

SOVIET SECTOR

East Germans, Czechs Counter Soft Line On Carter Warmakers

A view of the Carter Administration significantly contrary to the dominant Soviet "soft line" is receiving increasing publicity in East Germany (DDR), Czechoslovakia, and Moscow. Qualities of some of this criticism and the identity of the authors presenting it testify that those in the East who doubt it is possible to find acceptable or reliable negotiated arms agreements with the present U.S. government have something more on their minds than perfecting a military war-winning capability. Some leaders there are entertaining the alternative of collaboration with Western Europeans, Arab States, and other Third World governments for a new monetary system which would pull the rug out from under Carter and the Wall Street banks.

Professor Lutz Maier in the DDR weekly *Horizont* and the Czechoslovak daily *Rude Pravo*'s team of Bochenek and Matouš turned the spotlight on Zbigniew Brzezinski, the Trilateral Commission chairman whose presence in the Administration the purveyors of the "soft" public profile have of necessity downplayed. *Rude Pravo* identified Brzezinski with the unrelinquished desire to "restore capitalist rule over the entire planet" — which is to say, to go to war with the Soviet Union.

These attacks on Brzezinski, the majority of which identify his Trilateral Commission role and thereby implicate most of the Carter government, share an analysis formula: the Western press' activities on behalf of "dissidents" in the socialist countries, a campaign more or less explicitly attributed by them to Brzezinski (see EIR Vol. IV, No. 5), are a complement of the "Soviet threat" propaganda; the former is a more sophisticated ploy to gain strategic leverage against the Soviet sector. Thus the Trilateral Commission and the Administration are revealed as "enemies of détente," whereas the dominant Soviet line has been to portray Carter as victim of "outside" pressure from the Committee on the Present Danger, American Security Council, a supposed defense industry lobby, etc.

The analysis of the Trilateral Commission by the Czech and East German writers appeared in more muted form in an article in the February *International Affairs* (Russian-language edition), a Soviet publication.

The same idea emerged with exceeding vehemence from the Western European communist parties whose Moscow connections are most strong: Alvaro Cunhal's Portuguese Communist Party (PCP) and Gen. Enrique Lister's Spanish Communist Workers' Party (PCOE). The PCP-linked daily *O Diario* editorialized Feb. 11 that Brzezinski proposes a strategy of stimulating "polycentrism" in Eastern Europe, which is "more

reactionary and more dangerous" than even Henry Kissinger. A PCP propaganda department release to this effect was reprinted in full in the DDR's *Neues Deutschland* and in *Rude Pravo*, but not in Soviet papers.

The East German writer Maier who works at the Institute for Politics and Economics (IPW) in Berlin declared that the apparent will for "détente" on the part of the Trilateral Commission et al. is a deceptive phenomenon best described as "an imperialist concept of détente." Its advocates will not attack détente frontally, he explained, but use devious means to exact concessions from the East, stressing "opportunities for offensive activities." Maier went on to expose the real economic policies of the Trilateral Commission: shipping labor-intensive methods to the Third World while cutting back industrial output in the advanced sector. Treating the case of the International Energy Agency, which he identified as a parallel institution to the Trilateral Commission and other vehicles of this policy, Maier

Zorza Misses The Mark: Soviet Rand D

Observing in his Feb. 16 column "A Message to the Moscow Hardliners" that opposition to a "soft" line on SALT is just below the surface in Moscow, syndicated columnist Victor Zorza evaluated the military "hard-line" opposition in these brief passages:

(The issues in dispute) may be deduced, perhaps from Pravda's complaint that the critics insisted on 'all-embracing solutions' to disarmament problems, instead of accepting 'partial measures' as adequate. One such partial measure which is now very much at issue is President Carter's proposal that both the U.S. cruise missile and the Soviet Backfire bomber should be excluded from the next SALT agreement. For the Soviet military, this would be difficult to accept because the United States is so far ahead with the cruise missile that its further development might, in their view, deprive the Soviet Union of the strategic parity which it now enjoys.

....What the hawks want is to hold out for a more substantial agreement, perhaps after they have piled up even more strategic weapons which they could use as bargaining chips.

reported its task as international "crisis management... in the strategically key area of energy."

This added dimension of Maier's attack on Trilateralism is of special significance due to his past public advocacy of a "new method" of triangular economic cooperation among the socialist and capitalist sectors of Europe and the Third World as a step-stone to a new world economic order. His perspective, presented in a September 1976 paper for the International Peace Institute in Vienna, identifies Maier with the outward-looking Eastern European current most anxious to see the socialist sector's transferable ruble trade-financing proposals functional. It should not be missed in Western Europe and North America that the most sophisticated attacks on the Trilateral administration come from such a spokesman.

The Soviet party paper, *Pravda*, however, has gone to new lengths to maintain the public profile of seeking peace assurances through a SALT II agreement with the "soft" side of Trilateralism. Vitalii Korionov, one of the paper's top commentators, followed the scenario of a

staged debate when he wrote Feb. 13 that opposition to Trilateral Commission soft cop Paul Warnke's confirmation as chief arms negotiator is aimed solely to wreck SALT.

The opposition to this still dominant "soft" facade, and the SALT negotiating concessions it implies, is increasingly apparent in Moscow as well and has not escaped all Western observers. Syndicated columnist Victor Zorza, for instance, called attention to an on-the-air reference by Soviet TV commentator Yuri Zhukov to "some impatient comrades" who call partial SALT agreements a useless pursuit at best. But Zorza's supposition that the hardliners, particularly in the military, are merely holding out for a "more substantial" agreement misses the mark. Time gained would be used not essentially for quantitative buildup — "more strategic missiles" — and not for "bargaining chip" accumulation. Time means opportunity for Soviet development of a qualitative military technological margin of advantage, while in the U.S. the corresponding R and D capabilities are dismantled by the administration's policy of deindustrialization.

Triangular Trade Advocate From DDR Institute Exposes Trilateral Commission Policies

The following is excerpted and condensed from Prof. Lutz Maier's article "Monopoly Strategy in a Dilemma," from the weekly paper Horizont, 1977 issue No. 7.

...None of the measures which were supposed to bring about an upswing in 1976 succeeded....Investment activity is being expanded only very slowly and hesitantly and is mainly a matter of rationalization....The result of this is that raw materials and above all labor-intensive production activity is increasingly sent abroad. This means also that the products of these branches of the economy will tend to be imported and a growing part of domestic production of them will be liquidated....

The world economic position and activities of the Council on Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) and its members are more strongly affecting processes in the capitalist economic system. The growing participation of the socialist countries in international trade and exchange of services as well as in the international division of labor is generally developing, in close connection with the developing countries, into a motive force which limits the influence of the international concerns and cartels, and stimulates and strengthens the discussions for new international economic relations on the basis of fairness and mutual advantage.

Collectivity and Contradictions

The governments of the imperialist states are presently strengthening their joint efforts to alleviate acute manifestation of crisis. This appears on several

levels, such as:

- in U.S. ruling circles, especially in connection with the presidential election, a discussion is going on concerning the global strategic priorities of the U.S., in which the place of "Western partnership" would be redefined;
- on U.S. initiative a sort of summit-level government commission of the "big seven" — the U.S., Canada, Japan, BRD, France, Great Britain, and Italy — was formed and met first in 1975 at Rambouillet and then last year in Puerto Rico;
- the "Trilateral Commission," formed in 1973 of representatives of monopoly capital, government circles, and politicians from the U.S., Western Europe, and Japan. Its stated task is to study relations and differences of the three imperialist centers. The initiator of this commission was the U.S. policy expert and now security advisor to the new president, Brzezinski;
- the long existing military and economic organizations such as NATO, the OECD, etc.;
- institutions for special areas, such as the International Energy Agency (IEA), which are supposed to provide a sort of "joint crisis management" of the industrialized capitalist countries against the actions of the developing countries and coordinate long-term plans in such a strategically crucial areas as energy.

The U.S. especially pursues a revitalization of its leading role in the capitalist system and protecting the worldwide profit interests of the American multitis; Western Europe and Japan seek their own economic and political zones of influence and to strengthen their