



USSR Cabinet

CIMUN XV

November 29th - December 2nd



1. Topic 1 - Proliferating the Soviet System of Belief

1.1. Topic Overview

As the Soviet Union has accumulated more power, it has been met with competition from the United States. Recent ideological clashes have given the Soviet Union a renewed urgency to spread communism. The Tet Offensive resulted in more casualties on the Soviet and North Vietnamese end. The ideological implications of the event have left Americans questioning their stance on Vietnam and Soviets with a renewed motivation to spread communism.¹

While the United States tries to gain footing in Asia and other continents, it is imperative that the Soviet Union continues to spread its ideology and ensure that other communist nations remain protected from unwanted Western influence. The spread of communism will be met with a similar effort from the United States to spread capitalism, thus the USSR must allocate resources towards strengthening their existing sphere of influence as well.

1.2. Historical Background

The USSR has had previous success in spreading its influence around Europe and other areas. Much of its power was accumulated in the late 1940s and into the 1950s when the Soviet sphere of influence was first established. The Soviet Union initially drove forces out of Eastern Europe to assert their power. The Red Army namely focused on driving the Nazis back. Under the percentages agreement in October 1944, Stalin and Churchill agreed that Eastern Europe would become the Soviet "sphere of influence." The resulting increase in control over the region led to the creation of Comintern to ensure Communist countries were following Soviet rule. Exercising a strong control over the region, the Soviets expanded their sphere of influence and by 1949, almost all governments in Eastern Europe were considered Stalinist regimes and worked in close partnership with the USSR.²

¹ <https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/tet-offensive-ends>

²

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/gcsebitesize/history/mwh/ir2/sovietexpansionineasterneuroperev1.shtml>

The success of the Soviets can be accredited to the methods by which they spread their ideology. When the Red Army took over areas, they would first seize control of the radio station. The radio station served as a hub of information for many individuals. Thus, the Soviet forces could efficiently reach the masses and gain support. Communism spread into Eastern Europe and it was only a matter of time before the ideas of the USSR were popular among the public. The Soviets continued to hold elections for a period of time. In Hungary and East Germany, the Soviets were sure their representatives would win the election so they continued to involve the public. Under Marx's thinking, there would be a revolution among the bourgeois followed by a communist revolution. Workers would become conscious of their rights and promote communist theory.³ Although those in the Soviet Union may have suffered from famine, the Red Army ensured that industrial production within their Sphere of Influence was Soviet controlled.

The German capital city of Berlin has been a target from both the US and USSR's sides. After World War II, the allied nations each acquired a piece of Germany. Furthermore, they divided Berlin; the United States, France, and England controlled the western section and the Soviet Union held the eastern portion. In an attempt to take over West Berlin, the Soviet forces blockaded rail, water, and roadway passages into the city. They hoped that the lack of incoming supplies would force the citizens of West Berlin to surrender to Soviet forces. The western forces began their response to the offensive move: the Berlin Airlift. The United States Air Force delivered supplies to the two million residents to evade the Soviet's blockade. After 462 days, the Soviet Union lifted the blockade but tensions between the superpowers rose.⁴ Shortly after the end of the blockade, East Germany and West Germany were established as separate republics. The separation between the regions highlights the growing separation between democracy and communism.⁵

The United States and Soviet Union have come close to military confrontation. The closest to a direct confrontation occurred in the Cuban Missile Crisis, a thirteen day political and military standoff between the two superpowers. The Soviet Union placed missiles in Cuba to protect the

³

<https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/10/how-communism-took-over-eastern-europe-after-world-war-ii/263938/>

⁴ <https://www.nps.gov/nr/twhp/wwwlps/lessons/114airforce/114facts2.htm>

⁵ <https://www.history.com/topics/cold-war/berlin-blockade>

Cubans from the persistent threat of the United States. The US government had attempted to assassinate Fidel Castro numerous times to destabilize the communist government of Cuba.

The placement of missiles was an attempt to deter further US aggression towards Cuba. The standoff was the closest the two nations had come to war and resulted in various measures to reduce the likelihood of a similar occurrence. A direct hotline was established between Washington and Moscow to create a direct line of communication. However, the Cuban Missile Crisis also encouraged the Soviet Union to investigate intercontinental ballistic missile technology capable of reaching the United States from Soviet soil.⁶

Another clash between the superpowers occurred in Turkey and Greece. The Soviet Union knew of the strategic location of Turkey and the threat that capitalism in Turkey would create. When Truman announced the policies of the Truman Doctrine, Soviet officials knew they were being threatened by the United States. The United States government was trying to prevent the spread of communism into the Middle East and Mediterranean. The Truman Doctrine granted assistance to Greece and Turkey to prevent the spread of communism. The Soviets saw a particular appeal in the Dardanelles Strait in Turkey which was used by the Nazis to transport goods during World War II. The Soviets wanted assurance that the strait would not be used by its enemies.⁷

Korea was a site of conflict between communist and capitalist forces. Although neither side was completely backed by the United States or the Soviet Union, it contributed to the ongoing conflict between the two forces. The Soviet backed the northern forces while the southern forces were loosely supported by the United States. The initial dispute was over the border between the northern and southern forces. The Northern forces led by communist dictator Kim Il Sung were supported by the Soviet Union and invaded the South over the border conflict.⁸ The Americans were taken aback and retaliated. However, the Americans and southern troops were inexperienced and faced many casualties. After years of fighting, the Korean war reached a stalemate. After two years of negotiations, an armistice was signed in 1953 and drew a new boundary at the 38th parallel and featured a two mile demilitarized zone.

⁶ <https://www.history.com/topics/cold-war/cuban-missile-crisis>

⁷ <https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/truman-doctrine-is-announced>

⁸ <https://www.history.com/topics/korean-war>

1.3. Current Situation

Ethnic cleansing was necessary in much of the Soviet sphere of influence. German Nazis or those that had worked on the behalf of Polish resistance were deported. Considered a great achievement of the communist party, this cleansing was particularly popular. The task was run by the communist parties themselves in each of the countries which contributed to its popularity. Millions were placed on trains and shipped out of the country to prevent resistance within the Soviet controlled areas.⁹

Following Stalin's death, Khrushchev has attempted to maintain a cooperative spirit with the United States. In 1956, Khrushchev stated that imperialism and capitalism could coexist since the Communist system had become stronger. The Geneva Summit and Camp David Summit which occurred in 1955 and 1959 respectively, further raised the hopes of cooperation between Eisenhower and Khrushchev. The peaceful sentiment lasted a short period of time before the Cuban Missile crisis in October 1962 threatened global peace. The hostile faceoff ended peacefully but left both sides with a heightened urgency to build up power. The Soviet Union and United States recently signed confidence building agreements.¹⁰

The growing peaceful sentiment however, did not mean that the Soviet would reduce its sphere of influence. Rather, the Soviet Union would maintain the Iron Curtain and support its communist allies. A new face came to power in 1960: Leonid Brezhnev. His policies aim for peace while maintaining the USSR as a superpower.¹¹ The period of stability provides a good opportunity to build up Soviet forces and continue ideological expansionism. This period of détente is a prime time for the Soviet Union to expand its ideological sphere to the third world.

The ongoing arms race is primarily driven by political purposes. The spread of Soviet ideology must be backed by a strong military presence to ensure its reputation is maintained. Arms races are initiated by forces that challenge the political status quo thus the Soviet Union's arms build

9

<https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/10/how-communism-took-over-eastern-europe-after-world-war-ii/263938/>

¹⁰ <https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/archives/sovi.html>

¹¹

<http://origins.osu.edu/review/failed-empire-soviet-union-cold-war-stalin-gorbachev-new-cold-war-history>

up is necessary to prove its power. In the case of an ideological clash, the Soviet Union must be prepared to back its stance and protect its allies.

The early 1960s have marked a period of peacetime military buildup for the USSR. While the United States backs down on its military spending, the Soviet Union should continue to produce arms and weapons of mass destruction. The buildup of the nuclear arsenal and manufacturing of arms will likely boost the economy due to the creation of jobs. Furthermore, the Soviet Union will gain more recognition as one of the superpowers making its ideology more appealing to less powerful states.¹²

Although both nations identify as communist, the communism present in the USSR and China differ. The differences are primarily based on geopolitical and historical aspects. The establishment of the communism in China was fueled by peasants in the countryside whereas communism in the USSR was born from the factory working class in urban areas. The Chinese and Soviet leaders initially shared common principles in their governance. The differences in their rule were highlighted as Mao Zedong initiated the Cultural Revolution and the Great Leap Forward.¹³

The Sino-Soviet split was known publicly by 1965 and contact between the two countries had been severed. China had chosen to pursue an isolationist policy in which youth were educated about Maoist principles and deterred from free thinking.¹⁴ Unlike the Chinese, the Soviets pursued a route of cooperation rather than isolation. The USSR is currently working to promote scientific development to bolster the economy.

Due to the geographic proximity of China to the Soviet Union, the body must remain weary of the threats the Chinese may pose. The Chinese have previously communicated a desire to build a nuclear arsenal and requested help from the USSR. However, the USSR declined because the conflict with the Chinese could lead to a fatal outcome for the Soviet Union if China possesses nuclear weapons. Military buildup in China is a likely possibility thus the USSR must consider their relation with China carefully.

¹² <https://www.history.com/topics/cold-war/arms-race>

¹³ <https://www.marxists.org/subject/stalinism/origins-future/ch3-1.htm>

¹⁴

<http://www.nationalcoldwarexhibition.org/schools-colleges/national-curriculum/detente/sino-soviet-split.aspx>

The United States and Soviet Union have previously faced confrontation in Korea, Cuba, and the Mediterranean but a new theater has emerged: Vietnam. Vietnam serves as the current center of conflict for the US and Soviet forces. The ideological battle between the two is seen clearly in Vietnam with the Soviet Union supporting the Vietcong while the United States aligns with South Vietnamese. South Vietnamese leader Ngo Dinh Diem had announced that since South Vietnam did not sign the Geneva Agreement, they were not bound to its clauses. Thus, the unifying elections scheduled for 1956 were cancelled. The elections scheduled in 1956 would have resulted in a communist victory with Ho Chi Minh earning almost 80% of the votes.¹⁵

On January 31, 1968 the Vietcong forces staged the Tet Offensive. Nearly 70,000 forces under General Vo Nguyen Giap attacked 100 cities and villages in South Vietnam. Though the US backed forces struck back, the Soviets and North Vietnamese forces were determined to seize control of the cities. The Tet Offensive resulted in many casualties but has changed the viewpoint of many on the Vietnam War.¹⁶ Americans have a falling approval rating with the involvement in Vietnam which could benefit the Vietcong forces. Thus, the Vietnam War will be an arena of discussion for the body. The actions taken in Vietnam will have to be considered carefully to ensure that communism is sustained.

Despite the recent successes of the USSR and fellow communist nations, the progress that must be made in the coming months and years cannot be ignored. It is in the best interest of the Soviet Union to continue to build up in terms of military, economy, and foreign relations in order to spread communism to other areas of the world.

The military will benefit from buildup to ensure that the USSR is prepared to defend itself and other communist nations. While there is no ongoing direct conflict between the US and USSR, it is necessary to back the spread of communism with a strong military presence. The United States should not gain a security edge on the USSR especially in this period of peace. In term of economic growth, the Soviet Union can greatly benefit from the communist economic theory. The spread of communist theory can ensure that individuals have access to basic necessities while the USSR gains wealth. The political implications of communism are primarily seen in the

¹⁵ <http://www.english.illinois.edu/maps/vietnam/causes.htm>

¹⁶

<https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/diem-says-south-vietnam-not-bound-by-geneva-agreements>

form of foreign relations. In order to properly expand Soviet influence beyond Eastern Europe, the USSR must strategically forge political and economic ties with Asian and African nations.

1.4. Discussion Questions

- How can the Soviet Union promote communist ideology through political connections with other nations?
- How should the Soviet Union assert its ideologies in other nations while fighting the influence of the United States?
- Should the Soviet Union work with other communist nations to spread forms of Soviet ideology into more regions?
- Should the Soviet Union strengthen political ties with China to spread communism throughout Asia?
- Should aggression be used to retaliate against the United States or should it be used only as a response?
- How can economic liberalization strengthen the Soviet economy? What other actions should the Soviet Union take to strengthen its economy?

1.5. Key Terms

- Containment: the policy of the United States to curb the spread of Communism
- Communism: the central ideology of the Soviet Union in which all property is publicly owned and individuals work and are paid based on their needs and abilities
- Correlation of Forces: a qualitative assessment of the variables present in each region that may influence the outcome of a conflict
- Sphere of Influence: an area that is heavily influenced by a certain force or ideology
- Truman Doctrine: granted financial assistance to Greece and Turkey to prevent communism from reaching the nations

- Tet Offensive: A battle in Vietnam in which the Soviets faced many casualties and the perspective towards the Vietnam War shifted.

1.6. Resources

- <https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/tet-offensive-ends>
- <http://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/gcsebitesize/history/mwh/ir2/sovietexpansionineasterneurope1.shtml>
- <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/10/how-communism-took-over-eastern-europe-after-world-war-ii/263938/>
- <https://www.nps.gov/nr/twhp/wwwlps/lessons/114airforce/114facts2.htm>
- <https://www.history.com/topics/cold-war/berlin-blockade>
- <https://www.history.com/topics/cold-war/cuban-missile-crisis>
- <https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/truman-doctrine-is-announced>
- <https://www.history.com/topics/korean-war>
- <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/10/how-communism-took-over-eastern-europe-after-world-war-ii/263938/>
- <https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/archives/sovi.html>
- <http://origins.osu.edu/review/failed-empire-soviet-union-cold-war-stalin-gorbachev-new-cold-war-history>
- <https://www.history.com/topics/cold-war/arms-race>
- <https://www.marxists.org/subject/stalinism/origins-future/ch3-1.htm>
- <http://www.nationalcoldwarexhibition.org/schools-colleges/national-curriculum/detente/sino-soviet-split.aspx>
- <http://www.english.illinois.edu/maps/vietnam/causes.htm>
- <https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/diem-says-south-vietnam-not-bound-by-geneva-agreements>

2. Topic 2 - Protecting Sovereignty and the International Obligations of Socialist Countries

2.1. Topic Overview

“The history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggles.”

- Carl Marx and Friedrich Engels

Since the beginning of human history, the working class has been forced to toil for the benefit of the privileged few. Our brother Karl Marx understood this farce for what it was and knew that the cycle of slavery could be brought to an end. Throughout the world, socialism has freed millions from the abuses of capitalism, but there are those who wish to undermine our progress. As the most powerful socialist country in the world, it is our duty to protect the sovereignty of socialist countries and ensure that they maintain true to socialist ideology.

2.2. Historical Background

With the end of the Second World War, many peoples throughout the world were freed from the rule of emperors and kings. The remaining western powers agreed that each nation should be allowed to choose their own path, and so elections were held. Feeling emboldened by our strength, many chose to free themselves from the chains of capitalism and elected socialist governments. Although workers throughout the world rejoiced at this victory, western powers suddenly regretted their decision to allow free and fair elections, understanding that capitalism could only survive through trickery and force.

Since then, the U.S. and its allies have been acting like wounded bears, lashing out using propaganda, economic isolation, and military force in a desperate and violent attempt to survive. Although our comrades throughout the world have been fighting valiantly to resist these tactics, we can only remain strong for as long as we are united.

Over the past two decades, we have helped our comrades throughout Europe defend themselves against the onslaught of attacks from western agitators. It is our duty to defend the weakest among us, and the strength of socialism throughout the world is a testament of our commitment to this duty. As strong as we are today, there were many moments in recent history

during which our cause was threatened. Since the end of the war, the U.S. has focused its energies on weakening our comrades from within, instigating rebellion by implanting and supporting Anti-Soviet partisan groups in socialist states. Western-supported insurgents in Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Bulgaria, Ukraine, Romania, and other states survived for years, delivering blows to governments and terrorizing local populations¹⁷. Though we were able to suppress all of these insurgent groups, this did not stop our enemies' resolve to destroy socialism.

Failing in their promotion of violent insurrections, our enemies introduced more subtle tactics: instead of supporting insurgents, they began supporting political opponents who sought to infect socialist systems with capitalist methods disguised as "easier" paths to socialism. With the death of vozhd Joseph Stalin in 1953, socialist leaders throughout the Warsaw Pact began to tolerate and even embrace liberalization reforms, failing to see the treachery of these ideas¹⁸. Within a few years, however, it became clear reformers were not interested in enhancing socialism, and instead sought to destroy it by turning it into another capitalist scheme, and in 1956, liberal reforms gave way to crisis.

2.2.1. The 1956 Hungarian Crisis

In 1953, the reformer Imre Nagy became Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People's Republic and immediately sought to implement his "New Course" to socialism. The United States took advantage of the liberalization in Hungary, bombarding the airwaves with capitalist propaganda and installing a network of anti-government operatives to foment rebellion. The party eventually recognized the danger Nagy posed and replaced him with Mátyás Rákosi and later Ernő Gerő, but Hungary had already been placed on a disastrous course¹⁹.

As tensions continued to build, events in Poland known as "Polish October" emboldened antagonizers in Hungary. After the June 1956 rebellion in Poznań, Poland, was stopped by the government, state officials attempted to placate the subsequent unrest and appointed reformer Władysław Gomułka as First Secretary of the Polish United Worker's Party in October. Upon his appointment, Gomułka began making demands of the Soviet Union, including broad freedom to

¹⁷

<https://eng.lsm.lv/article/culture/history/forest-brothers-in-the-cia-archives-anti-soviet-sentiment-across-the-baltics.a247662/>

¹⁸ <https://www.britannica.com/topic/the-Thaw-Soviet-cultural-history>

¹⁹ <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/5379586.stm>

implement reforms and reduction of Red Army troops in Poland. Eventually, we conceded after receiving assurances that Gomułka was dedicated to maintaining communism in Poland²⁰. While this was perhaps the best choice for strengthening communism in Poland, it was perceived as a weakness by our enemies.

News of these concessions quickly spread with the help of American propaganda, and on October 23, 1956, massive protests broke out in Budapest, turning violent by the end of the day. That evening, First Secretary Gerő requested our assistance, and within hours our tanks arrived in Budapest. They were met not by protesters, but by armed and well-organized rebels. On October 24, the government was overthrown and Imre Nagy claimed power, promising to implement further reforms. While our forces and the Hungarian State Protection Authority fought to stop the violence, Nagy sided with insurgents and announced an array of changes, including Hungary's withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact and an official policy of neutrality. With Nagy unwilling to cooperate to stabilize Hungary, it was decided that an invasion of Hungary was necessary. On November 4, a Warsaw Pact military force entered Budapest and swiftly ended the rebellion - a majority of the fighting was ended within one day, and the rest was stopped by November 11²¹.

Though we managed to subdue the Hungarian crisis, it did not occur in a vacuum - the situations in Poland and Hungary invited counter-revolutionaries in Romania to protest as well. Largely due to the impeccable organization of the government, the Romanian protests were quelled before they could turn violent, but had the same protests occurred in other less stable states, a domino-effect of protests could have swept across the Warsaw Pact²².

Some of the lessons from the Hungarian crisis are clear: unrest can spread across borders if it is not immediately crushed, and conceding to the demands of protesters can encourage others. These lessons, however, present a bleak future for communism: however desirable a single path to communism might be, there will always be those who believe it must be done a different way, and we will always have to suppress them. Perhaps different lessons can be learned from the Polish crisis: though our concessions to Gomułka contributed to the crisis in Hungary,

²⁰ <https://www.britannica.com/event/Poznan-Riots>

²¹ <https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB76/>

²²

<https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/briefing-book/openness-russia-eastern-europe-russia-programs/2016-11-18/echoes-1956-hungarian-revolt>

ceding some control to Gomułka was the most politically expedient choice at the time, and since then he has proven to be a loyal ally to the Soviet Union and the Warsaw pact and a stalwart of communist ideology. While the Hungarian crisis shows that appeasement can be dangerous and infectious, the Polish example shows that it is possible for a socialist state to implement certain reforms that actually help further communism.

2.3. Current Situation

In the years since the Hungarian crisis, there has been relative calm throughout the Warsaw Pact in terms of ideological stability. As western powers ratcheted up their efforts against communism throughout the world, most of our allies came to the conclusion that unity is paramount. The situation in Czechoslovakia presents a challenge to us and our allies, and we must watch developments cautiously and make careful decisions about any actions we might take.

2.3.1. The Situation in Czechoslovakia

In December 1967, First Secretary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Antonín Novotný faced a crisis of confidence and approached Soviet leadership requesting support. Understanding that his credibility with the people and the party was low, we declined his request and on January 5, 1968, Alexander Dubček was elected as First Secretary. In spite of his promising background, concerns have arisen resulting from talks of reform. It is difficult to ascertain the seriousness of his promises, but earlier this month he lifted censorship rules and enforcement after being pressured by the Union of Czechoslovak Writers²³. This change is deeply concerning - preventing misinformation from being spread is an enormous responsibility, and time has proven that journalists cannot be trusted to carry this burden. Without the government's watchful eye, the likelihood that a piece of irresponsible journalism sparks a riot increases significantly.

The situation in Czechoslovakia has the potential to follow the Polish model or the Hungarian model. Dubček has provided assurances that he simply wants to make socialism more palatable for his citizens, and, given the opportunity, may very well implement reforms that strengthen

²³ <https://www.britannica.com/event/Prague-Spring>

socialism in Czechoslovakia. It is also possible for Dubček to lose control of the situation and create a crisis resembling 1956 Hungary.

2.4. Discussion Questions

- It is our duty to ensure the survival of spread of socialism throughout the world. How do we approach the situation in Czechoslovakia?
 - Is there a way to ensure that Dubček follows the Polish model while maintaining control?
 - What are the risks of ceding control to Dubček and trusting that he will keep Czechoslovakia loyal to socialist ideals?
- A threat to one socialist country is a threat to all socialist countries. How do we get the rest of the Warsaw Pact on board with whatever decision we make?
- What are the potential domestic or international consequences of any decision we might make regarding Czechoslovakia?

2.5. Key Terms

- Sovereignty
- Liberalization
- Warsaw Pact
- Polish October
- Hungarian Crisis
- Socialism
- Soviet Union
- Soviet Bloc

2.6. Resources

- <http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/collection/9/1956-polish-and-hungarian-crises>

- <https://www.rferl.org/a/1089303.html>
- <https://www.britannica.com/event/Brezhnev-Doctrine>