

EIRSpecialReport

Moscow faction fight: the stakes for the West

by Rachel Douglas

The 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which opens Feb. 23 in the Kremlin, will be a high point in Soviet politics—as vital to the rest of the world as is the makeup of the incoming Reagan administration.

At stake at the 26th Congress is the Soviet leadership succession. And not since 1952 have the “transition” points for each superpower fallen so close together.

The brawl over Soviet foreign policy, especially, is becoming more intense as the 26th Congress approaches. Officially, the congress has to vote up the 1981-1985 Five Year Plan and set foreign policy guidelines for the half-decade ahead. Both areas are already loaded with contending policy lines. Then the congress will elect the Central Committee of the party, the group of about 275 party apparat officials, government ministers, military officers, regional party leaders, and other party notables who comprise this keystone of Communist Party rule. From its membership, the Central Committee will re-elect its Politburo or elect a new one.

Because 11 of the current Politburo's 14 members are more than 65 years old, this year's promotions in the Central Committee—which regional party officials assume national responsibilities and which government and military men rise or fall a notch—determine who will be running the Soviet Union for the rest of this century.

The destabilization faction

If the powerful machine backing destabilization of the Third World and confrontation with the West prevails in Moscow, the path to a peaceful future without nuclear war will be very difficult to find. The alternative choice for the congress is a strengthening of the Soviet policy of “war avoidance,” which has emerged concretely in such initiatives of Soviet President and party General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev as his 1978 economics-centered 25-year cooperation treaty with West Germany or his current idea of a Persian Gulf security arrangement, tentatively greeted by several



Alain Noguez/Sigma

Arab states as an alternative to the explosion of more hostilities in the Middle East.

The evil that will come of victories by the Soviet "destabilization" faction is enormous. It should also be very recognizable to Western eyes, because this faction is not essentially a Russian or a communist phenomenon. There exists in the Soviet Union a network of people who have an *oligarchical* outlook on the world. They think in the terms of geopolitics invented by the mentors of Haushofer, the agent of the European and British oligarchies who wrote Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. To them, it is perfectly acceptable for Soviet actions to result in the death of millions of people in Africa or Latin America, if this serves their geopolitical aims.

These networks are the inside flank of an operation that spans the entire 60 years of Soviet history *and* reaches back into the Czarist period: the operation of British and continental European oligarchies to sabotage the development of Russia as an industrial republic. Today's agents of this international faction descend directly from the anglophile enemies of Russia's 19th-century industrializer Count Sergei Witte and from the Bolshevik circles around British agent Nikolai Bukharin. Bukharin tried to stop Lenin and Stalin from carrying out what he called the "monstrous" industrialization of Soviet Russia. From this heritage, the Russian agents of this international "dark ages" faction take the name "Bukharinites."

They are international networks, coextensive with the controllers of environmentalism and terrorism deployed

against leaders of state and industry in the West. In the U.S.S.R. they are coordinated by individuals like Anglo-Russian triple agent Kim Philby, the famous "defector" from British intelligence who is now a general in the KGB security organization. Their influence is dangerously amplified by those Soviet officials from bastions of power like the military who, especially in the face of confrontationist policies from the United States, get sold on the oligarchical perspective for revolutionary destabilizations, even if such officials started out simply as Soviet patriots.

The chief institutions that are instruments of the destabilization faction's power are:

The International Department of the Central Committee maintains Soviet ties to foreign communists and other "nonruling" parties and fronts, ranging from the British Labour Party to the Palestine Liberation Organization. It descends from the Communist International, or "Comintern," organization; its current chief, Central Committee Secretary Boris Ponomarev, worked on the Comintern staff from 1936 until the organization was disbanded in 1943. From its 1920s sabotage of Lenin's state-to-state foreign policy endeavors, when Nikolai Bukharin was a top Comintern executive, down to the present day, this "Communist Party" track of Soviet foreign policy has often run counter to Soviet state initiatives. Yet it is retained by the Politburo, including Brezhnev, as a historically legitimate element of Soviet power. Furthermore, the International Department's closest patron on the Politburo is the powerful Central

Committee Secretary Mikhail Suslov, without whose machinations Brezhnev himself might never have come to power.

Boris Ponomarev is the most prominent Soviet retailer of the line that, under capitalism in the West, environmentalism is “progressive” and revolutionary.

The KGB, especially its overseas sections, runs Soviet collaboration with Western terror and destabilization teams directed by other agencies of the oligarchies. KGB General Kim Philby, whose father St.-John Philby was one of British intelligence’s biggest field agents in the Middle East in the first half of the 20th century, directs KGB Middle East activities that reinforce the Islamic fundamentalist destabilization of the area.

The think tanks begin with the Institute of the World Economy and International Relations, or IMEMO. This is where British intelligence agent Donald Maclean, Kim Philby’s colleague, works on shaping Soviet perceptions of Europe. IMEMO preaches that unless it becomes socialist, the developing sector would be better off without foreign capital inputs at all.

IMEMO was founded after a 1956 directive from Anastas Mikoyan, an Armenian Bolshevik and Soviet Politburo member whose son today runs the IMEMO spinoff Institute on Latin America. Mikoyan drew on the cadre trained by Hungarian communist Eugen Varga, an adherent of the British school in communist economics, the school of Bukharin.

The think tanks advise the Central Committee and the Politburo; two top think-tankers, IMEMO Director N. Inozemtsev and the U.S.A.-Canada Institute’s Georgii Arbatov, are alternate members of the Central Committee. But the Politburo is still dominated by the associates of Brezhnev. Five Politburo members, including Prime Minister Nikolai Tikhonov and party Secretaries Andrei Kirilenko and Konstantin Chernenko, came up through the ranks from the same Dnepr River steel towns in the southern Ukraine where Brezhnev managed industrial reconstruction after World War II.

The war-avoidance efforts of the Soviet Union stem from the world outlook of these men. They are “production men,” whose careers hinged on building up the Soviet economy after the devastation of the war. Engineers by training, not diplomats, their striving to maintain the security of the U.S.S.R. as an industrial nation has created an impulse in Soviet foreign policy away from the “revolution” or destabilization designs of the Bukharinite faction.

Brezhnev’s 1978 diplomacy with Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany, for instance, was effective because Brezhnev took with him to Bonn a “builder’s” identity and communicated it to the German population by television, with a speech almost entirely about the hopeful prospects opened by the industrial development

of Siberia. On the basis of the 1978 treaty he signed with Schmidt, Brezhnev continued to carry on a war-avoidance dialogue with Schmidt and with French President Valéry Giscard d’Estaing throughout the precarious years of the Carter administration.

In this same period, the creation of a new “International Information Department” of the Central Committee, staffed by people who had done the legwork of Brezhnev’s war-avoidance diplomacy, served to institutionalize this tendency in Soviet foreign policy.

A major weakness of Brezhnev’s foreign policy is that, despite his overriding of the Philbys and Ponomarevs on specific issues, the institutional power centers of the Bukharinite faction have never been challenged. They are in a position to launch wrecking operations through KGB and International Department channels and, when the time comes, to present Brezhnev’s successor with all kinds of faits accomplis even if they do not seize the top party post directly.

Why the five-year plan is crucial

Because the Brezhnev group’s best contributions to international stability stem from a “builder’s” identity, the debate over economic policy at the party congress will be just as critical for Soviet world conduct as are the foreign policy decisions themselves.

In the face of slowing growth rates and the food shortage aspect of the crisis in Poland, the new five-year plan has already been redrafted to favor the consumer sector. This Polish shift provides an opening for several oligarchist projects directed against the Soviet Union’s own industry: the downgrading of heavy industry, “market economy” reforms, and even the creation of an environmentalist movement inside the U.S.S.R. This direction could not be followed through without a tremendous fight against the science, heavy industry, and military leadership of the Soviet Union, a fight that will unfold around the congress and in the following months.

If the anti-industry Bukharinites were to prevail in economic policy, the Brezhnev machine would lose its base and its basis for conducting war-avoidance policies. The profile of British agent Nikolai Bukharin—“radical” on foreign policy and “soft” on industry—would be complete.

It is in the vital interest of every nation to prevent that or any approximation of it from happening behind closed doors in Moscow. The most potent antidote would be the creation and protection of healthy, sovereign industrial republics in the West and the Third World—which could pull the rug out from under the Soviet destabilization faction’s claim that confrontation with the West is inevitable because the West is collapsing.