

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

inferiority of workers.

In signing the Humanist Manifesto II, Sakharov was joined by Eysenck, Skinner, zero-growth science-fiction writer Isaac Asimov, and food-control specialist Lester Brown. Soviet emigré Alexander Volpin, a mathematical logician, and Yugoslav Svetozar Stojanovic, Philosophy Professor at Belgrade University were the only other non-U.S.-British signers.

The basic propositions of the manifesto dovetail with so-called "convergence theory," essentially the notion that the Soviet Union and Western capitalist countries have gradually been growing more alike in their basic institutions and policies.

There is nothing essentially new in this classic-collaborationist "evolutionary" approach — indeed it was pioneered under Humanist Manifesto I which appeared in 1935 under the imprimatur of America's leading "pragmatic" philosopher, John Dewey, at a time when Kurtz's present close collaborator, Sidney Hook, was a budding "Marxist" luminary on the basis of his plagiarized rendition of British Fabian Society agent Karl Korsch's "synthesis" of Marx and existentialism. In no major feature did the original Manifesto deviate from the moral philosophy of Mussolini.

According to Dewey and his fellow "humanists," 1933 was a year of unrivalled scientific achievements ushering in a "deeper appreciation of brotherhood." Therefore, the time had come for discarding old forms of universalizing religion and constructing a secular religion providing fulfillment in the "here and now." First, one had to learn to "face crises in terms of their naturalness and probability." Then "reasonable and manly attitudes will be fostered by education and supported by custom," and "social and mental hygiene ...discourage sentimental and unreal hopes and wishful thinking" — like eliminating the capitalist financier class. Finally, Dewey's minions incanted, a new religion which permits "joy in living" will usher in the "quest for the good life" in "a social and cooperative order" which "must replace profit motivated society."

Sidney Spills The Beans

If Sakharov's well-known fantasies about the "convergence" of the U.S. and Soviet systems did not arise from any organic ferment to *that* end within the Soviet Union, what then was their origin? A recent interview with veteran agent Hook, as well as other extant sources, provides a partial, but generally satisfactory answer. When asked for sources of information on the Sakharov case, Hook — reached by a reliable source at his office in the CIA think tank Hoover Institute — recommended getting in touch with the New York branch of the International League for the Rights for Man, the umbrella for the Sakharov-Solzhenitsyn operation in Moscow. Hook also mentioned I.I. Rabi, a retired Nobel Laureate physicist who was close to J. Robert Oppenheimer and instrumental in the Pugwash Conference meetings between Soviet and U.S. scientists. The reference to Pugwash, a series of secluded meetings between presumably pro-détente, anti-nuclear war Soviet and American scientists, indicates the conjunctural conditions under which Anglo-American intelligence operatives anticipated the "capture" of a least some well-known Soviet scientist, and for which there is em-

pirical evidence in the Sakharov case.

From the time of the development of the Soviet atomic (fission) and hydrogen (fission-fusion) bombs, U.S. policymakers sought in vain for some military-psychological stance that would permit a non-suicidal military confrontation with the Soviet Union. The first generalized social "movement" aimed at undermining Soviet nuclear resolve, or failing that, at recruiting politically weak Soviets as the predictable "fall-out", was the Anglo-American "Ban the Bomb" operation. This was the brainchild of British Labour Party psychological warfare expert Richard Crossman. The up-front man was Fabian pacifist Bertrand Russell who earlier in the postwar period had called for a U.S. nuclear attack on the Soviets.

Ban The Bomb

The anti-Bomb movement created a milieu, by "leaking" information and stressing the dangers of radioactive fallout, in which there appeared to naive persons to be an *equivalency* between the U.S. and Soviet Union in terms of the threat they represented to the rest of the world, and an apparent *symmetry* in terms of their geo-political aspirations with respect to each other. The Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy — SANE — was the principal U.S. analog of the British group.

The Ban the Bomb Movement combined with the period of adjustment in the Soviet Union after the 1956 Twentieth Party Congress denunciation of Stalin, set the stage for the more specific conjuncture in the early 1960s out of which Sakharov began his career as a professional dissenter. The effect, however, of the late 1950s is reflected in Sakharov's comments in his autobiographical *Sakharov Speaks*: "Beginning in 1957 (not without the influence of statements on this subject made throughout the world by such people as Albert Schweitzer, Linus Pauling, and others), I felt myself responsible for the problem of radioactive contamination from nuclear explosions."

When the Kennedy Administration came to power in 1960, the entire nuclear weapons was destabilized, not only by Kennedy's demagogic campaign around the fictional "missile gap," but more importantly by Secretary of Defense McNamara's experimentation with strategies of "controlled and flexible" nuclear warfare. In June 1972 McNamara declared the U.S. was developing "first strike" capability against the Soviets. The McNamara scenario "mix" ranging from first strike to limited tactical warfare, sufficiently destabilized the strategic environment that a new round of missile and warhead development and testing ensued.

If Sakharov's memoirs are to be believed, he was this whole period as a series of mere bureaucratic "power politics" moves by Krushchev.

Sakharov Remembers

"I remember that in the summer of 1961 there was a meeting between atomic scientists and the chairman of the Council of Ministers, Krushchev," writes Sakharov. "It turned out that we were to prepare for a series of tests that would bolster up the new policy of the USSR on the German question (the Berlin wall). I wrote a note to Krushchev, saying, 'To resume tests after a three-year moratorium would undermine the talks on banning tests

and on disarmament, and would lead to a new round in the armaments race — especially in the sphere of intercontinental missiles and anti-missile defense.’ ”

In the year of the Cuban Missile Crisis Sakharov wrote, “...Another and no less dramatic episode occurred in 1962. The Ministry, acting basically from bureaucratic interests, issued instructions to proceed with a routine test explosion that was actually useless from the technical point of view...Realizing the unjustifiable, criminal nature of this plan, I made desperate efforts to stop it....”

Sakharov, if his statements are taken at face value, had capitulated to the issuance of Soviet “inflexibility” programmed into the CIA arms escalation-limitation policy.

Ironically, scientists such as Sakharov had already begun to play a role within Soviet society, which, in conjunction with the breakdown crisis of capitalism and the reawakening of international working class forces, could provide the sensuous knowledge of changing the world that had certainly been tragically limited or absent during the period of Stalin and the disarray or destruction of the Western working class.

In the 1940s Sakharov, a brilliant student, studied under one of the leading all-round Soviet physicists, Igor Tamm. He and Tamm then worked on the development of the Soviet H-Bomb and on the origins of the technology of controlled fusion. In 1950 the team laid the basis for Soviet theoretical work in the fusion field, which led into many subsequent ground-breaking Soviet developments in fusion.

In addition to being able to take the widest possible initiatives in science, Sakharov also took up successfully substantive issues of science and social policy, fighting against the dilution of education by proposed job training in high schools in the late 1950s, and against the reintroduction of Lysenkoism in biology in the early 1960s. Yet, by 1966, Sakharov abandoned these forms of intervention that are coherent with a meaningful concept of freedom and human development and lent himself to the intended artificial “polarization” of Soviet intelligentsia around the trial of “dissident” writers, Sinyavsky and Daniel.

‘All Rolled Into One’

From that period, Sakharov also apparently abandoned the task-orientation of fundamental theoretical fusion studies to embark on scientific work which by 1969 had led him to the fashionably esoteric but epistemologically ridiculous notion of a cosmological sea of anti-quark particles. The state to which Sakharov had reduced himself by latching onto all the worst features of reductionism in political and scientific thought was caputred with unintended irony by New York Times Kremlinologist Harrison Salisbury, in introducing the 1968 publication of Sakharov’s *Progress, Coexistence, and Intellectual freedom* in the *Times*. To Salisbury, Sakharov had become the whole gallery of Anglo-American-intelligence-controlled U.S. atomic physicists, “Oppenheimer, Teller, and Hans Bethe all rolled into one.”

This marked full circle for the spread of Humanist rot from the infamous 1933 Manifesto, as Sakharov’s “philosophical” work had been self-admittedly motivated by his real or postured fear that “the *division* of mankind threatens it with destruction.” (Emphasis added). His answer? Dissolve all differences in a com-

mon “human” structure and value system “beyond” capitalism and socialism.

This final consolidation of Sakharov as a defacto agent was not suprisingly also characterized by a proliferation of symptomatic intelligence contacts. His second wife, whom he married in 1970, was Yelena Bonner, an activist in dissident and Zionist circles. Her nephew, Eduard Kuznetsov, was among a group charged with attempting to hijack a plane in Leningrad to fly to Israel. In 1970, Sakharov sent messages to Presidents Podgorny and Nixon asking for clemency for the Zionist hijackers and Angela Davis.

By the 1970s Sakharov was plugged into other CIA cover operations such as Amnesty International, tied to Cambridge anti-Soviet operative Noam Chomsky of MIT which has continuously tried to set up a “local” in Moscow.

Media controlled by Sweden’s Olof Palme have also served as a continous conduit for Sakharov’s stylish pessimism. Even the left-CIA factional opposition to nuclear “chicken” games, best exemplified by the Federation of American Scientists (FAS), controlled by Director Jeremy Stone and CIA physicist Hans Bethe, consistently uses Sakharov to stake out its own claim to the anti-Soviet “convergence” turf.

In the Soviet Union itself, the Sakharov operation has gone nowhere. In a fit of candor in the January 1973 issue of the *Humanist*, Volpin admitted the total artificiality and definitive outside control of the highly touted Soviet dissidents movement. After reviewing the “highlights” of dissident activism, which included the gathering of liberals in defense of the Soviet Constitution in Pushkin Square in December, 1965, the founding of the Chronicle of Current Events in 1968, the setting up of the Initiative Group for the Defense of the Rights of Man in 1969, and the penultimate Moscow Human Rights Committee in 1970, Volpin let a few white cats out of the bag.

The total number of activists was never more than a handful of physicists, and literary figures led by the morbid mystic Solzhenitsyn. Most of their activity was directed at and mediated by foreign journalists and journals (*Humanist*, of course) because, by Volpin’s own testimony, there was hardly any Soviet audience for their work. In fact, by 1973, Volpin could comment from the “safety” of the U.S. that “it is evident that there are insufficient forces for further development of the struggle, that the struggle is near extinction and no new forces are visible. Only Zionists (since they receive help from Zionists abroad) and such known members of the Moscow Human Rights Committee as Sakharov...and the writer Solzhenitsyn are in a relatively favorable situation. I do not wish to say that this movement is ending, but I foresee a pause for several years in its activities with only the strong support of known Western cultural figures preventing this pause.”

There never was a significant indigenous dissidents movement during the late 1960s and 1970s! The “celebrities” that could be generated were conceived by themselves and the CIA as merely the focal points for an outside “juridical” movement to raise the issue of Soviet conformity to the International Covenants on Human Rights, to which it was a signatory. According to Volpin, the liberals had no program other than institutionalizing the right to any form of “dissent,” and then perhaps to form parties around different forms of dissent.

Dossiers in Brief: Czechoslovakia

The 1968 operation against Czechoslovakia known as "Prague Spring" was coordinated personally by Zbigniew Brzezinski. He travelled to Prague to give the insurgents their marching orders, announcing in June of that year that "we in New York welcome these events, and feel that this is a good thing, because the old values are actually being realized in a new form."

The heart of Brzezinski's operation was the rapid consolidation of control over the communications media by his agents. Starting with the 4th Congress of the Writers' Union in the summer of 1967 (keynoted by dissident Ludvik Vaculik, see below) the media became a powerful weapon against the Communist Party and State. President Novotny and other leaders were Watergated out of office. A witchhunt atmosphere developed, as the press built scandal upon scandal. "The media began to assume an uncontrollable power," said a Communist Party statement after it was all over. Even the book *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence*, by "ex-CIA agents Marchetti and Marx, references "a couple of ... public media projects ... such as the fall of Novotny in Czechoslovakia" which had "proven of value" to the CIA.

"Charter 77"

The core of today's grouping is composed of agents who did not leave after the Warsaw Pact invasion, including:

Ludvik Vaculik, who launched "Prague Spring" with his speech to the Writers' Congress, declaring that "not one human problem has been solved in the last 20 year" in Czechoslovakia. This provocative declaration led to Vaculik's expulsion from the Communist Party, which in turn provided the pretext for the media to raise an uproar about "persecution" by the Party leadership. Nearly a year later, in June 1968, it was Vaculik's notorious "2,000 Words" manifesto which proved the last straw for the Soviet Union, convincing the Soviet leadership that the situation in Czechoslovakia had gone dangerously out of control and that military intervention would be the only way to prevent the restoration of capitalism in that country. Vaculik's document was counterrevolutionary call to arms. He urged a final vigilante onslaught against what remained of the authority of the Party and Government: "Let us demand the resignation of people who have misused their power... We must find ways and means to induce them to resign, for instance, through public criticism, resolutions, demonstrations... strikes and boycotts... Let us organize our own monitoring service at meetings. If we hear strange news, let us check on it, let us send delegations to the people concerned, and nail their replies to the gates if need be." Vaculik provocatively called on his countrymen to be ready to take up arms against the Soviet Union, saying that if "foreign forces interfere with our internal development... We can assure our government that we will back it — with weapons if necessary — as long as it does what we give it the mandate to do."

Vaclav Havel, a playwright, was in 1968 a member of the well-funded organization KAN, "The Club of Committed Non-Party People." Its stated aim was the re-establishment of a multi-party system in Czechoslovakia, an end to Communist rule. Havel demanded "swift political actions by the liberals," while a colleague proclaimed: "Today we are a club; tomorrow we shall be a force! And the day after tomorrow we shall be equal to the Communists." The Soviet literary magazine *Literaturnaya Gazeta* sharply attacked Havel, pointing out his usefulness to imperialist intelligence and subversion agencies.

Havel was arrested Jan. 17 of this year and has been charged with subversion.

Jiri Hajek — the Foreign Minister in the government of Alexander Dubcek, which replaced the Novotny government. Hajek had been a member of the Social Democratic Party before World War II, and when the Social Democrats dissolved into the Communist Party in 1948, he and many others joined up. Many of them became an important part of the "reformist" (agent-controlled) current during Prague Spring. The Social Democrats, with KAN and others, were pushing to re-establish an opposition party which would ultimately replace the Communists.

Dossiers in Brief: Poland

During Prague Spring in Czechoslovakia, Brzezinski's circles had high hopes for parallel developments in Poland. A protest movement did emerge, involving students and professors who already had liaison with the emigré magazines and Fourth International publishing outlets, in particular. The Polish operation did not jell, but it intersected factional antagonisms in the Polish leadership and helped touch off an extensive destabilizing shake-up and purge of the Polish Communist Party in 1968-69. The prominent figures of the 1968 university movement, which shared slogans with its Czech counterparts, are in the news again today as members of the "Workers' Defense Committee" (WDC) or its overseas contacts and advocates.

When these people talk about opposition in Poland, their point of reference is 1968, not 1970 when the Gomulka regime was actually toppled in Poland. Although the 1968 crowd cheered during the December 1970 crisis, its direct trigger was a necessary but sudden retail price hike. This is why Freedom House is so excited about prospects for destabilization in Poland: the incidents of looting which led to arrests of the people who have now been adopted for defense by the WDC also occurred right after a price hike, one tentatively announced in June 1976 and most directly due to Poland's attempts to maintain payments on its debts to Western banks. A fusion of "1968" and "1970" in Poland is today's WDC aim.

Leszek Kolakowski (Oxford, All Souls' College), who in Dec. 1976 issued a manifesto from London warning of an "explosion" in Poland if open opposition is not permitted,

was a central dissident for nearly two decades starting with the CIA's "Polish October" in 1956. Polish authorities have repeatedly charged him of having contact with Zbigniew Brzezinski in that period.

In the 1960s he helped organize and defend a number of dissent documents from Polish writers, which culminated in an indictment of the government in a speech he gave in October 1966. Author of such works as *Marxism and Beyond* — a "socialist humanist" argument — Kolakowski was on hand at the key Writers' Union meetings in Warsaw in March 1968 which solidarized with the Czech Writers' Union, already won by Brzezinski's proteges. He left Poland in 1969.

Wlodmierz Brus (Oxford, All Souls College) was a colleague of Kolakowski at Warsaw U., as now. A reform economist, Brus was cited by the Czech Ota Sik as inspiration for his *Plan and Market Under Socialism*, the manual for economic policies of the Prague Spring regime. Today he joins Kolakowski in "manifesto" and support work for the WDC.

Of the 20-odd members of the WDC, these few are most prominent and active:

Adam Michnik, a 30 year old historian, was a dissident whiz-kid in the 1960s, associated with Kolakowski. He now serves as liaison between the WDC and its foreign support; he travelled to the Paris *Kultura* meeting in 1976 and then spent several weeks with Kolakowski and Brus in London.

Jacek Kuron was co-author of a 1965 "Open Letter to the Party," an incompetent indictment of Polish society as "state capitalist," which was published in Europe by Trotskyist groups. Kolakowski vigorously supported him then, as now.

Edward Lipinski, an octogenarian economist and former member of the pre-war Polish Socialist Party, has been a dissenter for over two decades. He toured the United States in 1976 to raise funds for the WDC among Polish-American groups, and authored a new economic critique of Poland which was published by the London-based Polish social democratic paper *Robotnik* and Freedom House's *Freedom at Issue*. New York Times dissident-follower Flora Lewis was received by Lipinski during her January 1977 trip to Warsaw.