



SOVIET ACTIVE MEASURES: THE WORLD PEACE COUNCIL

April 1985

Since its inception in 1917, the U.S.S.R. has sought the support of noncommunist individuals and groups to lend credibility and general appeal to its domestic and foreign policies. To this end, the Soviet Union maintains a network of international organizations which, while purporting to be nongovernmental groupings of people with common causes, are, in fact, facades, or fronts, for communist policies and initiatives. They are financed and controlled by the U.S.S.R., and their campaigns are largely directed against the interests of Western nations. The World Peace Council (WPC) is the archetypical front organization.

The World Peace Council was founded in 1949 as the World Committee of Partisans for Peace and adopted its present title in 1950. The WPC was based in Paris until 1951 when the French Government expelled it for "fifth column activities." The WPC moved to Prague and then to Vienna in 1954, where it remained until banned in 1957 for "activities directed against the Austrian state." However, it continued to operate in Vienna as the "International Institute for Peace" un-

Particularly annoying were the ceaseless requests from Moscow to assist the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council. That organization, which was headed by an Indian, Romesh Chandra, swarmed with KGB officers. Every year I was expected to help organize Chandra's speeches to UN bodies, arrange his meetings with UN officials, distribute Council propaganda, and persuade Waldheim to send Secretariat representatives to attend various Council-sponsored conferences. Moscow wanted to boost the Council's prestige by creating high visibility via UN recognition of the Council's "great role in the world movement for peace." I never developed a skin thick enough not to cringe inwardly with embarrassment when I approached Waldheim's deputies with my next recommendation for UN participation in another World Peace Council activity. I never became immune to their patient, knowing smiles when I insistently proposed that the Secretary General's upcoming statement praise whatever latest peace initiative the U.S.S.R. wanted to push no matter how transparent the initiative might be. Moscow even demanded that I try to get Waldheim to praise Soviet Communist Party gatherings.

Arkady N. Shevchenko,
former Soviet Undersecretary General
of the United Nations,
Breaking With Moscow (March 1985, p. 225)

til it moved to its present location in Helsinki in 1968. It remained in Vienna, presumably as the WPC's research organization.

The WPC seeks support in the Third World by posing as an independent body identifying with such causes as the new international economic order; anticolonialism; and assistance to "liberation movements." In NATO countries it exploits fears of nuclear war by stimulating and/or sponsoring antinuclear rallies and advocating Soviet-supported disarmament policies.

The WPC attracts some prestigious noncommunist figures—literary, humanitarian, scientific—who are motivated by a genuine concern for peace but not dissuaded by the preponderance of Soviet and pro-Soviet personnel in key WPC decisionmaking positions. Total membership information never has been made public. Most members do not belong to the WPC itself but to about 142 national "peace committees" (e.g., the Nicaraguan Peace Committee, the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace (SCDP), and the Danish Liaison Committee for Peace and Security). Historically, it has been the function of such fronts to mobilize people not normally reached by local, Moscow-linked communist parties.

Soviet Organizational Control

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) Central Committee maintains de facto control over the WPC through a sector of the CPSU Central Committee's International Department (ID), which is responsible exclusively for front organizations. This sector apparently falls under the general responsibility of Vitaliy Shaposhnikov, a deputy ID chief and a member of the WPC's Presidential Committee. Other prominent officials through which Soviet control of the WPC is exercised include Yuriy Zhukov, CPSU Central Committee candidate member, longtime *Pravda* journalist, SCDP chairman, and WPC Presidential Committee member; and Yevgeniy Primakov, director of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences Oriental Institute, an SCDP first deputy chairman, and a WPC vice president.¹ Through such direct lines to key WPC officials (WPC President Romesh Chandra heads the Presidential Committee, for example), the CPSU shapes WPC projects, prioritizes campaigns and activities, and structures the contents of WPC statements and communiqués.

¹Zhukov was elected SCDP chairman at a March 26, 1982 SCDP plenary session in Moscow. Because the SCDP chairman plays a vital role in the coordination of activities and financial assistance between Moscow and WPC headquarters in Helsinki, he always has held the position of WPC vice president, 1 of approximately 25 who are elected at the WPC's triennial world peace assemblies. Such elections were held at the last such conclave, the World Assembly for Peace and Life in Prague, June 21-26, 1983, but—in a break with past practice—Zhukov was not among those reelected. According to the July-August edition of the WPC publication *Peace Courier*, Primakov (instead of Zhukov) was listed as WPC vice president. Zhukov's failure to be reelected appeared to have culminated a year of press polemic between Zhukov and ID officials over the extent to which the U.S.S.R. should cooperate with noncommunist elements of the peace movement—particularly those elements that criticized Soviet foreign and defense policies. Zhukov's hardline position against cooperation was epitomized by a letter he wrote to prominent European peace activists in December 1982 (see Appendix 1). ID officials—including chief Boris Ponomarev, deputy chief Vadim Zagladin, and others—authored numerous articles in high-level Soviet journals in which they urged cooperation among all peace forces, regardless of political or ideological orientation. This line continues to be advocated today both by Moscow and the WPC.

Dissent Within the WPC

The WPC and similar fronts regularly face internal problems because their Soviet affiliation cannot always be reconciled with an image of independence and nonalignment. In 1949, for example, following the expulsion of Yugoslavia from the Cominform, the WPC expelled Yugoslav representatives and purged its ranks of so-called Titoists. Similarly, the Sino-Soviet dispute led to the WPC's ostracism of China. Nikita Khrushchev's revelations of Stalinist excesses at the 20th Soviet Communist Party Congress in 1956 and the suppression of the Hungarian uprising by Soviet troops the following November cost the fronts considerable popular support.

After the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968, Moscow had to replace many front officials in order to restore discipline. Criticism of the WPC's close alignment with the U.S.S.R. persisted, however: the WPC's eighth world assembly in East Berlin in June 1969 was widely criticized by various participants for its lack of spontaneity and carefully orchestrated Soviet supervision.

As the British General Secretary of the International Confederation for Disarmament and Peace and a delegate to the 1969 assembly wrote:

There were a number [of delegates] who decided to vote against the general resolution for three reasons (a) it was platitudinous (b) it was one sided and (c) in protest against restrictions on minorities and the press within the assembly. This proved impossible in the end for no vote was taken. (*Tribune*, July 4, 1969)

Those anxious to liberalize the WPC from the "straitjacket of its Soviet face" were blocked by the presence of too many pro-Soviet delegates and the practice of holding controversial discussions "behind closed doors."

Although opposition to Soviet control over the WPC occasionally occurs within the organization, leaders usually are able to confine criticism to small, private meetings. Dissenting views are seldom aired in large-scale, WPC-sponsored public gatherings. When they are, they either are suppressed during the proceedings or ignored in WPC-approved documents. Such was the case at the WPC's World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow, October 1973. Before the Congress, the War Resisters' International, the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, and the International Confederation for Disarmament and Peace jointly appealed to all participating organizations to raise the questions of freedom of speech and the treatment of dissidents in the U.S.S.R. The appeal was not acknowledged.

A Belgian delegate, addressing the congress' Commission on Human Rights, asked the congress to "demand that the Soviet Government grant amnesty to political prisoners, and to bring to light those forms of repression practiced in the U.S.S.R.," declaring that the disappearance of a "silent minority" into camps, prisons, and psychiatric asylums "could not be condoned." Soviet-bloc delegates denounced these comments as "interference in the internal affairs of Socialist countries," and the Soviet jurist, V. Kudryavtsev, accused the Belgian delegate of "incompetence and ignorance." *Pravda* (October 31, 1973) described the remarks as a "trite collection of anti-Soviet propaganda."

Similarly, Nobel Peace Prize winner Andrey Sakharov's message to a 1976 WPC-sponsored forum on disarmament in York, England, was not read to delegates as Sakharov had requested. At WPC meetings in 1977, questions from noncommunist participants about human rights violations in the

Profile: World Peace Council¹

Name: World Peace Council (WPC)

Headquarters/Formation. Helsinki/1950.

Claimed Strength. Affiliates in 142 countries; total membership unknown.

Publications. *New Perspectives* (bimonthly), *Peace Courier* (monthly), *Disarmament Forum* (monthly).

UN Status. UNESCO (A), ECOSOC (Roster), UNCTAD.

Presidential Board. President: (also de facto secretary general) Romesh Chandra (India); 39 vice presidents: Severo Aguirre de Castro (Cuba), Olga Aviles Lopez (Nicaragua), Richard Adriamanjato (Madagascar), Eduardo Arevalo Burgos (Colombia), Ali Ba Dhib (South Yemen), Mohammed J. Bajbouj (Syria), Vital Balla (Congo), Freda Brown (Women's International Democratic Federation), Martha Buschmann (West Germany), Jozef Cyrankiewicz (Poland), Camara Damiantang (Guinea), Jacques Denis (France), Guenther Drefahl (East Germany), Luis Echeverria (Mexico), George Georges (Australia), Dawit Giorgis (Ethiopia), Francisco da Costa Gomes (Portugal), Matti Kekkonen (Finland), James Lamond (U.K.), Pascual Luvualu (Angola), Rudolfo Mecchini (Italy), Khalid Muhyi-al-Din (Egypt), John Hanley Morgan (Canada), Gus Eugene Newport (U.S.), Alfred Nzo (South Africa), Camilio O. Perez (Panama), Phan Anh (Vietnam), E. M. Primakov (U.S.S.R.), Nadim Abd al-Samad (Lebanon), Ilona Sebestyen (Hungary), Blagovest Sendov (Bulgaria), Aziz Sharif (Iraq), Filifing Sissoko (Mali), T. B. Subasinghe (Sri Lanka), Mikis Theodorakis (Greece), Emma Torres (Bosnia), Tomas Travnicek (Czechoslovakia), Ibrahim Zakariya (World Federation of Trade Unions)

Secretariat. Executive secretary: Frank Swift (U.K.); 13 secretaries: Sana Abu Shakra (Lebanon), Paivi Arolainen (Finland), Djanghir Atamali (U.S.S.R.), Daniel Cirera (France), Nathaniel Hill Arboleda (Panama), Kosta Ivanov (Bulgaria), Karoly Lauko (Hungary), Rolf Lutzkendorf (East Germany), Max Moabi (South Africa), Bahig Nasser (Egypt), Philip Spillman (Switzerland), Ryszard Tyrluk (Poland), Arsenio Rodriguez (Cuba), Mamadu Sako (Mali), Tair Tairov (U.S.S.R.), Karen Talbot (U.S.)

Related Organizations. international Liaison Forum of Peace Forces (though Chandra is also its head, it involves additional and more innocuous organizations pursuing WPC aims); International Institute of Peace (research body left behind in Vienna when WPC moved to Helsinki); International Committee for European Security and Cooperation (pursues WPC aims regionally; Raymond Goor, head, is a WPC observer).

¹Names of Presidential Board and Secretariat cited in *New Perspectives* (January 1985, p. 2), published by the WPC.

U.S.S.R. never appeared in official reports. The December 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan generated considerable debate within the WPC; 2 months elapsed before the WPC was able to issue a statement endorsing it.

The Soviet Peace Fund and WPC

CPSU International Department Deputy Chief Vadim Zagladin, in an interview with the Vienna *Arbeiter Zeitung* (May 21, 1982) discussed Moscow's view of the European peace movement and explained how Soviet peace activities are meshed with those in Europe:

We highly appreciate the peace movement as an expression of the people's will to prevent war. . . . We also have a mass peace movement, but it expresses itself in other forms. . . . Our young people are now writing letters to Brussels, to the NATO organizations. Over 6 million youths have written such letters. Although May 9 was an official holiday, several working brigades came to work and collected all the money they had earned for the Soviet Peace Fund.

In response to the question "What did they do with the money?" Zagladin stated:

You have several peace committees for European security. They are printing newspapers, and all Soviet participants in peace demonstrations here in Vienna, Amsterdam or Brussels are being paid with the money from this fund. I think that we do not inform the public sufficiently about our peace movement. . . .

According to available information, the Soviet Peace Fund is a type of financial clearinghouse administered by the SCDP. It is nationally organized with at least 120 representatives throughout the U.S.S.R. Like the SCDP itself, the Peace Fund is a "public" organization, allegedly operating without the involvement of official Soviet organs.

In a May 22 appearance on Moscow television, SCDP chairman Zhukov elaborated on the Source of the Fund's in-

The Soviet Union invariably supports the peace movement. The World Peace Council, in its turn, positively reacts to all Soviet initiatives in international affairs. Wider mobilization of public opinion in support of the Soviet Union's peaceful initiatives . . . would help further to improve the world climate.

WPC President Romesh Chandra,
New Times, No. 28, Moscow, 1975

come. He observed that some 80 million Soviet citizens participate in "replenishment" of the fund. "Donations" are mailed to SCDP headquarters or paid through the U.S.S.R. state bank. The most common method of collecting money for the fund is for individual factories, plants, and collective farms to hold a 2-day "work shift for peace," similar to the activity of the "working brigades" cited by Zagladin. Individuals participating in such work shifts then "donate" their day's wages to the fund. According to *20th Century and Peace* (December 1981), the Krasnoyarsk Peace Committee alone received 2 million rubles (about U.S. \$1.5 million) for the fund in 1981. Actually, such "donations" usually represent levies imposed by the central authorities on the individual local affiliates which include peace committees in Moscow, Leningrad, and other cities and regions in the U.S.S.R.

According to the English-language weekly *Moscow News* (No. 19, 1981), the Soviet Peace Fund helps finance some of the WPC's "large public initiatives." Former Peace Fund chairman Boris Polevoi asserted that his clients included the "leaders of the international democratic organizations working for peace: the fund regularly gives them assistance in organizing their undertakings" (*20th Century and Peace*, April 1980). Polevoi also acknowledged that the fund worked closely with the SCDP to "render financial aid to the organizations, movements and personalities fighting for stronger peace, national independence and freedom."

Referring to the October 1973 World Congress of Peace Forces, an event organized jointly by the SCDP and the WPC, the November 1973 edition of the WPC's *Peace Courier* reported that "Soviet public organizations . . . covered all the delegates' maintenance expenses in Moscow." It also claimed that "Soviet citizens donated to the Soviet Peace Fund—which covered the delegates' maintenance expenses—about \$200,000. Moscow's Patriarchate also donated 3 million rubles."

Soviet Life (February 1983) reported that the fund "finances any undertaking aimed at strengthening peace and establishing better understanding among nations." It quoted Freda Brown, head of the Women's International Democratic Federation (WIDF) and a WPC vice president, who asserted in 1979 at a WIDF peace conference in Moscow that the money to conduct the gathering had come from the Soviet Peace Fund.

Money collected by the Soviet Peace Fund presumably is channeled to WPC headquarters in Helsinki either through the International Department and/or through the SCDP. Many peace committee chapters affiliated with the WPC; are believed to receive Soviet assistance via local Soviet Embassies and communist parties. (For example, in October 1981, Danish authorities expelled Vladimir Merkulov, a Soviet Embassy second secretary and KGB operative charged with passing money to Arne Herlov-Peterson, a long-time KGB agent-of-influence and member of the WPC's Danish affiliate, the Copenhagen-based Liaison Committee for Peace and Security. Peterson used the money to finance a newspaper campaign calling for the establishment of a Nordic nuclear-weapons-free zone.)

Financial irregularities forced the WPC to withdraw its application for reclassification to Category I Consultative Status in its relationship with the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) at a session, of the Committee of Non-Government Organizations held February 9-19, 1981, in New York. According to the ECOSOC Report (March 16, 1981), WPC accounts

. . . are not submitted to an independent audit. . . . the financial statement submitted to the committee covered only a fraction of the WPC's actual income and expenditures. In its application, the World Peace Council also stated that it does not receive contributions from any government. . . . But the representative of the organization [Romesh Chandra] carefully avoided answering specific questions put to him by members of the committee on that point. It is clear, however, that the World Peace Council has received large-scale financial support from government sources, and has gone to great lengths to conceal the fact from the committee.

More recently, the Executive Secretary of the WPC, Frank Swift (U.K.), when queried about WPC funding, commented: "I can assure you no money comes from Soviet government funds but from peace committees in the Soviet Union and in East and West Europe." (*Irish Sunday Tribune*, March 11, 1984)

Recent Anti-Western Campaigns

Since its original "Stockholm appeal" for "banning the bomb" in 1950, the WPC has consistently advanced Soviet positions on controversial international issues. For example, in conjunction with other front organizations, it established the "Stockholm Conference on Vietnam," active from 1967 until the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Indochina in 1973. It supported the "International Commission of Inquiry into U.S. War Crimes in Vietnam," created in 1970 as a subsidiary of the Stockholm Conference. Throughout the Vietnam war, the WPC sent many "peace" delegations to North Vietnam and regularly issued statements supporting Soviet policy on the war. In March 1979 following the Sino-Vietnamese border clashes, the WPC staged an "International Conference on Vietnam" to condemn the Chinese and organized a "special conference" in Hanoi to mark the 90th anniversary of the birth of Ho Chi Minh in 1980.

The antineutron bomb campaign initiated in mid-1977 claimed that the United States was pursuing military policies that disregarded the interests of its European allies. The WPC proclaimed August 6-13, 1977, a "Week of Action" against the bomb and organized peace and antibomb demonstrations in Europe, Africa, Latin America, and the Near East. President Carter's decision to postpone development of the neutron warhead was then touted as a victory for world "peace forces."

During the last few years, the WPC has intensified its efforts to influence European public opinion against NATO deployment of intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe (in response to continuing Soviet SS-20 deployments there), devoting particular attention to noncommunist elements of the European peace movement. (See Appendix I for details on Soviet-WPC efforts to court the peace movement.) Elsewhere, the organization has sought to discredit the United States and its allies around the world with "conferences" and "seminars" which carefully exclude any consideration of controversial Soviet policies or actions.

1981. The WPC Presidential Committee meeting in Havana (April 19-21) adopted resolutions calling for common action against the "threat of war and the arms race" condemning the deployment of U.S. forces in the Persian Gulf, Indian Ocean, Indochina, and Korea; and supporting Soviet "peace proposals" such as Moscow's call for a freeze on medium-range missiles in Europe. In May, the WPC sponsored a Nordic Peace Forces' Conference in Aalborg, Denmark, and in June, two gatherings devoted to ending the arms race and demonstrating solidarity with Syria and the Palestine Liberation Organization. Later that month, WPC President Chandra personally headed a march in Salonica protesting U.S. bases in Greece. On November 30, Chandra told a press conference in New Delhi that the WPC was seeking a "winter offensive" in support of the "mass movement for disarmament" and further attacked the U.S. Government's moves of "aggression and intervention" the world over.

1982. The WPC Presidential Committee met in Copenhagen January 6-8 for discussions concerning the tasks of the "peace forces in the struggle for disarmament and security in Europe,- the final document issued after the gathering denounced NATO deployment of intermediate-range missiles in Europe but made no mention of continuing Soviet deployment of SS-20 missiles there. An International Disarma-

ment Conference in Vienna (January 29-February 1), sponsored by the WPC's International Liaison Forum of Peace Forces (ILFPF), urged the creation of nuclear-free zones and called for a ban on chemical weapons. In February, the WPC staged a conference on the "Imperialist Arms Buildup" in the Middle East (February 6-9 in Aden). On April 23-25, a WPC-sponsored International Conference on the Indian Ocean in New Delhi urged the creation of a "zone of peace" in the region while attacking the British, German, French, and Australian presence there. In mid-August, the WPC hosted an international commission to "investigate Israeli crimes" against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples (August 15-16 in Nicosia). An International Conference on Socio-Economic Development staged in Kabul, November 12-15, condemned the "machinations of imperialism against peace and freedom" and condemned the "undeclared war" being waged against Afghanistan. Speakers at the Kabul meeting included Romesh Chandra and Dr. Najib, the head of the Afghan security services, KHAD. (*Kabul Radio*, November 12 and 16)

1983. An ILFPF gathering in Vienna in early January overwhelmingly endorsed the U.S.S.R.'s peace proposals; speakers at the meeting included Pravda editor-in-chief Viktor Afanasyev, also an ILFPF vice president. Later that month, the WPC-related Generals for Peace (see Appendix 11) met in

The World Peace Council . . . will spare no effort to promote further unity among the peace forces.

*WPC President Romesh Chandra,
World Marxist Review, No. 12,
Prague, December 1981*

Vienna to plan future activities. These included participation in anti-American "tribunals" designed to discredit Western defense policies. During 1983, the WPC also sponsored an international forum on Southeast Asia, which supported Soviet "11 peace initiatives" in the region (February 25-26 in Phnom Penh and co-hosted by the Cambodian Peace Committee); an international conference in solidarity with front-line states in southern Africa (March 25-27 in Lisbon, boycotted by the main Portuguese political parties because of its Soviet connection) an international "seminar" on war, which charged the U.S. "military-industrial complex" with preparing for a nuclear war (Havana, April 16-19); the World Assembly for Peace and Life Against Nuclear War (Prague, June 21-26; see Appendix III); an international conference condemning an alleged Israeli-South African "alliance" and U.S. support thereof (Vienna, July 11-13); an "emergency peace meeting" called to discuss Central America and to declare a week of solidarity with the peoples of the region who had become "targets of the expansionist actions of the present U.S. Administration" (Mexico City, November 2-4) and an international disarmament conference, attended by 400 delegates from 60 countries, which expressed opposition to NATO defense policies (Vienna, November 14-17).

1984. A WPC-sponsored emergency Presidential Committee meeting in West Berlin (January 22-24) issued an appeal to all "peace forces" to continue the "struggle against the deployment of U.S. rockets" in Europe. An ILFPF-hosted peace meeting in Stockholm (March 11-12) called once again for support of nuclear-free zones in central and northern Europe. An international peace conference in Quito (July 16-18) endorsed Soviet peace proposals, while an ILFPF meeting in Geneva (September 10-12) discussed ways of promoting cooperation between the United Nations and world peace forces. The WPC hosted a "peace dialogue" in Toronto (November 23-25) attended by some 300 "public figures," clergymen, and scientists who issued an appeal against nuclear war, discussed the WPC's future actions program and cooperation among "all antiwar groupings," and blamed the arms race exclusively on the United States. That same month, the WPC called for week-long demonstrations and protests, commencing December 5, at U.S. Embassies, consulates, and military bases around the world to "condemn the military policies of Washington." (*Rude Pravo*, November 10)

1985. Major gatherings so far this year have included an ILFPF-sponsored international peace meeting in Vienna (January 24-28) which attracted more than 400 delegates; resolutions were adopted urging a halt to the development of "space weapons" and the "militarization of space." At a WPC Presidium session in Moscow (March 22-25), President Chandra condemned "perfidious" U.S. plans to transfer the arms race to space, the undeclared U.S. "war" against Nicaragua, and Washington's support for Israel's "criminal acts" against Lebanon and the Palestinians. He also called for support for Central American peace initiatives-, zones of peace in Southeast Asia, the Indian Ocean, and the Mediterranean; and nuclear-free zones in northern Europe and the Balkans (*Pravda*, March 23). Despite his call for a unification of all the

world's "peace forces," Chandra did not mention Moscow's harassment and imprisonment of Soviet "unofficial" peace activists. The conclave's final declaration urged "all peace forces" to unite in "mass actions" for peace, against "revanchism and neofascism. . . against the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative. (TASS, March 25, and *Pravda*, March 26)

APPENDIX I

The WPC and the European Peace Movement

Because of its unqualified support for controversial Soviet foreign policies and refusal to criticize any Soviet actions, the WPC has since 1979 lost substantial credibility among non-communist European peace groups. This ostracism has complicated Soviet efforts to effect a tactical rapprochement with independent peace activists critical of the nuclear arms policies of both superpowers.¹

In an effort to overcome the credibility gap and promote a unified anti-U.S. peace platform in Europe, the WPC together with the SCDP attended the third European Nuclear Disarmament (END) convention in Perugia, Italy, July 17-21, 1984.²

Soviet media just before the END convention played up the theme of cooperation of European peace forces and downplayed allegations of aggressive Soviet military designs on the continent. For example, the communique issued after the July 11-12 meeting of bloc ideology secretaries in Prague, published on July 14 in *Pravda*, attributed the "growing dangers to peace" to the United States but nevertheless urged "joint action" of peace-loving forces. The communique also proclaimed an Eastern readiness for "active political dialogue and cooperation" with "various social and political forces of the antiwar and antimissile movement." *Krasnaya Zvezda* the same day pointedly denied rumors of an allegedly secret decision to deploy Soviet medium-range missiles in Bulgaria. And on July 17 (opening day of the Perugia convention) *Radio Moscow* termed the antiwar movement a "weighty and permanently active factor" in world politics, praised its mass character, and predicted "a new battle in the struggle for peace."

¹WPC and Soviet concern over tactical and ideological splits in the West European peace movement was expressed in a letter from WPC Presidential Committee member/SCDP chairman Yuriy Zhukov, sent in late 1982 to several hundred Western, noncommunist peace groups in Western Europe. The letter accused Bertrand Russell Foundation activists of fueling the cold war by claiming that both NATO and the Warsaw Pact bear equal responsibility for the arms race and international tension. Zhukov denounced the West Berlin Working Group for a Nuclear-Free Europe, organizers of the May 1983 European disarmament conference in Berlin, for allegedly siding with NATO, attempting to split the peace movement, and distracting the "peaceloving public from the main source of the deadly threat posed against the peoples of Europe-the plans for stationing a new generation of nuclear missiles in Europe in 1983." In addition, he criticized Western peace groups for favoring ties with "unofficial" peace movements in Eastern Europe. Zhukov ignored the fact that Soviet authorities have crushed the small Soviet "Committee to Establish Trust between the USSR and USA,- barred its contacts with Western correspondents, and imprisoned several of its members.

Kenneth Coates, director of the Bertrand Russell Foundation, replied that Zhukov's letter "does a disservice to your committee with its crude attempts to present us as mere agents provocateurs under the influence of Western powers." The Yugoslav daily *Delp* (March 3, 1983) criticized the Zhukov letter as "crude interference in the internal affairs of Western countries" and an indirect attack on the growing unofficial peace movement in East Germany and the Soviet Union.

²END is an umbrella organization comprising several West European independent and noncommunist antinuclear groups. It is highly critical of the U.S.S.R.'s suppression of its own unofficial peace activists and a major advocate of the equal-responsibility doctrine. The SCDP and the WPC boycotted END's 1983 convention in West Berlin in protest of its "anti-Soviet character."

WPC Statement on the September 1, 1983 Soviet Shootdown of Korean Air Lines Flight 007

Helsinki, September 7, TASS—The invasion of the Soviet Union's air space by a South Korean airliner and the simultaneous presence of a U.S. reconnaissance plane in that area are provocative acts which in the present unstable international situation could lead to grave consequences for the cause of peace. . . .

The World Peace Council expresses serious concern over President Reagan's speeches on that matter permeated with the spirit of confrontation. His official statements and his efforts to use sanctions and disrupt economic and cultural contacts with the Soviet Union can seriously aggravate international tensions. . . .

At the present moment when the threat of nuclear war is more grave than ever before efforts should be made to prevent the deliberate use of this incident for torpedoing the resumed talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe, for weakening the movement of peace supporters or justifying the unprecedented buildup of even more horrid weapons of mass annihilation. . . .

This dramatic incident vividly demonstrates the extent of the risk to which the world is exposed by the aggravated international situation and the intensified arms race. . . .

The future of the whole of mankind is at stake. Therefore, it is important that efforts be made to protect life and prevent nuclear war. Talks should be intensified and made more serious. It is necessary to work vigorously toward ensuring an early freeze of nuclear weapons, their rapid reduction and elimination, as well as toward positive results at the Madrid review meeting on security and cooperation in Europe. . . .

The World Peace Council urges all national peace committees not to let themselves be drawn into the cold war and anti-Soviet campaigns. The World Peace Council calls for joint action for disarmament, and for scaled-UP efforts to mobilize the public opinion to massive and effective anti-war demonstrations this autumn.

Moscow Faces Harsh Opposition. The realities of dealing face-to-face with several hundred anticommunist peace activists at Perugia (a total of 1,500 peace movement representatives attended) quickly dispelled Moscow's hopes for constructive dialogue.

The convention opened with a demonstration by 70 Italian peace activists and East European emigres protesting the denial of exit visas to 59 "unofficial" Soviet and East European peace activists who wanted to attend the gathering. Fifty-nine seats were left empty for the absent activists. Flags and banners belonging to Poland's Solidarity and several East German peace groups were displayed. (SCDP delegates Grigoriy Lokshin and Yevgeniy Sylin subsequently filed a formal complaint with the convention's organizers against "primitive and brutal anticommunist behavior.")

I cannot agree . . . with the assertion that there is an independent peace movement in the Soviet Union. What this is all about is actually a handful of people—10, 15, no more—among them [are] a few criminal types, who actually have only one aim: to assert their private, personal interests, and who to this end are abusing the emotions for peace, the longing for peace. The problem of the so-called independent peace movement has been thought up, made up, and developed by the West and has nothing whatsoever to do with the reality in the Soviet Union. We absolutely do not have this problem.

Viktor Afanasyev, *Pravda* editor-in-chief and an ILFPF vice president, Vienna radio, November 16, 1983

Of course a Soviet citizen can believe that all Russian troops should leave Eastern Europe and we should dismantle our missiles. You can believe that and remain a loyal citizen—but to campaign for it, that is different. Imagine how the media in the West would react to that.

Grigoriy Lokshin, SCDP member, London *Guardian*, November 14, 1984

Two days into the convention, an SCDP press conference was interrupted by outbreaks of "shouting, bursts of laughter and protests," according to the Milan *Corriere Della Sera* (July 20). Lokshin's explanation of the origins and positions of the Soviet peace movement and the SCDP itself (a "totally independent and democratically elected" movement) was greeted with "boos," as was his claim that unofficial Soviet peace activists were "supported" by President Reagan. Sylin, in reply to persistent questions as to why the SCDP had never criticized Soviet policies and why it approved of Soviet deployments of nuclear missiles in the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia, said there were no differences between the Soviet Government and the people. "Public opinion and official opinion are the same in our society," he said to laughter. "They are always the same. We have ways of establishing this link." (*New York Times*, July 20)

SCDP delegates also were forced to defend the U.S.S.R.'s invasion of Afghanistan amid shouts of "free Sakharov." Lokshin stated there was "no repression against activities for peace" in the U.S.S.R. and that the Sakharov case was "based on ignorance and lies." (*London Times*, July 25) Lokshin and Sylin threatened more than once to walk out of the conference if similarly hostile questioning was repeated. According to the Paris *Liberation* (July 21-22), 2 hours of "stormy debate" between the SCDP representatives and their noncommunist counterparts led one Soviet to whisper: "It is hard to face the real world."

East European and Soviet Reactions. East European reaction was predictably critical, with the Czechoslovaks most strident (*Rude Pravo* condemned Italian authorities after they denied visas to delegates of the state-sponsored Czechoslovak Peace Committee) and the Hungarians much less so. (*Nepszabadsag* even registered pleasure with the "exciting battle of words.")

Moscow reacted by saying nothing substantive for almost a month. It was not until August that *Kommunist* (No. 12, 1984) attacked the "irresponsible. . . clamorous Trotskyist and leftist-anarchist elements" that sought to "implant cold war confrontation" at Perugia. Their actions, according to *Kommunist*, "provoked indignation and condemnation" among activists interested in "serious dialogue" between Eastern and Western peace movements. The journal found it to be unacceptable that the state-sponsored peace committees of the East—which "naturally" supported the policies of the Warsaw Pact—should be forced to "act independently" and thus in opposition to their governments in order to prove their autonomy. And in a broadside against European Nuclear Disarmament itself *Kommunist* attacked the "perfidious essence" of the equal-responsibility thesis: its acceptance by large segments of Europe's antiwar movement was responsible for the continuing tensions between communist and non-communist peace forces.

Kommunist, nevertheless, expressed hope for future cooperation and gave Moscow's prescription for communist/noncommunist reconciliation: "dialogue, persuasion and patient explanation . . . as well as a considerate attitude toward the position of the others even when. . . these positions are inconsistent or wrong." Western peace activists also were implored to look for the source of tension and focus their attacks on the defense policies of the West:

. . . the specific effectiveness of peace actions and their ability to produce results reach the highest level when the actual problems of the arms race, detente and disarmament are not treated in general terms and on the basis of "equal distance" but when, instead, *the source and the cause of the nuclear threat are concretely pointed out* and the main blow is aimed at them.

APPENDIX II

Generals for Peace and Disarmament

In June 1981, the East German newspaper, *Neues Deutschland*, publicized a book, *Generals for Peace*, published in Cologne and containing interviews between Gerhard Kade, vice president of the WPC-controlled International Institute for Peace (11P), and eight retired NATO senior officers. The new group, now known as Generals for Peace and Disarmament, originated at "round table" discussions held during the WPC's World Parliament of Peoples for Peace congress in Sofia in September 1980.

Since March 1983, the group's headquarters have been at the premises of the London Centre for International Peacebuilding. Five members of the group are currently associated with the WPC: Marshal Francisco da Costa Gomes of Portugal (a vice president); General George Koumanakos of Greece (since June 1983 a member of the Presidential Committee); General Nino Pasti of Italy, Admiral Antoine Sanguinetti of France (both WPC members); and General Michael Tombopoulos of Greece.

The group has collectively or severally issued a number of statements and appeals. After its first meeting in Vienna in

February 1982 (arranged by the WPC-controlled IIP), a memorandum signed by 14 former officers was prepared. Launched in Bonn on June 4, 1982, and later submitted to the Second UN Special Session on Disarmament in New York, it called for an immediate moratorium on the deployment of nuclear weapons in the East and West as a first step toward disarmament. A second meeting, held in Vienna in January 1983, was attended by 14 former officers from nine NATO countries. The participants' main concern was the deployment of new NATO missiles; they welcomed the Soviet Union's latest "peace initiatives" and supported the Warsaw Pact's Prague Declaration of January 1983. Five members attended the World Assembly for Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War, in Prague in June 1983, although the organization as such was not represented. (Koumanakos and Pasti, with retired U.S.S.R. Colonel Proektor, headed the "military doctrine panel.")

At the group's third meeting in Vienna in May 1984, six of the members were present, together with eight military representatives from Warsaw Pact countries. According to Soviet sources, Vladislav Kornilov, a civilian Secretary of the Soviet Peace Committee, also was present. The Polish representative was Major-General Marian Naszkowski, also a WPC member. Colonel-General Alexander N. Ponomarev (U.S.S.R.), who jointly chaired the meeting with the group's chairman, General Major Michael von Meyenfeldt of the Netherlands, remarked that it was characteristic that views of the participants from both East and West either coincided or were very close to each other "on a number of points raised by the Warsaw Pact representatives." As Kornilov and Major-General Rair A. Simonyan, also a member of the Soviet Peace Committee, commented:

"the aims of the group [Generals for Peace and Disarmament]—an end to the arms race and a return to detente—are identical to those of the Soviet peace movement and the ideas of the anti-war movements of all honest-minded people in the world. . . . (New Times, No. 24, June 1984)

In September 1984 the group published a new book, *The Arms Race to Armageddon: Generals Challenge US-NATO Strategy*. Most recently, Nino Pasti authored an article in *New Times* (No. 5, 1985) which accused NATO of attempting to upset the nuclear balance in Europe to gain military superiority while praising the U.S.S.R. for manufacturing and deploying "only enough" weaponry to "maintain the peace." Pasti also denounced unidentified "Italian political parties, even those which claim to be left-wing," for "blindly accepting" propaganda accusations that the U.S.S.R. has tipped the existing nuclear balance in its favor by deploying SS-20 missiles in Europe.

APPENDIX III

The 1983 World Peace Assembly

World peace assemblies are major events staged by the World Peace Council (WPC) roughly every 3 years. The 1983 world assembly took place in Prague, June 21-26. Since the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, these meetings have been held only in Moscow or various East European capitals. The first was held jointly in Paris and Prague (April 1949) because French authorities denied visas to the majority of delegates from Eastern Europe, where communist regimes had recently

been imposed by the U.S.S.R. WPC triennial assemblies subsequently were held in Warsaw (November 1950), Vienna (December 1952), Helsinki (June 1955), Stockholm (July 1958), Moscow (July 1962), Helsinki (July 1965), East Berlin (June 1969), Budapest (May 1971), Moscow (October 1973), Warsaw (May 1977), and Sofia (September 1980).

These assemblies are designed to attract maximum non-communist participation by focusing on issues of concern to a broad range of social and political opinion. However, there are several features common to all the gatherings that underlie their pro-Soviet political bias.

- The majority of participants in the assemblies are Soviet and East European communist party members, representatives of foreign communist parties, and representatives of other Soviet-backed international fronts. Token noncommunist participation serves to lend an element of credibility.
- Discussion usually is confined to the inequities of Western socioeconomic systems and attacks on the military and foreign policies of the United States and other "imperialist, fascist" nations.
- Resolutions advocating policies favored by the U.S.S.R. and other communist nations are passed "by acclamation," not by vote. In most cases, delegates do not see the texts until they are published in the communist media.
- Attempts by noncommunist delegates to discuss Soviet actions (such as the invasion of Afghanistan) are dismissed as "interference in internal affairs" or "anti-Soviet propaganda."
- Dissent among delegates often is suppressed and never acknowledged in final resolutions or communiques.
- All assemblies praise the U.S.S.R. and other "progressive" societies and endorse Soviet foreign policy positions.

The World Assembly for Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War (Prague, 21-26 June, 1983) was attended by 3,625 delegates from 132 countries and 119 international organizations. Visitors included Yasir Arafat of the Palestine Liberation Organization (for the closing sessions only), Emil Zatopek (Czechoslovakia), Anatoly Karpov (U.S.S.R.), and Valentina Tereshkova (U.S.S.R.).

At a press conference in Prague on June 20, Tomas Travnicek, chairman of the Czechoslovak Preparatory Committee (and WPC Presidential Committee member), said that participants would be able to express their opinions openly and to hold informal meetings throughout the country. On the funding of the assembly, he said that a collection of over Kcs 62,000,000 (U.S. \$10,000,000) had been raised in "voluntary contributions" from Czechoslovak citizens.

After the opening speech by Travnicek, Romesh Chandra said that:

. . . the Assembly was a reply to those who did not want to listen to the voice of reason and expected a split among the anti-war forces. The Assembly would seek unity, joint and parallel actions. . . . The danger of war was now greater than ever before. . . . MX missiles were being tested, new medium-range missiles were to be stationed in Europe this year, but the Prague Assembly said: no missiles anywhere in the world, all nuclear weapons must be destroyed! There was no such thing as limited nuclear war a third world war would be the last, as all mankind would be annihilated. (Czechoslovak news agency, CTK, June 21)

According to the West German news agency, DPA, June 24 (quoting church sources in Vienna), the Czechoslovak Primate, Cardinal Tomasek, spoke out against all suppression

of individuals and groups, whether material or spiritual. He was reported as saying that those who threatened human freedoms, including freedom of religion, posed a threat to peace. DPA said his speech had not been published by the conference organizers.

On June 21, the assembly began work in 11 dialogue groups. Discussions focused on: (1) the dangers of nuclear war, the threat to life and how to prevent it-, (2) European security and disarmament-, (3) the arms race and how to stop and reverse it; (4) the exchange of experiences and ideas of peace movements in support of disarmament-, (5) the role of the United Nations for peace and disarmament-, (6) economic aspects of the arms race and of disarmament-, (7) development, the arms race and disarmament, international economic cooperation; (8) social, psychological and ethical aspects of the arms race, war and disarmament-, (9) the role of the non-aligned movement for peace and life-, (10) the danger of war and the problems of the Middle East, Asia, Africa, and Latin America; and (11) education for peace and the prevention of war (CTK, June 21).

According to CTK (June 26), the final plenary session was largely devoted to reports from the dialogue and special interest groups. The first dialogue group denounced the concept of a limited nuclear war, called on the United States, the United Kingdom, and France to follow the Soviet Union's lead in announcing that they would never be the first to use nuclear weapons and condemned U.S. plans to deploy nuclear missiles in Europe. Similarly "unqualified" were the reports from the 5th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th dialogue groups. The reports of the others were more qualified. The second was "almost unanimous" on the need to halt the arms race outside Europe; in the third, a "large number of participants" stressed the responsibility of the Reagan Administration for the present stage of the arms race; in the fourth, participants agreed on the need to counter efforts to split East and West, but there were "differences in motivation and approach to peace work"; and in the sixth "a number of participants" stressed that the military-industrial complex used its profits to influence political circles in favor of the arms race.

Various special interest groups also voiced demands. Trade unionists called for social rather than military spending; women's groups criticized the Western media for failing to report the peaceful life in socialist countries, artists and writers called for the establishment of an international organization to promote exhibitions on peace themes and cooperate with the peace movement" the education group called on supporters to lobby governments to provide funds for a world disarmament campaign; doctors condemned the amounts spent on arms and the cuts in social programs; the religious circles group agreed that unilateral moves to reduce the risk of war would culminate in multilateral agreements to halt the arms race-, the journalists blamed the monopoly control of the media and news agencies for the attitude of the Western press to the peace movement; the parliamentarians expressed concern at the building of new military bases by the imperialist powers in the "Indian Ocean, the Malvinas and Turkey." The lawyers called for the more effective use of existing international laws banning the use of nuclear weapons and stressed the need for a new convention banning the production, stockpiling, and use of nuclear weapons.

A final "appeal" warned that all talks on limiting and reducing arms were virtually blocked and new types of weapons of mass destruction were being developed. A particularly acute danger "is posed by the plans to deploy new first-strike nuclear missiles in Western Europe-, it was "utterly essential" to stop these. "We are deeply convinced that whatever differences there may be between us over some problems, nothing should divide us in the face of our common goal to save peace and life and prevent a nuclear war," the "appeal" said. (*Morning Star*, British communist newspaper, June 27)

Chandra told the closing session that the peace movements of the world would never be divided again. After Prague, the dialogue would enter a new stage. Travnicek said that despite different political, ideological, philosophical, and religious views, a sincere and open dialogue had taken place. (CTK, June 26)

United States Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

Official Business

Postage and Fees Paid
Department of State
STA-501

