

# Soviets: Camp David, 'another Munich'

Including three exclusive reports from Novosti press agency

The leadership of the Soviet Union has given an extraordinary warning to the international community. The world is now in a situation so dangerous that World War III becomes increasingly probable, the Soviets have declared in a number of public forums, just as Great Britain's pact with Hitler at Munich Sept. 29, 1938 meant that the countdown to World War II had begun.

And for the first time, the Soviet press has accused the British-linked "Black International" with seeking control over the foreign policy of the United States government in order to push that policy toward a "military catastrophe" (see the article by Sergei Vishnevskii excerpted below).

The Soviet decision to go public with this strategic evaluation, which the U.S. Labor Party has been circulating for over a year, is intended to provide a sufficient shock to particularly the United States and Britain to set war-avoidance measures into motion. That the Soviets believe such a turn of events is possible is indicated by the positive reference in *Pravda* Oct. 1 to former U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the commander of the U.S. armed forces in the wartime alliance against fascism, and representative, in the Soviet view, of the "sane-thinking" tradition in American public life. (For excerpts, see below.) However, as the accompanying excerpts from a second *Pravda* commentary make clear, the Soviet Union is prepared to take matters into its own hands should the West fail to act in time to prevent the outbreak of war.

## How the present turn developed

There can be little doubt that the treacherous agreements of the Camp David summit were what finally induced the Soviets to pull out all the stops. (See the article "The Microbes of Munich," below.) And well-aimed attacks on Britain and on Zionist control of international terrorism that have appeared in the Soviet military and youth-oriented press indicate that the present policy shift has the strong backing of a significant portion of the USSR's military and youth apparats.

The present turn has been building since March, when the military daily *Red Star*, on the anniversary of Hitler's annexation of Austria (the *Anschluss*), leveled the first significant attack on Britain. The

March 11 article described how Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain gave Hitler his blessing, hoping to turn Nazi Germany to the East. The "lessons of the *Anschluss*" retain their significance to this day, *Red Stars* said.

As Great Britain's present-day subversion of the U.S. government became increasingly apparent, and the gleeful British backing for Zbigniew Brzezinski's "China card" fantasy took on more and more tangible form (including Chinese Party head Hua Kuo-feng's trip to Romania and Yugoslavia in August), the Soviet attacks on Britain escalated. But contrary to Brzezinski's calculations, the Soviets have not, on the whole, reacted to the deterioration of their relations with the United States in a paranoid "hard-line" fashion. Crucial to this was the smashing success of Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev's May trip to West Germany, which resulted in a keystone 25-year treaty for political and economic cooperation.

The indications are that Brezhnev has consolidated political support behind this policy as reflected in the entire array of articles.

Ironically—from the standpoint of London—it may well have been the increasingly hostile activities of China and Israel that Britain has so lustily supported, plus the deteriorating U.S. political climate, that enabled Brezhnev to organize foot-draggers in the Soviet leadership to back him. Soviet military men in particular may well have been swayed by the argument that, in view of the escalating war danger, the USSR should seek every opening available to bolster the "prodetente forces" against the more aggressive tendencies within the NATO alliance.

## Moscow's perception of Carter

While the Soviets have never been enthusiastic about Jimmy Carter's Administration, there was a period one year ago when it looked as if things might not be so bad. The Oct. 1, 1977 U.S.-Soviet Joint Statement calling for a Geneva conference on the Middle East was a hopeful sign, and the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT II) were proceeding well.

The crisis in the Horn of Africa and the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, however, were among the key events that threw this fragile U.S.-Soviet rapprochement off balance. The Soviet news agency TASS responded to Carter's March 17 speech at Wake

Forest University, where he referred to the Soviet Union as "our adversaries," with a release charging that Carter's speech "means a shift of emphasis in American foreign policy" away from detente. Soviet Ambassador to the U.S. Anatolii Dobrynin abruptly flew to Moscow for consultations.

Brezhnev gave a major speech April 7 on board a cruiser in the Eastern port of Vladivostok, warning that "both to the West and to the East of our frontiers there are forces interested in the arms race, in working up an atmosphere of fear and hostility." Pointing to the "indecision and inconsistency" of the Carter Administration, Brezhnev called for the U.S. "to meet us half way." But "frankly speaking," he said, "we do not see such steps of late."

Soviet and East European press coverage of Carter increasingly treated him as the victim of a conspiracy, centered in the figures of Brzezinski and Energy Secretary James Schlesinger. The Czechoslovak daily *Rude Pravo* May 23 called Carter a prisoner of the "Israel lobby," and compared him to Harry Truman, whose "bad advisers" kept him from continuing the wartime alliance with the USSR. More recently, a *Pravda* feature by Vishnevskii Sept. 2 identified Schlesinger and Brzezinski as the hawks in Carter's cabinet, the main advocates of the "China card," who give the White House "top secret recommendations, constantly aimed to subvert the process of detente."

— Susan Welsh

## Exclusive to our readers:

*The three reports here, provided exclusively to NSIPS news service and its affiliates by the Soviet Union's Novosti Press Agency, include some of the sharpest Soviet polemics to date on the Nazi-brand racism of the Zionists, the ominous parallels between the Munich and Camp David Summits, and the road to lasting peace in the Mideast.*

### Tiger's paws a la Peking

The German Nazis were already using it, and the Zionist hawks are using it now, so one shouldn't honor Chairman Mao and his successors as the inventors of their policy on the national question.

When Germany set out to conquer the entire world, the Nazis had worked out a plan for the "Germanization" of the United States of America, where, they claimed, "30 million people have German blood flowing through their veins." In fact, the Nazis did succeed in starting a "German-American Bund" which recruited spies and various other people from persons holding leading positions in American factories, and they succeeded in forcing not a few

### "Black International" seeks to control U.S. government

*From the "International Week" column by Sergei Vishnevskii, Pravda, Oct. 1:*

...Above all, blind anti-Sovietism pushed the Anglo-French politicians into their disgraceful deal with the fascist aggressors at Munich. The internationally known scientist from California, Fred Neil, writes in the book *War and Peace in Germany*: "At Munich, Britain and France went for a deal with Hitler, proceeding from the theory that the German position and their own position toward the Soviet Union could be identical."

Having played the Munich card, and having given Czechoslovakia away to be torn into shreds by Hitler, the reactionary circles of

the Western states, tacitly supported by the USA, hoped that the fascist aggression would be directed above all and only against the East, against the Soviet Union. They bitterly miscalculated: within the same year, Western Europe was enveloped by a war conflagration. Later on, U.S. President D. Eisenhower said: "The world paid dearly for the lesson of Munich, but it also learned it." But did everyone learn it?

The sane-thinking politicians undoubtedly drew realistic conclusions from the lessons of the Munich deal—the inadmissibility of "appeasing" and encouraging aggressive forces, the necessity of a collective rebuff to the war instigators, the fact that anti-Soviet calculations are fruitless. However, the "Munich psychology" was not at all erased from the consciousness of certain

Western circles. The chairman of the Socialist International, W. Brandt, warns of the sinister activity of the "Black International" of right-wing belligerent forces who forget the lessons of history...

As a result of the willfully dangerous activities of the enemies of detente, the international situation has gotten more complex. Human reason cannot tolerate this. Maximal efforts of the peace-loving forces and governments are necessary in order to prevent another military catastrophe...

During the recent period, the most sinister forces of American imperialism have begun to launch a counteroffensive. Their vanguard is called the "new right" — this is a coalition of extreme reactionaries, bellicose anti-communists, and militarists, representing the most aggressive portion of the military-industrial

# three commentaries from Novosti

German-Americans into committing subversive acts against America.

The Zionist leaders in Tel Aviv follow the same principle, and demand from people of Jewish descent living in various countries of the world with different social systems, that they help the state of Israel, that they work for Israel without any consideration of the desires of the states in which those Jews live and whose laws they observe.

The Maoists have now seized on the formulation of "dual citizenship." But whatever the turns of phrase Peking uses to camouflage itself, the "Chancellory for the Affairs of Chinese Living Abroad of the People's Republic of China" is reminiscent of the corresponding institution in Hitler's Germany, called "Gau-Austland," which was charged with the Nazi-fication of Germans living abroad. This "Chancellory" is also reminiscent of the far-flung network of Zionist organizations, which work to extinguish people's national feelings.

"China is everywhere that the Chinese live," so insist the Maoists. "Your blood is thicker than your passport," is what the Nazis once maintained.

When one thinks about that, one comes to the conclusion that nothing lays bare the true nature of

politics and ideology so clearly as a racist standpoint on the national question, even if people attempt to cover it over with beautiful figures of speech.

The "Aryan" racial theory of the superiority of one chosen people above all others led to national socialism, with its hatred against Jews, Gypsies, Slavs, and other "Non-aryans." Where this led is well known.

Zionism, which sets everything Jewish and Israeli against all of humanity, is causing the tragedy of the Palestinian people, the sufferings of other Arab people, and the discrimination against the Black Jews in Israel. With cynical calculation, Zionism provokes anti-Semitism wherever it can in order to whip up emigration to Israel. The Maoists, of course, have copied this method from them, not for the purpose of motivating Chinese living abroad to return to their homeland, but rather to intervene unscrupulously in the affairs of other states under the pretext of protecting "countrymen living in foreign lands."

The Tibetans, Uigurs, Kazakhs, Mongols, and other related nationalities who live in the People's Republic of China and who consider themselves to be Chinese citizens became the first to experience the nationalities policy of Mao and his successors. They were deprived of the opportunity to practice their national

---

complex of the USA...

It is not difficult to imagine who is behind these extreme "hawks," when analogous infantile ideas are displayed in such solid publications as *Business Week*... This magazine recently called for building U.S. foreign policy in the spirit of the absolutism of the French King Louis XIV, and to use American power to "re-establish leadership." Closely allied with the "new rightists" is the "Black International" of Western Europe, which, through the conservative London *Daily Telegraph*, is counseling Washington to "increase the use of force..."

## "The Lessons of Munich"

*"The Lessons of History,"* by Vitalii Korionov, Pravda, Sept. 29: ...The last four decades have not only fully disclosed the class

meaning of the treachery committed at Munich by the Anglo-French bourgeoisie, with the direct support of influential monopoly circles in the USA, but have also given the peoples the possibility of drawing the necessary conclusions for themselves...

Attempts were made to justify the treachery at Munich by expressions of "concern for peace" in Europe. A tremendous threat did indeed hang over the world at that time. But the Hitlerite aggression still could have been stopped, stifled in its cradle. The defense of Czechoslovakia, which the Western powers had treaty obligations to carry out, provided a real possibility for doing this. The Soviet Union, true to its treaty obligations to Czechoslovakia and to its international duty, moved 30 infantry divisions to its western border, and placed air force and tank units in combat readiness to

help defend Czechoslovakia from fascist aggression. However the Anglo-French rulers preferred shameful collusion with the aggressor, preferred treachery and infamy. Anti-Sovietism and anticommunism turned out to be stronger than reason...

The people have drawn the necessary conclusions from the events of 1938. They advocate general peace, freedom, and independence with the full understanding of whom they can rely on and who should be feared... The people reject the policy of pandering to aggression and hegemonism, no matter what labels this policy may be covered with and no matter what part of the world it may appear in...

customs and traditions, their religious cult observances were forbidden, "elected" leaders of all ranks, most of them Chinese-born, were simply installed by the Chinese.

The suspicions of some China experts were justified when they viewed the solution of the national question inside China as a test of its national policy according to an international standard. The Maoists exploited people's national feelings and fabricated their 'fifth column' in Malaysia, Thailand, Burma, Indonesia and other countries by means of tricks, bribes and terrorism. In this, these champions of revolutionary phrases did not base themselves on the working-class section of the Chinese communities, but on their well-to-do leadership. Peking has not allowed itself to be embarrassed by bungled jobs or scandalous revelations. The Maoists are provoking feelings hostile to China everywhere — wherever there are Chinese streets, Chinese districts, or Chinese restaurants, wherever dishes with exotic descriptions such as "Snake à la Shanghai" or "Tigers' Paws à la Peking" are served. To put it another way: the Peking protectors of the inhabitants of these streets and districts do not hide their claw-like paws as a precautionary measure, but flourish them in front of everyone's eyes, in order to drive the 20 million Chinese living abroad into the isolation of the Chinese ghetto.

To think that every one of them must unconditionally be a spy, to think that people in every Chinese restaurant serve their visitors their favorite dish with a microphone hidden in it — one can be certain, that all this does not please the plain working-class people of Chinese descent who want to live in peace with their neighbors.

Therefore, the Maoists' policy on the national question really suits Washington's taste, for as I believe, the propagandistic uproar for "the protection of the Chinese living in Vietnam" did not accidentally coincide with the rapprochement between the People's Republic of China and the United States of America. In their own countries, the leaders of the capitalist world solve the national question with different methods than the People's Republic of China uses, but with similar results: the total repression of the national independence of national minorities (one should only compare the fate of the Tibetans with the fate of the American Indian). Even the hostile sanctions against Vietnam by both the People's Republic of China and the United States of America are identical. Peking is arranging provocations on the Chinese-Vietnamese border, and in the meantime Washington is extending the legal limit on trading with the enemy in relation to Vietnam.

And even capitalist countries, where chauvinism rears its head, where immigrants from Asian and African countries are considered to be second-class human beings, are happy with the uproar raised by Peking. For thanks to Peking, which has caused a situation in which every Chinese community is

considered to be a fifth column of the People's Republic of China, every national community that lives far from its historical homeland can be accused of precisely the same thing. White racism is making itself felt in England, for example, where the "National Front" plots provocations in areas where there is a colored population, and at the same time calls upon the whites for "self defense" (against whom?).

All the people in the world today need to be protected against racism, in whatever costume it may appear. The Peking claims of influence over people of Chinese descent, wherever they may live, is not an internal Chinese question. This is a further attempt by Peking to alienate populations, and first of all the population of Asia. For Peking wants to succeed in achieving world leadership through dissension.

— Fjodor Breus  
*Novosti Political Correspondent*

## The microbes of Munich

"To expand, deepen and continue the process of detente" — this is the well-known essence of the principles laid down at Helsinki. The healthy spirit of Helsinki has been realized in numerous bilateral agreements concluded over recent months on exchanges in trade, economics and culture, and also in the recent special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament, which expressed the will of all peoples to put a stop to the arms race. The final document of this conference, which incorporated many ideas from the Helsinki conference, emphasized the necessity of banning the use of force; of working toward the dynamic development of detente, which has expanded into all regions of the world and all areas of international relations; and of the most rapid and complete extension of political detente into military detente.

There are still people in this world who cannot stomach the spirit of Helsinki. They remain under the damaging influence of microbes of an old disease, the highly resistant Munich virus, which is known to thrive on anti-Communism.

Today, the 40th birthday of the conclusion of the ignominious Munich agreement to dismember Czechoslovakia, the damage done by the Munich virus — which turns up here and there in the policies of the NATO countries and of Maoist China — has become particularly evident.

Just as at the end of the 1930s the Munich "test of peace" in the West made one concession after another to the aggressor under the banner of the fight against the "Bolshevist danger" and "Red Moscow," and benevolently watched the preparations for the "Drang nach Osten" against the Soviet Union, today also there exist similar subjects which call back to memory the sadly well-known Munich policy of driving toward a confrontation with the Soviet Union.

Within the global strategy of anti-Sovietism, the Munich virus is primarily identifiable by the myth of the "Soviet threat." Leonid Brezhnev took one such instance as the occasion to observe rightly that every time the military adventurers want to conceal their aggressive intentions, "they always try to revive the myth of the 'Soviet threat:' they look for evidence of such a threat in the depths of the Indian Ocean and on the summits of the Cordilleras Mountains. If one observes the European lowlands through NATO's binoculars, one can see nothing except the Soviet divisions ready to spring against the West."

The Munich virus is also evident in Maoist China's regional claims on its neighboring countries. Just as Hitler began to prepare for the Great War by claiming Austrian and Czech territory, so also have Mao Tse-tung and his successors written on their banners of hegemony: "We must conquer the globe," and have undertaken numerous acts of aggression against neighboring countries. They are doing so in the course of preparations for establishing their domination over all of Asia, and after that, over the entire world. The military conflicts provoked over the past years by the Maoists on their borders with India, Tibet and Vietnam are eloquent testimony to this, and show how the "test of strength" succeeded, and how the reaction of public opinion was tested.

Maoist China's noisy campaign to "protect" the 25 million Huatsiao, the people of Chinese nationality living in neighboring countries, is likewise being conducted according to Hitler's formula of the 1930s, when he took the Sudeten Germans "under his protection," and reduced the civil rights they enjoyed in the territory of the Czechoslovak Republic before Munich.

The Munich "appeasement policy" is also reminiscent of the way China is currently inflating itself with its weapons of hegemony against our country — its policy of the "four modernizations," whose aim is well known to be the rapid militarization of their country and the furthering of the Peking leaders' intention to become a great anti-Soviet power.

I believe that the microbes of Munich can also be discovered at the Camp David talks, where two participants are demanding ever greater "elasticity" from third parties in the solution of the complicated Mideast problem, and are trying to make an "agreement" at the expense of the interests of the people of the Arab countries, to negotiate concessions to Israeli aggression, and to establish the "legitimate" right to station American military contingents and set up military bases in the Mideast. It is fair to presume that the Munich-style Israeli-Egyptian separate agreement organized by Washington will be rejected by all peoples of the Arab world and especially by the Palestinian people. The projected military-political presence of the USA in the zone of conflict can not solve the Mideast problem by peaceful means.

The results of Munich demonstrate clearly what can

be expected from a policy of aiding and abetting aggressors. To drive out the microbes of Munich forever is therefore the task of all those who are fighting for detente and the preservation of the spirit of Helsinki in relations between the states of all continents.

— Vasily Morosov  
*Novosti Military Commentator*

## Highlights: Soviets on Britain and Zionism

**June 22** **RED STAR**, on the anniversary of Hitler's invasion of the Soviet Union, Operation Barbarossa, writes: "The catastrophe at Dunkirk, the goose-steps of the fascist soldiers at the Arche de Triomphe in Paris, the windows of London staring like empty eye-sockets — that is what became of attempts by certain near-sighted politicians to direct the German aggression to the East. Those who make analogous efforts today would do well to remember this."

**July – August** **NEW TIMES**, the Soviet foreign circulation weekly, runs a series on "The Munich Tragedy," quoting the Soviet chargé d'affairs in the United States in 1938 on Britain's influence over U.S. policy: "Kennedy, the ambassador in London, acting on behalf of the Chamberlain set, has succeeded in persuading Roosevelt that Germany will inevitably take action and that Britain is unprepared; Bullitt, who is a fascist at heart, has 'sold' Roosevelt the idea that France is weak; the Anglo-ophile clique in the State Department headed by Sumner Welles and Dunn have been working on Roosevelt along these same lines. . . ."

**September 16** **KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA**, the youth daily, charges "Zionism and Masonry" with carrying out subversive operations, "gathering information, infiltrating themselves into top levels of civilian power, taking over ministries and unions and even influencing Parliamentarians and Presidents." Their purpose: "to liberate their devotees from reason, and to fight against the influence of science."

**September 22** **RED STAR** charges Israeli intelligence with "subversion and terrorist operations . . . aimed at kindling hotbeds of tension in various regions of the globe, torpedoing good-neighborly relations among nations, and contaminating the political atmosphere." "The Israeli Secret Services allocate more money for espionage and sabotage operations than Britain," the paper states.

## When the illusions of Camp David fade away

The trilateral agreement at Camp David has come up against strong criticism from the Soviet public, and no less from all those who are not so readily willing to be deceived by the noisy propaganda around the "historic success," and who are able to evaluate what happened from an objective standpoint. For there do exist other Arab countries besides Egypt, countries who are not indifferent to the fact that the agreement was made behind their backs. There also exists the Palestinian people, whose just demand for a sovereign homeland has for all practical purposes been ignored. And finally there also exists the world community of nations, whose common will concerning ways and means to settle the Mideast conflict has been expressed in the well-known United Nations decisions, and especially in the resolutions of the Security Council.

These resolutions state unequivocally that peace in the Mideast will only be a just one if the following conditions are met: (1) the withdrawal of all Israeli troops (and hence also the exclusion of all other forms of Israeli presence) from all occupied Arab territories; (2) the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination until an independent state for them is created; (3) guarantees for a secure and independent existence for all states of this region, under conditions of a lasting peace.

The Camp David talks may stir up illusions in many quarters that peace is close at hand. But what kind of peace can it be when the agreements made have put Arab sovereignty into question more than ever before?

I will begin with Egypt. From the document entitled "Framework for the Conclusion of a Peace Treaty Between Egypt and Israel" it can be ascertained that Israel merely "recognizes" Egypt's limited sovereignty over Sinai. Further talks are to determine Israel's "security zones" on the peninsula as well as "zones of limitation of arms and armed forces" for the Egyptian army. Israel will begin to pull out its troops from Sinai three to nine months after the signing of a peace treaty and will finish this in two to three years. What is noteworthy here is that Sadat accepted these conditions even though Israel had rejected Sadat's demands for the closing down of Israeli settlements on the Sinai peninsula.

Sadat, who has partially sacrificed Egypt's national sovereignty, was hardly inclined to remember how passionately he had previously defended "the most holy cause of all Arabs, the cause of the Palestinian people," and had stated that he would never put his

signature on an agreement that did not foresee the Palestinians' right to self-determination. Begin used Camp David in order to announce loudly enough for everyone to hear that Israel does not intend to grant sovereignty to western Jordan and the Gaza Strip. He thus blocked any possibility of the formation of an independent Palestinian state. The vague promises to grant "autonomy" to the Palestinian "residents" of West Jordan in five years have not the slightest correspondence with the Arab people's demands to make Palestine into a separate state. At the all-Arab summit conference, with Egypt's participation, the Palestinian Liberation Organization was recognized as the sole rightful representative of the Palestinian people. But the Camp David formula concerning the Palestinians, likewise drawn up by Sadat, gives the impression that there exists no such nation and no representative of their rights and their lives. In balance, the fate of Jerusalem was likewise handed over to Israeli dictates.

It is therefore justified to ask the question: why is a new "Framework for a Settlement" necessary when the only framework corresponding to the demands for a just peace has already been worked out previously?

The answer to this is not to be found in the theatrics of the concluded talks, but rather in the political tendencies which led to Camp David in the first place. The American diplomacy of "partial agreements," whose aim is to split the Arab world and to exclude the Soviet Union from the process of a comprehensive settlement, met up with Cairo's readiness to conclude a separate agreement at any price. Begin's government and Israeli military circles estimated this to be an opportunity to dictate conditions to Egypt. But in doing so they neglected Israel's own interest in a real and just peace, which would guarantee Israel's security not by means of a dictate the Arabs will not accept or an agreement made behind their backs, but rather by means of a demonstration of good will and the observance of the interests and rights of all those to whom a settlement guarantees the right to a home, an independent and secure existence and to peace. Already now it is symptomatic that immediately following Camp David Begin and Sadat began to give divergent interpretations to the key points of the agreement. The former leader is set upon firmly anchoring his dictates, the latter upon justifying himself before his own countrymen. Already now one can well understand the realistically thinking people who see themselves forced to point out the seriousness of the resulting situation and to the new dangers looming on the Mideast horizon. It was therefore no accident that the Egyptian Foreign Minister Kamel declared his resignation, and that a wave of criticism and protests is rising all over the Arab world.

— Spartak Beglov  
Novosti Political Commentator