

Eastern Europe Hard - Liners Push T - Ruble, Warn Brezhnev On Phony Detente

The same factions in the leadership of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union who this week substantially increased their negotiations with Western Europe and the Third World for a new world economic order have now come out with open attacks on Jimmy Carter. They are vehemently rejecting the policy — associated with Soviet General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev — of appeasing Carter in hopes of averting or at least delaying war. Recent issues of the Czechoslovak daily *Rude Pravo* dramatize the intersection of these two policy debates: in the first public ministerial level statement from the comecon sector on international use of the transfer ruble, Czechoslovak Deputy Finance Minister Mirko Svoboda called for expanded use of the transfer ruble, particularly with the Third World, in an article Feb. 21. *Rude Pravo* also attacked Carter for following a “new provocative doctrine” towards the socialist countries and seeking to “erase the signature of President Ford” from the Helsinki document on security and cooperation.

If an “appeasement” policy is followed instead, the war danger will increase, warned articles in the press of especially the German Democratic Republic (DDR). An article in the current issue of the theoretical journal *Einheit* by Peter Alfons Steiniger, of the World Peace Council, cautioned the Oblomov faction in the Kremlin not to be taken in by Jimmy Carter’s honeyed words and verbal promises of disarmament. “There are infallible distinctive marks to tell whether a government is only talking about peace in order to camouflage its war preparations, or if its stance for a lasting peace is meant seriously.” The litmus test, says *Einheit*, is “above all the longterm investment in the expansion of a peace-time economy and the initiation of longterm scientific research for the satisfaction of the material and cultural needs of the population.”

Leading DDR writers advocate a new gold-backed monetary system as the way to achieve this kind of real international economic expansion. The latest issue of the economic monthly *IPW* wrote that only a gold standard is a true reflection of the real economic basis of capitalist credit. The article, which is part of an on-going series devoted to monetary questions, analyzed the fundamental factional division in the West between finance capital and those industrially-based capitalists who oppose monetarist policies — and who should thus be supported by the socialist countries. Finance capital, with its “fictitious money,” constantly undermines the economy’s basis in real production, said *IPW*. Thus the U.S. dollar in the post war period — like Hitler’s “Mefo-Bills” — weakened the capitalist economic system itself. Fictitious capital mushroomed, augmenting the political power of

the financiers, who then “dictated their will” to the rest of the capitalist class, forcing the system to operate within their own limited interests.

Carter Under Fire

Einheit also ripped the Carter-Brzezinski campaign for “erosion” of Eastern Europe through activation of “disident” agents and Carter’s “human rights” operation. *Einheit* quoted last year’s Bucharest Declaration of the Warsaw Pact: “where subversion begins, peaceful coexistence ends.... Attempts at interference (in the internal affairs of the socialist countries — ed.) endanger understanding in those areas where understanding is possible and necessary, in the interests of living and future generations.” The article showed how National Security Council head Zbigniew Brzezinski’s policy increases the danger of war: “all imperialist deformations of peaceful coexistence, whether openly or covertly, serve the confrontation policy of militant anticommunism.... Today it is clear: militant anti-communism is playing with the fire of a third World War, a nuclear war.”

Pravda, by contrast has tended to give Carter the benefit of the doubt, especially as concerns the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT II) — even going so far as to depict Brzezinski as favorable to a SALT agreement, and Institute for Policy Studies agent Richard Barnet as a friend of détente. But following Carter’s announcement of his new military budget this week, Soviet Defense Minister D.F. Ustinov attacked it as “higher than ever before,” and even *Pravda* took a critical tone, reporting that Carter has reneged on his election promises, succumbing to pressure from the “military-industrial complex and right-wing militaristic circles.” Such budget cuts as were made, *Pravda* reported Feb. 22, were limited to a few controversial strategic armaments programs like the “M-X” ballistic missile.

A Fight in the Military

The “Clausewitzians” in the Soviet military are a principal source of opposition to the “appeasement” line associated with General Secretary Brezhnev. Fully aware that Carter’s “disarmament” is a fraud aimed to blunt Soviet moves for a new world economic order and to restrict Soviet military R and D advances, they are stressing in their public statements that Warsaw Pact military might is the precondition for an effective peace policy. The Soviet Communist Party machine has been fully mobilized over the recent period to keep in check the opposition to Brezhnev’s policies that has surfaced within the armed forces. As in past periods of crisis — like the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 — Party spokesmen in the military have set out on a vigorous campaign on

the need for strict Party control over the military and over strategic policy decisions. Contrasting articles by Marshal D.F. Ustinov, the Soviet Defense Minister, and Marshal V.G. Kulikov, Commander-in-Chief of the Warsaw Pact, on the occasion of Soviet Armed Forces Day Feb. 23, reveal the ongoing struggle over policy towards Carter. Ustinov, writing in *Pravda* on behalf of the hitherto dominant Party line, praised Brezhnev personally, and quoted the Party chief that the USSR is not striving for strategic superiority, and has no intention of "raising the sword" against anybody, of launching "either a first or a second strike," since the Soviet Union is committed to putting an end to nuclear war in general. Any step that might be taken to strengthen the defense of the state, Ustinov cautioned, must be determined by "the Party leadership, its Leninist Central Committee... and the remarkable party, state and military figure, Marshal of the Soviet Union, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev."

Kulikov's emphasis was quite different. Writing in the government daily *Izvestia*, he related the history of Soviet military doctrine (the Theory of the Offensive, developed principally by Marshall Tukhachevski before World War II and elaborated further after the war as a commitment to a war-winning nuclear strategy —ed.) calling it a "progressive, advanced doctrine directed against predatory and unjust wars." He stressed the Communist Party's "concern" for the development of the country's military forces, which it has equipped with "modern military technology and terrible weapons." The Party, he wrote, created the preconditions for victory over the aggressors in past wars, and the "retaliatory strikes" delivered by the Red Army to Hitler

"made apparent the high military art of the generals of the Soviet Army..." When Kulikov chose to quote Brezhnev, it was a distinctly "hard-line Brezhnev," emphasizing that the Party before World War II "foresaw the possibility of a military clash with the forces of imperialism and prepared the country and people for the defense."

Carter Turns Back on Helsinki

The following is a translation of a Feb. 23 article in Rude Pravo entitled "Against the History of Helsinki:"

In his first press conference after taking office, President Carter declared that the U.S. cannot use military force to change the internal mechanism of the Soviet state... It does not take great political experience to see that the Soviet Union is not the Dominican Republic or some other Central American republic which American marines can bloodily pacify...

President Carter now has sent a personal letter to the disloyal Sakharov, expressing his "sympathies" for this anti-Soviet element. Carter very cynically refers in his letter to some supposed right of his to act as "world defender of human rights."

We are the direct witnesses of a public attempt by the American government to institute a new tactic in international relations — the tactic of gross interference in the internal affairs of the socialist countries... Does this mean that the new President of the United States is striking the signature of his predecessor from the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe?....

A Litmus Test

The following are excerpts from an article in the February issue of Einheit entitled "Socialism-Nation and Bastion of Peace":

...Wherever there is subversion, peaceful coexistence ceases to exist. Attempts at interventionism endanger co-existence in those spheres in which there is a potential for peace, and where it is necessary for present and future generations. Let us simply consider the possibilities offered by the scientific-technical revolution — to investigate new sources of energy, to research the universe and the world's oceans, to master modern communications problems and to protect the environment.

...In the past, Ernst Thaelmann once warned: Hitler means war. Today it is demonstrated that militant anti-communism plays with the fire of the third world war, of a nuclear war whose prevention is the major task of our times. Just this point was emphasized by Leonid Illich Brezhnev in an interview with an American journalist in December 1976. No reasonable human being in the world can contradict this as our primary goal.

...There are infallible litmus tests to determine whether a government is only talking about peace in order to camouflage its preparations for war, or whether it is actually seriously intervening for a lasting peace. One such test for example is its rea-

diness to rapidly and mutually reduce its troops and arms on the foundation of undiminished security for all participant nations in the agreement (which is the proposal of the socialist states at the Vienna disarmament negotiations); or whether it is ready to ban first-strike use of nuclear weapons (the proposal of the Warsaw Pact Treaty nations to the signatory states of the Helsinki Accords); or to enter into an obligation to refrain from the use of armed forces, 'applying all forms of weapons, including nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction on the land, sea, in the air or outer space' (proposals for a world treaty on banning use of or threatened use of violence in international relations, presented to the XXXI Congress of the U.N. General Assembly by the USSR at the end of September).

...One clear litmus test for a nation's actual orientation towards lasting peace is above all the provision of long-term investments for the expansion of the non-military economy and the assumption of long-term scientific research tasks for the satisfaction of material and cultural needs of the population. A look at the Comecon plans and the coordinated plans of the member nations provides clear evidence of the will for peace of the Soviet Union and its allies.