War economy ‘czars’ move up the Soviet ladder

by Konstantin George and Rachel Douglas

On Feb. 17-18, the Soviet Central Committee held a two-day plenum, called to draft and adopt measures to upgrade the Soviet education system. The plenum was dominated by Yegor Ligachov, the Politburo member who runs the party through his direction of the all-powerful Central Committee Secretariat. Ligachov delivered the keynote address.

The plenum’s results, most striking in the personnel decisions that it ratified, demonstrate that the subject of “education” was treated strictly as a means to further the development of the Soviet war economy. The results also certified the consolidation of power by an institutional “troika” of the party Secretariat through Ligachov, the military through Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov, and the KGB led by Politburo member Viktor Chebrikov.

The two new candidate Politburo members named illustrated the power of the war economy “czars” and of Ligachov’s Secretariat. They are: 1) Yuri Maslyukov, who shortly before the plenum was named head of the State Planning Committee (Gosplan), and thus put in charge of running the Soviet economy. Since April 1983, Maslyukov has directed the government’s defense industry commission; 2) Georgii Razumovsky, Central Committee Secretary in charge of the party’s Organizational Work Department. He has been the purge “hatchet man” for the Secretariat, dispatched to supervise personnel changes at republic, regional, and local levels.

Much attention has been focused in the Western media on establishing a “geographic proof” that Razumovsky, first Secretary of the Krasnodar Krai (region), Gorbachov’s home turf, from 1983-85, is therefore a “Gorbachov protégé.” What is ignored in this “Kremlinology” is that Razumovsky, during that time, carried out a major “anti-corruption” purge, and in that capacity cooperated closely with Yegor Ligachov.

Serving to underline the point, is the case of Lev Zaikov, the Politburo member who in November replaced Boris Yeltsin as Moscow City party boss. The plenum confirmed him in both the Moscow party function and his continuing function as Central Committee Secretary in charge of the Soviet defense industry. This combination of functions is unprecedented in Soviet history.

Without losing Zaikov, the CC Secretariat gained yet another representative from the defense sector, as Oleg D. Baklanov became a CC secretary. Since April 1983, Baklanov has been Minister of General Machine Building, in charge of missile and spaceship production.

Early February also saw an infusion of military-industrial managers into the Soviet government. Yuri Maslyukov, former head of the State Military-Industrial Commission, became chief of the State Planning Commission (Gosplan), first deputy prime minister, and candidate member of the Politburo, while Minister of Shipbuilding Igor S. Belousov became a deputy prime minister.

The emphasis on the military’s line, and on launching a “cultural” revival of Great Russian chauvinistic traditions, formed the most crucial portions of the plenum’s concluding speech by General Secretary Gorbachov.

‘Education’ and war buildup

The emphasis, both in Ligachov’s speech and throughout the plenum, was on bringing Soviet education up to the levels required by perestroika, the modernization of the U.S.S.R.’s military-industrial base. As Ligachov and other speakers stressed, Soviet youth must receive the kind of scientific, technical, and vocational education and training necessary for them to perform industrial labor in plants that are to be modernized.

There was a heavy concentration of plenum speakers from the Soviet Academy of Sciences, including its chairman, Yuri Marchuk; V.A. Koptiug, its vice president and
chairman of the Siberian branch in Novosibirsk; A.A. Logunov, also vice president and rector of Moscow’s Lomonosov University; as well as party first secretaries of regions in the Urals, where military industry predominates.

The plenum also devoted attention to the military’s demand for increased teaching of Russian to youth in the non-Russian republics, above all in the non-Slavic Turkic republics of Azerbaijan and Central Asia. An increasing number of draft-age youth, about one-third of the total pool, come from these republics. Their low level of proficiency in Russian has been repeatedly identified by the military as an obstacle to Soviet war preparations.

A total of 27 speakers addressed the two-day plenum, 19 on the first day, 8 on the second. All 8 speakers on the second day spoke at length. One of them was General of the Army A.D. Lizichev, the chief of the military’s Main Political Directorate. It can be assumed that his theme was measures to properly “educate” Soviet youth to upgrade the quality of recruits in general and entrants into the officers’ academies.

Gorbachev echoes the military

As concerns Gorbachev’s plenum speech, the foreign policy section could have been delivered by Defense Minister Dimitri Yazov, and the “cultural” section could have been stated by super-Russian chauvinist Pobedonostsev, the Russian Orthodox Church Procurator of the Holy Synod in the late 19th century, who embodied the person of the Grand Inquisitor.

The tough foreign policy line was linked to the Feb. 21 arrival in Moscow of Secretary of State George Shultz. After the INF treaty’s signing, Moscow has only escalated its demands on the Reagan administration. How many more sellouts can be procured from Washington, on arms control, on regional issues such as Afghanistan, the Near East, and the Gulf? And, last but not least, as the Gorbachev speech made clear, the Reagan administration is being told by the Kremlin to “liquidate” the opponents of the “Munich II” treaty and the “New Yalta” agreement it embodies.

In this spirit, Gorbachev focused his rage on the “consolidation of reactionary, extreme anti-Soviet forces. All kinds of so-called analysts, and Kremlinologists, are presenting recommendations to their governments that there will be catastrophic consequences for the West if the process of disarmament continues.”

Since the Reykjavik summit, a repeated Soviet demand has been that Western establishment forces eliminate those political forces, beginning with Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche, who are opposed to a “New Yalta” and to reversing the economic, military, and moral collapse of the West. Or, as Gorbachev put it, “the importance of liquidating the militarists.”

Gorbachev’s venom was also directed at European opposition to the INF treaty, in particular, in Britain and France: “The militaristic activities in the European part of NATO have been noticeably increased. They are in a hurry to ‘compensate’ for the missiles to be removed under the treaty. They are planning a modernization and a build-up of other types of nuclear weapons, especially at sea and in the air, cynically claiming that the latter are not covered by the treaty.” He attacked Britain and France for planning to increase their nuclear forces, and their bilateral military cooperation, “It is precisely after the signing of the treaty that the NATO states demonstrate enhanced activity in the field of bilateral and multilateral integration.”

Special anger was revealed over anti-INF forces’ successes in puncturing the myths of Gorbachev the “reformer” and “liberal,” so widely propagated in the Western media. Gorbachev complained that not everyone in the West is falling for his “charm.” He mentioned that to some, Moscow’s “diplomacy of smiles” arouses suspicion. “Western radio stations,” he said, are spreading “provocative inventions” about a leadership struggle in Moscow. “They wish to sow uncertainty, disbelief in the possibility of achieving the aims of the party.”

Gorbachev the “liberal” utterly vanished in the Great Russian chauvinism of the “cultural” section of his speech. “Bolshevism based itself on the leading humanistic traditions of the great culture of Russia. We know how Lenin valued the richness and humanism of so-called old culture, which played an important role in world civilization. And now we should, without any hesitation, energetically expand the cultural realm of perestroika, using and developing all the spiritual richness given us by our forefathers.”

Any illusions concerning better living standards were shattered. His message was austerity, “One can’t live by bread alone.” In his conclusions on the subject of perestroika: “There are no such things as miracles. perestroika is hard and complicated. Perestroika is work, work, and more work.”

One other important item to be noted in the speech was the announcement that the next Central Committee plenum would deal with the nationalities question, which Gorbachev identified as “the most vital question” facing Soviet society today. The next plenum will be held in the spring, certainly before the June 28 extraordinary 19th Party Conference. Ligachov, in his keynote speech, had strongly denounced “extremist” and “chauvinist manifestations,” that is, anti-Soviet riots and demonstrations in Kazakhstan, the Baltic republics, and Yakutia in the far northeast of Siberia.

Nationalist unrest was surging on the eve of the plenum, with mass demonstrations and church vigils in Catholic Lithuania on Feb. 14 and Feb. 16, the 70th anniversary of Lithuania’s short-lived independence. Since the plenum, Armenia was rocked Feb. 19-22 by mass demonstrations involving tens of thousands, (article, page 48) Nor has the unrest in the Baltic died down. There were large demonstrations and clashes with the police Feb. 2 in the Estonian university town of Tartu, and more actions on Feb. 24, the 70th anniversary of Estonian independence.