

## SOVIET SECTOR

# Soviets Denounce Committee on Present Danger, Limited Nuclear War

Nov. 19 (NSIPS) — Sharp warnings from the Soviet press this week targeted Jimmy Carter's backers in the Committee on the Present Danger, reiterating the Soviet strategic position: if the Carter maniacs have their way, there will be thermonuclear war. *International Life*, the Soviet foreign policy journal, identifies U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Ray Cline and Joseph Sisco as backers of the insane "limited war" doctrine which could easily trigger World War III. The article pointedly reiterates the World War II lesson, which has now been incorporated in Soviet strategic doctrine: that a preemptive strike against the Nazis (as proposed by Marshal Tukhachevskii then) would have prevented "world conflagration" at that time.

### *Izvestia:*

#### Committee on Present Danger Poses "A Very Real Danger"

Nov. 18 — Following is a translation of an article on the Committee on the Present Danger which appeared in the Soviet government daily *Izvestia*, Nov. 14. The article was written by Melor Sturua, and titled "A Committee of 'Hawks.'"

In Washington, the creation — on a, so-to-speak, public basis — has been announced of an organization with the somewhat dramatic name of "The Committee on the Present Danger." What danger? Unemployment, inflation, the growth of crime, pollution? Not at all. In reporting the birth of this committee, the *Washington Post* writes that it "will oppose president-elect Jimmy Carter and anyone else, who tries to reduce the American military budget for next year."

And so, it would be more appropriate to call the newborn the

"Committee on the Present Danger to Pentagon Appetites."

The godfathers of the newborn are well suited to their role. Henry Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations was chosen chairman. He is a man who normally used to shell out the money of Americans on orders from generals. Among the members of the committee are the industrial magnate David Packard, who was Assistant Secretary of Defense from 1969 to 1971, and still another former vice-chief of the Pentagon, Paul Nitze. With them in the leadership of the committee are a few more "formers" — former Secretary of State Dean Rusk and his former deputy Eugene Rostow, whose names are eternally linked to the American aggression in Vietnam. The idea of creating the committee was given by yet another "former" — former Secretary of Defense in the Republican Administration, James Schlesinger.

In short, this is not a committee, but a flock of hawks. With a hawkish screech, these people of yesterday do not only evoke the gloomy spectre of the past, but try to darken the prospects of a peaceful future. Under the fanfare of provocational proclamations about "Soviet expansionism," they are engaged in cynical lobbying for the Pentagon and the military-industrial complex. Brought forward from oblivion, or more accurately from the ice of the Cold War, they intend to freeze up international relations again.

Eugene Rostow announced that the committee already possesses substantial means — and in this there could be little doubt — and it will operate tax free. An irony of fate: after all, the committee's activities will help increase the already heavy tax burden dumped onto Americans because of escalation of the arms race.

Although this society of "formers" has just been created, it occurs to us that the need is already ripe for another committee — a committee to fight the danger issuing from the "Committee on the Present Danger." A very real danger, unfortunately.

### *International Life:*

#### "Military Hotspots - A Threat to the General Peace"

Nov. 18 — In their November issue, the editors of the Soviet foreign policy monthly *International Life* recommended the article excerpted below to their readers for use in theoretical seminars and other educational work in the Soviet Communist Party. The author is A. Voronov.

...Not infrequently leading figures of the Western powers even try to lay down conditions, prerequisites to the weakening of tensions, to the continuation of detente and the solution of urgent international problems — that the socialist states should renounce support for the struggle of peoples for their vital

rights, freedom and independence. U.S. Secretary of State H. Kissinger for example, speaking in July before the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, declared: "We cannot agree with demands for restraint in the approach to strategic armaments or reduction of armed forces and weapons in Central Europe, and at the same time the aggravation of tensions in other regions of the globe in the name of national liberation or proletarian internationalism."

However the real state of affairs in the world shows that the reasons for the aggravation of tensions in various regions is not at all what bourgeois propaganda and certain official figures of the Western powers try to indicate.... In other words, armed international conflicts are not caused by the actions of the liberation forces and those who come to their aid, but by the struggle of reactionary imperialist circles, their striving — in one way or another, directly or indirectly, using their own forces or various henchmen and puppets — to perpetuate their rule and privilege, the spheres of their influence, and the possibility of exploiting other peoples and their natural resources.

However it is perfectly obvious that it has now become significantly more difficult for them to carry out such policies. The time has passed when imperialist powers could make short work of weaker peoples unobstructed,...

The history of the pre-war period graphically demonstrated how the unhindered development and growth of aggression by the fascist states ended up in a world conflagration. The aggressive policy of the fascist states was not blocked from the very beginning, when it would have been much easier to do so than later, when the aggressor had become sure of his strength, had accumulated enormous military potential and was acting more and more brazenly....

Today there is an ever greater understanding in the world that war, the use of armed force, must not be the means for solving urgent international problems. The unprecedented destructive might of modern nuclear weapons indisputably exerts its influence on the political and strategic thought of leading figures of the imperialist powers, and forces them to take into account the possibilities of catastrophic consequences to which the use of military force against the socialist countries would lead under present circumstances.

However, militaristic circles in the West are continuing to work out doctrines and conceptions justifying the unleashing of local wars and conflicts. The preachers of such doctrines believe that under conditions of an equilibrium of the strategic nuclear forces of the leading states of the two opposing systems — or, as they express it, the "nuclear deadlock" — it is fully permissible to resort to military pressure in order to achieve various political goals, especially "on the periphery" of the region where the forces of NATO and the Warsaw Pact are directly counterposed.

Certain bourgeois military men and politicians believe that the use of conventional weapons in local wars is acceptable, under the cover of a "shield" of strategic nuclear weapons. Among them there are also those who assume the possibility of conducting limited wars with tactical nuclear weapons....

It is not difficult to see that in the new international situation, the authors of such conceptions continue to think in outdated categories of imperialist policies and to put their stake primarily on military force for the solution of international problems. For example, deputy U.S. Secretary of State J. Sisco, speaking in April before the Subcommittee on Political and Military Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives' Com-

mittee on International Relations, stated that "military might is the basis of the achievement of the goals of our foreign policy." He asserted that the USA must have, apart from strategic forces, "sufficient" armed forces which could be used in local conflicts. He particularly stressed the importance of military presence of the USA in Asia and other "troubled" regions.

In this connection, the position of several critics of detente is extremely characteristic — those who contend that hurtling into world thermonuclear war must not at all necessarily be the alternative to the weakening of international tensions. As the American professor Z. Brzezinski asserts, for example, "the alternative to the policy of detente is not war, but a whole range of intermediate conditions. When there was no detente, there was also no war."

There were wars, of course. After the Second World War many local armed conflicts were unleashed by the aggressive forces. However, such conflicts are not taken into consideration in this case, since it is only world thermonuclear war that is at issue, and the fact that it has not occurred in the past, under conditions of sharp confrontation of the states of the two systems and of international tension, is put forward as a guarantee that it will not occur in the future.

Ray Cline, the director of one of the sections of the Center for Strategic and International Studies of Georgetown University, holds an analogous point of view. Criticizing those who say that today there is no rational alternative to detente, he states: "There is an alternative, and this is precisely what we are concerned with — it is the continuing...serious conflict of political and economic might."

Stating that there supposedly exists some kind of "Soviet challenge," Ray Cline calls upon the government of the USA to counteract this "challenge" "in the strategic regions of the greatest significance for the USA, on any level, according to need — from diplomacy, political advice to our allies and economic aid to them — to guarantees of security and deployment abroad of our armed forces, for the defense of any threatened territories or regimes."

If you consider that the indicated "strategic regions" encompass just about the whole world, and "threatened regimes" can be, let us say, the likes of the racist regime of Vorster in South Africa, then what you have is a program of global imperialist intervention in the affairs of other countries and peoples, carrying out the function of "world gendarme" in the defense of reactionary forces and maintaining the "strategic interests" of the USA....

Under modern conditions, any local conflict — the more so if imperialist powers try to intervene in it — represents a threat to the general peace, can expand, go beyond its original bounds and envelope many states and regions. Calculations that the nuclear parity of the great powers supposedly "neutralizes" this threat are absolutely untenable. On the contrary, the existence of nuclear-missile weapons, the enormous, growing military might of the leading states of the two opposing systems, just increases and aggravates that threat, gives it an especially dangerous character. Only completely irresponsible people can suggest that despite the various military hot-spots, local conflicts, and wars that have arisen and continue to exist, it has been possible to escape nuclear catastrophe.

Disregarding this threat in the age of nuclear-missile weapons would be too disastrous in its consequences: to ignore it would truly mean to play with fire. This is precisely why it is so important to extinguish the slightest spark which could lead to world conflagration....