

Proletariats of all countries, unite!

Communist Party of the Soviet Union. CENTRAL COMMITTEE
TOP SECRET

No. P182/2

To Comrades Brezhnev, Suslov, Andropov, Gromyko,
Kirilenko, Pel'she, Ponomarev,
Zimianin, Zamiatin, Rusakov

Extract from protocol No. 182 of the session
of the Politburo of the CC CPSU of February 1, 1980

Re: Information for the Chairman of the Sotzintern W. Brandt and the Chairman of the
Social-Democratic Party of Finland, K. Sorsa.

1. Confirm the text of a telegram to the Soviet Ambassador to the FRG
(Attachment 1).

2. Confirm the text of information for transmittal to K. Sorsa (Attachment 2).

[Written along left margin]

Must be returned within 7 days to the CC CPSU
(General Department, 1st Sector)

SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

[Stamp]

Attachments to No. 300s

17-re
pe

Re: Item 2, Protocol No.182

SECRET

Attachment 1

[Stamp]
Without Right
of Publication

BONN

TO The SOVIET AMBASSADOR

Meet personally with W. Brandt, tell him that you are authorized to communicate certain views on the international situation that has developed, and expound on the following text.

Recently, especially in connection with decisions of the December session of the NATO Council, events have transpired that have sharply complicated the international situation.

It is possible that we do not share the same views on everything. One way or another, under present circumstances, precise and first hand information about assessments and intentions becomes especially necessary. The important thing is to find a common language on the issue that has already been the topic of our mutual preoccupation for many years - how to support the aim of strengthening international security.

Our general assessment of, and our position on, the current international situation, are known to you from the responses of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev to questions put forward by the newspaper "Pravda," published on January 13 of this year. That document reflects the principal position of the Central Committee of the CPSU, from which we shall proceed.

We would like to communicate to you our viewpoint on several concrete issues.

The "Carter Doctrine." The general assessment of it by the Soviet side is set forth in the leading article of the newspaper "Pravda" dated January 29 of this year. In our view, the platform articulated in the American President's speech, with which you are familiar, expresses in a concentrated form the course of the present American administration, which was not just adopted today, in connection with the events in Afghanistan. This course had already emerged a long time ago.

Fact No. 1. At the May 1988 special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York, the urgent issues relating to disarmament were discussed, in connection with which the comprehensive program of actions proposed by the Soviet Union occupied the center

of attention.

However, during the very same period of days, in Washington, a session of the NATO Council at the highest level adopted a "long term program" of acceleration in armaments, calculated over a period of ten to fifteen years. At the same time, President Carter proclaimed a doctrine of global actions by NATO, expanding the "sphere of responsibility" of that military bloc into widening regions, significantly exceeding the framework stipulated in the agreement that created the North Atlantic Bloc. In the application of this plan, NATO has appropriated to itself the right to interfere militarily, particularly in Africa (recalling the events of Zaire). Finally, at the same time, American official powers for the first time openly proclaimed a tie between their interests, the interests of NATO, and the interests of the Chinese Government, which, as is known, blatantly undermines the policy of detente.

Fact No. 2. A little more than half a year ago, Carter signed the SALT II Agreement and spoke of its great significance for the cause of peace and security. However, in the last year, the American administration has essentially ruined the chances for ratification of the agreement.

Fact No. 3. In the autumn of this year, the American government has undertaken active measures to organize a provocative outcry concerning "Soviet forces in Cuba." This Cuban "mini-crisis" has been necessary in order to whip up military fears and further propagate the myth about a "Soviet threat," to complicate the process for ratification of SALT II and to justify new military measures aimed at the reinforcement of the hegimonic and imperialistic aspirations of the U.S. This was a distinctive rehearsal for that which is presently being perpetrated in connection with the events in Afghanistan.

Fact No. 4. In October and November of last year, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev put forward a comprehensive program to advance the cause of military detente in Europe, called for immediate negotiations, and the Soviet Union also undertook unilateral steps, with which you are familiar, aimed at the lessening of military confrontation in Europe.

The USSR has adamantly called for the institution of negotiations for the reduction of intermediate range nuclear weapons in Europe prior to the adoption of a decision on new American missiles.

And what was the response of the U.S.? The American administration literally untied the hands of its confederates and set about in such a way that the December session of the NATO Council adopted a decision to produce and deploy in Western Europe new nuclear missile armaments, representing a substantial increase in the already existing American arms deployed at the front line and aimed at the Soviet Union.

Fact No. 5. Immediately following the NATO session and despite the voices resonating there about intentions to strive for a reduction in the level of military confrontation in Europe, President Carter is pushing through Congress a five year program of automatic (that is, irrespective of any changes in the international situation) build-up in the arms race.

Fact No. 6. Already this year, citing the events in Afghanistan, President Carter is embarking upon full blown measures to curtail Soviet-American relations and even to apply so-called economic sanctions against the Soviet Union. The SALT II Agreement has been withdrawn from consideration and its ratification has been postponed for an indefinite period.

On the heels of this the "Carter Doctrine" is proclaimed.

In it is a summary of the measures undertaken by the American administration in recent time to escalate the arms race and inflame international tensions. We are talking about efforts to resurrect the doctrines from the days of the Cold War - "containment" and "rolling back" of Socialism, and "brinkmanship."

During meetings with the working group of the Sotzintern in Moscow, the issue was discussed as to where the policy of President Carter is leading. Now, that is fully apparent. We are literally talking about the destruction of that which was achieved in the last ten years, accomplished by men of good will, including the Social Democrats.

Under these circumstances it is mandatory to reaffirm the policy of detente in international tensions. Great significance adheres in pronouncements to the effect that it is now important to "preserve cool heads and continue the process of negotiations," that "hysteria must not substitute for rational policy," and that "it is necessary to beware of ill-conceived and hypertrophied reactions which do not conform to the reality of events and which, in their entirety, could lead to an even worse situation."

Our position is to seriously, responsibly and adamantly adhere to the principles of peaceful co-existence, and to everything positive in the development of normalized, mutually advantageous relations between governments that was achieved in the process of detente.

Events in Afghanistan. We would request you to examine them without the prejudice and hysteria characteristic of the Carter Administration.

We think it would be useful to bring the following information to your attention.

The facts establish that only a short time after the April revolution of 1978, an intense "undeclared war" was instigated against Afghanistan. Bands of mercenaries, financed with money from the CIA and Beijing, have literally terrorized the civilian population of that country. Pakistan has become the principal staging ground for this war. Here, more than twenty bases and fifty support points have been created, at which terrorist and military detachments are trained under the direction of American, Chinese, Pakistani and Egyptian instructors. In just the period between July 1978 until November 1979, the training of not less than 15,000 individuals was carried out there. They are equipped with American and Chinese weapons and then dispatched into the territory of Afghanistan. Moreover, they do not conceal their aim - to liquidate the April revolution, to reinstate the previous anti-popular order, to convert Afghanistan into a staging ground for aggression against the USSR, with which that country has a 2,000

kilometer border.

These plans were carried out by the previous leader of Afghanistan, H. Amin, sustained, as the facts attest, in large part by the CIA. Having entered into a contract with emigre leaders, he prepared a counter-revolutionary coup and carried out acts of repression against genuine patriots on an unprecedented scale. After seizing power, Amin physically destroyed H. M. Taraki, president of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, a veteran soldier against Afghan despotism. The government of Afghanistan, led by B. Karmal, turned once again to the Soviet Union for help, as Taraki had done.

Responding to the request of the Afghan government for help in the struggle against interventionist activity directed by Washington and Beijing, we acted in accordance with Article 4 of the Soviet-Afghan Treaty on Friendship, Neighborly Relations and Cooperation, concluded in 1978. Our assistance was also fully in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, providing for the right of any government to collective self-defense, that is, the right to supplicate any other country for help in defending against aggression. And in the case of Afghanistan - and we want to emphasize this once more - there was and continues to be external aggression, the form of which, as defined by the 29th Session of the U.N. General Assembly, consists of "the sending of armed bands, groups or regular forces or mercenaries by a government or in the name of a government, which carry out acts in the application of military force against another government."

In fulfillment of our treaty commitments, we were obligated to defend the national sovereignty of Afghanistan against external aggression. Moreover, we were unable to stand by idly, in view of the fact that the U.S. is attempting (with the assistance of China) to create a new and dangerous military-strategic staging ground on our southern border.

We would like to emphasize that our actions in no way affect the legitimate national interests of the United States or any other government. We have never had and do not have any expansionist plans in relation to Afghanistan, Iran, or Pakistan. We reject as a malicious lie any talk that our goal is to expand into the "third world" or toward sources of oil. As soon as the reasons have dissipated which caused the Afghan government to address us with a request for the dispatch of Soviet forces, they will be withdrawn from Afghanistan.

At the present time, the military intervention by Washington and Peking in the affairs of Afghanistan has by no means come to a halt. Washington is openly accelerating the delivery of arms to the so-called insurgents. As illustrated by the visit of the minister of foreign affairs for the PRC, Xuan Xua, Beijing does not lag behind Washington. Xuan Xua assured the ringleader of the mercenaries that China will also henceforth render them assistance and support "without any limitations."

Washington and Beijing are also attempting to enlist several Arab states in their aggressive actions against Afghanistan (Egypt, Saudi Arabia and others). In this fashion, Washington and Beijing are specifically following a course designed to create a hotbed of international tension

in the Middle East.

At the same time a profusion of unmitigated nonsense is being voiced about some kind of occupation by us in Afghanistan or about a usurpation of that country's sovereign rights by the Soviet Union. Every one who is in Afghanistan these days, including correspondents from the Western information services, acknowledges that circumstances are normalizing there. The new Afghan leadership, headed by Babrak Karmal, is pursuing a rational and sober policy, attempting to eliminate the remnants of the policies of H. Amin, and to reinstate democratic freedoms. All political detainees, representatives of the intelligentsia and the clergy have been released from prison. Relations are improving with the nomadic population, the Muslim clergy, although, speaking candidly, the situation in the southeast and eastern provinces, where terrorists are operating, remains tense.

The Afghan government has declared - and has confirmed by means of practical measures - its firm intention to pursue a policy of international peace and friendship and a policy of non-alignment. It is undertaking all measures toward the establishment of normalized relations with neighboring states based on principles of peaceful coexistence and non-interference in the internal affairs of one another. Such is the truth about Afghanistan.

Our position on the decisions of the December session of the NATO Council. You are already aware of our principal assessment of its results. Here are several additional observations.

As you are aware, the Soviet Union has warned more than once, that if NATO in December implements its decision, then it will knock the ground out from underneath negotiations and destroy their basis. Our agreement to negotiations in the face of the NATO decision would mean conducting them as to the reduction only of Soviet defensive capacity at the same time as the United States is carrying out, in full stride, preparations for new nuclear missile systems.

In the communique from the session of the NATO Council, the condition was laid down in the harshest of terms that negotiations shall be conducted only in regard to American and Soviet tactical nuclear intermediate land based missile systems. Excluded from these proposed "negotiations," and to be preserved inviolable, are all of the other means of front line deployment belonging to the U.S., and the nuclear arsenals of other Western European countries, that is to say, everything in respect to which the Soviet intermediate range forces serve as a counterbalance. They are demanding of the Soviet Union a sharp reduction in its existing defensive forces with a simultaneous preservation of the entire existing powerful NATO nuclear potential, aimed against the USSR and its allies.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, in his recent interview with the newspaper Pravda, stated that "the present position of the NATO countries renders negotiations on this question impossible. At the same time, Comrade Brezhnev emphasized that "we are for negotiations, but honest and co-equal ones which conform to the principal of parity in security."

Our long term intentions

It is apparent that Carter and Brzezinsky are gambling on the prospect of intimidating the USSR, on the isolation of our country, and on the creation of difficulties wherever possible. This policy is doomed to failure, because it is impossible to intimidate the USSR or to shake its determination.

In this complicated situation, the leadership of the CPSU does not intend to adopt a policy of "fighting fire with fire." We shall henceforth exhibit a maximum degree of cool-headedness and reasonable judgment. We shall do everything possible to prevent the Carter administration from drawing us into confrontation and undermining detente. We shall not engage, as the American administration is doing, in impulsive acts which can only intensify the situation and play into the hands of the proponents of the "Cold War."

The American side, forgetting the elementary principals of restraint and prudence, is conducting a policy leading to the destruction of all the inter-governmental ties which were constructed with such difficulty during the past years. Moreover, and this can no longer be doubted, the Carter administration is striving to spoil the relations of the West European countries with the Soviet Union, and is demanding support from them for its dangerous line, i.e., that they subject themselves to that policy which Washington considers necessary.

A great deal that is positive and constructive could be achieved in connection with the meetings that have taken place in Madrid by the conference on issues of European security and cooperation, as well as on the path to implementation of the proposal of the Warsaw Pact countries concerning the conduct of a conference on military detente and disarmament.

In a word, despite all the gravity of the developing international situation, we believe that there is a possibility of bringing to a halt the dangerous development toward which the present administration in Washington is pushing.

The entirety of these circumstances demand joint efforts from all who value the cause of peace and detente.

In Moscow, the meetings with you in the Soviet Union are fondly recalled, and it is believed that they were useful.

If Mr. Brandt should request a text, deliver it to him, translated into German.

21-af,chv
ob,vv

Re: Item 2, Protocol No.182

Attachment 2

In recent time, especially in connection with the decisions of the December session of the NATO Council, events have transpired that sharply complicated the international situation.

Our general assessment of it and the line that we are planning to take under the circumstances that have developed, is known to you from the responses of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev to questions of the newspaper "Pravda," published on January 13 of this year. This document reflects the principal position of the Central Committee of the CPSU, from which we shall proceed.

We would like to communicate to you the Soviet point of view on several concrete issues.

The "Carter Doctrine." The general assessment of it by the Soviet side is set forth in the leading article of the newspaper "Pravda" dated January 29 of this year. In our view, the platform articulated in the American President's speech, with which you are familiar, expresses in a concentrated form the course of the present American administration, which was not just adopted today, in connection with the events in Afghanistan. This course had already emerged a long time ago.

Fact No. 1. At the May 1988 special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York, the urgent issues relating to disarmament were discussed, in connection with which the comprehensive program of actions proposed by the Soviet Union occupied the center of attention.

However, during the very same period of days, in Washington, a session of the NATO Council at the highest level adopted a "long term program" of acceleration in armaments, calculated over a period of ten to fifteen years. At the same time, President Carter proclaimed a doctrine of global actions by NATO, expanding the "sphere of responsibility" of that military bloc into widening regions, significantly exceeding the framework stipulated in the agreement that created the North Atlantic Bloc. In the application of this plan, NATO has appropriated to itself the right to interfere militarily, particularly in Africa (recalling the events of Zaire). Finally, at the same time, American official powers for the first time openly proclaimed a tie between their interests, the interests of NATO, and the interests of the Chinese Government, which, as is known, blatantly undermines the policy of detente.

Fact No. 2. A little more than half a year ago, Carter signed the SALT II Agreement and spoke of its great significance for the cause of peace and security. However, the American administration, at first pandering to right wing forces, and later on its own, perhaps even consciously, has already in the past year essentially ruined the chances for ratification of the

agreement.

Fact No. 3. In the autumn of this year, the American government undertook active measures to organize a provocative outcry concerning "Soviet forces in Cuba." This Cuban "mini-crisis" has been necessary in order to whip up military fears and further propagate the myth about a "Soviet threat," to complicate the process for ratification of SALT II and to justify new military measures aimed at the reinforcement of the hegimonic and imperialistic aspirations of the U.S. This was a distinctive rehearsal for that which is presently being perpetrated in connection with the events in Afghanistan.

Fact No. 4. In October and November of last year, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev put forward a comprehensive program to advance the cause of military detente in Europe, called for immediate negotiations, and the Soviet Union also undertook unilateral steps, with which you are familiar, aimed at the lessening of military confrontation in Europe.

The USSR has adamantly called for the institution of negotiations for the reduction of intermediate range nuclear forces in Europe prior to the adoption of a decision on new American missiles.

And what was the response of the U.S.? The American administration literally untied the hands of its confederates and set about in such a way that the December session of the NATO Council adopted a decision to produce and deploy in Western Europe new nuclear missile armaments, representing a substantial increase in the already existing American forces deployed at the front line and aimed at the Soviet Union.

Fact No. 5. Immediately following the NATO session and despite the voices resonating there about intentions to strive for a reduction in the level of military confrontation in Europe, President Carter is pushing through Congress a five year program of automatic (that is, irrespective of any changes in the international situation) build-up in the arms race.

Fact No. 6. Already this year, citing the events in Afghanistan, President Carter is embarking upon full blown measures to curtail Soviet-American relations and even to apply so-called economic sanctions against the Soviet Union. The SALT II Agreement has been withdrawn from consideration and its ratification has been postponed for an indefinite period.

Out the heels of this the "Carter Doctrine" is proclaimed.

In it is a summary of the measures undertaken by the American administration in recent time to escalate the arms race and inflame international tensions. We are talking about efforts to resurrect the doctrines from the days of the Cold War - "containment" and "rolling back" of Socialism, and "brinkmanship."

During meetings with the working group of the Sotzintern in Moscow, the issue was discussed as to where the policy of President Carter is leading. Now, that is fully apparent. We are

literally talking about the destruction of that which was achieved in the last ten years, accomplished by men of good will, including the Social Democrats.

Under these circumstances, confirmation of the policy in favor of detente has important meaning. International social democracy has a role to play here. We are aware that a meeting among leaders of the social democratic parties has been taking place in Vienna over the past few days, at which T.K. Sorsa will be delivering a report.

Considering the trust that has developed in recent years in our relationship with you, would you not consider it possible to utilize in that connection, at your own discretion of course, the following several ideas.

1. In the transition from the 1970's into the 1980's, the situation in the world has perceptibly deteriorated. Of course, it is hardly justified to speak of an "end to ten years of detente" (although such a viewpoint exists, principally in the United States and to a lesser extent - at least in the press - in Western Europe); nevertheless, it is difficult to deny that the process of detente has come to a halt.

2. It is especially disconcerting to note that there is no progress in the specific area of military de-escalation. It is bad enough that there have been no meaningful results from the negotiations in Vienna, but in addition, a new and sufficiently alarming element has been introduced by the decision of J. Carter to defer ratification of the SALT II Agreement, and by doing so, to bring a halt to the Soviet-American dialogue over the limitation of strategic weapons. The fact that the Soviet Union is refusing at present to engage in negotiations over the reduction of intermediate range nuclear forces in Europe on the conditions proposed by NATO (which the USSR deems to be totally unacceptable and to be destroying the very basis for negotiations), requires us to start at the beginning in an evaluation of the situation developing on the content, in a search for a rational way out that is mutually acceptable to both sides.

3. Both superpowers, the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union, have their own explanations for the reasons behind the deterioration in the international situation, and are putting forth divergent proposals.

Jimmy Carter, following upon his performance in December of last year and January of this year, and citing the imagined Soviet threat, is relentlessly advancing the objective of an increase in the military capability of the U.S. and NATO. He has adopted a decision to increase the military budget, to develop new weapons systems, and to create a rapid response force. In combination with plans to deploy American missiles in Western Europe and the agreement of the NATO countries to automatically increase their military expenditures in the course of the next fifteen years, all of this can produce a reciprocal response from the USSR and the Warsaw Pact.

As a result of anti-Soviet actions by the U.S., Soviet-American relations have significantly deteriorated, and this is reflected in the general climate of international relations.

In the midst of this, Carter, as before, is holding forth in favor of a continuation in the search for methods to achieve progress in the area of arms limitation.

In his interview with the newspaper "Pravda" (in January of this year), L. I. Brezhnev persuasively illustrated that the blame for the deterioration in conditions rests with the U.S. Carter's allusions to the growth of the Soviet threat, including those in connection with the events in Afghanistan and surrounding areas, are simply a pretext to substantiate the reversal in U.S. foreign policy.

In the viewpoint of the USSR, the decision of NATO is unacceptable and dangerous to the fate of detente, first of all, because it undermines the parity of military force that had been achieved in Europe. Without denying the complications that have arisen in the world, the head of the Soviet government is simultaneously refraining from dramatizing the situation, and emphasizing that the policy of detente has deep roots. L.I. Brezhnev has declared the readiness of the USSR to continue the policy of detente, and to carry on honest and co-equal negotiations for disarmament in conformance with the principal of parity in security.

4. In Western Europe there are also divergent assessments of the reasons for the deterioration in conditions and the present approach of both superpowers to the pressing problems of international politics. However, the predominant viewpoint recognizes the need to preserve detente.

5. The deterioration of Soviet-American relations, whatever its causes, we feel, should not be allowed to foreclose what is important to us: the need to capitalize on the promising political potential that has built up over the past ten years (especially in Europe) for the purpose of moving forward, most of all as to issues relating to a halt in the arms race and a transition to actual disarmament. It would obviously be rash, one way or another, to allow, and all the more so to aggravate, the sharpening confrontation between the superpowers.

6. There is no realistic and constructive alternative to detente and disarmament. Western Europe could, in this deciding moment, make a positive contribution to the "calming of fears" in the international arena. It would appear that the most effective means to which it could resort would be to avoid "choosing between the U.S. and U.S.S.R." and not attempting to serve as the arbitrator of their relationship. The important thing is to choose not between them, but between "Cold War" and detente, and the choice in that connection has already been made by Europe in favor of the latter.

Of course, this would require implementation of a more active agenda, particularly in regard to questions relating to the strengthening of European security (the accomplishment of success at the Madrid conference), military detente in Europe (the attainment of progress in Vienna), development of cooperation between East and West on a bilateral basis and within general continental frameworks.

It is obvious that international social democracy must not remain indifferent to the practice

which, in recent time, has more and more incessantly revealed itself in intergovernmental relations, and which leads to an arbitrary and one-sided departure from previously achieved agreements and to unilateral reexamination of them.

7. International practice confirms the correctness of the line adopted by the Socialist International in support of more active participation in the examination and resolution of problems relating to disarmament. This line, to an identifiable extent, has assisted in the stimulation of serious discussion on these questions in various public contexts (particularly West European), and has shown that social democracy also commands great possibilities for rendering a positive influence on the governmental powers in those countries upon which successes in progress on the road to military detente most depend.

Analysis of the situation that has developed permits us to render the following recommendations:

It would be advisable for the Socialist International to continue carrying out its line on questions of disarmament. It is especially important for the Sotzintern to complete the development of a position in respect to the entire complex of problems relating to disarmament and to adopt it in the form of an official document.

The Sotzintern could step up its activities (utilizing in this connection the promising opportunities that it commands, including in the trade unions and in the mass media), to overcome the passivity and confusion among that portion of the public opinion which is obviously discouraged and distraught by the sharp turn of events in the international arena.

Finally, it would be useful for the Sotzintern, and its Working Group on Problems of Disarmament, to continue contacts with Moscow and Washington, which would promote a more refined articulation of the Sotzintern's own positions on questions of disarmament under these new circumstances and, to the extent possible, its influence on the positions of the superpowers. And this all the more so, considering the readiness in Moscow, as is recognized, to continue moving forward in cooperation with international social democracy on concrete questions, especially in regard to issues relating to detente and disarmament.

20-yav, chv
ob, vv

[following page, archive stamp]
TsKhSD (Central Archive of Contemporary Documents)
Fond 89
Opis list 34
Document 4
Pages 19
Copy No. 03.31.94