

EXCLUSIVE

Geneva And The Factional Line-Up In The Soviet Union

The following is an analysis of the several different factional viewpoints expressed in the Soviet party and government by the U.S. Labor Party's Director of Intelligence, Criton Zoakos. It originally appeared in the Labor Party's newspaper, New Solidarity.

Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev delivered his speech Nov. 7, on the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution at the height of a sharp fight over foreign policy which has been raging among top policymaking circles in the USSR over the past two months. In fact, the leading factional networks in both Moscow and Washington are presently assuming that if the Carter Administration fails to deliver on its promises of an early Geneva Middle East Peace Conference, then the centrist faction over which President Brezhnev is presiding will suffer a serious setback in the hands of the combined forces of Soviet military hardliners and internationally oriented forces in the Soviet scientific and intelligence establishment who are favorable toward recent French Gaullist proposals for a world development program and a monetary reform based on gold.

The indications coming from events around the 60th anniversary celebrations point to the likelihood of an early collapse of the recent Gromyko-Vance deal and a return to the climate of U.S.-Soviet diplomatic hostilities which existed during the March-April period. Only a decisive defeat of Israel's and the Zionist lobby's drive to derail the Geneva conference would avert this course of developments.

This has both the American and Soviet principals of the Gromyko-Vance deal very worried, to the point that a major part of these two groups' activities involve efforts to boost up their counterparts' factional positions in their respective countries. The overall effect of these efforts has, during the past week, amounted to a comedy of errors as the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* buried their "human rights" propaganda and engaged in articles and editorials of virtual adulation of President Brezhnev. The comedy of errors also extended to editorial attacks by these two dailies against the so-called Jewish lobby which has so far made it almost impossible for Secretary Vance to deliver on the Geneva Conference part of his bargain with the Moscow leadership.

More amusing, however, was President Brezhnev's claim, during the anniversary celebrations in Moscow that his unprecedented offer to stop all peaceful un-

derground nuclear testing is to be taken as an intervention into the factional brawl in Washington.

Hard Line Reaction

As it turned out Leonid Brezhnev is the one who will need all the help he can get if he is to survive. However, the help offered him by the editorial writers of the *Washington Post* is not exactly what is required.

The problem with Katherine Meyer's *Washington Post* and certain associated New York Zionist lobby policymakers is that they do not have the slightest notion of how Soviet political reality—into which they presume to intervene—really works. For instance, despite the apparent consolidation of the centrists around Brezhnev since the Gromyko-Vance joint statement, the "Gaullist" Soviet hardliners carried out a major coup in the course of the October Revolution celebrations. They cancelled British-agent Santiago Carrillo's, the boss of the Spanish Communist Party, scheduled address before the Soviet Supreme Soviet; they triggered a series of attacks against the London-inspired drive for "Eurocommunism"; they published in the government's official daily *Izvestia* for the first time an account identifying London as the inspirator of international terrorism; they censored from Soviet TV broadcasts those sentences of Brezhnev's anniversary speech which offered to cancel all peaceful underground nuclear explosions.

Further indications from a number of East European capitals leave no doubt that the top Soviet leadership is in the middle of an intense three-way factional fight.

Three Factions

The two opposite extremes in this three-way lineup can best be termed as the "British" and "French" factions, named after the foreign partners each tends to align with. Between the two lies a large "centrist" inertial force which is presided over by Leonid Brezhnev and intervenes to ensure that neither the "British" nor the "French" tendency gains too much ground.

To understand the concerns and the character of this "centrist" tendency one need only consult Brezhnev's panegyric speech Nov. 3. That speech is driven by an obsessive effort to strike a balanced growth among the key sectors of the Soviet economy under conditions of continued isolation from the world economy. Evident throughout the address is the plea of the Soviet Oblomov tendency to be left alone, to ignore the international monetary chaos, to ignore the impact of the collapse of world trade on Soviet capital formation programs—and

also to ignore the persistent deterioration of the world strategic situation which puts strains on Soviet heavy industry and defense production. Brezhnev's centrist faction represents a Soviet impulse to make believe that the all too real problems of the outside world will go away if one makes certain "rational" concessions to the other side.

Neither the "British" nor the "French" faction of the Soviet leadership, however, suffers from the delusion that the USSR can remain insulated from the world. As a matter of fact, the "British" faction of Messrs. Arbatov, Afanasiev et al. whose pedigree goes all the way back to convicted British intelligence operative N. Bukharin, are on a mobilization footing to impose today Her Britannic Majesty's concepts of consumerism, "Eurocommunism," and integration into the bankrupt International Monetary Fund as the only path to "modernization" available to the Soviet Union. The intelligence and covert operations warfare currently raging in Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary and to a lesser extent in the Soviet hierarchy is aimed at creating the necessary bureaucratic balances for such a shift.

The so-called "French" or "Gaullist" tendency, entrenched mainly in the Soviet military and scientific traditions, approaches the issue of the Soviet Union's role in the world arena in a way conceptually similar to Admiral Gorshkov's notion of modern military power: the Soviet Union, 60 years after the Bolshevik Revolution has reached the point of industrial, political and scientific maturity which obliges it to take major positive responsibility for world industrial and economic development, including responsibility for shaping a new international monetary system.

What the Washington Post and other British-connected expectant manipulators of Soviet politics do not understand is the ultimate affinity in the outlook of the centrist and the "hard line" Gaullist tendencies in Soviet politics. The basic programmatic approach of the hardliners is oriented around a core-program of world industrial development and world monetary reform based on gold and the transfer ruble as the only viable war-avoidance posture. To them, the destruction of London monetarists' control over the world markets is a fundamental issue of national interest; thus, they represent the most advanced and sophisticated articulation of the Soviet state's long-term interest.

Leonid Brezhnev's problem is that the ultimate loyalties of his "centrist" Oblomovist base are to Soviet state interest, as this basically isolationist base understands that interest. If his current policy course fails, all bets are off. It will only take a failure of the scheduled Geneva conference and some further progress in London's continuing subversion and destabilization efforts in Poland and Yugoslavia for a drastic upheaval in the Soviet political scenery.

If events move in this direction in the weeks ahead, then one of two possible alternate situations will replace the present Brezhnev policy, both of which will involve the merciless purging of the British faction. One alternative, the worst-case scenario, will involve the replacement of Brezhnev's failed war-avoidance strategy with a purely military hard line and the shift to a war-winning posture. This would be based on a political

cooptation of some of the "Gaullist" faction's military leaders into the enraged camp of awoken centrist Oblomovists waving the banners of Mother Russia.

The second, best-case scenario will be the replacement of the present Brezhnev policy with an aggressive, Clausewitzian war-avoidance strategy with a drive to bankrupt London and related New Nork monetarist interests on the basis of a Paris-Moscow alliance for world industrial development which would increasingly tend to pull into its orbit "Rapallo-oriented" industrial-labor interests in West Germany, Italy, Japan, and the United States itself.

Red Army Uses Brezhnev Against Brezhnev

The Soviet Union celebrated the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution Nov. 7 with a military parade in Moscow twice the size of last year's. The Soviet military took the occasion to remind, in a greeting to last week's special session of the Central Committee and Supreme Soviet, that Soviet overtures for peace — for a Middle East settlement and a new strategic arms agreement, for example — are not to be taken as a signal of weakness.

The Armed Forces statement stressed the crucial nature of advanced technology for Soviet defense.

The statement was a factional comment on Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev's exceeding flexibility in offering a suspension of nuclear blasts for peaceful purposes, for the sake of a new test ban pact.

The Armed Forces greeting, excerpted here from the Daily Red Star Nov. 4 issue, compiled the toughest highlights from past speeches of Brezhnev himself. The military prefers to remind President Brezhnev that he also carries the title "Marshall of the Soviet Union."

Years and decades have passed, but as long as imperialism exists on our planet, the wise Leninist dictum remains sacred for us: "Be sharp, guard the defense capability of our country and our Red Army, as the apple of your eye...."

The men of the army and navy, like all the people, fully support the internal and foreign policy of the party and government, their struggle for international detente. *But when Soviet people talk about peace, let no one take this for a sign of weakness.*

As a symbol of fidelity to Lenin's principles, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's words sound as a warning to the enemies of peace: "Continue to maintain the country's Armed Forces on a high level, so that Soviet soldiers always have the most modern weapons, which the imperialists have to reckon with — this is our duty to the people, and we will fulfill it sacredly..."

With a feeling of warm thanks to the party and people, who have entrusted awesome weapons to us, we solemnly declare: "We have something with which to defend the socialist Fatherland!"...

Revolutionary, militant traditions live and multiply. This is why we soldiers of the seventies solemnly declare

to the people and party: "We have someone to defend the Soviet Fatherland!"

Every year, a better educated, politically and technically more literate young generation enters the army and navy. But the demands on the Armed Forces personnel constantly grow. Each soldier must completely master complex technology and be prepared for any trials on the field of battle. This requires great and persistent labor, high discipline and organization. On land, sea and water and under water — intense combat training is going on. In maneuvers and exercises, military skill is developed, and the moral qualities of the soldiers and officers are tempered.

The main result of all our work is that the Soviet Army and Navy are stronger and more monolithic than ever.

But the personnel of the army units and ships view what has been achieved only as a stepping stone for further growth. We have no small reserves for raising the efficiency and quality of combat training. And the nature of the period, so full of historical events, demands that we go further and achieve more.

The new Constitution of the land of October — the outstanding document of modern times — has affirmed the truly great achievements of the workers. It not only declares the rights and freedoms of the citizens of the USSR, but guarantees them. Soviet soldiers well understand that the basis of these rights and freedoms is the might of the socialist state, the peaceful creative labor of the people, and its reliable defense.

On this solemn day we vow sacredly to fulfill our duty to the people, and as the Basic law of the USSR states, to be on constant combat readiness, guaranteeing the immediate rebuff of any aggressor.

Evans , Novac Find "Gaullist" Faction Strong In USSR

Recognition that a strong Soviet faction wants to gear Soviet policy to Soviet economic development needs was expressed in an apprehensive column by Evans and Novak Nov. 16. The real Soviet threat to Western Europe

(from the monetarist point of view) is not a military invasion, they wrote, but an upsurge of technological exchange and trade. "Moscow wants an economically healthy Western Europe — not one devastated by war....," they cited European observers.

The impetus for Soviet collaboration with progrowth Western political and industrial leaders is dramatized in the current Soviet-Japanese economic negotiations, which are on the verge of a new quality and scale of projects: nuclear power development, Siberian resource exploitation, and a much higher trade turnover. Among Soviet scientists, planners, and party administrators responsible for aspects of the USSR's huge Siberian development program, there are many who know that its implementation can only be speeded by a healthy capitalist industrial sector generating technology exports to the USSR.

The Siberian natural gas projects to which Japan will contribute, for example, are geared to a *thirty-year* growth plan for the entire region. Japanese finished goods may find a market in the new cities being built along the new extension of the Soviet trans-Siberian railroad and around new hydroelectric power stations and industrial complexes.

The arrival of Soviet fusion research leader N. Basov in the U.S. to seek new broad cooperation on nuclear energy development is another mark of this "Gaullist" faction.

Banned Carrillo Speech Was "Prepared" By Pravda Editor

The Spanish Communist Party has revealed that the speech which Eurocommunist kingpin Santiago Carrillo was forbidden to deliver in Moscow last week was "prepared" by V. Afanasyev, the editor of *Pravda* and Carrillo's current chief apologist in Moscow. While putting an end to the official proclamation — released by Afanasyev himself — that the ban on Carrillo was due to "translation" problems, the PCE's press announcement confirms that the emcees at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses silenced not the foreigner Santiago Carrillo, but a leading "Britisher" in the Soviet party itself.