

Faction Fight In Moscow

The Bonn-Moscow pact draws fire from 'Bukharinite snakes'

Since the May 6 signing of a series of long-term agreements for economic and political cooperation between West Germany and the Soviet Union, a faction has emerged in the Soviet Union's leadership which is trying to block the spread of President Leonid Brezhnev's detente and development initiatives. This faction bases itself on political directives traceable to the City of London, but has roped in certain staunch defenders of "Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy" with the battle cry that the Bonn agreement represents a "sell-out to capitalism."

In a statement issued May 24 (see *Executive Intelligence Review*, Vol. V, No. 21), U.S. Labor Party Chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche described the Moscow Anglophiles as "Bukharinite snakes." Wrote LaRouche: "The British mode of operation is precisely the same as that which destroyed the Zhukov-Eisenhower agreement on Atoms for Peace, precisely the same as that which destroyed the 1970 'Rogers Plan' for peace in the Middle East. The British Bukharinite snakes, Henry Kissinger, and their masters in Great Britain are up to their same treacherous tricks...."

"If Brezhnev is serious about his peace initiatives, he must move at once to crush these British Bukharinites. If not, we are headed irrevocably for World War III."

British influence in Moscow is funneled directly through highly placed agents such as "former" British intelligence operatives Kim Philby and Donald Maclean. Philby now holds a high post in the Soviet state security forces, the KGB, and Maclean heads up the European desk of the foreign policy think-tank, the Institute of the World Economy and International Relations (MEMO).

The conducting of the British line is shockingly direct. Thus the London *Daily Telegraph's* chief British intelligence "stringer" Robert Moss hailed France May 22 as the "gendarme of Africa." No sooner did this wretched line find its way to Moscow than the "Bukharinite snakes" in the editorial offices of the Soviet weekly *New Times* rushed to press with a mirror-image analysis of the recent events in Zaire. France is pursuing a "divide and rule" policy in Africa, said *New Times*; France is the "gendarme of Africa."

Moscow's Anglophiles have formed an unsavory alliance with certain Soviet hardliners of an isolationist bent. A case in point is Politburo hardliner-in-chief Mikhail Suslov, who delivered a 2,000-word speech May 12 that omitted any mention of Brezhnev's just-concluded trip to Bonn.

Countering this faction are Brezhnev and his supporters, such as Politburo member A.P. Kirilenko, who are continuing their efforts to consolidate the gains

of the Bonn accords, and particularly to draw in the United States. This grouping, backed by the scientific community and the least isolationist cadres in the military command, is behind the official Soviet government call for international cooperation in fusion power development and disarmament, published in *Pravda* May 31.

How The Snakes Came Out

Brezhnev's agreements with West German Chancellor Schmidt, in the weeks since May 6, have repeatedly threatened to expand into a "Grand Design" which would draw the U.S. into a global development policy, wrecking Britain's influence in Washington for good. Statements by Chancellor Schmidt, by French President Giscard d'Estaing, by Mexican President Jose Lopez Portillo, and by U.S. Administration officials such as Andrew Young and Cyrus Vance, all have affirmed the need for economic cooperation to underwrite efforts toward disarmament and peace settlements in the hot-spot regions of Africa and the Middle East.

This international pattern provides the context in which to evaluate the significance of certain key articles in the Soviet press, and to identify their factional significance.

A sudden explosion of press attacks on France and the U.S.—two countries key in the "Grand Design"—correlated with authoritative *Pravda* and *Izvestia* articles rejecting the very idea of cooperation with "corrupt capitalists." (We reprint below excerpts from some of these key articles.)

One tip-off was a May 19 *Pravda* feature by Timur Timofeev, director of the Institute of the International Workers Movement. Timofeev praised the zero-growth environmentalism which is Great Britain's ideological hallmark and specifically rejected the idea that scientific and technological progress is the basis for progressive developments in *capitalist* society—as well as for cooperation between the two social systems.

Characterizing Timofeev in *New Solidarity* May 30, U.S. Labor Party chairman LaRouche wrote: "Moscow *Pravda* proposes that Timofeev is a spokesman for the Soviets' Institute of the International Workers Movement. That may or may not be true. In the matter of the Zaire Shaba Province bloodbath, *Pravda* has lately asserted some things as facts which I know to be the wildest falsehoods. At the moment, I take *Pravda's* word for nothing without proof. Timofeev may be a *nom-de-plume* for Britain's Prince Charles, for all I know. It makes no difference to me: *I smell Maclean*. I smell the

peculiar aroma of defective drains, of which nothing can cleanse an Oxonian or Fabian."

The case against the "snakes" was clinched when *Izvestia* May 20 singled out for criticism the so-called Rogers Plan for Mideast peace through economic development. First circulated by a U.S. State Department grouping under Nixon's Secretary of State, William Rogers, in 1970, the "Rogers Plan" has received renewed international attention this year, in part through the U.S. Labor Party's exposure of Henry Kissinger's role in sabotaging the plan's economic development features, the essential basis for any lasting Middle East settlement.

The Mess in Washington

What has given Moscow's "Bukharinite snakes" room to maneuver is the failure of the United States to place itself squarely within the trade-and-development framework of the Brezhnev-Schmidt accords. It also lends credibility to arguments that "you can't trust a capitalist." The provocative antics of U.S. National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, his much-publicized efforts to draw China into an anti-Soviet military alliance, have caused extraordinary concern in Moscow. If Brzezinski and his mentor Henry Kissinger are not reined in, it will become increasingly difficult for Brezhnev and other "moderates" to keep Moscow's own British-backed elements in check.

The "Bukharinites," taking advantage of this situation for their own subversive purposes, are leveling whole-

sale and undifferentiated attacks against the United States — not merely against Brzezinski and his ilk. In so doing, they have blacked out completely the role of Great Britain in setting up U.S.-Soviet confrontation. Similarly, they have blasted France for its neat surgical operation in Zaire, whitewashing the role of Britain and its allied Belgian interests. (See press excerpts below.)

The London *Daily Telegraph* smugly noted May 26 that Soviet charges against France are "causing a further strain between Paris and Moscow." Soviet Chief of Staff Nikolai Ogarkov cancelled a scheduled trip to Paris.

Refractions in Eastern Europe

The Soviet faction fight extends into other Eastern European countries as well.

The German Democratic Republic (GDR) has historically been sensitive to any improvement in Soviet-West German relations, and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko flew to East Berlin immediately following Brezhnev's Bonn visit to reassure the East German government that it was not being "sold down the river."

This evidently satisfied GDR party head Erich Honecker, who endorsed Brezhnev's moves at a Central Committee meeting of the ruling Socialist Unity Party May 25. But the unusually scant coverage given to Honecker's address in some GDR news media, including the government radio *Stimme der DDR*, plus statements by some other party officials, indicates that Moscow's Bukharinite-leftist alliance has its counterpart in East Berlin as well.

What Is A 'Bukharinite Snake'?

Nikolai Bukharin (1888-1938) was the Bolshevik leader best known for his dramatic left-right factional shifts, and for his opposition to Stalin's policy of rapid industrialization and collectivization of agriculture. Throughout all the zigs and zags of Bukharin's career, there was one invariant feature: hostility to any "Rapallo"-style agreements with capitalist industrial powers.

As the leading spokesman for the Bolshevik "Left" in 1918, Bukharin strenuously opposed the Brest-Litovsk treaty to end the war with Germany. Great Britain's strategy was to have war-weary Russia and Germany wear one another out, to keep Germany fighting on two fronts, so that after the war Britain would grab up political control over the two major powers of the European continent.

Lenin alone in the Russian leadership insisted that a separate peace must be made with Germany at all costs, while Bukharin (supported by Trotsky) declared that the time for a "revolutionary war" against capitalism had come. "Peaceful coexistence... between the Soviet Republic and international capital," he said, is out of the question. Bukharin's policy would have meant the early demise of Soviet power in Russia.

After the Civil War, when Lenin initiated trade with the capitalist West to get the devastated Russian

economy going again, and forced through the 1922 Rapallo Treaty for economic and military cooperation with Germany, Bukharin and the "Left" opposed him every step of the way crying "sell-out"!

Bukharin announced that "capitalist industrialization is the parasitism of the city toward the countryside, the parasitism of a metropolis toward its colonies, the hypertrophic, bloated development of industry, serving the ruling classes..." The United States, as the dominant power of the capitalist world, was always portrayed by Bukharin—and by Trotsky—as the Soviet Union's number one enemy.

Bukharin's formulation in 1924 of the concept of "socialism in one country," and its acceptance by Stalin eight months later, certified that the era of Rapallo was drawing to a close, and that henceforth the Soviet Union would have increasingly to "go it alone."

Bukharin became the leader of the party "Right," calling the peasantry the great revolutionary force which would enable Russia to triumph in isolation. Bukharin believed—as Mao Tse-Tung did after him — that the "Eastern-Asiatic peoples," "the suppressed and humiliated colonial masses" of the "world countryside" would rise up and "guarantee our final victory" over the hated imperialist "world city." This "great liberating force," Bukharin said, "will decide the whole struggle."

Honecker praised Brezhnev's trip as "a significant step in developing the coordinated policy of the socialist community of states for safeguarding peace." Cautiously assessing his own country's relations with Bonn, he said that problems that exist between them could be solved in a reasonable manner.

The West German daily *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* of May 26 evaluated this as an indication that the GDR is ready to continue talks with Bonn on various levels and come to agreements. The May 27 announcement that 125 political prisoners in East German jails (largely people involved in border incidents) were deported to West Germany was probably intended as a good-will gesture toward Bonn.

While Honecker emphasized that the GDR wants no fuss around West Berlin, others in the leadership are emitting hardline rumblings on that very issue. Kurt Hager — the "Suslov" of the GDR — made a point of stressing in a recent speech that relations with Bonn demand West Germany's strict observation of the spirit and the letter of the Four-Power Agreement on Berlin. The Soviet Embassy in Berlin subsequently issued a release attacking West Germany Chancellor Schmidt for accompanying Britain's Queen Elizabeth to West Berlin — despite the fact that Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko had already assured Schmidt that the USSR would view this as a matter of British, not West German, policy.

In Hungary, Communist Party head Janos Kadar gave a speech attacking two identifiable tendencies within the party, according to the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* May 29. Kadar attacked both those who falsely praise cooperation with the USSR but are in fact narrow nationalists, and on the other hand those ultra-leftists who are against intensive cooperation with the West. "Nobody can be more religious than the Pope," Kadar assured the grumblers, "and nobody can be more conscious of the class struggle than the Central Committee."

In Czechoslovakia, President Gustav Husak is walking a tightrope between various factional groupings, and Brezhnev's current visit to Prague is being viewed as a show of support to Husak's moderate course. Husak, at a meeting of the Prague Party organization May 13, strongly endorsed Brezhnev's foreign policy line: "A great struggle is being waged in the world for a peaceful or non-peaceful solution of the problems which exist... An immensely progressive role... is played by the Soviet Union, its personalities, and above all, Comrade Brezhnev personally, as you were able to read about during his latest visit to the Federal Republic of Germany. We wholeheartedly support this policy of establishing good-neighborly relations with regimes with a different social system. This was also the meaning of my trip to the FRG."

—Susan Welsh

Soviet 'Bukharinites' Print The London Line

In these two excerpts from the Soviet press, "supermilitant" attacks on capitalism function as an implicit attack on Brezhnev's just-concluded agreement with West Germany.

"Bourgeoisie Incapable of New Ideas"

Pravda, "The Ideological Maneuvers of the Opponents of Marxism-Leninism," by Timur Timofeev

...The bourgeoisie, like any other class departing from the historical arena, is incapable of putting forward new constructive ideas which would attract the attention of the masses. Therefore, it is no coincidence that it stubbornly tries to renovate, to galvanize old ideas. But the very idea of such a 'renovation' is hardly new: it consists in replacing the idea of social revolution with the categories of scientific-technological progress, and especially in belittling the world-historical consequences of those grand revolutionary social transformations which began in October 1917....

The economic crisis of the 1970s, massive unemployment, galloping inflation, the inability of the ruling circles to solve the social-economic problems caused by the scientific-technological revolution by means of state-monopoly regulation — all of this discredits capitalism still more...

Bourgeois ideologues cannot but take into account the enormous growth of the interest of the broadest popular masses in global problems—ecological, energy, and demographic problems...

Capitalism Is Capitalism, Even If It Is For Development

Izvestia, May 20, "The Developing Countries and the Grip of the 'Mini-Blocs,'" by L. Koryavin

In the American biographical reference book "Who's Who" William Rogers is described above all as a former Secretary of State in the Nixon Administration, Richard Helms as a former CIA head, and Kermit Roosevelt is noted on the genealogical tree of the strong men of America as a grandson of the late President Theodore Roosevelt.

But there is a certain side to these peoples' activities today about which many Americans are not informed. All three, as well as tens of other American politicians and businessmen, have become attorneys for the affairs of Arab and Iranian oil capital in the USA.

The division of the developing countries into "poor and rich" does not mean that the western powers intend to erase the barriers between them and promote the betterment of living standards of the peoples of the developing states. On the contrary, they are striving to preserve this state "class structure" in order, using the so-called "elite", to mercilessly exploit those who remain on the lowest levels of the pyramid...

...The development of relations of American businessmen with the oil-extracting countries must be looked at above all in the short term general relations of the USA with the developing world...

(The imperialists) lean heavily on knocking together so-called "sub-imperialist regional alliances" or "mini-blocs"...

Thus Israel plays the role of an "agent-state" in defense of imperialist interests in the Mideast, South Africa, and as a Western outpost in the struggle with anti-imperialist forces in southern Africa, . . . and the "Saudi-Egypt-Sudan" Axis has been called by American journalist Robert Manning "an instrument of realizing American plans in northeast Africa."

The architects of the "mini-blocs" in fact are none other than the imperialist circles and their agents, and it is no accident that to carry out cooperation with "agreeable regimes" experienced politicians and intelligence officers, these same Rogerses, and Helmses were chosen. . . .

'Bukharinites' Play Press Games On Africa

American Colonials in Africa

Pravda "The American Threat to Africa", by A. Serbin May 21:

Now, as before, Washington's policy is determined by the interests of American monopolies seeking domination over Africa.

There has never been and is not a single instance, in which the USA acted in Africa on the side of its peoples. On the contrary, Washington has always been on the side of the colonialists.

...The USA has long been undermining African unity. It tries to split the African countries to create proimperialist "mini-blocs." Among its plans are the formation of a "Red Sea bloc" which would unite a number of northeast African countries with reactionary Arab regimes, and forming a military-political group in western Africa.

...The policy of the USA everywhere is aimed at wrecking settlement of controversial questions, at creating pretexts for interference...

Back and Forth

Krasnaya Zvezda (Red Star) "American Gendarme in Africa," May 17:

Neocolonialism, attempts to hold reactionary racist regimes in power, to subvert the national liberation

movement of the peoples, to ensure the "interests" of the monopolies — such is the essence of the policy of American imperialism on the African continent. One of the principal methods of American diplomacy and of the CIA in Africa is the inflammation of internecine conflicts, especially on the borders of progressive states. At the direct instigation of the USA, Somalia initiated aggression against neighboring Ethiopia and invaded the Ogaden region. After the failure of this armed adventure, the United States conducted negotiations with Somalia on supplying it with "defensive" weapons....

Compare this with Izvestia, "Against Logic," by V. Kudryavtsev, April 9:

...The truth is that Britain and nobody else pushed Somalia into reckless adventure, with its promise to send arms. A fact is a fact.

London's Back Up

The Times, London, "Soviet Union Accuses France and Belgium of Carrying out Kolwezi Massacre to Put Blame on Rebels" May 26:

The Soviet Union today accused French and Belgium troops of committing a massacre in Shaba in order to be able to blame the Katangan rebels in the southern part of the province.... Tass said: ..."After coming to the aid of the unpopular regime, French legionnaires and Belgian soldiers staged a real massacre in Kolwezi and other towns of Shaba so as to blame the rebels for the mass murder of whites."...

Meanwhile the Soviet press today continued its denunciation of the French and Belgium intervention, this time making no bones about detailing the French role—from which, Pravda said, other members of the European Community had tried to dissociate themselves at the foreign ministers' meeting in Nyborg, Denmark. (The only minister to do so was Britain's David Owen—ed.)

An article in the weekly *New Times* accused France of a "divide and rule" policy in African, prompted by nostalgia for the colonial past. What it called the "African interference corps" proposed at the Franco-African conference in Paris would be a kind of police force to suppress liberation movements in Africa, it alleged.

The magazine said France was playing the role of "gendarme of Africa." It detailed the French role in Chad.