

Rouche's decisive input would be the crucial element of 'flexibility' in an otherwise strictly predetermined mechanism leading into war via any suitable Sarajevo.

Neither Giscard nor Schmidt is actually doing what he is saying; channels are being kept open with Moscow, development initiatives are indeed being prepared and partly implemented on the quiet, outside the policy-framework set by Anglo-American demands. But France and Germany are also not saying what they are doing, dangerously denying their unique role in world affairs. The international weight and authority of the French government—and singularly that of the heir to General de Gaulle, President Giscard d'Estaing—and the strength of West German industry, are the two elements which have, over the last four years, kept the world from the brink of general thermonuclear war. Such a responsibility cannot be eschewed, all the more now that the forceful emergence of the LaRouche presidential campaign within the United States signifies a real potential return of the U.S.A. to reason.

5) They understand the worries voiced by those nations committed to a genuine nonalignment, and stress that these nations must play an important and independent role for peace and stability in the world. Therefore it is necessary to avoid a spreading of the East-West conflict into the Third World.

6) The citizens of France and the Federal Republic of Germany have experienced the horrors of two world wars on their own soil and have worked for the creation of a more stable and peaceful world during the past 30 years. In this context, their mutual rapprochement and their common efforts to rebuild Europe have been crucial steps on this course. They share the view that the European powers have to bear special responsibilities under present circumstances, and they thereby try—together with their alliance partners—to guarantee the fundamental balance upon which the security of their nations and the security of Europe depend.

7) Their efforts to overcome this crisis will only make sense if the Soviet Union states publicly its commitment to respond to these efforts. France and Germany have recognized the statements given by the U.S.S.R. that they intend to withdraw their troops from Afghanistan. New actions are required to follow these declarations of intent. This is necessary for successful efforts on which the security and future of peace will depend.

U.S.S.R.

Scientist's rise a clue to policy

by Rachel Douglas

One week ago a 47-year-old member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences who has spent the past 17 years working in its Siberian Division was vaulted into the powerful post of Chairman of the U.S.S.R. State Committee on Science and Technology and became a Deputy Prime Minister of the Soviet Union.

The State Committee where G.A. Marchuk takes the reins is responsible for submitting influential recommendations on Soviet Research & Development budgeting, for drafting long-term science and economic plans, and for arranging aspects of Soviet economic deals with Western countries.

Marchuk's transfer to this command point in Moscow is part of a mobilization of resources in the Soviet Union, which is occurring because the Russian leaders consider all-out war a growing likelihood. His experience in Siberia means that Marchuk will bring to the job the competence of running vast projects, where efficiency and skillful deployment of resources are vital. He also brings first-hand contact with the U.S.S.R.'s most advanced work in mathematical physics, which is the basis of Soviet weapons development.

Before his 1962 move to Novosibirsk headquarters of the Siberian Division, itself the location of top Russian laboratories, Marchuk worked for nine years at the Physics & Power Institute at Obninsk, a research center which was also the home of the first Soviet atomic power station.

Other causes of the shakeup which brought Academician Marchuk from Novosibirsk to Moscow are also important, but subordinate to the primary fact of a Soviet pre-war mobilization. These include a push by Soviet leadership elements who have the least confidence or interest in restoring East-West scientific ties to shut them down for the long term, by such measures as the arrest of dissident physicist Andrei Sakharov with its subsequent, inevitable wave of protests from Western scientists, and the removal of Marchuk's predecessor, V.A. Kirillin, who had chaired both the Franco-Soviet

and the Soviet-American committees on scientific cooperation.

What would be seriously wrong is to adopt the view offered last week by one analyst at Radio Free Europe headquarters in Munich, that the replacement of Kirillin by Marchuk was merely dust settling in the trail of Sakharov and that Marchuk's distinguishing feature was his having denounced Sakharov six years ago. Not the crackdown on dissidents, but the crank-up of the economy is what counts ultimately and deserves close attention.

What is Novosibirsk?

The Siberian Division of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, based in the special suburb "Akademgorodok" outside the West Siberian city of Novosibirsk, is the brain center of the biggest development project in the world, the Siberian frontier. Since its establishment in 1959, Novosibirsk has combined a leading role in advanced R & D such as the work of its laboratories on controlled thermonuclear fusion power, with a broad agenda of special projects for Siberian application: cold-weather machinery development, hybridization of food plants for rare weather conditions, mineral resource mapping, and many others.

Novosibirsk and its leadership are the best of the Soviet Union.

For Americans, who face the U.S.S.R. as an adversary, thanks chiefly to Washington administration policies that have led inexorably towards superpower confrontation, the "best" of the Soviet Union means two things. First, the "Siberian" approach to basic research, R & D, defense spending, and manpower has made the U.S.S.R. the world's premiere military power, while United States strength was eroded during the past decade and a half by a combination of incompetence and economic collapse.

But second, the development of Siberia is the closest thing to "the American way" to be found in Russia. It is a program of building entire new cities around giant hydroelectric power stations on the Angara River in southern Siberia, laying thousands of miles of railroad track across wilderness, and extracting oil from beneath permanently frozen ground. Were our own leaders not up to their frown-lines in the game of geopolitical confrontation with the U.S.S.R., this Soviet commitment to conquering the Siberian frontier would define the greatest commonality of outlook and interest between their nation and ours.

An alternative line of succession to leadership of the State Committee on Science and Technology would have had far worse results. In promoting Marchuk, the Kremlin bypassed Jermen Gvishiani, Kirillin's deputy on the State Committee and the son-in-law of Prime Minister Aleksei Kosygin.

The setback for Gvishiani, whom the Washington Post has called "a jet-setting technocrat" in an editorial appreciation, is a defeat for the "systems analysis" school of thought in the Soviet Union. Gvishiani is known for his extensive contact-work in the West, but his Western friends are typified by those based at the Vienna International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) which he co-chairs with McGeorge Bundy of Ford Foundation fame. These ties hold together an East-West cooperation approach markedly different from the one defined by the Siberian frontier development. The IIASA is one channel for purveying into the Soviet Union the same "fixed resources" thinking that has done so much to undermine the American economy!

Soviet economic debate

The shakeup at the State Committee on Science and Technology has occurred at the start of the year in which the Soviets will finalize the 11th Five Year Plan, covering 1981-1985. It adds to indications that an overhaul of the Soviet planning and management is underway, whose repercussions have not finished sounding.

When Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev addressed the semi-annual plenary session of the Soviet party Central Committee Nov. 27, he launched a rare attack on the leaders of particular branches of industry for shortcomings. Brezhnev criticized six ministers by name and also instructed the State Committee on Science and Technology to work "more energetically."

As he spoke, Brezhnev already knew that the Soviet economy at the end of 1979 would turn in its worst performance since World War II. The overall industrial production growth target would be missed, steel production would register an unprecedented decline in total tonnage, and the harvest of a bad weather year would be a meager 179 million tons of grain. Brezhnev also was anticipating that demands for military spending would rise due to the international situation.

On Dec. 7, ten days after the plenum, Pravda carried an article written by one of G.A. Marchuk's deputies at Novosibirsk, Academician A. Aganbegyan, Director of the Institute for the Economics and Organization of Industrial Production at the Siberian Division, that picked up Brezhnev's challenge.

Aganbegyan delivered a detailed indictment of the Steel Ministry, Transport Construction Ministry, and others for bungling on various Siberian projects that cost the Soviet economy billions of rubles. The message was clear: for a streamlined, efficient mobilization of resources under difficult conditions, the Siberian scientists had the key to success.

To the woeful stories of lost rubles and railroads that would have saved billions had they been built, Aganbegyan counterposed several thumbnail drafts of plans that would continue Siberian development "in a professional

manner." The organizational precedent he cited spoke volumes to any Soviet citizen who remembered the mobilization to lift Russia from backwardness to the status of an industrial power: a government bureau for the Urals-Kuznetsk Combine, the greatest area development project of the First Five Year Plan in the 1930s.

Aganbegyan stated bluntly that the State Committee on Science and Technology "ought to" set up a subdivision to be responsible for a coherent program of science and technology in Siberia, whose development Brezhnev and other leaders consider crucial to the entire country's economic health. With the promotion of Marchuk, Novosibirsk took responsibility for the State Committee itself.

What next?

There are several key areas of policy development in which follow-up to the State Committee shakeup will occur.

1) The economic debate will continue as the Soviets grapple with the demands of their current mobilization. Probable follow-up to Marchuk's promotion will be a further shakeout of Soviet planners and administrators whose "managerial" approach results in the kinds of inefficiencies Academician Aganbegyan exposed.

These circles overlap with the systems analysis advocates, but include other followers and associates of Prime Minister Kosygin, who has been in charge of economic reforms for over a decade. Kosygin, reportedly ill, is not active in the Soviet leadership at this point.

The clash between "managers" and "Siberians"—bearing in mind that not everyone in the latter group works at Novosibirsk—raises a perennial Soviet argument over the balance between "applied" and "basic" research. With the promotion of Marchuk, the Siberian Division has evidently recouped from a Central Committee criticism two years ago, when it was accused of being too tied up in basic research to produce sufficient "concrete results for practice." Aganbegyan in *Pravda* demonstrated that it is the Novosibirsk combination of both kinds of effort that leads to successful development.

2) A broader and more intense attack on the advocates of systems analysis is a strong possibility, especially since these layers are heavily involved in promoting "environmentalist" arguments in the U.S.S.R. Cothinkers of Academician Marchuk, such as President of the Academy A.P. Aleksandrov, have openly criticized the Soviet "greenies" in recent weeks.

3) The question of Western participation in Siberian development remains open. Marchuk and people like him in the leadership are acutely aware of the benefits accruing to the Soviet economy from Western investment in Siberia, as well as of the leverage that Western business interest in such investments provides toward business taking a more active role in saving détente.

MIDDLE EAST

Can Abolhassan Bani-Sadr rule Iran?

by Robert Dreyfuss

For several weeks, it has been an open secret in Washington that the Carter administration has placed its bets on Iran's newly elected President Abolhassan Bani-Sadr. According to administration sources, Washington—especially National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance—believes that Bani-Sadr can assemble a working political coalition with a mandate to negotiate a release of the hostages. Then, according to their scenario, Bani-Sadr will bring Iran into harmony with the policy enunciated by President Carter in his State of the Union address, in which he called for a virtual alliance with Iran against the U.S.S.R.

Zbigniew Brzezinski, who visited Saudi Arabia on Feb. 5, reportedly paid a secret visit to Teheran to discuss the resolution of the Iranian crisis. Brzezinski's visit came after reports of intensive secret negotiations between Iran and the United States over the shape of a proposed alliance to follow the release of the hostages. The London *Sunday Times* reported Feb 3 that a package deal to free the Americans held in Teheran was the subject of "messages sent by President Carter to the Ayatollah Khomeini and the new Iranian President, Abolhassan Bani-Sadr over the past few days." According to the *Times*, the messages included "promises that the moment the hostages are freed, the U.S. government will start negotiations with Iran for future cooperation, including the important matter of military spare parts."

For the one year since the seizure of Teheran by the Khomeini forces, *Executive Intelligence Review* has reported on the extensive behind-the-scenes cooperation between Iran and the Anglo-American military and intelligence establishment. In fact, the Khomeini dictatorship was put into power as a deliberate act of geopolitical strategy by the Carter administration and the City of London, who encouraged the growth of Muslim fundamentalism and the activities of the secret society called the Muslim Brotherhood to which most of the present Iranian leadership belongs. It is therefore not surprising to readers of the *EIR* that President Carter now openly moots a military alliance with the Khomeini regime. In