

---

## The Kremlin Connection

---

# Why the Arbatov faction promotes the 'strategic materials' policy

by Rachel Douglas

The Action for World Development Committee, engaged in selling the Reagan administration on Third World population reduction policies packaged as protection for "strategic minerals," has found allies in Moscow. Events during the March-April visit to the United States by the Soviet Union's Americanologist Georgii Arbatov have exposed the workings of a ghoulish alliance running from the Soviet KGB to the strategic minerals advisers employed by Reagan.

Its purpose: secure the support of both superpowers for the strategy known as "Global 2000," the reduction of the earth's population by 2 billion people through deindustrialization, war, famine, and epidemic.

On a stopover in West Germany on his way to Washington, Arbatov told *Der Spiegel* magazine that there should have been Soviet-American talks on crises in Africa three or four years ago. In Philadelphia, an Arbatov subordinate from his U.S.A.-Canada Institute suggested to a meeting of political science professors that détente had failed because Washington and Moscow had no "code of conduct" for the Third World.

The team now in the process of drafting such a code encompasses the Soviet faction represented by Arbatov, the interlocked international networks of the Socialist International and the Club of Rome, and American geopoliticians spanning the Carter and Reagan administrations. Under their Third World regulations, the great power posture toward countries written off to complete collapse will be "noninterference."

Arbatov's announced purpose on his U.S. visit was to promote renewed détente and efforts for disarmament. The International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), whose conference he attended in Warrenton, Va., is an affiliate of the "Palme Commission" for disarmament, which Arbatov cofounded.

The "antiwar" trappings of the IPPNW and the Palme Commission only thinly cover their overriding aim, the restriction of technology-vectored development policies.

The chief of public relations for the IPPNW revealed that the doctors were proselytizing not only against nuclear war, but against nuclear power. The Global 2000 report drafted in the Carter administration's State Department, he said, was a strategically important docu-

ment consistent with the goals of the IPPNW.

This spokesman for the doctors was George Kroloff, of the Washington public relations firm Ruder & Finn. Kroloff is also an organizer for the Action for World Development Committee, a pivotal group in the attempt to insinuate Third World population control and reduction policies into the Reagan administration, on the grounds that large Third World populations threaten American access to strategic mineral deposits.

Robert Keating, a Washington consultant who guided the Strategic Minerals Task Force of the Reagan transition team, works closely with Kroloff and shares his advocacy of low-energy, labor-intensive projects only for the Third World.

### The Soviet 'one-worldists'

Among those behind the Action for World Development Committee are prominent Russian-handlers Averell Harriman, the American patrician involved in Soviet affairs since World War II; Armand Hammer, the Occidental Petroleum chairman who has Soviet stakes going back 60 years and a more recently developed relationship with Libya; Pepsico's Donald Kendall, and Chase Manhattan's David Rockefeller, the last two leading lights of East-West trade in the early 1970s.

Their strategic evaluation is that the Soviets will not intervene to stop Third World disintegration, especially when the related crises are comfortably far from their own borders, because they lack the wherewithal for extending economic assistance and they welcome instability that appears to hurt the West.

This assessment, as Averell Harriman and the people he has trained know, does apply to a faction of the Soviet establishment, a faction with two guises. It encompasses the international policy think tanks, like IMEMO and Arbatov's U.S.A.-Canada Institute, which overlap with British intelligence through double and tripple-agency as well as open consultation on global management issues. The faction's second component is the Moscow advocates of radical revolution abroad for the sake of maximum destabilization of the West.

Both these factions are willing—and able—to *cooperate* with the Global 2000 planners in the West to foment conditions in the developing sector leading

inevitably to the deaths of millions by war and starvation.

The Institute for World Economy and International Relations, known as IMEMO, is a leading source of the Soviet doctrine that technology under capitalism exploits workers, strengthens the West, and is therefore undesirable. Founded in 1956 by networks of the old Communist International, or Comintern, organization, IMEMO is a channel of Soviet liaison with the Club of Rome and the Socialist International. Together with the International Department of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and the foreign policy apparatus of the Committee for State Security (KGB), IMEMO-centered forces account for the Soviet input to international environmentalism and terrorism.

Ivan Frolov, deputy director of the Soviet All-Union Institute of Systems Research, typified the IMEMO outlook in a January 1981 article endorsing the "new humanism" of the Club of Rome's Aurelio Peccei. A frequent collaborator of International Vadim Zagladin, Frolov praised Peccei for moving from a merely "bourgeois" humanism to a global approach and proposed that today's globalism was the road to revolution:

Though international cooperation can, at this time, only help toward a *partial* solution of global problems . . . it is exerting a deep positive influence on the entire course of world development, stimulating the process of internationalization, which in the future will become the very basis of the new civilization. Global problems are today the most powerful *stimulating factor* in the development of the world's material and spiritual life toward communism.

On Feb. 16, this Soviet faction gave qualified public support to Global 2000, in a Pravda article by Academician Yevgenii Fyodorov, a deputy chairman of the World Peace Council and head of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace. In January 1981, Fyodorov had toured the United States under the auspices of the American Friends Service Committee.

Under the headline "Protecting Nature for People," Fyodorov acknowledged Global 2000 as a case of the West's coming to terms with the need for international cooperation on global problems. Fyodorov proposed "global problems and environmental conservation" as prime areas for international efforts.

### **Factions dispute development**

In the months of discussion leading up to the 26th Soviet Communist Party Congress held Feb. 23 through March 3, it was clear even in the controlled Soviet news media that Third World policy was the subject of a fundamental factional debate. It hinges on the issue

underlying "geopolitical" confrontations: will the future of the underdeveloped sector be industrial growth, or economic devastation and genocide?

Some of the most striking Soviet testimony against global deindustrialization came from journalist A. Bovin in late 1980, when he deplored the ravaging of education and culture under the Ayatollah Khomeini in Iran. Bovin, long considered a spokesman for Soviet President Brezhnev's policies, has since been named to the prestigious Central Auditing Commission of the party.

Bovin called Iran's disaster a "cultural revolution," a reference to the Chinese model. In the weekly *New Times*, No. 2 for 1981, commentator D. Volsky described the Chinese-directed genocide in Kampuchea (Cambodia) as a case of convergence between Maoism and "imperialism"—the geopolitics of Henry Kissinger's and Jimmy Carter's China card policy.

In a guest feature appearing in Kabul *New Times* Feb. 9, Soviet Prof. Mikhail Kiryan attributed the threat of world war to "transnational financial oligarchies"—not essentially capitalist—who pursued a policy of depopulation:

The transnational oligarchies do not always coordinate their activities with the interest of individual states. They plan the establishment of a world government to rule the planet. . . . Having become disappointed with capitalism as a social system, they want to replace it by another system, also to be based on "sacred private property." The transnational oligarchies are turning into totalitarian groups, torn away from their class and nations and dreaming about world denomination. . . . The transnational financial oligarchies make their main stake on world nuclear war which would help them, they hope, solve such global issues as to destroy socialism, *save the planet from "overpopulation"* and clear the way to a new "rational social order" [emphasis added].

The Soviet faction which developed this analysis has a corresponding policy impulse in the U.S.S.R., which would take off from already established Soviet industrialization projects—such as in India—to join the efforts of others for world economic recovery. That is the outlook Brezhnev took to India last year, and to Bonn in 1978 to solicit European trade and investment at the very moment that West Germany and France were forging the European Monetary System with its huge potential for funding Third World development.

Thus Georgii Arbatov, assigned to represent Moscow to the world on matters of "disarmament" but actually running errands for the Global 2000 conspiracy, helps ensure that Brezhnev's most promising initiatives for stability may never come to fruition.