

straight coverage to Schlesinger's call for dictatorial control over energy flow, *Pravda* illustrated the U.S. plight by quoting "the Governor of West Virginia" (whose name is John D. Rockefeller IV, although *Pravda* did not so inform its readership). Said the junior Rockefeller, "We have a plan in case of nuclear war, but when the fuel runs out nobody knows what to do."

#### *Czech Press Stands Firm*

The Czechoslovak press has recently served as an outlet for the views of those hardliners in Eastern Europe who have not been driven into a paranoid profile, and are pushing for an aggressive political orientation, to make the transfer ruble the basis for a new world monetary system. A rapid-fire series of commentaries in the daily *Rude Pravo* this week departed sharply from both the "hard" and "soft" line in the Soviet press.

\*\*\*Attacking Carter's "human rights" crusade, *Rude Pravo* underlined that this is "an indispensable part of its

foreign policy." Western Europeans, the paper said, are being "driven into desperation" by Carter's provocations. The Soviets — and especially Arbatov — have suggested that the human rights tactic is an unfortunate diversion forced on Carter. "Maybe (Carter) has not studied the whole situation, and especially how it looks to us," said Arbatov to *U.S. News and World Report*.

\*\*\*On the eve of the French elections, *Rude Pravo* denounced the Atlanticist head of the French Socialist Party (PSF), François Mitterrand, for his part in the "human rights" campaign. Mitterrand should know what repression means, since he served as Justice Minister in Paris when the government launched the bloody war in Algeria, said *Rude Pravo*. The Soviet press, by contrast, has dished out undifferentiated praise for the "Union of the Left" between the PSF and the French Communist Party.

\*\*\**Rude Pravo* ran the first major attack in any East European paper on U.S. "sabotage" of the nuclear reactor deal between West Germany and Brazil.

## Arbatov Lauds Brookings' 'New Strategic Conception'

*Soviet Academician G. Arbatov reviewed The Dynamics of Detente — How to End the Arms Race, by Arthur M. Cox (New York, Norton and Co. 1976) in the March 13 Izvestia. The review, which is excerpted below was titled "From a Position of Realism."*

All those who follow the American political literature cannot help but observe one obvious paradox. The real political shifts of recent years, the turn toward detente, the improvement of Soviet-American relations, the prospects for limiting armaments opened up by the new situation — all of this has a rather strange reflection in many books (and articles). It could even be called a reflection in *camera obscura*, where the real object is seen upside down....

Against this background, the lesser number of works written from positions of realism attract particular attention. The more so since a significant part of them — and this is the other paradox — come from the pens of people who are veteran American politicians, people who held distinguished offices when the "cold war" began and gathered strength. They know their subject very well, and even if sometimes their views are colored by personal connections with many events of the past, still their voices demand to be heard. For these are essentially voices warning that history has shown the complete futility of the political recipes now proposed by the opponents of detente.

Among works of this sort is the book by Arthur Cox, *The Dynamics of Detente — How to End the Arms Race*. Its author began his career in the "Marshall Plan" Administration, served in the State Department and the White House apparatus under President Truman, and worked in the Central Intelligence Agency. He resigned

and then became a fellow of the well-known research center, the Brookings Institution. His book is not only the fruit of an office researcher's creativity, but also a generalization from political experience, which in Cox's case was simultaneously the experience of life.

This is a book with a thoroughly defined central theme. Namely, that only the policy of detente is rational today, and the core of this policy is reducing the arms race, and disarmament....

The author of the book absolutely accurately identifies the root of the problem: the striving of U.S. militaristic and military-industrial circles for military superiority.

It is important that Cox, not stopping here, reveals the full danger of such a course from the standpoint of American national interests. He indicates especially that the achievement of practically meaningful nuclear superiority (that is to say, superiority that can be "realized" in policy) is simply not achievable in our day, and the only thing that such efforts lead to is the continuation of the arms race. No less important, in the opinion of Cox, is that the striving for superiority and the arms race that it caused not only do not strengthen U.S. national security but, on the contrary, undermine it.

These considerations lead the author of the book to a quite definite conclusion: "What is needed in this situation is a new strategic conception, a completely new view of our role in the world — a new foreign policy, which will also define the basic directions of defense policy. The time has come for the USA to turn towards creative leadership and to throw off mistaken and fabricated fears which stifled our foreign policy for so long...."

He has no doubt that the Soviet Union, its leadership, are sincere in their desire to deepen detente and limit the

arms race.... "The arms race," Cox writes, "will end when the U.S. decides to end it."

Cox fully realizes the sharpness of the struggle around detente and limitation of the arms race which is presently raging in the U.S....In this chapter, there is a detailed list of the main forces and groups who are opposed to detente. The list begins, absolutely justly, with the military-industrial complex. Cox describes in detail the close ties and dependence between the Pentagon and over 11,000 industrial companies and research centers, and relates the channels of influence on policy of the alliance of the militaristic clique with the military business....In this list, finally, are the leaders of extreme reaction (basically representing the right-wing of the Republican Party), and reactionary organizations....

Cox does not conceal his political sympathies and antipathies. He has long been a Democratic supporter, and many of his criticism are directed against the

Republican administration and Republican politicians. It was that much easier to do so at the time, since the book was written while the Republicans were in power.

Now the Democrats have come to power. If the line of criticism set forth in Cox's book is projected forward, we can see that it has not lost its timeliness — whether on questions of the arms race or on the need to put an end to the policies of the "cold war." Concerning the latter, Cox devoted quite a few pages to criticism of attempts at pressure on the USSR to change the existing order and institutions (including the notorious question of "civil rights"). He does not conceal his sympathies with these goals, but he strongly disagrees with those who make detente, the weakening of tension, dependent on "fundamental changes in the Soviet system." Attempts to exert pressure on the USSR in this direction, according to the author of the book, not only do not produce results, but are also harmful for America itself....