

## Now or never, says Harriman, on arms deal with Andropov

by Rachel Douglas

A Soviet arms cut proposal, presented by party chief Yuri Andropov in a Dec. 21 speech, occasioned an outburst of cries to "give Yuri a chance," from NATO headquarters and Western governments as well as from Andropov's natural sounding board, the so-called peace movement. It was enthusiasm tinged with anxiety, which showed in such responses as the *New York Times* commentary penned Jan. 2 by the aged anglophile W. Averell Harriman. Harriman, a chief promoter of the so-called 'freeze' movement, wrote that it is "now or never" for a new strategic arms control agreement with the U.S.S.R., to be achieved by positive response to Andropov's speech.

Averell Harriman and his family are among the biggest funders of racist eugenics in this century, responsible for the globally destructive economic policies that will have caused the next world war, if it breaks out. Not only that—for over four decades, "Old Ave" has been the certified "Russian handler" of the American anglophiles, the East Coast patriots. His job has been to cultivate those in the Soviet leadership most amenable to arms control deals that curb the technological progress he and his fellow oligarchs abhor. For this, Harriman and his co-thinkers in London are counting on Andropov, but they say "now or never" because they suspect Andropov's allegiance to technology-limitation, or his staying power if he were to stick with it, may not be so great. One British expert on the Soviet military has said that Andropov is working on a margin of tolerance from the military that could vanish in six months.

Andropov's proposals merely elaborate what Moscow

has been putting on the table at Geneva talks with the United States, first on limiting medium-range rockets (the "Theater Nuclear Force" talks) and then on restarting strategic arms negotiations. He offered to reduce Soviet SS-20s stationed West of the Ural Mountains to 162, equivalent to the forces of Britain and France, if the United States refrained from installing new Pershing-2 missiles in Western Europe, and he talked about a 25 percent reduction in strategic arsenals. Both facets of the plan are within the geometry of deterrence and overkill, the Mutual Assured Destruction insanity which such arms talks have helped perpetuate for decades (see Special Report, page 26). The purpose of the proposal, and its delivery by Andropov at the prestigious occasion of the 60th Anniversary of the founding of the U.S.S.R., lies elsewhere than in its own terms.

France's Defense Minister, Charles Hernu, told Paris' *Le Monde* that Andropov's initiative was intended to split the West European countries from the United States and to build up the "peace movement." What Hernu criticized, Bulgarian Communist Party head Todor Zhivkov, in Moscow for the celebration, plainly confirmed to *Izvestia* in a Dec. 28 interview: "They provide the anti-war movement in the West," he said of the arms talks proposals, "with powerful arguments, which will undoubtedly give it a new, mighty impulse."

### Anglo-Soviet movement

Moscow also has people on the ground to boost the "peace" mob. Its Anglo-Soviet coordination was featured on the front page of *Pravda* Dec. 27, in an article about consultations in

Britain of Soviet and British "social scientists" under the auspices of "Quakers for Peace and Social Justice." The session proclaimed support for "anti-war, peace demonstrations in all countries."

The leader of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) in Britain, Msgr. Bruce Kent, has endorsed Andropov's arms limitation proposals, as against the position of President Reagan. Kent conferred during the last week of 1982 with Sir Francis Pym, Foreign Secretary in the British Conservative government, who was due to arrive in Moscow Jan. 7 for talks with Andropov and Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko. CND sources say that the peace movement in Europe is set for much "hotter" efforts to "stop the mad arms race" and that the proposals of Dr. Edward Teller for strategic defensive weapons will be special targets.

Following Pym's visit, Gromyko will be in West Germany for three days of talks with the government and with the Social Democratic Party opposition, in whose circles there are dreams of an SPD government—backed by the Green Party and taking an absolute stand against nuclear weapons—in the near future.

This Soviet diplomacy is designed according to the thesis, energetically promoted by Andropov's long-time associate and advisor Georgii Arbatov of Moscow's USA-Canada Institute since October 1982, that the time is ripe for Western Europe to step forward as a third great power, separate from the United States. "Europe has a new role in the world," Arbatov told the Italian daily *Il Sole 24 Ore* on Dec. 20, "One cannot use the expression 'two superpowers' any more." In that interview, Arbatov linked this shift to "a radical rethinking of the nuclear age from the side of a powerful movement of people"—the peace movement—and singled out technological advance as the key problem in weaponry: "The progress of science and technology, and in this case the growth of weapons of mass annihilation, especially nuclear weapons, has overturned the world of traditional conceptions."

### France objects

The government of France is greeting such claims with appropriate skepticism. The French have made clear that they consider the nuclear freeze, advocated by proponents of a conventional arms build-up like Robert Strange McNamara and McGeorge Bundy, a threat to peace. At a Western European Union conference Dec. 1, Hernu denounced the McNamara-Bundy grouping which, he noted, "are the very same ones who presided over the impressive rearmament effort of the United States in the 1960s, the very same ones who dumped on Vietnam an amount of explosives greater than that which was used during the last world conflict," and yet now they "explain to us that the European countries will have to do without the American security guarantee."

Paris was equally cool to the Andropov offers, especially insofar as they implicated France. In a nationally televised statement on Jan. 2, President François Mitterrand declared,

"To Mr. Andropov, all I can say is: talk all you want with the United States; make your arrangements; but as for thinking that France could in the slightest reduce its present level of weapons, it's not worth dreaming about." Mitterrand's statement shows to what extent the socialist President has been politically captured by traditional military and other groups still committed to the basic tenets of Charles de Gaulle's policies, such as maintenance by France of an independent nuclear strike force.

### Soviet beams not frozen

The spectacle of Soviet foreign policy spokesmen lining up shoulder to shoulder with British ones to stop the United States from embarking on the path of directed energy beam weapons development, a defensive strategic capability and a catalyst for economic recovery, is unmatched for cynicism as 1983 begins. Even though Georgii Arbatov's insinuations about the need to overthrow "traditional" thinking might not sit well with Soviet officers, there is every indication that Soviet military and scientific leaders are demanding and getting what they want for intensive beam technology R&D. A program for laser and other directed beam technologies, run by Academician E. P. Velikhov using the resources of Moscow's largest auto plant and a dozen other factories, was publicized in the national daily *Izvestia* Dec. 27, as it had been in specialized economics journals some months ago.

Army General V. Varennikov, writing in *Izvestia* Dec. 19, flatly asserted the decisiveness of these technologies for strategic power, giving the approximate argument: the United States is already looking at these technologies, so we had better get them. Varennikov wrote, "It must be said that the danger of the military plans of the imperialist powers is growing in connection with the speedy development of military affairs, the possibility of the appearance, on the basis of the latest scientific achievements, of fundamentally new types of weapons and military technology, including highly precise conventional weapons systems and weapons based on new physical principles."

In the leadership transition period, the lobby of Soviet economists advocating revolutionary technological advances as the solution to Soviet economic stagnation has also become more vocal, so that the military's push for beam weapons is effectively seconded by some economists' argument that precisely these technologies could bring about the drastic increase in productivity the Soviet economy sorely requires. In the November issue of the monthly *Voprosy Ekonomiki* (*Questions of Economics*), Soviet investment specialist Viktor Krasovskii advocated the broad introduction of technologies fit to raise the temperature of the economy as a whole. He talked about directing investments to create "interlinked complexes of high-energy physics, space research centers, progressive technological schemes of advanced nuclear energy and laser technology" that would be at the core of such an economic approach in the U.S.S.R.