideast.

## "What Game Is NATO Playing?"

*June 26 (NSIPS) — The following are major excerpts from an article by Col. M. Ponomarev appearing in the June 20 Soviet military newspaper Red Star.*

The final communique of the May session of the NATO council — the highest leadership organ of the North Atlantic bloc — was notable for its contradictoriness and ambiguity. On the one hand, the participants in the Oslo meeting recognized the existence of "certain reassuring aspects" in relations between East and West, and called for further lessening of tensions. But on the other, they revealed the clear intention not to take into account the demands of the times, the strivings of peoples for the development and

deepening of detente. And it was the latter tendency which predominated in the resolutions of the session, and in the political arrangements that were outlined.

The essence of these arrangements, to make a long story short, is further to activate militaristic preparations, and to whip up the arms race in the Atlanticist camp. This was the main sense of the political directives worked out in Oslo. And a series of sessions of the military organs of the bloc was devoted to discussing measures for their implementation, in Brussels from June 9 to 14. . . .

Unanimity reigned at (most of) the sessions of the military organs of the bloc. Particularly in the discussion of questions of unification of the organizational structures of the Atlantic armies, and also in training of personnel and officer cadre, and other measures aimed at raising their military preparedness and striking power.

The danger of these new plans of the Atlantic strategists to peace and the security of peoples is so obvious that even organs of the Western press have been forced to admit it. Thus, the West German paper *Neue Ruhrzeitung* indicates that in Brussels the policy of speeding up military preparations, which is being conducted by the NATO military leaders, "received a new stimulus." As a result of the decisions passed in recent days in the Belgian capital, the newspaper decided, the Western powers "again intend to speed up the arms race."

This course was particularly distinctly revealed at the session of the Nuclear Planning Group. In essence, its participants adopted decisions on a new stage in the nuclear missile arms race in the NATO countries.

Indeed, the representatives of the countries which are members of the group (USA, England, West Germany, Italy, Canada, Holland, Norway and Turkey) reviewed in detail plans for "raising the effectiveness" of operative-tactical nuclear weapons — in Atlanticist terminology, "nuclear forces in the theater of military actions." The Defense Minister of the United States D. Rumsfeld informed the other participants in the group of plans for modernization of American nuclear weapons in Europe. His aim was to replace certain old-fashioned types, which are considered "dirty and imprecise," with new "clean and precise" ones. The same with his attempt to convince the public of the "admissibility" of the use of such weapons in case of a military conflict on the European continent, since this would make it possible to hit "only" limited objectives.

Concerning the means of delivery of nuclear supplies to their goals, according to reports of the news agency, UPI, D. Rumsfeld set forth to his colleagues plans for replacement of the antiquated "Honest John," "Sergeant," and "Pershing-1" missiles with the more modern "Lance" and "Pershing-2." Similarly, it was proposed that instead of some of the planes which carry nuclear armaments, ballistic missiles launched from submarines be used, which are considered less vulnerable. Particular attention is also being given to increasing production of tactical missiles which can carry either nuclear or conventional warheads. . . .

This is the general picture of the decisions passed by the military organs of the North Atlantic bloc. However it should be particularly stressed that their work took place with a deafening accompaniment of lying talk about the "Soviet threat." The enemies of detente, setting the tone for the sessions in Brussels, have noticeably increased their activeness. Trying to wreck detente, they slander in every possible way the policies of the Soviet Union and the other

socialist countries. In the course of this all kinds of accusations are dragged out from the "cold war" period about "aggressive plans," "hegemonistic strivings," and such.

To the rhythm of this drumbeat for battle, the Atlantic politicians and strategists are again putting their stakes on policy "from a position of strength." Just recall that in recent times the military budgets of the USA, England, West Germany, and France have been sharply increased, and new measures are being taken to speed up the arms race and other militaristic preparations.

Analysis of the decisions taken in Brussels reminds us once again that the class nature of those forces which are directing the activity of the North Atlantic bloc remains unchanged. This bloc is a gigantic international state-monopoly amalgamation. Its course is defined primarily by the mercenary interests of the military-industrial complexes and the policies of reactionary circles in the capitalist states. Whatever individual declarations may be broadcast by Atlanticist figures on their adherence to the ideas of lessening of tensions, the practical actions of NATO are in scandalous contradiction with the defining tendencies of modern international life.

In this connection let us recall the words of General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party L.I. Brezhnev, in his speech at a dinner in honor of Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi: "The development and deepening of detente — this is the command of the times, the demand of all peoples, dictated by their vital interest in a firm peace. And he who indulges the campaign of the enemies of detente, or who submits to the pressure of one conjunctural consideration or another, takes upon himself a grave responsibility."

He who wants to bring mankind to a new stage of the arms race, the development and accumulation of ever more destructive types of weapons, bears a grave responsibility.

And it is precisely towards this that the decisions of the leading military organs of NATO, which just completed their series of meetings in Brussels, are directed.

## "Mister Rumsfeld's Theatre"

*June 26 (NSIPS) — The following is excerpted from an article by Soviet commentator Yuri Zhukov appearing in the June 21 Pravda, the official paper of the Soviet Communist Party.*

It is said that the style makes the man. And in this case, the communique (of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group — ed.) is clearly marked with the style of Mister Rumsfeld. Listen. . . . They (the NATO defense ministers - Y.Z.) reviewed the significance of the contribution of the nuclear forces of the theater of military action in NATO strategy of a dosed out response strike as an element of the NATO triptych, consisting of strategic forces, nuclear theater forces and conventional forces.'

What military actions are being discussed? With whom are Rumsfeld and his colleagues fighting? What theater are they talking about? Of course, the devil is not as terrible as his reputation; in actuality they were talking not at all about a

"theater of military action," since there is no war in Europe and none is anticipated — no, this is the showcase where the American military men played out their latest show, displaying the moth-eaten scarecrow of the notorious "Soviet threat," in order to scare their protesting Western European allies and force them to open up the coffers to finance the arms race.

Barely touching down in Brussels by plane on June 10, Rumsfeld stated that the USA is supposedly "concerned over the growth of the Soviet Union's military might," and, referring to the increase in the U.S. military budget, made it clear that similar efforts are demanded from its NATO partners.

Strange as it may be, the theatrical trick of this trans-oceanic guest produced its terrorizing effect. UPI triumphantly reported June 15 from Brussels: "American officials

reported that on Monday the NATO nuclear planning group basically approved the ideas laid out by the American Defense Minister Donald Rumsfeld." And then followed a long list of new types of weapons from the "trptych" put forward by the Pentagon chief: new "land to land" rockets, SLBMs, cruise missiles, etc. All of this will cost the U.S. allies insane amounts: and the missiles will be sold to them by American military-industrial firms!

It's a wonder, to what degree these gentlemen irresponsibly and unceremoniously sacrifice the vital interests of their peoples, in order that the military-industrial monopolies might grow rich!

After all, they cannot but know that in reality there has not been nor is there any "Soviet threat," and that the "theater of military action" exists only in the feverish imagination of Pentagon generals. So why does Mister Rumsfeld's strange show succeed so well?