

U.S.S.R. would now be allowed to go.

'Dobrynin told me so!'

During mid-April, Giffen and U.S. Commerce Secretary C. William Verity had led a giant delegation of over 500 American businessmen to the U.S.S.R., to discuss joint ventures, and the establishment of U.S.-Soviet working commissions, in the field of energy and other areas. On April 26, Verity told a conference in Washington sponsored by the Committee for National Security that Gorbachov "enjoys the backing of the Army, the KGB, and the Politburo," and had prevailed in the Soviet politburo over Ligachov. According to Verity, the source of this information was former Soviet ambassador to the United States Anatoly Dobrynin! "Dobrynin might have been saying this for our consumption only, but I don't think so," Verity intoned.

Evidently, Dobrynin, who spent 25 years in Washington learning how to manipulate American "useful fools," is an important source for the disinformation that began to pour out of American media sewers, beginning in mid-April, about Gorbachov's "triumph" over Ligachov.

Other "Trust" channels now activated include the Anglo-Soviet Roundtable and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) in Laxembourg, Austria.

The Roundtable held its annual series of meetings from April 11-13, at the Royal Institute for International Affairs, also known as Chatham House, in London. The Soviets brought over a high-powered delegation, led by Yevgeni Primakov, now head of the influential IMEMO think tank in Moscow. Primakov let his British interlocutors know that the Soviets would be eager to reach new Afghanistan-like regional deals and to move closer to a "superpower condominium" approach to world crises, in part through the agency of a United Nations Security Council that would be upgraded in status.

As for IIASA, its Vienna-based affiliate, the New Initiatives Committee for East-West Trade, will be holding a meeting on expanding East-West trade opportunities on May 16-17, in Vienna, simultaneous with the Inter-Action meeting in Moscow. With participation from Goldman Sachs of New York, Italy's Banco da Roma, France's Crédit Lyonnais, Britain's Barclays, Austria's Kreditanstalt, and others, and participation from the Soviets' Gosbank and Poland's Handlowy Bank, the two-day session will discuss themes like, "The integration of COMECON into the world financial system," "Western financial integration and its consequences for East-West trade," and "New possibilities for financing joint ventures." As is the case with IIASA, the co-founder and *éminence grise* of the New Initiative Committee is Dzhermen Gvishiani, the chief of the Global Systems Analysis program of the U.S.S.R. For two decades, Gvishiani has specialized in manipulating the West's liberal establishment and neomalthusian organizations, to help destroy the West from within and further Soviet Russian imperial aims.

The lid will shortly the succession fight

by Konstantin George

It's the pre-summit "New Yalta season" in Moscow. The Reagan administration has already sold out Afghanistan and Pakistan, via the April 14 Geneva "agreement." The Moscow talks held between Secretary of State Shultz and Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze April 21 and 22 will go a long way toward defining the scope of the next round of expected American capitulations—START, ABM-SDI, the Middle East, and the Gulf—during the May 29-June 2 Reagan-Gorbachov summit.

This is true irrespective of whether or not a formal START treaty is signed at the summit. The Reagan administration's policies are doing a superb job of crippling the SDI and other vital programs, without the help of "arms control" agreements. Regarding the summit, there is a distinct danger that minus a START treaty, a superpower "understanding" on ABM could be just as deadly.

Beneath the picture of hasty pre-summit diplomacy, there is the brawl of the Soviet succession fight. This involves not only selecting a replacement for Mikhail Gorbachov, a purely secondary feature of the process, but forming the institutional combination that will *successfully* implement the war buildup policies code-named perestroika for the remainder of this decade and into the 1990s, a "period" Moscow believes will culminate in Russian world domination.

May will be an extremely important month in Moscow, but contrary to popular opinion, the most important event in Moscow during the month of May will *not* be the Reagan-Gorbachov summit.

Radio Moscow announced on April 24 that the Supreme Soviet (parliament) will convene on May 24. Sessions of the Supreme Soviet are almost invariably preceded by a Party Central Committee plenum. This one will be the last Central Committee plenum before the June 28 special Party Conference, making it of decisive importance.

The Supreme Soviet membership includes the Central Committee membership, who will thus all be present in Moscow for several days. This will give all the "mafias" of the Soviet *Nomenklatura* more than ample time to fine-tune the policy shifts in the making, and, should a decision on the leadership succession be made, organize the appropriate con-

come off in in the Kremlin

spiracies to settle the secondary matters, including outstanding "personnel questions."

Urgent questions must be resolved soon, beginning with a policy to tackle the catastrophic economic situation in the captive nations of Eastern Europe, threatening severe disorders in the very near future, and potential explosions in countries like Poland and Romania (see page 6).

The April 20 'mini-plenum'

The heat of the buildup to the June 28 XIX All-Union Party Conference, was demonstrated on April 20. Twenty-four hours before Shultz arrived in Moscow, TASS announced that Gorbachov had met, in three separate sessions on April 11, 14, and 18, "the first secretaries [party leaders] of all republics, regions [oblast], and territories [krai]." The tense pre-conference atmosphere was certified when TASS, in its remarkably terse statement on this "mini" Central Committee plenum (about one-third of the Central Committee was present), reported "an exchange of views" on the analysis and "preparations for the . . . Party Conference." Despite reference to "unanimity," this statement pointed to raging fights and disagreements.

The importance of this conference was underscored by the near total lack of coverage of it in the Soviet media. It, and not the Shultz visit, was the most important event of the week, indeed, of the month, in Moscow.

Events of this type ought to make Western governments look twice at what's really going on in the Soviet Union. They have been largely fooled by a contrived pattern in the Soviet media, a pre-summit ploy, giving the appearance of a Gorbachov "comeback." Why?

The hysteria in the West on this issue reached its peak with the April 21 lead story in the *New York Times*, asserting that the Politburo's chief ideologue, Yegor Ligachov, had been "dumped," or "stripped of his functions," in a "victory" by Gorbachov.

Within 24 hours, it was the *New York Times* which had been "stripped" of its pretentious claim to be a newspaper, as the "dumped" Ligachov appeared, seated next to Gorbachov at the April 22 Lenin birthday celebrations.

The pre-summit 'Potyomkin village'

Moscow has been staging a *show* to give the appearance that Gorbachov is "firm" as general secretary. This is being done to preserve an atmosphere in which Moscow can haul in as many strategic concessions from Washington as possible. The Soviet news media are therefore painting over the dramatic eruption of the post-Gorbachov succession fight, highlighted by the March-April war between the U.S.S.R.'s two leading party newspapers, *Pravda* and *Sovetskaya Rossiya*, as if it had been resolved in Gorbachov's favor. Looking at *Pravda* and *Sovetskaya Rossiya* coverage from April 5, the day of *Pravda*'s attack on *Sovetskaya Rossiya*, until Shultz's arrival in Moscow, one could write a lengthy documentation of a Gorbachov "victory" over his opponents. Since April 5, *Sovetskaya Rossiya* has twice published lengthy apologies for the "errors" in what *Pravda* called its March 13 "Manifesto by the Opponents of the Perestroika."

Added to this, the Soviet press, beginning with *Pravda*, has been filled, day in and day out, with reader's letters hailing *Pravda* and denouncing *Sovetskaya Rossiya*.

The April shower of "letters" and *Sovetskaya Rossiya*'s "apologies" illustrate an old Russian tradition, the *Potyomkin Village*, all façade with nothing behind. But ironically, the very "letters" campaign launched to create the image that everything's okay with Gorbachov, has shown the opposite to be true.

The April 18 edition of *Pravda* was to have been the climax of the "letters" campaign. That day, *Pravda* published a statement signed by nearly all of what are called the "creative unions," from the arts, culture, and media. On the surface, it all looked very impressive. The letter, denouncing *Sovetskaya Rossiya* and praising the April 5 *Pravda* editorial, was dutifully signed by; Yu. Platonov, first secretary, U.S.S.R. Union of Architects; Yu. Solovyov, chairman of the U.S.S.R. Union of Designers; E. Klimov, first secretary of the U.S.S.R. Union of Cinematographers; T. Khrennikov, first secretary of the U.S.S.R. Union of Composers; K. Lавrov from the U.S.S.R. Union of Theater People; A. Vasnetsov, chairman of the U.S.S.R. Union of Artists; and, I. Zubkov, *first deputy chairman* of the U.S.S.R. Union of Journalists.

The Journalists Union's chairman is Viktor Afanasyev, the editor in chief of *Pravda*. Thus, the boss of *Pravda* failed to sign the letter from his own organization in his own newspaper. Another omission: The most important of all the "creative unions," the U.S.S.R. Writers Union, was not represented. This signal touched off panic in the camp of Gorbachov and his close ally on the Politburo, Alexander N. Yakovlev.

The next evening, April 19, the chairman of the U.S.S.R. Writers Union, Viktor Karpov, was hauled onto the Moscow evening news program, *Vremya*, to explain why the Writers Union had not signed the letter in *Pravda*. Karpov replied that the Writers Union planned to draft a "separate" letter,

being vague on details and as to when.

The next day, the plot thickened, when 38 leading writers signed a letter printed in *Pravda*. The fact was striking on two counts. It was a defense of perestroika that anyone could support, as the list of signers proved, from the ultra-liberal poets, Yevgeni Yevtushenko and Andrei Voznesensky, to the arch-Russian chauvinist editor of the Komsomol (youth) monthly, *Molodiya Gvardiya*, Anatoli S. Ivanov. The content was safe, "Prose writers and poets, publicists, playwrights, and critics, and the entire Writers Union hereby declare that to be a patriot of the socialist fatherland means to be a fighter for perestroika."

The "letter" contained yet another signal. Despite the phrase "the entire Writers Union hereby declare," it, too, was not signed by the head of the Writers Union, Viktor Karpov.

The Russian military and Russian chauvinism

Behind the obstinacy of Karpov and the great majority of the Writers Union, lies some very powerful support, transcending that offered by the Politburo's chief ideologue, Yegor Ligachov. Over March and April, there emerged a solid alliance between the Soviet military establishment and the Russian nationalists among Soviet writers, reflecting the "Russian Party" in the *Nomenklatura*.

It all began, as *EIR* reported two issues ago, with the statement in the March 13 *Sovetskaya Rossiya*, that it was "especially important" to publicize Stalin's July 28, 1942 "Not One Step Backwards" directive, wartime Directive 227. That call was picked up in a spread in the Defense ministry daily, *Krasnaya Zvezda*, March 26, authored by Colonel Filatov, and titled: "Directive 227." In between, the defense ministry had gone out of its way to award its 1987 literary prize to an arch-Russian chauvinist writer, Valentin Pikul. Pikul writes mostly for the aforementioned *Molodiya Gvardiya*, a publication notorious for its Russian chauvinist and anti-Semitic diatribes.

Filatov's *Krasnaya Zvezda* feature was an editorial by the military, just as devastating as the *Sovetskaya Rossiya* broadside, though couched as an historical feature. Filatov called for the Soviet Union today to be run in "all sectors of Soviet society, including the economy, scientific-technological labs," etc. on the principle of Stalin's directive. The implication is that, because this principle has not been instituted, the war economy perestroika has been failing under Gorbachov, and this unpardonable sin must be urgently rectified.

It also echoed *Sovetskaya Rossiya* in calling for the elimination of liberal trends in literature and the arts, and for bringing to the fore writers on military and "patriotic" themes, hailing the late 19th-century ideologue of the Great Russian "master race," Fyodor Dostoevsky, as the model for today's writers, "Yes, Dostoevsky wrote about many things . . . criminals as well. At the same time, he did not shy away from other themes; he considered it his national duty, the duty to the Fatherland . . . the duty to say a word about the

soldier. . . . Where are those writers today who are trying to inspire our soldier?"

In the March 30 *Krasnaya Zvezda*, the answer was given by Defense Minister Dmitri Yazov, when he awarded laureate prizes to a group of writers on "military-patriotic" themes. The awards were presented to Valentin Pikul, Alexander Prokhanov, Vladimir Vozobikov, etc. Each gave a statement of thanks, from which we excerpt. These statements, printed front-page in *Krasnaya Zvezda*, are editorials, a military declaration of war against the neo-Bukharinites in the thick of the ongoing succession fight:

Pikul: "I love the military reader, especially the officer, the most educated and prepared to grasp the . . . facts of our heroic past. History showed that Russia [not the "Soviet Union"] more than once had to defend its worthiness and independence on the fields of cruel battles, defending the very right of the people's existence and its culture. For the culture of the military man is an inseparable part of our national culture.

"In the near future, I expect again to encounter military readers in the pages of the magazine *Nash Sovremenik* [a Russian chauvinist publication], where my new novel: *Honor I Have. From the Notes of an Officer of the Russian General Staff*, is appearing."

Prokhanov: "Above all, I'm interested in the present army and its role in our daily life. . . . On the one hand, the idea of global disarmament is more and more influencing the minds of politicians and military men. . . . The liquidation of certain types of weapons does not mean simply their annihilation. . . .

"Today's army is the essence of the very high and very dear values which today's society lacks. The masterful comprehension which the army has preserved ought to become the property of society as a whole. This, above all, is patriotism, love for the Motherland."

The alliance between the military, and the political and cultural "Russian Party," was again visible on April 5, when *Sovetskaya Rossiya* printed a feature by the same Colonel Filatov, extolling the virtues of Russian nationalism, Russian "military-patriotic" glory and traditions, and again portraying at great length Fyodor Dostoevsky as the model for today's writers. The glories of Russia spanned the centuries from Prince Dmitri Donskoi's victory over the Mongols at Kotelnikovo in 1380, through the 19th-century conquest of Central Asia, complete with Dostoevsky's role in propagating such imperial expansionism.

With the onset of the "April Fool" Potyomkin Village game in the media, there has been a temporary, relative hiatus in such polemics. Exemplary is the fact that the April issue of *Molodaya Gvardiya*, containing a monster feature entitled, "The Meaning of Our Life," echoing the polemic of *Sovetskaya Rossiya*, has yet to appear on the newsstands. But no one should be surprised when the lid comes off, and very soon.