

**The World Peace Council
and
Soviet "Active Measures"**

By Herbert Romerstein

The Hale Foundation

“I wish to be useful, and every kind of service necessary to the public good becomes honorable by being necessary. If the exigencies of my country demand a peculiar service, its claims to perform that service are imperious.”

**—Capt. Nathan Hale
1755–1776**

The Hale Foundation is dedicated to enhancing the capability of U.S. intelligence to serve the fundamental objectives of the Constitution—“insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare.” The foundation has tax-exempt status under Section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code as a non-profit, social welfare organization. To retain the freedom to take strong, positive positions on issues vitally affecting the ability of American intelligence to serve the above Constitutional goals, it has not sought contributions exemptions.

**The World Peace Council
and
Soviet "Active Measures"**

By Herbert Romerstein

The Hale Foundation

Herbert Romerstein is a Professional Staff Member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. He has studied and investigated Soviet operations against the West for over 30 years, 18 of them for the U.S. Congress. Romerstein is the author of a number of publications, including *Soviet Support for International Terrorism*, 1981.

This research is part of a much larger study being prepared by Richard Shultz and Roy Godson. The tentative title of the study is "The Role of Overt Propaganda and Covert Disinformation Themes in Soviet Strategy." It will be published by the National Strategy Information Center in 1983.

The World Peace Council and Soviet Active Measures

Introduction

The Soviet Union uses the term "active measures" to describe its influence operations in foreign countries. In some ways the term active measures is similar to the CIA term "covert action." However, it is different in the sense that the Soviet Union combines both overt and covert influence operations in its active measures programs. While the KGB carries out the covert form of active measures, including agent of influence operations, forgeries, and even support for terrorist organizations, a variety of active measures are carried out in the overt area. These are done by the official Soviet propaganda organs, such as Radio Moscow and the foreign language publications printed in the Soviet Union, as well as the activities of the Communist Parties and the international Soviet fronts. The International Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union headed by Boris Ponomarev controls both the foreign Communist Parties and the international Soviet fronts. In most cases, the Communist Parties provide the cadre for the national sections of the international fronts. The most active of the international Soviet fronts is the World Peace Council.

On foreign policy matters the other international Soviet fronts follow the lead of the WPC. These include, the World Federation of Trade Unions, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the International Union of Students, the Women's International Democratic Federation, and the Christian Peace Conference.

The World Peace Council

Origin

The World Peace Council officially traces its origin to the August 1948 World Congress of Intellectuals held in Wroclaw, Poland. That Congress appealed for the formation of a worldwide peace organization. The first World Congress of Defenders of Peace was held in April 1949 simultaneously in Paris and Prague. The World Peace Council was formed at this Congress.¹

In reality its origins go back to the 1920s, when the Communist International organized the first international Communist fronts with similar purposes and formats. In 1924, Willi Munzenberg, the Comintern's expert on organizing these fronts, told a meeting of the leadership of one of them, the International Workers Aid, "we must penetrate every conceivable milieu, get hold of artists and professors, make use of theatres and cinemas, and spread abroad the doctrine that Russia is prepared to sacrifice everything to keep the world at peace." Munzenberg however indicated that it was not enjoyable being involved in this kind of work. He said, "personally, these committees do not interest me very much—it is not really interesting to form these innocents clubs . . ."²

The trade unionists and socialists, who were to be enticed, were not enamoured with the idea of the united front with the Communists for the purpose of meeting Soviet needs. In addition they remembered that two years before at the Fourth Congress of the Communist International, Karl Radek revealed that the Communists

do not unite with others when they are strong, but it is a tactic to use, "when we are lacking the necessary strength . . ." Radek pointed out that they were cooperating with those in the united front but didn't intend to merge with them. The purpose of the united front was "to stifle them in our embrace."³

In 1935 Comintern official Otto Kuusinin was even more frank. He told the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern, "We want to attack our class enemies in the rear when they start the war against the Soviet Union. But how can we do so if the majority of the working youth follow not us, but, for instance, the Catholic priests or the liberal chameleons. We often repeat the slogan of transforming imperialist war into a civil war against the bourgeoisie. In itself the slogan is a good one; but it becomes an empty and harmful phrase, if we do not do everything today to create a united youth front."⁴ This is the true purpose of the international Soviet fronts. It is to stab their enemies in the back when the Soviet Union engages in its acts of aggression.

In the pre-World War II period, the Comintern directed the international Communist fronts, including the peace fronts. After World War II, the Cominform (Communist Information Bureau) provided the direction. In November, 1949, the Cominform held its third meeting. The first one in 1946 organized the Cominform; the second in 1948 expelled the Yugoslavs. The third meeting in Hungary in November 1949 provided direction for the World Communist movement. At that meeting the report on "Defense of Peace and the Fight Against the Warmongers" was presented by M. Suslov, then a Central Committee member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and later, until his death, a member of the Politburo and the chief theoretician for the Soviet Communist Party. Suslov in a fit of Communist hyperbole stated that, "For the first time in history an organized peace front has arisen, which has made its aim to save mankind from another world war, to isolate the warmonger clique, and to insure peaceful cooperation among nations."⁵ He went on to say that, "the peace movement arose as a protest movement of the masses against the Marshall plan and the aggressive Western Union and the North-Atlantic alliance."⁶ According to Suslov, "Of great significances to the development of the peace movement were the Wroclaw Congress of Intellectuals for Peace, the World Congress of the Women's International Democratic Federation in Budapest (autumn, 1948) and especially the World Peace Congress in Paris and Prague on April 20-25 of this year at which 600 million organizers for peace were represented."⁷

NATO—The Main Target

The main purpose of the Soviet sponsored peace movement was opposition to the North Atlantic Alliance. As Suslov pointed out, "the North-Atlantic alliance of imperialists under the aegis of the U.S.A. represents a threat to all progressive mankind."⁸

Echoing Munzenberg decades before, Suslov stated, "Particular attention must be given to bringing into the peace movement trade unions and women's, youth, cooperative, sports, cultural and educational, religious and other organizations as well as scientists, writers, journalists, cultural workers, members of parliament and other political and public men and women who come forward in defense of peace and against war."⁹

Of particular importance in this operation were the communist-led trade unions organized in the World Federation of Trade Unions. According to Suslov, "The trade union centres affiliated with the WFTU are playing a big part in organizing the supporters of peace. They are the initiators of the national peace movements in many countries and of national peace committees. The trade unions have taken a leading part in the organization of protest strikes and demonstrations against the aggressive North-Atlantic treaty, and in organizing nation-wide petitions and other mass measures in defence of peace and the national independence and liberty of peoples."¹⁰ Suslov however did not forget the role of the Communist Parties. He said it is the task of the "... Communist and Workers Parties to head the fight for peace of all the mass public associations, and to lend it a purposeful and effective character."¹¹

The resolution using the same language as Suslov's report served as a directive to the Communist Parties. The resolution on peace said, "The representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties consider that their major tasks in the great and noble work of saving mankind from the threat of a new war are as follows: 1. They must work with still greater persistence for the organizational consolidation and extension of the movement of peace supporters, draw ever larger sections of the population into it and make it a movement of the whole people. Particular attention must be given to bringing in to the peace movement trade unions, women's, youth, cooperative, sports, cultural and educational, religious and other organizations, as well as scientists, writers, journalists, cultural workers, members of parliament and other political and public men and women who come forward in defense of peace and against war." The directive went on to say, "5. Wide application should be made of the new and ef-

fective forms of mass struggles for peace which have fully justified themselves, such as peace committees in town and country, petitions and protests, popular referendums—such as are widely practiced in France and Italy. Publication and distribution of literature exposing war preparations; collection of funds for the struggle for peace; organization of boycotts of films, newspapers, books, magazines, broadcasting companies, institutions and individuals that preach a new war—all these are the vital duties of the Communist and Workers' parties."¹² If there was any doubt who ran this movement the Cominform resolution said, "For the first time in the history of mankind an organized peace front has arisen, headed by the Soviet Union, the bulwark and standard-bearer of world peace. The courageous call of the Communist parties—declaring that the peoples will never fight the first socialist country in the world, the Soviet Union, is reverberating ever wider among the masses of the capitalist countries."¹³

The purpose of the Communist "peace offensive" had been revealed in February, 1949 when Maurice Thorez, head of the French Communist Party, and Palmiro Togliatti, head of the Italian Communist Party, announced that they would welcome the Soviet army when it entered their countries, "in its battle against the aggressor."¹⁴

Western Europeans were concerned for their safety when they remembered that nine years before the Soviet army had invaded Finland with the excuse that they were pursuing the Finnish aggressor.

The Communist Party, U.S.A., second to none in its Soviet patriotism, announced on March 2, 1949 over the signature of its leaders, William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, "The Thorez and Togliatti statements emphatically serve the cause of universal peace. Only those who plot a third world war and seek to embroil France and Italy in aggressive military operations against our great ally of World War II, the Soviet Union, could read anything un-French or un-Italian in these statements."¹⁵

The first major campaign of the WPC was the "Stockholm Peace Pledge." Released at the WPC Committee meeting in Stockholm, March 1950, the pledge read,

"We demand the absolute banning of the atom weapon, arm of terror and mass extermination of populations.

We demand the establishment of strict international control to ensure the implementation of this banning measure.

We consider that any government which would be

first to use the atom weapon against any country whatsoever would be committing a crime against humanity and should be dealt with as a war criminal.

We call on all men of good will throughout the world to sign this appeal.”¹⁶

In November of 1950 the second Congress of the World Peace Council was held in Warsaw, Poland. A resolution of the Congress claimed that 500 million people had signed the Stockholm pledge.¹⁷

The United States had the nuclear edge on the Soviet Union so “ban the bomb” was the slogan of the day. The Communists understand the use of slogans. Any idiot can be taught to chant “ban the bomb.” But try to teach him to say, “The banning of nuclear weapons requires safeguards against cheating.” The political idiots were enticed into this new “innocents club”, the World Peace Council.

The Trotskyites, who usually know what goes on in the Communist movement, reported on the Warsaw WPC conference in a pamphlet written by James P. Cannon, the leader of the American Trotskyite organization, the Socialist Workers Party. Cannon referred to “the recent Warsaw Peace Conference of professional fellow travelers, congenial stooges and moon-struck clergymen steered, like all such gatherings, by hard-faced jockeys from the Stalinist riding stables.”¹⁸

The World Federation of Democratic Youth, the international Soviet youth front, actively participated in the “Ban the bomb” signature campaign and proudly announced that, “In the Soviet Union, the bulwark of peace, the Stockholm appeal is warmly supported by all the peoples and millions upon millions of signatures have already been collected. In the United States of America, where the ruling circles are preparing a new war and atomic air raids, constantly growing sections of the people are expressing their concern and their will for peace by raising their voices resolutely against the war preparations and by signing the Stockholm Appeal in continually growing numbers.”¹⁹

The nature of the WFDY was revealed by the Soviet writer Nicolai Mikhailov when he wrote, “It was not only the Komsomol (Young Communist League of the USSR) that helped the Soviet activists to organize the World Federation of Democratic Youth. We also got valuable assistance from the Party Central Committee: we were shown a correct approach to the problems of the youth movement and clear orientation regarding the difficult and involved tasks that faced it.”²⁰

An editorial in the April 1950 issue of *World Youth*,

the WFDY magazine revealed that "the Soviet people, led by Stalin, is now at the head of the camp of peace and democracy."

The World Federation of Trade Unions played the role of goon squads for the "peace" movement. A leaflet distributed in Belgium to American seamen was reproduced in the March 1950 issue of the WPC magazine *In Defense of Peace*. This leaflet called for a strike against American war cargoes and said, "attempts will be made to unload your war cargoes with SCABS. Such attempt will endanger the safety of your ship, it will endanger your very life."

North Korea invaded South Korea on June 25, 1950. The World Peace Council, of course, supported the North Korean aggression. From 1950 to 1953 Korea was the focal point of WPC propaganda. One of the propaganda weapons of the Chinese Communists and the North Koreans during the Korean War was the false charge that the United States was waging germ warfare. On February 25, 1952, Red Chinese official Kuo Mo Jo sent a telegram to the President of the World Peace Council, Professor Frederic Joliot-Curie, claiming that the United States had engaged in germ warfare in Korea.²¹ Joliot-Curie, a member of the French Communist Party, immediately organized a world-wide protest and sent telegrams to American officials protesting the alleged germ warfare. On April 1, 1952, the World Peace Council bureau meeting held in Oslo, Norway, issued a protest against alleged American use of bacteriological warfare.²² On May 17, 1952, Dr. Heinrich Brandweiner, the president of the Austrian peace council, released material at a meeting in Gratz, Austria, purporting to prove that the Americans were in fact involved in germ warfare. That material was published in pamphlet form in June 1952 by the Austrian Peace Council. Much of the "evidence" consisted of claims by the Chinese and Korean Communists and confessions forced out of American POWs in their hands.²³

Brandweiner's career is also interesting. On May 1, 1938 less than two months after Hitler's conquest of his native Austria, Brandweiner joined the Nazi party. He served Hitler just as he would later serve Stalin. Brandweiner was a member of the World Peace Council, chairman of the Austrian Peace Council, and was a recipient of the Lenin Peace Prize.²⁴

Assisting the World Peace Council in the dissemination of the false germ warfare charges were two other international Soviet fronts, the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Union of Students. In 1952 the IUS published as a supplement to their maga-

zine *World Student News*, Vol. 6-No. 11, the report of a supposed "scientific commission" organized by the World Peace Council to promote the germ warfare falsehoods. The WFDY accused the U.S. of using science, "to wage bacteriological warfare in Korea. Their manner of waging war now consists of spreading insects infected with the bacilli of plaque, cholera, typhoid and other diseases among children women and the whole civilian populations."²⁵

Both the WFDY and IUS have played a major role in World Peace Council organized campaigns since the Korean War and continue to provide major support for the work of the WPC. NATO remains the main target. Of all the international Soviet fronts the World Federation of Trade Unions provides the most assistance to the World Peace Council. Its leaders have boasted "The WFTU has taken an active part in every mass campaign conducted by the Peace Movement."²⁶ Just as opposition to NATO is the center-piece of World Peace Council activity so it is also of significant importance to the WFTU. In 1961, WFTU General Secretary Louis Saillant explained to the Fifth Congress of the WFTU, which took place in Moscow, that, "... it is essential to rouse the mass of the workers and peoples in all countries to act in unison against the policy of strength and the aggressive plans of the imperialists so as to avert the danger of war.

This explains why trade union organizations must use every opportunity to explain the origin of this danger and condemn the aggressive strategy being conducted by American imperialism against the socialist camp.

This strategy is carried out by the setting up of an ever-larger number of imperialist military bases and the activities of imperialist military blocs organized under the North Atlantic Treaty (NATO) and the South-East Asia (SEATO) and the Middle East (CENTO). These blocs are directed in the first place against the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, and against the national liberation movements and the independence of the people."²⁷

The WPC-WFTU propaganda line on NATO was clearly described in 1971 by Romesh Chandra, the Secretary General of The World Peace Council. Chandra said, "Europe, divided and torn, is a Europe which could still be the source and the starting point of a new world conflagration. Europe is divided into two military blocs. But the impact of this division is not confined to Europe. The fangs of NATO can be felt in Asia and Africa as well. ... European security is of significance for the peoples of the world, because of the terrible present, when the forces of imperialism and exploitation, particularly NATO and the other imperialist aggressive military pacts, bear

the major responsibility for the hunger and poverty of hundreds of millions all over the world.’’²⁸

WPC propaganda is, as always, consistent with official Soviet propaganda. An example of the Soviet line on NATO was given in 1971 in an official Soviet propaganda booklet, “NATO is an aggressive-military bloc. The defensive efforts of the socialist countries, the national liberation movement, the revolutionary and working class movement, and the peace movement in NATO countries have thus far restrained NATO from acting in keeping with its aggressive nature.’’²⁹

As the WPC and WFTU go, so go the other international Soviet fronts. An example of International Union of Students propaganda on NATO was a resolution of the Eighth IUS Congress in 1964. The resolution, “requests the government of the United States, Great Britain and France to immediately proceed to liquidate their overseas military bases and to recall all troops stationed abroad” and “invites the national unions (that belong to the IUS) to voice their protest against the maintenance of overseas military bases and to manifest their full solidarity with the peoples fighting for the elimination of these bases.’’³⁰ Of course IUS never suggested that the Soviet Union withdraw its troops from Eastern Europe or to liquidate the bases that it has established, either directly or through surrogates, in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. According to a 1964 IUS resolution, “the main enemy of humanity and peace is imperialism, headed by the United States.’’³¹

The World Federation of Democratic Youth, said in a 1972 resolution, “there still exists serious problems and obstacles in the way of building a stable system for European security and cooperation. The forces of the past, of the cold war, of militarism and neo-fascism, are trying in every way to check progress in this direction, using also for this purpose the aggressive NATO pact.’’³²

To Communists “peace” and “national liberation war” are not incompatible. A 1965 Report of the WFDY Bureau to the Executive Committee meeting presented by N’Diongue Babacar of Senegal, the Deputy General Secretary of WFDY revealed that “Peaceful coexistence presupposes also the continuous development of the national liberation movement, going so far as armed struggle.’’³³

The Vietnam War: A Major WPC Campaign

The campaign against NATO was integrated with the campaign in support of the North Vietnamese during the Vietnam War. Romesh Chandra pointed with pride in 1971 to the work being done by the West European organizations affiliated with the World Peace Council, "against the U.S. war in Indochina." He pointed out that "these movements are linking their struggle more and more, with the problems of their own people, above all with the problems of European security of the ending of aggressive imperialist pacts and bases which affect the economies of their countries and the well-being of their peoples."³⁴

As part of their campaign in support of North Vietnamese aggression against South Vietnam, the World Peace Council organized "The Stockholm Conference on Vietnam." A meeting of this group was held in Stockholm, May 16-18, 1969. The major international Soviet fronts had representatives. The World Peace Council was represented by a delegation of six, including Romesh Chandra. The World Federation of Democratic Youth, International Union of Students, World Federation of Trade Unions, International Association of Democratic Lawyers and the Christian Peace Conference were also in attendance. The action program ordered by this meeting included "An extension of activity against United States products such as petrol, firms providing goods, arms or services for the war in Vietnam such as Pan Am, and against other non-American firms supplying and feeding the war. Also activity to isolate and subject to continuing protest and criticism representatives of the U.S. government. An appeal to sailors to refuse to serve on ships transporting goods to South Vietnamese ports . . ." In addition assistance should be given to "Americans abroad in refusing the draft, in defecting from the U.S. armed forces, for carrying on propaganda within the army and for militant action against the Selective Service Systems. This could include pressure for full political rights and security for defectors and draft resisters in various countries and an appeal to all countries to give political assylum (sic) to those who refuse to fight in Vietnam."³⁵

The WPC provided the guidance and support for the Stockholm Conference on Vietnam. Information Letter #2 of the Stockholm Conference dated May 7, 1970, reported that "the Presidential committee of the World Peace Council, at its meeting in Moscow on May 6, 1970, unanimously adopted the following resolution: 'The latest developments in respect to Indochina make it more imperative than ever before to stop the war of aggression

waged by the United States. All organizations, all peoples of the world, who stand for peace, freedom and independence must unite in their effort to demand that the United States stop the war in Vietnam and the whole of Indochina. The presidential committee of the World Peace Council strongly supports the decision for a worldwide mass campaign in favour of the Vietnam Appeal issued by the Stockholm Conference on Vietnam, in combination with the "OUTNOW" project initiated by the U.S. anti-war movement' . . . There is immense possibility in a campaign like this. Of course, it means a lot of work but you reach new people, you can force them to begin to think, and you have the opportunity to develop a campaign on an unprecedented scale."

The Stockholm Conference organized a World Conference on Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia on November 28-30, 1970. Again every international Communist front had its representatives and Romesh Chandra was one of the WPC representatives. In addition, however, the Soviet Union sent a delegation from the "Soviet Peace Fund" which included Mr. Ivan Kovalenko. In the book *KGB, The Secret Work of Soviet Secret Agents* by John Barron, an expert on Soviet intelligence activities, Ivan I. Kovalenko was identified as a KGB officer operating in Japan in 1948 and again in 1967. The CIA's unclassified *Directory of Soviet Officials*, in December of 1975, identified Kovalenko as the sector chief for the southeast Asian sector of the International Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The same publication for November of 1979 indicated that since 1968 he has had particular responsibility for Japan.³⁶

With the end of the Vietnam war, WPC and the other international Soviet fronts reverted to their normal anti-Western propaganda, particularly the anti-NATO campaign. World Peace Council activities over the past decade have paid much attention to attacking the interests of the West and protesting defensive weapons developed by western countries.

The WPC Campaign Against the Neutron Weapon

Since 1977 a major campaign of the World Peace Council has been against the neutron weapon. This weapon which can be used against tanks but would leave the surrounding civilian areas intact, could remove the imbalance in Western Europe threatened by the massive Soviet tank army in East Germany. It is vitally important for the Soviet Union and its international fronts to prevent the development and deployment of the neutron weapon which would remove so powerful a force from the Soviet arsenal threatening Western Europe. In September 1977, the World Peace Council published a pamphlet entitled "Neutron Bombs No!". Its slogan was "In the name of life itself, ban the neutron bomb!" The introduction to the pamphlet was written by Romesh Chandra. According to Chandra, "The worldwide campaign launched by the World Peace Council in August 1977 for the prohibition of the neutron bomb is the most powerful mass movement of recent times against weapons of mass destruction and for the ending of the arms race. The call of the World Peace Council has been supported actively by numerous international and national organizations representing literally tens of millions people in all countries." He went on to say, "In the NATO countries the protest movement has grown as the holiday period has come to an end: in each country actions are specially directed towards demanding that the government concerned declare publicly its opposition to the placing of neutron bombs on its territory and demands that President Carter abandon his perilous policy of stepping up the arms race. In the socialist countries the campaign against the neutron bomb embraces the entire population and continues in ever new forms. In Asia, Africa, and Latin America the protest actions against the neutron bomb have grown remarkably in a number of countries. The World Peace Council has called for the continuation and the intensification of the protest actions to ban the neutron bomb."³⁷

The World Peace Council appeal, carried in the same pamphlet, says, "The Bureau of the Presidium of the World Peace Council meeting in Berlin, September 9 to 12, welcomes the world protest against the neutron bomb—a torture weapon being cynically presented as a so-called 'clean' bomb by the United States administration." The appeal goes on to say, "the Bureau urgently calls for worldwide actions during the fortnight from October 1–15 *Against the Neutron Bomb and All Other Weapons of Mass Destruction* (emphasis in original) . . . The Bureau

calls upon all national peace committees, peace forces, political parties and other national, regional, and international movements and organizations to raise the alarm about these new dangers by organizing: mass rallies, meetings, demonstrations, delegations, petitions to parliamentarians, legislators, governments and heads of state, leaflets, publications and wide spread use of the mass media. We urge letters of protest especially to the President of the United States against the development of the neutron bomb."³⁸

Among the organizations whose statements against the neutron weapon are to be found in the WPC pamphlet are the following international Soviet fronts: The World Federation of Trade Unions, The Christian Peace Conference, the Women's International Democratic Federation, the International Union of Students, and the World Federation of Democratic Youth.³⁹

From January 25-28, 1978 the Bureau of the World Peace Council met in Washington, D.C. The place was chosen very carefully. Its major agenda item was clear. A WPC report said, "A special session of the Bureau was dedicated to the review of the campaign to Ban the Neutron Bomb. Reports made to the Bureau showed the wide and broad nature of the campaign."⁴⁰ Washington, D.C. as a site of this meeting was useful in getting as much publicity as possible in the United States for the campaign against the neutron weapon.

On May 22, 1978 the World Peace Council took advantage of the United Nations special session on disarmament which had been promoted by the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc to present what they claimed were 700 million signatures on disarmament to the U.N. Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim. In a statement presented with the signatures the WPC complained about the American development of the neutron weapon and the stationing of cruise missiles in Western Europe.⁴¹

On June 3 and 4, 1978, the World Peace Council organized a meeting of parliamentarians in New York City supposedly in support of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on Disarmament. The meeting of parliamentarians "declares that the production of the neutron bomb accelerates, in a tragic fashion, the arms race." It went on to say, "This meeting appeals to parliamentarians and all other elected representatives of the people to reject the fabrication and deployment of the neutron bomb."⁴²

The WPC newsletter *Peace Courier* was filled with stories of protests against the neutron weapon. In West Berlin the Communist Party, which there calls itself the "Socialist Unity Party, West Berlin," issued to its members a

collection of articles from publications around the world attacking the neutron weapon. This collection was designed to be used in agitation against the neutron weapon during demonstrations in West Berlin. It takes careful examination of the documentation to realize that most of it comes from Communist sources.⁴³

Despite the agreement by the West Germans to deploy the neutron weapon in their defense against the Soviet tanks, President Carter succumbed to the pressure of the international propaganda campaign and cancelled the deployment of the neutron weapon.

When President Reagan came into office, in January 1981, discussion began again of the deployment of the neutron defensive weapon. On February 23, 1981, Leonid Brezhnev boasted to the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that "Actions by the peace forces have brought about the suspension of plans for deploying the neutron weapon in Western Europe. All the greater is the outrage of nations over the new Pentagon attempts to hold the neutron Sword of Damocles over the countries of Europe. For our part, we declare once more that we will not begin manufacturing this weapon if it does not appear in other countries, and that we are prepared to conclude an agreement banning it once and for all."⁴⁴ Of course the Soviet Union is prepared to abandon the weapon that would be used defensively against its tanks. The Soviet Union, not facing an invasion from anyone, does not need such a weapon.

On March 6, 1981, the Soviet army newspaper *Red Star*, in an article by L. Semeyko, stated "the champions of the neutron weapon assert that it would be the most reliable means of combating enemy tank groupings in order to prevent them from 'reaching the English Channel' and thus 'save European civilization.' But, first, no one, as is well known, is threatening the English Channel. As for 'European civilization,' it is precisely the U.S. neutron weapon, like U.S. nuclear 'Euromissiles,' which could jeopardize it."⁴⁵

In early August, 1981, stories began appearing in the American press that President Reagan had decided to continue development and production of the neutron weapon. On August 10th, Paris radio interviewed French defense minister Charles Hernu, who expressed the opinion that President Reagan's decision would certainly cause great reaction from the Germans, "Because when President Carter, in the brutal way, which we know about, announced he would not assemble the components of the neutron weapon, we must remember that at the time Helmut Schmidt—this was in 1977—had succeeded

in gaining acceptance to the idea of its deployment in the FRG (Federal Republic of Germany). He had obtained an agreement. Then President Carter said: No, we will not assemble it."⁴⁶

Moscow was not slow to respond to the news. On August 11, *Tass* reported, "commenting on U.S. President Reagan's decision to go all the way in the production of the neutron weapon, *Pravda* writes that 'the horrendous decision to produce the neutron weapon is the latest step in the present U.S. administration's adventurist policies, for the neutron bomb is one of the most refined and barbaric means of mass destruction. It is a weapon which produces an exceptionally high level of radiation, directed not against military targets or hardware but against human beings.'"⁴⁷ Prague reported on the same day "The Prague-based World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) sharply condemned the cynical decision by U.S. President Ronald Reagan to start production of the neutron bomb as an act of hostility towards working people, and all mankind, in a statement issued Monday. This decision means further escalation of the arms race, serious deterioration of the international atmosphere and an attempt to reverse the process of detente. This attempt of the U.S. administration to incite a new round of the arms race comes in a period when the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries put forward concrete and constructive proposals in the interest of the halting of the arms race and a removal of the danger of a world nuclear war."⁴⁸

Vadim Zagladin, the first deputy chief of the International Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the deputy to Panomarev, was in Prague when the news broke. He was interviewed on Prague Radio and asked to comment. His statement was bizarre even by Soviet standards. According to Zagladin, "In fact it is a weapon for a possible war by Washington not only against the world of socialism but also against its own West European allies. The nuclear bomb, the neutron bomb, cannot make a distinction between communists and noncommunists, citizens of a socialist or of a nonsocialist country. It hits everything and everyone in the vicinity and West Europe became a dangerous competitor of the United States a long time ago."⁴⁹

By August 13th, Soviet propagandists were becoming completely hysterical. A *Tass* English language transmission by its political observer Gennady Shishkin stated, "The ruling circles of the United States are in the grips of dangerous insanity. This is the only way to assess President Reagan's decision on the production of neutron weapons and the motives by which he is guided." Shishkin referred to the decision to develop the neutron weapon as

“a cannibalistic philosophy.”⁵⁰ The cannibal slogan was repeated the next day over Radio Moscow’s Domestic Service by Soviet journalist Oleg Anichkin. He said, “This form of weapon is intended purely for killing personnel, i.e., for killing both civilians and military since it has only a radiation effect. This is why these weapons are so monstrous and cannibal—like. Houses, various structures, military equipment, will remain unscathed. Only people will be killed. They will die either at once or slowly and very agonizingly.”⁵¹

On August 18th, *Tass* was proud to report that at recent sessions of the United Nations Disarmament Committee, representatives of the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia, Cuba, and Rumania “have strongly condemned the decision of the U.S. administration to start full-scale production and stock piling of the neutron weapon. They described it as a blow to international security and the process of disarmament talks as a whole.”⁵²

On August 18th, Radio Moscow broadcast, in English to America, an interview with Mikhail Milshteyn, who was identified as “an expert on military matters” at the Soviet Institute of the United States and Canada. Radio Moscow neglected to say what General Milshteyn has often admitted, that he was a retired lieutenant general of the Soviet Army where he served in Military Intelligence, the G.R.U. Milshteyn described for Radio Moscow listeners in the United States his view of the neutron weapon. “Neutron weapons cannot be called a tactical nuclear weapon because they are intended for deployment in Europe. Any nuclear weapon that will be used on the territory of European countries must be regarded as strategic, because they will bring about great destruction and casualties. Washington is trying to make the world believe that the neutron bomb is intended against tanks. This is a false concept. It will be used not against tanks, but against the people. Neutron deaths won’t choose between people in schools, churches, or other buildings, or inside tanks. The American strategists say the new weapon is clean and humane because it only affects living people, leaving all material values intact. This is absurd. It is strange and even wild that the present American administration is trying to stand among those who regard killing people (as) humane.”⁵³ General Milshteyn failed to point out that civilians flee when they see tanks approaching. The weapons will be used against the Soviet soldiers in tanks, if they invade West Germany, not against civilians in schools and churches who will not be around when the tanks appear.

The World Peace Council brought their forces into

play in support of the Soviet position. WPC issued a statement saying,

“The WPC condemns, in the strongest possible terms, the decision by U.S. President Reagan to produce neutron weapons. This action defies overwhelming public opinion which compelled the former U.S. administration to suspend production of this inhuman weapon. It is the latest step in the U.S. drive for military superiority and thrust the world even closer to a nuclear catastrophe”⁵⁴

The WPC instructions to their troops read as follows:

“Send to President Reagan and the U.S. administration cables, post cards, letters, petitions, and statements of protest solicited from prominent elected officials, trade union leaders, scientists, church leaders, and ordinary people.—Urge elected officials in NATO countries to speak out against the neutron bomb and the deployment of U.S. Pershing II and Cruise missiles. Make your request to them by cable, phone calls, post cards, letters, petitions, etc. Seek resolutions against the neutron bomb by elected bodies, city councils, legislatures, parliaments, political parties, trade unions, churches, community and civic organization.—Seek sermons against the bomb in places of worship—churches, synagogues, mosques, etc.—Organize advertisements in newspapers signed by prominent citizens.—Write letters to newspapers and other mass media underlining the dangers of the bomb and urging opposition to it.—Organize street corner tables for distribution of literature; collecting signatures on petitions, post cards, etc.—Organize demonstrations, meetings and similar actions.—Produce leaflets, posters and other types of literature explaining the dangers of Reagan’s decision and the nature of the bomb.—Organize referendums and ballot initiatives.—Remember no matter how insignificant or small an activity you undertake may seem to you it adds to the weight of the national and international campaign.”⁵⁵

Recent WPC Campaigns Against NATO

The WPC continues to support every Soviet initiative and defend every Soviet action. As *Pravda* pointed out on January 28, 1982, "Representatives of 60 states taking part in the WPC Presidium Bureau session in Copenhagen resolutely expressed their support for the Soviet peace initiatives and appealed for the implementation of the dangerous Pentagon and NATO plans to be prevented." *Pravda* pointed to the success of the WPC in getting two hundred thousand people to participate in the demonstration in Lisbon and another two hundred thousand to participate in the demonstration in Norway.⁵⁶ Unfortunately for *Pravda* the demonstrators in Lisbon claimed only 50 thousand people and there appeared to be much fewer than that since only the communists were marching. The Socialists and others who normally support peace initiatives denounced the march as "an exclusive reflection of the diplomatic and military logic of the Soviet Bloc."⁵⁷ It is doubtful that the demonstrations in Norway even achieved the numbers claimed by those in Portugal.

The 1982 demonstrations had as their purpose the prevention of the NATO plans to upgrade and modernize theater nuclear forces. NATO's plans were developed to counter the increase of Soviet military power in the European theater. The World Peace Council propaganda booklet arguing against the NATO modernization claimed that while NATO had 791,000 ground troops in Europe, the Warsaw Pact had 805,000. Therefore they were roughly equivalent.⁵⁸ Even if these Warsaw Pact figures were correct, which is doubtful, they do not take into consideration that the figure includes only 300,000 of the Soviet ground forces. These are the ones stationed in the East European satellites. The WPC ignores the fact that at least another million and a half Soviet ground troops are in the Soviet Union itself and that this does not count those stationed in Mongolia or in combat in Afghanistan.⁵⁹ The WPC booklet also claims parity between the NATO and Soviet medium range nuclear launchers, showing each of them at a little under one thousand.⁶⁰ However, the booklet *Soviet Military Power*, published by the U.S. Department of Defense, points out that with the introduction of the SS-20 Intermediate Range Ballistic Missile by the Soviet Union in 1977, the situation changed substantially. The Department of Defense stated, "Previously, the theater-dedicated strategic nuclear missiles were based at fixed, vulnerable sites, and each missile carried only one warhead—although provisions for force reconstitution and refire were made. The

SS-20 eliminated most of these weaknesses. Its launchers are highly mobile, and each SS-20 is fitted with three, very accurate and independently targetable (MIRVed) warheads. Moreover each SS-20 unit is equipped with re-fire missiles—one per launcher—and each re-fire missile is fitted with three warheads. Thus the firepower of the theater strategic nuclear missile forces is being greatly multiplied, even though the Soviets are withdrawing older SS-4s and SS-5s from the forces as the SS-20s are deployed. As of July 1981, some 250 SS-20 launcher/missile sets equipped with a total of 750 nuclear warheads had been deployed. Of these, 175 with 525 warheads are deployed opposite the NATO countries. There is no sign that the deployment is slackening. Since January 1981, the pace of SS-20 base construction has increased, particularly opposite the NATO nations. At bases known to be under construction, another 65 launchers with some 195 warheads will be deployed.”⁶¹

The World Federation of Democratic Youth in a 1982 collection of documents called *Youth for Disarmament—Facts, Arguments, Information* claimed that, “The balance of military power will not be disturbed by the SS-20 since this represents merely a modernization of the 20-years-old 4 and SS-5 and should replace these, so that the number of actual missiles does not increase.” As can be seen the U.S. Department of Defence information shows that the SS-20s do much more than replace the SS-4s and 5s. Because of both the re-fire capability and the fact that each has three independently targetable warheads the SS-20s provide much greater firing power against Western Europe than did the SS-4s and 5s.

The WFDY package of false “facts” and arguments is being used throughout the world in the debate currently being conducted. It is a good example of WFDY’s support for a World Peace Council campaign conducted on behalf of the Soviet propaganda machine.

The WPC campaign against the modernization of theater nuclear forces in Western Europe did not begin during the Reagan administration. It began when the Carter administration began discussing the issue. The World Federation of Trade Unions organized an International Trade Union Round Table in Sofia, Bulgaria, on September 26, 1980 to protest the Carter administration’s suggestions for improving West European defense capabilities. Ibrahim Zakaria, the acting general secretary of the WFTU, opened the meeting by saying, “We are meeting at a crucial time for the whole of humanity. The alarming new spiral in the arms race poses extremely important tasks for the trade unionists of the whole world, regardless of their political orientation or international af-

filiations. We are impelled to work together to find common platforms and move forward in united actions.”⁶²

The Soviet delegate to the international conference set the tone. “Following the mentioned decisions, the danger of a world nuclear war has become so much more likely that we may say it is virtually knocking at our doors. With joint forces, all of us must avoid this danger in order to save the life of mankind today and in the future. Under these conditions the trade unions of all countries and, in the first place, those of Europe have to explain to the largest masses of the population, the serious danger represented to the cause of peace by those NATO and Carter projects. Using trade union language we might add that the cost of American missiles in Europe—in the broadest sense of the word—will have to be borne by the working people and not by the NATO generals or the Carter administration.”⁶³

In addition to supporting the Soviet propaganda line against West European defense, the WPC still provides support to all the other Soviet propaganda lines. When the Soviet Union was deeply stung by the revelations that it was involved in support of international terrorism, WPC president Romesh Chandra immediately leaped to the defense. A WPC Presidential Committee meeting was held in Havana in April of 1981. Havana radio reported, “Within the framework of the WPC presidency meeting being held at Havana’s Palace of Conventions, WPC President Romesh Chandra, held a press conference during which he stated that the terrorists who place in jeopardy world peace are those who produce arms and promote the arms race, concretely the United States and its NATO allies. Chandra added that the statements by Leonid Brezhnev during the 26th CPSU Congress are sound and translate into the demand by world public opinion favoring peace.”⁶⁴

Just as the Soviet Union supports the Palestine Liberation Organization, a major terrorist group in its own right, and the supplier of training, arms, and logistical support to a variety of other terrorist groups, the WPC also supports the PLO. The Palestine Liberation Organization is officially represented in the WPC, and in 1975 when a WPC delegation was called on Dr. Kurt Waldheim, the Secretary General of the United Nations at his Geneva office, the PLO provided a member of the delegation.⁶⁵

In 1979 the WPC held an international conference of solidarity with the Palestinian people. In reality that was a conference in solidarity with the PLO. Chandra said at the conference, “Our conference not only extends its total and unconditional solidarity with the Palestine Liberation Organization; it also extends full support to the unity

of the Arab governments and peoples who oppose the Pax Americana and the treachery which accompanies it and who are carrying forward the great cause of the Palestinian people." "Pax Americana" referred to the peace agreement at Camp David between Israel and Egypt. Chandra went on to say, "The Palestinian cause is the cause of the main struggles which we are waging at this time in every part of the world. You cannot fight against the NATO arms buildup, against the neutron bomb and against all the other weapons of mass destruction, which are being put into operation by United States imperialism and the NATO powers, unless you understand at the same time that the cause of Palestine and the struggle of Palestine are also vital for the success of that struggle, just as the fight against the NATO arms race is at the same time a fight against the NATO and imperialist conspiracies in the Middle East and therefore a fight for Palestine."⁶⁶

Soviet Control of the WPC

Soviet control of the World Peace Council and the other international Communist fronts is maintained both through the financing and the personnel of the organizations. Ruth Tosek, a former senior interpreter for several of the Soviet controlled international organizations, contacted James Lamond, a British member of parliament who is active in the World Peace Council. She wrote to Mr. Lamond in July of 1980 advising him that, "all funds of these organizations, in local and in hard currency, are provided above all by the Soviet Union, but also by other East European satellite countries on the basis of set contribution rates, paid by the governments of these countries through various channels." She told Mr. Lamond that she would, "be only too happy to give him more details based on my personal experience." He did not respond to her offer. Mr. Lamond still maintains that he has no information on Soviet financial support to the World Peace Council.⁶⁷

In early 1981, the World Peace Council attempted to gain consultant status with the Economical and Social Council of the United Nations. After being questioned by the British representative on their financial activities, the WPC withdrew its application. The British delegate, in a statement to the Council, stated, "The representative of the organization carefully avoided answering specific questions brought to him by members of the Committee on this point, but the answers we did receive left my delegation in no doubt about the truth of the situa-

tion. The World Peace Council received large scale financial support from government sources, and has gone to great lengths to conceal this fact from the Committee." Rather than reveal its sources of funds, the World Peace Council withdrew its application.⁶⁸

Control of the World Peace Council is also maintained through the president of the organization, Romesh Chandra. Chandra is a member of the National Council of the Communist Party of India.⁶⁹ Like most Communist Parties it is subservient to the Soviet Communist Party and follows its propaganda line. The Communist Party of India has, of course, been active in supporting World Peace Council initiatives. For example, in 1970, the Communist Party National Council meeting passed a resolution in support of the so-called "patient peace initiatives" by the Viet Cong. This was one of a series of peace ploys used by the Viet Cong when they needed time to regroup their military forces. The resolution said, "The World Peace Council has called for the observance of the week from 26 October to 1 November of 1970, as an international Week of Solidarity with the Peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, when attention will be spotlighted above all on gaining support for the new peace initiative." The resolution went on to say, "The Communist Party of India calls for actions and demonstrations all over India in support of the PRG's (People's Revolutionary Government) peace initiative particularly during the International Solidarity Week from 26 October to 1 November."⁷⁰

The International Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which directs the activities of the international Soviet fronts also controls the Communist Parties, both directly and through the publication *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, which has an English edition called *World Marxist Review*. That magazine published in Prague, Czechoslovakia, provides monthly directions for the various Communist Parties. In its January 1981 issue, this international communist directive organ carried an article by Romesh Chandra.

In that article Chandra described the work of the World Peace Council. He said, "The activities of the World Peace Council have acquired a new content: 700 million signatures were collected to the WPC's new Stockholm Appeal to Halt the Arms Race and handed over to U.N. Secretary-General Dr. Kurt Waldheim on the occasion of the Special Session of the U.N. General Assembly on Disarmament in May 1978. In Europe, the struggle to curb the arms race has become a mass demonstration against the deployment of new U.S. missiles; in North and Latin America, in Asia and Africa it has developed

into mass action against the arms build-up, against the military bases and stepped up tensions in the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf and the Caribbean.”

According to the WPC, while any defensive Western military buildup threatens peace, Soviet military buildup aids peace. Chandra wrote, “The Soviet Union’s military policy fully corresponds to these goals. It is of a purely defensive character.”

Soviet supported terrorism (euphemistically called “national liberation struggles”) are also consistent with the WPC’s concept of “peace.” Chandra in his *World Marxist Review* article pointed out that, “detente by no means implied that the oppressed and exploited were deprived of their legitimate right to fight, with arms in hand, for liberation from national and social oppressions. The peace movement has always supported and will continue to support just national liberation struggles in any form, the struggles for freedom, democracy and social progress.”

In another article in the December 1981 issue of *World Marxist Review*, Chandra boasted that, “The peace movement in Europe is acquiring diverse forms. In the FRG hundreds of thousand of people are taking part in marches, rallies, and demonstrations demanding that the Bonn government deny the countries territory for the deployment of U.S. weapons. Massive actions are developing against U.S. mediumrange missiles in Britain, the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark and Norway. The movement is spreading to neutral states. Large anti-war actions have taken place in India, Japan and other countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. “It should be noted that all of the actions that Chandra reports in the international Communist publication are actions against western military deployment. No such actions are ever organized by the World Peace Council against Soviet and satellite military deployment.

WPC and KGB

Soviet overt propaganda using the World Peace Council and the Communist parties is supplemented by covert action. This is the KGB element of Soviet “active measures.” It includes KGB officers providing subsidies and advise to Moscow-controlled parties and peace groups in Western countries.

On November 4, 1981 the Danish press reported that Vladimir Merkulov, the Second Secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Copenhagen, had been declared persona non

grata because he carried out subversive activities in Denmark. These activities, according to the Danish press, included providing funding and advice to local anti-NATO and pro "nuclear free zone" groups as well as providing funds for political advertisements designed to influence Danish opinion makers.⁷¹

On November 5, a Copenhagen newspaper *Aktuelt* reported that the Merkulov case was not the first. Other Soviet embassy officials had been declared persona non grata in Denmark and quietly asked to leave. According to the Copenhagen newspaper "the affair casts an unpleasant light over certain 'movements' here in Denmark. Merkulov's path through the swamp must be charted. In which of his contacts has he been able to count on naivete and on corruptibility?"⁷²

The *Baltimore Sun* reported on November 6 that a Danish leftist writer and translator had been arrested and charged with being a Soviet agent. Arne Herloev Petersen was arrested by the Danish police and held for 72 hours to give Danish intelligence time to investigate the case. The judge who ordered Petersen's detention stated that intelligence officers told him that Petersen had taken money from Merkulov to finance the campaign to ban nuclear weapons from the Nordic countries.

More information was provided by the *London Economist's "Foreign Report"* of November 12, 1981. According to *Foreign Report*, Petersen received 7,000 Danish Kroner, the equivalent of over 1,000 U.S. dollars, from Merkulov to pay for an advertisement in the Danish press, signed by 150 artists and writers, supporting a nuclear free zone in the Nordic countries. Some of the writers and artists said that they would not have signed if they knew there was Soviet money involved. Petersen was a prominent member of the Danish-Korean Friendship Committee and provided the Koreans with a supposed American document, forged by the Russians, to discourage North Korean contacts with the Chinese Communist government. Merkulov worked very closely with the Liaison Committee for Peace and Security, a Danish organization active in the World Peace Council. Using the facilities of this group, Merkulov was able to organize trips to Denmark by Soviet propagandists, including some who made speeches in Danish high schools. As a result of the exposure of the KGB officers' involvement with the Danish group, leaders of the Social Democratic Party urged their members to have nothing to do with the Liaison Committee for Peace and Security.

On November 28, 1981, the Associated Press reported that the Norwegian Special Branch Police had asked the Ministry of Justice to declare three Soviet diplomats per-

sona non grata. The three, who were identified as KGB officers, were Col. Alexander A. Makarov, a Soviet Embassy Military Attache, Stanislav Tchebotek, a First Secretary at the Soviet Embassy; and a third, unidentified individual involved in the Soviet trade delegation. According to Norwegian press reports, the Danish police had advised the Norwegian police that Makarov and Tchebotek were involved in the case of Petersen in Denmark. Both of these KGB officers had been employed in the Soviet Embassy in Copenhagen before coming to Norway a few years earlier.

On April 18, 1982, Agency France Press reported that the Danish Minister of Justice had dropped the charges against Petersen. However, the Minister of Justice Ole Esperson stated that three Soviet diplomats had worked with Petersen and used him to influence public opinion. Petersen took documents from the Soviet Embassy to the North Korean Embassy in Copenhagen, supposedly written by an American journalist, in an attempt to increase tension between China and North Korea. The decision not to prosecute Petersen was made according to the Danish Justice Minister because he had not sufficiently damaged Danish interests and because the Soviet diplomats involved in the scandal had already left the country.⁷³

The use of KGB personnel to provide support to the overt "active measures" campaigns is not unusual. It is part of a traditional Communist concept, "to combine legal and illegal work." At times KGB personnel appear using the cover of Soviet organizations at open meetings of the fronts. As seen earlier, there was an example of this during the Vietnam War when Ivan Kovalenko, a KGB official, attended the Stockholm Conference on Vietnam in November 1970 as a representative of the "Soviet Peace Fund." Similarly, during a meeting of the Christian Peace Conference's Working Committee held in Kiev, USSR, March 28 to April 1, 1981, a KGB official named Radomir Bogdanov appeared as a "guest" representing the "USA and Canada Studies Institute" of the USSR. Bogdanov served as the Soviet ideological nursemaid at the meeting. He has also appeared at WPC activities, including the June 1978 meeting of the WPC Bureau in Washington, D.C. He was identified by John Barron in his 1974 book *KGB, The Secret Work of Soviet Secret Agents* as having served the KGB in Poland and India. In 1982, the CIA released a biography of Bogdanov that confirmed Barron's identification of him as a KGB officer.⁷⁴

The World Peace Council's consistent support for Soviet foreign policy positions, and the exposure of KGB

“active measures” parallel to WPC propaganda campaigns, have not created an easy situation for the World Peace Council. E. P. Thompson, a leading unilateral disarmament supporter in England, has openly criticized the World Peace Council and warned other disarmament activists to beware of the organization. In an article in *The London Guardian* of February 23, 1981, Thompson wrote, “To allow the Western peace movements to drift into collusion with the strategy of the World Peace Council—that is, in effect, to become a movement opposing NATO militarism only—is a recipe for our own containment and ultimate defeat.” Thompson described his experience in the United States meeting a Soviet propagandist. He wrote, “Last autumn I spoke at a large and friendly meeting in Manhattan’s Riverside Church—a church with an outstanding record of work for international reconciliation. In a smaller discussion meeting afterwards, a well-briefed Russian (I think a Georgian) announced himself as secretary of the World Peace Council. In an eloquent and peace loving statement he commended me for my correct delineation of the aggressive strategies of NATO, but then explained, very patiently, that I was mistaken in calling on the Soviet Union also to halt deployment of SS-20’s. After all that I had said about NATO’s menacing strategies, I would surely agree that this was ‘quite impossible’? The SS-20’s were absolutely ‘necessary’ for the Warsaw powers’ ‘defense’.” Thompson has frequently been the victim of Soviet propaganda ploys. He fails even to recognize that the “peace” activities of New York’s Riverside Church seldom deviate from the Soviet line. But, he does understand the role of the World Peace Council.

As early as 1959 Velio Spano, a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Italy and the Secretary General of the Italian peace movement affiliated with the WPC, complained in an article in the International Communist theoretical organ *World Marxist Review* about some of the leaders of non-Communist peace movements. He explained that such people “have in recent times become even more distrustful of the World Peace Movement in which much work is done by the Communists. They fear that their actions might coincide with the steps taken by Soviet diplomacy. The reason for this is an erroneous and at time deliberately distorted assessment of certain events (e.g., in Hungary) which are seized upon by the enemies of socialism for unleashing a furious anti-Soviet and anti-communist campaign.” He went on to explain that “it is not the fault of the peace supporters that on the major international issues a consistent peace policy is pursued only by one side. This

question was very simply explained by N. S. Krushchev in a talk with the participants in the Moscow meeting of the Bureau of the World Peace Council in February this year. He said: 'It might appear strange to some of you that your movement has never opposed the Soviet Union's policy. And we say to you: if you find we are mistaken, give us your advice. We shall pay heed to it. But it seems to me that it will be difficult for you to object to the Soviet Union's actions because they are always aimed at defense of peace.' And to those who are fond of finding fault we say: In general we agree with the policy of the Soviet Union because it stands for peace, and it is wrong to assert that we uphold peace only because the Soviet Union stands for it.'⁷⁵

Even among the Communist Parties, those which are not under total Soviet control are having some problems with the World Peace Council and the Soviet propaganda campaign. At this time, this includes even the Italian Communist Party. On April 28 and 29, 1980, the Communist Party of France hosted a meeting of European Communist and Workers' Parties "for Peace and Disarmament." All of the Communist bloc C.P.s attended, but among the western countries the Communist Parties of Spain, Italy and Great Britain refused to attend. The Polish delegate was Andrzej Werblan, a well-known pro-Kremlin hardliner, who was responsible for writing anti-semitic material in the Polish Communist press in 1968.⁷⁶ Werblan complained, "Dear comrades, several communist parties decided to refrain from taking part in our meeting. Regrettably, they did not fully understand our intentions." The representative of the Communist Party of Belgium which did attend pointed out that, "the Communist Party of Belgium is represented at this meeting only by observers, since it has certain reservations regarding its character, and also its preparation, in which only a small number of parties took part." The conference made it clear that it supported Soviet positions while claiming that, "We Communists are advocates of peace, we want disarmament, cooperation and friendship among nations." They went on to make their demands, "We shall—work for the annulment of the NATO decisions on the manufacture of new U.S. missiles and their deployment in Europe, or for a genuine suspension of the fulfillment of these decisions in order to start effective talks on the question of medium-range missiles in conditions of equality and equal security . . ." No mention was made of removing the Soviet SS-20 missiles threatening Western Europe.

The Soviet delegate to the meeting was Boris Ponomarev, who heads the International Department of the Cen-

tral Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the department that runs the international Soviet fronts, such as the World Peace Council, and the Communist Parties. Ponomarev complained that, "The deployment in Western Europe of new missiles with nuclear warheads capable of striking at the territory of the USSR substantially increases the already powerful American so-called forward-based capability." He went on to speak of the "unreliability and unpredictability of the behavior of the U.S. administration, its tendency to rush to extremes, to succumb to hysteria, to take unexpected decisions not coordinated with anyone, its preference of 'tough measures' have all been demonstrated eloquently enough in recent times." Ponomarev was talking of the Carter administration, in just the same terminology now used against the Reagan administration. Ponomarev then issued orders to the Communist Parties. He said, "Communists have the full moral right, or rather the duty, to call on the working class, the peasantry and the intellectuals, the trade unions, religious circles, women's, youth and other organizations, scientists and artists, members of parliament and business people to devote every effort in order to:—thwart the dangerous NATO plans for deploying new American nuclear missiles on our continent;—prevent a fresh round of the arms race, which may have catastrophic consequences for all mankind . . ."77

It is interesting to note that not only is Moscow having problems with some of the Communist Parties in the West—those Parties which have to maintain some semblance of responsibility to the people in their countries—but is even having problems with citizens of the Communist countries.

In early 1982, taking advantage of the official propaganda on peace, dissidents in the Communist bloc countries began their own peace appeal. In East Germany a petition was circulated in churches and factories entitled the "Berlin Appeal—Make Peace without Weapons". The appeal demanded the removal of all nuclear weapons from both East and West Germany and the withdrawal of occupation forces from Germany. The organizers of the petition campaign also demanded that military instruction in East German schools be abolished and that public demonstration of military power be discontinued. They also supported the idea that substitute service for conscientious objectors be allowed instead of military service.⁷⁸

In the Baltic states Soviet citizens have demanded that Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia be included in a North European nuclear free zone. The signers of a letter to the Soviet government and the governments of the Nordic

countries included a number of people who had been persecuted and imprisoned by the Soviet authorities in the past. The letter also points to the shortage of food in the Baltic states and implies that it is the war preparation that are denying them the necessities of life.⁷⁹ When West Europeans who support disarmament attempted to make contact with these people in the Soviet bloc and suggested a march for peace through East Europe, the World Peace Council supporters opposed these ideas emphatically. The chairman of the Danish affiliate of the World Peace Council, the Liaison Committee for Peace and Security, Villum Hansen, warned against having any kind of a march through Eastern Europe or cooperating with anyone but the official East bloc peace organizations. According to Hansen, "If one wants to make contact with East Europe, it should be done in such a way that it will be regarded in those countries as having friendly intentions. If you go blasting in with a poster advocating a refusal to perform military service, for example, it will be regarded as an undiplomatic move and serve as a direct provocation. If one wants to influence the leading groups in East Europe, one must work with the peace organizations that are operating in the open. It is true that people talk about an underground peace movement in the East, but I know nothing about that. You never see those people." The Liaison Committee was described in the Copenhagen publication *Information* as a group that was "directly inspired by Moscow." While it did get broad political support at first, "Later on, events in Afghanistan and Poland caused most non-communist members to leave (the Liaison Committee) in protest against the failure of the Committee to take a clear stand against these military encroachments."⁸⁰

The Soviet Controlled "Peace" Movement in the United States

Over the years various Communist front peace groups controlled by the Communist Party, USA served as the American affiliate of the World Peace Council. The present affiliate is called the U.S. Peace Council and was proposed at a conference in Chicago in November, 1978. An organizational convention was held in Philadelphia in 1979. A Soviet description of the objectives of the U.S. Peace Council is enlightening. In an article in the Soviet magazine *USA: Economics, Politics, Ideology* for August, 1980 S.A. Karaganov wrote, "The convention in

Chicago set extremely broad objectives for the council and the organizations making it up. They included the resistance of the plans of NATO and the Pentagon to begin a new round in the race for strategic weapons, and further struggle for the ratification of the SALT II Treaty. A resolution on the Middle East, condemned the Camp David agreements, and demanded recognition of the legitimate right of Palestinian Arabs to establish their own state. The convention also condemned the 'dangerous militaristic atmosphere' connected with the American-Iranian conflict and warned the US government against any attempts to use this conflict as a pretext for military intervention. The decisions of the convention appealed for recognition of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the People's Republic of Kampuchea and for the lifting of the embargo on trade with Cuba. In connection with all of these and many other issues, the Peace Council and many of the organizations it more or less unites are conducting energetic explanatory work through the mass media, and the movements activists are speaking at various gatherings and organizing demonstrations and protest rallies."⁸¹

The November 9-11, 1979 conference in Philadelphia heard a keynote address by Michael Myerson, identified as the Interim Executive Director, U.S. Peace Council. Myerson was elected at the conference to be the Executive Director of the organization. In 1969 Myerson spoke at New York University on behalf of the Young Communist Club and the *Village Friends of the Daily World*, the CPUSA newspaper. Myerson, identified then as the Secretary of the Peace Commission of the New York State Communist Party, spoke on his visit to Cuba to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the revolution and the fact that he was the first U.S. citizen to visit North Vietnam. In 1982, *Party Organizer*, published by the Communist Party U.S.A. for Party members only, listed Myerson as a member of the National Council of the Communist Party, U.S.A.⁸²

The Philadelphia Conference passed a resolution of nuclear power and nuclear weapons which read, "Realizing the dangers of Nuclear Power requires a shutdown of Nuclear plants, we urge the recognition that nuclear arms production is even more dangerous and needs to be shut down also."⁸³ In the Soviet Union, the Communists don't find nuclear power either for peaceful or non-peaceful uses to be a danger. The Soviet Communist Party theoretical organ *Kommunist* No. 12 for August, 1979, carried a review of a book entitled *The Peaceful Atom in Socialist Countries. Cooperation Among CEMA-Member Countries*, published by Atomizdat,

Moscow, 1979. The book was written by a team of authors from the various Soviet bloc countries—the CEMA countries. The review states that, “Speaking of the immediate future, the CEMA-member countries are linking the further expansion of their power base with the building of nuclear power plants using the energy released from the splitting of heavy nuclei. In 1980 the overall capacity of nuclear power plants in CEMA-member countries will be higher by 3–4 factor compared with 1976. In particular, the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress indicate the need ‘to contemplate the faster development of the nuclear power industry in the European part of the USSR.’ ” The non-peaceful uses of atomic power were also described in the Soviet review. “The use of nuclear power made a revolution in the navy, inordinately expanding its capacity. Everyone clearly remembers the outstanding accomplishments of the Soviet nuclear powered ships.”⁸⁴

The Communist Party, USA, provides the cadre for the U.S. Peace Council, but it also pays a great deal of attention to its activities and provides substantial support. The Wisconsin Communist Party formed a Peace Commission in 1980. A report on the Wisconsin Communist Party Conference on the fight for peace was contained in *Party Organizer*, the confidential publication of the Communist Party, USA, No. 1 for 1981. According to this report, most of the afternoon session was devoted to a history of the World Peace Council. The main political report was given by a “comrade” who had attended the founding conference of the U.S. Peace Council. A report was also given on combating “anti-Sovietism”. According to the Communist Party, “if our comrades are to fight effectively for peace, we have to understand Anti-Sovietism as an enemy ideology, and the biggest road block to world peace.” This report was given by “a comrade from the ‘People’s Progressive Party’ days of the 40’s, the Stockholm Peace Appeal of the 50’s, and the anti-war and civil rights movement of the 60’s to the present.”⁸⁵

An article by Danny Rubin, the chairman of the organizational and educational departments of the Communist Party, USA, in the January, 1982 issue of *Party Organizer* describes the concepts used by the Communist Party, USA, and through it the U.S. Peace Council. Rubin wrote, “The struggle for peace is increasingly closely related to the fight for the people’s daily living needs. We need to do more to show these links. In the struggle for peace a central task is how to give shape and expression to a developing peace majority against nuclear confrontation and for successful negotiations and against inter-

vention. We also have a major task to make known the Soviet peace proposal and combat the myth of a Soviet threat.”⁸⁶

The U.S. Peace Council, in a letter dated March 1, 1982, signed by Mike Myerson, urged its members to support the activities around the United Nations Second Special Session on Disarmaments (SSD-2) in June of 1982. The demands of the U.S. Peace Council were: “1. Stop and Reverse the Arms Race, and 2. Cut the Military Budget; Transfer Funds to Human Needs.” This linking of the slogans of funds for human needs with cutting the military budget is precisely what was outlined by Daniel Rubin on behalf of the Communist Party. The U.S. Peace Council urged their members “to appeal to any local church, community or campus organization, trade union local or labor council for support and participation.” A massive rally called for June 12, 1982, was the main operation of U.S. Peace Council According to Myerson, “the U.S. Peace Council has made mobilization for June 12th its first priority for the next 100 days.” The members were ordered:

- “1. Join you local June 12 coalition. If there is not one functioning in your area, help to start one.
2. Begin now to reserve busses for New York for that weekend.
3. Make a list of local trade unions, community organizations, churches, local affiliates of national organizations supporting June 12 and get them involved.
4. Get local unions, city councils and other important bodies to pass resolutions in support of the SSD-2 and the June 12 demonstrations.”

In a speech to the Communist Party’s Extraordinary Conference held in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Apr. 23–25, 1982, Myerson explained how Communist Party members should use the June 12th demonstration and the U.S. Peace Council. Myerson’s instructions were:

- “1. Every club discuss concretely at its next meeting how it is going to build for June 12.
2. That there be a strong Party presence on June 12th, with banners and literature in addition to the Party press.
3. That we help develop a national trade union peace network out of the local union activity on behalf of the Freeze and in support of June 12.

4. That where the U.S. Peace Council (USPC) exists, we work with others to aid its participation for June 12; where it doesn't exist we work with others to try to launch local Peace Council participation with buses and banners; that we undertake to help distribute a half-million USPC special leaflets for June 12th.
5. That we implement the proposals of Comrade Hall in his Central Committee report **What the Reds Say Today**, particularly the need to help build multi-racial, multi-national, working class affiliates to the USPC at the grass roots. It was stressed that such instruments of struggle are necessary to influence other movements even as we cooperate, not compete, with them. Attention was paid to some liquidationist tendencies, to the absolute need to support the legitimacy of the USPC in all struggles and to link up economic and peace struggles.
6. That we work to overcome the weaknesses of approach now evident among white middle-strata forces in the organized peace movement that create obstacles to the full participation of the Black and other minority communities. Discussion in the workshop affirmed the urgency of taking actions to bring the local and national operational leadership of peace movements into conformity with the actual reality of the situation in respect to the position of the entire Afro-American community which is solidly against Reaganism and militarism.
7. That larger districts create or reactivate Peace and Solidarity Commissions and forms within the Party to guide the work. Smaller districts should assign a cadre to be in charge of the work.
8. Reaffirmed the inseparability of the struggle for disarmament and support for the liberation movements such as the A.N.C. of South Africa, SWAPO of Namibia, FMLN-FDR of El Salvador and the PLO; and affirmed that the anti-interventionism movements gaining great strength in the churches, unions, communities and campuses represent an inseparable part of the anti-Reagan all people's front."

Testimony by Edward J. O'Malley, Assistant Director of the FBI for Intelligence before the House Intelligence Committee on July 14, 1982 made clear the role of the Communist Party U.S.A., the World Peace Council, the

U.S. Peace Council and the KGB in Soviet "active measures" campaign in support of Soviet foreign policy objectives. O'Malley testified that,

"the KGB has clandestinely transferred funds to the CPUSA on behalf of the CP Soviet Union. Several Soviet officials affiliated with the KGB at the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D.C., and the Soviet Mission to the United Nations are in regular contact with CPUSA members and officials of CPUSA front groups. They monitor CPUSA activities and transmit guidance to the CPUSA officials.

The World Peace Council is, of course, the largest and most active Soviet front organization with affiliates in approximately 135 countries. It is one of the major Soviet instruments for political action and propaganda in the peace movement. The World Peace Council has placed the highest priority on the peace movement, and a program of action for 1982 calls for a worldwide campaign against the danger of nuclear war, and is clearly directed at U.S. defense and arms control policies.

The World Peace Council has taken a direct hand in organizing and mobilizing the American peace movement. Romesh Chandra, president of the World Peace Council, and other officials of the World Peace Council, have headed delegations that have come to the United States in connection with the peace movement.

World Peace Council activities in the United States have been coordinated in the past by the CPUSA. In 1979, however, the CPUSA assigned two of its longtime members to establish a U.S. chapter of the World Peace Council. At its founding convention in November 1979, the U.S. Peace Council was formed as a U.S. World Peace Council affiliate. The key leadership positions in the U.S. Peace Council were given to CPUSA members."

An FBI report provided as an appendix to the O'Malley testimony revealed that,

"In early 1982, it became apparent that peace activists in Western Europe and the United States were focusing on the Second Special Session on Disarmament at the United Nations (SSOD II) to make a major political statement on peace and disarmament. Peace organizations were urging concrete accomplishments from SSOD II in particular, a U.S.-Soviet freeze on Nuclear weapons, a com-

prehensive nuclear test ban, and a pledge of non-first use of nuclear weapons.

“Their call for action at the SSOD II was accomplished by a pointed notice that they intended to join forces and converge on New York City for a mass rally on June 12 in conjunction with SSOD II. Some organizations warned of vigils, public fasts, and acts of civil disobedience.

“The Soviet Union, of course, was not only aware of the plans of the American peace movement concerning the rally but was involved in them through its international front organizations and the CPUSA. Listed below are several examples of Soviet involvement in the U.S. peace movement, particularly the June 12 disarmament rally in New York City, which was attended by over 500,000 people and was one of the largest demonstrations of its kind in the United States.

“KGB activities

“A primary focus of the KGB has been arms control and disarmament matters and the American peace movement. KGB officers have recently instructed their contacts to devote serious attention to the anti-war movement in the United States, especially with respect to coalitions forming among the various factions within the movement. The KGB is particularly interested in information concerning the peace movement's slogans, political platforms, plans for conferences or demonstrations, and relations with European anti-war groups.

“In addition KGB officers have recently asked their contacts in the peace movement to report on meetings, participate in the planning of demonstrations, and distribute leaflets and other publications. Some KGB officers are also directly involved in efforts to influence the U.S. peace movement.

“A Soviet diplomat involved in active measures operations assigned to the Soviet Embassy in Washington has been actively attempting to influence the American peace movement. He has attended numerous conferences and has made substantial number of speeches to various peace and disarmament groups throughout the United States.”⁸⁸

Conclusion

The Soviet controlled World Peace Movement and its affiliates in the various target countries are an important element of the Soviet "active measures" campaign to weaken the West in the face of an aggressive Soviet military threat. From time to time, the World Peace Council has been able to enlist the support of naive noncommunists who sincerely believe in the cause of peace. Nevertheless, peace is not the purpose of the World Peace Council. Its purpose is, as Kuusinin told the 7th World Congress of the Communist International, "to attack our class enemies in the rear" in the event of a war with the Soviet Union.⁸⁹

1. *The World Peace Council—What It Is and What It Does*, Information Centre of the World Peace Council, Helsinki, December 1978, p. 6.

2. Based on confidential Comintern documents first published in 1924 in German by the German Trade Union Federation (A.D.G.B.) under the title "The Third Column of Communist Policy—I.A.H. (International Worker's Aid)." Quoted in English in *Labour Magazine* (British Labour Party publication) December 1924. The quotes were authenticated by Munzenberg's widow Babette Gross in her book, *Willi Munzenberg—A Political Biography*, Michigan State U. Press, 1974, p. 121 and 133.

3. *Fourth Congress of the Communist International—Abridged Report of Meetings held at Petrograd and Moscow Nov. 7-Dec. 3, 1922*, published for the Communist International by the Communist Party of Great Britain, London, 1922, p. 53.

4. *VII Congress of the Communist International Abridged Stenographic Report of Proceedings* (July-August, 1935), Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1939, p. 489.

5. *Meeting of the Information Bureau of Communist Parties—in Hungary in the latter half of November 1949*, published by the Journal "For A Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy" (the Cominform organ) printed in the U.S.S.R., 1950, p. 48 (The CPUSA reprinted it under the title *Working Class Unity For Peace*, New Century Publishers, N.Y., Feb. 1950).
6. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 36.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 53.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 54.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 55.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 11-13.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 14-15.
14. *For A Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy* (Cominform newspaper), Bucharest, March 1 and March 15, 1949.
15. *Political Affairs* (CPUSA theoretical organ), New York, Apr. 1949, p. 1.
16. *In Defense of Peace* (WPC magazine), Paris, Apr. 1950, p. 2.
17. *World Peace Movement, Resolutions and Documents*, published by the Secretariat of the World Council of Peace, no date (circa 1954), no place, p. 47.
18. *The Road To Peace*, James P. Cannon, Pioneer Publishers, N.Y., Nov. 1951, p. 8.
19. *World Youth* (W.F.D.Y. magazine), Paris, July, 1950, p. 2.
20. Nikolai Mikhailov, *We Live to Bring Peace*, Novosti Press Agency, Moscow, no date (circa late 1960s), p. 15.
21. *Schwarzbuch Über den Bakterienkrieg* (Blackbook on Germ Warfare), Österreichischen Friedensrat (Austrian Peace Council), Vienna, June 1952, p. 2.
22. *World Peace Movement, Resolution and Documents*, op. cit. p. 102-3.
23. *Schwarzbuch*, op. cit.
24. *Ex Nazis in the Service of the "German Democratic Republic,"* Investigating Committee of Free Jurists, Berlin, no date (circa 1959), p. 13. (Note: Brandweiner's biography appears in the first German Edition and in the English language edition both published in 1959).
25. *World Youth*, Budapest, July 1952, p. 3.
26. *World Trade Union Movement* (magazine of W.F.T.U.), London, Jan. 1-15, 1954, p. 3.
27. Louis Saillant, *The W.F.T.U. and the Tasks of the Trade Union Movement*, report to the Fifth Congress of W.F.T.U., Moscow, Dec. 4-16, 1961, W.F.T.U. Publications Ltd., London, 1961, p. 20-21.
28. *Assembly of The World Peace Council, Documents, Budapest, May 13-16, 1971*, issued by World Peace Council, Helsinki, 1971, Report by Romesh Chandra, p. 54.
29. M. Kukanov, *NATO—Threat to World Peace*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971, p. 147.
30. *World Student News* (IUS Publication), Vol. 18, #11-12, 1964, p. 8.
31. Resolutions, 8th I.U.S. Congress, Sofia, Bulgaria, 28 Nov.-10 Dec. 1964, I.U.S., Prague, 1964, p. 11.
32. *Documentary Record, W.F.D.Y. Executive Committee Meeting Moscow, 16-18 November 1972*, published by World Federation of Democratic Youth, no place, no date (Hungary, circa 1973), p. 72.
33. Executive Committee of the W.F.D.Y. Accra, April 15-19, 1965 W.F.D.Y., Budapest, 1965, p. 20.
34. Op. cit. #28, p. 43.
35. Mimeographed documents appended to a letter of Bertil Svahnstrom, chairman of the International Liaison Committee of the Stockholm Conference on Vietnam, May 23, 1969.

36. Mimeographed list of participants issued by World Conference on Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, Stockholm, Nov. 28-30, 1970; *K.G.B. The Secret Work of Soviet Secret Agents*, by John Barron, Readers Digest Press, New York, 1974, p. 392; *Directory of Soviet Officials*, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D.C., December 1975, Vol. I, p. 36; *Directory of Soviet Officials*, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D.C., Nov. 1974, Vol. I, p. 22.
37. *Neutron Bombs NO*, published by Information Centre of the World Peace Council, Helsinki, Sept. 1977, p. 6-7.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 39-40.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 50, 53, 61, 63 and 64.
40. *New Perspectives* (WPC magazine), March 1978, p. 6.
41. *World Peace Council & Disarmament*, published by World Peace Council, May 27, 1979, p. 1, 7 and 8.
42. *World Peace Council & Disarmament* (a WPC publication), June 8, 1978, p. 4.
43. *Stoppt die Neutronen-Bombe* (Stop the Neutron Bomb), published by SEW-Hochschulgruppe (Socialist Unity Party West Berlin, High School Group), no date (circa mid-1978).
44. L. I. Brezhnev, *Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Novosti, Moscow, 1981, p. 36-7.
45. *Krasnaya Zvezda* (Red Star), Mar. 6, 1981, p. 3, translated in FBIS, 12 Mar. 81, p. III, AA1.
46. Paris Domestic Service in French, 10 Aug. 1981, translated in FBIS, p. VII, 11 Aug. 81, K1.
47. Moscow TASS International Service in Russian, 10 Aug. 81, translated in FBIS, III, 11 Aug. 81, AA1.
48. Prague CTK in English, 10 Aug. 81, FBIS, II, 11 Aug. 81, D2.
49. Prague Domestic Service in Czech and Slovak, 11 Aug. 81, translated in FBIS, III, 12 Aug. 81, AA2.
50. Moscow TASS, 13 Aug. 81, FBIS, III, 14 Aug. 81, AA4.
51. Moscow Domestic Service in Russia, 14 Aug. 81, translated in FBIS, III, 17 Aug. 81, CC7.
52. Moscow TASS in English, FBIS, III, 19 Aug. 81, AA3.
53. Radio Moscow in English to North America, 18 Aug. 81, FBIS, III, 20 Aug. 81, AA2.
54. *Peace Courier* (WPC publication), Sept. 1981, p. 1.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
56. *Pravda*, 28 Jan. 1982, p. 1, translated FBIS, III, 2 Feb. 81, CC1.
57. *Washington Post*, Jan. 17, 1982, p. A16.
58. *The Global Military Build-up Threatens All Mankind*, Information Centre of the WPC, Helsinki, no date (1982), p. 18.
59. See *Soviet Military Power*, published by U.S. Dept. of Defense, Washington, D.C., no date (1982), p. 27 and 28.
60. *The Global Military Build-up*, op. cit., p. 4.
61. *Soviet Military Power*, op. cit., p. 26-7.
62. *International Trade Union Round Table, Detente-Conversion Disarmament*, Sofia, Bulgaria, 26 Sept. 1980, W.F.T.U., Prague, Mar. 81, p. 6.
63. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
64. Havana Domestic Service in Spanish, 21 Apr. 81, translated by FBIS, VI, 22 Apr. 81, Q2.
65. *Peace Courier*, Aug. 1975, p. 1.
66. *Rights of the Palestinian People—Key to Peace in the Middle East*, International Conference of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, Basle, Switzerland, May 4-6, 1979, WPC, Helsinki, May 1979, p. 11 and 13.
67. Letter to the editor from Ruth Tosek, *New Statesman*, London, Oct. 17, 1980, p. 22.
68. Oral statement of the United Kingdom representative to

ECOSOC, Feb. 1981 session (typescript copy), p. 1 and ECOSEC Report 16, Mar. 1981.

69. *Documents of the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party of India, 3-10 Oct. 1971*, Communist Party Publication, New Delhi, Jan. 1972, p. 414.

70. *Resolutions of the National Council of the Communist Party of India, 1 to 5 October 1970*, Communist Party Publication, New Delhi, Oct. 1970, p. 48-9.

71. Paris AFP in English, 4 Nov. 1981, FBIS, VII, 4 Nov. 81, p. 1.

72. *Aktuelt*, Copenhagen, 5 Nov. 81, p. 2, translated in FBIS, VII, 13 Nov. 81, p. 3.

73. Paris AFP, in English, 18 Apr. 82, FBIS, VII, 19 Apr. 82, p. 1.

74. C.P.C. Working Committee, Kiev, Mar. 28-April 1, 1981, mimeographed *List of Participants*, p. 4. John Barron, *KGB* op. cit. footnote (36) p. 382; *Soviet Active Measures*, hearings before the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, July 13, 14, 1982, (CIA prepared biography of Bogdanov, declassified Nov. 1982), G.P.O., Wash. D.C., 1982, p. 70.

75. *World Marxist Review*, London, May 1959, p. 11 and 17 (Spano in a footnote explained that the Khrushchov quote was not verbatim but contained the gist of Khrushchov's ideas).

76. See Andrzej Werblan's article "Contributions To The Genesis of Conflicts" in the Warsaw magazine *Wiesieczni Lileracki*, June 1968, p. 61-71 for an example of his anti-Semitic writing, (note a Library of Congress translation of this article appears in *Theory and Practice of Communism Part 2—The Communist Party U.S.A.—Defender of Soviet Anti Semitism*), House Comm. on Internal Security, Feb. 20, 1973, G.P.O., Washington, D.C., 1973, p. 2171f.

77. *Meeting of European Communist and Worker's Parties for Peace and Disarmament*, Paris, 28-29 April 1980, Progress Pub. Moscow, 1980, p. 36, 38, 12-13, 51, 52 and 58.

78. *Frankfurter Rundschau*, Frankfurt, 9 Feb. 1982, p. 1, translated in FBIS, II, 11 Feb. 82, E1.

79. Stockholm International Service in Swedish, 10 Feb. 1982, translated in FBIS, VII, Feb. 82, A3.

80. *Information*, Copenhagen, Mar. 6-7, 1982, in Danish translated by JPRS (The Liaison Committee is also known as the "Coordinating Committee").

81. *USA: Economics, Politics, Ideology*, Aug. 1980 (publication of the Institute of U.S. and Canadian Studies, U.S.S.R. Academy of Science), in Russian, translated by JPRS, 16 Oct. 1980, p. 35.

82. Leaflet of the NYU Young Communist Club and the Friends of the Daily World, Feb. 13, 1969, *Party Organizer*, Vol. XVI, No. 4, 5, 6 (1982), p. 48.

83. Mimeographed *Resolution From the Workshop on Nuclear Power and Nuclear Weapons*, USPC Conf., Phila., Nov. 9-11, 1979.

84. *Kommunist*, Moscow #12, Aug. 1979, translated by JPRS, 24 Oct. 1979, p. 150b.

85. *Party Organizer*, C.P.U.S.A. internal organ, Vol. XIV, No. 1, 1981 (only issue for this year published early 1981), p. 31.

86. *Party Organizer*, Vol. XVI, No. 1, Jan. 1982, p. 18-19.

87. *Party Organizer*, op. cit. footnote (82).

88. *Soviet Active Measures*, op. cit. footnote (74), p. 203 and 232.

89. Op. cit. footnote 4.

Approved For Release 2010/06/15 : CIA-RDP90-00806R000200720005-5

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from:

The Hale Foundation
422 First Street, S.E., Suite 208
Washington, D.C. 20003
(202) 546-2293

Price: \$5.00 each

Approved For Release 2010/06/15 : CIA-RDP90-00806R000200720005-5