The Intelligence Profession Series

Number THREE

The KGB
An Instrument of Soviet Power

By
Thomas Polgar

6723 Whittier Avenue, Suite 303A
McLean, Virginia 22101
(703) 790-0320

$1.25

The Association of Former Intelligence Officers (AFIO) was formed in 1975 by former intelligence personnel from the Federal, military and civilian intelligence and security agencies. Its purpose is to promote public understanding of, and support for, a strong and responsible national intelligence establishment.

AFIO believes that effective intelligence is the nation's first line of defense against surprise from abroad and subversion at home and is indispensable for our national leaders in the conduct of foreign and defense policy. AFIO therefore holds that reliable intelligence is essential to the cause of peace.

In its first years, AFIO was active in providing expert testimony to committees of Congress which were investigating various aspects of national intelligence. With a lessening of the amount of effort required to provide Congress with objective, expert testimony, AFIO is embarking upon an education project designed to provide material which will support the teaching of the subject in American universities and colleges. This series of monographs is the first venture into that project.

AFIO is independent and has no affiliation with the United States Government. Publications of the Association, however, which could divulge sensitive information regarding sources, methodology, and techniques, are cleared with the proper element of the intelligence community. Clearance with a government element merely serves to satisfy security requirements and does not constitute substantive approval by that element. In fact, AFIO will not accept substantive direction. Opinions expressed in these monographs are those of the authors, not necessarily those of the Government or of AFIO.

Future editions of this series will address other subjects of current critical interest to the United States intelligence community and the citizenry. These will include secrecy, warning, estimates, the legal and ethical bases for national intelligence, the history of national intelligence in the United States, comparisons with foreign services, collection, policy, and the establishment of requirements.

The KGB —

An Instrument of Soviet Power

Thomas Polgar

The Association of Former Intelligence Officers
McLean, Virginia

About the Author

Tom Polgar retired in December 1981 after 38 years of Federal service, of which more than 35 years were spent in intelligence work.

During the Second World War, Mr. Polgar served in the U.S. Army with the 7th Infantry Division until his transfer, in military status, to the Office of Strategic Services, the predecessor of today's Central Intelligence Agency.

Discharged from the Army in 1946, he embarked on a civilian career in intelligence. He became associated with the Central Intelligence Agency when it was formed in 1947 and he held important assignments in CIA Headquarters and abroad.

In the course of his service with the CIA, Mr. Polgar headed six field installations, including the two largest stations, in Europe and in Vietnam. He holds the State Department's Award for Valor, CIA's Intelligence Star and two Distinguished Intelligence Medals.

Since his retirement he has worked as a consultant for the U.S. Government and for commercial interests on international security matters.

The monograph series, The Intelligence Profession, is published by the Association of Former Intelligence Officers, 6723 Whittier Avenue, Suite 303A, McLean, Virginia 22101. Individual copies are priced at cost and are available for classroom use. Current issues are available at $1.25 per copy. Payment must accompany each order.

Printed at McLean, Virginia.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The past year was not a good one for the KGB. The death of Yuri Andropov, for fifteen years Chairman of the Soviet Union's ubiquitous organization for state security, must have come as a shock and a disappointment to his former subordinates, even if it can be assumed that top-level changes in the ruling hierarchy of the Soviet Union do not alter in any substance the authority and privileges of the state security organization.

The death of Andropov was a shock, but even former chiefs of the KGB are among the mortals. Old men get sick and die and it is no one's fault. During the past year, however, the KGB got plenty of publicity and has suffered numerous setbacks as a result of human errors in planning, judgment and operational implementation.

During 1983 every North Atlantic Treaty Organization member, with the exception of Luxembourg, has expelled, detained or convicted personnel identified as officials or agents of the Soviet intelligence service. There have also been significant revelations of Soviet clandestine activities in Asia and in Latin America. The discovery of the extent of Soviet activities in Grenada was of course of particular interest to the United States and in the Caribbean area.

In addition to Grenada, world-wide headlines were created by the expulsion of 47 Soviet diplomats from France in April 1983 and of 18 Soviets from Iran a few weeks later because of clandestine activities incompatible with diplomatic status.

Rare are the days when careful readers of major newspapers cannot find some reference to the KGB.

In the following monograph the reader will be informed about the nature and the operational activities of the KGB -- an acronym for the Committee of State Security, the official title of the Soviet Union's senior service in the areas of clandestine activities abroad and in those of traditional political police at home.

The KGB is a uniquely Russian institution. Attempts to compare it with the United States Central Intelligence Agency, with the British Secret Intelligence Service or with any other intelligence organization in the non-Communist world are bound to be misleading. There are elements of KGB activities which may be duplicated in other countries, but only in the Soviet Union is there a total centralization of all activities bearing on the security of the state. The KGB reflects accurately the truly totalitarian nature of the Soviet State. It is only fair to add, however, that the KGB is also in the Russian tradition, with a continuity of operational concepts readily traceable to the days of Ivan the Terrible in the 16th Century.

Following the death of Josef Stalin in 1953, there have been organizational and conceptual changes in the administration of state security affairs. The reforms, particularly during the Khrushchev era, were significant, but it should be understood that their purpose was not to make anti-party dissidence more comfortable within the Soviet Union or the KGB's activities abroad less effective. Indeed, the KGB prospered under Krushchev and under Brezhnev.

The KGB enjoys considerable prestige in the Soviet Union. It is able to attract ambitious, well-qualified people to its ranks. The combination of its budgetary and material resources, favorable publicity, lack of any overt criticism and a lot of good people adds up to a truly formidable instrument of statecraft.

As any large bureaucratic organization, the KGB has had its failures and disappointments. 1983 does not seem to have been a good year. The very aggressiveness of the Soviet service has spurred Western counterintelligence services into greater activity of their own. Nevertheless, we can fully expect that the KGB, in the service of a determined political leadership, will continue as a formidable factor in East-West relations.

THE KGB — AN INSTRUMENT OF SOVIET POWER

In April 1983 the Government of France, a leftist coalition including three Communist ministers, created headlines when it expelled 47 Soviet officials on charges of espionage. A month later the Ayatollah Khomeini's Islamic Republic of Iran surprised friend and foe alike by its expulsion of 18 Soviet diplomats on charges of espionage, subversion and illegal interference in the internal affairs of Iran. During the past two years Soviet personnel were expelled, detained or convicted on similar charges also in Great Britain, West Germany, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Canada, Norway, Sweden, Thailand, Australia and the United States of America. In earlier years there were spectacular expulsions of Soviets masquerading as diplomats from Mexico, Argentina, Turkey and Uruguay and, in the perhaps most dramatic incident of all, from Great Britain in 1971, when 107 Soviet personnel were expelled, to be sure only after Soviet intelligence had scored some truly astonishing successes in the penetration of the British establishment.

The above list of countries is merely a sample of the many locations in which the KGB's activities were found intolerable by the local authorities, but it should suffice to indicate that the KGB's operations are conducted independently of the political coloration of any local government.

The Nature of the KGB

What then, is this KGB, which has inspired the ire of leftists and rightists; which seems to be ubiquitous and whose chief for fifteen years, Yuri Andropov, became the head of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (even if his rule was a short one because of poor health and untimely death)?

In simplest terms, the KGB -- the Committee of State Security -- is the large, influential and much feared agency which is responsible for the security of the Soviet state. Its responsibilities include espionage, covert action, counterintelligence, border protection and population control along with a limited charter for the enforcement of laws and administrative measures bearing on the security of the state. (Prior to the mid-fifties, the charter of the KGB and its predecessor organizations was virtually unlimited, or limited only by the will of Stalin.)

The KGB has no Western counterpart -- the centralization of internal and external security and the coupling of population control, law enforcement and executive authority under a single agency would be anathema in any democracy. The organization outside Russia which came perhaps closest to the concept of the KGB was in Hitler's Germany where the Main Office for the Security of the Reich (RSHA --Reichssicherheitshauptamt) combined most of the functions which are associated with the KGB. Fortunately, the RSHA did not survive the defeat of Nazi Germany.

Just as the Gestapo -- Hitler's secret state police -- inspired through its state-sanctioned terror fear within and outside the borders of Germany, the Soviet state security service, whether under the acronym of KGB or under its former designations of MVD, NKVD, GPU, OGPU or Cheka, has become the symbol of an all-powerful, omnipresent, absolutist and cruel secret service. (This reputation persists even though in the post-Stalinist era there have been reductions in the authority of the KGB and in the internal sphere there has been some moderation in the style of KGB operations.)

The KGB is not the only Soviet intelligence service and it is not the only security force in Soviet Russia. It is, however, the supreme and senior organization in all areas of state security.

The unusual role and stature of the KGB in contemporary society derive not merely from the size of the organization and its status as the principal intelligence service of the Soviet Union but from the manner in which the rulers of the Soviet Union have utilized the KGB as a political weapon both at home and abroad. Because of this the KGB is essentially different from the intelligence and security services of other countries, even though the utilization of the intelligence service as an integral part of statecraft is as old as written history, perhaps even older.

Roots in History

Intelligence services like to refer to their origins by citing the Old Testament. When Moses was in the wilderness with the people of Israel, he was directed by the Lord to spy out the land of Canaan. Following the instructions of the Lord -- today we would call it tasking -- Moses commanded his subordinates "to see the land, what it is; and the people that dwelleth therein, whether they may be strong or weak, or few or many."

The Chinese statesman Sun Tzu, writing about 400 years before the birth of Christ, was perhaps the first to spell out the concept of the organization of a secret service -- a fish net of many strands all joined to a single cord. This concept of centralization has remained a constant in the modus operandi of intelligence services. "Center" and "control" have been popularized in spy novels. They are also indispensable elements in any effective intelligence service. Nowhere have "control" and "center" been developed to the extent that we have seen in Russia.

The Russian Experience

In his book "The Craft of Intelligence" Allen W. Dulles -- former Director of Central Intelligence and the best known U.S. intelligence operator during World War II -- provides many relevant examples of the history and utilization of intelligence in the Western world along with some blunders of statecraft, committed because of lack of intelligence, poor intelligence or the misinterpretation of the available information. Such blunders have certainly played a role in the evolution of East-West relations over the centuries.

According to Mr. Dulles, the most serious mistakes of Western Europe in the Middle Ages were made in relation to the East, "due in large part to inadequate intelligence collection." Western European rulers consistently weakened Byzantium, the spiritual parent of modern Russia, instead of supporting it as a bulwark against invasion from the East. Byzantium and Russia were left on their own to cope with the Mongol drives to the West and with the expansion of the empire of the Ottoman Turks. They failed to come to the aid of Eastern Europe and paid little attention to the emergence of a Slav empire which in due course consolidated its position as a Christian power with the Byzantian version of Catholicism as the official religion.

After the fall of Byzantium to the Turks, the Slavs came to regard themselves as the strongest bastion of Christianity. By the 15th Century the Grand Duke of Moscow proclaimed himself as "the only faithful and really Christian prince in the world" and Moscow as "the third Rome." As can be seen, the Russians started to claim pretty early in history that they were the "Center" and authentic interpreters of the dogma.

During the Middle Ages the rulers of the Slav empire -- the Grand Dukes of Moscow, Kiev and Novgorod -- considered themselves part of what we today know as Western Europe. For example, the Grand Duke of Kiev, Yaroslav, gave his three daughters in marriage to the kings of Norway, Hungary and France; the wives of his three sons came from Poland, Greece and Germany. Social and intellectual development was influenced by increasing trade and travel with Western Europe and the Mediterranean. This trend was interrupted by the Mongol invasion which left a lasting imprint on Russian mentality and practices. The seeds of Russian security complexes were planted during the Mongol invasion.

The beginnings of Russia as a modern national state can be traced, aptly enough, to the reign of Ivan the Fourth, called "The Terrible." He not only made sweeping reforms in the administration of the state, but also restricted the free movement of the nobles (serfs, of course, never had such freedom) and classified as treason any attempt to live in territory not under his rule. This was an early version of Russian emigration controls which are still in force today.

National Characteristics in Intelligence Work

All major powers have intelligence and security services. The nature, size, power and operating methods of these services are different in the various countries. They are influenced not only by the size, wealth and military or political ambitions of the governments concerned but also by the experiences of national history, national tradition and the continuing evolution of social, moral, and legal values in the respective societies.

The intelligence services in the United States of America today reflect the constitutional, codified and "checks and balances" approaches to affairs of state and they have been given additional strong emphasis during the past fifty years, starting with the "New Deal," through the civil rights struggles, the post-Vietnam reaction and Watergate. There is general acceptance in the United States of the concept that U.S. intelli-

gence services and activities should operate in a constitutional and legal framework, subject to Congressional supervision and without undue interference with the rights of the individual. This consensus is a legacy of our history and of the application of the traditional values of our society to all governmental activities.

The intelligence processes in the United States are products of the American experience -- that of a relatively young, continental nation which has been traditionally secure within her own borders; which has never been occupied by a foreign foe; and one which has consistently benefited from the combination of great natural wealth, moderate climate, the contributions of energetic, resourceful and heterogenous immigrants, constitutionally anchored and generally observed respect for individual rights, a federal structure, a permissive and productive economic system, substantial geographic, economic and social mobility and frequently practiced peaceful changes in executive authority.

The Russian experience is entirely different. Russia is an old nation, whose land borders were constantly threatened and violated by unfriendly neighbors; she was invaded often and from all possible directions; individual or civil rights were never held in high esteem; while her natural wealth is great, its exploitation has been hindered by the climate, by traditional and legislated obstacles to free enterprise and by slow and inefficient economic development. Foreigners and foreign ideas have mostly been viewed with suspicion; the absolutist political system permitted no system of checks and balances and there were no accepted and practical means of bringing about legal changes of power.

Just as the American experience produced one type of approach to intelligence and security problems, the Russian experience has produced a fundamentally different approach.

Distrust of Foreigners

The framework in which Russian security and intelligence practices developed was aptly described by that great Bolshevik, Leon Trotsky, the first Peoples' Commissar for War, in his "History of the Russian Revolution":

"The fundamental and most stable feature of Russian history is the slow tempo of her development, with the economic backwardness, primitiveness of social forms and low level of culture resulting from it."

Along with sluggish economic development, the stagnation of social and cultural life, and the uncertainty created by the several foreign invasions, Russia has, historically, suffered from lack of political stability. Again and again Russians were diverted from their economic pursuits and mobilized to fend off foreign incursions by the Mongols, by the Ottoman Turks, the Teutonic Knights, the Swedes, the French, the Poles, the Japanese and three times within living memory the Germans.

Perhaps the silliest, militarily least significant but in its political after-effects most damaging was the landing of Allied forces, including

those of the United States, in the days of anarchy following the collapse of the Czarist regime and the emergence of the Bolsheviks in 1917.

After the Russians signed a separate peace with Imperial Germany the Allied Powers were much concerned about the release of German divisions from the Eastern front. Already hard-pressed by the Germans, the Allies also feared that Bolshevik propaganda would infect the troops in the West and that an unchecked Bolshevik regime would create social upheavals in the industrialized societies of Western Europe and in the United States.

The new revolutionary regime in Russia appeared weak and was under continuing pressure from the Germans and the Poles in the West, the Czech Legion in Siberia, the Japanese in the Far East and the remnants of Czarist and other anti-communist elements throughout Russia. In this environment of strain and turmoil, the Western Powers had hoped that a little push here and there would topple the Bolsheviks. Greatly influenced by their own firm opposition to communist ideology and acting on the basis of very little reliable intelligence, the Allies sent some 8,000 British and American troops to Siberia; the British intervened with troops in Northern Russia and in the Central Asian provinces and both provided various forms of assistance -- what we would call covert action today -- to anti-Bolshevik armed groups and to local counterrevolutionary regimes. All this was to no avail. Russia was simply too large a country for outside elements to play a decisive role in a Russian civil war.

In the event, the improvised armies of the new communist regime proved equal to the challenge. Although the American and British roles were relatively small and certainly indecisive, they were sufficient to mobilize the nationalistic sentiment of the Russians and the presence of foreign troops on Russian soil helped to forge a concept of national unity against the foreigners. As George Kennan, one of the outstanding Eastern experts of the U.S. Foreign Service, put it:

"Until I read the accounts of what transpired during these episodes, I never fully realized the reasons for the contempt and resentment borne by the early Bolsheviks toward the Western powers."

The Allied activities in Russia and the failure of the United States Government to recognize the Soviet regime for some 15 years undoubtedly contributed to the frigid atmosphere of East-West relations and is likely to have influenced the motivation, attitude and performance of the Communists in the area of state security.

While Lenin exploited the foreign attacks on the Bolshevik state to forge a nationally based resistance, the concept of a powerful, authoritarian, cruel and secret state security or police organization was well established in Russia long before the Bolshevik revolution.

I refer to page 23 of Dulles' "The Craft of Intelligence":

"...In early Russian history the Tatars and other steppe people continually sought to ascertain the strength of garrisons within the walled

stockades (the kremlins) of the Russians. As a result, the Russians became congenitally suspicious of anyone seeking admission to the walled cities, fearing that the real mission of the visitors was spying. The tradition of attaching a visible object to a visiting foreigner, so that he could be readily identified as such, goes back at least to the sixteenth century. There is a long ancestry for the surveillance of foreigners and keeping them in "guided tours" in Russia. When the Russians began sending their own people abroad in the seventeenth century to study at foreign universities or to learn foreign trades, they usually sent some trusted person along to watch and to report on the Russians abroad. The custom of attaching secret police (KGB) observers to delegations attending international conferences, athletic or cultural events, so much in evidence today, has hoary antecedents."

Development of the Secret State Security Service

The establishment of the Third Section of the Imperial Chancellery of Czar Nicholas the First in 1826 marked the beginning of modern, centrally directed, police-based secret intelligence collection in Russia. As responsibilities grew and communications improved, the security functions of the Imperial Chancellery were absorbed by the Security Section (Okhrana) of the Ministry of Interior.

The Okhrana developed into a powerful, much-feared organization. As a principal instrument of an autocratic, indeed absolutist regime, the Okhrana became active in all areas of state security, but in the end it failed in its task of keeping the Czarist regime secure. The military mutinies and the dissatisfaction arising from the misery of the long and losing war simply swept away the power of the police and created the conditions for the Bolsheviks' seizure of power.

In contrast, during World War II, the Soviet state and its military forces held together in the supreme test of the strength of all the organs of state security. Yet just prior to World War II, the massive purges and the Stalinist terror had reached a level perhaps unparalleled in history. The KGB was not only an instrument of the terror, it was also a victim of it. Four successive chiefs of the KGB — Yagoda, Yezhov, Abakumov and Beria -- followed their own victims. In all this turmoil, while millions of Russians deserted to or were captured by the Germans and major grain-growing and industrial areas were destroyed or occupied by the invaders, the Soviet state security organizations were able to arrange for the deportation of millions of their fellow citizens, maintain discipline at home and in the armed forces and make the preparations for firmly establishing Soviet power in the territories adjacent to Russia in the West. How was this possible?

I think the answer lies in the synthesis of purposeful statecraft, military strength, collective effort and a massive terror which, in turn, grew and became acceptable through the combination of deeply ingrained national characteristics of the Russian people through the communist ideology and its indoctrination through the central control of all means of information dissemination, and through the unique strength and continuity of the KGB.

Before discussing the KGB in any detail, a few words should be said about the human environment in which it operates at home and from which it draws its mission and personnel for operations abroad.

Mother Russia

Russia is an intensely patriotic country. In all truly national states people are patriotic to some extent. Love of and pride in one's own country are normally absorbed by a child at home and in the years of primary and secondary education. The intensity of patriotic propaganda in the schools of the different countries varies widely; suffice it to say that such propaganda in the schools of Russia has always been very strong. Because of their constant exposure to this patriotic propaganda but also because of the size and geographic isolation of the country, the obvious manifestations of Russia's size and power and their ignorance of life abroad, most Russians are extremely chauvinistic. Anyone who has dealt with Russians can testify that their patriotic boasting has little relevance to accuracy.

Most Russians profess an almost mystical attachment to Russian soil, the vastness of which, along with the cruel climate, became Russia's best defense against Napoleon and against Hitler. The very size of the country promoted inefficiency, sloppiness and discomfort which Russians proudly share as their heritage. "Mother Russia" is not an empty expression.

While hospitable and friendly at the personal level, Russians have been and remain very uneasy about foreigners. This is not merely because there has been a traditional and enforced attitude of suspicion about foreigners as potential spies. Mistrust of foreigners is certainly the official policy but for most Russians it is also an intuitive response, reinforced by constant emphasis in the propaganda on the need for vigilance and by the historic experience of the many foreign invasions.

Enormous efforts are made to keep foreigners in Russia away from the substance of Russian life. A thick wall has been constructed, consisting of thousands of people whose sole purpose is to deal with foreigners. These are the official Russians, the Russians that foreign diplomats, journalists, businessmen, tourists or other visitors will see and deal with. Physical access by foreigners to non-official Russians is carefully and consistently limited through a form of privileged segregation enforced and orchestrated by the KGB for its own defensive as well as offensive purposes.

The Tradition of Absolutism

Russians -- throughout their national history -- have tended to show uncritical and devoted attention to the will of their rulers, even when rulers were arbitrary, cruel, in violation of the laws of justice and of humanity and even insane. With the sole exception of 1917 when the October Revolution was provoked by the cumulative effects of the lost war rather than by purely political factors, misdeeds and scandals in high places were never the causes for corrective action from among the populace. The notion that even rulers were subject to the restraint of law has simply not

taken hold in Russia. The endemic insecurity among Russians has caused them to accept willingly the concept of strongly authoritarian central leadership and they went along with such leadership as a manifestation of natural order. Josef Stalin, perhaps the bloodiest of dictators and responsible for the killings of literally millions of people, had great prestige among the ordinary people. Russians admire power and bigness.

After more than six centuries of absolutist rule, without a heritage of respect for individual rights or the habeas corpus, the excesses of Stalin and his secret police were just another phase of history that had to be endured. The Ochrana of the Czars and the GPU or KGB of the Soviet rulers all had their roots in Russia's history. Whether under the Czars or under the communist system, Russians were fearful of anarchy. They tended to accept that only strong central power could counteract the regional and nationalist dissidence threatening the unity and cohesion of the vast empire. Absolutist power, centrally directed, with the Czar or the Party Leader projected as the supreme authority, has been the tradition in Russia.

Such a system could not function without strong executive organs or without uniform and uncompromising implementation of executive authority. Both the Czars and the Communist leaders availed themselves of such. There has been fairly constant historic and conceptual continuity from the OPRICHNINA, the police organization of Ivan the Terrible in the sixteenth century, to the Ochrana, the secret police of Czar Nicholas the First, to Lenin's Cheka which in turn became the GPU and OGPU (the acronym stood for United State Political Administration). From 1934 through 1943 the secret police and intelligence organization was called NKVD -- Peoples' Commissariat of Internal Affairs. From 1943 through 1946 it was NKGB -- Peoples' Commissariat for State Security. In 1946 the state security functions were absorbed by the MGB -- same thing except it now became a Ministry. In 1953, after the death of Stalin, the still current terminology was adopted -- KGB: The Committee for State Security.

The acronyms, some of the names at the top and the organization diagrams have changed from time to time but the substantive functions and the manner of their implementation remained essentially the same, with one exception: After the death of Stalin the new leadership, fearful of the possibility of a new wave of terror which might be directed against it, took away law enforcement jurisdiction from the secret services and enhanced the power of the Prosecutor General of the Soviet Union and of the prosecutors subordinate to him at the various levels of local government.

This was a truly significant reform, specifically intended to reduce the authority of the secret services in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union. Foreign operations, or operations aimed at foreigners, do not appear to have been affected.

The KGB and its origins

The KGB and its predecessors, the NKVD, GPU and Cheka, have never been the only security or the only intelligence structure in the Soviet Union. The very size of the Red Army and the perceived and actual

foreign threat clearly called for the functioning of a strong military intelligence service. The GRU (acronym for Main Intelligence Directorate) fulfilled that role. It has had some spectacular successes in the foreign intelligence area but encountered serious security problems in the nineteen-fifties and has come increasingly under the domination of the KGB. In the internal area there have always been numerous police functions, including responsibilities for traffic control, crime detection and administrative population control in which the KGB would not become involved in the absence of compelling state security reasons. Nevertheless, and it bears repeated emphasis, the KGB is and remains the supreme authority in all aspects of intelligence and state security work and it can impose its jurisdiction in a manner which would be quite unthinkable in the United States.

The development and influence of the KGB are characteristic of the dynamics of a secret police in a totalitarian state. Since the very essence of such a state denies the legitimacy of opposition, there is permanent need for a strong, well-informed, repressive organ to discover and to control dissidence and to protect the regime. The first step toward efficient repression is good intelligence -- on the composition and intention of the domestic opposition.

Since domestic opposition will often have ties abroad or support from foreign countries, it is almost natural for any aggressive security service to expand outward, to cover the activities of emigres, exiles or other "enemies" of the regime and then -- one logical step further -- to take an interest in the policies of countries which tolerate or support such activities. This is exactly what happened in the case of the first Soviet security service, organized for Lenin in 1917 by Felix Dzerzhinski. This new organization was called CHEKA -- "Extraordinary Commission against Counterrevolution and Sabotage." There were plenty of such activities in Russia during the early years of the Bolshevik regime and the Cheka turned out to be very useful and ruthless in eliminating opposition in the areas behind the forward thrust of the Red Army. By 1921 the Cheka was attending to the oppositionist activities of Russians in Western Europe, the Middle East and China and constituted a source of continuing threat to Russian military and nationalist leaders in their exiles.

"Wet Operations"

This is not a maritime term or a strategy for water polo, but a colloquial expression used by Soviet intelligence personnel to refer to operational activities in which a targeted victim may come to physical harm; the essence of "dirty tricks" in clandestine operations. This is not propaganda; it does happen and quite logically, too, when you look at the situation from the perspective of a state security service.

The definitive way to counter or to neutralize the activities of opponents is to kill them. The Cheka did this first in Russia and then also abroad. The leaders of the White Russian war veterans, former Russian Army generals Miller and Kutepov and the leader of the Ukrainian nationalists, General Petlura, were kidnapped or murdered in Paris; the first Communist War Commissar and later Stalin's influential opponent,

Leon Trotsky, was murdered by a Soviet agent in Mexico; Soviet intelligence defector Ignaz Reiss was killed in Switzerland; another important defector, Walter Krivitsky, was shot to death in Washington, D.C.

The non-communist world gained valuable insight into the methods of the KGB death squads when KGB Captain Nikolai Khokhlov defected in West Germany, rather than carry out his assigned mission to assassinate Georgi Okolovich, a Russian emigre who was in charge of the secret activities of the anti-Soviet Russian Peoples Labor League. It was from Khokhlov that we learned that murder and kidnappings were the regular work of a department of the First Chief Directorate of the KGB -- that is to say murder and kidnappings were not aberrations resulting from the excessive zeal of some operators; murder and kidnappings were not merely tolerated as justifiable excesses but were in fact systematized as part and parcel of the KGB's organizational structure. The author was stationed in Germany when Khokhlov's knowledge of KGB methods surfaced to the public. Many did not believe him. In any case, no countermeasures were taken to attempt to foil similar attempts of the KGB in West Germany. Other victims were claimed by the KGB, both West Germans and Russian exiles, including two well-known Ukrainian leaders in Munich, Lev Rebet and Stephan Bandera. It was only after the defection of another KGB officer, Bogdan Stashinsky, that the world found out that the KGB has kept pace with the advance of technology and has developed murder weapons which leave no obvious evidence that the victim was murdered. In Munich the technique used was that of a gas gun which shot a spray of prussic acid -- also called hydrocyanic acid -- causing contraction of the blood vessels and in turn stoppage of the heart. Routine autopsy would find no trace of the crime.

Khokhlov defected prior to carrying out his mission of murder but Stashinsky only after he killed Bandera. Thus he had to stand trial in the Federal Republic of Germany and the impact of the affair was very great. Within the solemn framework of German federal court proceedings in Karlsruhe it was revealed, proven and documented in minute detail that the Soviet intelligence service, the KGB, was directed to and did engage in a continuing conspiracy to murder its targets within the borders of a friendly foreign nation. The prominence of the victim, Bandera, and the technical sophistication of the murder weapon added to the newsworthiness of the story. There could be little doubt left after that trial that the KGB used murder as a method of implementing its operational objectives.

The Prison State

News of the Soviets' official Murder Incorporated might have come as a surprise to some, but it was an old story to those familiar with the internal practices of the GPU and NKVD during the great purges of the nineteen-thirties and in the period following World War II. Alexander Solzhenitsyn's "Gulag Archipelago" can be considered a definitive work on the Soviet official approach to the administration of matters relating to state security during those periods. Solzhenitsyn and others who were fortunate enough to survive their years in Stalin's jails and forced labor camps give persuasive accounts of the role of the GPU/NKVD/KGB not only as the instruments of repression, but as the executioners of death

sentences which were handed down through administrative procedures and not through any court proceedings.

Physical torture during interrogation has also been documented widely, along with psychological pressures, retaliation against relatives of the accused and humiliation designed to break down the physical and moral resistance of the prisoners. Similar methods were practiced also under the Czars -- civil liberties and the rights of the accused were never considered of great significance in Russia -- but there seems to have been a world of difference between the Siberian exile meted out as punishment prior to the First World War and the methods in Stalin's forced labor camps. Yet it could be argued that the absolutist approach and cruel treatment of political opponents has long been accepted in Russia. Solzhenitsyn acknowledges that the "wolf tribe" -- meaning those who did the dirty work of the secret service -- came from among the Russian people, that it stemmed from Russia's own roots and blood and that it was, indeed, truly Russian. He asks: "And just so we do not go around flaunting too proudly the white mantle of the just, let everyone ask himself: 'If my life had turned out differently, might I myself not have become just such an executioner?' "

An even greater authority on the prison state and the policies of repression as integral elements of Soviet governmental activity was the late Nikita Khrushchev, the party secretary, premier and de facto ruler of the Soviet Union for nearly ten years, until October 1964 when his colleagues on the Politburo forced him to retire.

The Khrushchev Era

Toward the end of the Stalinist purges in 1938 Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev became First Secretary of the Communist Party in the Ukraine, perhaps the most important single component state of the Soviet Union. While most of the killing and most of the nearly 200,000 arrests in the Ukraine took place prior to his assumption of office, nevertheless -- as his gentle Soviet biographer Roy Medvedev put it -- "it would be wholly inaccurate to claim that Khrushchev played no part in the campaign of terror that swept through the Ukraine ... In his speeches and reports Khrushchev made no mention of those who had been destroyed; and occasionally he joined in the chorus of those who justified Stalin's slaughters. For example, at the 18th Party Congress in Moscow he invoked the people's hatred for 'these despicable scums, spies and vermin ... this refuse of humanity ... Fascist agents, contemptible Trotskyites, Bukharinites and bourgeois nationalists'" with reference to the leadership of the Ukrainian Communist Party who were liquidated on Stalin's orders, to make place for Khrushchev. The latter, in his own words, proclaimed himself a devoted follower of Stalin and recalled: "I was literally spellbound by Stalin, his attentiveness, his concern. Everything that I saw and heard when I was with him bewitched me; I was absolutely overwhelmed by his charm."

Still, history will remember Khrushchev not for his own role in the repression of the Ukraine or even for his valorous military service against the Germans during the Second World War, but for his forceful campaign after the death of Stalin to curb the excesses of the secret security

services, culminating in his "secret" speech to the 20th Party Congress in February 1956.

This speech, actually an oral report "On the Cult of Personality and Its Consequences," provided a detailed and unprecedented official account of the illegal mass repressions, of the tortures, of the arbitrary and illegal executions, of the terrible conditions in the prison camps and other reprehensible activities of the security forces under Stalin.

Khrushchev was instrumental in bringing about a substantive change in the operating practices of Soviet state security. To be sure, the secret police and intelligence organs did not suddenly convert into guardians of civil liberties. They continued to do much of what they have been doing all along, but with considerably more attention to form, with a trimming of the excesses and with at least some adherence to legal accountability.

Khrushchev stopped short of dismantling the Stalinist services. In the very speech in which he denounced the consequences of the cult of personality, that is to say the many illegal acts of the secret services, he found good words for them:

"Our Chekists in their overwhelming majority are honest people. We have confidence in the cadres. We must strengthen revolutionary vigilance and the organs of State Security."

And strengthened they were. Soon after the Khrushchev speech they had an opportunity to prove their mettle in the supression of the Hungarian rebellion of 1956, during which -- a strange quirk of history -- Yuri Andropov represented the Soviet State in Budapest.

Khrushchev brought a change of style to the work of the security organs and there have been significant reforms which remained in effect also during the Brezhnev regime. The separation of the KGB from most internal police functions, the establishment of the Procurator General as a prosecuting authority organizationally independent of the state security service and a generally more humane approach in dealing with suspects -- these are important changes even if they did not and do not come to grips with the essential evil of the system. Khrushchev denounced the most glaring of Stalin's crimes mainly in order to rationalize the system of bureaucratic government and to consolidate the privileges and power of the Soviet ruling class. Khrushchev's intention may well have been to relieve the higher strata of the Communist administration of the fear of unreasonable repression and thereby perfect the totalitarian system. If so, it could be argued today, nearly three decades after the event, that he succeeded to a remarkable degree. Soviet military power has never been more formidable; Soviet political and ideological influence has been extended in Asia, Africa and in the Western Hemisphere; the KGB has gained in prestige and authority; its chief Yuri Andropov was elevated to the Politburo in 1973 and to the posts of President and 1st Party Secretary upon the death of Leonid Brezhnev.

Granted that Andropov was not a KGB careerist. Still, the fact that a man like Andropov, after 15 years as head of the KGB, became the ruler

of the Soviet Union would suggest that the KGB had considerable prestige and that members of the Politburo must have been well impressed with the KGB's performance. Conversely, it would be unlikely that Andropov could have been elevated to the top leadership ranks of the Soviet Union had the Politburo concluded that the KGB's performance under Andropov was unsatisfactory. Thus the appointment of Andropov was also a vote of confidence in and approval of the KGB.

Andropov's recent death was not part of the plan and does not cancel the political meaning and impact of his elevation. His appointees will function for many years after their patron's demise.

The KGB Today

First and foremost, the KGB is the world's largest intelligence service. Some experts claim that it is also the best. Lacking access to the KGB's own evaluation of its work and in the absence of any objective comparative criteria such judgments remain conjectural. We do know, however, that the KGB continues to enjoy high status within the Soviet Union and that it continues to dominate in Soviet official representations abroad.

We know from literally hundreds of Soviet intelligence operations which have come to our attention one way or another that the KGB functions not only as a collector of secret intelligence but also as a secret arm of the Soviet state. Harry Rositzke put it this way in his book "The KGB -- The Eyes of Russia" published in 1981 by Doubleday and Company:

"The KGB is intent on stealing the secrets of Western governments, undermining the loyalty of their citizens and plotting revolutionary actions in the Third World. The exposure of Soviet spies, the expulsion of Soviet diplomats for espionage and the testimony of Soviet defectors have revealed the KGB as an intelligence operation of staggering range and complexity."

In the Soviet Union today all aspects of state security and public safety administration are run by senior KGB personnel, even though routine internal matters are outside the KGB's formal jurisdiction. KGB anniversaries are celebrated publicly with patriotic fervor. KGB personnel are showered with public honors. The KGB demonstrates all the symptoms of high prestige within its own governmental hierarchy. This in turn is reflected in generous budgets, large staffs and the ability to attract bright people to its ranks.

The KGB has its headquarters in the building of the former All-Russian Insurance Company in Moscow's Dzerzhinsky Square (named after Lenin's chief of the Cheka and the founding father of Soviet intelligence operations).

We know that the KGB is organized in a number of Main Directorates or Chief Directorates dealing with Foreign Intelligence, Counterintelligence and State Security, Armed Forces Security, Political Dissidents and Border Guards; there are also Directorates for Technical Support, Person-

nel, Administrative Support, Surveillance, Communications Intelligence and Protective Security (personal security for Very Important Persons).

Each of the Main Directorates and Directorates has numerous departments, divisions and branches for the implementation of the respective missions. For example, the First Chief or Main Directorate, responsible for clandestine activities abroad and for the collation and dissemination of the intelligence product, has components specializing in functions applicable across the board in all geographic areas. Such functions include, but are not limited to, scientific and technical matters, the placement of "illegal" agents (meaning those not covered by overt, official Soviet status), counterespionage abroad, covert propaganda, special operations (a traditional euphemism for operations which may involve acts of violence) and dissemination of the intelligence product. Other departments specialize in specific geographic areas and function as managers and planners for clandestine activities in the areas concerned. Thus, for example, Department One deals with the United States and Canada; Department Two with Latin America; Department Three with England, Australia, New Zealand and the Scandinavian countries; Department Four with Germany and Austria; Department Five with Western Europe and so forth. There are also Departments dealing with Arab affairs and with East Asia. Interestingly, Africa is divided into two areas: English-speaking and French-speaking. This is suggestive of the great care and emphasis in the KGB on adequate foreign language preparation of its field personnel. (Those interested in more details of KGB organization may wish to peruse the two books on the KGB by John Barron, published respectively in 1974 and 1982. Mr. Barron has made extensive use of information provided by defectors from the Soviet intelligence services.)

Most of our knowledge about the KGB is about the First Main Directorate, for the simple reason that it has been personnel from this Directorate that we have encountered outside the Soviet Union. Western intelligence services have found it possible to develop a variety of personal relations with officers on KGB assignments abroad. Those relations have ranged from the casual, to a degree of sincere, personal contact, to officially condoned quasi-liaison and to the recruitment of the Soviet. Also, and quite logically, it has been from the ranks of the First Main Directorate that we have had the largest number of defectors because these people had the opportunity to seek asylum while abroad and in relative safety.

Defectors have provided voluminous and disturbing particulars about KGB operations. Based on information from defectors and corroborated by the observations and other discoveries of Western intelligence and security agencies, it has been established beyond the shadow of any doubt that the KGB has achieved penetrations and has had agents at high levels in key governmental and military installations in many countries. It has also been proven that the KGB was involved in several revolutions and other activities aimed at the overthrow of governments through violence or other illegal means and also, as previously cited, in murder. It is true, however, that we know about those KGB operations because they have been publicized and become of law enforcement or historic interest, or because the operation failed or because it was "blown" -- that is to say revealed --

by a defector or by a local participant in the activity. We do not know about those KGB operations which are still running. Based on the record of past performance, it would be naive to assume that there are no current KGB activities comparable to what we have seen in previous years.

Our knowledge about the KGB is limited both in substance and in specifics. There has never been in the Soviet Union a counterpart of the overt congressional investigations such as those dealing with the Central Intelligence Agency in the U.S. some years ago. There has never been a Soviet report on the KGB comparable to the study on the CIA issued by the Rockefeller Commission in 1975. KGB personnel do not publish their memoirs. Defectors sometimes do but most Soviets abroad do not defect. Also, however valuable the information from a defector may be, both objectivity and veracity of the information may often be questionable. The defector has an obvious motive to exaggerate the significance of the information he provides and to try to enhance his own position in the eyes of the interrogators.

There have been very few, if any, defectors who could be considered as having had policy-level positions or positions from which they could have had access to a broad spectrum of normally well-compartmented KGB activities. I cannot recall any KGB defector of higher than field-grade rank. There have been very, very few defectors from outside the First Directorate. Thus it is inevitable that we should know more about some of the KGB's failures than about its successes.

Intelligence operations tend to have a high mortality rate. In due course even the best-planned espionage activities may get compromised. Such compromise may be the result of an accident, normal wear and tear, human weakness or a lucky break for the other side. A clandestine collection agent, the classic spy, with as much as a decade of successful, productive activity would be a rarity in any service. Against that background we know that the KGB has had some spectacularly successful operations, some of them of twenty years' duration. Such operations, even in their failure, can bring dismay and lasting damage to the Western side.

The Operational Performance

Current and continuing successes of the KGB are obviously not known to the non-communist security services, otherwise the KGB operation could not be continuing. Past successes were plentiful -- and we refer here to only a few but representative samples -- such as the stealing of the U.S. atomic bomb process; the multiple penetrations in the British Foreign Office and in the British Secret Intelligence Service; the placement of Soviet agents in the upper reaches of the U.S. Federal Government; the massive penetrations of the Canadian political and scientific establishment; the Soviet achievements in planting their sources in key positions of the West German intelligence service and even literally next to the then West German Chancellor Willy Brandt; the recruitment of Swedish Air Force intelligence chief Sig Wennerstrom, of the U.S. cryptographers Mitchell and Martin, of a string of secretaries in the Defense Ministry and in the offices of important politicians in Bonn, West Germany, of NATO officials of diverse nationalities in Belgium, senior officials of the French

Defense Staff, at least a dozen U.S. military personnel including field grade officers, at least one Iranian general, and a West German Vice Admiral. The list could go on and on ....

Scientific and Technical Collection

Because we live in the age of technology and because modern technology is vital to the war-making potential of today's superpowers, the current Soviet emphasis on the collection of scientific and technical intelligence, including the illegal acquisition of high technology products, is noteworthy and of great significance.

The scope, importance and threat of Soviet technical collection are such that the problem merited the attention of the U.S. Senate, whose Committee on Governmental Affairs held hearings in 1982 on the transfer of U.S. high technology to the Soviet Union and to the several Communist countries of Eastern Europe.

In July 1983 the New York Times carried a series of articles on the KGB and noted: "... Western high technology with military applications, worth millions of dollars, disappears beyond the borders of the Soviet Union and its Allies. American laws and North Atlantic Treaty Organization agreements ban the transfer of such sophisticated microelectronic and computer equipment. But the volume reaching the Eastern Bloc is startling ... Much of it is obtained through dummy corporations and covert suppliers who cooperate with the technology procurement campaign, which is regarded as the current priority task of the KGB, the Soviet intelligence. ..."

A U.S. intelligence assessment, unclassified, published by the U.S. Government Printing Office in 1982, Document Number 95-929-0, stated the case as follows:

"The United States and its Allies traditionally have relied on the technological superiority of their weapons to preserve a credible counter-force to the quantitative superiority of the Warsaw Pact. But that technical superiority is eroding as the Soviet Union and its Allies introduce more and more sophisticated weaponry -- weapons that all too often are manufactured with the direct help of Western technology ... The Soviets have been very successful in acquiring Western technology by blending acquisitions legally and illegally acquired by different (Soviet) governmental organizations. The Soviet intelligence services -- the KGB and the military intelligence service GRU -- have the primary responsibility for collecting Western classified, export-controlled and proprietary technology ... Clandestine acquisition of the West's most advanced military-related equipment and know-how by the KGB and the GRU is a major and growing problem."

A very painful illustration of the KGB's collection of scientific and technological intelligence and the damage caused by such collection to U.S. interests may be found in the Boyce-Lee espionage case which was tried in U.S. Federal Court in California in 1977. The record of the trial reflects a systematic, money-motivated sale of U.S. technological secrets, in the

possession of TRW Corporation, by two young Americans, Christopher Boyce and Andrew Daulton Lee. Tasked and guided by KGB officers in the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City, Boyce and Lee acquired and transferred to Soviet officers secret and top secret information on such items as the details of a CIA-funded electronic surveillance satellite, and techniques used in the monitoring of Soviet communications, missile tests and radar systems. (A detailed and in the author's judgment too understanding account of the Boyce-Lee operation was published by Robert Lindsey in 1979 under the title "The Falcon and the Snowman.")

The interests of the Soviet intelligence service in ferreting out the scientific and technical secrets of the West were first publicized as a result of the defection in 1946 of Igor Gouzenko, a code clerk in the Military Attache's office in the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa, Canada. His revelations about the extent of Soviet penetrations into the British and American atomic bomb program and related secret scientific areas were such that the then Prime Minister of Canada felt it necessary to travel to Washington to inform U.S. President Harry Truman of the apparent extent of the damage.

An American sequel was soon to occur when the British investigation of a German-born British scientist, Dr. Klaus Fuchs, produced information leading to the discovery of a well-organized Soviet spy ring reaching into the very center of the U.S. nuclear program. The trial and subsequent executions of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg and the conviction of their fellow spies David Greenglass and Harry Gold served to prove the effectiveness of the Soviet intelligence effort. And when, largely as a result, the political climate in this country became receptive to widespread suspicion of Communist conspiracies, the Soviets tried to make propaganda capital out of "McCarthyism."

The quick succession of major Soviet espionage revelations in the period following World War Two also had the by-product of undermining the confidence of Western Allies in each other. In sum, the losses of Soviet positive intelligence collection could at times be converted by the Soviets and their propagandists in the West to serve the objectives of Soviet political campaigns.

War by Other Means

The KGB's intelligence collection and state security functions are similar in their concepts, if not in their methods or scale, to the work of the intelligence and security services of other major nations. In the areas of political and psychological actions, however, the KGB's role is fundamentally different from that of any Western intelligence service. So are the results, which -- when viewed from the perspective of three decades since the death of Stalin -- are very impressive. This is not because the people in the KGB are all brilliant or because of any unique techniques which might have been invented or developed by the Soviet Union and not be known elsewhere. The answer is simple and involves no magic. The KGB works at it harder, more consistently, with greater personnel resources and in continuity.

According to Professor Michael Voslensky, who was an official of the International Department of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, the Soviet ruling class is in its essence an expansionist class, whose class foundation is political power. Generally speaking, every ruling class wants to consolidate and expand its foundation. A peaceful, mercantile society tries to increase its influence through the export of goods or the offering of services. The Soviet ruling class also wants to export its wares, its political authority and influence, to other countries as a means of strengthening and perpetuating its position.

Czarist Russia conducted a policy of expansion but it had a more limited and concrete goal: the Balkans. To aid this program, Czarist Russia developed the concept of Pan-Slavism -- an empire of the Slavs. The Soviets adopted that concept, but combined it with the ideology of communism and made the approach global. No country is exempted, even if the pickings are clearly better in some places than in others.

In 1982, testifying to a committee of Congress, a spokesman of the Central Intelligence Agency said that political influence operations are the most important but least understood of Soviet active measures. They are, he said, difficult to trace and to deal with because they fall into the gray areas between a legitimate exchange of ideas and (secret intelligence-directed) active measure operations.

Active Measures

What, then, are these "active measures" -- which the CIA termed so important?

We do not have an authoritative, official Soviet definition of the term but the collective conclusion of several experts on the Soviet Union is that active measures are those Soviet acts in the area of foreign policy which promote the political objectives of the Soviet Union through other than normal diplomatic means and short of war.

The Soviets prefer to avoid war. They take every opportunity to plead for a condition of non-war. They want victory -- or in the absence of one big victory many small victories -- without war.

How can you have victory without war? By demoralizing or subverting your opponent through activities which may include political or military threats, overt or covert propaganda, sabotage, terrorism, subsidies to groups in opposition to the policies of particular governments, support of so-called national liberation movements and so forth. The sum total of these activities, coordinated at the level of the Secretariat of the Central Committee and of the Politburo, most likely equal the meaning of an established term in the political lexicon of the Soviet party apparatus: "aktivnye meropriyatiya" -- active measures, essential elements of continuing Soviet political strategy implementation.

The KGB has recovered from its several defeats, setbacks and purges because each successive Soviet leader found that the KGB was the

indispensable organizational weapon for the continuation of war by other means.

Looking to the Future

Despite important setbacks in 1983, perhaps the KGB's worst year since 1971, the KGB's prestige was enhanced by the dramatic rise of Andropov to the highest positions in the Soviet Union. While Andropov is gone, the influence of senior officials who were placed into their current positions through Andropov's influence remains.

While the incumbent, at the time this is written, First Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, Konstantin Chernenko, will also deal directly with the Chairman of the KGB in accordance with the established practice in the Soviet Union, obviously he cannot have the same cozy relationship, based on shared background, which the KGB leadership had hoped to have with Andropov. Still, it is most unlikely that Chernenko would reverse the trends which have given the KGB additional requirements, bigger budgets and more personnel year after year. If U.S. intelligence can be said to operate on the principle that "more is better," the Russians have demonstrated time and time again, throughout their history, that "only too much is enough."

Looking to the future, we can expect that the Soviets will continue their massive, well-financed and centrally coordinated programs of foreign espionage and internal state security enforcement. There will be continuing emphasis on the acquisition of Western high technology from the United States, from Western Europe and from Japan. In all these countries governmental attitudes and public opinion will continue to be targets of "active measures," aimed at softening the resistance to the Soviets in the political and military spheres.

In contrast, Soviet propaganda will stress the allegedly militaristic and threatening nature of United States policies. There will be continuing emphasis on the creation of a psychological environment in which even confirmed anti-communists may parrot and act on slogans made in Moscow. Fear of a nuclear holocaust will be exploited for propaganda and political warfare purposes.

An important by-product of this psychological campaign will be the facilitation of recruitment efforts of the KGB among students and intellectuals in the densely populated areas of the industrial world, similar to the opportunities and the advantages of the Soviet intelligence services in recruiting among anti-Nazis in the nineteen-thirties when the Soviet Union managed to masquerade as the most active opponent to Hitlerism. One can only hope that the several Western intelligence services will recognize that the anti-war and anti-nuclear movements can be and are exploited by the Soviets not only for political action purposes, but that within these movements -- and without in any way impugning the motives of their leaders -- they may also be fertile breeding grounds for the Soviet spies of the next generation.

In the Third World the KGB will continue its manipulations to disrupt the non-Communist societies. The immediate objective will not be the establishment of a Communist regime. That method, going directly from a non-Communist to a Communist system, was found to be impractical when tried after the Second World War, except in those areas where the presence of the Red Army gave a helping hand to Communist political operatives. On the other hand, supporting, exploiting and directing anti-regime efforts, dismantling the traditional order, taking advantage of real or imagined grievances, stimulating and aggravating alienation and bringing Marxist influences to bear throughout the target countries' educational systems have turned out to be highly effective methods. Within our lifetime we have seen the expansion of Soviet influence in a large number of countries.

The KGB's authority and the Soviet Government's personnel policies permit the recruitment of first-class human material for secret intelligence and state security work. Even so, the KGB cannot consist exclusively of shining intellects and people nine feet tall. Like any large bureaucracy it will have its share of mediocrities and incompetents.

The KGB's continuing strength will come less from the brilliance of its individual members -- although we should not underestimate native intelligence, scientific know-how, single-minded purposefulness and motivation -- but more from immense numbers, large resources, continuity of management and concepts, firmly established status in Soviet reality and the KGB's exemption from overt criticism within its own society.

At the service of a determined political leadership, the KGB will continue as a powerful weapon and an important factor in East-West relations.

SEMINAR SUGGESTIONS

- The KGB is uniquely Russian. Therefore it must be studied and analyzed as part of the Russian experience. The word "Russian" is used because the guiding concepts of the KGB can be found in substance and in continuity during some 500 years of Russian history and because the Soviet Union's leadership and culture continue to be dominated by Russians. An understanding of the KGB and of the pervasive security climate in which it prospers can be obtained only through a reading and understanding of Russian history. An individual or group can be asked to study the major trends of Russian history since 1825 (Czar Nicholas I) and suggest when, and in what way, the successive heads of

state depended on a centrally directed secret intelligence apparatus.

- Those who wish to study the British or German or American security or intelligence services need only the will and the time to do so. Ample material is available in the form of governmental reports, legislative hearings, studies and findings, in the work of scholars and of informed amateurs, and indeed from television or from the pages of the daily press or the news magazines. Sources of information are listed under "Recommended Reading" and mentioned or quoted in the text. Ostensibly, the material is different in kind from that available on the Western services. Students may be asked to discuss the differences.

- Words and phrases can be translated from one language into another, but it is not easy to translate in such a manner as to convey the essentially different concepts and meanings covered by the same word. For example, words such as "democracy," "justice," "constitutional rights," or "elections" -- to mention but a few -- mean different things in the Soviet Union from what they mean in the Western democracies. As written, the Soviet Constitution is a model of perfection. The reality is different. The students should find it interesting and challenging to explore those differences, and to come up with other terms and expressions where identical terms have different connotations.

- With the caveat that much of the information known in the West about the KGB comes from defectors -- some of it inevitably slanted and self-serving -- it should nevertheless be possible to make comparisons between the Soviet and Western approaches to secret intelligence and state security operations. Students may be encouraged to take a look at the first monograph in this series, The Clandestine Service of the Central Intelligence Agency, or at William Hood's Mole, in order to make the comparisons.

- Finally, a discussion of current events in which secret or covert activities appear to be in support of governmental policy may allow seminar participants to gain an understanding of how covert techniques can be utilized to achieve political goals.

Recommended Reading

BARRON, John. KGB: The Secret Work of Soviet Secret Agents. New York: Reader's Digest Press, 1974. Introduction by Robert Conquest. Bibl. notes. Bibl. 462p. (pap. N.Y.: Bantam Books, 1974).

BARRON, John. The KGB Today - The Hidden Hand. New York: Reader's Digest Press, 1983. Notes, incl. bibl. notes, 489p.

These two books present detailed accounts of many years of research and the systematic debriefing of defectors. Mr. Barron has spared no effort to gather material on the KGB and the results are impressive even though both books suffer from some internal contradictions: one one hand it is claimed that the Soviet Union and its intelligence services are corrupt and inefficient; on the other hand they are presented as permanent, omnipresent and deadly threats to Western interests. Mr. Barron is, of course, strongly anti-communist and at times he tends to write as an advocate rather than as a scholarly observer.

CONSORTIUM FOR THE STUDY OF INTELLIGENCE. Intelligence Requirements for the 1980's: Counterintelligence. Edited by Roy Godson. Washington, D.C.: National Strategy Information Center, 1980. 339p.

For those who want to know more about the KGB, two chapters in this book are of particular relevance: Chapter Four, "Soviet Intelligence and Security Services in the 1980's - The Paramilitary Dimension" and Chapter Six, "Soviet Intelligence in the United States." Both chapters illustrate the impressive capabilities of the Soviets to mount and to maintain intelligence collection and other covert activities in different geographic and political environments. Caveat: In discussing KGB operations in the United States, we tend to know more about the failures of the KGB simply because the record is established by disillusioned agents, defectors and those spies who have been caught.

CONQUEST, Robert. The Great Terror: Stalin's Purge of the Thirties. New York: MacMillan, 1968. Bibl. notes. Bibl. 633p. (Revised pap. Middlesex, England: Pelican Books, 1971).

A well-documented and terrifying account of the Stalinist purges and of the great show-trials of the 1930's. This was a period when the state security organs, including the predecessors of the KGB, were at the climax of their powers, subject only to the wishes and whims of Josef Stalin. The result was truly an orgy of state security depredations and the development of a security climate in which no one could feel safe.

DULLES, Allen W. The Craft of Intelligence. New York: Harper & Row, 1963. Bibl. 277p. (pap. N.Y.: Signet Books, 1965).

A former Director of Central Intelligence (1953-1961) and one of the almost legendary spy-masters of modern times has authored a useful primer on the history, concepts and implementation of intelligence operations. While some may find that his chapters on Soviet Bloc intelligence services are tainted by excessive Cold War rhetoric and the author's ideological opposition to everything communism stands for, the book remains a convenient summary of the important role of secret intelligence in the schemes of government. (It should be noted that the paperback edition of this work has a little added material, particularly as to specific cases).

EBON, Martin. The Andropov File. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1983. Bibl. Index. 284p.

Andropov's untimely death cut short the KGB's greatest success story, but several chapters of this book still provide fascinating insight into KGB activities and the Soviet milieu of which the KGB is an integral part. The chapters entitled "KGB Traditions" and "KGB Andropov-style" and the book's Appendix One, containing the texts of several speeches made by Andropov while he was KGB Chairman, are of particular interest. "Fifty Years of Secret Service" was the title of a speech Andropov gave on December 20, 1967, to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the Soviet State Security Service (KGB). He concluded that despite the many changes since 1917 "the basic functions of state security remain unchanged." In another speech, on 9 September 1977, entitled "Communist Sense of Conviction is a Great Force of the Builders of the New World" Andropov honored the memory of Felix Dzerzhinsky, the first director of the Cheka, a predecessor organization of the KGB. Andropov recalled that Dzerzhinsky, known as "Iron Felix," had acted within the framework of "socialist legality" and in accordance with "revolutionary law" in putting down opposition to the Bolshevik revolution following the Communist seizure of power in 1917.

GOLITSYN, Anatoly. New Lies for Old. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1984. Index. Bibl. 412p.

One of the best informed and senior post-war defectors from the KGB offers some fascinating glimpses of his old service, along with questionable theories and dubious conclusions about the extent and effect of Soviet covert operations on Western policy-making. Golitsyn's contribution to Western understanding of the KGB is considerable and his services to our counterintelligence are unquestionable but, like some other defectors, he tends to become a zealot in his writings.

KENNAN, George. The Decision to Intervene. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1958. Select bibl. 513p.

In this book the former Chief of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff, a former Ambassador to the Soviet Union and a great historian presents a comprehensive and amply documented account of the

ill-conceived and ill-executed Allied attempt to topple the newly-hatched Soviet regime during the period 1917-1920 and to bring to power, instead, an anti-communist, nationalistic coalition in Russia.

The Allied operation was founded on the misconception that Soviet power was the product primarily of German intrigue, that the communist government was without popular support, that the Russian people were with the Allies and that the Soviets, detracting as they did from the Allied war effort, must be regarded as evil and crushed.

The complex and contradictory nature of the truth escaped the Allied policy-makers. The resulting intervention was confused and futile. Its main result was a permanent poisoning of the atmosphere between Russia and its erstwhile Allies. This is not to say, however, nor does Mr. Kennan claim, that in the absence of an intervention all would have been smiles and roses. As Kennan points out, even the very first generation of Soviet leaders had strongly distorted preconceptions of the capitalist world, had dizzy illusions about the imminence of a world revolution, had no intention of cultivating constructive relations with the Western democracies and, just like their Czarist predecessors, manifested paranoid xenophobia and fear of foreign observation and influence. They also practiced from the very beginning -- and in the old Russian tradition -- over-secretiveness, suspiciousness, dissimulation and deception in dealing with foreigners.

It is a moot question what would have happened if there had been no Allied attempt to prevent the communists from consolidating their power, but it is certain that the intervention by British, French, U.S. and Japanese forces provided the Soviets with an excuse for drastic countermeasures and contributed to the milieu in which forceful counterintelligence and state security activities could be implemented with a semblance of legitimacy.

MEDVEDEV, Roy. Let History Judge. New York: Vintage Books (Random House), 1971. Index. 566p.

The author is a Soviet citizen, born in 1925 and son of a victim of the Stalinist purges of the 1930's. He is currently with the Soviet Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and the holder of a Doctorate in Education. There are good reasons to believe that Medvedev enjoys friendly relations with the KGB.

His book is an insider's story of the origins and consequences of Stalinism. He does not hide the excesses of state security organs but follows closely the Khruschev line to the effect that while some of the things that happened were very bad, the concept of state security is sound and only Stalin is to be blamed for the errors. It may be assumed that Medvedev reflects the Soviet official interpretation of the events of the past.

POND, Elizabeth. From the Yaroslavsky Station -- Russia Perceived. New York: Universe Books, 1981. Index. Bibl. 296p.

A correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor in Moscow for over a decade, the author packages a great deal of Russian history and her

intuitive judgment and personal observations in the Soviet Union into an account of her journey on the Trans-Siberian Railway.

Pond sees the Soviet government in firm control, based on the nationalistically-motivated desire of Russians and other Slavs to maintain their own system. She discounts the prospects of any incipient pluralism and points out that the Czars also ruled unchallenged for many centuries. The absence of independent cities, strong guilds, land-based aristocracy or an influential merchant class -- elements in the formation of modern Western societies -- has worked to minimize the impact of social pressures on governments in Russia. Thus, despite slovenliness, inefficiency, corruption and disdain of individual rights, the regimes tend to be stable and enduring, with the secret police making sure it stays that way.

ROSITZKE, Harry. KGB -- The Eyes of Russia. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1981. Index. 295p.

A well-informed, objective treatment of the Soviet State Security Service by a professional who has spent more than a quarter of a century in U.S. intelligence operations against the Soviet Union.

Unlike some others who write about the KGB, Rositzke does not claim that the adversary is ten feet tall, nor does he lose himself in moralizing or propaganda. He presents a realistic account of the Soviet intelligence threat to Western security interests and acknowledges and describes the achievements of the KGB in its operations during the past several decades. If there is time for only one book to be read about the KGB, this should be it.

SOLZHENITSYN, Aleksandr I. The GULAG Archipelago, 1918-1956. Vols I-III. New York: Harper & Row, 1973/74/78, 660p., 712p., 558p.

Perhaps the greatest living writer in Russian, the author draws on his own experiences as a Soviet Army officer and later as a victim of the Soviet State Security system to describe and to document the activities and excesses of the internal security organs during and after the Stalinist period. The image evoked by the title is that of an archipelago consisting of thousands of islands, some tiny, some vast, with millions of inhabitants. In fact, GULAG is a word formed of the initials in Russian of the Main Administration of Corrective Labor Camps, the prison system under the jurisdiction of the various state security organs, and the islands of the archipelago are the thousands of official installations, the penal institutions, the detention camps, the interrogation centers and the state security offices which together form the enormous network for oppression and terror developed in Russia since 1917. While the worst excesses have been eliminated after the death of Stalin in 1953, the supremacy of state security considerations continues to govern Soviet policies and procedures.

Solzhenitsyn's book gives an authentic and comprehensive account of Soviet reality. It also serves as a vivid reminder of what can happen when people do not have a sufficient love of freedom, when they hurry to submit themselves to authority, and when they fail to comprehend that there must be a continuing and consistent defense of individual rights against the encroachments by the state.