

violated. Once inside, there was no doubt that this was a restaurant for the *Nomenklatura*. The Russians we saw there were not only rich, but flaunting how rich they were: The most expensive and exquisite clothing—yes, a fashion show, that would put the *schicki-mickis* of Germany to shame.

We had seen first-hand what the population curses as the “*spets class*” (*spets* is an abbreviation for “special”)—special as in special privileges; special restaurants; special food shops, while the ordinary people get by with no meat or fruit and vegetables; special hospitals with the latest equipment and medicines, while even aspirin is no longer available in the pharmacies; special holiday resorts, trips to the West; special dachas, and so on.

What communism has created is the worst, most despicable class society anywhere. The greatest contrast perhaps was the scene around the Hotel Rossiya, a fancy Moscow hotel for the native *Nomenklatura*. Nearby, almost in front of it, an encampment of Moscow’s homeless in self-erected plastic tents. The pensioners, invalids, and others who can no longer get by on low fixed incomes came to protest in the capital city. The old *babushka* holding a placard which read “Mikhail Gorbachov, We Are Awaiting Your Reply,” told us after finding out we were tourists from the Federal Republic of Germany: “Take pictures and show to the world outside how the system treats the old, poor, and unemployed.” Among the homeless was an unemployed factory worker with wife, child, and dog forced out into the rain and cold. By night that evening, the temperature had dropped to 10-12°C (50-53°F).

In every conversation, without exception, what struck us so much was the support for and happiness over Germany being united again as a nation. The Russian on the street sees this as his great hope. Mixed with this, as one Ukrainian patriot living in Moscow stressed, is the hope that the West will help the people, but not the system: “The West must make the kind of accords that allow the ideology to collapse, and not support it.” He continued: “The best thing was Reagan with the SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative]. That really scared them. The system is at the precipice. One of Reagan’s biggest mistakes was to stop it; he slowed it down too much. The SDI would have forced the system to fall. They need Western help, and we and the Baltic need sovereignty. That’s the mistake of the West, again in the Baltic. Support Baltic and Ukrainian independence, do not be afraid. Moscow needs the West.”

He was talking in the middle of a crowded room. We asked him: “Aren’t you afraid to talk so openly about bringing the system down?” His answer: “Why, everyone talks like this now. What can they do? Arrest 10, 20, 50 million?” He wasn’t exaggerating. As we saw in our days in Moscow, everyone talks like this.

A revolution is coming, and soon, unless things change. But the very scale on which they must change to prevent a revolution would itself amount to a revolution.

## Will Moscow legalize drugs?

by Muriel Mirak

Since the historic Kohl-Gorbachov talks in the Caucasus, most people both East and West have been trying to imagine what Russia will look like, once it has adopted Western technologies and modes of production. The center of debate in the West is the question of which type of Western economic policy the Soviets should follow: the Listian approach, which could replicate the process of rapid industrialization we went through in the last century; or the monetarist version, favored in London and Washington, which concentrates on “buying cheap and selling dear,” i.e., speculative profit per se.

It seems there are some even in Moscow who are toying with the latter alternative; in fact, one organization has come into being which is proposing the legalization of narcotics—the biggest profit maker which has the most devastating economic effect on both producer and consumer. Believe it or not, an international conference was held at the Moscow Institute for Historian-Archivists, to debate whether or not dope should become a legal product on the free market to be set up in Russia. According to a report appearing in the Soviet magazine *New Times* (No. 30, 1990), top names in the international legalization lobby, such as Arnold Trebach and Italy’s Sen. Lorenzo Strik Lievers, gave their audience, mainly composed of young people, the usual pitch on legalization: that prohibition, whether of alcohol or drugs, is the reason why narcotics prices are so high; that such immense profits make it impossible to dissuade the poor from pushing drugs; that law enforcement efforts are expensive and futile. Trebach, who is the president of the U.S. Drug Policy Foundation, which pushes for a drug-controlled police state, demagogically warned that “the imposition of harsher sentences for drug users . . . threatens to lead to the creation of a police state in the most democratic country in the West.”

Conclusion? Trebach and Lievers proposed that the Soviet Union legalize drugs, on the Dutch model, complete with free distribution of needles (to “deal with such frightening enemies as AIDS”), the breakup of organized crime, and the reduction of market prices. The two Western drug apologists also called for expanding one of the key lobbies in the West, the Radical Party, which has now become transnational.

And the Soviet response? According to Konstantin Isakov, writing for *New Times*, “So far some 260 Soviets have responded to the call, forming the active core of the party in the Soviet Union.” The article continues: “It is possible that the idea of the legalization of drugs is not all that bad. But

are we ready for such an experiment in the Soviet Union? Senator Lievers reasons in the following way: The Soviet Union for many years remained a closed society, outside of the drug trade. Now that it has begun to open up to the outside world, *it could become a colossal market for drug trafficking*. Drug addiction, stressed the Italian senator, should not impede the process of democracy in the Soviet Union. The 'war on drugs' in the American fashion could have such an adverse effect. *If the legalization of drugs came on the initiative of the Soviet government, it would have an enormous positive impact*" (emphasis added).

### The KGB and drugs

To understand what is behind this otherwise inexplicable event in Moscow, and the reportage appearing in an official Soviet magazine, consider a few facts.

It was the Soviet KGB, under Andropov, which in 1967 took over the controlling share in the illegal narcotics traffic, run up to that time by the British, the Chinese, and parts of the U.S. intelligence and financial elite. Detailed information on the Soviet role released by high-level defectors from Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, have since been confirmed in the revelations regarding East German Stasi (secret police) drug and terrorist operations, around such figures as Alexander Schalck-Golodkowski, Erich Honecker, and Markus Wolf. Further confirmation has been provided in breaking scandals around the CIA funding of similar operations run by the Masonic lodge P-2. The Iran-Contra case established down to the finest detail how the drugs were run from the American side. And all the pieces fit together, like a jigsaw puzzle, to compose the picture of the international narcotics cartel, stretching from the opium fields in China and the cocaine plantations in Peru, to the consumers throughout the world.

That most highly articulated, militarily protected structure, which turns over anywhere from \$600 billion to \$1 trillion a year, is now being threatened by the revolutionary developments sweeping Eastern Europe, developments which, by opening up a new era of productive growth and cultural progress, could wipe out the scourge of drugs. Such economic process would also threaten the fragile banking empire resting on dirty drug money. Politically, it would have the power to take on the drug mafia seriously, and dismantle its network, which consists not only of former communist rulers, but of many highly placed government officials still in the West.

Therefore, it should come as no surprise that the drug mafia would seek to keep its monetary and political clout, by turning the newly opened nations of Eastern Europe into a vast new market. This would kill two birds with one stone: keep the speculative finances afloat, and break the morale of the targeted populations, thus sabotaging healthy economic progress. And what better means exists than to use the insidious argument that legalizing drugs is a sign of "democracy"?

J

# Bhutto is removed; says the President

by Susan Maitra and Ramtanu Maitra

The teetering Pakistan People's Party (PPP) government led by Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto was summarily dismissed Aug. 6 through a proclamation by President Ghulam Ishaq Khan. In his statement the President charged the government with corruption, nepotism, and ineffectiveness, and accused it of defeating the "utility and efficacy" of the parliament and undermining the constitution.

In one fell swoop, President Ishaq Khan also dissolved the National Assembly and four provincial assemblies and sacked all four chief ministers. The President announced that fresh elections will be held on Oct. 24, and, later, declared a state of emergency nationwide. Almost at once, President Ishaq Khan named a five-member caretaker cabinet to be headed by the combined opposition parties' parliamentary chief, Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi. Later, three more members were added to the cabinet.

The final nail may have been driven into the political coffin of Benazir Bhutto, when, on Aug. 2, the Iraqi tanks rolled over Kuwaiti borders, posing a threat to Saudi Arabia. Since Pakistan has strong military links with Saudi Arabia, the United States might expect substantial Pakistani help to protect Saudi Arabia, an expectation that may have contributed to suddenly boosting the Army's say in the affairs of the country.

Further, Army Chief of Staff Gen. Mirza Beg, whose frustration with the Bhutto government has been building up for months, is keen to build a "Fortress Pakistan," impregnable by its enemy in the east, India, and as a result, has developed a military doctrine which will form a strategic consensus among Pakistan, Iran, Turkey, and Afghanistan. However far-fetched the particular scheme may be, it is based on a vision of the Army as the protector of the nation and not the keepers of law and order, much less administrators. General Beg strongly resented the Army being used for keeping law and order in the restive Sindh province, and repeatedly reminded the administration that Sindh is not a military but a political problem which the PPP and the Mohajirs, who settled there after the partition of the subcontinent, must resolve.

In the event, a series of mistakes and underlying disasso-