Open The Arbatov File

The War Of Ideas In Contemporary International Relations
by Georgii Arbatov
Theories And Critical Studies Series
Progress Publishers, Moscow 1973 English Language edition
317 pages, hard-cover

Mr. Georgii Arbatov is an "agent of influence," a species in the intelligence profession quite distinct from the espionage agent who, in the present world exists mainly in the popular imagination. However, when an investigative authority undertakes to look into the record of an "agent of influence", it is advisable to follow procedures applied in the past in investigations of simple espionage agents.

In both cases, the most crucial piece of juridical evidence is located in what the agent's activities and statements (including signed confessions) systematically *conceal.* We apply this method to Georgii Arbatov's special propagandistic and analytical activities as an "agent of influence" to demonstrate that he is engaged in such a systematic concealment of a crucial fact: that the synthetic "New Left" of the 1960s and early 1970s is the systematically controlled product of the Rockefeller-led financier faction of lower Manhattan.

Once we have demonstrated that, then the reader (or the appropriate investigative authority applying the procedure we recommend) is advised to regard the remainder of Mr. Arbatov's writings, analyses and propagandistic contributions either as fulfillment of his agent-assignment or as a classic "cover story."

The particular case to which we apply this procedure is, properly, Mr. Arbatov's major book, *The War of Ideas in Contemporary International Relations,* specifically its 1973 English language edition which, we are told, follows the autumn 1970 Russian language edition with only minor alterations.

"The War Of Ideas In Contemporary International Relations"

Mr. Arbatov's book is the product of unmistakable erudition. It is also very carefully stage-managed. It purports to give the reader, in its four, well-arranged sections, a systematic acquaintance with the institutions, agencies and methods of imperialist psychological warfare practices. However, Mr. Arbatov makes one crucial mistake: he focuses with obsessive exclusivity on the only one flank of imperialist propaganda deployments, the so-called "right wing." There is a fine irony in the way in which Mr. Arbatov discusses such well known "right-wing" outlets as the Hoover Institute, the Foreign Policy Research Institute of Pennsylvania State University, the CSIS at Georgetown, the Research Institute on Communist Affairs at Columbia, Harvard's Russian Research Center, the Hudson Institute, etc. This fine irony is his admitted competence and depth of knowledge, which is also one of the grounds for his indictment.

Thus once Mr. Arbatov's expertise on United States affairs is established, it is no longer possible for him to credibly plead ignorance when he is called to account to explain the most important portion of his book, namely its *omissions.* And what he omits is that flank of imperialist psychological warfare deployments of most interest and concern for Soviet statesmen, namely the "Left wing" and "liberal" flank of subversive imperialist propaganda.

The book does not contain one single solitary word on the Institute for Policy Studies, the Brookings Institution, the Fabian Society and their associated agencies. McGeorge Bundy's Ford Foundation itself is given a world of commendation for being a "realistic force" eager to facilitate the "people's" revolutionary impulses. This systematic omission by Arbatov is crucial.

As everybody knows, the Institute for Policy Studies was established by John F. Kennedy's National Security Council. Its main assignment was to control and coordinate a wide array of pseudo-organizations, from the Weathermen, the October League and the various little "Marxist-Leninist" countergangs to the zero growth and environmentalist freak shows. In short, the entirety of what became known in the 1960s as the "New Left Movement." This NSC operation has included such projects as the manipulation of the anti-war movement, the civil rights movement and the launching of the drug and "hard rock" counterculture. The FBI and sections of the CIA have provided the controllers and deployment managers of the "New Left" etc. IPS has provided the "cover stories" and the "ideological" management.

This operation has systematically included the historical "Trotskyist" gangs operating under NATO intelligence, as well as the various terrorist projects such as the Symbionese Liberation Army, Black Liberation Army, Baader-Meinhof gang, "Carlos," Red Brigades and so forth. Full documentation of the command-and-control structure of this entirely contrived "New Left Movement" has existed in the public domain for at least four years as a result of the Labor Committees' and the Labor Party's investigative activities. However, it has been well known, long before our own discoveries among intelligence professionals both East and West.

The special reasons why the Soviet KGB has been

silent on this issue will be discussed below. In the meantime, with respect to Mr. Arbatov, two items are to be emphasized in this respect. First, he has known the Institute for Policy Studies personally since the founding of that group from 1963 — in fact most of his publicly recorded contacts with United States organizations have been with IPS, and particularly with Richard Barnet of IPS. So, the question arises: why is the erudite Mr. Arbatov remaining most silent about the U.S. National Security Council project he knows the most about?

Second, it is self-evident that the appropriate Soviet authorities, when they concern themselves with problems of imperialist psychological warfare, are properly concerned with the "left" flank of such enemy deployments and not the "right wing," on which Mr. Arbatov focuses. The reason for such special Soviet government interest is obvious: any serious damage that has been inflicted upon the Soviet Republic from Kronstadt to Czechoslovakia 1968, has been the result of "left" or "liberal" subversion, not of "right-wing" propaganda. As everybody knows, "right-wing" propaganda is so discredited, it is not suitable for any sort of subversion operations almost anywhere in the world.

So, the question arises: why is the erudite Mr. Arbatov remaining most silent about the U.S. National Security Council project he knows the most about?

The reason why Mr. Arbatov focusses obsessively on "exposing" this impotent and ineffectual sort of "right wing" is because the assigned objective of his book is to whitewash and cover up the "left" and "liberal" psywar capability of the Rockefeller group.

Repeatedly in his book, Arbatov presents the "New Left Movement" as a genuine mass revolutionary phenomenon, albeit "young" and thus necesarily "confused." "Youth actions have been shaking the entire capitalist world," he informs us on page 112.

He goes so far in covering up imperialism's "left" and "liberal" psywar capability that he makes the fatal mistake of attributing the 1968 Czechoslovakia events to "honest errors" of party leadership. On page 151 he informs us: "The activation of anti-socialist forces in that country in 1968 *as a result of errors made by the former leadership of the party and the government* was widely used by the imperialists in an effort to discredit socialism and prove that that system was incompatible with the interests of the masses and was encountering resistance from the people."

We should take some justified pleasure in rubbing this blunder in Mr. Arbatov's face: every intelligence officer worth his keep on either side of the dividing line knows beyond doubt that the "Prague Spring" was exclusively the creation of intelligence agencies, a classic inside-outside job under cover of Operation "Socialism With A Human Face," which was fostered by Atlanticist agents in West European Communist parties and in the Czechoslovak party and government. It is an accident that a number of Mr. Arbatov's "erring former leadership of the party and the government" have, since their flight from that country, taken up employment with precisely those types of imperialist psywar agencies that Mr. Arbatov's book fails to mention?

But here, our dear GeorgiiArkadyevich is treading on very thin ice: he ought to remember with cold chills that it was precisely the KGB's colossal blunders around the 1968 events in Czechoslovakia which led to those minimal kinds of administrative adjustments which allowed the Intelligence Directorate of the Soviet General Staff, the GRU, to regain a modicum of professional autonomy from the blundering politicians of the KGB and repair some of the damage inflicted by Khrushchev's General Ivashutin with his "reforms" of the early 1960s.

What Is the "Right-Wing Military Industrial Complex?"

Street-wise working class kids in any American town are very well acquainted with the expressive terms "Mutt and Jeff act," "hard-cop — soft-cop routine," "carrot-and-stick" and such other folk designations of day-to-day capitalist brainwashing folklore. Soviet leaders are unfortunately unaware both of these English idioms and of how extremely widespread psywar practices are in ordinary daily life in capitalist countries. They thus fall victims of cheap tricks that ghetto gang kids can smell from miles away.

In a recent conversation with a Soviet diplomat, Labor Committee officials were surprised to see the veritable identity crisis that diplomat experienced when it was explained to him that Paul Nitze, the "hawk" of the Commitee on the Present Danger and his partner, the "dove" Paul Warnke of the U.N. Association, are engaged in such a "Mutt and Jeff act" at the expense of the Soviet leadership.

"You mean all this is... is... orchestrated?" the diplomat inquired with very visible alarm when confronted with the relevant documentation. His facial expression betrayed that special kind of sinking feeling in the stomach which accompanies the panic caused by one's realization that the world around him is not what he thought it was.

Upon closer inquiry, it was determined that the cause of this sort of reaction was the fact that Mr. Arbatov's "analysis" of American politics was hegemonic in the social environment of that particular diplomat.

The "Right-Wing Military Industrial Complex" is a myth which must be necessarily maintained in the course of imperialist psychological warfare operations because without it, the "Mutt and Jeff act" is impossible. As in any routine police entrapment operation, the "hard cop" is there exclusively for the purpose of guiding the victim into the embrace of the "soft cop." Thus the embrace of Mr. Arbatov's victims with the Institute for Policy Studies.

There exists of course, a marginal right-wing population in the West, the well known lunatic fringe. This is the product of the same imperialist financial interests, namely the Rockefellers and their associates who also

control and cultivate the "left wing" in precisely identical fashion. The specific *domestic* assignment of this right-wing fringe is to systematically entrap and neutralize Mr. Rockefeller's Whig opposition, the "conservative"-oriented traditionalist-industrialist, anti-monetarist interests.

Anyone who has studied the so-called American "right" cannot fail to observe that whenever anti-Sovietist "kookishness" and "war-hawkish" attitudes are pronounced, they are invariably there as a result of the presence of Rockefeller intelligence networks, or Rockefeller-allied Buckleyite intelligence networks.

Soviet observers, otherwise, cannot fail to observe that every positive American government move toward detente both during the Eisenhower and the Nixon Administrations was the result of initiatives of these anti-Rockefeller traditionalist-industrialist interests. And conversely, every war and every war provocation in United States history during the last sixty years, from Woodrow Wilson, to Franklin Roosevelt, to Kennedy, to Carter has been under Democratic Administrations, i.e., under a party in which the monetarist-Rockefeller faction has always maintained unchallenged hegemony.

Soviet observers also cannot fail to notice that until the 1917 October Revolution, this class of American traditionalist-industrialist forces had been the most iconoclastic, heretical, revolutionary bunch of voluntarists that ever hit the international arena. Until 1917, America was the synonym for revolutionary aspirations for the oppressed and persecuted the world over.

This was reversed only when the monetarist faction emerged hegemonic with the imposition of the Versailles Treaty, a subject conclusively treated in Lyndon H. LaRouche's *The Case of Walter Lippmann*. The point in short is that Arbatov's analysis has one crucial vulnerability: it fails to explain why every serious, genuine impulse for detente from the United States has come from anti-Rockefeller Republican initiatives and every single solitary war or pro-war initiative invariably emanated from the monetarist-Rockefeller controlled Democratic Party. American history proves Mr. Arbatov an unabashed liar.

Moreover, Arbatov's contention that the "war profiteers" and "Pentagon-connected industrialists" are the ultimate explanation of imperialism's impulse toward war, is a piece of charlantanery. Any competent Marxian economic thinker, especially since Rosa Luxemburg's analysis of militarism, has no difficulty identifying *finance capital* as the driving impulse toward war production, not the "munitions manufacturer" per se. A "munitions manufacturer" is not an authentic economic category in anybody's textbook. What occurs in a capitalist economy's capital-goods producing sector (Department I) that causes a shift away from further advanced capital goods has exclusively to do with financial processes under the control of monetarist financiers, and absolutely nothing to do with Department I capitalists.

When new advances and new technologies in the capital-goods producing sector begin to threaten the paper-profitability to finance capital of investments in old, already existing capital plant and equipment, then the secular tendency to produce weapons instead of new capital goods *is initiated by the financier faction.* This secular trend was established in the United States by Franklin Delano Roosevelt as the only way out of the depression of the 1930s. And this secular trend has been systematically maintained by the same faction that put Roosevelt in the White House: the Rockefellers and their lower Manhattan allies.

The fact that in the course of the last thirty years of monetarist-fostered war economy many individual industrialists have been either born into a war-production oriented environment or have been corrupted into accepting it, does not create a "war profiteer" industrialist category in the science of political economy. The cause and the controllers of a militarist economy are the monetarist financiers, in our case the Rockefellers.

Anybody who is talking about a "military industrial complex" is either engaging in an effort to conceal and protect the Rockefellers from public scrutiny, or he is a dupe of others engaged in that effort.

It is not difficult to prove that Mr. Arbatov belongs to the category of those systematically engaged in concealing and protecting the Rockefellers.

Any competent Marxian economic thinker, especially since Rosa Luxemburg's analysis of militarism, has no difficulty identifying *finance capital* as the driving impulse toward war production, not the "munitions manufacturer" per se.

The Rockefeller Question

To the conscientious Soviet political intelligence officer laboring away at his desk on Dzerzhinski Square, the Rockefeller nexus is a crucial piece of the vast jig-saw puzzle he is attempting to put together. If he ignores that crucial piece, he is confronted with a grotesque and complex picture that will never make sense. If, on the other hand, he proceeds from the hypothesis that the Rockefeller-led faction of New York financiers is in fact the General Staff of modern imperialism, he will eventually be able to trace the threads of evidence from virtually every suspicious operation back to that General Staff, provided he is armed with rigorous habits of procedural method.

Such a hypothetical officer will not have any difficulty in eventually piecing together the entirety of the world-wide "Mutt and Jeff," "left" and "right" deployment of imperialist psychological warfare capabilities, all pulled by strings that end in the Rockefeller General Staff's hands.

From this standpoint, an experienced eye, scrutinizing Mr. Arbatov's book, will notice certain otherwise totally innocuous passages. Let me give some examples:

On page 232: "Although the imperialist bourgeoisie is making a considerable effort to con-

duct this struggle in a purposeful and organized manner, it would be naive to surmise that the changes in the tactics, means and methods of the political struggle are taking place in the same way as in the military sphere: that a kind of political General Staff, which draws up a common plan and issues orders in accordance with which various campaigns are launched, has come into being."

Or the celebrated gobbledygook on page 233: "Another crucial specific of the political struggle is that as distinct from the military struggle it is more difficult to make an immediate assessment of the real significance of an event, phenomenon or action — whether it is a pure victory or defeat, the price that has to be paid for it, the consequences it will have in the more remote future and so forth. In this situation phenomena, events and political actions may be assessed differently by the various groups of one and the same class: what seems like a victory to some groups may be regarded as a defeat by others." The Heidegger school of political science!

A most charming little piece of sleight-of-hand by this seasoned "agent of influence" strikes the wordly wise reader in the following innocuous paragraph on page 212:

"Subscribers to the respected journal *Foreign Affairs* who read in 1966 a learned treatise by George Carver defending the Johnson Administration's Vietnam policy were not told by the editors if, indeed the editors knew — that Carver was employed by the CIA."

That, "if, indeed the editors knew" was just a bit too perfect. The educated American reader is firmly established in his knowledge that if the "respected journal" Foreign Affairs is anything, it is the journal of the Rockefeller family's Council on Foreign Relations, whose main job has been to appoint the top officials of the CIA from the days of Allen Dulles to Admiral Turner! Mr. Arbatov not only knows this fact exceptionally well, but he happens to have met very frequently over the years with David Rockefeller, Foreign Affairs editor McGeorge Bundy and many others of the imperialist General Staff whose existence he denies. He met both within the context of the Council on Foreign Relations and elsewhere. Ironically, Adm. Stansfield Turner, the present Director of Central Intelligence, got his job as a result of a recommendation by William Bundy, the present editor of Foreign Affairs.

At any rate, the passages cited above happen to be a sly polemic against very specific schools of thought in Soviet leadership circles. In the years 1958-1961, there was a very heated public debate in the official Soviet press over the role of the Rockefeller family in controlling United States policy. The preponderant attitude in the flurry of articles on the subject during that period was that yes, indeed, the Rockefellers constitute some sort of "General Staff."

The clamor over the subject was decidedly extinguished when Khrushchev made his deal with JFK to sell the anti-monetarist West European factions down the river.

Some Institutional Considerations

We are justified in claiming that such an obvious agent as Arbatov has been allowed to continue functioning mainly because of the highly anomalous situation that Nikita Khrushchev's "harebrained scheming" caused in the KGB. To put it in a nutshell, certain KGB operations, dating back to the late fifties-early sixties, have a vested interest in concealing the truth behind the "left" and "right" myths of imperialist subversion procedures. These "certain" KGB operations in turn enjoy the protection of top, Politburo-level Soviet leaders for an entirely different set of reasons on which we shall report in the third installment of this series. In the meantime, it would be a grave error to assume that the top Soviet leadership is protecting these blunders because it naively believes in the Mutt and Jeff routine. This is not necessarily the case.

The KGB however not only has fallen for these cheap tricks, but in numerous instances it has been entrapped into becoming an unwitting accomplice of the Institute for Policy Studies "New Left" fun and games. Since all the parties concerned know exactly what we are talking about, and the layman would only be distracted by excessive detail, we shall limit ourselves to identifying the more salient cases. We shall merely reference the 1971 IPS-instigated attack against the Labor Committees through the KKE's *Neos Kosmos* at a time when that magazine was being published in Eastern Europe, the Konstantine George case of 1973 and the assassination attempt on USLP Chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., which was being prepared by IPS through the Communist Party USA, during the winter of 1973-74.

It is more cogent to report that a serious brawl took place between the relevant KGB and GRU officials when Soviet intelligence finally caught on to the fact that the entirety of the Communist Party USA is under the total control of the FBI and the State Department jointly. Despite the fact that this relationship between the FBI and the CPUSA has been ongoing since 1938, we are told that the KGB caught on to the fact only sometime in the early 1970s. Interestingly, the Intelligence Directorate of the Soviet General Staff, the GRU, made this discovery only recently, much later than the KGB. But the GRU made another discovery also: that the KGB itself concealed this crucial piece of intelligence from the Soviet General Staff. How very interesting indeed.

All crucial evidence indicates that as President Nixon's favorite saying goes, "all the trees in the forest are going to fall" when the causes of this piece of dishonesty by the KGB are systematically gone after. For example, take the highly instructive Nosenko-Oswald affair: One of the various Lee Harvey Oswalds that the FBI and then Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy had put into circulation in preparation of a "dummy" assassination attempt of JFK was in fact allowed entrance into the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that he was laundered through the so-called Security Division of the CPUSA, the State Department-FBI control point in that party which makes recommendations to the appropriate Soviet authorities on whom to issue visas and whom not to.

When Kennedy was assassinated, a wave of horror swept through the Soviet leadership and their immediate reaction was to order a thorough cleanup of the KGB's Seventh Division, the department responsible for clearing visitors into the USSR and travelers to the outside. The head of the American Section of this department, the man presumed responsible for direct dealings with the CPUSA Security Division, was a certain Mr. Nosenko who defected to the United States in 1974. It is from his published testimony that we know of the cleanup in the Seventh Division.

This particular vulnerability of the KGB, however, is symptomatic of a much worse disease: at least certain sections of that organization are highly vulnerable to imperialist "left-wing" subversion especially in the context of various developing sector "national liberation" projects. The disease dates back to Khrushchev's establishment of the Patrice Lumumba Friendship University, which from the outset was taken advantage of by the Rockefeller networks which used it to launder penetration agents, many in a "double agent" capacity. It seems that each time the KGB tries to "play back" these double agents, it gets a black eye.

This state of affairs could at least in part account for the notorious shortsightedness and lack of insight of Soviet diplomacy toward the developing sector, including the systematic efforts throughout the year 1976 to dissuade a number of Third World nations from declaring debt moratoria. It also accounts for such secondary problems as the notorious blunders of Soviet intelligence personnel around their Mexican Embassy, for example, which the bourgeois press takes exceptional relish in reporting.

—Criton Zoakos
Director of Intelligence,
National Caucus of Labor Committees

Executive Intelligence Review

Press Service Bureaus

CONTINENTAL HEADQUARTERS

Wiesbaden BRD
62 W. Schiersteiner Str. 6
Tel. (06 121) 37 70 81

Mexico City
Apdo Postal 32-0229
Mexico, 1., D.F. Mexico
Tel. (915) 546-3088

New York
231 W. 29 St.
N.Y., N.Y. 10001
Tel. (212) 563-8600

LATIN AMERICA

COLOMBIA — Bogota
VENEZUELA — Caracas

EUROPE

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY — Bonn, Frankfurt, Hamburg, Dusseldorf
BELGIUM — Brussels
FRANCE — Paris
ITALY — Rome, Milan, Turin
SWEDEN — Stockholm
DENMARK — Copenhagen

NORTH AMERICA

UNITED STATES — Boston, Charlotte, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, D.C., Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago, Denver, Seattle, San Francisco
CANADA — Vancouver, Toronto, Montreal

Subscription Rates for
New Solidarity International Press Service
Executive Intelligence Review

Executive Intelligence Review
P.O. Box 1972, GPO
New York, N.Y. 10001

Name _____

Affiliation _____

Street _____

City _____ **State** _____ **Zip** _____

$ 60 ☐ **for three months**
$115 ☐ **for six months**
$225 ☐ **for one year**