

Czechs Attack 'Carter Doctrine' Of Blackmail And Subversion

Zbigniew Brzezinski, chief of the U.S. National Security Council and Jimmy Carter are using a combination of "military blackmail and long-term subversion" against the socialist states, charges the Czechoslovak daily Rude Pravo in the article printed below. "The Carter Doctrine," the article declares, is identical to the Truman Doctrine of "rolling back socialism."

Two Doctrines, One Goal — Yesterday Truman, Today Carter

The United States supposedly has a new political doctrine. This has been announced by the Western press, which describes the American President's attitude on the question of human rights as the "Carter Doctrine." This is not the first doctrine announced by Washington, and it probably will not be the last....

As is well known, President Carter is big on tradition. He says he is proud to be a part of it. Even before he entered the White House, he claimed that the United States' tradition of world leadership was preordained. In order to have strength for this task, he said, "it is time to undertake a new creative initiative in foreign policy, just as we did years ago following the Second World War." And as his model, he described the policy pursued by a "courageous President," by which he obviously meant Truman.

The fact that he harkens back to this tradition necessarily brings up the question of whether this "Carter Doctrine" is supposed to be another version of the Truman Doctrine, modified for present conditions....

When Truman announced it in March 1947, American propaganda told the world that "the USA must take over responsibility for the future of humanity." ... This was the signal for an anti-Communist crusade.... The Truman Doctrine later led to the strategic conception of "rollback," whose goal was "to force Communism back to its original borders," and "liberate" countries which had taken the socialist path after the Second World War. J.F. Dulles, who under Truman already exerted decisive influence on American foreign policy, had still more ambitious plans. "We must deal such powerful blows to Russia, that this centralized state disintegrates," he said in a speech in Detroit at the end of 1951.

By the first half of the 1950s, all the American imperialists' hopes ... of being able to implement an offensive strategy against the socialist countries "from a position of strength" had vanished.... And so, in the 1960s after the failure of every conceivable offense conception aimed at changing the borders of socialism, new conceptions began to take hold, directed toward an internal transformation of socialism's social and political system.

These are what produced the Carter Doctrine. The basic goal of the Truman Doctrine has remained unchanged; only the means of achieving them have changed. Nuclear blackmail has been replaced by ideological diversion, which is supposed to effect an internal transformation of the socialist countries into bourgeois states.

In the Pentagon in Washington and NATO's staff in Brussels, however, the strategy of intimidation with nuclear weapons has not been given up; but in Washington political circles it has been decided that the "inflexibility" of this strategy must be complemented with a more flexible political and ideological strategy. From this we can draw the logical conclusion: as imperialism's opportunities to conduct their battle against socialism with military means become more limited, the ideological confrontation becomes all the more pronounced.

Even before Henry Kissinger became Nixon's Secretary of State, he publicized the theory that "with regard to many not-too-stable countries, a radio station can be a more effective form of pressure than a squadron of B-52 strategic bombers." James Carter clearly is of the same opinion. This is demonstrated by his decision to significantly strengthen the network of American stations designed to "destabilize" socialist countries with their tendentious transmissions, and to double the funding for the Munich-based Radio Free Europe....

These goals were clearly formulated by Carter's closest advisor Z. Brzezinski as early as 1966, when he stated that the "East" must be opened up to "Western influences," so that "Soviet dominance of Eastern Europe becomes weakened," and that therefore the socialist countries must be "isolated" from each other. To achieve this, it is necessary to have a "free circulation of people and ideas," so as to be able to "politically influence the socialist countries." ... Just as Carter said during his election campaign that "Eastern Europe will never be a stable area until these countries achieve independence," his advisors had already described the nature of such "independence": "independence" from socialism, but dependence on capitalism.

Brzezinski, who hurried to Prague in June 1968 "in order to greet the process of renewal," learned one solitary lesson from the failure of this attempted counter-revolutionary subversion: it fails because people proceeded too quickly, and the leaders did not have sufficient patience....

This is the primary purpose of the support Washington is giving to various dissidents in the socialist countries. This is the actual content of the Carter Doctrine. So-called human rights are merely a transparent pretext.

The United States, however, has not been successful in its role as the world's policeman. The "world moralist" role which Carter wants to give the country is even less serviceable. He is not the first one to claim that "America's historic mission" entitles the United States to preach to the world. Over 50 years ago the following statement could be read in the American press:

"We are the world's greatest nation. Our government is the best.... As a population, we are the most intelligent, politically we are the most free, and socially the most progressive.... Our history is an epic of the triumph of

justice in this nation.... We have been called upon by God to use our example in order to purify and save the world."

If this reminds the reader of Carter's statements, he is mistaken. This is the statement of the Ku Klux Klan, printed in the American Journal of Sociology in January, 1925, and in truth the current President has nothing in common with this organization, except the invocation of the United States' "historic mission."

But one thing is beyond question: neither the past nor the present of the United States in fact gives its President the right to assume the role of "the world's moralist."

How Soviets Achieved A Fusion Sputnik:

'The Strategy Of Scientific Search'

The Soviet trade union daily Trud published the article, "The Strategy of Scientific Search," excerpted below, by Nobel laureate and leading fusion physicist Academician A.M. Prokhorov on April 28. The editors of Trud introduce Prokhorov as follows:

Leading Soviet physicist Aleksandr Mikhailovich Prokhorov is one of the originators of quantum electronics, for which he and Academician N.G. Basov were awarded the Lenin and Nobel prizes. Academician Prokhorov's path to science was not an easy one. He did not finish his graduate work at the P.N. Lebedev Physics Institute (FIAN), but went to the front (in World War II - ed.), where he was a scout. A.M. Prokhorov has remained a "scout" — in science. He created new types of lasers, which are used today in the most diverse fields: medicine, energy, metallurgy, chemistry.

Besides very intensive work at the FIAN, A.M. Prokhorov is an academician, secretary of the section of general physics and astronomy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, and the chief editor of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia.

Not infrequently a scientist, talking about his work, is asked: "But what does it do?" This question — and its forms are quite diverse — can be heard not only during popular scientific lectures, but also from representatives of industry and planning organizations, and its meaning is always the same: what practical use can be anticipated from a given scientific work?

This question is perfectly natural, since significant resources are expended for the development of scientific investigations. This, however, is often taken to mean that direct usefulness is practically the sole criterion of the value of any scientific research work.

Such an approach, of course, curtails the role of science in the development of human society. Of course research aimed at achieving important practical results should be recognized as timely, useful and worthy of support. But is the inverse also true? Does this mean that any research is useless if it does not bring a tangible practical result and if such a result is not even evident in the foreseeable future? . . .

Speaking of basic science, it should be recalled that

this is an inalienable component part of the scientific-technological revolution in our country. . . .

Acceleration of the development of atomic energy in our country is anticipated in accord with the resolutions of the XXV Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. . . . Where did this presently most important branch of the national economy have its beginning? Its inception was directly connected with research in nuclear physics conducted during the '30s of our century.

During the 1920s and 1930s various major scientific discoveries were made in this field, which fundamentally influenced our conception of the structure of matter. From the strictly practical point of view, the purely scientific results at that time were completely "useless." At the time, when discussions arose on the possibility of achieving nuclear energy, one noted scientist in the field of nuclear physics even stated: "The energy released from the splitting of the atom is exceedingly slight. Anyone who hopes that these transformations can become a source of energy is preaching nonsense." And only in 1939 did the possibility emerge of using the achievements of nuclear physics for the goal of energy production. . . .

There are two types of research work: basic and applied, and their effectiveness must be evaluated differently. Research is considered basic if it is directed towards elucidating the lawfulness existing in nature, and the main result here is new knowledge. And knowledge then is the foundation upon which are built both further scientific investigations and applied research, which has as its goal the use of known lawfulnesses in the practical activity of man. Therefore the criterion of practicality truly is the main one, but only in the evaluation of the results of applied research. In basic research however, strict planning is senseless, since the scientific discovery always appears unexpectedly, as a qualitative leap arising from the long accumulation of knowledge. And every discovery fundamentally affects not only the course of research work, but frequently also the activity of branches of industry.

The example of quantum electronics, which arose twenty years ago, is extremely instructive in this regard. Its genesis was preceded by basic research on the radio-spectroscopy of gases, which in turn was made possible