

While the “neo-liberals” orient to the West, the other “alternative tower,” to use the language of Prokhanov [a popular author on military themes], the “conservationists and traditionalists” strive “to overcome socialism by regression.” In other words, by reverting to the social forms of presocialist Russia. . . . In their opinion, the moral values accumulated by peasant communes in the misty fog of centuries, were lost 100 years ago. The “traditionalists” certainly deserve credit for what they have done in the exposure of corruption, . . . ecological problems, the struggle against alcoholism, the protection of historical monuments, and the opposition to dominance by mass culture, which they correctly evaluate as consumerist psychosis.

At the same time, the views of the ideologists of “peasant socialism” contain a lack of understanding of October’s historical importance for the fate of the fatherland, a one-sided assessment of collectivization as a “terrible atrocity against the peasantry,” an uncritical understanding of mystical religious Russian philosophy and the old czarist concepts in our historical science, and hesitation to recognize the post-Revolution split of the peasantry as well as the revolutionary role of the working class.

When it comes to the class struggle in the countryside [during collectivization], for example, excessive emphasis is often placed on the ‘rural’ commissars, who “shot the kulaks [middle peasants] in the back.” In our vast country, at the height of the revolutionary conflagration, there were, of course, commissars of every sort. The main path of our lives was, however, paved by those commissars who were shot at. . . . The “attacking class” to sacrifice not only the lives of commissars, Chekists, rural Bolsheviks and members of the Committees of Poor Peasantry, but also those of the first tractor drivers, rural correspondents, young women teachers, rural Komsomol members, and tens of thousands of other nameless fighters for socialism.

Behind Gorbachov’s back

A striking example of behind-the-scenes collusion by the military and the KGB at Gorbachov’s expense, is the story of Stefan **Mukha**. Until early 1987, when Gorbachov had him removed in disgrace, Mukha was the head of the KGB in the Ukraine. But he recently surfaced, with the rank of *Army Gen. Lt.* (two stars), as the chief political officer of the Turkestan Military District, which has headquarters in Tashkent and adjoins Afghanistan and Iran. The military not only got away with this maneuver, but Mukha’s superior, Gen. Col. Nikolai **Popov**, commander of the Turkestan MD, was promoted in early March to General of the Army (four stars).

Yakovlev’s ‘Russophobia’ attacked by chauvinists

by Luba George

On April 9-10, for the first time ever, Soviet television broadcast live sections of the Russian Orthodox Easter midnight Mass at the crowded Epiphany Cathedral. The broadcast included Moscow Patriarch Pimen’s Easter Message. The head of the Russian Orthodox Church hailed the upcoming June celebrations of the “Millennium of Russian Christianity,” and stressed that the jubilee is having a “large and positive influence on culture, morals, and family life” in the Soviet Union.

The Easter “kickoff” for the millennium celebrations also included an interview with Patriarch Pimen in the government newspaper, *Izvestia*. Pimen spoke of a “beneficial process of perestroika” affecting all institutions, including the Church. Signaling the rising power of the Church as an institution in the context of the current post-Gorbachov succession fight, Pimen, for the first time, used the interview to attack state “repression” against clergy and believers. The attack, and the fact that *Izvestia* printed it without comment, attest to the process of expanding Church influence in the new power constellation emerging in Russia.

This is a signal of what to expect from Pimen’s successor—a new *public* assertiveness from the Church hierarchy, absent during Soviet rule until now. The Patriarch has been the head of the Church in the Soviet Union since 1971; 78 years old and ailing, he will not remain much longer as Patriarch. In the Church, as in the Kremlin, a succession fight is under way.

At the end of March, religious dissident Father Gleb Yakunin and five other Orthodox activists—all of whom were permitted to return from forced exile in Siberia last year—accused Patriarch Pimen of senile incompetence and suggested he step down before the millennium. Their statement, released at a press conference in Moscow, read, “Your Holiness has been so weakened by your enemies that you are no longer in a fit condition to bear the burdens of Patriarchal office.” It was angrily rejected by Metropolitan Filaret of Kiev and Galich, often cited as a potential successor—very unlikely, since his surname is Ukrainian, Denisenko. “The rule in our church is that the Patriarch is elected for life. I see no grounds to introduce changes.” Other possible successors being mooted: Metropolitan Alexei of Leningrad, Metropolitan Pitirim of Volokolamsk, and Metropolitan Yuvenaly.

With the continuing calls for a “perestroika” in the Church, there is also the strong rumor that the state is planning to ease

the old Stalinist law of 1929, which nationalized all Church possessions and restricted the size of gatherings, the teaching of religion to children, the sale of religious material in book shops, etc. The change, establishing a kind of Church-State *concordat*, was originally set for the beginning of the year. The outbreak of the succession fight in the Soviet leadership has postponed this.

High-level resistance to the *concordat* has been launched by the section of the *Nomenklatura* that would be eliminated from power in the event of a post-Gorbachov "Russian Party" victory.

Nothing better illustrates the growth in power of the *Nomenklatura*'s Russian Party than the successes scored during the past year by the mass Russian chauvinist organizations, beginning with the notorious Pamyat Society. The success achieved by Pamyat and the 16.8-million-strong All-Russian Society for the Preservation of Historical and Cultural Monuments (VOOPIK)—about one person in ten in Moscow is said to belong to VOOPIK—has upset some Kremlin leaders.

Contrary to what many in the West would expect, the most angry response to the new assertiveness of the Church came, not from "ideological hardliners," but from Gorbachov's right-hand man, Politburo member Alexander Yakovlev, one of the architects of *glasnost*.

The Jan. 2 *Economist* of London reported that Yakovlev had recently replied to allegations of leadership indifference toward widespread destruction of historical and religious monuments, especially churches, with the assertion that the Communist Party had no intention of supporting "religiousness," and rejected the "single stream" (*yediny potok*) school of thought, which sees the Bolshevik Revolution as an "organic" continuation of Russian history. He said, "All attempts to depict [Byzantine] Christianity as the 'mother' of Russian culture must be categorically rejected. If medieval Russia merits the attention of historians, it is in no way because of the millennium of the Orthodox faith."

For his views, Yakovlev has become the principal target in the Politburo of Pamyat and other Russian chauvinist groups. Pamyat has never forgiven Yakovlev for his 1972 article, "Against historicism," in *Literaturnaya Gazeta* (No. 46) assailing "Russophile tendencies" in culture, journalism, and history. On Dec. 8, 1987, the Pamyat Society issued an "Appeal" in which it again accused Yakovlev of being a "Russophobe." The document strongly suggested that he step down as Central Committee secretary in charge of the propaganda apparatus. The Pamyat document added what in retrospect echoes the line taken in the March 13 *Sovetskaya Rossiya* "Manifesto." "The press, radio, and television continue to propagate cosmopolitanism and idolization of the West, to the exclusion of national and folk elements."

According to well-informed sources, the April 5 *Pravda* piece that attacked the *Sovetskaya Rossiya* "Manifesto," bore the imprint of Yakovlev.

France

The troubling drift Mitterrand and his

by Jacques Cheminade

The author is general secretary of the Parti Ouvrier Européen (European Labor Party) of France. In this writing, he comments on the draft presidential platform of François Mitterrand, the Socialist incumbent who is bidding for a second seven-year term as President of France. The first round of the presidential election takes place on April 24. The final run-off between the two candidates who receive the highest number of votes, will take place on May 8. Another candidate, Raymond Barre, was profiled in EIR's March 25, 1988 issue.

The rejection of the most advanced weapons of our era: In his presidential platform proposal, François Mitterrand offers disturbing pledges to the partisans of a New Yalta deal with Moscow.

His Socialist Party friends, meanwhile, are letting it be known that they will "economize on military spending." They will do this 1) by abolishing the Hades program (which foresees, by 1992, the creation of a large autonomous unit made up of 45 launchers of two missiles apiece, fitted with "neutron bombs" and with a range just under 500 km), and 2) by throwing onto the same scrapheap the "pre-strategic" Medium-Range Ground-Air Missiles (ASMP), which are supposed to be put onto part of the 38 Super-Etendard fighter-bombers which are in service in the Air Force of France.

This may make it clearer why the French Communist Party is putting out the word that it will tell its members to vote for Mitterrand in the second round of the presidential elections, after voting for the Communist candidate in the first round.

Good news in the Kremlin

In the French President's reelection platform, three things are likely to bring great satisfaction to the Kremlin:

1) Mitterrand congratulates himself for having torpedoed, in 1986, France's adherence to the Strategic Defense Initiative of President Reagan, and blames the SDI for "carrying the arms race into space." This is the opposite of the truth, since not only is space already militarized by missiles, strategic and otherwise, but anti-missile weapons in general, and laser and particle-beam weapons in particular, are "de-