

countries as well as of the immense majority of individuals, and, finally, the temptation to substitute confrontation for dialogue, we must remember the teachings of history. History shows that societal conflicts have often been treated through violence and persecution, and internal difficulties masked by external adventures. And we must reflect that things do not only occur to others.

It is urgent that the citizens of European countries free themselves from the control of pressure groups, which place ideological enslavement or material interest above the independence and the freedom of action of their nations. It is urgent that European countries disengage from the ideological blocs, whose primitive antagonism may very rapidly lead to a cataclysmic confrontation.

USSR Answers 'Team B' Report

The official Soviet press has stepped up attacks on Western propaganda about a "Soviet threat" to the U.S., identifying its source as the Committee on the Present Danger (CPD), the American Security Council, and the "Team A" vs. "Team B" strategic intelligence estimate controversy. A major feature in the party daily, Pravda, on Jan. 8 located the "Soviet threat" campaign as an attempt to "shock the population" and step up arms spending and militarization in the West. The following day Pravda warned that "the danger stemming from this kind of hysteria must not be underestimated."

Pravda warned that a U.S. push to surpass the Soviet Union in strategic capability — the CPD-dominated "Team B" demand — would be viewed in the Soviet Union as a departure from the West's own notion of a "balance of forces." *The clear implication of the Pravda article is that if the CPD line becomes dominant in the West, the USSR will view this as a declaration of intent to go to war.*

The paper particularly debunked scenarios of Soviet tank invasions of Western Europe as completely incompetent. The real military issue in Europe, Pravda stressed, is not "tank superiority," but "the strategic conceptions and military programs" of NATO and the Warsaw Pact — for instance, the placement of "huge stocks of (NATO) tactical nuclear weapons" at the borders of the socialist countries. This deployment, known as "forward defense," has previously been characterized by Warsaw Pact spokesmen as a blitzkrieg strategy against the East.

Politics Decides

It is politics that decides everything in matters of war and peace, declared Pravda on Jan. 8. The perception of

U.S. politics, expressed in Pravda, and simultaneously in the Soviet military paper Red Star, is that the "Team B" line represents tremendous pressure on Jimmy Carter not to go for a new strategic arms agreement with the USSR.

The Soviet Union is publicly giving credence to Carter's ostensibly pro-détente utterances: his promised reductions in the defense budget and stated desire to succeed in negotiations with the Soviets to curb arms. This credulity is based on a profound *wish* that the Carter Administration might contract disarmament agreements and not give full rein to James Schlesinger (the ideologue of the CPD) to provoke confrontation, and that such agreements would make war less likely. The Soviet response to the "Team B" ruckus indicates that even this flawed hope that war could be avoided in a world still dominated by Schachtian economic policies is disintegrating.

The Soviet government daily, Izvestia, in a Jan. 8 feature on disarmament which also included the line that Carter is basically favorable to Soviet disarmament initiatives, also pointed to a fundamental factional issue in the United States — the question of development. Noting that massive military spending precludes solution of global problems such as food production and raw materials development, Izvestia observed that "it is possible that precisely these growing global needs will finally force some of the most stubborn people of the bourgeoisie to recognize the necessity of shifting resources for social purposes." Izvestia cited Edward Teller — the Rockefeller family scientist who in 1976 was brought to the point of advocating fusion power development by the impact of Soviet advances in that field — for his estimate that U.S. energy needs require investments seven times the size of what now goes for arms.