

Soviets make ready for U.S. 'sneak attack'

by Rachel Douglas



High-level Soviet officials who spoke at the end of March in Moscow with a leading West German political analyst startled him with their grim assessment of the prospects for preserving world peace. One Soviet spokesman after another angrily denounced the Carter administration's vacillating and dangerous policy, and demanded Western European action to reverse the plunge toward war before it is too late.

In Moscow, wrote Theo Sommer, editor of the weekly *Die Zeit*, "it looks in the present situation as though Soviet-American relations are irreparably damaged as long as Jimmy Carter resides in the White House. The Soviet assessment of the man from Georgia is quite similar to that of Carter's Western European critics: they see him as dilettantish, unstable, uncalculable. To be sure, where the West Europeans see in the President merely wide-eyed naiveté, the Soviets suspect a Machiavellian malice. And whereas NATO partners react with amused dismay, the Soviets fly into icy iron indignation."

"If we fail—Western Europe and the socialist countries—to stop Carter, the world will find itself in a dangerous situation," a high Soviet official told Sommer. "We have many common interests, although we belong to different alliances—particularly a common interest in peace. We invite you to ally with us. If America is now using all its might to destroy the conditions of peaceful coexistence, real solidarity consists in stopping the United States from doing so."

Theo Sommer is a leading West German representative of the Anglophile "realist" faction which fears that Carter's shenanigans will get Europe as well as the United States blown up. A member of the Trilateral Commission and the International Institute of Strategic Studies and a frequent contributor to the publications of the New York Council on Foreign Relations, Sommer served as an adviser to West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt when Schmidt was Defense Minister (1969-72). Other members of the international Anglophile elite such as George Ball and George Kennan in the United States have recently betrayed an exasperation with Carter's policies similar to what Sommer's article reflects.

A U.S. 'surprise attack'

Since Theo Sommer's report appeared, the Soviet leaders have stated more explicitly through the official press what Moscow means by the Carter administration's incalculability and "fraud," as Foreign Minister Gromyko put it during the month of March.

A series of articles is comparing the Carter administration, the Thatcher government of Great Britain, and Teng Xiao Ping's China with Nazi Germany. Like the Nazis, wrote Major-General Matsulenko on April 3, the U.S. is attempting to conceal the "economic reasons"—weakness—behind their war policy.

The United States is preparing a "surprise attack under false pretenses," the general continued.

The U.S.S.R. has adapted a military and diplomatic



Soviet ICBMs on display in Red Square. Were such missiles to reign down on Peking, Brezhnev told a visiting representative of France early this year, NATO would have "a very short time" to decide between peace and total war in defense of her Chinese allies. He more recently declared that in the face of Washington's "incalculability," the Soviet Union "must keep our powder dry."

profile that matches the seriousness of this warning. Practically all diplomatic contacts between Washington and Moscow are frozen. The Soviet ambassador in Washington, Anatolii Dobrynin, has returned to Moscow on sick leave and has no scheduled date of return.

In this report, we will present translated excerpts from significant articles in the Soviet press that belie the illusions still prevalent in Washington about how the Soviet Union, allegedly "bogged down" in Afghanistan, would sit tight and do nothing while American marines are landed in the Persian Gulf. This material documents the Soviet assessment of the international situation: internal economic collapse is driving the U.S., under a leadership which is nothing short of crazy, to start World War III.

A "surprise attack," defined by *Red Star's* General Matsulenko as a nuclear strike against the U.S.S.R. or its allies, or a major deployment into the existing hot-spots, would not surprise Moscow at all. But Moscow's response will evidently surprise every member of the Carter administration.

Putting Moscow's cold war posture vis-à-vis Washington together with a Politburo-authorized ultimatum to China and a visibly growing concern in Soviet ruling circles that the governments of continental Europe cannot uphold detente on their own, we can conclude that the U.S.S.R. has shifted onto a war footing. Their mobilization is not for step-wise expanded regional clashes, but for full-scale thermonuclear war, whether instigated

by China or the United States-NATO combination directly.

Understanding the Soviet press

The speech by Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev that we quote speaks for itself, and communicates the view of Moscow that the international crisis is *increasingly* dangerous.

In our other excerpts, the reader will be struck by the language directed against "imperialism." Like an *Izvestia* article two weeks ago which pictured the roof of the American embassy in Moscow bristling with antennae from monitoring equipment, these terms belong to the lexicon of the Cold War.

By "imperialism," the Soviet press does not denote every power in the West. Moscow identifies an international war party led by Washington, London and Peking, and has banked on the governments of Western Europe to countervail and form the kernel of an alliance for peace and economic cooperation.

The question of Europe

Even the slightest sign of capitulation to the policies of Washington, Peking, and London on the part of continental Western Europe is read in Moscow as a grave deterioration of the international situation. A pattern of sharply escalating Soviet attacks on Helmut Schmidt's government in West Germany indicates that Moscow sees the crucial buffer against war that Europe has in the

past provided in danger of being eroded thanks to the unprecedented Anglo-American pressure on the West German chancellor.

Following the warm reception extended to West German opposition leader Franz Josef Strauss in Washington, the Soviet press toughened its analysis. While at first saying that Schmidt was leaning toward endorsing the Carter administration sanctions "punishing" the Soviets for Afghanistan, more recent coverage is noting a "shift" in Bonn. *Izvestia's* Matveev wrote April 1 that Schmidt was going to "sacrifice the gains of Ostpolitik (detente) for the sake of Atlantic solidarity."

The question of how far Schmidt has gone into the U.S. camp is still being debated in Moscow, but the Soviets believe without a doubt that the Paris-Bonn alliance (on which their remaining hopes of preserving peace are based) is in jeopardy.

The Soviets view war in terms of total war. Were Franco-German resistance to NATO war-preparations to collapse in fact, the Soviet command would assume the inevitability of a NATO decision for war, and at that point, take the decision themselves. The Kremlin might order last-ditch war-avoidance actions, Afghanistan-style *warnings*, but after Afghanistan, the only options remaining must incur the immediate risk of world war as Afghanistan did not. Such action must therefore constitute an immediate pre-war deployment. As Brezhnev told France's Chaban Delmas earlier this year, once Soviet missiles hail down on Peking, NATO will have "a very short time" to decide between peace and total war.

The China danger

While considering the leadership of China dangerous in its own right, the Soviets hold that the threat of a Peking-triggered war outbreak becomes much more immediate with increased military backing of Peking by the U.S. and Britain.

The April 7 *Pravda* article signed I. Aleksandrov, from which we excerpt warnings that China will "pay the price" of "allying with imperialism," concludes with an offer of peace talks with Peking. It has the nature of an ultimatum.

If China does not stop now, the Soviets conclude that newly contracted American and British arms deliveries to China will give Peking the means to carry out "new threats to Vietnam, instigation of Thailand into conflict with Cambodia, provocations on the Laotian border," in the words of *Izvestia* analyst V. Matveev April 1.

Other Soviet commentaries identify tight collaboration of these same powers in southern Asia. These range from a March 28 *New Times* exposé of U.S. and Chinese backing for "Islamic fundamentalism" to attacking the activation of the "Brahmaputra Plan" to split the state of Assam out of northeast India.

Documentation

Harsh warnings from Moscow

Soviets anticipate 'sneak attack'

Major-general V. Matsulenko wrote an article in Krasnaya Zvezda (Red Star) April 3 under the headline "Lessons Which Should Not Be Forgotten." The occasion was the approaching 35th anniversary of V-E day.

The first, most important lesson of the Second World War and the Great Patriotic War is that the victory of the Soviet Union over fascist Germany and militarist Japan was lawful....

The second, no less important, lesson of the war is that it showed that the real culprit was international imperialism....

The third lesson shows the necessity of highest vigilance with regard to the aggressive plans and intrigues of imperialism.

In launching war, the imperialists carefully mask its political essence and the underlying economic reality. They try to conceal their true reasons and goals, by resorting to all sorts of political tricks and defrauding their own people as well as world public opinion.

German fascism, for example, justified its aggressive plans for gaining world rule on the grounds that they supposedly had insufficient "living space" for Germany and masked them with talk of "the communist threat." The Hitlerites justified their surprise attack on the U.S.S.R. as a necessary preventive strike....

These perfidious devices have been used by the imperialists in the postwar period. In particular, there was the intervention against Egypt in 1956 by England, France and Israel, supposedly to defend the "freedom" of ship movement in the Suez Canal, which in reality was being threatened by nobody. ... These states used the factor of surprise—they began combat actions without declaration of war, in order to seize the initiative and attain decisive results.

It is the same today. The imperialists of the United States under cover of an invented myth of the "Soviet military threat," are winding up a military machine, in order to alter the correlation of forces in their favor and gain military superiority over the Soviet Union....

The aggressive, reactionary policy of the U.S. impe-

rialists...shows that they have not made the necessary conclusions from the lessons of the Second World War. They are intensively carrying out military preparations, forming and strengthening aggressive blocs, setting up new military bases around the Soviet Union, developing and updating plans to attack the U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries with nuclear missiles, and launching local wars.

'Keep your powder dry'

We excerpt the front page editorial that appeared under the headline "Keep your powder dry" in Krasnaya Zvezda on April 5. The quotation from Brezhnev was drawn from his March 31 speech accepting the Lenin Prize for literature.

Brezhnev has stressed, 'The entirety of accumulated experience, the international situation which has taken shape, and especially the events of the most recent period, oblige us to keep our powder dry, to be stalwart and consistent in upholding the cause of peace, and to bear in mind our historical responsibility for the fate of all humanity.'...

Despite the fact that imperialism has been dealt serious defeats, its nature, as before, remains aggressive. The more that imperialism's ability to rule other countries and peoples shrinks, the more wildly the aggressive and short-sighted imperialists react to this.

The war-mongering circles of the United States forced upon their NATO allies a multiyear program of intense arms build-up, and then the decision to station new medium-range nuclear missiles in several Western European countries... The U.S. has deployed major naval forces to the shores of Iran and is creating a so-called "rapid response corps." Overseas politicians and strategists try to pass off these dangerous actions as 'a response' to the events in Iran and Afghanistan. But this is just a pretext. The build-up of military might and forces for armed interference began before these events. The Chinese leadership is acting as the direct accomplice of imperialism...

There is no Vance-Brzezinski split

The Tass dispatch on Secretary of State Cyrus Vance's testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the end of March was brief, but it laid to rest the myth of a dividing line between Vance and National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski which Moscow had retailed for several years.

In some circles in the American capital, there is a story rampant that there exists some sort of "difference" between the "sober" line of the State Department and

the policy of presidential adviser on national security Z. Brzezinski, known for his pathological anti-Soviet inclinations. But the statement of Secretary of State C. Vance clearly showed that he and his agency unflinchingly implement the "hard" line of Carter and Brzezinski. ...Vance's statement was more like those of Pentagon generals than of the leader of a foreign policy institution.

The hawks in three capitals

A senior foreign affairs analyst of the government daily Izvestia, V. Matveev, reviewed the international situation from the standpoint of "The Hawks' Ambitions." He placed the "hawks" in Washington, London and Peking.

[Soon after U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown's trip to Peking], British Foreign Secretary F. Pym, during his trip to China, declared Britain's intention to supply China with not only "defensive, but offensive arms." The Tories, having learned nothing from history, are following in the footsteps of Chamberlain in their tricky anti-Soviet game. Military transport planes, specially equipped helicopters, Harrier destroyer-bombers, early warning systems—this is far from the complete assortment of technology being sent to China, whose leaders are constantly issuing new threats against Vietnam, inciting Thailand to clash with Cambodia, carrying out provocations on the Laotian border, and repeating Mao's dictum that a destructive world conflict would be "acceptable" for China....

There is an invisible, but clear line between peoples and peace-oriented governments on the one hand, and the handful of those who for the sake of their egotistical, raving plans are ready to put humanity on the brink of catastrophe....

Vice President W. Mondale...virtually came out as a spokesman not only for cold war but for hot war.

Politburo warns China

The authoritative signature "I. Aleksandrov" appeared under a major article on China in Pravda April 7. It warned Peking:

The anti-Soviet policy of Peking has an instigating, provocative nature. It is no secret for anybody that the frank intention to let the Soviet Union and U.S. confront each other in the abyss of thermonuclear war is part of Peking's strategic plans...The U.S. ... is trying to involve Peking in its military adventures which can only bring new harm and suffering to the Chinese people.

The role of accomplice and junior partner of imperialism is the price Peking must pay for the policy of allying with imperialism in its policy of aggression and war...