

Soviets publish LaRouche letter; different 'voices' in the Kremlin

by Konstantin George

The October English-language edition of the Soviet monthly, *International Affairs*, has printed in full a letter to its editors by U.S. presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche. Remarkably, the letter was published without any censorship. It had been written in reply to a March *International Affairs* article which slandered LaRouche as a "neo-fascist." Its Soviet publication marks a turning point in a debate on LaRouche, his strategic evaluations, and his policies within the ruling Soviet *nomenklatura*.

The reader may judge for himself, from the text below, the importance of the LaRouche letter being read, digested, and discussed among the Kremlin elite.

Different Kremlin 'voices'

The Kremlin's decision to publish the LaRouche letter now, six months after its receipt in Moscow, indicates that a debate on LaRouche himself, as a force on the world scene, is under way at the Kremlin, and has been for months at least. There are diametrically different "voices" manifested in *International Affairs'* introduction to LaRouche's letter, and in its reply to the letter—a reply much longer than the letter itself.

Concerning the time frame, the letter actually appeared first in the September (Number 9), Russian-language edition of *International Affairs (Mezhdunarodnaya Zhizn)*, which was ready for the printer Sept. 1, appearing in the English-language edition one month later. Thus, the decision to publish it was taken during the long absence of Gorbachov from Moscow, shortly before *Pravda* (mid-September) inaugurated open Soviet coverage of an impending "final crisis of capitalism."

The "Introduction" contains the "voice" of that current in the Soviet leadership which is forced to agree that LaRouche has been right in his definition of the fundamental issues of the present crisis period. It reads in part: "Had it only been a question of Mr. LaRouche's squabble with the journal, his letter would not really have been worthy of note. But, he touches on some fundamental realities of today, and we therefore print the full text of his letter and our reply to it."

However, whoever wrote that Introduction, the same person clearly did not write the reply (see *Documentation*). It is an entirely different "voice." The reply goes right back into the slander-diatribes style of the original Pustogarov article,

and, moreover, never replies in the manner promised by the Introduction. At no point does the reply dare to address LaRouche on those "fundamental realities of today" which LaRouche "touched on," to quote the Introduction.

Across-the-board debate

A striking feature of that October English-language edition of *International Affairs*, which is published by the All-Union *Znaniye* (Knowledge) Society, and regularly has input from foreign ministry circles and the party Central Committee's International Department, is that its composition is otherwise devoted to matters military. That issue of the journal was turned into a mouthpiece of the Soviet defense ministry.

The edition's lead article was written by Defense Minister Gen. Dmitri Yazov, followed by an article by recently appointed (March 1987) First Deputy Chief of the General Staff Gen. Col. Vladimir Lobov. Again, we see indications of different "voices" in the Kremlin leadership. Yazov's startling formulations are in sharp contrast with the policy line issuing from the Soviet Foreign Ministry, as well as from Anatolii Dobrynin's International Department of the Central Committee and Aleksandr Yakovlev's Propaganda Department fiefdom.

Yazov's article clearly indicates that President Reagan's "Munich II" signing of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force (INF) treaty will be followed by, not a new era of détente, but a period of bold Soviet confrontations against a United States caught in the grip of appeasement, much as the 1959 "Spirit of Camp David," and Khrushchov's U.S. tour, were followed by the U-2 incident, the cancellation of Eisenhower's Moscow visit, and a rapid escalation into the 1961 Berlin Crisis and the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis.

Writes Yazov, "Responsibility for international tensions lies primarily with the United States. Reluctant to give up the arms race, the U.S. ruling circles intend to deploy weapons in outer space to threaten the whole of mankind from there. Theirs is a double-standard policy. While paying lip service to strategic stability and an atmosphere of trust, they are encroaching upon parity, striving for strategic superiority."

Then comes a tirade:

"The extensive war preparations by the United States and its NATO allies, their growing military presence near the U.S.S.R. and the socialist countries, unending provocations,

violations of airspace and sea borders, delirious schemes to dismantle the social systems in the socialist countries, and other hostile imperialist activities undermine peace and security everywhere.

“Of late, at Washington’s prompting, the West has been going out of its way to present certain flaws in our organization of our airspace combat patrol as a weakness of the Soviet Armed Forces, and to encourage some hotheads to test our security in other areas.

“To put it bluntly, we wouldn’t advise anyone to check our strength. Our answer to provocations is the growing defense might of the Warsaw Treaty States and the rising vigilance and combat readiness of their Armed Forces.

“This refers, in the first place, to the personnel on combat duty and their arms and equipment.”

In short, on the eve of the Reagan-Gorbachov summit, the Soviet military command has loudly dispensed with all niceties, and proclaimed, not the dawning of a new era of “détente,” but a *pre-war situation*. And, Yazov’s article, in this regard, only confirms the conclusions one would draw from a recent article by the new commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces, General of the Army Ivan Tretyak, in the weekly *Nedelya*. Referring to the Matthias Rust incident, he announced that any future incursions into Soviet airspace, will be dealt with in the fashion of 1983’s KAL-007 shoot-down.

Colonel General Vladimir Lobov’s article in the same edition of *International Affairs* presented the Soviet offer for a U. S. “compromise” sell-out on ABM in the context of the strategic arms talks. The Soviet offer, presented in detail, reads: “. . . the U.S.S.R. agrees that the research in the sphere of space-based ABM systems be allowed at the laboratory levels, that is on the earth—in research institutes, on testing grounds, and at manufacturing works, without taking any ABM components to outer space. The Soviet side has said, it is prepared to agree on a list of devices that may or may not be placed in outer space.”

This is the first time that a top Soviet military leader has ever issued such a direct response to the traitorous “ABM sell-out” crowd within the Reagan administration, such as Paul Nitze, and the State Department.

East bloc security

There will soon be a new policy statement by Yazov and the Soviet military. Before the end of November, the Warsaw Pact defense ministers’ Military Committee will convene in Bucharest, Romania. Amazingly, the announcement of the meeting, front-page in the Soviet Defense Ministry daily *Krasnaya Zvezda* Nov. 18, was not picked up by any of the Western press.

Pro forma, the defense ministers’ meeting will have on its agenda the INF treaty and the Dec. 7 Reagan-Gorbachov summit. Its major focus, however, will be *internal East bloc security*. Having a Warsaw Pact defense ministers’ meeting

in Bucharest is as rare as “hen’s teeth.” But then, on Nov. 15, there were mass riots in the Romanian city of Brasov, the bloodiest inside the East bloc in decades. Moreover, there is an overall expectation of more and worse to come, in Romania and throughout the East bloc.

A new round of steep price rises will soon hit Poland, where small-scale demonstrations have already been staged in the main cities in anticipation. It will be Hungary’s turn in January, when a new value-added tax is introduced, causing a roughly 20% across-the-board price increase. In the U.S.S.R. itself, the restiveness of the captive nations will continue, especially in the Baltic region. The Nov. 18 demonstrations throughout Latvia, in commemoration of its 1918 Independence Day, were not a “one-shot” affair. In February at the latest—the month of Lithuanian and Estonian independence—the next major wave of freedom demonstrations in the captive Baltic republics will occur.

The power struggle

The various indications of different “voices” in the Kremlin underline the extremely fluid situation generated by the factional disputes raging before, during, and after the celebrations of the 70th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. This fact alone is significant. Such is the intensity of the feuding, that for the first time, the Soviet leadership has permitted its dirty laundry to be seen during the hallowed anniversary, in effect “soiling” the celebration. In the past, even were such faction fights under way, they would have been kept quiet until after the anniversary.

But instead, the Oct. 21 Central Committee plenum removed Geidar Aliyev from the Politburo on the spot, and, minus the formalities, decided the fate of Moscow party boss Boris Yeltsin. Then, there was Gorbachov’s Nov. 2 speech in which he began to profile himself in the tradition of *Stalin*, reflecting the fact that a neo-Stalinist policy matrix is the future winner in Russia. Gorbachov named two types of opposition to his *glasnost* and *perestroika*, and indirectly compared them to the Left (Trotsky) and Right (Bukharin) Opposition to Stalin during the 1920s. In this regard, Gorbachov uttered the very significant statement, “The leadership core of the party, with Stalin at its head, defended Leninism in the ideological struggle.”

Then, on Nov. 11, the Moscow party leadership met, with Gorbachov and Politburo ideological boss Yegor Ligachov present. Yeltsin was expelled and humiliated in language identical to that employed by Stalin during the 1920s against the Opposition. On Nov. 17, Gorbachov and Ligachov addressed a special meeting of the Central Committee apparatus. Gorbachov’s speech was published in *Pravda*, Nov. 21. Here, the Nov. 2 thread was picked up with a vengeance.

Gorbachov used Stalin’s tactic of amalgamating the two types of opposition, “conservatism” and “pseudo-revolutionary” or “artificial avant-gardism.” “As different as their rhet-