

How The White House Manufactures 'Soviet Dissenters'

President Jimmy Carter and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance have publicly declared the cause of "human rights" in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to be a point of U.S. Administration policy on a par with strategic arms limitation. This priority, however, is not in fact a matter of human rights. It is a feature of the Carter Administration's strategic posture toward the Warsaw Pact countries and the rest of the world — one of the features which marks it as a posture for confrontation.

The people known as "dissidents" are paid or manipulated pawns in a scheme which has two immediate goals. The first is to destabilize the Soviet Union by fomenting unrest in Eastern Europe if possible, or at least by keeping the USSR uncertain of when and whether the U.S. will suddenly spring the human rights issue as a barrier in the strategic arms (SALT) negotiations.

Secondly, the Carter Administration intends to use human rights to play on its opponents from traditional conservative circles, people who favor world economic development, trade, and détente with Eastern Europe, but are susceptible to pleas to resist "communist oppression." Karin Soeder, Foreign Minister in the pro-development conservative Swedish government, was prompted by the hue and cry over Eastern European dissidents to denounce Eastern governments last week. Norway cancelled a Czechoslovak trade delegation due there Jan. 31, on the same account.

The individuals and institutions which pull the strings of the dissident networks, and the nets of propaganda which keep them a live story, overlap extensively with the Carter Administration. The appointment of Zbigniew Brzezinski as National Security Council chief is sufficient to make the case: long before he served as director of the Trilateral Commission, Brzezinski made his career in the study and subversion of Eastern Europe. His name has for years been synonymous in Warsaw Pact circles with "militant anti-communism" and then the 1960s strategy of "bridge-building", which culminated in the 1968 "Prague Spring."

If Warsaw Pact leaders today had considered that Brzezinski and Carter should have a grace period upon coming into office, the latter are provoking its speedy end. No sooner did the State Department release public endorsements of Soviet chief dissident Andrei Sakharov and his counterparts in Czechoslovakia last week, than Brzezinski came under fire in the Czech weekly *Tvorba* and some Western communist party papers with Eastern connections.

Leading propagandists for the dissident cause and network string-pullers openly admit that the potential for unrest sufficient to threaten the ruling parties and governments of Eastern Europe is next to nil (see interviews, below). Poland is the only country where, because of particularly difficult economic circumstances (the country's debt-exports ratio is the highest in Eastern Europe) and the strong influence of the Catholic Church, significant street action is considered a real possibility.

For all other countries, as well as for Poland, the Carter Administration's strategy is to push "human rights" as far as possible and rely on the effect that can be generated by the Western media.

The perception that mobilization around the dissidents can only provoke the Warsaw Pact nations is shared by numbers of leaders in Western Europe. Mr. Romili of the Italian state sector firm Montedison warned this week that the USSR might react violently to further pressure on this issue. Italy's Foreign Minister Arnaldo Forlani vehemently told fellow Europeans at the Strassbourg European Parliament meeting Jan. 29 and then at the Feb. 1 Western European Foreign Ministers meeting that debate on human rights must not be allowed to submerge military and economic détente topics at the June 1977 Belgrade follow-up to the 1975 Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). The Belgrade meeting is one event slated for sabotage by the Carter Administration. Forlani denounced U.S. manipulation of the human rights issue, and suggested that if there were any real problem in that regard, the Soviet Union would be far better able to resolve it in a world of détente than a world where détente had been wrecked.

Freedom House And The Press

Freedom House, Inc., a New York-based think-tank and publishing house is a major source of documentation of alleged oppression in Eastern Europe, which it feeds to the press. Associated Press President Keith Fuller, whose employee George Krinsky stands accused by the Soviets for his active work among dissidents, is an associate of Freedom House. The House puts out a bulletin called *Freedom at Issue*, which reprints material from Eastern European dissidents, often rerun from emigrée social democratic magazines.

Zbigniew Brzezinski sits on the Board of Directors of Freedom House. So do New York Senators Daniel Moynihan and Jacob Javits. While such luminaries as these lend their names, support, and direction to the

Freedom House, the members most active on a month-to-month basis include Sidney Hook and Paul Kurtz, who won fame for their anti-intellectual University Committee for Rational Alternatives (UCRA), and Leo Cherne of the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board.

Among Freedom House's sources of money is the J.M. Kaplan Fund, Inc., which also finances Amnesty International's similar efforts to publicize dissidents from Eastern Europe and maintain a "local" in Moscow, as well as a number of "left" and "right" extremist organizations. In 1967, *Newsweek* magazine cited the J.M. Kaplan Fund as a CIA front for transfer of funds to organizations engaged in CIA covert operations.

Legal counsel to the J.M. Kaplan Fund is the firm Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver, and Kampelman. Partner Max Kampelman in otherwise counsel for the Committee on the Present Danger (CPD), the war-mongering organization whose interlock with the Carter Administration is most dramatically indicated by Carter's energy chief James Schlesinger's initiating role in the CPD. No surprise, *Freedom at Issue* has recently run an article on the "Soviet threat" and "Soviet imperialism," by CPD leader Eugene Rostow.

The Commission On The CSCE

The center of "human rights" organizing on Capitol Hill is the Commission on the CSCE, formed of six Senators and six Representatives in 1976. Its leading lights include Rep. Millicent Fenwick (R-NJ), the aristocratic representative from New Jersey's wealthiest district; Sen. Clifford Case (D-NJ), a former Wall Street lawyer whose background includes branch work in the Ford Foundation; and Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-RI), scion of a Rooseveltian Democratic Party family and board member of the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) think-tank.

The Commission will hold hearings in Washington this month to air testimony on human rights by witnesses ranging from Cyrus Vance to Vladimir Bukovskii, the recently exiled Soviet dissident tried in the USSR for organizing armed bands.

Not confined to the U.S., the Commission has sent delegations abroad for liaison with European centers of dissident control. In November 1976, a delegation including Fenwick, Pell, Rep. Jonathan Bingham (D-NY), Rep. Paul Simon (D-IL), and Rep. Dante Fascell (D-FL) visited 20 countries. Their contacts included:

- European correspondents for the *New York Times*, *Associated Press*, *Washington Post*, and *United Press International*;
- Soviet exiled and emigré dissidents including right-wing self-styled prophet Andrei Amalrik and Andrei Sakharov's friend Viktor Sparre;
- NATO Secretary General Joseph Juns;
- Long-time subversion specialist Richard Loewenthal, who was a guest professor at Zbigniew Brzezinski's Russian Institute at Columbia University in 1976;
- Social Democrat leaders Bruno Kreisky (Austria) and Olaf Palme (Sweden);
- Officials and programmers for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, the traditional CIA-funded mouthpieces for destabilization propaganda broadcast from the West into Eastern Europe;

— Numerous nationality-centered emigré groups based in Western Europe;

— Specialists in Soviet Jewry from Zionist organizations, including the hard-core Rockefeller organization, the American Jewish Committee, which leads the field with a history of profiling for social control and propaganda purposes

Commission staffers also stress the body's contacts with the Federation of American Scientists (see "The Sakharov Case") and the World Council of Churches, an important conduit of funds from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Rockefeller Family Fund, the Russell Sage Foundation and the Stern Family Fund.

The Commission's February hearings also promise to introduce as witnesses Soviet Jewish emigrés who have been stuck in Rome for up to three years, supported by the Hebrew Immigration Aid Society (HIAS — also contacted by the Commission delegation in November), and waiting for visas to enter the U.S. It is no small irony that these people, seduced and abandoned by U.S.-based recruiters of prospective Soviet Jewish emigrés, may get their long-awaited visas for the express purpose of testifying in Congress for maximum propagandistic exploitation.

"Left" Meets "Right" As West Meets East

The operational coordinators of the current dissent in the Eastern European countries are to be found at national-language emigré magazines printed in Western Europe to circulate in the East. These journals operate with substantial backing from and coordination with both "right" CIA fronts like Radio Free Europe, and "left" intelligence countergangs such as Jean Paul Sartre's *Liberation*, the Trotskyist Mandel 4th International groups, and those sections of the Social Democratic 2nd International which are subservient to Rockefeller interests.

The magazines specialize in obtaining, publishing, and on occasion authoring writings which appear over the signatures of the dissidents of the hour. Two of the Polish journals, *Paris Kultura* and *Uppsals* (Sweden) *Aneks*, took the opportunity recently to carry articles by Zbigniew Brzezinski — "America in a Hostile World" and "International Relations: Conflict and Change."

In the summer of 1976, *Kultura* sponsored a meeting in Paris which brought together the editors of *Balt-Press* (Lithuanian), *Svedectvs* (Czech), *Kontinent* (Russian), *Suchanist* (Ukrainian), and *Irodalmi Ujsag* (Hungarian), with attendance from Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, all of the above-mentioned supportive tendencies, and observers from the major Western European press. This was a planning session for the human rights campaign that has been unfolding since then.

The keynote speaker, Polish Leszek Kolakowski (see dossier below), declared rightly enough that the capability for attempting takeovers in Eastern Europe such as Czechoslovakia in 1968 no longer existed. His alternative recommendation conformed to the Carter Administration's line today: it is still possible to carry out fruitful subversion, he said, by appealing directly to the public on human rights and using international agreements such as the CSCE to trip up the Eastern

European governments. This cemented the subsequent emergence of "Charter 77" — a document alleging Czechoslovak violations of the Helsinki accords (and which several signers have averred they were not shown in full before signing), and play-up of a Moscow committee to "monitor" Helsinki.

The USSR dissidents have a carefully cultivated image of political neutrality — neither "left" nor "right"; if anything, it is one of the delights of the Western correspondents who write on this to emphasize that dissent runs the gamut from Alexander Solzhenitsyn's "visionary" Russian Orthodoxy to "humanist socialism" of the Euro-communist breed. It is instructive, however, to observe where the dissenters gravitate when they emigrate or are expelled from the Soviet Union. Solzhenitsyn, most recently, has collaborated in a nationally distributed American Security Council-AFL-CIO film retailing the Committee on the Present Danger's line about Soviet intentions to inflict a nuclear first strike on the U.S., from sheer aggressivity. Vladimir Bukovskii, expelled in exchange for Chilean communist Luis Corvalan, appeared last week on a platform in London with representatives of the British National Association for Freedom (currently involved in attempts to Watergate the Callaghan government), CIA-linked Brian Crozier of the Institute for the Study of Conflict, and the anti-détente Tory leader Margaret Thatcher.

Now out of the Soviet Union, Solzhenitsyn continues to service the star dissenters by shipping them funds. Dissident Aleksander Ginzburg has just revealed that Solzhenitsyn sent in over \$350,000 in the past two years.

Freedom House Director Sussman Outlines Hopes For Dissidents

The following are excerpts from an interview with Leonard Sussman, the director of Freedom House.

Q: Mr. Sussman, are the human rights efforts here and in Eastern Europe futile based on past actions?

Sussman: The effort is very serious and long overdue as an important aspect of U.S. foreign policy. It is a welcome change from the policies of Henry Kissinger. If we do nothing else, we have to make the Helsinki accords work. It is of no use for this country to make military concessions to the Soviet Union, as we have, without having them reciprocate by relaxing repression.

Q: Then the dissident movement in Eastern Europe is building momentum and is not simply reflective of increased attention in the U.S. press.

Sussman: Oh yes, definitely. It varies from country to country depending on the amount of repression and police measures in each. The most repressive countries show the least dissent, obviously. All the indications we have point to increased dissent activity all over the world. The really promising country is Poland, however. Poland is the loosest on restrictions and is the area of the most activity. Why, over last summer there were riots in Poland and a (deputy—ed.) prime minister was over-

thrown because of them. The Soviets backed down immediately by rescinding the price rises which caused the riots, so that the situation didn't get too far out of hand. But the spirit is there, in Poland, that discontent is still brewing.

The TASS response to the Sakharov affair of last week is all part of a game. They are trying to make the Helsinki accords into a one sided affair while we are trying to make it a symmetrical agreement. They take an indignant stand publicly for diplomatic reasons just like we make strong statements the other way. The real bargaining will go on at the SALT talks and the Helsinki meeting in Belgrade. We've got to make the Helsinki accord an East-West affair, and that means the Soviets must concede on basket III (the human rights issue —ed.).

Kissinger was the exact opposite. I welcome the Carter administration's approach to the problem. While Kissinger wanted to keep the issue on the back burner and play very low key, Vance is acting admirably by encouraging voluntary activity and giving that activity and giving that activity governmental backing.

Q: Is there any reason at this time to go slow in pushing the campaign for fear of provoking a Soviet response?

Sussman: We've got to push as hard as we can. History shows that whenever we have not put the human rights question out front, the Soviets have gained ground in their struggle. We have to take an ever firmer stand on the question and give as much strength as we can to the dissidents.

You know the Soviets view detente as simply a relaxation of military tensions. They have no compunctions about demanding military concessions while cracking down ever harder on their populations. Ideological struggle does not come under their definition of detente. The harder we push on the compliance with Helsinki, the more strength we have, and greater strength we give those yearning for freedom around the world. The ideological struggle will continue! And the Soviets had better be prepared to make concessions on the human rights issues or else they won't get any military agreements. Secretary of State Vance stated that policy very admirably when he said, "We will push the point without being provocative." That doesn't necessarily mean a great intensity in the cold war. I think you'll find George Kennan expressing the same views, and you certainly wouldn't call him a cold warrior. We simply tend to gain a firmer stand and put the Soviets in a more defensive posture the more the human rights issue is brought up.

Q: How does the message of human rights activists in this country get over to Eastern Europe?

Sussman: First and foremost are the radio networks, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, but outside of that there exists a well organized campaign of international telephone calls going into the east bloc. Human rights leaders in this country are continuously on the phone with human rights leaders there and communicate everything that is going on here. That information is then put out on the underground networks through the Samizdat newspaper and other aspects of the dissident movement. The typewriters and mimeograph machines have been very busy in Eastern Europe lately.

Kohler Of The CPD: 'Human Rights'

—SALT Link Tricky

The following are excerpts of an interview with Dr. Foy Kohler, former ambassador to the Soviet Union during the Kennedy administration. Dr. Kohler is currently the co-director of the Miami University Center for Advanced International Studies and member of the Committee on the Present Danger.

Q: What is the relationship between arms treaties and the human rights question, and to what extent can the Soviets be pushed on the human rights question before they take some other tack of action?

Kohler: One can't plan too far ahead on these things. We are carefully looking for signs in the Soviet press of what their reactions are to all sorts of things. There have been two main areas of concentration which the Soviet Union has been pressing.

The first area is arms talks. There is no doubt about the fact that they badly want a SALT II agreement based squarely on the Vladivostock accords as they now stand. They would be happy to have the accords signed untouched. I have a strong suspicion that President Carter would like to do the same thing, but I doubt that he'll get away with it because the Senate must approve the treaty first. The Senate are a hard nosed bunch on military questions. My own views on this is that what will be signed will be an unsubstantial piece of paper with any

issues of substance or value left out simply to get the signatures affixed. The overall numbers limit of Vladivostock would be adhered to but not much else.

The second area which a great deal of attention has been paid to is human rights, with the Soviets taking an extremely defensive position. They have had a tremendous campaign of protecting themselves from charges of repression from the west. They say that the U.S. is violating the policies of non-interference and that the U.S. is meddling in the affairs of foreign countries. There are constant attacks on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. The administration could conceivably try to link the arms control package with the SALT or other military agreements — this has been done in the past — but I don't think it would be very effective in that it would tend to impede both types of treaties.

Q: What about a tripwire conception? Is it possible to push the Soviets too far on this question and force a reaction, I'm thinking specifically of Prague, 1968.

Kohler: There is no chance for another Prague. The Soviets would never let it happen. Czechoslovakia is a strong state and I'm sure that there is collaboration with Soviet police to keep whatever dissent there is very controlled. They will essentially get away with anything they can. There are subtleties and shifts from country to country but the East bloc governments are in full control. There are some additional incidents which we don't hear about here but by and large there is nothing outside the realm of police control which could get out of hand. What you read in the Western press contains a good deal of the total dissident activity. The Soviets are not about to let any more large scale embarrassing incidents happen.

The Sakharov Case

The following is excerpted from a feature article by Dr. Morris Levitt which appeared under the title "The Sakharov Case" in New Solidarity Vol. VI No. 64, Nov. 3, 1975. It was written soon after Sakharov was presented the Nobel Peace Prize.

The Soviet dissenters movement which Sakharov purportedly represents is a hoax. No such group exists as an actual Soviet social formation. A handful of pathetic individuals is being manipulated by Anglo-American intelligence circles primarily for the purpose of demoralizing Western scientists and intellectuals about the prospects for the further development of human progress.

In themselves these people, Sakharov included, are entirely unimportant both with respect to their immediate collective impact on Soviet society and their long-term influence on world events. The sophisticated agent operation which sustains their performance, however, can be traced to Fabian origins dating back more than 40 years ago.

The Anglo-American intelligence authorship and present control of the Sakharov swindle is best indicated

by reporting that in 1973 Sakharov signed something known as Humanist Manifesto II.

The Manifesto was authored by Paul Kurtz, a former U.S. Air Force Intelligence Officer who is now a philosophy professor at the University of Buffalo. Kurtz is the prize pupil of Sidney Hook, the chief academic redbaiter of the 1950s McCarthy witchhunt period. During the 1960s and 1970s, the Kurtz-Hook University Committees for a Rational Alternative played right-wing intellectual cops, maintaining "law and order" on U.S. and Western European campuses by purging genuine leftists and intellectuals.

The Bestialists

Hook and Kurtz publish a magazine, also called the *Humanist*. The magazine has awarded Sakharov the prize of "Humanist of the Year"; another so honored was B.F. Skinner, the psychologist who asserts that men have no minds. Racialists Arthur Jensen and William Shockley, both of whom attribute congenital intellectual inferiority to blacks, have published frequently in the *Humanist*, as has British quackademic H.J. Eysenck, most recently noted for efforts to prove the congenital