

card. But when it turns favorable for them, they can use this card against the other one. Every time—as they play NATO against the Warsaw Pact, playing Warsaw first against NATO. All the time, they play two cards at the same time.

Sneider: Do you think that, perhaps, in the minds of the Chinese, there are two countries in Asia that they must deal with as the obstacle to Chinese domination? And those two countries are Vietnam and India?

Thach: You are right.

Human rights not a 'technical' issue

Sneider: What do you think the significance was of Mrs. Gandhi's government's recognition of the Heng Samrin government in Phnom Penh?

Thach: We think it has a very great significance, because first it is the biggest country in the nonaligned movement, it is a founding father of the nonaligned movement. This is very important.

Secondly, India always had close relations with Kampuchea, long-time ties. Especially Buddhism, Brahminism and Hinduism had a great influence in Cambodia. This shows that this is a country that knows Cambodia very well [which] has recognized the new regime. . . .

Thirdly, the recognition by India of Cambodia has ethical aspects. The main ethics of Buddhism is the human being; there is no caste; there is no killing of any living creature. So this ethical aspect, the moral aspect of the Indian people, the Indian culture, of Indian civilization, is very important. This shows who is really for human rights and not for human rights.

The people who had dropped 50 million tons of bombs on our heads, they say that they are protecting human rights. It is a bluff. The second bluff—they say that they condemn Pol Pot but they must support the seating of Pol Pot because of a technical issue. What is technical? There is the technique of bombing—bombing is technical too. What is technical? Very, very immoral.

All of humanity has the responsibility to do justice for the three million people who died in Cambodia. We must have this responsibility to do justice and to condemn the criminals. We must have this responsibility as human beings. Secondly, we have a responsibility to help the resurrection of four million people who come from death to life now in Kampuchea. We have this responsibility.

It is not a question of seating or not seating. This could not help. All human beings, all humanity has this responsibility. . . . The gas chambers of Hitler also were very "technical." What is this? I think that everyone with common sense must be revolted, cannot accept the so-called logic of these people. We must revolt against it.

SOVIETOLOGY

An amazing air of unreality

by Edith Hassman and Webster Tarpley

Some 1,300 Kremlinologists and scholars of East European affairs gathered in Garmisch, West Germany the last week of September for the "Second World Congress of Soviet and East European Studies." These are the people whose studies and theories about the U.S.S.R. are supposed to assist governments in formulating policies toward Moscow and the other Warsaw Pact countries.

An aura of unreality hung over the Bavarian mountain setting. Discussion panels that omitted major components of Soviet policy revolved instead around geopolitical scenarios for the future disintegration of the Soviet bloc. The conference was, in short, shocking—not for the novelty of the presentations, many of which could be read in only slightly different prose on the op-ed pages of the *Times of London* or the *Washington Post*, but for the incompetence that reigned.

If the danger of war by strategic miscalculation comes in part from failure to understand how Warsaw Pact leaders think, the vagaries of this assembly of advisers on policy toward the Soviet Union give cause for alarm!

Convened while the aftershocks of the American Presidential Directive 59, on "counterforce" strategic doctrine and the feasibility of fighting limited nuclear wars, were still rumbling in Europe and the U.S.S.R., the Garmisch congress nevertheless omitted to schedule a panel on Soviet military doctrine or capability.

A three-hour panel on Soviet policy in Asia managed to isolate this topic from the question of China, which was not mentioned at all.

The workshop on energy proceeded from the assumption that the U.S.S.R. would be squeezed by an energy shortage in the years ahead. Prof. Robert Campbell of the University of Indiana, a specialist in fossil fuel resources who usually refrains from rash claims that the Russians are running out of fuel, brought his presentation into line with this idea by way of a peculiar forecast: because the Soviet plan to quintuple nuclear power generation by 1990 mandates "too high a concentration" of reactors in the Western part of the U.S.S.R., he said, "There will *have to be* a nuclear catastrophe within the next 10 years!"

The primary topic in a panel on Soviet planning and economic policy was not the 1981-1985 Five Year Plan,

now being drafted, but the black market and so-called parallel economy dominated by graft and side transactions. Making this secondary, although important, aspect of Soviet economic relations the central one exposed the methodology of, especially, British Sovietology. Since the days of Bertrand Russell's 1920s profiles of Soviet Russia, these Russia-watchers have tried to gauge Soviet society by a modern application of the "pleasure principle" of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. What is the level of "material greed" of the population, they ask, and how may it be exploited?

Heinz Haushofer, the son of the geopolitician Karl Haushofer whose theories formed the backbone of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, succinctly put forward the rationale for this approach in Soviet studies when he spoke at the Garmisch panel on sociology. "To raise the question of what the people really want, what it is that makes them happy," he pronounced, "destroys any society, be it capitalist or socialist. This is the task of modern sociology." The more strictly "geopolitical" approach to destruction was broached during a review of nationalities problems in the U.S.S.R. One participant summed up the discussion, "The Soviet empire was not built in a day, and it will take more than a day to destroy it."

At issue were the potentials of Islamic fundamentalism and the national identity of Kazaks, Uzbeks, Crimean Tartars and other Soviet minorities for the destabilization and eventual dismemberment of the Soviet Union. This design of balkanization has been the core of British policy for Russia for 200 years, notwithstanding London University Prof. Hugh Seton-Watson's bizarre assertion at Garmisch that until the end of World War II Britain thought the Rhine River in Germany was the Eastern boundary of Europe. But after speeches on each of a dozen nationalities of the U.S.S.R., the deliberators could only conclude that they provide weak leverage today.

The celebrities of the Garmisch conference were emigrés from the Soviet Union, speaking on dissent in the U.S.S.R. Their utilization as authoritative sources on Soviet society has become a habit in the field of Soviet studies that introduces a bias guaranteed to distort the picture, as in the startling example of Richard Gabriel's recent book *The New Red Legions*, a purportedly objective field study of Soviet soldiers, in which the primary informants were Jewish emigrés from the U.S.S.R.

Genscher, Kennan speak

The prevailing scenario-mongering of the British and American Sovietologists obscured the contributions of some specialists from France, West Germany, India, and other countries whose governments to date have pursued a more measured policy of seeking to exploit the possibilities of economic and scientific cooperation with the U.S.S.R. and its allies. West German Foreign

Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher also introduced the continental West Europeans' independent approach to the Soviet bloc.

Opening the Garmisch conference, Genscher reviewed the perspective of Chancellor Helmut Schmidt's policy on relations with the Warsaw Pact, which was a central plank in Schmidt's platform for the West German elections set to occur the following week. Genscher called for a pan-European energy development conference, in which he said the nations of the less-developed sector should participate. Contradicting the preference of many conference participants, Genscher argued that economic stability in Eastern Europe was desirable for the West as much as for the East.

But Genscher, who, though Schmidt's government coalition partner, is more inclined to the Anglo-American conception of the Western alliance than Schmidt is, also introduced the idea of "conflict management." This notion, holding that international crises can be contained but not fundamentally resolved, belongs to the international grouping that currently seeks Soviet participation in carving out spheres of influence in a new, global "Yalta" agreement.

Seton-Watson, with a homily to the principle "love thine enemy," introduced former U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union George Kennan to expound the doctrine of détente through arms control. In the "new Yalta" scheme of things, arms control is the sister of spheres of influence in the attempt to recruit Moscow to a crisis management posture.

Kennan, arguing that the arms race leads to war of its own momentum, entered a plea for a "chorus of outside voices" to say to Moscow and Washington, "For the love of God, stop this madness."

His speech was received as a bid for the initiative on the part of the American SALT lobby, for which Kennan has become an elder statesman, speaking out from his chair at the Princeton Institute for Advanced Studies.

Kennan revealed what the goal of a new global condominium of the superpowers would be, beyond the slogans of "arms control." The proper direction for Soviet-American joint efforts, he said, was environmentalism on a world scale, to defend individual "quality of life" against the encroachments of "great industrial societies" and "the artificial environment that modern technology has created."

This elaboration by Kennan of where superpower agreement is supposed to lead exposes how his policy will fall apart. The U.S.S.R. may go some distance playing geopolitics in the underdeveloped sector, but a world deindustrialization perspective that encompasses the deindustrialization of the Soviet Union itself will run up against the Soviet conception of national security. That will be the end of the game.