

The Two Faces Of Oblomov

Georgii Arbatov, Director of the Soviet Union's "USA and Canada Institute" and a close advisor to Communist Party head Leonid Brezhnev, has proclaimed the entire body of Soviet military doctrine passé, by writing in *Izvestia* March 13 that strategic superiority is impossible in the nuclear age. Arbatov glowingly reviewed a book by Arthur Cox, formerly of the Brookings Institution, for espousing this view and concluding that disarmament is therefore the only rational course.

Arabatov's endorsement of Brookings — the architects of the economic policy pursued by Hitler's Finance Minister Hjalmar Schacht, not to mention such subsequent institutionalized Dollar Empire looting arrangements as the Marshall Plan and the current "Common Fund" commodities swindle — confirms that a Carter-Brezhnev deal, for which Arbatov has been a key agent, is now in effect. For the sake of a speedy SALT II agreement, the USSR is to refrain from pushing the socialist sector's transfer ruble as means for financing world trade or otherwise aiding a European-Third World challenge to the dollar.

Carter's deal with Brezhnev was all but formally announced by former CIA head William Colby in testimony yesterday before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Arms Control. The U.S. must go for a SALT agreement *fast* said Colby, since "General Secretary Brezhnev has a personal commitment to this approach. While he remains at the apex of Soviet decision-making, we should not let this opportunity pass. We cannot be sure his successor will be equally receptive." Colby admitted that Soviet military doctrine insists on strategic superiority as long as the danger of war remains, but called this merely a "surface" commitment. Referencing Arbatov and his friends, Colby said that there exist layers of managers, engineers and politicians in the Soviet Union who "respect U.S. power" and are reluctant to "provoke" U.S. countermeasures to Soviet strategic advances.

Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, when he goes to Moscow late this month, will zero in on Brezhnev and his factional allies in hopes of achieving maximum Soviet concessions. According to reports from the West German *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung's* Washington correspondent yesterday, Vance's trip will not be merely a probe, as has been rumored, but will offer "very definite proposals" for Brezhnev to choose from. One of them, suggested Andrew Pierre of the Council on Foreign Relations in the *New York Times*, will be for an international conference on limiting conventional arms sales. This could have the effect of pre-empting recent initiatives by the West Germans at the Mutual Balanced Force Reduction talks in Vienna. Finally, there are signs that Brezhnev may bend over so far as to go along with the Carter Administration's scenario for a SALT II pact barring

Research and Development with potential weapons applications. The British *Daily Telegraph* has reported that at an ongoing 30 nation disarmament conference in Geneva, the Soviet delegation revealed that the General Secretary's proposal to ban "new systems of weapons of mass destruction" applies specifically to laser and concentrated beam systems, the key area of marginal Soviet R and D superiority.

Soviet hardliners, particularly in the military, are opposed to such abject propitiation and have forced into print increasingly direct attacks on the Carter Administration's policies. The resulting shift in line, widely heralded in front page articles in the *Washington Post* and *New York Times* March 14, included specific rejection of Carter's proposal to exclude the U.S. cruise missile and Soviet "Backfire" bomber from a SALT II accord. The *Washington Post* observed that the deteriorating atmosphere indicated by the sharp Soviet commentaries may wreck Secretary of State Vance's upcoming trip to Moscow.

This tougher line, however, is a U.S.-profiled response just as manipulable as that of Arbatov. In fact, it has been observed that U.S. energy czar James Schlesinger, in particular, anticipates that the continuing "human rights" campaign and outlandish proposals for SALT concessions will provoke a paranoid hard line from the Soviets and induce them to break off the SALT negotiations. Soviet "intransigence" then becomes the excuse for revving up war hysteria in the West.

The announcement in the Soviet military daily *Red Star* March 10 of 25,000-man maneuvers to take place in the Odessa region the first week of April underscores the fact that, no matter what Arbatov says, the Soviet high command has few illusions about Carter and his backers.

Arbatov's Excesses

Arbatov, in an interview with *U.S. News and World Report* last week, raised some eyebrows in Moscow when he praised the Carter Administration as "legitimate" and "one Americans and others can expect action from." In his *Izvestia* article, entitled "From a Position of Realism," he gushed over the allegedly "pro-detente" stand of Arthur Cox. Confessing that Cox's background includes stints not only with Brookings, but with the Marshall Plan Administration, the State Department and the CIA, Arbatov dubbed it "paradoxical" that such an obvious dyed-in-the-wool Atlanticist would share policies so similar to those of Arbatov himself. Arbatov approvingly retailed Cox's slanderous attacks on the Republican Party, and especially the "right-wing Republicans" — the most public congressional opposition to Carter's fascist global zero-growth policy.

Pravda, in an article March 11 on the U.S. "energy emergency," sank even lower than Arbatov. Giving

straight coverage to Schlesinger's call for dictatorial control over energy flow, *Pravda* illustrated the U.S. plight by quoting "the Governor of West Virginia" (whose name is John D. Rockefeller IV, although *Pravda* did not so inform its readership). Said the junior Rockefeller, "We have a plan in case of nuclear war, but when the fuel runs out nobody knows what to do."

Czech Press Stands Firm

The Czechoslovak press has recently served as an outlet for the views of those hardliners in Eastern Europe who have not been driven into a paranoid profile, and are pushing for an aggressive political orientation, to make the transfer ruble the basis for a new world monetary system. A rapid-fire series of commentaries in the daily *Rude Pravo* this week departed sharply from both the "hard" and "soft" line in the Soviet press.

***Attacking Carter's "human rights" crusade, *Rude Pravo* underlined that this is "an indispensable part of its

foreign policy." Western Europeans, the paper said, are being "driven into desperation" by Carter's provocations. The Soviets — and especially Arbatov — have suggested that the human rights tactic is an unfortunate diversion forced on Carter. "Maybe (Carter) has not studied the whole situation, and especially how it looks to us," said Arbatov to *U.S. News and World Report*.

***On the eve of the French elections, *Rude Pravo* denounced the Atlanticist head of the French Socialist Party (PSF), François Mitterrand, for his part in the "human rights" campaign. Mitterrand should know what repression means, since he served as Justice Minister in Paris when the government launched the bloody war in Algeria, said *Rude Pravo*. The Soviet press, by contrast, has dished out undifferentiated praise for the "Union of the Left" between the PSF and the French Communist Party.

****Rude Pravo* ran the first major attack in any East European paper on U.S. "sabotage" of the nuclear reactor deal between West Germany and Brazil.

Arbatov Lauds Brooking's 'New Strategic Conception'

Soviet Academician G. Arbatov reviewed The Dynamics of Detente — How to End the Arms Race, by Arthur M. Cox (New York, Norton and Co. 1976) in the March 13 Izvestia. The review, which is excerpted below was titled "From a Position of Realism."

All those who follow the American political literature cannot help but observe one obvious paradox. The real political shifts of recent years, the turn toward detente, the improvement of Soviet-American relations, the prospects for limiting armaments opened up by the new situation — all of this has a rather strange reflection in many books (and articles). It could even be called a reflection in *camera obscura*, where the real object is seen upside down....

Against this background, the lesser number of works written from positions of realism attract particular attention. The more so since a significant part of them — and this is the other paradox — come from the pens of people who are veteran American politicians, people who held distinguished offices when the "cold war" began and gathered strength. They know their subject very well, and even if sometimes their views are colored by personal connections with many events of the past, still their voices demand to be heard. For these are essentially voices warning that history has shown the complete futility of the political recipes now proposed by the opponents of detente.

Among works of this sort is the book by Arthur Cox, *The Dynamics of Detente — How to End the Arms Race*. Its author began his career in the "Marshall Plan" Administration, served in the State Department and the White House apparatus under President Truman, and worked in the Central Intelligence Agency. He resigned

and then became a fellow of the well-known research center, the Brookings Institution. His book is not only the fruit of an office researcher's creativity, but also a generalization from political experience, which in Cox's case was simultaneously the experience of life.

This is a book with a thoroughly defined central theme. Namely, that only the policy of detente is rational today, and the core of this policy is reducing the arms race, and disarmament....

The author of the book absolutely accurately identifies the root of the problem: the striving of U.S. militaristic and military-industrial circles for military superiority.

It is important that Cox, not stopping here, reveals the full danger of such a course from the standpoint of American national interests. He indicates especially that the achievement of practically meaningful nuclear superiority (that is to say, superiority that can be "realized" in policy) is simply not achievable in our day, and the only thing that such efforts lead to is the continuation of the arms race. No less important, in the opinion of Cox, is that the striving for superiority and the arms race that it caused not only do not strengthen U.S. national security but, on the contrary, undermine it.

These considerations lead the author of the book to a quite definite conclusion: "What is needed in this situation is a new strategic conception, a completely new view of our role in the world — a new foreign policy, which will also define the basic directions of defense policy. The time has come for the USA to turn towards creative leadership and to throw off mistaken and fabricated fears which stifled our foreign policy for so long...."

He has no doubt that the Soviet Union, its leadership, are sincere in their desire to deepen detente and limit the