

Moscow on a military footing

Soviet Sector Editor Rachel Douglas analyzes the fundamental Kremlin shift away from diplomacy, toward war-preparedness.

Leonid Brezhnev signaled on June 23 that the Soviet political command has shifted emphasis from war-avoidance diplomacy to military preparedness. They are no longer in the mode characterized, for example, by a Soviet Central Committee resolution on foreign policy exactly one year ago to the day (June 23, 1980), which stated that there existed Western state leaders who could "avert the threat of world thermonuclear conflict."

The leading such figure, France's President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, who was Brezhnev's leading negotiating partner, is out of office. West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, whose alliance with Giscard preserved the peace throughout the Carter years, is weakened, and the Franco-German alliance has evaporated.

Soviet President Brezhnev delivered a speech denouncing "bellicose-minded imperialist circles" before the Supreme Soviet on June 23. Brezhnev evoked images from World War II—the "holy war against the Nazis"—and recalled "the millions of Soviet people who fell."

Brezhnev's June 23 speech spoke of no trustworthy or reasonable heads of state in the West, but called only on "parliaments and peoples" in the West to seek peace.

The change in basic Soviet strategic posture is encapsulated in that difference in the language of June 1980 and the language of June 1981. *EIR* founder Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. recently observed: "Under conditions of perceived threats to the 'Soviet fatherland,' key elements of nearly all Soviet factions will reunite as one fist around the memory of World War II."

Soviet sources, from Brezhnev's entourage to the military, are currently motivating the kind of Soviet nationalist mobilization LaRouche forecast.

Leonid Zamyatin, whose Central Committee International Information Department was founded to publicize Brezhnev's policies, told a national television audience that the subversion of Poland and NATO plans to install medium-range Pershing rockets in Western Europe are two prongs of an offensive meant to split the socialist bloc. Marshal Viktor Kulikov, Warsaw Pact commander, wrote in the Russian army daily that "counterrevolutionary forces are trying to tear [Poland] out of the socialist community."

Defense Minister Marshal Dmitrii Ustinov warned in *Pravda* in a statement comparing today's war danger with that in the 1930s, that the U.S.S.R. will "match" any military challenge.

The late June newspapers reporting these warnings also carried news of the latest Soviet space launch, Cosmos 1267, a satellite that docked with the orbiting laboratory Salyut. The Cosmos series subsumes many experiments for the Soviet military, and Cosmos 1267 was the first step toward a permanent space station with military as well as civilian capabilities.

How relations became strained

The election of Ronald Reagan was not the decisive cause of Moscow's shift toward a war-fighting military posture as the dominant feature of its foreign policy. Many of Brezhnev's advisers welcomed the political elimination of the unstable Jimmy Carter.

But troubles that began with the destabilization of Poland in the summer of 1980 culminated in the ouster of President Giscard in the May 1981 French elections. With Giscard's defeat, Brezhnev lost a mainstay of his war-avoidance approach to world affairs. Although Brezhnev is slated to meet West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt later this year, this is a less powerful combination than it was when the Giscard-Schmidt team shaped European policies.

Personal diplomacy between Reagan and Brezhnev still could avert superpower confrontation, but there are weighty forces both in the West and in the Soviet Union working to prevent such a rapprochement.

The behavior of some Trilateral Commission members and Reagan administration officers bespeaks a remarkable inclination to plunge into World War III.

The much-publicized Peking ventures of Secretary of State Alexander Haig, especially, displayed to the Soviets that the most dangerous Carter-era policies have been reborn with a vengeance under Haig's stewardship over American foreign policy. If the United States arms China and Pakistan, with Giscard gone and Schmidt weakened, the Soviet supreme command concludes that

there are growing military threats on all fronts.

In the Polish crisis, too, the Trilateral Commission is goading the Soviets.

It would be easy to conclude, for instance, that David Rockefeller wants the Soviet Union to invade Poland. Rockefeller's practically bankrupt Chase Manhattan Bank was a major force in a June 19 creditors' meeting on the Polish debt. This was a rump meeting of American banks only, preparing an independent stand to submit to the 19-bank Multinational Task Force on Polish Debt the next week.

The American committee recommended a freeze on principal payments and deferral of a comprehensive decision on rescheduling until the end of this year, while attempting to collect interest payments in the meantime. This blocked a European plan to reschedule the debt over seven-and-a-half years. Chase and its fellow American creditors appeared to be hoping for realization of the scenario offered by the Swiss financial paper *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* some months back, according to which the Soviet Union would invade an economically and politically disintegrating Poland and guarantee the debt. The West German business daily *Handelsblatt* commented with alarm June 16, "The participating U.S. banks have proven themselves to be difficult negotiating partners."

German industrialists with a stake in their Polish projects and possible future investment there were not the only ones objecting to the American banks' unbridled pursuit of payment on the Polish debt. The geopolitical designs of British intelligence circles on the entire Soviet bloc could also be upset by a Polish default and certainly by a Soviet invasion.

Hence Richard Portes, a University of London professor who has advised the New York Council on Foreign Relations for several years on the strategic weight of the Soviet bloc debt, cautioned in a June 19 *New York Times* column that U.S. banks were "risking very dangerous consequences for no clear benefits."

This seemingly more sober attitude emerged not only on the Polish question, but from a faction of British strategists who are considering a broad web of international relations, from China to Poland to the world economy. This last element is key.

On June 14, the Basel-based Bank for International Settlements (BIS) reversed its earlier policy, and denounced the usurious interest-rate policies of the U.S. Federal Reserve. Arrigo Levi of the London International Institute for Strategic Studies gave a defense for such a switch, in a June 11 column reporting statements of David Watt, head of the Royal Institute for International Affairs. Said Watt, according to Levi, "The most important thing for the alliance is to get our economic situation right, to get more growth."

Days later, former U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus

Vance returned from a trip to Moscow full of criticism for Haig's arranging arms sales to China. "Bear-baiting," he called it. The *London Times* concurred: "It is with the Soviet Union, not China, that we share the European continent. . . It is, therefore, with the Soviet Union that we have to do business directly in order to lessen the dangers inherent in this relationship."

Reality, the eventual defeat of an economically depleted West in military confrontation with the Soviet Union, had registered with these circles, though not with Haig or Trilateral Commission members like David Rockefeller.

William Beecher of the *Boston Globe*, who was on intimate terms with the Carter administration State Department run by Cyrus Vance, gave the long view: The best hope, Beecher wrote from Moscow June 19, would be for Poland's model of economic liberalization to succeed and then be emulated by the entire Soviet bloc, including the U.S.S.R. The Polish model, however, consists of deindustrialization, and deindustrialization stops where Soviet military requirements begin; the "long view" of Beecher and Arrigo Levi, who predicted the "disintegration of the Soviet Empire," contains the seeds of yet another strategic miscalculation.

Vance's mid-June visit to Moscow was for a session of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Questions (the "Palme Commission"). With fellow members—Social Democrats Olof Palme of Sweden, David Owen of Great Britain, and Egon Bahr of West Germany—he sought Soviet collaboration on crisis management, still in a world subject to deindustrialization. Sources close to the Palme Commission revealed that the agenda in Moscow focused on nuclear nonproliferation, technology control, and North-South relations, especially respecting the Mideast.

While wining and dining Vance and the other commissioners, the Soviets telegraphed an underlying policy of readying for military conflict. Brezhnev used a meeting with Palme, displayed on the front page of *Pravda*, as a platform to attack the Reagan administration; Palme Commission member Georgii Arbatov said that no new proposals on arms negotiations would be forthcoming until the United States changed its stand on ones already tabled.

Vance's Palme Commission venture, which its organizers boast is a fallback channel for superpower dialogue, served to increase the danger of war. It invited new Soviet expressions of hostility toward Reagan, and it encouraged Soviet backing for international economic policies that cause greater instability than ever.

Russian maneuvers, Iranian bloodbath

Soviet connivance with the Socialist International and international terrorism originates from Soviet fac-

tions that interlock with British intelligence and European oligarchical networks, and has often undercut Soviet state policy. Prominent in the Soviet factions involved are the machine of the old Communist International, certain Moscow think tanks, and the KGB.

It is a feature of Soviet politics since Giscard's defeat that the line between Brezhnev and representatives of these factions, such as Central Committee Secretary Boris Ponomarev, is increasingly blurred. It is Brezhnev who will receive Socialist International chairman Willy Brandt June 30 and Brezhnev who has warmly praised the Ponomarev-patronized, Socialist-led peace movement in Europe in three consecutive speeches. The entire Soviet press choruses in support: *Izvestia* proposes that Britain's Lord Carrington could lead Great Britain into "détente" with Moscow, and *Pravda* hails the great example set for disarmament advocates by Bertrand Lord Russell, the British intelligence master whose Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in the 1950s pioneered the use of antiwar mobilizations to block scientific and industrial progress and to destabilize chosen governments.

Moscow's fanfares for the Socialist International fully accord with the underlying military preparations mode, if the Soviets are calculating that war is inevitable. From the military point of view, movements that weaken the potential adversary are welcome.

Olof Palme's next stop after Moscow was Teheran, for his ongoing mediation of the Iraq-Iran war. Landing in Teheran the same day, also from Moscow, was Ayatollah Sadegh Khalkhali, the reputed chief of Iran's supersecret *Fedayeen-e Islam* society.

Khalkhali, a recent visitor to Peking, had toured several Soviet republics where Islam is practiced. His hosts were the government Council for Religious Affairs and the Spiritual Administration of Muslims; like the Russian Orthodox Church—which joins forces in disarmament campaigns with the Socialist International and prominent Anglicans and Episcopalians, among them Cyrus Vance—the Spiritual Administration of Muslims is tightly interpenetrated with the KGB.

Within hours of his return, Khalkhali was spurring Iranians into new chaos and civil strife with calls to shoot "renegades" to the Islamic revolution and cries of "Death to America." Soviet commentator Alexander Bovin, who has relayed Brezhnev's policies to the world in the past, did raise some doubt about the ultimate outcome of the Iranian mullahs' rampage. Iran's real problems "are beyond the limits of their understanding," said Bovin of the mullahs.

But for now, Moscow is not backing any alternative for Iran. The KGB and Socialist International forces, who helped the ayatollahs to power in 1978, are ascendant there, in part because the Soviet leadership has cut back on war-avoidance endeavors internationally.

Book Review

What are the true roots of Islam?

by Thierry LeMarc

Numerous books published over the past several months have addressed themselves to the task of defining a future to the Arab-Islamic world, a world in crisis since the takeover of Iran by Ayatollah Khomeini two years ago. The central feature in that ongoing philosophical and political debate is the very existence of the nation-state as it is known today: the most advanced form of society.

Since the "Islamic revolution" in Iran, various styled organizations have taken it upon themselves to pave the way for the annihilation of the nations of the Islamic world, but a key proponent is one Zia Uddin Sardar, consultant to Saudi Arabia's King Abdul Aziz University and an Islamic member of the "Aquarian conspiracy," named after the famous book by Marilyn Ferguson, with whom Sardar entertains close relations. In a recent discussion about his latest book, *The Future of Muslim Civilizations*, Sardar explained that presently existing nations in the Middle East, Africa, and Southwest Asia are key "obstacles to a true Islamic revival. . . . Imposed by the West, present nations are primarily relying on geographical boundaries and do not care about human development. The nation-state never existed until the 19th century in the Islamic world. All was not rosy during the Ottoman Empire, but you had better human communication," he continued.

As one could guess, Sardar's present target is primarily Saudi Arabia—as it was from Iran a few years ago. Thus he moans that in the kingdom "the nomads have lost their identity. They have become alienated from their own history. The nice old cities have been replaced by high buildings. De-urbanization, that's what I want," he concluded before going on to proudly stress that his ideas were being studied in numerous Middle Eastern-based institutes of "futurology" and that the "nation-state is already crumbling. We have to reinforce local