

Will Computers Destroy the Soviet System?

By James V. Ogle

AT A RECENT PRIVATE MEETING of 16 intellectuals in an Eastern European capital, the keynote speaker opened the debate with these words: "Let me warn you that my views are rather extreme. . . . I know of no example in the history of mankind where quantitative changes of this order of magnitude did not cause a revolutionary qualitative change . . ."

A discussion of Solidarity's program in Warsaw? No, it was a meeting of computer science researchers and manufacturers in Budapest discussing the latest developments in the new generation of supercomputers now on the drawing boards.

It is no accident, as the Marxists love to say, that computer science conferences in the Soviet sphere increasingly sound like veiled political debates. Computerization is a major element in the evolutionary changes now building in the Soviet bloc. There can no longer be any doubt that within this decade, the Soviet bloc will be completely transformed.

In today's world, computerization is an economic necessity. If the Soviet Union and its satellites were to try to prevent the spread of computers within its borders, its industries would be doomed. They simply could not compete with the rest of the world.

However, as computerization does continue, the Soviet bloc faces even larger contradictions. Contrary to the once-popular belief, computerization brings with it a transformation which is just the opposite of that projected by George Orwell in "1984." Big Brother — the party dictatorship centered in Moscow — can no longer watch the whole society. Instead, tens of thousands of computers in the hands of analysts and technicians dispersed all over the continent are watching Big Brother, creating new opportunities for decentralization and debate.

The economies of the bloc countries are still planned economies, but the planning process is changing and, as a result, so are the societies. In the past, an elite could direct the movement of vast resources with very little feedback from the lower-level managers who were supposed to make the system work.

But the most common dictum of the computer age is helping to change this. That dictum is "Garbage In, Garbage Out." What that means is that computers, by their very design, require that they be programmed with a coherent data base, a common set of numbers, a common set of assumptions, a common view of the future, in order that their results not be meaningless.

See COMPUTERS, Page C5

James Ogle, who served in the Central Intelligence Agency from 1956 to 1973, now works in an intelligence-related computer project.



By Vincent Lawrence for The Washington Post

I Do, Too, Have a Mideast Policy

It's merely a quiet one, Reagan asserts, except for the part about the PLO

By Trude B. Feldman

WITH SOVIET RECOGNITION of Yasir Arafat's Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the death of Egypt's President Sadat and the battle in Congress over the sale of \$8.5 billion in American arms for Saudi Arabia, the Middle East has become the focal point of American foreign policy.

In the first interview on the Middle East since he won the presidency, conducted in the Oval Office a few days before the Senate voted to sell AWACS to the Saudis, Ronald Reagan reveals his strategy for bringing peace to that troubled area.

Q: In the aftermath of President Sadat's death, do you think Egypt will adopt a new foreign policy?

A: So far, every indication we have is that there won't be. After the funeral, Secretary of State Haig and others had top-level meetings with the new Egyptian leader. President Mubarak assured us he intends to continue and follow through with the plans laid out by President Sadat.

Q: What about America's policy?

A: Some people say we don't have a policy in the Mideast. In fact, we've always had a policy. There are people in the press who say you don't have a policy unless you keep telling them what you're doing, so they can put it on the front pages. I don't happen to believe that's a good way to conduct foreign policy. I believe in quiet diplomacy — for example, the fact that we had the Saudis' help in arranging a cease-fire in Lebanon. We didn't have to get on the front page to do that. That was quiet diplomacy.

Q: What's your next step?

A: We'll continue what we've been doing, which is not to impose a settlement on the Mideast. We want to be in a position to help, wherever and whenever we can, to build on the Camp David process and bring peace to the region.

See REAGAN, Page C5

Trude B. Feldman is a White House and Washington correspondent who has specialized in Middle East affairs for the past 21 years.

By Steven Brill

FORMER ARIZONA Supreme Court Justice Renz Jennings is one Phoenix lawyer who isn't thrilled that Sandra O'Connor has been elevated to the U.S. Supreme Court. He doesn't like her.

In 1978, Jennings, by then having returned to private practice, stood in open court as O'Connor, the trial judge, told Jennings' client that Jennings was representing him so poorly that he should get a new lawyer. Not content to stop there, O'Connor reportedly complained to the state bar disciplinary board that Jennings, then 79 years old, was senile and should be removed from practice.

"For Sandra to do that took a lot of gumption," says Barry Silverman, a Maricopa County commissioner who was then a prosecutor assigned to O'Connor's court. "Jennings' problem — missing deadlines, mishandling cases — was something all of us had winked at. But here was a

Steven Brill is the editor of The American Lawyer, from the November issue of which this is reprinted.

The High Court's New Justice Is Actually One Tough Cookie

trial court judge publicly declaring that a former supreme court judge was incompetent."

Sandra O'Connor's record is that of a woman who winks at nothing. Often that has made her formal, even rigid, in demeanor. But more often, and more important, it has made her a strong, sometimes gutsy judge who rigidly respects the legal process and is intolerant of those who take it less seriously.

Spurred by references in the national media to her supposedly limited credentials and to the middling ratings she had been given in local bar association surveys, I went to Phoenix the month before O'Connor's confirmation expecting to find in her record, especially in the cases she had handled on the front lines as a trial judge, all the in-

redients for a profile of someone who didn't belong on our highest court. I found the opposite. O'Connor is not dazzlingly brilliant. But she has all the makings of a great judge and maybe even a great leader of the bar. She's going to surprise everyone who thinks that, except for an understandable streak of feminism, she's a quiet, quaint, harmless and mostly conservative way for the court to break the sex barrier.

Ask defense lawyer Lionel Estrada. "She embarrassed me terribly," he says, referring to a case in which O'Connor sentenced his client to 30 to 50 years for rape and sodomy and then vacated the conviction because Estrada

had, she said, handled the case incompetently. O'Connor ruled that he should have moved for a mistrial after the defendant's mother had asked two jurors to let her son go free and that Estrada had not prepared adequately for certain aspects of the trial. (The state court of appeals overturned O'Connor's decision.)

"There are a few other cases like that, where she overturned verdicts (or declared mistrials based on lawyer incompetence)," says assistant county court administrator Rob Raker. "But what was more important with her was she'd scare lawyers into being prepared. One method she'd use was that if she thought a lawyer wasn't prepared and was there to ask for a continuance, she'd refuse to hold the hearing in her chambers. She'd embarrass the lawyer in open court by making him explain why."

Sometimes she went further. "This is typical Sandra," says former prosecutor Silverman. "One day I was waiting for a case in her court with two other prosecutors. One, who had a probation motion on the calendar, told the other to cover for him because he had to go to another

See O'CONNOR, Page C4



By Steve Mendelson - The Washington Post

The Sandbox That Roared: Barbuda for Barbudans!

By Jonathan Greenberg

FORGET AFGHANISTAN or El Salvador. The real takeover threat these days is in Barbuda. That's right, Barbuda. Okay, you never heard of the place. Neither have

Jonathan Greenberg is on the editorial staff of Forbes magazine.

most people, which doesn't bother Barbudans much. Barbuda is no industrial or strategic giant, and it's not part of the Third World. It's more like an Other World nation — a tiny Caribbean paradise whose chief exports are sand and stamps, whose wealthiest inhabitant may be the grocery store operator, whose goats, horses, cows and sheep outnumber its citizens, and whose people worry about a takeover by the so-called "civilized" world.

Barbuda's Eden-like character stems in good part from its common ownership of almost all of the island's lands or rental costs — natives just plant plots where they please — and no class conflict to speak of. "Since everyone has basic rights to land, there's little difference in power among Barbudans," says anthropologist Riva Berleant-Schiller, who has lived there.

See BARBUDA, Page C2

Sic the CIA On Its Buddies In Libya

By Mary McGrory

THE CIA WANTS authority — for what reason we are, naturally, not told — to go back to spying on Americans.

They want to infiltrate domestic organizations. They did that without permission for many years, we found out

MARY MCGRORY

later. Okay, it's nice of them to ask, and we've got the perfect opener for them. How about infiltrating their own Old Boy Network?

Let them break out the red wigs — you remember, they provided one for old grad Howard Hunt for his famous hospital interview with Dita Beard. Let them get the voice-altering devices, and send them to The Company's alumni meetings.

Maybe they could find out how many retired spooks are in touch with two former employees, Edwin P. Wilson and Frank Terpil, who are engaged in some mysterious but highly lucrative business with Col. Muammar Qaddafi, the Libyan dictator the Reaganites all love to hate.

The CIA can't do a thing with Wilson and Terpil, who are under indictment for exporting explosives to Libya. They are also engaged in recruiting U.S. pilots and mechanics to fly and service airplanes.

See MCGRORY, Page C4

The writer is a Washington Post columnist.