

# Soviet foreign policy debate

## *Will it be a Rapallo-ite detente or 'class struggle'?*

An activation of British agents in the Soviet Union in combination with the recent developments in Iran and the continued failure of the U.S. government to adopt a solid prodetente foreign policy has brought into full relief a factional dispute between the "Russellites" and the "Rapalloites" in the Soviet Union. The former are sounding an increasingly shrill anti-American, "Jacobin" propaganda line in the Soviet press. But the main thrust of Soviet international policy remains detente as the speeches by Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev on the importance of a strategic arms limitation agreement with the United States and the flurry of Soviet diplomatic activity toward Western Europe amply demonstrate.

Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko arrived in Rome on Jan. 21 for meetings with top Italian leaders and with Pope John Paul II. Agreement was reached to sign a ten-year economic and scientific-technical cooperation agreement in the near future. On the eve of Gromyko's departure, the Soviet daily *Izvestia* asserted Soviet readiness for a dialogue with the Catholic Church and hailed the Pope's statement recently that "peace is the prime condition for real human progress."

Spanish Foreign Minister Oreja visited Moscow last week to sign agreements on expanding trade and scientific-technical cooperation. Vice Chairman of the Soviet State Committee on Science and Technology D. Gvishiani, the son-in-law of Premier Alexei Kosygin, is now in Paris for meetings with French officials.

The ultraleft side — the agent networks cultivated by Bertrand Russell and H. G. Wells and including most prominently "former" British intelligence officers Kim Philby, currently highly placed in the Soviet KGB, and Donald MacLean, working under a pseudonym at the Moscow institute of international affairs (MEMO) — is putting out the word that Soviet support for Islamic nationalist, the Ayatollah Khomeini, against the government of Iranian Prime Minister Shahpur Bakhtiar, will hasten what is asserted to be "the revolutionary process" in Iran.

The Soviet Russellite faction is parroting recent statements by Great Britain's most reactionary circles — Robert Moss of the *Daily Telegraph* and Enoch Powell of the neofascist National Front — by proclaiming the U.S. a has-been. All that is needed in Iran, they say, is a good dose of Khomeini-led destabilization to squeeze the U.S. out of the area for good.

### Watching the Soviet fight over Khomeini

*The following are excerpts of an article published in Le Figaro Jan. 15 on the Soviet attitude vis-a-vis Ayatollah Khomeini, written by Kremlinologist Annie Kriegel, a leading militant in the French Communist Party before her expulsion many years ago. Despite the fact that Kriegel does not differentiate between the various current factions in the USSR, her article, entitled "A Systematic Enterprise," draws the lines of battle.*

... For the past two centuries, the West has been living on a system of thought whose key words are: individual, class, nation, reason, science, technology, progress. Secularization, instruction, industrialization, emancipation are the broad programmatic outlines derived from this system of ideas. And to a certain extent, the Marxism of Marx and of Lenin's "Soviets plus electricity" was only a radical version of this: as of 1960 the challenge for the Khrushchevian USSR was still to "catch up with America."

But the Communist movement has been able to measure

the fragility of the lay modernizing currents in the Land of Islam. From Morocco to Indonesia, Islamic fundamentalism is still providing cohesion and identity to the great popular masses. Communism is now, with some vigor, drawing the consequences: except in some countries like perhaps Turkey where kemalism (the economic development strategy of Kemal Ataturk, founder of the Turkish Republic — ed.) took root and still nourishes a broad social and political movement based on the theme of progress, communism now intends to make compromises with this religious populism provided that (contrary to its form in Saudi Arabia) it is based on "anti-imperialism," that is to say anti-westernism. This is how a shift is taking place from Islamic-progressivism with a lay undertone to Islamic-communism which is both more radical, more popular and with greater religious emphasis...

A conflicting alliance? Not necessarily, and in any event, not immediately. If a conflict takes place it threatens to be one in which we will only be spectators — like in Cambodia.

### Shah's despotism and American domination

Exemplary of the Russellite line was *Pravda's* authoritative International Week column on Jan. 21 by the paper's London correspondent V. Ovchinnikov. He hailed Khomeini's Shi'ite movement for its "long established reputation as opponents of the tyranny" of "the Shah's despotism and American domination." The fate of the Shah — "a travelling salesman for foreign capitalism" — should be a warning to others who cooperate with Washington.

Contrary to the scenarios being spun out in the international press that "a spectre is haunting the Kremlin," as columnist John P. Roche wrote in the *Washington Star* on Jan. 22, the danger to the Soviet state posed by the destabilization of Iran is not Islamic revivalism struggling against the Shah and its spread across the border to the Moslem regions of the Soviet Union like Azerbaijan and Kurdistan. It is Zbigniew Brzezinski's "arc of crisis" scenario for the region stretching from the Indian Ocean to the Mediterranean Sea that is the danger — if thermonuclear war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union does not intervene.

The vulnerability of the Soviet leadership to the "class struggle" rhetoric of the Russellites, in this case vis-à-vis Iran, accounts for their continuing failure to ruthlessly purge the agent networks who are trying to sabotage the Rapallo-type policy of peaceful coexistence with progressive capitalist forces. That failure was exemplified by a Dec. 30 feature in *Pravda* by its Washington correspondent G. Vasiliev, who packed his article about the alleged "hypocrisy" of America's Founding Fathers with quotes from spokesmen for the British linked Institute for Policy Studies about U.S. crimes in Vietnam, Chile, Nicaragua, and Iran. Just last spring, the government daily *Izvestia* identified IPS as the controller of Italian terrorism.

### The Rapallo policy toward Europe

Continuing to pose a policy dilemma to the Soviet leadership is the new European Monetary System, which the government has not officially backed despite the crucial importance of the May 1978 meeting between Brezhnev and West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt in setting the EMS in motion. The dilemma has been expressed like this.

The latest issue of the economics weekly *Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta* ran an article saying that the EMS lacks an "economic basis" and will hence fail as have all other European Community integration schemes.

This runs counter to an article in the foreign policy weekly *New Times* during December that reported the intentions of the EMS founders to use the system for Third World development and to further East-West detente. The weekly concluded that the system might very well work.

The depth of the factional dispute is best indicated by the fact that one of the best calls for international cooperation in economic development and detente to appear in the Soviet press came from none other than Nikolai Inozemtsev, the director of the IMEMO institute which harbors British agent MacLean. Inozemtsev, in a feature in *Pravda* Jan. 22, in effect calls for a positive Soviet response to Chancellor Schmidt's appeal for the Soviet Union to participate in joint East-West efforts to develop the Third World.

Inozemtsev analyzed the world energy crisis. It is not a resource crisis, but one of speculation on oil prices. The task for coming decades is to utilize broad resources, including coal, and

especially to "accelerate the construction of nuclear plants." It is obvious, he continued, "that humanity has entered a phase of preparing for the inevitable radical reconstruction of the whole structure of the fuel economy, preparing for the utilization of such effectively infinite resources as thermonuclear fusion and solar power."

These tasks, he concluded, require "broad international cooperation" and a new world economic order, including economic advancement in the Third World as "a necessary precondition for the vitalization of international relations and the progress of human civilization."

The policy of French President Giscard d'Estaing, one of the founders with Schmidt of the EMS, is also the subject of debate in Moscow. Vice Chairman Gvishiani of the Soviet State Committee on Science and Technology, now in Paris, wrote an article for *Izvestia* on Jan. 18 stressing the importance of scientific and economic cooperation between France and the USSR. Gvishiani urged the United States to adopt a similar policy of mutually beneficial cooperation.

Yet the magazine *New Times* attacks Giscard in its current issue, calling him an "Atlanticist" who has departed from the true heritage of Gaullism. *Pravda* on Jan. 16 praised the French Communist Party and the Gaullist RPR party for their opposition to the European Monetary System.

—Susan Welsh

### French Foreign Ministry: New Times slander not official Soviet view

The French Foreign Ministry issued an unusual statement Jan. 24, disassociating the Soviet government from a slanderous attack on French government leaders which appeared in the most recent issue of the Soviet foreign policy weekly *New Times*.

*New Times* had attacked French President Giscard d'Estaing as "Atlanticist" and accused him of pursuing a "de facto alliance" with China. The magazine denounced the new French Foreign Minister Jean François-Ponçet for his ties to the French steel industry, which in turn is connected to the German steel barons. The Franco-German cooperation which François-Ponçet personifies, said *New Times*, represents a "slide toward Atlanticism."

According to the French Foreign Ministry statement, "the views expressed in the *New Times* article do not represent the views of the Soviet government to our knowledge."

As an indication of the real progress in Franco-Soviet relations, the weekly *VSD* reported that when President Giscard goes to Moscow this spring, the Soviets will offer to accredit France as an observer to the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA), the socialist countries' economic alliance.

## And in the Soviet press

### 'Unrealizable hopes'

*Coverage of the European Monetary System in the Jan. 3 Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta reveals columnist V. Gorskii's British-burdened view of the new economic system.*

... Attempts to revive the process of monetary integration by creating the so-called European Monetary System (EMS), in particular, have the goal of counteracting the weakening of economic ties among the members of the grouping, manifested, for example, in the slow-down in the growth rate of trade within the Common Market. However, the creation of such a system does not rely on the corresponding economic base, and the organizers of the EMS, who "put the monetary cart before the economic horse," as the *Financial Times* wrote, were punished with the following: a sharp outbreak of contradictions between France and the Federal Republic of Germany prevented introduction of the system, which had been planned for Jan. 1, 1979. . . .

### 'For an Independent Policy'

*The Soviet Communist Party paper Pravda printed an analysis, quoted here, by F. Arsenyev Jan. 16 which conveys his suspicion that "Atlanticism" controls France's economic initiatives.*

... Even among ruling circles of the country (France—ed.) doubt is being expressed about the consequences for France and its national independence of continuing the course of further integration within the "Common Market." Disagreements are increasing on this question within the government coalition.

Thus, the leaders of the centrist grouping (Lecanuet, Ponia-towski, and others) have long advocated extensive integration, even up to the creation of "supranational organs" and "joint" foreign policy. The Atlanticist circles too are pushing France in this direction. . . .

The Rassemblement Pour la Republique (RPR) takes a dif-

ferent position. The Gaullists have for a long time attempted to preserve their special positions on some questions of government policy. Giving the government their support and speaking essentially jointly with the other parties of the ruling coalition, they at the same time are not infrequently critical of concessions to the advocates of "supranational organs" and Atlanticism. Literally the day after the Brussels meeting of the heads of state and government of the EEC countries in December 1978, at which the resolution creating the "European Monetary System" was adopted, the chairman of the RPR, J. Chirac, addressed the members of his party and the public of the country. He was very critical in his evaluation of the government policy on "European construction" and spoke in favor of defending the independence of the country, calling the advocates of integration "foreign parties," who are trying to weaken the role of France in international affairs. . . .

### 'Science Serves Peace'

*The Soviet government newspaper Izvestia, excerpted here, set the course of internal debate on the EMS toward the purpose of international detente in their Jan. 18 publication.*

... The experience of scientific-technical cooperation of the USSR with capitalist countries shows that this cooperation develops more actively and more fruitfully where favorable political conditions for this exist. The development of Soviet-French scientific-technical and economic cooperation could be mentioned as a positive example in this regard. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, in his speech to the XVI Congress of the Trade Unions of the USSR, called our country and France "the pioneers of detente." As experience shows, the deepening of Soviet-French cooperation in the areas of science, technology and economics is linked in the closest manner with the development of political relations between the two countries. Soviet and French scientists cooperate on a broad scale in various divisions of basic and applied science. . . .