

Fragments

Vol. 1

December

1973

by

Charles Joel

BITTER CORN

A dramatic story in 6 parts,
with 2 mottos,
2 J. Bonds
and
1 moral.

Translation by Charles Joel

Copyright 1915 by Charles Joel
Printed by THE BOSTON COMPANY
Boston, Mass., U.S.A.

Translation of an article
written by Brukselczyk in
Polish magazine "Kultura"
No. 12/303/72, published
in Paris, France.

© Copyright 1973 by Charles Joel

Printed by THE ESSICC COMPANY
Sutter Creek, Ca., 95635

BITTER CORN

Motto No. 1: "Soviet Agriculture has achieved another great victory. In Kazakhstan this year's crop reached 27 million tons of grain...3 million more than for 1975, the last of 5 years plan. It's important to stress the far-reaching sight of Agricultural Politics of our Government.... The success of Kazakhstan is more significant as it happens on the 50th anniversary of the USSR.... The victory of Kazakhstan means that socialistic system of Kolhoz - Sowhoz and the new type of relationship between the socialistic States, Kolhozes and peoples of USSR is higher...."

Citizen M. Maximow, Commentator of
"Novosti" October 26, 1972.

Motto No. 2: "The total strain of Soviets' grain balance has been disclosed during the past weekend, when secretary of Agriculture Mackievitch confirmed that Soviets' Agriculture has crossed the worst year of the present century. All observers confirm that the triumvirate of Brezniev is facing the most serious food crises since it came to power...."

Mr. M. Simmons, commentator of
Financial Times, November 6, 1972.

On June 29, 1972 at the Hotel Madison in Washington, 2 delegations from the USSR have arrived. The first one was greeted with an official cordiality. That was Mr. Nicolay Patolitchev who came to sign an agreement of grain purchase in the USA for 750 million dollars during 3 years, and of American credit for it, to the extent of 500 million dollars. The refreshments have been served and after a short recess Mr. Patolitchev and company went to the official dinner party.

Part One, or who is the man with the name of Bielousov?

Nobody has taken any notice of the 2nd delegation although it has stopped at the same hotel and also...but at its own expense had a dinner. Its leader was a certain Bielousov, also Nicolay and also in the business of grain. Though in Moscow Bielousov is managing "Bread Export," this time (as it was found later) he came on the business of importing bread. Later some specialist said: "Bielousov has known American grain market better than any American expert." For this delayed reflex the American taxpayer has paid many, many dollars. Here is why:

While Mr. Patolitchev has been

engaged in all the ceremonials with finalizing the transaction (that has been decided long time ago), shaking hands and posing for reporters, Bielousov was making telephone calls
.....

The first bell rang in a stylish palace in Minneapolis where Cargills Inc. is seated. The second in Manhattan's skyscraper in the offices of the Continental Inc. The third one - in Argentina's business Bunge Corp., the fourth in Cook Inc., the fifth in the department of French Dreyfuss Corp. All these 5 corporations represent the cream and the dictatorship of the American grain market. No need to add that all of these Bielousov's correspondents have known everything, or in any case something about the competitors. Bielousov hasn't even asked for discretion.

The grain trade in the USA is very mysterious; the grain companies don't have any Stock Exchange notations; the competition is unbelievably sharp and the success quite often depends on the second plane details, so there is not much general knowledge about the size of the transactions.

Soon after the telephone calls, the disputes have begun. On July 1st, Mr. Saunders, commercial director of Cargill, has appeared at the Madison Hotel. The

Russians, above all, were interested in corn and barley, avoiding any talk about the wheat. Mr. Saunders invited Mr. Bielousov to dinner, after which, announcing his offer for corn and barley, went home. "We'll call you later," said the Russians.

The next day, and it happened to be Sunday, the gentlemen from Continental have had their turn. From the beginning they had some superiority, because there was at their disposal a certain Gregory Ziv, an American specialist of Russian origin. The guests have taken a walk around Washington and incidentally have met Mr. Clarence Balmby since not long the vice-president of Continental. Since not long, because only on June 6th Mr. Balmby was an advisor of... the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture and as such has been a chairman of the American delegation in dispute over the grain credits for the USSR. Because Balmby and Ziv were old friends, they both were very eager in helping Messrs. Bielousov, Kalitenko and Goldobenko, in sight-seeing of Washington. Mr. Balmby, on this occasion, took a chance of showing the guests the beautiful house he recently bought...with a help...pure luck...of Mr. Fribourg, president of Continental.

After a busy Sunday all participants have moved on Monday to New York to the

Hilton. There everything went fast, and 2 days later the biggest contract of the grain trade has been signed. The USSR has bought, through Continental, 4 million tons of wheat and 4-1/2 million tons of fodder. Mr. Fribourg and Mr. Bielousov toasted each other as it should be with grain Vodka and promised to keep this sweet secret as long as possible.

When on July 6th and 7th the gentlemen from Dreyfus and Bunge had arrived, in turns naturally, there has been no end to pleasantries and the Russians acted as if not any contract ever existed.

The same manner had been applied to Mr. Saunders of Cargill. On July 10th he came to the Hilton in order and in accordance with the preliminary exchange of ideas, to put an offer for selling corn and barley. To his surprise, after initial cordialities, the Russians simply asked: "Mr., how much is it for wheat?"

Next morning, and this was July 11th already, few subsequent vodkas honoured some modest million tons of wheat sold by S. to B. But this was not the end yet. The same day B. bought next million tons from Cook. On July 12th the Russians have jumped to Canada; there, they bought 1 million tons of wheat, then returned to New York. On July 19th Cook threw in another 100 tons and some newcomer, Swiss Garnas, 200 tons...little...but still

something.

Part Two, or what is a bushel and how much does it cost?

On July 12th the Russians have returned to Moscow. During a few days they had bought for cash 7-1/2 million tons of wheat, and it has been done in such a secrecy that with the exception of B., nobody knew exactly or in approximation what kind and how big were the transactions.

The whole procedure was so discrete, that while B. was proudly reporting to his Party bosses in Moscow about dispossessing imperialistic Americans of 1/6th of their yearly crop, Mr. Butz, the American Secretary of Agriculture was telling already anxious farmers that the Russians were buying mainly corn and that there is no need to worry about this.

The initial galloping of grain companies in so-called wheat subvention couldn't help Mr. Butz in this "corneous" predicament.

The grain trade in America is somewhat complicated. The world's prices of wheat are quite often lower than the prices paid to the farmers, because of high production costs in the USA. In

order to dispose of the costly surplus the Government covers generally small differences and pays it to the companies engaged in buying grain for foreign customers. So it went this time too. At the time of Bielowsov's arrival, the grain merchants were permitted to sell wheat at \$1.63 per bushel (1 ton = 36.4 bushels). But because transactions were made in greatest secrecy in the enormous space of the USA, the American agents of Bielowsov were able to buy from disoriented farmers great amounts of grain at the price even lower than the World's market prices, in any case lower than the expected subsidies.

Consequently, when the Russians suddenly have returned to New York, they could calmly continue, broken for a while, procedure. From the Hilton the discrete calls have begun again and surely on August 1st an old friend from Cargill has appeared...in order to sell the next million, then Dreyfus the next 1-1/2 million, and Cook threw in only 300,000 tons. In short, during 3 days of August the Russians have bought a further 4 million tons of American wheat. This, plus the previous transactions made about 11 million tons and represented not 1/6th but 1/4th of honest American farmers' crop. And all for \$1.63 per bushel.

Part Three, or who is Mr. Smith?

All this would have been going on and on if not for a certain Mr. Smith. The first sign of him had been noted already in mid-July when some mysterious voice of excellent English accent sounded in the telephone of Baking News in Kansas City. "Gentlemen, I am offering you for nothing a real bombshell. The Russians in secrecy are buying fantastic amounts of wheat. To start with, 5 million tons - making fools of farmers." The editor, Mr. Sosland, a serious man, knocked himself in the forehead, said - "Nuts!" - and put down the receiver. Smith didn't give up, calling every day with new claims; finally introduced himself as a correspondent of the Financial Times from London. Then, Mr. Sosland has decided to investigate. He made a call to London but nobody over there has ever heard about a correspondent named Smith. But people in the Times have known a certain Woivoski who has been popular as a grain expert from East Germany.

Well, this Woivoski, being very interested in the Russians' buyings, was transmitting (for nothing) to the Times the same information as Mr. Smith in the USA. He, even, had warned the Times that Baking News of Kansas City already knew about all and that it would be just shameful to let the small provincial paper in the USA to be the first in the news.

Then Sosland began real checking. Everything has fitted perfectly. The Russians were indeed back in New York and buying has reached, in fact, enormous amounts.

On August 2nd the bomb planted by Smith-Woivoski blew off. Baking News has screamed: "Russians are buying and the farmers pay." In one day the price of a bushel went up 8 cents, in a week it had jumped to over 2 dollars. Then the Department of Agriculture woke up. Two dollars a bushel means that the subsidy must go to 40 cents a bushel and this definitely is too much, much too much... even the USA Government can't afford it. The Department of Agriculture has announced that enough is enough and this is the last week of subsidies.

This week was not only the last but also the blackest. As it should be expected in this week when the subsidies were 47 cents, the grain merchants bought for the Russians (or said that they bought) unbelievable amounts of bushels. Trifle, indeed...the amount of bushels was 282 million and subsidy as it's easy to calculate - no more, no less than 128 million dollars.

The matter is very simple. Only the go-between people knew about the Russians' appetite and have been buying in secrecy, without creating any panic, at very low

prices. When the official price went up they applied for subsidy. The rest is well known.

Part Four, or from Washington to yesteryear Poland.

The queerest thing is that the Russian appetite for American wheat did not surprise the Department of Agriculture in Washington. Before the visit of Bielousov, the agricultural attache of the USA Embassy in Moscow had sent a reliable prognostic report about the catastrophic crops in Russia. It has been evident that the grain deficit of USSR in 1972 was going to be about 30 million tons, that this was to be one year in a hundred of years, and that the catastrophe was enlarged by bureaucratic immobility of Soviet's system.

Even to Mr. Butz it should have been clear that:

Firstly, and this is an economic conclusion, that in the situation of permanent imbalance of food supply this gargantuan deficit is menacing everything: supply, prices, horticulture and the whole economic plan.

Secondly, and this is a political conclusion, the Kremlin would do everything

to avoid catastrophe because economic crisis (remember Khrushchev in 1964?) might be the end of the ruling team and Brezniev doesn't like it; that Russians must find the grain somewhere and in order to get it they are ready to pay a very high price in western currency and in political concessions.

But, for the reasons unknown and never understood, the American Department of Agriculture decided to treat this report as top secret and has locked it deep in the safe.

In effect, a small group of Russian specialists could, in the utmost secrecy, buy 1/4th of the annual production of American wheat, and to blow up the system of subsidies to farmers. American taxpayer must pay twice more for Brezniev's sowing in Ukraine and harvesting in Ohio; this is because the USA Government has paid additional millions of dollars to the deal and also because in consequent shortage of supplies the prices of wheat, flour and its products will go higher; thirty biggest bakeries already have started screaming.

According to certain theory that was known among the merchants of yesteryear Poland, before, the Russians had experience and Americans had wheat, but the Americans now have experience and Russians have their flour.

Part Five, or how the FBI wastes its time.

Because the FBI doesn't know Polish merchants of the old days and doesn't have their sense of humor, it began to look closer at the circumstances of the grain "Bonanza." Six teams investigate the backstage of the operation that had resulted in the American taxpayer paying high price for the bread on Russians' tables.

The process is not simple. Everybody seems to be embarrassed. The Department of Agriculture has difficulties in explaining top secrecy of the report of the American Embassy in Moscow about the catastrophe of leading Kolhoz-Sowhoz system; it can't also convincingly explain how a few weeks before opening secret grain talks, 2 high ranking officials of the Department have resigned and moved...to grain companies, strangely, to the same companies which later made the gigantic transactions with the Russians. These 2 officials have known the needs and troubles of the USSR, not to mention that they were participating in international talks in Moscow.

Snoopy FBI is interested also in the

"black August week" when the Department of Agriculture had blocked the subsidies, but has given enough time to conclude the rest of record sized business and record sized losses of the Nation.

Well, it appears (to me) that the FBI is wasting its valuable time. This is not the job for the Police, because this is a matter of Politics. The USA Government simply recognized that an ally is in trouble and Russians should have been helped.

Part Six, or Mr. Hammer and "Donna Zarate."

Firstly, the crisis in Russia wouldn't be beneficial to America. Breznief has given so many examples of good will and loyal cooperation with the USA, that it would be reckless on the part of Nixon to put his life in jeopardy. Enough to mention the quiet and radical departure from Egypt, mediating (with discrete persuasion) in contacts with N. Vietnam, and the peace on the front of world's revolution....

Secondly, after the death of Jalta, as a consequence of independence gained by China and Japan, and in the face of the impudent emancipation and richness of the European Community, it is important to close the ranks of super powers.

In connection with this, we should not be surprised that in Washington and in Moscow they talk in similar language about the European Economic Community and about Japan. Love is blooming. Gromyko, since the days of Khrushchev, became the first eastern politician to be invited to stay in Camp David - the president's boudoir. At the peak of the election campaign, the Russians press explicitly indicated its feelings and quite sharply has attacked....McGovern. Even Angela Davis, who at that time was visiting Russia, has been kept quiet; some parts of her publication about the victory of communism in USA have been censored.

Thirdly, it is worth while to pay for good argument in election time. The voice of "International Sionism" has something to say in the USA, and it just has happened that in the after "grain" era, Russians began permitting Jewish hostages to immigrate in little larger numbers and without paying monetary tribute.

Fourthly, what does it matter to lose a trifle few millions if at stake are tens of billions? "Siberia is calling you." is the new slogan that makes the American businessman thrill with greed. New "Gold rush" pushes the Americans to the new treasures of Siberia. The time is coming where we'll be having new

"Westerns", the saloons will be back, only the sheriffs will be from...KGB.

Mr. Armand Hammer, who as a young man had known Lenin and in the twenties helped to organize Soviet-American trade, presently returned to Moscow as a millionaire and president of Occidental Petroleum.

He is preparing a kind of business with the successors of Lenin that it paid him to make a gift to Ermitage Museum of the portrait of Donna Antonia Zarate by Goya. "Ermitage doesn't have any Goya's work, it can't be." said Mr. Hammer, and added that he just bought one for 1/2 price, only for 1 million dollars.

I am asking you? If it pays to Mr. Hammer to make a modest gift of 1 million dollars, wouldn't it pay the USA Government to make a gift of much, much larger value?

Nothing strange then. that while on November 7th in Moscow and in Washington champagne corks were popping off, it hasn't been clear whether Brezniev was celebrating Nixon's victory or Nixon was celebrating the anniversary of the great socialistic November revolution.

One moral: Because, my dear people, Socialism makes one rich. Even the Capitalist.

Fragments

Vol. 1/2

February, 1974

WHITE NIGHTS IN HELSINKI

by

Charles Joel

WHITE NIGHTS IN HELSINKI

By

Charles Joel

A tragicomedy in 35 speeches,
with a motto, a prolog and a moral.

Copyright 1911 by Charles Joel

Author Charles Joel

Translation of an article
written by Brukselczyk in
Polish magazine "Kultura"
No. 9/312/73 published in
Paris, France.

© Copyright 1973 by Charles Joel

Published by Correspondence Home Study of
Languages

Printed by The Essicc Company
Sutter Creek, California

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

"The white nights in Helsinki are
intoxication.....".

Helsinki, the capital of Finland,
lies in a subarctic region where summer
nights are short. This phenomenon cre-
ates an atmosphere of mystic charm that
has probably suggested to the author the
title of his article.

What you are about to read had been
written in August 1973, one month after
conclusion of the European Peace Confer-
ence at Helsinki. No doubt you have been
well informed about it by the news media.
Yet, was this conference like a bright sun-
ray shining through the clouded skies of
the World's affairs and showing the road to
a real peace? Or, was it another game on
the chessboard of high politics.

The author gives us a very detailed
view of the background, intricacies, con-
duct and consequences of this political
event.

The article has a number of terms,
historic facts and names. Some, a reader
might not be familiar with or might have
forgotten, are collected and explained on
the last page in the numerical index.

C.J.

WHITE NIGHTS IN HELSINKI

I. Motto:

"FROM CHASE MANHATTAN SQUARE NO. 1
TO KARL MARX SQUARE NO. 1, IT'S WE, IT'S
COMMON SENSE IN ENTANGLED NEGOTIATIONS
BETWEEN EAST AND WEST. OUR ADDRESS IN
MOSCOW: METROPOL HOTEL, ROOM NO. 227,
TEL. 225-6227."

*(From advertisement of Chase Man-
hattan Bank in Anglo-Saxon press.)*

II. Prolog:

In 1848, Karl Marx, economist, by the joint effort of Prussian and French police, was forced to leave the continent. He went to England, in those days the largest center of capitalistic world. The secret agent of Prussian KGB describes the kennel in Soho at Dean Street where Marx had lived with his wife, three children and a seldom paid woman-servant: "Marx lives in the worst and cheapest quarters of London. He occupies two rooms...there is no single piece of respectable furniture in there... in the middle stands an old-fashioned table covered with oil-cloth...on it, the manuscripts, books, newspapers mixed with children's toys....". But the Prussian

agent didn't know that on this oil-cloth Marx had written *Capital*.

One hundred twenty five years later, Leonid Brezhnev, head of the Empire that supposedly realized the ideas in *Capital* created on London's oil-cloth, went also to the center of capitalistic world. He went not because of the police, but because of politics, stayed not in the kennel, but in comfortable residences in the mountains and at the seaside of the presidents of the U.S.A. As a result of this visit, Brezhnev is not going to write a new *Capital*; rather, he is taking advantage of the old one. And all under the startled face of Marx who had never dreamt of such outcome but who must watch it from his portrait that is always placed first, always on the left side, followed by the portraits of the actual revolution's leaders.¹

III. The second first secretary:

Although it has been Brezhnev's first voyage across the ocean, it has already been the second secretary of Russian Communist party officially visiting the U.S.A. Fourteen years earlier, Nikita Khrushchev had invaded the U.S.A. There were some similarities: National anthems were the same, also the distinctions and diplomas for laureates of Lenin's peace reward, granted the day before the departure, the sad face of Gromyko, and the menu of the official supper (*caviar, salmon, borsch, crabs, ice cream, etc.*). The rest was

entirely different.

It is worthwhile to look closer at the differences; they, better than a hundred comments and declarations, define the meaning of the event.

When Khrushchev was landing in Washington, to the "Silent Majority" of Americans, bolshevik meant something between the devil and Al Capone, most often - both at the same time. It wasn't incidental that Khrushchev, at the reception organized by the cream of American industry in an exquisite New York club, began his address thus: "It is not strange that when a communist appears in front of you, you want to pull his tail and check whether he has horns." Besides, during his 13 days stay in the U.S.A., Khrushchev, the non-believer, had used the name of God 40 times - not in vain, but on the contrary, in order to dispose of that devil's mark.

Brezhnev, compared with Khrushchev, is a real gentleman. In Blair House (*the residence of the crowned guests*) he feels at home like in the Kremlin; he wears well-made suits, not the Ukrainian shirts, he shows the golden studs and diamond pins in his ties, he drinks champagne, not an ordinary vodka, and when he spills it, overwhelmed with emotion, he discreetly excuses himself. Truly, he permanently wears 2 golden stars in the flap of his jacket and he greets the onlookers with both hands like a boxer, but this doesn't surprise anybody in the U.S.A. Only once he exaggerated and that happened when in San Clemente he jumped into the arms of 2 meters tall actor from popular

westerns, but as this was in California, where the governor is also an "ex-gunman" from the westerns, nobody has been alarmed, especially as Brezhnev, contrary to the general fear, had no desire to kiss the actor but only to give him a hug.

Khrushchev, in 1959, had made real *Tour de U.S.A.* He was in several states, in towns and in the country, in factories and universities, groped hens and sown corn; he went to the film studio in Hollywood where he hadn't jumped into anybody's arms but, on the contrary, he had played hell with one of the directors and had been shocked by the can-can dance performed by the girls, among them if I remember well, the most exquisite *dessous* had been shown by my favorite actress, Shirley McLain, of late a maoist.

Hell! Never mind the "derriers" of the actresses!

Khrushchev hadn't hesitated to stand in front of the National Press Club taking up the heaviest gauntlet ever thrown by a group of extraordinary jackals of the press. But Nikita had managed, though there wasn't any lack of questions. For example, "And what were you doing while Stalin was committing his crimes?"

Brezhnev had seen the U.S.A. only during 20 minutes from a helicopter. Mainly the wilderness of the Grand Canyon and he had been upset that people may vegetate in such a terrain. Besides this, he limited himself to the acquaintance of several scores of statesmen, senators and indus-

trialists and of 175 guests at the reception at Nixon's San Clemente. It's not too many for 220 million Americans. The working class, howling of exploitation and poverty, Brezhnev had reached only through TV, if, of course, they had any.

Khrushchev in 1959 had sent to skirmish a magnificent ambassador: the first "Lunik" chirping from the moon. Visiting a preserve factory Nikita could calmly kill his hosts: "So it is, you are leading in the production of sausages, but we are first on the moon".

Brezhnev had sent his skirmishers to buy the grain and arrived in the U.S.A., not only after the fiasco of "Salute" (*one firing - 500 million dollars*), but at the time when 3 Americans were having a good time exercising in the Skylab. And production of sausages still was growing....

But all of this you may say, belongs today to folklore. You are right - in 1973 the real thing is somewhere else.

Khrushchev in the U.S.A. without a smile had foretold: "I am sure that communism is going to win because it is a system that guarantees freedom and assures the development of mankind. Beware, hurry up, someday we'll say to you 'Good bye', our train is going fast, leaving you behind. But don't worry, we shall be ready to give you our fatherly help."

Brezhnev came in order to catch up with the American train and not to give, but to ask for help.

Khrushchev was warning with a most serious face, "And what will happen if West Germany causes the new world war."

Brezhnev arrived almost straight from Bonn where he hadn't talked about the war with Germany, but had said to his friend Brandt in farewell: *Auf wiedersehen* in the original German language.

To die for Paris?!

The balance of the visit was imposing, all records of signing up the agreements have been beaten. Brezhnev took 9 big agreements, not to count some of the small stuff, one Lincoln Continental (*what is he doing with so many cars?*); a shotgun with ornaments of American eagle, the Russian bear and the initials L.B., made specially for him; and a golf cart (*one thing he hasn't had yet*). The success was so astounding that some people made a parody of General Motors director's maxim: "What is good for Russia, is good for the U.S.A.", and others reflected: "is Russia becoming the 52nd state of the U.S.A., or is Nixon preparing for himself the position of vice-secretary of the Russian communist party, after leaving the White House." Luckily, those malicious talks of some envious persons haven't interfered with both gentlemen's official proclamation of the end of the cold war and with the counting of the gains.

For the U.S.A.: The end, or a longer break in Soviet dreams of the world's revolution, mediatorship of U.S.S.R. in bring-

ing peace to Vietnam, departure from Egypt, peace in Cuba, withdrawal from penetration in Latin America, eventual profitable access to Siberian sources of energy meaning a decrease of dependency on Arabian monopoly in the face of the world's energy crisis.

For the U.S.S.R.: Deliverance from the grain troubles, peace on the western flank and a free hand on China's border, acceptance of Brezhnev doctrine in Eastern Europe, progressive process of reduction of American forces in Western Europe or perspective of finlandization,² and above all, the technology badly needed to counteract consumptive pressures inside the U.S.S.R.

In the Kremlin Brezhnev, as white dove with the list of purchases instead of olive branch in its bill, has caused Harriman "blood sucker, part owner of Gruzia's manganese mine in the twenties" to become "active partner of economic co-operation of the twenties". Famous Senator Jackson, who defends Russian Jews "Agent of Sion and of military-industrial Boeing in Seattle," became only a Sionist because at that time the vice-president of Boeing was in Moscow preparing a sale of a few "Jumbo 747s" for the Kremlin.

To the rest of the world, like to a betrayed husband, all began to unveil. Western Europe again woke up too late. One couldn't have been sure what to admire more: naivette or bungling, but the reaction has been typical.

First, despicable silence, then sudden dazzlement. Cries "New Yalta,"³ conspiracy of super powers, again replaced the joint action; this super kick in the pants couldn't weaken nationalistic barriers and divisions simply ridiculous on the background of romance in the boudoirs of San Clemente. Indeed, there were some attempts to cover up this truth like the loss of virginity. Radio France-Inter, during 2 days at the end of July (that means already after Californian defloration), broadcasted live from Moscow such a beautiful picture of U.S.S.R., that the French people ought to go in masses behind the Ural, or at least to trust Mr. Marchais, boss of the French communist party, with the presidency. Even Mr. Edgar Faure, after returning from Moscow, had announced that nothing changed in the feelings of the U.S.S.R. toward France, that Mr. Brezhnev desires free exchanges of people and ideas and though he demands the sovereignty of his country, this for the average Frenchman is entirely understandable.

These aberrations - as well as a consequent impotency of a reasonable counteraction on a European scale, made it possible that, only after some time elapsed, the truth came to light, that history repeats itself and that as the French in 1939 didn't like to die for Danzig, so presently the Americans seem to lose the will of dying for Paris, risking New York for Hamburg or Berlin not to mention Prague. Brezhnev had been assuring Pompidou that agreement in prevention of nuclear war means a new stage in the world's history, but we, after all, know what could have been possible to do in

Vietnam, in the Middle East, in Hungary and in Czechoslovakia - without even the smallest hint about using atomic warfare.

But it had been too late. The engagement party was over. Sad western Europeans grumbled quietly that the U.S.A. had sold them out too cheaply.

IV. From Brezhnev to Freud.

The white nights in Helsinki are intoxicating, but not to all. For example, not for one of the clerks of the Russian Embassy in Finland; on the second of July at 5 a.m. he appeared at the gate of the Finnish Foreign Affairs Office. He stood there patiently until the gates opened, shivering in the Scandinavian frost. But, owing to this operation, Gromyko was able to be the first one on the list of speakers at the conference of 35 foreign ministers on security and cooperation of Europe. It is not known why Gromyko was in such a hurry because he had nothing new to say. He proposed some old well-known international Code of Honor, with the difference that the author of said code believed in his principles of honor, and Gromyko, of course, didn't take seriously the anachronisms of respecting the sovereignty of the other nations, of respect for freedom, of writing, of family reunions, etc.

Rogers behaved in similar fashion. Yet, for him it has been an excellent occasion for showing an independent way of

thinking, as usually Kissinger was doing the thinking for him. But Rogers didn't take advantage of this occasion (*with the exception of the epilog, but about that in a minute*). He was the last to talk, but he grasped that it would create some unpleasant comments and suspicions of previous staging (*Gromyko opens, Rogers closes*) so he surrendered his turn on behalf of the Vatican.

Impartial observers say that Rogers too need not have talked, that his speech was surprisingly similar to Gromyko's, that strange changes of text that had been distributed beforehand, had taken place. Namely, the following has been cancelled: "The problems of European security and cooperation cannot be handled by the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. only." Later Rogers had announced that he threw it out of the spoken text because of modesty, as talking about the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. handling the problems of other nations, is just absurd. The others said that the "handling" was so obvious that there was no need to talk about it and that Rogers did right canceling it.

I don't know who is right, but I would assign to a psychoanalyst the following scene: Rogers talks: "The agreement of Nixon-Brezhnev" - he says - "is an important point in the history of American-Soviet relations and it should strengthen the security of Europe...." And after a while, looking in the text: "...also". Nothing strange then, that Gromyko up to the end of the conference didn't try to hide

his yawning. Let us say, to justify his behavior, that the meeting in Helsinki had occurred for the U.S.S.R. too early, or rather, too late. The idea of such a meeting is pretty old. Already citizen Lenin..... but in fact, it had started in 1954 when well-known intercessor of peace Molotov, at the conference in Berlin, had proposed completely unrealistic treaty of "collective security in Europe". A year later Bulganin had repeated it in Geneva, of course, without attaching any weight to it. Because the others didn't care too, the invention had rested in the drawers waiting for better times. It had waited 10 years.

By then, the idea had hardly been revised, it became necessary to break the romance and to secure in 1968 the collective and individual "freedom" of Czechs and Slovaks. And in March 1969, in Budapest, the communist summit, in seeking for the duster to wipe out the traces of the invasion from the face of Europe, had returned to the idea of Molotov. In addition, to make it more spicy, the chairman of this conference had been Dubcek.⁴ Never mind the continuation. It's full of funny disputes between the Warsaw pact and NATO to the extent of comic scenes like, for example, sitting for several months on the luggage of Mr. Brosio, ex-secretary of NATO and his waiting in vain for the visa to the U.S.S.R.on the business of talks about the European conference. But, such visa had been given straight to Mr. Kissinger, who in Sept. 1972, went to Moscow and established with Brezhnev almost instantly, between

ice cream and mocca, the date and terms of the meeting in Helsinki and in Vienna.

Exactly as in the meetings of Communist party of the U.S.S.R.

I suppose, that if they could, Mr. Nixon and Mr. Brezhnev would have preferred to avoid the conference in Helsinki and to continue handling all matters face to face *(after all, their cooperation had reached the point of using only one interpreter, Sukhodrev, from Moscow)*. But it was too late. Brezhnev's prestige had been tied up with European conference; he had been forced to carry on the business to its end, though looking realistically there wasn't much to do.

Firstly - security. Let us be serious. After ending of the O S T P O L I T I C of Brandt,⁵ after signing up the agreements in Moscow and Warsaw, after silencing the quarrel with Prague, recognition of Germany's division and opening the door for East Germany to the U.N.O., Molotov's program, 18 years old, had been completed with great surplus. Even if the West had wanted, it couldn't do anything with regards to the western boundary of Russian Empire. And if talking about the matters really important, the ones that are measured in megatons, the presence of Monaco, San Marino, or even the Vatican *(and how many divisions has the Pope? Stalin used to ask)*, do not bring much. The real questions are settled down somewhere else. No, not in Vienna, as some believe, with Romania's or Belgium's participating, but in Geneve, or who knows where, in the

second round of SALT in the matter of nuclear future, between the two, two....

Secondly, the economic cooperation. Funny question. Has anybody ever seen the serious matters handled with 33 witnesses? Has Messrs. Hammer *(this one who already with Lenin)*, Rockefeller, Beitz and others waited for Helsinki in order to open their offices at Karl Marx Square in Moscow?

Adding up, the mob in marble clinic called "Finlandia House" at Helsinki reminded Gromyko not of any serious performance but of just another common session of the UNO, common meeting of communist party of Russia in the Kremlin, or another solemn and dull committee with 35 speeches on the agenda.

Shall Amalrik⁶ be alive in 1984?

Of course, from time to time, some moments of liveliness and impatience had occurred. For example, when lead in a row, the ministers of the Peoples Democracies torpedoed the free exchange of ideas and information - in the name of socialism's purity; they see this free exchange as a cover for smuggling of propaganda and information. Douglas Home had dreamed about buying for himself, at Victoria Station in London, a ticket and about going to any place of his choice without a passport; Dan had wished to buy any western papers in Moscow; Norwegian to discuss openly worldwide on TV; Shell to allow the dispersed families to be joined; and such like nonsense.

All this couldn't disturb the harmony of Moscow. At the same time when the ministers in Helsinki smoked cigars and babbled about creative and other kinds of freedom, in Moscow, another three years of concentration camp had been given to Amalrik. As to this, one may have doubts whether he himself or the U.S.S.R. "shall live up to 1984". Three English films had been thrown out of the film festival, and the foreign minister Gromyko despicably, without a word of explanation, had been returning the list of 31 largest western publishers asking permission for their correspondents to observe upcoming process of Yakir. Moreover, the peaceful harmony of Moscow had been undisturbed because the methods of KGB are doing fine behind the capital of socialists republics. Finland, democratic and sovereign country, on demand of Gromyko and under the noses of his 34 partners at Helsinki's conference, had arrested 9 Americans of Baltic descent; they arrived in Helsinki to remind that in the countries of their fathers something had happened 30 years ago....., nay, more. The Independent Finnish Navy had caught a Lithuanian refugee who quietly sailed in a rubber dinghy to his family in East Germany (uniting the separated families - paragraph such and such from Helsinki). At the time of writing these words it isn't known whether the refugee had managed to avoid his transfer to Moscow, which act is provided by the agreement of sovereign Finland with U.S.S.R.; if he'll be transferred then with all probability he'll meet some Kudirko, Lithuanian sailor too, who a few years ago had been delivered to Moscow by mistake, of course,

by the American Navy and who is dying away in some Siberian camp.

In Oslo, capital of Norway, at the end of July, the world Congress of psychotherapy had gathered. In the name of apolitical cleanliness of science and in order not to offend the delicate feelings of the Soviet delegation, Congress authorities had refused to put on the agenda the question of Russian psychiatry that serves to liquidate political opponents and to change the lunatic asylums into jails for the intellectuals.

The loudest comment of the conference in Helsinki sounded from East Berlin in the last day of the 35 ministers' deliberations; "Grepes"⁸ machinegunned 3 Germans who had taken the Helsinki conference seriously and had desired to take advantage of several freedoms at one time; freedom of choice to live in another place, of political structure, and of uniting with their families.

V. Epilog.

Shell⁹ was right when, in Finnish marathon of oratory, he shouted "*oesterum censeo...*",¹⁰ reminding of a famous sentence of Talleyrand¹¹ about the participants of Congress in Vienna: "Too cowardly to fight and too stupid to come to an understanding." But he hadn't been right if he had thought that such learned analogies might bring something positive. It is because Americans and Russians came to an

agreement in San Clemente not for the reason of breaking it down in Helsinki. That's why Rogers went straight from Helsinki to Prague. I, myself, had been shocked by this coincidence but, after emotion (that shouldn't have taken place in politics) had died, I concluded that this step had been completely logical.

American in Prague

Of course, this voyage has some suspicious characteristics. It's difficult, for example, to avoid an impression that Rogers went to Prague on the suggestion of Brezhnev, in order to definitely wipe out of the partner's records the unpleasant memories of invasion (it happened that this voyage took place on the day before its 5th anniversary) and it appeared that in this manner one is giving the international certificate of morality to the occupational and collaborationist forces in Prague.

It's difficult too to find convincing ground for the fact that this was the *ausgerechnet*¹² American Foreign Affairs Minister, the first leader of Western diplomacy to visit Prague since the time of the invasion and in general the first U.S.A. Secretary of State since the war.

Moreover, Rogers went to Prague two weeks after Zamiatin, advocate of Brezhnev, has announced in Washington that the agreement of the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. in no way changes the duty of Moscow to defend socialism in the communist peoples' republics,

and, three days later, Safinski, assistant of Gromyko, had stated in Helsinki that there wasn't any invasion but only the cry of authorities (what kind?) of Prague for saving socialism (from whom?) and that in the domain of relations between U.S.S.R. and its partners the conference in Helsinki cannot change anything.

Is it possible that Rogers went to Prague without any knowledge of these announcements? No? Quite the contrary? He went there because the U.S.A. agrees with them. Privately, Rogers had been trying to justify his behavior by explaining that it had been in accord with Congress' orders to keep relations with all nations, which doesn't mean the sympathy for their systems. Well, if this is so, why didn't Rogers go firstly to Havana...?

All reservations of moral nature don't make any sense because in politics there is no need for seeking any moral grounds. The U.S.A. and other western nations don't give a damn for democracy of the East. The West wants two things - peace and business. It is interested not in democracy or in marxism of Brezhnev or Hussack¹³ but in their payability. Important is not the independence of Hussack's government, but the peace in Czechoslovakia. For, isn't the propagation of freedom and democracy equal to playing with fire? Or, could Hungarian revolution of 1956, spring of Prague of 1968, "incidents" in Poland in 1970, be reconciled with security of Europe?

The West knows that these kind of

plays may end pretty badly. On the other hand, the West knows too, that threats and roaring of Brezhnev and his followers in socialistic nations about ideological war don't make any sense, that in fact, contrary, the East will do anything to avoid this kind of war because it's not in a position of undertaking any, absolutely any ideological confrontation with the West. That's why all censures, barriers, concealments from socialistic citizen of grain purchase in the U.S.A., of butter in the Eastern Common Market and of catastrophe of the TU-144 in Paris; that's why the jails and concentration camps, difficulties in obtaining a passport, silencing of the radio, and shooting at the Berlin wall at the inauguration of the youth festival and in the day of Ulbricht's¹⁴ death, as this was a most magnificent salute to a man who perfectly personified the virtues of the Soviet man.

Phoenicization¹⁵ of the world.

Once upon a time the U.S.A. had been the protector of the world's freedom. Don't laugh. This is true. Even, when at the beginning of the twentieth century the U.S.A. had taken a position of a voracious imperialist, some traces of this noble mission had been left. After all, didn't the U.S.A. belong to the loyal camp of decolonization of Africa?: Didn't UNRRA exist on American money; didn't the Marshall Plan save Western Europe? All of this ended. Now, not only Hungary and Cambodia, but nobody should count on the U.S.A., because

presently what prevails is realism, not soc-realism yet, but already "real politic".

Of course the U.S.A. has no monopoly on zigzags and abandoning friends. U.S.S.R. too, in this area has a history, a short one but very rich. In Rapallo¹⁶ with the Germans against France and England, then with France and England against Hitler, with Hitler, against Poland, France and England, with the U.S.A. and England against Hitler, with China against the U.S.A., with U.S.A. against China, at every turn a different ally.

Harold Nicolson in 1954 had published his lectures in Oxford on the subject of the methods of diplomacy. Asked why he didn't mention anything about the Russian diplomacy, Nicolson answered: "This is no diplomacy, this is something different."

This "something different" has caused that the world enters the period of phoenicization, where ideologists are replaced by merchants, a period which for motto and program has only one sentence of Rogers in Helsinki: "We represent 75% of all the world's wealth and 85% of its armaments."

All the western nations sigh to the freedom and rights of mankind cannot be compared with the strength of the expression of some Japanese, who at the news of peace in Vietnam, shouted with immense joy; "Now, we'll have some trade going on."

VI. Moral, or, there is nobody to pray to.

The U.S.S.R. is presently displaying this dilemma: Cold war, or relaxation - model San Clemente 1973. This is a false dilemma and just common blackmail. Among other characteristics, it brands everyone who thinks differently than *PRAVDA* as warmonger and antisoviet; alas! This different thinking, in some Western solons, is considered as, simply, a social lack of tact.

I have never been and I am not for cold war. Not for the sentimental reason, but because it doesn't agree with the present order of the world. But I am warning against cold peace. I am sorry for the past years, but the cold war had been giving me a reason to dream, indeed, it had been forcing one to dream and hope for a better tomorrow.

People have been praying, some to the Statue of Liberty, some to the statue of Lenin, some to the statue of Mao Tse-tung.

The cold peace is the end of dreams. There is nothing and nobody to pray to.

Everywhere, only the statues of Shylock....¹⁷

Brukselczyk
August 5, 1973

Numerical Index

of some terms, foreign words,
historic facts and persons.

- 1/ Page 2: The author talks about the arrangement of communist leaders' portraits hanging on the front walls of the official and nonofficial public places, meeting halls and establishments all over Soviet Union and Eastern block countries.
- 2/ Page 7: Finlandization - process of becoming a nation that has (like Finland) all appearances of independence but in fact is at the mercy of a powerful neighbor.
- 3/ Page 8: Yalta conference of 1945. Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin settled down postwar future of Germany and Eastern Europe.
- 4/ Page 11: Dubcek, R. - defeated leader of Czechoslovak 1968 revolution that attempted to establish "socialism with human face", called also "Prague spring".
- 5/ Page 12: Ostpolitik - West German Chancellor W. Brandt's politics directed toward the Eastern (communist) block countries.
- 6/ Page 13: Amalrik, A. - Russian writer, author of "Whether the Soviet Union will last up to 1984".
- 7/ Page 14: Author has in mind the period of 1939 - 1944 when Finland had fought

and lost 2 wars with U.S.S.R.

- 8/ Page 15: Grepos, popular name given to East German border guards.
- 9/ Page 15: Shell, W., West German minister of foreign affairs.
- 10/ Page 15: Ceterum censeo, Latin expression of various meanings. Here, Shell, in his rhetoric means figuratively: "I strongly believe that some groups of...", or, "I condemn some of...". (Probably indicating the group of communist block countries - translator's remark.)
- 11/ Page 15: Talleyrand, Charles M. de, French statesman and diplomat, main figure in organizing Congress of Vienna in 1815, after the fall of Napoleon I.
- 12/ Page 16: ausgerechnet - most righteous, most prestigious.
- 13/ Page 17: Hussack - 1st secretary of Czechoslovak communist party, present ruler of this country.
- 14/ Page 18: Walter Ulbricht, East German ruler, famous (or infamous) for building the Berlin wall by order of Khrushchev.
- 15/ Page 18: Phoenicization, der. from Phoenicians, shrewd merchants and founders of ancient Carthage on the north coast of Africa in 814 BC.
- 16/ Page 19: Rapallo, Treaty of, 1922. Between Germany and U.S.S.R.
- 17/ Page 20: Shylock - merciless money lender, main character of Shakespeare's

"The Merchant of Venice".

Fragments

Vol. 1/3

March, 1974

THE GULAG ARCHIPELAGO
of
Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn
by

Charles Joel

A translation of an article
written by Michal Heller in
the Polish magazine "Kultura"
No. 3/318/74 published in
Paris, France.

© Copyright 1974 by Charles Joel

Published by Correspondence Home Study of
Languages

Printed by The Essicc Company
Sutter Creek, California

Editor's Note

Dear Reader,

In the present issue I depart from the
sophisticated humor and sarcasm of
Brukselczyk.

Instead, in view of the latest develop-
ments in and around Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's
book *The Gulag Archipelago*, the writer's
exile and the enormous interest in the
book - yet unpublished in the U.S.A., I
confront you with the translation of its
review written for KULTURA by Michal
Heller.

For this reason the planned article on
the Soviet press has been postponed and
will probably appear in the next issue.

I believe that my translation of *The
Gulag Archipelago* review will bring you
to an understanding of the powerful mes-
sage that radiates from Solzhenitsyn's
work all over the world, and offer you
a thought about the meaning of the word
freedom which in the U.S.A. is so often
taken for granted, perhaps misunderstood,
and, if I may say so, abused.

C.J.

Some terms, historical facts and names
for the convenience of those readers who
might not remember or have forgotten them
are arranged in the numerical index at
the end of this issue.

"THE GULAG ARCHIPELAGO"

of

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn

At the end of December 1973, in the YMCA-Press, a small publishing house of Paris, there appeared in Russian, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's book *The Gulag Archipelago 1918 - 1956*. It is the most dreadful document of the twentieth century, produced by the great writer.

There is no doubt that the word "Gulag" which sounds like a dove's cooing but which makes the hearts of Soviet citizens stop beating will soon be known in all languages of the world like the word *Sputnik*. Gulag is an abbreviated name for one of the departments of NKVD - Main Administration of Labor Camps. In naming his book *The Gulag Archipelago* Solzhenitsyn employed an ingenious laconism to explain its meaning: When in 1948 the name for Comintern newspaper was under consideration, Stalin, an old newsman had ordered it named: "*For eternal peace - for people's democracy*". With a cunning smile, Stalin added that whenever the bourgeois press cites the name of the paper it will be forced to spell out "our motto - our name." I don't know how the bourgeois press managed to comply with Stalin's wish, but at any time when the Soviet or

any other communist country's press should try to attack Solzhenitsyn's book, it would be forced to cite its title. And the title itself is an accusation which is impossible to deny.

Under the title of the book are two dates: 1918 - 1956. That is the period of the book's substance - the "Archipelago's" life.

There have been many books written about the Soviet labor camps. Some readers believed in what was written in them, some not; some believed in part and then the others had begun to say that all this is over, gone. Solzhenitsyn's work resembles all these books and at the same time is unlike any of them. The writer says that the book is "a test of artistic investigation." Let's note that in the terminology of literature this is a new and unknown definition.

"Writing this book" - he says in the foreword - "has been a task beyond the strength of one man. Besides my own experiences in the *Archipelago* of what has been imprinted in my eyes, ears, on my own body - the contents of this book are made of stories, recollections and letters of 327 people." It is a history of an empire of slave labor camps of incredible dimensions and the country that created this empire; *The Gulag Archipelago* is a tale of millions of captives, of life's records, suffering and ripening of the author's conscience.

In 1962 the communist party decided

to build in Moscow a monument in memory of Stalin's terror victims but only to those who were party members; later, somehow, the project was abandoned. Solzhenitsyn with his book has built a monument dedicated to the unknown captive, to millions who were sentenced irrespective of their party membership, age, sex and nationality.

The writer had been working on this book for 10 years and finished it in 1968. He thought that it would be published after his death. But the KGB decided differently. Hunting for the manuscript, the KGB traced and arrested Elizabeth Woronyanskaya who had kept one of the manuscripts in hiding. After 5 days of "intensive" interrogation she broke down and revealed the hiding place of the manuscript. She returned home and committed suicide by hanging herself. In consideration of the safety of those who supplied him with sources of information for the book by writing and talking to him, Solzhenitsyn decided to publish the book immediately. He has been long convinced that fear of world opinion might be a protection against KGB's willfulness. The volume which appears now contains 2 of 7 written parts. It is possible that the rest will appear later.

The two first parts, "Industry of Prisons" and "Eternal Move" are stories about how one is taken to that mysterious country that doesn't exist on the map of the Soviet Union but in which "at any time of day planes are flying, ships are

sailing and trains are clattering; about *how* it happens that one finds himself in this country, and the description of the merciless, unavoidable procedure of arrest, cell, sentence and dispatch by the prisons' transportation system in a "Caravan of slaves" to some distant island of the *Archipelago*.

In the old movies about Chicago's slaughter houses, a pig after being put on the conveyor belt, appears at the other end as a sausage. In Solzhenitsyn's book, the Soviet citizen who happens to be put on the conveyor belt of the *Archipelago* automatically reappears as a *zek*, a prisoner behind the barbed wire. In addition, Solzhenitsyn uses another metaphor. He describes the "stinking pipes of the prisons' sewage system" which absorbs the streams of millions of arrested people. He tells us only *how* one finds himself in the *Archipelago* because the question *why* one is there, even the author cannot answer definitely and accurately. Rather, he quotes a famous anecdote on labor camps: The commandant of Novosybirsk labor camp asks a prisoner: What's your sentence? - the prisoner answers: Twenty-five years. What for? - asks the commandant. For nothing - says the *zek*. You are lying! In our country for nothing they give 10 years!

Solzhenitsyn defines the crimes for which one is "given" sentences of 10 and 15 and 25 years and the firing squad - the "highest administration of social

justice." He describes the "streams" of the opponents of the revolution - real and potential; the socialists, democrats, revolutionaries, the people with a high education - branded as "pests"; the enormous "stream" of peasants during the period of collectivisation and "liquidation of the kulaks"¹ class, the post war "streams" of those who were abroad, the war prisoners who were in the occupied territories. And the "streams" of Poles, Finns, Latvians, Germans, and scores of other nationalities that lived of their own free will in the U.S.S.R., or found themselves there after the war, not to count the esperantists, philatelists and - of course, the families of the arrested.

And all of them were forced to travel the same road: arrest - at home at night, at daytime in the street, in the railway station, in the place of work, while just on a walk, at rest at home; prison cells (Solzhenitsyn writes: "First cell - first love."); interrogation - as a rule, with tortures (Solzhenitsyn counts 31 "methods of breaking down a prisoner most often used in Soviet prisons"). After signing the confession to nonexistent crimes - sentence; many months of long waiting in overcrowded cells then dispatch to a place of destination in the slave labor camps.

"Close your eyes my reader. Do you hear the clatter of the wheels? The "krasmoukhy"² are passing by; in every minute of the day; in every day of the year; is that the sound of splashing

water? No, the boats full of prisoners are running; and over there the roar of "Voronki's"³ motors...and what's this noise? - Those are the overcrowded cells of transient prisons. And this howl? - Those are the cries of the robbed, raped and bitten... and even the last human hope that soon things in camp will be better - this is a deceitful hope; it will be worse in the labor camps."

That's the end of the first volume, the end of the first thread of a great theme. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn has managed to tell the universal story about those who had heard the fateful "You are arrested" and who had been turned into a drop in the "stream."

The second thread is a history of Soviet law that opened the door for populating the *Gulag Archipelago* with millions of slaves and that allowed during only two years (1937 - 1938) the shooting of one million people: "To what extent are these figures accurate?" - asks the author. "Considering that the shooting lasted not a full two years but only 1 1/2 years, it would amount to 28,000 killed per month in the entire Soviet Union... these figures mean that in any town during one day, six people were shot. Is it too fantastic? These figures are rather small."

The history of Soviet law began long before these shootings. In the beginning, as it was written a long time ago, was the word. To Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn the

beginning was the concept expressed by Lenin in January 1918 in an article "How to Organize the Competition,"⁴ proclaiming the "cleaning out of the Russian soil all the harmful pests."

The parts dedicated to the "growing up" of Russian law are given the titles: "Law - A Child," "Law - Grows into manhood," and "Law - Has Grown Up." The growth of this monstrous dragon devouring humanity, from the days of the yet unperfected set-up trials of 1918 to the gigantic show-trials of Moscow in 1937, is analysed from well known facts and forgotten political lawsuits. As sources, Solzhenitsyn uses official records of the lawsuits, speeches of the main prosecutors, Nicolay Krilitchenko and Andrei Wyshinsky, as well as the testimonies of the few still living accused.

And the third and last thread - the fate of the artillery captain Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn arrested in the spring of 1945, a few months before the end of the war, accused of antisoviet propaganda. A censor had picked up his letter to a friend in which the young officer offered his opinion of Stalin by expressively calling him a "pakhan."⁵

These threads blend together and make a book that reflects the experiences of the country and the world in our century. This book is about a country and a people who let themselves be locked in prison, who let the country be transformed in a *Gulag Archipelago*. Why were millions of innocent people, quietly, in

fear, in disbelief going to labor camps and to torture chambers? These are the basic questions that are put to us by the writer. And he does answer: First, because all of this had not begun in Stalin's regime, as many presently think or are inclined to think, but it had started with Lenin. It had begun immediately after the October revolution: the wave of suppression growing slowly and inexorably was not only killing people - it was breaking the souls of those who survived. Russia has been "cleaned" gradually: One kind of pest after another; and while one group of pests was being eradicated, the others kept their mouths shut because they thought that it didn't concern them; and then, as Solzhenitsyn describes it, "The great step toward nationwide participation in the sewage system had been achieved." Those who waited in anticipation of tomorrow's death or labor camp, by their silence gave approbation to the annihilation of others; in this way all became guilty.

However, it might have been the other way: "If, for example, in Leningrad where 1/4 of the city went behind bars, people during mass raids wouldn't have been sitting in hiding, fainting of fear at every knock at the door, at every step heard on the staircase, if they had understood that they had nothing more to lose, and would have begun organizing in the corridors of their homes, lying in ambush with axes, hammers, iron pokers, with anything at hand.... Against the best

wishes of Stalin, the damned machine might have been stopped." If every prisoner who was led through the streets would have shouted: "Disguised bandits are catching people like dogs! They catch them because of false accusations! The silent hunting for millions of people is under way! Hearing these shouts thousands of times a day, the KGB, perhaps, wouldn't have had such an easy job in making arrests." "If in every cell, all those sentenced to die prisoners, together, would have killed every entering executioner, would the tortures have not ended? Couldn't one, at the edge of the grave put up a fight?"

This was "because we lacked the need for freedom" - the author ironically announces; it was because we were frightened, swindled; because we let ourselves be frightened, and we agreed to be swindled; because "One needed to have great courage to say in this uproar, no!" "Resistance has been more difficult because even at the beginning of Soviet history it had been found that...an accord of kinship existed between those who were judging and those who were defendants"; "some mysterious union between the executioner and his victim arose."

In that shocking chapter devoted to the infamous liquidation of the old bolsheviks, Solzhenitsyn describes the fate of Nicolay Bukharin; he shows how in participation of crimes, a feeling of partnership with the executioner had decayed the souls of ex-revolutionaries, changing them into men shaken by fear,

counting upon Stalin's goodness up to the last moment of their lives.

With great sincerity Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn writes about the bestiality and indifference of the prisons' guards and personnel and the weaknesses of their victims; painfully comments on the behavior of his own people, omitting nothing. He reminds us of the "ill-fated Katyn"⁷ and Warsaw of 1944: "While some Russians were perfidiously napping and sunning on the eastern side of the Vistula river, watching through field glasses the drama of Warsaw's destruction, others were suppressing the Polish insurrection. Hadn't there been enough Russian evil imposed upon the Polish people in the nineteenth century? Now Russian knives are stabbing Poland's body again in the twentieth - is this the last time?"

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn has the right to tell his own people the whole truth; he talks with the same truthfulness about himself. He, too, is a son of his country and has grown up in an atmosphere of nationwide approval of a phony system of justice that was used as a tool to suppress the so called "enemies of the country"; He, too, had been poisoned by the venom of revolutionary slogans and myths. He tells us how an unintelligible, mysterious impulse of his conscience forced him to reject the Komsomol's⁸ proposal to enter the NKVD school; and how, when he received his army officer's golden shoulder patches, he felt his importance and superiority

toward the common soldiers; and how in prison, he passionately defended marxism, convinced that Stalin would reform Lenin's "line." While accusing millions of remaining silent he doesn't justify his own behavior. Too many times he remained silent when he should have cried out. He remained silent when he was led by NKVD men through Moscow; in the subway. "I kept silent as we went through Ochotnyy Riad; I still did not cry out when we passed the Metropol. Nor did I act when my eyes embraced the Golgotha of Lubianski's square." "In each of us" the author states bitterly - "we can always find a dozen unimportant reasons for justifying our unwillingness to sacrifice ourselves."

However, Solzhenitsyn's behavior has been justified. He remained silent in the subway "because the number of people riding the escalator is still too small, too small! What about 200 million?.... I still have a misty dream that some day I'll cry out something to all these 200 million...." The great writer wasn't deceived by his vision. *Gulag Archipelago* is a cry to the millions, to his fellow citizens and to all readers of his book. It is both a call to freedom and a call to do battle for human dignity. In the whole expanse of the book, Solzhenitsyn, crumb by crumb, gathers the testimonies of human courage, examples of refusal to submit to fear and proofs that under any circumstance one can still remain a human being.

The principal method to gain freedom from fear, the basis of inner freedom, is to achieve a final settlement of accounts with the past, a disclosure of the truth about the past.

In the prophetic novel *We*, Yevgenij Zamiatin⁹ describes a future State in which the citizens are deprived of their dreams for freedom by undergoing a brain operation which severs the cells of the imagination. In the Soviet Union alone among all nations in the same way the people are deprived of their memories of history. *Gulag Archipelago* returns to the people their historical memory. It is a history of the war between State and man; a history, first of the enslaving of man by the State and then of the gradual increase in tolerance of slavery by man. The spiritual degradation of man has resulted from the monstrous growth of the State - meaning party, which had decided, at one time or another, that the State is synonymous with the revolution and the country itself.

Writing each page of *Gulag Archipelago* demanded enormous courage, but a very special kind of courage was needed to reject the main canon of Soviet religion - trust in the infallibility of the State. Identifying the State with the country, the country with Soviet authority, Soviet authority with all its actions is an axiom and the slightest deviation from it is a crime.

Solzhenitsyn speaks with inconsolable

pain and bitterness about the numerous "streams" of prisoners flowing into the sewage pipes of "Gulag Archipelago." One of these "streams" has affected him more deeply than all others and he says about it: "History of millions of Russian prisoners of war always stabs me like a needle stabs a cockroach." And if it is necessary to point out the chapter of the book written with a special passion, emotion and pain, one must choose the chapter which is entitled "That Spring."

It is about the victorious spring of 1945; the spring when Russian war prisoners were overwhelmed with joy and hope that resounded throughout all the German POW camps. Alas! "Stalin feared that the floodtide of all those who were in Europe, of the immigrants from the days of civil war, and of the new ones, of red army officers too intelligent and too knowledgeable in what was going on, would bring to Russia the truth about European freedom the way others did 120 years before.¹⁰ Most of those prisoners were my childhood companions, not mine perhaps, but the companions of October, those who were born during the October revolution...." Those companions (Solzhenitsyn was born in 1918) were especially close to and understood by the writer. But this isn't the only reason for his love for their history. Their fate opened his eyes to the extreme inhumanity, ignominy and cruelty of the State. When they became prisoners of war the country let them die of hunger, cold and neglect: Soviet Russia disowned her

dying children. "Proud sons of Russia" were needed as long as they were able to lie down in front of German tanks, as long as they were able to attack the enemy. But to feed them? Superfluous boarders! And the superfluous witnesses of the disgraceful deceptions! The many who somehow survived and lived to see the liberation were denounced as traitors.

"In how many wars has Russia been involved?" - asks Solzhenitsyn - and, "how many traitors have we had in these wars? ... And, how is it that now, during the reign of the most "righteous" government in the world, all of a sudden, there are millions of traitors, all of them just simple common people.... How do you understand this? How do you explain it?"

The writer offers an explanation: He says that perhaps the State should be blamed; "all these prisoners were put behind bars...because they might speak of Europe to their fellow citizens; one cannot dream about something one has never seen or heard of." Despite the records of the courts in which one cannot find anything about the reason for sentencing the war prisoners except as a "traitor of the country," these millions of soldiers and officers were, perhaps, not traitors. It was not these unfortunate who betrayed the country but a perfidious country that betrayed them three times. The first time was when it sold them out on the battle field at the time when the war was going badly at its beginning and was almost lost. The second

time when it cruelly let them die in the prisoner of war camps. And a third time when it wickedly deluded them with false motherly love ("your country has forgiven you! Your country is calling you back!") then chaining the deceived when they crossed the boundary back into Russia.

Solzhenitsyn willing to embrace the problems pertaining to the "whole truth" dwells too on the sinister question of Vlasov's army, pointing out that only its soldiers could have been accused of treason; he realizes that he'll be spat upon for any mention of them as "nobody has the courage to say a sentence whose subject is one word - *Vlasovists*." But he thinks that he hasn't the right to keep silent in this matter: "This is the most unusual phenomenon of world history; hundreds of thousands of young men 20 to 30 years old took up arms and fought under German command against their own country. That's why one should think: Who is to be blamed more - these young men, or their country?"

Only corrupt and dishonest critics can accuse Solzhenitsyn, fearless enemy of might and injustice, of sympathy toward fascism. In the war he fought Hitler and Vlasov, but "a quarter of a century later, when a majority of Vlasov's men died in labor camps and some are still dying in far distant Siberia" the writer tells us the historical truth about them: "They were driven to Vlasov's army of the *Vermacht*¹² by final, boundless despair, by the unlimited hate for the Soviet

regime and by disdain for their own lives."

For the first time in Soviet history there has arisen a towering man armed only with his talent, who distinctly says that the State has not only the right to govern the country but also has duties toward its citizens, and what is more important, the citizens have the right to judge the State.

In this concept lies the dynamic, revolutionary power of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's book. Spiritual, inner freedom gives him this power. "I am an interplanetary wanderer," he says about himself - reminding one of Jack London's novel. "They may take my body, but my soul cannot be subjected to anything."

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn dedicated his book "to all those whose lives were too short to allow them to cry out." He asks for their forgiveness from heaven if he "didn't see, didn't remember or didn't foresee everything." Undoubtedly the writer couldn't see or remember everything - this is beyond the strength of one man. But there is not the slightest doubt that he "foresaw" and understood many things; and that he has taken upon himself the mission of telling it all.

On the last page of the book Solzhenitsyn recollects how in Butyrsk prison he met with Moscow's students; they taught him a lot of things, among them how to understand Boris Pasternak's¹³ poetry. He cites in his book two stanzas

from a poem by Pasternak which deeply moved and influenced him. One poem in which a rebel before he dies in front of a firing squad says about his destiny:

In vain in the years of chaos,
One looks for the happy ending,
For some to punish and to repent,
For the others to die on Golgotha.

The writer has accepted his destiny and nothing can stop him.

Michal Heller

INDEX

1. Page 9: Kulak - a wealthy peasant who employed labor and opposed collectivisation of farms.
2. Page 9: Drasmoukha - goods railway carriage used for transportation of prisoners.
3. Page 10: Voronka - special motor truck.
4. Page 11: Lenin, V. E., Collective works, 5th edition, Volume XXXV, p. 204.

5. Page 11: Pakhan - (slang) boss of gangsters or bandits.
6. Page 12: October revolution of 1917; Lenin's bolsheviks party overthrew the monarchy.
7. Page 14: Katyn - better known as Katyn Forest near Smolensk. Mass grave of 10,000 Polish officers who were perfidiously executed by order of Stalin. It has been found and proven that all had been killed by shots to the base of the skull from close range.
8. Page 14: Komsomol - the young communist league of the Soviet Union.
9. Page 16: Zamiatin Yevgeny (Ivanovich) 1884 - 1937.
10. Page 17: Russian armies of czar Aleksander I (1777 - 1825) stationed in France after participation in the battle of Waterloo where Napoleon I was finally defeated.
11. Page 19: Vladimir Vlasov, gen. - led the armies made of Russian war prisoners and organized by and under German command; fought against the Russians.
12. Page 19: Vermacht - German Armed Forces.
13. Page 20: Pasternak, Boris (Leonidovich) 1890 - 1960. Best known for his book *Doctor Zhivago*.

Fragments

Vol. 1/4

May, 1974

IN AND AROUND SOVIET PRESS

by

Charles Joel

IN AND AROUND SOVIET PRESS

By

Charles Joel

A translation of excerpts from the articles written by Adam Kruczek in Polish magazine KULTURA from September 1973 to March 1974, published in Paris, France.

© Copyright 1974 by Charles Joel

Published by Correspondence Home Study of
Languages
Sutter Creek, California

Printed by The Essicc Company
Sutter Creek, California

FOREWORD

In the following article I wish to acquaint the readers with the works of Adam Kruczek, a prominent Polish reporter. His regular column written for KULTURA reflects a deep insight of Soviet relations with the rest of the world.

However, my intention goes a little further: In this issue, apart from many political nature problems, by the selection of several "flashes", or excerpts from the articles which appeared in KULTURA during the period of time from September 1973 to March 1974, I want to project an image of the Soviet press in action which is so contrasting with the freedom of American press and with freedom of expression of American people.

I hope that my intention will be fulfilled.

I believe that from time to time I'll be able to publish translations of Mr. Kruczek's valuable articles in full.

C.J.

IN AND AROUND SOVIET PRESS

I

Maximov's "Karantin" is after the books of Solzhenitsyn, undoubtedly the most interesting book about a cross-section of Soviet society. I don't intend to compare both writers - Maximov doesn't deny that he is a pupil of Solzhenitsyn; as to the book "Karantin", one may have some claims and objections. But there is one thing one cannot deny: It is a very penetrating, honest story about conditions in which the people of the Soviet Union are living today. The action takes place during 6 days in a train that has been stopped for quarantine because it was traveling from Odessa which has just been seized by an epidemic of cholera. In the train like in Noah's ark are the specimens of Soviet fauna (a pair of each category): From thieves to the employees of party organizations; from beggars to the high ranking officials. During the quarantine all Russia is sick with cholera. The main hero is led through the quarantine period - through this purgatory - by a good devil Ivan Ivanovich (borrowed by Maximov from Bulgakov). During the 6 days the inhabitants of the train never stop drinking. All Russia is living on Vodka. Only vodka makes it possible to suppress one's scruples, forget the victims, treacheries and villainies. Ex-martyrs and ex-executioners may - as Maximov believes - have hope for forgiveness.

The outstanding character is portrayed

in a cheerful rogue and swindler, Lev Balykin, a man who found the "secret" of Soviet society". "His methods of operation are based entirely on scientifically proven methods of Freud and academician Pavlov. After all our people are crazy, frightened; our people react only to fixed and conditional reflexes". Maximov describes plainly how taking the advantage of "conditional reflexes" Soviet authorities can force people to commit the worst imaginable crimes. In the book there is a fantastic scene in which Balykin is selling "china powders": Lev Balykin is used to a high risk living. Waking up one morning he finds that he has only 20 kopecks in his pocket; he goes to the nearest drugstore and buys a packet of tablets that are made of pine needles; he takes it to the railway station where he meets his first victim, a typical Soviet citizen; as he passes by, he says quietly under his breath: "Do you need a china powder?" - That's enough; the victim doesn't know what a china powder is, but he knows that whatever is sold undercover is worth buying. For the tablets made of pine needles, Lev Balykin gets all victim's money and some of his belongings also, and.....scientific methods of Freud and academician Pavlov are fully proven in practice.

Even if in Maximov's book there wasn't a simple thought entirely unacceptable to the official Soviet ideology, his writing gives such a terrible, sad and hopeless picture of Soviet society, that his exclusion from the Soviet writers union (whose main duty is deceiving the readers) seems to be quite a logical act.

II

Soviet statistics have been subject to doubt for a long time. We know quite a lot about these matters. It's well known that Stalin was shooting statisticians whose figures didn't please him. The regimes of other general secretaries whose concern were statistics had many problems too. For example there is the scandal that took place during the Khrushchev days in the Riazan district which by buying butter in the neighboring districts outstripped the U.S.A. in its production.

But this is nothing to compare with a case that was reported by TRUD in June 1973. It is worth while to describe it closer because normally Soviet people have a hushed up knowledge about "things" that are happening in their communities, and in this case, somehow, a scandal was brought to the attention of the whole nation in such an open manner that the Soviet citizens were provided with an opportunity of their lives to read about it.

Well, TRUD recalls that on the 19th of December 1968, IZVIESTIA published a front page article stating: "The 7th generator in Nazarian electrical power plant has been put to work. During the night of 17th it joined the Siberian power net". Some other papers described the Nazarian plant in Southern Siberia as the "beginning of technological revolution". PRAVDA pompously reported: "In just a few seconds the gigantic machine quivered and her powerful basso blended with the joyous choir of the six generators already operating". This announcement was repeated in many other papers in December 1968.

TRUD, continuing its recollections 4-1/2 years later, writes that the "powerful basso" of the 7th generator never had sounded and the production of 500,000 kilowatts had never begun because the generator burned down during the tests. Despite this, it had been put into statistics and it works very well.....on paper.

If Brezhnev would decide to give the real picture of Soviet economy for the purpose of acquiring credit in the U.S.A., the true story of the Nazarian plant would be a very convincing demonstration. But very dangerous: Where does one stop when one begins to tell the truth.....?

III

On the 7th of October 1973, IZVIESTIA on the front page printed a communique: "Israel assaulted Egypt, Syria and Lebanon". IZVIESTIA appears at the newsstands during afternoon hours so it was clear that the Middle East war had already been on its way for 24 hours and everybody knew perfectly well who assaulted whom. In the following days the Soviet press continued publishing only the Arabs' war communiques, stressing the victorious mood of Arabian forces and the aggressive intentions of Israelites. However, in Soviet reporting there was sort of a lack of true conviction and satisfaction. Writing about the move of the U.S.S.R. delegate to the U.N. - Malik, who charged that Israel bombers destroyed the Soviet cultural center in Damascus, the Soviet press cancelled from his speech the part about Soviet citizens who were killed. It appears that neither those citizens had been killed, nor the authorities in Moscow like to bring the

"antisionistic feelings" to the boiling point.

I am writing this report at the time when the 4th Arab - Israel war has just begun to unwind. Nobody yet, can prognosticize the outcome of the war. But one thing is possible to disclose today: The Soviet warfare including the latest models of rockets, proved to be a deciding factor in the successes of Arabian forces in the first stage of war. And today one may assume that the Soviet leaders, independently of all their other plans and wishes, are using the Middle East war as testing ground for their armory. The Western military experts note with surprise the enormous effectiveness of Soviet rockets in comparison with their magnitude in Vietnam not long ago. Today nobody doubts that Vietnam experience had been used too as a testing ground which had helped to improve the Soviet warfare.

"If you want peace, prepare war" - the ancient Romans used to say. During the last 2 years Soviet leaders have never stopped assuring the world that they want peace. And we can see quite clearly - that they never stopped preparing the war. But against whom?

IV

Western observers confirm the concentration of Soviet forces on the border with China. Andrei Samokhin too writes about it, quoting in particular the Soviet manual of "War History" (Moscow, 1971, page 273), in which one can read: "The experience of the Manchurian war" - meaning the war with Japan

in 1945 - "confirms the possibility of using the conventional military forces in the specific character of the far Eastern theatre of operation". But, beside this A. Samokhin quotes some facts that were not known to the West "The changes in the internal life of the country" - according to him - "say more about the preparation for war than the concentration of forces on the border of China". Among those "changes" he mentions: Introduction of a higher restriction system of permits for travel by train and plane in many regions close to China, where before these permits were not needed; limitations in the movement of the populace on the extreme North where the captives of labor camps are being evacuated from the zone of conflict; storing of food supplies of kinds that may be preserved for a longer period of time; increased activities of political agents in the army - using every possible method for creating an atmosphere of hate toward China and her life style; reorganization of the Politburo in April 1973 directed toward the concentration of power in one authority; and the announcement that China "is not a socialist country" and that she has been banned from the "world communist church".

A. Samokhin envisages that conflict may burst out in the coming 4 - 5 years. Arguments of the author are of course only wishful thinking. But he gives enough facts that support his suppositions. It is, for example important to stress the fact that in the latest edition of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia, the definition of China as a socialist people's republic has been deleted.

It looks like one confirmation of A. Samokhin's assumptions.

The war in the Middle East, where Soviet armaments are playing such an important role probably creates another argument in favor of preventive war with China; an argument which up to now the adherents of war with China were lacking.

V

Punishment of Russian people who don't conform appears such a natural act that the Soviet press doesn't bother to write much about it. But, on the other hand the same press shows much concern with matter of punishment in the other countries.

The magazine SOVIET CULTURE which began to appear in 1973, strongly expressed its disapproval of the "mild sentences" of the court in Bologna. The court forbade showing the movie "Last Tango in Paris" and sentenced American actor Marlon Brando and French actress Marie Schneider to 2 months jail. Kolin, the author of the report, just dies with laughter. What a sentence! In addition there was no success in putting the culprits behind bars, because, to his regret, "they hastily left Italy and nobody had even tried to stop them". It is laughable to Kolin... ... but this is not the end of his story. He revolts not only against the indulgence of Italian justice but also against the fact that the movie of Bernaldo Bertolucci has been allowed to go on the screen in Israel. And what is worse: "That the film is not censored and is being shown in its original

negligee". The care of the Israelites' clean behavior is a new problem of concern for the Soviet press. One shouldn't have any doubt that with the number of ex-Soviet citizens in Israel on the increase, the interest in this problem will increase too. Who knows when the Soviet Union will capitalize on the "love for the old country" which now motivates Soviet Jews' immigration to Israel but is being refused to them? It is annoying that the time may come when this care of ex-Russian citizens will result in the reverse tide - the "old country" or the "love for the old country" will become Russia, or love for Russia.

VI

There were the days when Stalin was heard by all the nations of Soviet Union, by the world proletariat and later by all mankind that loves peace; to Khrushchev the peoples of the world listened; to Brezhnev - as the Soviet press writes on the 25th of October 1973 - "the whole planet" listened. If at any time anybody doubted that the world has already passed into the stage of interplanetary life, then now for sure all doubts are gone.

Leonid Brezhnev appeared at the All World Peace Conference delivering a 2 hour speech. In it, everything was as it should be: Review of international situation, announcement that those who talk about "liberalization" (quotations in B. speech) "have as a target the liquidation of the real achievements of socialism", and those who talk about the human rights don't even suspect that no human being in any other country of the world has rights as compared to the individual rights

in the "country of victorious socialism".

VII

Reading the Western press, daily papers and periodicals of different countries, during the last month I found little mention of so called "good news". From the texts of these Western publications, I discovered that "good news" refers to the white bears which have been given some measure of protection by new regulations. All other news is bad. By contrast, in the Soviet press most of the news is good. In any case where the lives of Soviet citizens are involved the Soviet press doesn't stop assuring everybody that life is becoming better. Of course, there is a corner of these publications which is devoted to bad news but this applies only to life in the West.

Lately, this corner is full of data pertaining to Western living under pressure of the oil crisis. However, one must realize that in these reporting there is a lack of triumphant feeling, or joy, which should be caused by the approaching and apparently quite real decline of capitalism. The oil crisis is discussed from the position of the working masses who according to Western capital correspondents of PRAVDA and IZVIESTIA are beginning to suffer from the cold in unheated homes, cannot drive their cars and enjoy holidays. In short, the working people of the West lead the kind of life that would never be acceptable to the Soviet citizens. Correspondent of PRAVDA from Bonn in particular, reported that Western Germans store their supplies of gasoline in their bathtubs. This fact must sound very convincing to the Soviet reader

as he too behaves in exactly the same manner during many a crisis. In all this reporting one gets the impression that the main concern of the published material is the conviction of Western observers that the Soviet Union is somehow behind the oil crisis. And doubts in this respect do exist. James Reston of NEW YORK TIMES admits that perhaps Moscow "not knowing how to realize the scientific and technological revolution that is well under way in other industrial countries, takes advantage of its influence in the Middle East in order to harm the production in the West and Japan". Victor Zorza in TIME supposes that the Soviet Union inspires the limitation of oil shipments by the Arabs because it needs oil itself. All these suppositions, judging by the reaction of the Soviet press must have touched a very sensitive point. The Western press was answered by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, PRAVDA, SOVIETSKAYA ROSSIYA, and in a long and detailed article, NOVOYE VREMYA. One feels that through all these answers which actually amount to the analogical arguments meanders an anxious attempt to convince the West that the Soviet Union has nothing to do with the oil crisis.

One of these arguments is that the Soviet Union does not need to bother with Arabian oil because it has more than enough of its own and is completely safe for many years to come. This argument cannot pass when faced with the following facts: The Soviet Union, according to provisional calculation, produced 420 million tons of oil in 1973. This is below 429 million in the plan made in 1971 and even below its

correction that lessened production to 424 million tons. No doubt, the Soviet Union has fantastic riches of oil in Siberia and in the Arctics, but Soviet industry alone isn't able to recover it. The help of the West is needed. Besides, the Soviet Union must pay the West with oil and other raw materials and it's necessary even today to sell oil because, up to now this is the only way of getting foreign currency. Not to mention that all socialist nations (except Romania) need Soviet oil. No, I think that the only realistic approach of the Soviet press would be to say: Oil is needed by the Soviet Union as well as by the West.

Why then the Soviet press with all strength denies any partnership of Soviet Union in Arabian pressure on the West? Because it doesn't want the trade agreements to be broken, it doesn't want to lose the precious help from the West, so important in recovery of oil and of other mineral resources.

Alexandr Levikov in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA tells about how much is needed from the West in an article entitled "Simulation of activity" which is devoted to the Soviet system of administration. From lack of space (editor's remark) I'll omit most of his deliberations as they don't reveal anything new, but I'll stay with the following interesting comment:

In all these statements there is nothing special. The only thing new is Levikov's recipe borrowed from the book of Nicolay Smilakov writing about American - capitalistic methods of administration. "I don't like the famous American style of life" -

writes Levikov (let him try to say that he likes it!!) - "with its false standards, ever growing panics, ruthlessness and social contrasts". But, from further reading, it appears that the American businessmen know how accomplish more than the Soviet economic activists and, though, whatever they do "is dictated by the interest of competition", Soviet managers should learn from them.

Simultaneously with the call for learning from American businessmen and with information about the visits of American capitalists in Moscow, some measures are enforced in order to prevent American-Soviet detente from becoming a "free exchange of ideas". Sharp warning was given by Suslov, Secretary of the Central Committee and main communist party ideologist. In his great speech at Vilno, Suslov blasted at "reactionary forces which recently try to undermine the credibility of peaceful politics of the Soviet Union". However, he doesn't define any of these mysterious "reactionary forces".

VIII

At the beginning of January, IZVIESTIA, summarizing the results, described 1973 year as the best in the history of the Soviet Union since the end of the 2nd world war. It's probably true. But the new year began less favourably because of Alexandr Solzhenitsyn. Publishing of "Gulag Archipelago" took the "organs" by surprise. Five days elapsed before TASS published its first comment, and this was done for the use of foreign countries only. Two days later comments appeared about "Gulag Archipelago" on TV, but the commentator says

only that Solzhenitsyn is a "traitor" who in his "novel" (?) whitewashes the traitors of the country. Evidently, at this point, the book has not yet been studied carefully. The next day, on the screen, Yurii Zhukov, a famous specialist on international affairs appears. In front of him, on the table is a pile of letters and each of them, as Zhukov assures the audience, contains the words of honest Soviet citizens revolting against the book of Solzhenitsyn. If we take into account that "Gulag Archipelago" had appeared 10 days earlier in France, and hadn't been on sale in Moscow, we must admit that Soviet citizens demonstrated a great degree of operativeness: having had time not only for reading the book and knowing it well, but also for developing an indignant opinion expressed in hundreds of letters too. Well, evidently there is no reason to doubt that the Soviet Union is a country of unlimited possibilities.

And later the Soviet press went all out. In PRAVDA - an article after 17 days; articles in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, in SOVIETSKAYA ROSSIYA and in others. In the papers, letters of indignant citizens, writers, and voices from brotherhood of communist parties in other countries all over the world. The campaign develops according to the well known scenario which already has vexed everybody. All the papers, periodicals, and speakers repeat exactly the same empty and deceitful words. Through all of it pierces a single pressing question: What is to be done with Solzhenitsyn?

IX

If planning by the Moscow Central Committee exasperates the directors of Soviet

construction firm who must perform unbelievable tricks to complete the plans, then it is strange why it doesn't annoy the American capitalists who, judging by their own statements, prefer Moscow to any other capital of the world. For example, a reporter of NIEDIELA (NO 2) paid a visit to the vice-president of the Bank of America Alex Jankovich in his apartment on the 20th floor of one of Moscow's hotels. The vice-president "proudly showed me his apartment - three small rooms". Mr. Alex Jankovich, looks at home nestled in one room together with his wife and kids, and is happy having obtained such a luxury in Moscow. The sharp eyes of the reporter caught a recently purchased gravure of the palace square in Leningrad leaning against the wall. American banker shared his secret dreams with the guest: "I wish I could hang up by this gravure another one that would tell something about the October revolution in order to let my guests look and think about what had happened. To many of our businessmen you still are Russia, but for a very long time you have been the Soviet Union. One must open some people's eyes to your present day reality".

One must be convinced that with this kind of American banker the Soviet Union cannot lose. As they say in Moscow: This is the kind of bankers we need.

Adam Kruczek

Fragments

Vol. 1/5

June 1974

SILENCE IS NOT ALWAYS GOLDEN

by

Charles Joel

SILENCE IS NOT ALWAYS GOLDEN

by

Charles Joel

Published by the Pacific Company

San Francisco, California

A translation of an article
written by Juliusz Mieroszewski
in the Polish magazine "Kultura"
No. 11/314/73 published in
Paris, France.

© Copyright 1974 by Charles Joel

Published by Correspondence Home Study
of Languages
Sutter Creek, Ca. 95685

Printed by The Essicc Company
Sutter Creek, California.

FOREWORD

"Silence is not always golden".
"The fight for respect of human rights in
the Soviet block should be led by 2 opinion
making powers of the free world: Christian
churches and organized Science".

These 2 quotations seem to be the main
conclusions of the article you are about to
read.

Although written by Western European,
and, it appears, in behalf of Western Europe,
the theme has an immense attraction and, in my
opinion, is of great value to any reader,
regardless the country, or place he lives in.
Despite many new events that had occurred on
the political scene since this article was
written, it retains its actuality and signi-
ficance; it will retain them for as long as
there is the question of East - West rela-
tions unsolved.

Juliusz Mieroszewski, the author of this
work is a reporter of pre-war Polish leading
newspaper, writer, essayist on many political
topics, and coworker of Kultura from its
start at the end of 2nd world war.

I sincerely hope that this translation
will provide you with another present day
thought and will be worthy of your attention.

C.J.

SILENCE IS NOT ALWAYS GOLDEN

On the 3rd of September 1973, British TV presented a one hour telecast from Kiev. The program has been very interesting. It showed the life of an average inhabitant of Kiev - the work in factories, summer camps for children, the celebration of a civilian wedding and of a "baptism", subways, shopping at the great food markets, private homes etc. Everything is organized by the State, from the cradle to the grave.

The life is slow, organized. People clean and disciplined - one would say automated; sunk in limitless small town boredom. The atmosphere of Kiev reflects a passiveness - boredom nationalized, institutionalized.

But this is not what I want to write about. It was striking that in this presentation not one word was spoken in the Ukrainian language. Everybody was talking Russian and the British commentator called Kiev "mother of Russian cities".

One cannot blame the young British commentator because he and his team were surrounded by Russian specialists and advisors. Not to mention the fact that Britishers wouldn't know the difference between Russian and Ukrainian.

In the West we say that "everything depends on the point of view". In the Soviet orbit, everything depends on the point

of view too but the point of view is nationalized.

Let's take an example of the nationalized point of view. We write a lot about so called "detente". This word was printed so many times that a publicist hesitates to use it if he doesn't like to scare his readers. Nobody has any doubts that to the Soviets the term "detente" has a different meaning than to us. The Soviets clearly and openly expressed their view on this problem as late as the first decade of September 1973.

Logically, on the basis of facts and statistics we must conclude that we are threatened by the Soviets. Are the threat and detente synonyms? It seems that they are not, though, as I am going to point out, this depends on the point of view.

In the West we reason that the threat must go away in order to make room for detente. All talks about mutual and "balanced" reductions of arms have an objective the lessening of the threat which is an inevitable condition for improving relations, or, for so called "detente".

It appears that the Soviets point of view on these matters is entirely different than that of the bourgeois political logic. The Soviets consider the threat and "detente" as synonymous and to them without the threat there cannot be detente.

We know that as a result of the Soviet pressure there is no more talk about the

"balanced" reduction of arms. There cannot be any talk about the balanced reduction because it is not the balance but the superiority of the Soviet block that can protect the "detente". And don't we want it?

The Hungarian and Czechoslovak communist parties press in the first days of September 73, quite openly stated that only owing to the great military superiority of the Warsaw pact nations over Western Europe had the "detente" become a reality. A representative of Czechoslovakian Defense Department told Western reporters that Warsaw pact nations must strengthen and build up this superiority in order to secure the "detente's" prosperity and durability. In the Eastern block (with the exception of Romania) nobody could announce this kind of view on his own initiative. Particularly the representatives of Defense Departments.

From the standpoint of the totalitarian power, the above reasoning is logical. In the structure of the totalitarian power, the interior as well as the exterior politics result from the fear. Chachaturian, or David Oystach condemned Prof. Sakharov because of fear. The Soviet authorities don't care whether Oystach thinks identically as the boss of KGB. Everybody knows that he, or people of his class think the way Prof. Sakharov thinks. But the triumph of the apparatus and the test of its efficacy are so much better if KGB can force conformity upon the people who are known as nonconformists.

There are many anticonformists, or

dissidents in Russia. Very probably more than, for example, in Poland. The strength of terror demands of the dissident a stature of a hero. In every European community one may find many free thinking people but the number of Palahs in them is very limited. (Editor's remark: As most readers remember, Palah was a student who burned himself to death publicly in Prague in protest against the Russian invasion of his country in 1968.)

The methods of terror are very highly developed and in many cases the true heroes can be deprived of their heroism. Special chemical preparations and "psychiatric" treatments can change man into a submissive automaton. Cutting off certain nerves' connections in the brain also causes irrevocable changes in personality of a patient. These methods are not used in mass yet, but it is possible today not only to break down spiritually and morally the "chosen ones of KGB", but to take away their own personality too.

This isn't always necessary. In many cases common blackmail is sufficient. If for the price of confession and admitting "the blame", a prisoner can save his wife and children from deportation and ill-treatment, not many will refuse the proposition. So, one must be very careful in passing judgement on those who broke down, confessed and even publicly spat on their own lives.

A hero can victoriously survive the "old fashioned" methods of torture and can

take a lot of physical pain. But nobody can overcome the effects of chemical preparations, much less the effects of neurosurgery. Depriving an authentic hero of his heroism and transforming him into a scoundrel whom he never was is the most monstrous crime ever created by humans of the XXth century. Among the injustices this is one that is the crying outrage.

On the 8th of Sept. 1973, Prof. Sakharov said to the gathering of Western press in Moscow that the psychiatrists of Western Europe whose arrival and participation in U.S.S.R. scientific conference was expected, should demand the right of visiting and examining the political dissidents placed in institutions for mentally ill. He stated further that 12 prominent intellectuals are locked in these places and that many of them are under duress effected by chemical preparations.

Just a few days before the above statement of Prof. Sakharov, one of the British psychiatrists who recently has visited in Moscow said in an interview on BBC, that in none of Moscow's psychiatric asylums had he met any political dissidents and added that the gossip about this matter circulating in the West does not seem to be convincing nor documented. The same day BBC invited a reputed British sovietologist who quoted a number of documented reports about the U.S.S.R. political dissidents who are being kept in this kind of institutions.

I quote this example because it is typical for certain, unfortunately, of quite a large number of people. It is easier, not to check

and more comfortable to throw away the reports as unsufficiently proven, than to admit in one's own conscience that in one of the European capitals crimes against mankind are under way; the crimes that have no analogy in the history of our continent.

Not only in the Germany of Hitler had thousands of people closed their ears repelling the "gossip" about extermination camps as unsufficiently proven. In the West too, thousands resisted believing that Hitler was conducting the systematic destruction of 6 million European Jews.

Of course, one shouldn't believe in the gossip nor approve of the violations which have no basis for evidence. But in the situation where the credible relations and documented proofs are present, it is a moral cowardice to refuse to believe in facts because it disturbs the "peacefulness" of one's conscience. It is undoubtedly nicer and more comfortable to believe that even in Russia everything is OK, and that the opposition, though not recognized yet, is tolerated.

But this is not all that should be said on this subject. The average Westerner reasons: A war with todays technology would become not only a misfortune, but a cataclysm. "Detente" is a necessity if we want to avoid it. At this point in this simple reasoning begins "the Russian vicious circle" and the Westerner has an immense difficulty in grasping at it.

It is obvious that the Russians of such

stature as Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn are men who think as we do in the West. If there are differences between them and us, this doesn't mean that we differ in outlook on such fundamentals as the right of man and citizen. In other words, the people who talk to us through Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn are Russians with whom the detente would be possible. Are we going to let them be devoured by those Russians with whom detente d e f a c t o is not possible?

There is another aspect of this problem. The hope of mankind that the peace will be sustained is based on the idea that a group of leaders in the Kremlin and in the White House, in times of crises that are unavoidable in politics, will show a degree of responsibility born from the sense of morality and not from the fear.

In the past, fear proved to be insufficient instrument, or brake. Fear did not stop the leaders of Hitlerian Germany from genocide, from sinking unarmed passenger ships, from massive bombing of the open cities. Fear is not a substitute for morality.

I don't mean morality of the lofty quality. I don't propose converting marxists to christianity nor to impose on Russia an action of "moral armament" because I am not a member of any movement that acts under this call. In this writing I am concerned with a minimum of honesty that leads to a mutual trust.

The Kremlin leaders have at their disposal 20 times more nuclear missiles than the needed minimum for the liquidation of life on our planet. What we define as "peace"

in 1973 is in fact the belief and hope that the Soviet leaders will not use their nuclear power.

Up to now, during the periods of wars, the whole regiments and even the whole armies, but never the whole nations, have been lost. We adapted ourselves to wars as to the historical phenomena because during the wars millions of people but never civilizations have been destroyed.

Presently the situation changed. The Soviets have technological means of wiping off whole nations and indeed are able to turn into radioactive desert not only the cities, but the whole continents. This is a situation which cannot be found in the most stormy historical past and for this reason, we are unable to adapt ourselves to this situation. We can and should adapt ourselves to our own death, to dying off of the whole generation, but we cannot live with a vision of a cataclysm that would become the end of our civilization. If we would get used to living with this vision, this would mean that our phenomenal adaptability to which we owe everything from the beginning of human existency on Earth, has failed us.

But this article isn't devoted to the question of nuclear war only. I wanted to underline the fact that as in the past the amorality of tyrants meant only a "private" calamity of a nation, so today amorality of the tyrants who own the nuclear arms, is a threat to all mankind.

Politicians who break the elementary rights of man, who lock the political dissidents in the asylums for madmen, do not give

any assurance that during the serious international crisis, they won't reach for nuclear arms.

If Russia would be governed by men of cultural-humanistic views of Solzhenitsyn and of Prof. Sakharov, one would consider it certain that Russia will not detonate an atomic war either against the West or against China. But it would be a limitless naivety to assume that the persecutors of Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov won't trample all agreements and conventions if at a certain point they find it politically convenient.

Standing behind Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov (I use these names as symbols) we do it not in the name of noble ideas, but above all for the sake of our own security, which depends directly on the answer to the question: By whom is Russia governed? Until those who govern Russia are the people who understand governing as a total and moral act, the peace of the world will be on the brink of collapse

* * *

Contemporary sovereignty cannot be a license for committing injustice inside the border of the nation. One cannot be assured that the government which does injustice in internal politics won't do it in foreign affairs. Between the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 and the persecution of dissidents inside Russia there exist a close relationship. They are 2 sides of the same coin. State which would observe the basic rights of its own citizens wouldn't invade Czechoslovakia. State which wouldn't organize false political lawsuits against its

own citizens wouldn't conduct p e r
p r o c u r a false lawsuits against the
leaders and writers of Czechoslovakia.

This argument is immensely realistic, but it is stubbornly untouchable by the Western politicians and press. Naive and pious wishes tell the Western politicians to believe, or to pretend to believe that the Soviets can break all human and God's commandments inside and at the same time to behave impeccably and civilized in outside. That's not all. The Soviets are so "marvellous" that in Moscow, they can organize witches' sabbaths and at the same time conduct, in relation to the West, politics of "detente" and "exchange of people and ideas".

There are many examples of that Western naivety but unquestionably the leading personality in this question is chancellor Brandt, the creator of O s t p o l i t i k. At the press conference in Bonn on the 12th of September 1973, he announced that he would search for an approach with Russia even if Stalin were alive. In accordance with this position when asked by the newsmen, he stated that as a laureate of the Nobel prize, he doesn't intend to propose Prof. Sakharov for candidacy of this prize.

It seems to me that chancellor Brandt without realizing it, may have spoken "historical words" which will be long remembered and remonstrated to him.

The unfortunate Chilean president Allende was proposed for the Nobel prize by its 5 Western laureates. To the moment of writing these words, Prof. Sakharov was

proposed only by Solzhenitsyn. Cowardice and cajolery of the great percentage of Western intellectuals must arouse surprise and contempt. In this case it is more than "betrayal of the clerks".

Basic changes are not created by the initiative of governments but by the individuals. In the West we are gloating over America and it seems to us that nothing can destroy democracy because behind it stands the greatest power of the world. But, in fact, the democracies represent a threatened minority. Soviet Union, China, Latin America and most of the African nations have nothing in common with democracy.

The base of our civilization of which we are the progenies, is the democratic system - basic rights of man and citizen. They are the universal rights which should be defended everywhere and by all if the mankind is to survive.

Science has given to the world a modern technology, but in confrontation with moral problems, on the whole, it takes the stature of Pontius Pilate. But the matters went too far and the scientists should realize that science in the rest free of the globe can't afford to be neutral in relation to things that are happening in Russia. Otherwise, the dreadful prediction of Solzhenitsyn that the image of today's Russia is a projection of future world, may become true.

Several British scientists as a sign of protest refused the membership of Soviet Academy of Sciences. All this is too little. The scientific world as well as the Christian churches play a game of diplomacy. Both

practice their own O s t p o l i t i k , which as all O s t p o l i t i k s , is based on an assumption that it is possible to achieve more by one sided "detente" than by a protest.

The church, up to now, doesn't understand that the right of creed and of teaching religion is a part of human rights and where the basic human rights are being crushed, it is naive to assume that religion will be excepted.

For many years, the catholic church in different States of Europe was enjoying a status of a State religion. In those days from the pulpit, the thunderings were thrown on the liberals and socialists. Teaching religion in schools was compulsory as it is now the teaching of marxism-leninism in the Eastern block countries schools. The church did not ask whether the parents wished or did not wish their children be indoctrinated in the religious system.

Although I am not an orthodox catholic, I am happy that in formative years of my high school I was shaped on the christian principles and outlook. In my opinion, Christianity cannot be replaced by anything. Nevertheless, I believe that the compulsory teaching of catholic religion in the schools was a blow to the cardinal liberties of a citizen, exactly as presently the compulsory teaching of marxism-leninism is. None of the religions can be "the king's religion" because it then turns into the State's ideology.

The christian churches, catholic church in particular, should take a hard and wide

open line in defense of all who fight for the cardinal rights of man. I don't know whether Prof. Sakharov is a religious man but by fighting for freedom of his countrymen, by the same token, he fights for the freedom of the religious cult. The church loudly and distinctly should brand all violations of basic rights of man, because every violation of free thinking is also violation of the religious cult.

The church taking a hard line in defending the freedom of an individual has nothing to lose except its own hypocrisy and naive O s t p o l i t i k . The church of yesteryear could rely on concordats and privileges given by the emperors and kings. All this is long gone. Alas! Although inside, the church is modern and progressive, on the outside it practices, above the heads of millions deprived of elementary rights and liberties, the same old methods of negotiations and agreements with the "mighties" of the world.

Pharisaism of Roman church consists in readiness to ally itself with any State against the liberal and independent thinking under the condition that the catholic doctrine will have full freedom and privileges. Rose Luxemburg rightly observed that freedom means always freedom for the others. The church never was for freedom because it never wanted it for the others, on the contrary, it demanded it always for itself. Owing to this tradition the church is not prepared to fight against Sovietism because it still didn't grasp the idea that freedom for others is a necessary condition for freedom of all including the church itself.

In my opinion the fight for the respect of human rights in the Soviet block should be led by 2 opinion making powers of the free world: Christian churches and organized Science. These 2 powers undertaking an open fight for restoration of human rights that are violated in Eastern block, in fact, would be fighting for their own existence. Politicians, State institutions, gigantic bureaucracies, may exist under any system. But Christian churches and Science in the most honest meaning of these words - may exist only in the civilized world. It is unbelievably shocking how much the churches and organized Science do not realize the dimension of their own danger.

At the time of writing these words, the press declares that the chairman of "Amnesty International" is going to Moscow to discuss with the Soviet authorities the problem of political dissidents and the situation of Prof. Sakharov in particular. But, as I said before - this is not enough, or, this is too little. Universities, institutions and scientific organizations of which many, for example, the Royal Society, enjoy enormous prestige in the world, should create an international committee whose objective would be defending the rights of man and citizen. A committee of this type would perform the task of a powerful tool of pressure and it would put a fence against Soviet access to Western technology, should the Kremlin continue its politics of repression against political dissidents. In other words the role of the proposed committee would be convincing the Russians - not by manifests or declarations, but by practical means, that they may count on the cooperation with the West only for the price of accepting the basic

principles of our civilization.

Christian churches and the Western Scientific world have many more possibilities in this respect than the governments. The Soviets may always say to the American or to the European politicians: "If you don't like our armies staying in Czechoslovakia or in East Germany - try to throw them out". There is no answer to this type of statement and this is why this problem is never touched. But the organized scientists of the West would be able to paralyse the cooperation and exchange in technology and economy with the Soviets.

A disgracefully small percentage of Western scientists protested publicly in the question of Prof. Sakharov. Why? There is a false myth that Science should be politically neutral. This myth sanctions the opportunistic position of disengagement. Nobody wants to get involved, as the saying goes. It is more comfortable to state that one didn't see anything nor didn't hear anything, than to appear in the court to give testimony to the truth in defense of the persecuted.

Silence is not always golden. Most often it is a cowardice dictated by opportunism.

For those who have the courage to face the truth - the problem is clear: For as long as we attempt to defend our prosperity at the same time accepting the misery of 2/3rd of world's population, we won't be able to defend our democracy, passively accepting the violations of human rights in the countries which are under the communist system.

It was found that a dog in England during 1 week eats more protein than the inhabitant of India during 3 months. Only an irresponsible man may consider this situation as "normal"; as a s t a t u s q u o which should be defended.

The European Community and the United States represent 500 million people who live in luxury in both a material and spiritual sense. We consume 70% of the high quality food and we have taken for ourselves 90% of the freedom attainable by man of this planet. We must share with hundreds of millions who starve, even for the price of rationing the food in Western world and we must actively fight for the freedom of millions deprived of basic citizen's rights.

Politicians such as Nixon and Kissinger will be greatly disillusioned. They dream that with billions of transistors, thousands of radio stations and hundreds of communication satellites uniting the world in the informative area, one can govern the nations by "conferences on the summit level". One could play Metternich in the days of stage coaches but not now in the era of electronic technology. And presently nobody seems to accept our legacy and our "untouchable rights" to welfare and freedom at the cost of poverty and the slavery of millions of less privileged.

Let's repeat once more. Science and Christian churches should give the alarm and try to convince the rich Western democracies that today the philanthropy, whether in the form of Oxfam or of "Radio Liberty" is not enough. Our blindness and hypocrisy are something more than Watergate.

Will one, some day, say about Western Europe, using the words of Solzhenitsyn who commented on the Watergate scandal: "What can one expect from democracy which has no moral system built in it?"

To us, Western people, these words sound pathetic. Politics never had anything in common with morality. But the invention of nuclear arms changed the situation. There is nothing left to oppose the absolute universal doomsday, except morality. The balance of terror won't save us. We may be saved by the balance of moral levels, meaning the acceptance of common definition of wrongdoing. What is wrong in London - must be accepted as wrong in Moscow too. For these reasons the problem of nuclear arms overshadows the expanse of politics. Politicians in this matter may only "hope for a better tomorrow". The question of how we should behave in order to live in safety and peace holding in our hands the potential of our own destruction, should be answered by organized Science and organized Christianity. So far, both, along with the politicians, "hope for a better tomorrow".

Juliusz Mieroszewski

Fragments

Vol. 1/6

July 1974

MIRAGES AND PHANTOMS

IN THE SOVIET PRESS

by

Charles Joel

MIRAGES AND PHANTOMS

IN THE SOVIET PRESS
(excerpt)

by

Charles Joel

Printed by the Easton Company
Butler Creek, California

A translation from Polish
magazin Kultura, No. 4/319/1974
published in Paris, France.

© Copyright 1974 by Charles Joel

Published by Correspondence Home Study
of Languages
Sutter Creek, California

Printed by The Essicc Company
Sutter Creek, California

FOREWORD

This issue contains two themes.

First is Brukselczyk's article on the worldwide arms trade pictured on the background of political scenario.

People have always lived, in one way, or another, with weapons "close at hand" and the trade in weapons has always been a fact of life. But the extent of the current arms trade is something unsurpassed in history of mankind. The author in his usual humorous and sarcastic manner projects to us this idea. "Read the papers, my friend, somewhere, somebody is shooting at somebody," is the sad and convincingly hopeless conclusion of this interesting and intriguing writing.

The second part is an excerpt from "In the Soviet Press" of Adam Kruczek, who writes about the atmosphere in the Soviet Union after Solzhenitsy's exile.

I have chosen the fragment of the article which comments mainly on the Russian poet Yevgeny Yevtushenko and his ambiguous position on the question of Solzhenitsyn's "Gulag Archipelago."

The reason for publishing this excerpt is Yevtushenko's popularity among the American intellectuals, especially the influence of his personality (in the form of his poems, recitals, TV appearances and other activities) on American people. Adam Kruczek questions the credibility of Yevtushenko's behavior.

C.J.

MIRAGES AND PHANTOMS

Flight No. 442 Tel-Aviv -Paris ran according to schedule. The Swiss Air DC4 was rocking slightly over Mediterranean Sea. In seven hours I'll be in Paris, thought Abdul Azzis Kerine, captain of Syrian Army. Good dinner, some rest, and tomorrow the next stage... Capt. Kerine was deeply affected by seriousness of his mission. Ahmed al Sheratabi, Defense Minister of Syria, one of the two independent nations in the Near East in the summer of 1948, told him yesterday: "We must be ready to crush the Jewish State at once in the day of its proclamation of independence. We must arm the Arabs. What we have now is nothing but scrap unfit for any use and without parts. At last we have the address of a reputable supplier and his quite substantial offer. Here is the list of purchases: 10,000 rifles, 1000 machine guns, armoured cars..."

In the same plane, a few rows behind Kerine, one George Alexander Uberal, director of a road construction firm in Tel-Aviv, was reading D a w a r. Strange director. In his bag he had only a Bible, Faust, a toothbrush and a check for 1 million dollars. In his Palestinian passport only the photograph and age were correct. The real person under Uberal's name was Ehud Avriel, one of Hagana's leaders. He too was affected by the seriousness of his mission. Yesterday he was called by Ben Gurion. "My dear," said the "Old Man" - "we have only 6 months, the Arabs won't let us live in peace. We need weapons. Here are the addresses in Europe and the list of purchases: 10,000 rifles, 100 machine

guns, armoured vehicles..."

A few days later, while Capt. Kerine assisted by his charming host was leaving the premises of the firm with which he just signed the contract for supply and transport to Syria of 10,000 Mauser E18 rifles, and of 100 MG34 armoured cars, in the door a somewhat familiar face flashed by. Oh! How come? Acquaintance here? Impossible...

Several hours later, Avriel too was affectionally bidden farewell by the host and was passing through the same door. In his pocket he had a contract similar to Kerine's; he just paid with a check drawn on Union de Banques Suisses in Geneva for 10,000 E18 rifles and for a 100 MG34 armoured cars ...; leaving, he looked once more at the name plate and address of the firm: "Armoury Brno, General Management in Prague, 20 Belchrid Street."

Several years later, May 1955. Cairo. A reception at one of the embassies. "Sir! Colonel! Would you like to give me a minute of your time?" - Daniel Solod the ambassador of the U.S.S.R. asks Nasser. "When?" - returns Nasser. "Immediately, here," replies Solod and both men walk arm in arm. "Would Egypt like to receive arms from the U.S.S.R.?" Sir, do you know the size of French supplies to Israel? The Kremlin expects your quick answer."

On the 22nd of July, Shelepilov, editor of PRAVDA arrived in Cairo. A discreet visit

as Shelepilov not Solod received Nasser's answer. One year lapsed and Shelepilov arrived in Cairo not as a newsman but as a Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. On the day Egypt celebrated the departure of the last English soldier, Shelepilov had in his pocket a contract for arms supply and was able to announce at the meeting in Moscow that "the U.S.S.R. doesn't intend to create any hostile feeling of Arabian nations toward Western powers."

At that moment, in the port of Alexandria the first crates with arms were being unloaded. But on the crates one couldn't see any inscriptions in Cirrilic alphabet. The consigner was Armoury Brno, Czechoslovakia...

*

Eighteen years later, center of London, 2 steps from Picadilly where the hippies from all over the world are fifing the psalms of worldwide peace and of brotherhood of all. Mr. E.H. Holden, director of an old company "Cogswell and Harriman" doesn't receive just anybody. When a customer makes a good impression he is asked to leave his business card and to return in an hour. If everything is OK and bank references are clear, then Mr. Holden receives him with open arms and offers everything from a whole panzer division and aircraft carrier to a modern type AK-47 carbine of the firm Omnipol. The usually cold Englishman simply cannot find words of admiration for Omnipol-: "They are the most charming people that I know. And how they know their profession?! The arms from Omnipol are always delivered with all accessories...,

bayonets, cleaning instruments, even the instructions are in several languages. Today from observation of every battlefield one must conclude that owing to its authority and quality of its material, Omnipol became a dangerous competitor of the biggest arms suppliers..." No need to add that AK-47 carbine and other materials so worthy of Mr. Holden admiration are the products of Armoury Brno, Czechoslovakia and that Omnipol is one of its commercial representatives.

PEACE FOR 3 YEARS...

Of course, the arms trade is not a monopoly of Czechoslovakia. It is the only branch of international trade in which neither the recipient nor the supplier is boasting of the amounts, conditions and other details of the contracts. It is difficult to say how large the deals are on the specific markets, but they are running into hundreds of billions of dollars.

Fifteen states participate in the present world arms trade. In order to avoid offending anybody let's list them in an alphabetical order: Belgium, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Holland, Israel, Canada, West Germany, South African Republic, U.S.A., Great Britain, Italy, and U.S.S.R. Naturally, the list would look differently if we arrange the names in order of esteem and seniority. The U.S.A. alone takes care of about 40% of the market, mainly in the direction of her Atlantic partners and of several faithful customers in Asia, Africa, and Latin America; 30% is in the hands of the U.S.S.R. and its satellites

though it isn't known how they share in "business" because quite often Czechoslovakia, Hungary, or Poland shield the transactions that are strictly Russian. Far behind the superpowers are France and England competing for 3rd place. The rest are pygmies, though I must proudly underline the honorary place of Belgium which in many parts of the world is better known for the qualities of its small caliber products of the FN factory than for the riches and beauty of Flemish art. (Editor remark: The writer resides in Brussels).

A wider discussion of the reason for my interests in arms trade would amount to being unkind to my readers. Hence, only the basic elements of the subject follow.

Firstly, the arms trade is an important factor of national economy in all its aspects: investment, employment, export, technological progress, etc. Let's take France as an example. The choice of France from among the others is better because it is easier to comprehend than, say, the American colossus, or the Soviet arms industry which is absolutely secret and hidden in 5 years plans and in budgets that contain several hundreds of obscure entries.

In France 270,000 persons work in the arms industry; 65,000 of them work for export only. What does it mean? It means that the export of arms amounts to 8 billion francs and represents 8% of the total French export, or 25% of France's mechanical equipment export (this is the official name under which the arms trade business is operating). It is the only branch of industry whose portfolio of

customer orders is full for 3 years in advance. This is extremely important if one considers the fact that the most advanced invention of French technology the Concorde has been ignored by the industrial countries of the world and even the friendly interest of king Feisal and of Persian shah will not suffice to save the future of this miracle machine. With regard to this situation one cannot afford to disagree with the statement of Mr. Galley the French Secretary of War who emphatically announced: "I have no intention to reduce our export and to condemn to unemployment our working people in the name of moral principles that are not observed by any nation..."

Besides, how can one talk about moral principles when the foreign drafts are at stake? And how large are the drafts?! In order to cover the Syrian losses in only the first few days of war, king Feisal sent to Damascus a check for 1 billion dollars, which, by the way, went straight to the safe of Gosbank in Moscow. The American Senate has been more generous and passed a bill which gave to Israel on the spot credits for 2.5 billion dollars to supplement the losses of equipment during Yom Kippur war. One modern aircraft costs about 30 million dollars. According to the American statistics, today's demand for military aircraft, projected to 1982, for the Western world, will be 150 billion dollars. Tanks, much cheaper than planes, are selling like pretzels. The Arab nations during 2 weeks of Yom Kippur war lost more tanks than was sent by Hitler to conquer Russia in 1941.

ABU DHABI

Naturally, in order to protect American, French, or Soviet working people's prosperity it is necessary to have, here and there, smaller, or bigger wars, conflicts of interests, insurrections, revolutions, quarrels, adventures, aggressions, diversions, domestic and nondomestic wars, civilillian and military, just and unjust, cold and hot and preventive wars, blitzkriegs, surprise wars, provocations, occupations, brotherly interventions, general wars, coups d'etats, invasions by invitation and not by invitation, people's movements, encounters, collisions, misunderstandings, attacks, battles, brawls...

Supplying them all is the business of diplomacy. This is the 2nd necessary factor of arms trade development. Let's have a look at the most absorbing market for "mechanical equipment". There is no need to go into long discussion on the subject of both superpowers' insistence of being "present" in the Middle East. Every child knows that this is a matter of half the world's oil production. But not every child knows that this is also a matter of Suez Canal. For the U.S.A. it represents an easy link between the 6th and 7th fleet, and simple and cheap sailing along the borders of Soviet influence. The same goes for the U.S.S.R. Instead of 11,000 miles from Vladivostok, or 9,000 miles from Odessa, the Red fleet has only 2,200 miles to the Persian Gulf where long since so many attractive places tempt the greedy eyes of Russians. And one more argument: this is a matter of peace, which can, as we know from experience

exist only as armed peace. Only the balance of armaments gives the assurance of peace in this part of the world and excludes the danger of direct, eye to eye confrontation of super atoms.

Nothing strange then that even without the Yom Kippur war, Russia spent on Egypt's armaments about 5 billion dollars. Is it too much, or too little? I answer that the whole Assuan Dam and steel factory in Helluan cost 1.5 billion and how much fussing about it we witnessed.

Do you, ladies and gentlemen, know Abu Dhabi? Who of you can point straight to this place on the map? Abu Dhabi is located at Persian Gulf and recently makes heaps of money because wherever emir stomps the sand there is an oil spring bursting out. This country, if you can call it a country, has 80,000 inhabitants and an annual per capita income 35 (exactly thirty five) times more than both neighbouring republics. One would expect that the efforts and riches of Abu Dhabi, as well as Saudi Arabia and other oil producing neighbours would go for helping their Arabian brothers dying of hunger. Well, not necessarily.

Abu Dhabi does not have any reserves because it has recently bought 30 Mirage-5 French military aircraft. By buying them Abu Dhabi has become a super power as it has more hunting-bombers per capita than any other country in the world; more than the U.S.A., U.S.S.R. and Israel together.

It certainly looks strange, but there is more to say. Abu Dhabi hasn't any pilots of its own, so the planes are piloted by... Pakistanis (Mohometans too, which is important). What does Abu Dhabi need Mirage aircrafts and Pakistani pilots for? What are these supersonic machines for if there is not enough room even for the takeoff; Abu Dhabi Mirage in one second is already over foreign land, or above the sea? Kuwait too, has bought both Mirages and Phantoms, and it has more planes per capita than Israel. Lately the citizens of Kuwait may sleep undisturbed because their emir has bought a... U-boat, but he still needs a crew. I was told a story that there lives a sheik who already has his own Mirage, a tank brigade, and a platoon of Russian Katiushas, but he is dreaming about having a camel...

The military budget of Iran for 1972/73 had grown 47%. In the fifties Iran was spending annually 8.5 million dollars on arms. In the sixties this figure jumped up to 150 million. In 1974 Iran will spend ... 2.5 billion. Is Iran going to be safer? One may rather doubt it. Iraq, not necessarily friendly with the shah, spends a lot of money too, the only difference is that it pays to a different "cash box". And Feisal spent 40% more on arms in 1973 than he did in 1972.

"You must defend yourself against the Soviet threat," cry Americans. "You must defend yourself against Israeli-American penetration," cry Russians. "You must defend yourself against Israeli-American-Soviet

penetration," cry the Chinese. "You must defend yourself against Chinese penetration", cry both, Americans and Russians. And the music box plays on...

THE MODEST MR. CUNNINGS.

"Weapon is an eternal symbol of human craziness. Hurray! Let's get them! This is the call of our civilization. This is why my profession is truly eternal..." These words belong to Mr. Cummings, born 45 years ago in Philadelphia, until recently a citizen of the U.S.A., presently a subject of Monte Carlo, residing in that very place, merchant by profession. Mr. Cummings has not too many occasions to enjoy the beauty of the Riviera. He seldom stays home. He travels, his profession demands it. Namely, he deals in the arms trade. This fact may not be interesting, but this gentleman deserves our attention because the private arms trade represents 10% of the total national trade. This 10% is valued at billions of dollars per annum, and Mr. Cummings alone handles 90% of this 10%.

Well, he must be a talented man. Let's have a look at him from a distance as he is watched very closely by the intelligence and counter-intelligence offices of all the nations of the world. The clients of Mr. Cummings are, as it is commonly known, mostly, "victorious dictators and optimistic revolutionaries." Among them were Cuban Castro and Dominican Trujillo. "Dictators" -Mr. Cummings used to say - "have an immense sense of order and they

always pay their bills on time." Sometime the situation is ambiguous. In 1955, Costa-rican emigrants decided to destroy unsympathetic President Figueres. Armed with the Beretta pistols and Madsen machine guns they were defeated by the government forces that were armed with Brownie 30 cal. machine guns. Naturally all these armaments were supplied by Mr. Cummings, who immediately after the cease fire, took care of supplementing the losses of "mechanical equipment" of both fighting sides.

Mr. Cummings started very modestly as a functionary of CIA. After 4 years of impeccable service he decided that this occupation had no prospects, quit, and became an independent operator. The knowledge and experience obtained in the past 4 years evidently became extremely useful, and his first transaction proved that he had taken the right road. In 1953, Cummings "with his last 25,000 dollars" bought 7,000 pieces of firearms from the Panama police. He immediately sold them for 75,000 dollars. A year later when he was only 25 years old, he took over all surplus supplies of Sten pistols from the U.S.A. Army Depots. He bought them for 50 cents and sold them for \$4.00 a piece. In 1958 he performed a bombshell transaction (a word perfectly fitting in this place): he bought 6000,000 Lee Enfield carbines from the British Army paying 28 cents a piece. Some time later, Cummings sold the Enfields, modified at little cost, through the U.S.A. supermarkets for \$25.00 a piece. That man won't die easy. Indeed there are others that are dying. "Interarms" of Cummings in a very

short time almost completely monopolized the private arms sale market. His wife, young and pretty (I think) waits patiently for her husband in a luxurious nest in Monte Carlo; and she doesn't marvel at anything. This modern Penelope repeats only: "It's same as any other profession." Lately, Cunnings had been seen in Bangladesh. He bought what he could of what was left after the war with Pakistan. Paid cash naturally...and to whom is he selling it all? Read the papers, my friend, look at the maps. Somewhere, somebody is shooting at somebody...

HOW MUCH IS THE AM-30 TODAY?

French reporter Yves Barraud too was interested in the subject. Once, he met, as he describes, an anonymous arms dealer.

- Do you work for IRA?
- No, they don't need me. Thousands of Irish people in the U.S.A. take care of it; as you know there is a free market for weapons in the U.S.A.
- And the Japanese weapons at Lod, were they from you?
- From Palestinians, of course. They have got them from Omnipol, or its intermediaries. Only Omnipol sells the Soviet Tokariev and Kalashnikov.
- And you, for whom do you work?
- For those who pay better.

How much do they pay? To the interested readers I quote the prices of August 1972. In order to make these figures up to date, one must make certain adjustments taking

into account the increases of price of raw material, labor and inflation. (Editor's remark: quotations that in original article are given in French francs are calculated in the U.S.A. dollars at 1973 exchange rate).

Hand grenade	\$1.00
Projectile 105 mm AMX-30	\$264.00
Antitank rocket SS-11	\$2,500.00
Armoured vehicle	\$110,000.00
Tank AMX-30	\$400,000.00
Artillery gun 155mm	\$160,000.00
Frigate	\$94,000,000.00
Mine sweeper	\$10,140,000.00
U-boat 1200 ton	\$30,400,000.00
Heavy helicopter Freton Super	\$3,400,000.00
Mirage III (without parts)	\$1,500,000.00

The training cost of some of the above
"mechanical equipment" crew (including
amortization):

Tank platoon leader	\$27,000.00
Pilot of Mirage III	\$720,000.00
Mirage III squadron leader	\$1,200,000.00

WISHING YOU ALL THE NOISIEST!

Brukselczyk

IN THE SOVIET PRESS
(excerpt)

Last month I ended my note about Solzhenitsyn with the words: "One cannot guess what will the Soviet Union do with a man who is not afraid of it." Today we know what the Soviet Union did. On the 12th of February Solzhenitsyn was arrested. He was locked in Moscow's prison at Lefortov where he underwent the stages of prison procedure which he had so faithfully described - registration, personal search, change into prisoner's uniform. The next day he was put aboard a plane and flown to an unknown destination. Only when he saw through the plane's window the name of Frankfurt-am-Main did he guess that he had been brought to West Germany.

For the 3rd time in its history, the Soviet government has applied exile as a method of settling matters with its opponents. In 1922, on the initiative of Lenin, over 200 most important members of the Russian intelligentsia were deported. This initiative was strongly supported by Trotsky who gave the theoretical explanation of this decision in an article courageously titled: "Dictature! Where is your whip?" During the next 7 years the whip had been found for Trotsky who was exiled by Stalin. The liberal intelligentsia had been thrown out of the country 5 years after the revolution. The Soviet republic of those days was too weak and feared the ideological opponents. Trotsky was exiled 12 years after the revolution at the time when Stalin hadn't quite felt settled in his autocratic seat. Solzhenitsyn was exiled 57 years after the revolution, when, one would think,

nothing, or nobody could threaten the most powerful Soviet State. Forcing the Soviet authorities to make the decision for his exile, Solzhenitsyn had won: he forced the Soviet Union to admit its own helplessness and its inability shown in the fact that after half century of being in power, the Soviet Union still reacts to the ideas of freedom and justice with nothing more but brute force.

Letters supporting the decision of the highest organs appeared instantly in every Moscow paper together with a Tass communique about deportation of the writer. Many of these letters had been signed by the inhabitants of far away cities from where the mail reaches Moscow in seven to ten days. This time, however, the letters "flew" to the capital within hours as if they were carried on the wings of love to Soviet Motherland so badly hurt by Solzhenitsyn.

Nobody should be surprised that not too many people were protesting against the exile of the writer. Victor Nekrasov in a letter TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN distributed among the foreign correspondents told how an attempt was made to force him to sign the statement of Solzhenitsyn's condemnation and about the threat to cancel the publication of his books. "Can an honest man join the choir of blackmailers?" - asks the author of IN THE TRENCHES OF STALINGRAD.

Certain surprise was aroused in connection with the protest of Yevgeny Yevtushenko.

After he sent the letter of protest to Brezhnev, he was invited not to KGB as it was in the case of Nekrasov, but to the meeting of Moscow's branch of the Soviet Writers Union committee where he was reprimanded in an old fashioned fatherly manner and simply told to condemn Solzhenitsyn. He refused and wrote another letter this time to the NEW YORK TIMES.

As usual for Yevtushenko the letter was ambiguous. Firstly, Yevtushenko complained to the American readers that Soviet officials consider him a politically suspected person: him who is the author of WHETHER RUSSIANS WANT WAR that glorifies the heroism of Soviet people during the war, and of the poem KAZAN UNIVERSITY describing the revolutionary tradition of Russia; him, the author of poems on Vietnam, or on bloody incidents in Chile. The poet complains that they want to "get rid of him from the Russian scene," and admits that he doesn't agree with many of Solzhenitsyn's point of view, but "no matter how great are the mistakes of Solzhenitsyn, they cannot even be compared with the bloody mistakes of the Stalin period."

He tells also about his last year's encounter with the young people in Siberia, where, during discussion, an 18 year old girl-student toasted the memory of Stalin, explaining to the shocked Yevtushenko that "all Russia trusted him and had won the war owing to the trust in Stalin."

Ambiguity of the letter and Yevtushenko's behavior are obvious: coming out with opposition against Stalin's crimes, reminding the American readers of his poetry, he attempts by all means to forget the most important idea, or thought of Gulag Archipelago, "that it all had begun not with Stalin, but with Lenin." The sanctions applied toward Yevtushenko (his broadcast in Moscow's TV had been cancelled) have raised his esteem in the West.

At the conference of the Writers Union, among the accusations of recklessness and of being "unwilling to listen to the friendly critique," one particularly deserves attention. Sergei Narovchatov remarked: "Isn't it time that Yevgeny Yevtushenko, who is close to 50 years of age, stop swinging on the seesaw on which he has been swinging for so long?" But perhaps this swinging is to the benefit of the Soviet Union, perhaps Yevtushenko will go West again to take over the task of explaining to the Western people the "mistakes" of Sozhenitsyn?!

Adam Kruczek

Fragments

Vol. 1/7

August, 1974

FROM MALTHUS TO MANSHOLT

In The Soviet Press

by

Charles Joel

FROM MALTHUS TO MANSHOLT

IN THE SOVIET PRESS
(excerpt)

by

Charles Joel

A translation from Polish
magazin Kultura, No. 6/321/1974
published in Paris, France

© Copyright 1974 by Charles Joel

Published by Correspondence Home Study
of Languages
Sutter Creek, California

Printed by The Essicc Company
Sutter Creek, California

FROM MALTHUS TO MANSHOLT

"THERE WILL COME THE SECOND SEVEN
YEARS OF SUCH BAD CROPS THAT ALL
ABUNDANCE OF THE PAST WILL BE
FORGOTTEN. FAMINE WILL DESTROY
ALL EARTH".

Genesis 41:30

This year I decided to abandon my habit of cruising on board the "France". I found that this ship is operating at a loss (over 20 million dollars a year), and that the shipping company directors had decided to economize. Wine won't be served à discretion anymore, and what's worse, caviar will be cut to half its normal serving. The caviar cutting alone saves about \$100,000 a year. I don't see any reason for becoming a victim of "France" inefficiency, consequently I cancelled the cruise. I'll stay on dry land. By the way, "France" is the French counterpart of the Polish ship "Batory" (toute proportion gardée); the only difference between them is that nobody jumps off the "France"... seeking political asylum.

I stay behind in order, among many things, to indulge myself in the delights of reading the daily press. As a result I have found that in West Africa (so-called Sahel) about 6 million black savages (after all - men too) are threatened not by a shortage of caviar, but by death from famine and that 500,000 of them have already left this beautiful world of ours in the past 12 months having not the slightest idea about the difficulties of the

"France". Because of draught, 90% of cattle in North Niger and in half of Mauritania have already perished, and half the population of Upper Volta is about to follow the same track. At the best, 10 years will be needed to restore the original number of cattle herds, including 5 years of intensive help and rationalized administration to bring the Sahel countries to (if we may use this word) the level from before draught. I say, at the best, because if the rain does not fall, then there will be a catastrophe such that the oldest African can't remember...

God's providence doesn't seem to like the poor; the calamity hit the countries which even without the draught were listed by the UNO as 25 of the world's poorest - kinds of countries which eat only when there are rains and which, in addition, have the recklessness that mother nature hasn't refused them - the highest natural population growth in the world.

ONE SQUARE METER FOR ONE MAN

Once upon a time Darwin discovered that a pair of elephants, after 750 years, will multiply to 19 million. I calculated that when today's conceived child in the year 2000 will be 25 years old, it will be one of 6.5 billion of the world's people (the number being twice larger than that of today), of which, let us add 5 billion will be living in the so-called developing countries and every fourth man on Earth will be a Chinese.

The same child when he reaches 65 years of age will be living in the world of 12 billion inhabitants. It means that in 65 years the world population will grow 3.5 times, which is absolutely fantastic, though possible. If everything goes "normally", meaning, if the people, like Darwin's elephants multiply themselves senselessly, after 650 years one man will have only 1 square meter of land to live on. Hallucination? Very likely, but only to a certain degree. Theoretical extrapolations are indeed very dangerous in the region of sociological sciences and there are not only sick maniacs warning humanity against death resulting from the overpopulation. Chairman Mao, a man known for his modesty, already in 1957 had proclaimed the stabilization of China's populace at the level of 600 million. This proclamation failed, and soon there will be twice as many Chinese people, but it doesn't mean that Mao wasn't right. If I were a Frenchman I would vote for René Dumont: firstly, because I didn't like the other candidates for presidency; secondly, because he was the only serious man among the candidates and that instead of promising things that are impossible he was predicting things that are impossible to avoid-unless something happens.

THE BASIC FAULT OF MALTHUS

In order to continue our deliberations, it is necessary to upset two basic taboos. First, the demographic-political taboo. Some governments propagate the fast growth of their people believing that number means power and assures position in the world.

Second, religious taboo. Some mediators between us and God's providence think that abortion is the opening of the door to hell, but they don't consider at all that living on 50 dollars...per year in "bidonville" is not caused by the grace of Lord and that it would offend the dignity of God and men. Neither the tendency to grow in number or power, nor believing in providence can hide the fact that today we have less food per head than we had had during the thirties of the great depression. That today in developed countries the average income of man is \$2,400 a year and in underdeveloped - only \$180. That if things continue as they are, by 1980 the income of "developed" man will rise by \$1,200 and of "underdeveloped" by only \$100 a year.

For fear that you would say "We didn't know anything about it", I give you some statistics prepared by the World Bank, an institution which shouldn't be suspected of subversive or revolutionary tendencies. Of course, let's be careful, as income per capita doesn't reflect all the complexities of the economy. But it is worth reading because it's educational.

Well, the list of African nations is led by Libia - \$1,500 yearly per inhabitant, South Africa - \$810. At the lower part of the list are: Dahomey and Nigeria - \$100, Guinea, Zaire and Malawi - \$90, Czad and Burundi and Rwanda - \$60. In Asia: first is Japan - \$2,130, then Singapore - \$1,200, Hong Kong - \$900, Formosa - \$480, and at the end

of the list are: India - \$110, N.Vietnam and Ceylon - \$100, Nepal - \$90, Burma, Indonesia and Afghanistan - \$80, and the last, Bangladesh - \$70. The Near East is most contrasting: Kuwait leads - \$3,900, Arabian Emirates - \$3,150, Kwatar - \$2,370, and oil-less Israel \$2,200. Closing the list are: Syria - \$290, Jordan - \$260, and both republics of Yemen, democratic - \$120 and Arabian - \$90.

Superficial investigations of additional circumstances will suffice to conclude that the only mistake of Malthus, Thomas Robert, economist and English clergyman, who was so thoroughly "buried" by Marks and his followers, was not what he was proclaiming, but that he had proclaimed it too soon. His thesis that there will not be enough room for all at nature's table now becomes not only true, but also perfectly clear to everybody. Of course, there is a lot of truth in talks that malthusianism is an argument used by "imperialism in the stage of decay" that tries to put the blame for all the evils of the world on overpopulation. Of course, the limitations of natural growth alone can't cause a break in the consumptive or economic balance of Nigeria, or Czad. Of course, there is the need for sharp, decisive industrial and modernized actions. But, it is also clear that none of the cursing thrown on Malthus will not cover the fact that the limitation of population growth is a necessity. "Make money, not children", cried Malthus, and he was right. Only the criminal blindness doesn't permit the enemies of malthusianism to notice that every month there is 1 million more Hindus (\$110 per capita) and that by the year

2000 the number of Philipppinos (\$200 p.c. will increase from 41 million (presently) to a 100 million.

ONE SMALL CATASTROPHY IN THE USA WOULD BE ENOUGH...

The poverty of the present world is dynamic, as the professionals say. A few years ago, Lord Snow, an English essayist in the book "State of Emergency" warned: "The catastrophe will come before the end of our century. Rich countries will be overflowed by the sea of hunger which will destroy millions of human beings". Unsuccessful candidate for presidency René Dumont in his book "Utopia or Death", in 1966 was demonstrating that "we all go toward famine". And what of it? Nothing. We are already approaching famine; and some already have met with it. Of the 2.5 billion "underdeveloped" 60% are chronically underfed and 20% are on the border of death by famine. World population increases daily by over 200,000 people which makes 75 million per year. Because of this "elephantine" increase (and the figures naturally are more impressive in underdeveloped countries) in West Africa, where from the early sixties, the production of food, taken globally, had grown 22%, the average consumption of each inhabitant (even without draught) went down by 5%. I don't need to add as we know it from our own experience, that in the same time consumption in our slow population growth part of the world had increased in value of protein by 5% to 10%.

Of course, let us keep calm, let us

not be disturbed by harmless lunatics and descendants of Cassandra. At least, it is worth knowing that this is not a matter of caviar only and that in the past 25 years the food supplies have never been so low. In June 1974 the global grain stock will be about 21 million tons which equals to 3 weeks of global consumption (without the Soviet grain because its stock, naturally, is a secret of the Kremlin).

Every government has been watching the level of its 2 months supply of oil, a level that is called strategic. There is no such a level for grain. And this is called the art of governing. Owing to this art, millions of people are either dead, or are getting ready to die, but nobody has died yet because of oil shortage. Pardon me, a little correction: Among those sentenced to die of famine were also some people who would have been saved by the fast and cheap supply of oil. But oil never arrived and its price increased. In order to assure for themselves the indispensable oil, the Third World countries which don't produce any of this life saving fluid, are forced to spend more during one year than the total value of help received from the rest of rich humanity. But all this is another story.

Before the 2nd World War only Western Europe and Japan were grain importers. Today, grain is imported by the whole world, above all by the socialist world, despite, or perhaps because of the victorious collectivization of agriculture. Everybody buys grain, U.S.S.R., Japan, China, European Community, Latin America and of course, Africa, naturally, if it has any money.

Only the U.S.A. and Canada, in lesser degree Australia, Argentina, and in lesser yet France, have valuable grain surplusses. But attention! A small atmospheric catastrophe in the U.S.A. would be sufficient to cause the death of those who wait for help in Africa and to create sharp tension in the countries that are not yet threatened. Brezhnev may proudly carry his chest adorned with medals because for the first time his statistics show some grain surplusses which eliminate the necessity of shameful though ridiculously cheap import from the U.S.A. But what would Brezhnev have done in 1972/3 when Russia had been threatened by famine if Americans from Iowa had been working the way the kol-hozniks in Bielorrussia work?

Today, the American supplies of grain are so low that the government has been one step from embargo on grain export (as it had been with soya in 1972), that European Common Market took over the American export obligations to the extent of 500,000 tons, that the price of some varieties of grain, similarly to the price of oil, had tripled during the past year. Results? Countries rich in oil, somehow, made both ends meet, having even some surplusses for cruising on the "France". But the rest? What's going to happen in the 25 countries listed at the end of statistics, from the list of absolute dynamic poverty? They will die because they are oscillating on the border of famine. They must live today for...30 cents a day. Exaggeration? According to the statistics of the World Bank, today there are 800 million people living on 30 cents a day. Any more questions?

SURROUNDED BY THE SEA OF POVERTY

Let us be just. Impressed by caviar defficiency at Malthus' nature table the West did not remain deaf to the cries from desserts, steppes and jungles.

At the beginning there were only emotions. What a disaster! How the providence can be so cruel? What a fatal coincidence of natural phenomena! How can we poor mortals retaliate this nature's fancy? Sure, Sahel, Ethiopia, or India! It is an awful drama, but what can we do against God's will?

The appeals as usual were plentiful. Who didn't sign them? Everybody from the left to the right, from governments to oppositions. You were given the number of the bank account. Some spent fortunes on buying full pages of advertising in the leading magazines. And that wasn't all. When "on duty" signers became tired, the Red Cross took over. "It appears that the unavoidable fate of people in Upper Volta, Nigeria, Mali, Mauritania, Senegal and Czad, is to die before the end of this year", announced the gentlemen from Geneva. Stylistically pretty, but it can't be eaten, it can't prevent one from dying.

As soon as someone else's hunger began to take familiar shape, when it became clear that children's stories about the exclusively natural causes of famine will not convince anybody, that hunger is a part of world's political set up, then the West woke up.

F.A.O., the World Food Organization sort of the UNO for eating problems, which,

one must admit, for so long has rang the alarm bell, proposed that independently of the necessary instant help a "world reserve of grain security" should be created. This reserve would be (as long ago some Jewish youth named Joseph advised a certain Egyptian pharaoh on the question of seven fat and seven lean cows) intervening and saving people in the days of hunger and draughts. At once, F.A.O. began its work. The airlift of food for dying Africa cost...30 million dollars, or half the value of the food that was sent.

The UNO, on the motion of the 3rd World has gathered to discuss the politics of raw materials. This session is separate theme, but here we'll only mention the fact that its results amounted to zero. Firstly, there is nothing in common between the sophisticated emir of Kuwait and dying of hunger citizen of independent nation of Czad. Secondly, the initiators of the session did not want to save people from hunger, but to get revenge which is understandable in "view of lasting exploitation", or just wanted to practice politics, namely to unmask imperialism. The only concrete result of this game was that the American proposition of creating the 4 billion dollars helping fund had been withdrawn. Thirdly, one billion people whose lives depended on the eventual results of this session couldn't, which was perhaps better, get acquainted with them, because they don't read, don't have radio or TV, and, above all, were busy in direct action, meaning in saving the remnants whose lives were ebbing away.

The West invented the "green revolution". Its author, N. Borlaugh received

the Nobel prize for it. And justly so, because the cultivation of new varieties of wheat or rice has brought undeniable results. But, firstly, not so great as it has been publicized. René Dumont, perhaps a maniac but no doubt one of the best agriculturists of the world, proved that the triumph of Burlaugh in S. Asia had been deducted on the basis of comparison with the worst crop (1965/66) and not with the average crop. Secondly, after introducing new cultivation and the green revolution, the West, wrongly, decided that its mission had ended. As it turns out, the green revolution without an adequate intra-structure creates new millions of superfluous working hands. And what do they do? They go to cities. And what do they do there? There is no room and no work there; it is estimated that presently about 500 million people vegetate on the outskirts of the cities in so-called "bidonvilles"; that by 1980 that figure will go up to 1 billion and up to 2 billion by 1990. In this way, ladies and gentlemen, in 15 years from now, at the present rate of population growth, inhabitants of the cities who read "Culture" (Editor's remark: and hopefully "Fragments") will be surrounded by 2 billion people; by the sea of hunger, poverty and hate. I don't know whether you understand it well: 2 billion people in bidonvilles represent a figure 10 times larger than the population of European Community.

CAINS AND ABELS

The help of the rich to their poor brothers was, in principle, assessed as 0.7% of the total gross national income. It isn't too much

and should the rich countries follow this assessment, they wouldn't feel any loss and certainly wouldn't become poor. But, it appears that the whole idea is destined to be a failure if, despite all good wishes, the help will not, for the period 1970 - 75, be larger than 0.34%, or half of the assessed figure. Most malicious people calculate that even then the help returns to the givers in the form of percentage from credits given through the normal channels. The others point out an interesting phenomenon, namely the fact that the 0.7% limit has been reached by the "second class" countries such as: Holland, Norway, Sweden, Belgium and Denmark. Great Britain, Japan, and West Germany oscillate between 0.38% and 0.45% and the U.S.A., which alone delivered 1/2 of the financial help to the 3rd World has fallen down to 0.24% of gross national income.

A much worse example is given us by the 3rd World itself. In Brazil (country of the miracle economy) the national gross income was growing 2.5% every year through the last decade. That's true, but part of this income allotted to 5% of richest people has increased from 29% to 38%, while the part allotted to the poorest 40%, came down from 10% to 8%. The majority of the 3rd world governments, unable to provide proper population politics and to administer more equitable sharing of income, took the easiest, but the worst direction: Let the speculators do the speculating, let the rich be richer and the poor poorer. In other words they practice a model of XIXth century Europe, forgetting that in that Europe there wasn't any problem of overpopulation and that capitalism which they are presently imitating was in those days in a stage of dynamic bloom.

That Western Europe, or America is not eager to throw money away for helping the blacks, or yellows, that well-fed is not able to understand the hungry, that a reasonable policy for preventing the approach of calamity is not worked out, all this is stupid, but in some human way excusable. But that inhumanly rich oil countries do not want, in their own sphere of action, to intervene instantly, this is simply a crime.

And what is this all about? In 1973 the U.S.A. and Australia exported 100 million tons of grain equal to 1 year consumption of 500 million people in the 3rd World. Today for saving the threatened 1.5 million tons is needed. Will it be found, or not? It is difficult to entice, say, a Belgian to pull out of his pocket, every Sunday, a few francs of his savings and to put them into a box inscribed Sahel, or Ethiopia, obtrusively extended by boy scouts, or the Salvation Army, while the sheiks, Islamic brothers of the oppressed, are having a good time in their Rolls-Royces, their harems and throwing away money on Mirages. Indeed, it is difficult to convince a Belgian or Dane that it is he who ought to save Sahel when of 80 billion dollars made by the oil owners, 1 billion is spent for covering losses in weapons during one week of war in Syria, but no more than 50 million can be found and carelessly given by Feisal for saving black brothers from hunger, especially since these dollars are coming in from the same Dane, or Belgian, or other. Do you, ladies and gentlemen, know how large the participation of oil countries is in helping their brothers who don't have the oil? Less than 1 (literally one) percent of all (insufficient) help given to the poor by the rich!!

Enough complaints. I didn't want to scare anybody. But, I think it would be nice to add a few remarks but solemnly and without emotion. The solution of the world's problems lies not only in the matters of contraceptives and abortions but in social conscience and concrete public opinion too. In August in Bucharest and in November in Rome there will gather two worldwide conferences called by the UNO. The first, in question of overpopulation, the second, of hunger. I wish only to remind the respectable participants that from today to the time of the opening of the conferences, mankind will be larger by the next...3 million consumers.

René Dumont, I return to him again as he is a sympathetic and intelligent prophet of destruction, said to the French people that they shouldn't bother about changing the social politics, but rather about changing the society.

There is also a certain individual named Mansholt, whom we had occasion to meet on the pages of this magazin and who for the past several years has led the campaign "zero population growth". This socialist, ex-minister and premier of Holland, and ex-chairman of the European Community Market is talking very wisely. But roaming through the world he cries in the wilderness.

In his opinion, today's situation is just a little thrill in comparison with what is waiting for us in about 1985, or practically tomorrow. If mankind and consumption continue to grow with today's rapidity, in 15 years there will be no oil, no gas, and no food; and none of the conferences, political capitulations, or arms trade will find any new

resources. It is necessary to cut down both, natural population growth and consumption, because the abyss between poverty and richness is growing exactly in direct proportion to the population growth. There is no need to add that Mansholt has been barked at abundantly by left and right, by politicians and moralists, capitalists and syndicalists. To some - a subversant, to the others - an enemy of progress and an opponent of working class betterment ideas. When asked whether his world would look rather sad he stated that, firstly- unnecessarily, because this depends on what one is enjoying, and secondly- that it is better to have the world sad but alive ...you would say, you are a maniac Mr. Mansholt...

And then I happened to run into a little book entitled "For better life of 2 billion people", full of figures and remarks, quite closely agreeing with the thoughts of Dumont, Malthus and Mansholt, warning the world against the suicide from overpopulation, illiteracy, and starvation; full of slogans literally taken from Rousseau, or from the HIPPIES. The author is McNamara, president of the World Bank, ex-Secretary of Defense in the Kennedy administration. He ends his writings with a sigh: "Let us hope that a certain minimum of common sense still governs the World". Incurable optimist.

B.

IN THE SOVIET PRESS

(excerpt)

The reporter's duty is to write quite often about the celebrations, anniversaries, jubilees and common joyous holidays to which the Soviet press devotes million of words daily. Today, for the first time I must write about the event which is not going to take place. Exactly 250 years ago Peter the Great signed a decree for creating in Russia the Academy of Science. For a few years the entire Soviet nation was making preparations for celebrating this great day. Many people from many countries of the world were invited. The invited had already bought tickets to Moscow, acquired the gifts and received the visas. And suddenly - 2 weeks before the festivities all foreign guests received from the secretariat of the Academy of Science of the U.S.S.R., letters in which they were asked not to bother to come, because the anniversary had been cancelled.

One must assume that the cancellation had been made in such a hurry that there was no time for inventing any reasonable pretext. In the letters, the foreign would-be visitors were informed that because of June 16th elections to the Supreme Soviet, the May 14th Academy anniversary could not be celebrated. The date of founding the Academy is known for 250 years and the elections to the Supreme Soviet take place once in 4 years; something, somehow doesn't fit...

We may suppose that the anniversary has been cancelled for quite different reasons. Lately, the Soviet authorities are more and

dissatisfied with the behavior of some of their scientists (Academician A. Sakharov, for example), who don't want to be robots that perform the functions ordered by the party and the government, and who demand freedom for scientific research. It is well known that in the Soviet Union "there are no indispensable men" and that it is possible to deal with disorderly scientists using well-known methods. However, what seems to be disturbing the minds of the leaders is a new element in the form of solidarity of the scientists in the Soviet academic circles. The Academy of Science refuses to exclude A. Sakharov and Vieniamin Levitch. During the press campaign against Sakharov only 25% of academicians joined the slanderers. This is far, very far from the majority of scientists. Besides, the scientists from all over the world have shown a sense of solidarity with their Soviet colleagues. In August 1973, the American Academy of Science threatened the Soviet authorities with sanctions should A. Sakharov be arrested. In April this year, more than 80 prominent French scientists sent a telegram to Brezhnev expressing anxiety in connection with persecution of the Soviet scientists. And the British Kings College of psychiatrists passed the resolution "condemning common use of psychiatry for political repression in the U.S.S.R.".

The last ominous sign which convinced the Soviet leaders that the presence on Soviet soil of important personalities from abroad is dangerous to the system, was the appearance of Edward Kennedy at the University of Moscow. Owing to various political estimates, the Senator from Massachusetts was greeted in Moscow with wide open arms. He attained, entirely unknown in history of Russia's

relations with the West, honor - he was allowed to address an audience of students. In fact, crowded into the auditorium was a core of ideologically faithful students of KGB and its plain-clothed functionaries, but even they were stunned by the words of the "ungrateful" American. Senator Edward Kennedy turned to his audience with the question: "Do you think that the defence budget of the U.S.S.R. should be larger or smaller?" The question was so unusual, so unheard of, so daring, that the chairman of the meeting could afford only to announce: "Our guest suddenly feels tired and for this reason I consider the meeting as ended". The guest tried to protest, that to the contrary, he felt fantastic, but the chairman knew better how the guest should feel.

Several days later the anniversary of the Soviet Academy of Science was cancelled. It is interesting to know that all this was happening while the repressions against the friends of Solzhenitsyn were already under way. A well-known professor of History of Literature at Leningrad Institute of Pedagogy, Efin Etkin, after 23 years of work, was dismissed. The continuation of repressions should be expected.

Adding up all the observations expressed in this short report one must conclude that the Soviet Union leaders desperately want to solve their internal problems without witnesses from abroad. This was confirmed by Leonid Brezhnev who, at the 17th Congress of Komsomol, warned the Soviet people against the danger of foreign influence.

Adam Kruczek

Fragments

Vol. 1/8

October, 1974

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

by

Charles Joel

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

On the 15th of December 1914, when
the world was still under the shadow
of the memory of 1914, the National
Council of the Y. M. C. A. of America
at Christiania, under the presidency
of the Rev. Dr. H. N. Sævi, held a
conference. It is characteristic that the
first thing that was said was that the
world was still under the shadow of 1914.

The conference was held, as usual,
in the Y. M. C. A. building, and the
first thing that was said was that the
world was still under the shadow of 1914.
FOOD FOR THOUGHT
by
Charles Joel

The speaker was Charles Joel, who
was then a student at the University of
Christiania. He was a young man of
about 25 years of age, and he was
very intelligent and very capable.
He was a member of the Y. M. C. A. of
America, and he was a member of the
National Council of the Y. M. C. A. of
America. He was a very capable man,
and he was a very intelligent man.
He was a member of the Y. M. C. A. of
America, and he was a member of the
National Council of the Y. M. C. A. of
America. He was a very capable man,
and he was a very intelligent man.

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

On the 10th of December 1948, when Hitler's crimes were still deeply engraved in the memory of all, the UNO enacted "The Universal Declaration Of Human Rights". Only Christians, believers or not, but Christians, could enact a declaration of this kind. It is characteristic that the Soviet block, Saudi Arabia and South African Union abstained from voting for it.

The anticlerical reader would, at this point, remark that the declaration of the UNO originated from the liberal, secular philosophy which long before had produced the English BILL OF RIGHTS of 1689, the French Declaration of Human and Citizen Rights of 1789, and the American BILL OF RIGHTS of the same year.

The answer is simple: These declarations wouldn't have been created without Christianity. The genetic source of Western democracy is Christianity not marxism. The church, even in the periods of its sinning against Christianity, when it was allying with feudal absolutism and was sanctioning social injustice, has never stopped proclaiming Christian principles in their purest form. The church, long before all liberal-revolutionary declarations, was proclaiming equality of all men and love of neighbor, and, though it demonstrated greed for riches and power, it has never stopped telling the socialistic parable about the rich man and the needle's eye. Christ forgave a rogue in the hour of death, but neither the rich money lender nor pharisees

A translation from Polish
magazin Kultura, No. 6/321/1974
published in Paris, France

© Copyright 1974 by Charles Joel

Published by Correspondence Home Study
of languages
Sutter Creek, California

Printed by The Essicc Company
Sutter Creek, California

found forgiveness in His eyes.

The great merit of the Roman church is that it had never falsified The Bible, and this conduct, or posture, guarantees its endurance. Nevertheless, its interpretation of The Bible has always been in accord with the, so called, spirit of the epoch. Equalization, or elimination of social injustice would demand radical reforms, if not revolution, inside the church. And that's why the church has always been trying to associate institutionalized christianity with conservatism. That's why the church had been defending slavery and later the feudal servitude. It has always been against any progressive thinking. No more than 100 years ago the activists of trade unions, with full approval of the church, were sent to penal colonies. Yet, these people were fighting against indescribable exploitation that was a crying outrage.

The church teaches that one should humbly accept inequality because all sufferings will be rewarded in heaven. But Christ, contrary to the church, didn't tell that the question of social injustice belongs to, beyond the grave, spiritual existence. He was demanding that the rich, here, on this earth, during their earthly life, should give out their abundance to the poor and follow Him.

The social philosophy of Christ was so strange, so unlike anything that had already been proclaimed, that His contemporaries often used to say: "Hard are Your words".

I came across the opinion of some intellectual "madcaps" who believe that socialism is an "ERZATZ - religion". Socialism is not religion at all; we may say only that it could arise in a Christian society. Carl Marx could not have been born in Japan, China, or Malaya. He could have been produced only by Christian Europe.

In time, the institutionalized Christianity had taken form of its own antithesis. Similarly, institutionalized socialism in all Eastern block countries turned out to be its own antithesis too. In general, none of the ideas can be realized without some degree of institutionalism though we know from experience that institutionalism is a grave for an idea.

Socialism should be like a "fighting church", because in ideas such as Christianity and socialism, the road to the goal is more important than the goal itself. The goal in its perfection is unreachable and only the degree of approach to it indicates one's success, or defeat. This characteristic leads us to another observation: The "acid test" for socialism is its performance after victory. The socialist party which in the free elections gains a parliamentary majority is able not only to induce severe radical reforms but is also able to brand any antisocialistic activity as activity against the whole country. We can see here the "acid test" in its fullness. It creates a gate for institutionalism; once the victors cross this gate - they are lost. Socialism won, went through the gate and fell.

There isn't and cannot be the socialistic State. We can talk about socialistic society only. The State as a national institution may be, and should be defended by force at the time of invasion. But socialism cannot be realized, or defended by force because a socialist who uses force stops being a socialist. Similarly, a socialist who applies press censure in order to defend socialism stops being a socialist and the system which he tries to defend stops being socialism.

The slaves, exploited and abused have moral right to revolt. But we don't talk about revolts, or uprisings - we dispute the question whether socialism is able to live through its own victory.

In my opinion, socialism in the socialistic State cannot outlive its own victory. In other words, as rigorous division between the State and church must exist, so must exist the severe division between socialism and the State, even in the situation where the socialists have a parliamentary majority. Socialism should function as a social program not as a State ideology.

It appears that we are dealing here with a paradox. Every socialist desires not a partial, but the full victory of socialism. He desires to see socialism as a deciding factor which influences every branch of the citizens' activities. But the road to this goal leads not through the nationalization of socialism equipped with a legitimate police force. Socialism, if it is to retain that noble name, must be a conviction, or view,

one chooses on his own free will, because only then it becomes the true socialism. A society in which only 1/3rd of the people are socialists, real believers in socialism, deserves to be called a socialistic society more than the society in which 90% of the people become socialists through opportunism, or compulsion.

In other words, it is necessary to give up the idea of the socialistic State if creating a socialistic society is desired. It is necessary to, purposely, resign from institutionalized socialism in order to preserve socialism alive and meaningful. If socialism as a dynamic social idea is to survive it must resign from the State ideology that relies on the apparatus of police force. True socialism may be built up only by believing, unselfish socialists and never by apparatchicks, bureaucrats and policemen. It must act as a vivid, never exhausted and never limited movement of reform and progress which would correct the permanent evils of institutionalism. It must be a creative, criticizing spirit of opposition against the STATUS QUO because STATUS QUO always means petrification of the progress into conservatism.

The communists would argue that power and police are needed for cutting down the "Sacred Oaks" of capitalism and for building socialism on the "clearing". They would say that when one gives up the power, one is giving up socialism too. They have an illusion that it is possible to convince 30 million people and to convert them into socialists using compulsion and force. (Editor's

remark: Author has in mind the example of Poland and the Polish people forced to live under the communist heel.)

Well, during past decades we have gotten rid of small-pox by applying compulsory inoculation. If it were not for compulsion, the epidemics of small-pox could have been still with us. Treating socialism as if it were small-pox resulted in its liquidation. Socialistic pragmatism must practice, literally, everything that it proclaims. The depth of the grave in which socialism in the Soviet Union is buried may be measured by the abyss which separates the constitution of the U.S.S.R. from its daily life practice.

True socialism may bloom and be practiced in a democratic system only. Historic experiences have shown that it's impossible to destroy democracy, preserving, at the same time, the power of people.

Democracy doesn't guarantee the blossoming of socialism. Parliaments with conservative majority quite often enact antisocialistic laws. Democracy doesn't guarantee the blossoming of socialism but liquidation of democracy guarantees liquidation of socialism. The last 50 years existence of the Soviet Union and the 30 years existence of the satellite countries are striking, though grim illustration of this thesis.

Perhaps parliamentary democracy is obsolete. Perhaps, we are on the road to the "New, Magnificent World", which will be governed by oligarchies supported by the

complicated systems of computers. But if democracy is fading away, so is socialism.

I can't believe it. To me, Christianity and socialism incarnate the most intimate and utmost longings and desires of man. Some may say that those ideas belong to past, to mythology. They should be answered with a question: Does the history of human civilization from Euphrates, Nile, Tiber, to the Seine, Rhine and Thames belong to mythology too?

* * *

The oil crisis has caused the predictions of futurologists of the previous decade, though accepted as greatly authoritative, to turn out to be an untimely joke. On the pages of Kultura I had discussed the studies of the Hudson Institute in which the authors had foretold the 3 day work week, the richness of consumptive products, permanent government pension for every American regardless of whether he worked or did not work. Based on these assumptions they built up a prognosis that the most important problem of near future will be a question of free time.

Several years ago it seemed that most of the productive work might have been gradually assigned to the automatic industrial complexes directed and supervised by correctly programmed computers.

A slave who supposedly was to work instead of us would have been energy, mostly

in the form of electricity. Comparison with ancient Rome whose might had been based on slaves' work would be rather false, because a slave as a unit of energy looked pretty poorly. Every American, or Western German who has several cars and numerous electronic gadgets, has at his disposal an energetic potential that none of Roman slave owners could have dreamt of.

Those futurologistic predictions came to my mind when I was reading the statement of the Bank of England's governor. We must save and tighten our belts at least up to 1984 if we want to survive the present crisis. In the governor's opinion, lowering standards of life, radical decrease of consumption, discipline of work and saving - all are the guiding lines for nearest future.

The vision of futurologists has gone with the wind because of the energy crisis. Our readers who, contrary to me, own cars will be revolted if I say that the energy crisis is a "camouflaged blessing". We are not ready yet for futurologistic "Garden of Eden" in which all work would be done for us by the spiritless energy.

Lenin had dreamt that socialism plus electricity would create the simplest road to the ideal communistic State. Experiences did not prove it either in Russia or in any other place under the sun. My wife "went through Russia" as we say using this common idiom. In Kazakhstan to where she was deported, there were famine, typhoid, tuberculosis, malaria, and lack, literally, of

everything, except electricity. That electricity shone not upon socialism but upon unbelievable misery.

Simple logic tells us that the raw materials being unrenewable, by the same token, are destined to become exhausted. Oil is unrenewable and its resources, sooner or later, must end. But water, or so called "white coal" in the ecologically regular economy of nature is renewable because we have rains every year.

It isn't important that in relation to the unrenewable oil we are showing an inexcusable giddiness. The real problem is that along with this voracious consumption of energy in the past decades, we had achieved enormous economic growth but without social justice. This process created situation in which the rich were growing richer and the poor, poorer.

Misery doesn't preclude social justice. One may imagine that there may exist a poor country whose citizens are poor, but, at the same time promoting and having maximum of social justice. Social justice doesn't relate to the level of income per capita, but to the income in relation to the "loaf of bread" representing the total national income. One would think that when the loaf is bigger then it's easier to divide it justly. Unfortunately, we learned by experience that with the growth of the loaf, with the speedier growth of its weight and volume - its sharing is most unjust.

One of the British economists calculated

that should the total national income of Great Britain be absolutely equally divided among citizens, each Britisher would have 4 thousand pounds sterling a year. Undoubtedly, on average, we all would be well off, assuming that pound wouldn't be further devaluated. But would social justice be attained in the nation whose every citizen had 4 thousand pounds yearly income? Would it be just to pay identical salaries to airline pilot and to a postman? Or to a prestigious physician and a typist in one or the other office?

It's obvious that the basic postulate lies in the question of the lowest earnings which should assure a modest, but fully satisfactory living. Earnings on the border of famine are contradictory to social justice. Everybody agrees on this point but we must underline that it is the only point upon which there is a unanimity of opinion.

The British workmen understand that just earnings represent not only relation of their earnings to the gross national income, but, above all, the earnings of one workmen' group to the earnings of other groups. The main reason for miners' strike is their conviction that on the list of earners they should be put in the first place. They believe, quite justly so, that their work is dirty, dangerous and often resulting in mortal disease of lungs.

But we may say that nurses in hospitals work pretty hard too. In the first half of January of this year, British TV, during miners' strike invited to their

studio a miner, a nurse, an electrician, a railway worker, a postman and a bank manager. They were asked in turn to set the table of earnings each of them thought to be just for every group represented in the interview. The bank manager put the bank managers in the first place, miner put miners. Only the postman didn't put postman as the first, allocating the first place to nurses. The program, beyond any doubt, proved that, gathered in the studio, representatives of working people would never agree how to arrange the consecutive table that would delineate the position of a particular group of workers in relation to the earnings. Thus, even for the duration of a one hour debate it hadn't been possible to establish a just politics of wages that would be acceptable to everyone.

This example leads us to trade unions which believe that FREE BARGAINING is the best method in solving the problem of wages. There is no doubt that powerful trade unions which by strike might paralyze the economy of the whole country, are able to obtain for themselves unproportionally larger wages than the wages of the unorganized, or belonging to the less important branches of industry workers, because the bargaining power of the latter is insignificant. We may say that though all workers are equal - some are "more equal" than the others.

The "Capital" of Marx was written in England. Marx thought that as soon as the British working class is organized in powerful trade unions, it will use its power to rebuild the structure of the nation. If "rebuilding" means communism - it did not,

and it will never happen.

The organized working class is able to overthrow any government and to dictate to England any system, including communism. But the enormous majority of British workers do not want communism. This fact is proven by the Parliament in which not even a single communist representative has a seat. Trade unions representing the working class attach great weight to the principle of FREE BARGAINING. The smallest attempts to limit the extent of this principle are fought back by trade unions with the greatest force.

Communism liquidates the principle of FREE BARGAINING. The State, by unilateral decision, settles the wage problem of workers and strikes are suppressed by police, army and tanks.

Since the end of the Second World War the power of trade unions has been growing rapidly. But, along with it the knowledge of communism has been spreading too. Romanticism of Civil War in Spain had been overshadowed by the Hungarian uprising and by the invasion of Czechoslovakia. British workers read the press, listen to radio, watch TV and have for quite a long time had no illusions how the communism looks in practice.

British communists are aware of this and proclaim that communism in a British "edition" would look differently than the Soviet. As a result neither Soviets, nor the British working class trust them.

Communism would conquer England only by force, by Soviet army which would occupy the country. Of course, the first step made by the occupants would be jailing the members of Central Communist Party Committee for their revisionism and "rightist deviation". Reorganized British communist party would be led by Britishers imported from Moscow and well trained by the KGB.

This will never happen. Britishers are always ready to compromise, but not to capitulate. They will defend their islands to the last.

Marxists ought to think deeply about the example of England. Here is a country where the organized working class became the most powerful social force. A country which among many countries of the world is the least probable to choose revolution and communism. Consequently, we can state that born in England, communism most obviously found its grave there. The organized and powerful working class votes for the Labor Party which, by all means, is socialistic but not communist.

We may claim that British working class and other Western European working classes are egoistic, with no ideology, basically inclined to care for their own interests and assets. With regard to this we must stress 2 points. British workers are the product of capitalistic education. The principle of FREE BARGAINING is a twin of FREE ENTERPRISE and free play of market forces. From capitalists the workers inherited the idea that the only objective measure of success in life and social progress

is money. From them also they took the philosophy which proclaims that money is the main, worth while goal and that one should fight in every possible way to obtain possible penny.

And the second point. Not all the British workers are well paid. Those of well paid groups, for example the miners, represent the first generation of well paid miners. Their fathers and grand-fathers were exploited and had lived in utmost poverty. Nothing strange then that the contemporary worker is busy and emotionally involved in fortifying his own prosperity and doesn't care about social problems of the world.

The capitalistic system of England undergoes ever growing changes. It becomes clear that in future it will be not the workers who are going to be seeking alignment with capitalists, but to the contrary, capitalists will be forced to adapt themselves to the demands of the working class whose trade unions represent the biggest power in British social and economic structure. This new BALANCE OF POWER didn't find yet its proper form and the evolutionary process in this respect will go through the next decades.

The abused word "crisis" implies that not necessarily we are going to lose the battle against inflation. I am convinced that it will be a long struggle after which the capitalistic system will never be the same as in the past. In other words, overcoming the crisis will not mean restoration of capitalism in its

old form. The changes are breeding in our own eyes causing a chaos and disturbances which we define using a collective word "crisis".

Capitalism in its classic form has not been overthrown in Western Europe. It just outlived itself, similarly to many earlier systems. This characteristic creates a mortal blow to communism which has always been proclaimed by its advocates as the only remedy for capitalistic disease. "Disease" dies faster than we would think; what's the use of a remedy which even during the capitalistic epidemics didn't cure anybody?

There is only one sanctuary which insures capitalism against the crisis, against its reconstruction, or evolution. That sanctuary is communistic propaganda which needs capitalism like a fish that needs water. If all males in the world suddenly stopped getting bald, what would be left for the multitude of producers who sell "miraculous" and "scientifically proven" elixirs for hair growing? Just think of it!

Actually we haven't got any ideal solution for all social problems. The statistical table of workers' earnings that would be called conformable to an ideal social justice must be avowed as just and right by 80-90% of workers of any particular country. We have not, and we won't ever have such a table.

Social justice isn't a stable idea. It's an evolutionary process that hasn't

and cannot have an end. Apart from economic and political changes, every generation of workers has different criteria of evaluation of this as well as other questions.

In my opinion, neither the social systems nor the political theories can pretend to be scientific. There isn't such a thing as a scientific socialism as there isn't scientific democracy. Consistent with science would be a system which recognizes the natural characteristics of human development; a system built not on dogmas only; a system which in its frame allows for an organized evolutionary struggle in the name of social ideas of a generation. Each evolution is a fight not necessarily bloody and with weapons in hand.

The system in which the civil struggle for progress and social justice is legal, is the democracy of West European type. Democracy may be defined as a never-ending fight among generations of people, as an incessant battle of opinions and trends, and as a critique of the past which at the same time plans for future. In democracy one may find everything but peacefulness, because peacefulness has never been a characteristic of the healthy and the free people. Freedom is not peacefulness. It remains to be a battle forever. That's why the people in the Eastern block are not free.

* * *

Perhaps Russia, if she were a democratic State, would practice imperialistic politics, taking advantage of superiority in

number of people, territorial expanse, army, etc. The democratic States quite often practice imperialism, but against this type of imperialism one may put a defense line. In democratic Russia there would exist some factions, or political parties which would help us, and certainly there would be many Russian publications that would be objective with regard to the democratic voices of the Polish press. We would, in that democratic Russia, have enemies as well as friends, but in any case we wouldn't be helpless. Democratic Russia would, no doubt, have a great influence on Poland and it would be in our interest to have good relations with such a powerful neighbor. (Editor's remark: Again, this paragraph is rather for Polish readers as it relates to Poland and Polish people under communist Russia's rule. I include it as characteristic and applicable to many other nations.)

Each totalitarianism is imperialistic but imperialism isn't its main characteristic. Its characteristic lies in transmuting the myth into an "objective fact". Atheism and religions are subjective attitudes. Scientifically it cannot be proven that God exists, or doesn't. But when some atheists insist that their "creed" is scientifically objective truth - they are, indeed, riding on an inclined plane.

It is absurd to present unscientific facts as scientifically proven and this absurdity is a backbone of totalitarian power. And it doesn't matter whether "the scientifically proven facts" are in the form of atheism, racism, myth of "blood and iron", or a "scientific socialism".

Totalitarianism must rely on lying because there isn't in it any possible rational argument that would justify its claims. Religions have fideism, which means a conviction based on faith. Totalitarianism, specifically the Soviet totalitarianism went a step further; it liquidated metaphysics. The operation has been performed naively and simply - the Soviets put an equation mark between metaphysics and physics. Communism, in which only an insignificant part of society believes, is taught in schools and universities as a scientific theory that has the same status as Darwin's theory of evolution which had passed the test of time and with scarcely small number of corrections had been acclaimed as objectively true.

In order to convert people into Christians it is necessary to convince them and to dazzle them by the beauty and goodness of this unique religion. But there is no need to convert anybody into a "belief" that $2 + 2 = 4$. In order to do so, it is enough to teach one just a simple arithmetic. The Soviet totalitarianism has murdered socialism because it took away from it its "metaphysics" replacing it by the false physics.

The true socialism is a conviction, a belief in goodness and unselfishness of human being; it is a psychological attitude characterized by one's readiness to sacrifice and to work for betterment of others. Socialism in this context is not a "scientific theory" but an idea to which people should be reconciliated by all available means, but excluding force.

Communists and reactionaries would say that this kind of socialism is a utopia because the success of socialistic reforms can be obtained by an administrative compulsion.

When in a democratically elected Congress the parliamentary majority passes a socialistic proposition, this proposition becomes a law to be obeyed by all. But this doesn't mean that socialism has become an ideology that should be accepted by all. The law should be compulsory to all, but socialism only to socialists.

The conservatists who cannot grasp the sense of socialism and of Christianity as well, quite often argue that social injustice results from "natural order of things". By nature, some people are clever and hard working, some others are dull and lazy. Some are beautiful and healthy, some others - ugly and sick. Nature is cruel and unjust and we, the humans, must accept this natural order of the world.

The social mission of Christianity is counteracting this natural order. The commandment of loving your neighbor which of all commandments Christ put in the first place demands of us to equalize, or to appease the harms that are caused by unjust nature. This is a concept of the highest order initiated by Christianity. Someone who doesn't understand it is a pagan though de nomine he might be a Christian.

If the nature were just and merciful nobody would demand of us to practice justice and mercy- because the ideal of justice and mercy would have been achieved. As it is

not so, the demand for changing the unjust and unmerciful world into a human world of order and social justice is the essence of both - Christianity and socialism.

Let me stress once more. In Christianity and socialism the road to the goal is more important than the goal itself. Society of truly socialistic order is a utopia, likewise the society ideally Christian is a vision that belongs not in this world. But the sense of life is possible to find only on the road that leads to a greater and better goal than we ourselves are. In this aspect humanity is a utopian concept. But it assigns to a man an exceptional, by religion defined as the supernatural status in the panorama of all existence.

Juliusz Mieroszewski

Fragments

Vol. 1/9 & 10

November, 1974

ABOUT DÉTENTE

by

Charles Joel

ABOUT DÉTENTE

by

Charles Joel

A translation from the
Polish magazine "Kultura"
NO 9/324/74 published in
Paris, France.

© Copyright 1974 by Charles Joel

Published by Correspondence Home Study
of Languages

Printed by the Essicc Company
Sutter Creek, California

ABOUT DETENTE

There is no sense in talking about the fall or crisis of the so-called politics of *DETENTE*. If *DETENTE* is thought to mean a mutual relaxation, it might be compared with an ornamental imprint on the cover of a book which hasn't been written yet. We see the title and pretend that something really decisive has happened.

That nothing in the way of relaxation between the Soviet Union and America has occurred is proven by the almost 2-1/2 years that have passed by since before the last visit of Nixon to Moscow.

There was so much written about all this that one shouldn't even think about adding anything more if it were not for the events, which for the purpose of this writing, should be reminisced upon.

The American politicians and military intelligence have shown their great credibility in taking Brezhnev's assurances which he made during the summit meeting at San Clemente. As an example which illustrates this statement is the first reaction of American Intelligence when the war in the Middle East in Oct '73 erupted. "When - on Oct 4th - two days before Egypt attacked Israel, the Soviet planes began to evacuate Russian families from Egypt, some American specialists evaluated this action as a sign of further Soviet-Arab relations' inflammation whose first act took place in 1972 (in throwing out the Soviet experts and advisors from Egypt - Ed. postscript). In the morning of Oct. 6th, at the time of wars eruption, the most authoritative reports were suggesting that the conflict is not unavoidable.

When the war began to unroll the reports dispatched information that it had been Israel who attacked the Arab nations". 1/

As we can see from the above paragraph, neither the American politicians nor the military Intelligence had ever dreamt about possible disloyalty of their Soviet partner of *DETENTE*. Recovery came later when it was necessary to prevent the landing of 50,000 Soviet airborne troops in Egypt, forcing in effect the U.S.A. to alert its all land, sea and air forces.

The history of the last 2 years - including Soviets' efforts to widen the war in the Middle East and Gromyko's speedy appearance in Damascus for torpedoing Kissinger's mission - should demonstrate to the American politicians how the Soviet side understands *DETENTE*.

1/ Article of Theodor Draper, *COMMENTARY*, June 1974, page 38. According to another relation published in *NEW YORK TIME MAGAZINE* of June 23, '74, written by Marvin and Bernard de Kalb, in fact the military Intelligence of the U.S.A. had no doubts that the war in the Middle East is approaching and knew who will be an assailant in it, but counted on the peaceful intervention of the Soviet Union. Completely surprising were the Soviet transports of weaponry from the first day of conflict not to mention Brezhnev's efforts to draw into action as many as possible Arab nations, among them - Algeria.

Whether it did - I don't know. There is nothing in the voices of senators or Congressmen, not to mention American TV which attacks Nixon for everything he did or didn't do, with the exception of *DÉTENTE*. *DÉTENTE* with the Soviets is the golden apple which should be treasured as a permanent quarry of American politics even after getting rid of Nixon Presidency and his eventual conviction.

The present efficient elimination of the Soviets from Arab countries does not result exclusively from the diplomatic abilities of Kissinger or the initiative of Nixon, but from the effects of an old and well-known maxim: diplomacy without support of arms is equal to zero. If it were not for the mining of Haiphong in 1972 after which the Soviets backed off, if it were not for the alert ordered by the Defense Council of the U.S.A. in Oct. '73, even a hundred Kissingers couldn't have been able to bring Sadat and the other Arab masters over to the American side. The arrogance and brutality of the U.S.S.R. couldn't cause it. An alternative could be the U.S.A. which at least at certain times stopped behaving like a humble dog on the leash of *DÉTENTE*, and moreover, was able to show its claws. The elimination of Russia's influence from the Arab countries - if it'll be finally accomplished - must be acknowledged as her greatest defeat in the last 2 decades.

We may conclude that after the unpleasant experiences of America in the Middle East war, *DÉTENTE*, which appeared to be contradicting its own role, has

brought pretty good results as far as the restraint of the Soviet expansion is concerned.

However, in order to stop *DÉTENTE* from being such as it is desired to be by the Politbureau - meaning slowly progressive capitulation of the West to Russia - the will of the opposition and solidarity among the Western nations against threats and blackmails is needed. One would think that the recent events in this region of the world should become a source of inspiration for the Western Europe. But is not so. Europe continues to be not so much of a partner in *DÉTENTE* as an object of the Soviets' patient endeavours. It's evident that the troubled countries of Western Europe not having military power comparable to the U.S.A. are not in a position to oppose Russia as successfully as America.

Discussing the possibilities of Western Europe's opposition against Russia as if NATO and American divisions over there already were nonexistent, might appear strange. But, such is the reality, and, for the time being, neither the declarations of the NATO partners in Brussels on the occasion of Nixon's visit on the way to Moscow, nor Kissinger's consultations with premiers and ministers of Italy, West Germany, Belgium and President of France have produced any significant changes. If Western Europe with France in the lead, scared by the threat of Arab oil embargo, didn't wish any guidance of the U.S.A. and decided to come, at any price, to an understanding with Arab masters - not collectively, but individually - then we

can imagine what panic would arise from a blackmail by a more powerful party such as the Soviets. *FOR THE ESSENCE OF THE MATTER RESTS NEITHER IN WEAKNESS NOR IN THE BREAKING DOWN OF EUROPE. BOTH RESULT FROM HER ABSOLUTE UNWILLINGNESS TO UNDERTAKE ANY RISK OF CONFRONTATION WITH THE SOVIET EMPIRE.* Some Declarations of statesmen and politicians appear to be expressing their belief that the Soviet expansionism lost its fighting spirit and stopped being a threat to the West. Those declarations shouldn't be taken too seriously. He who doesn't want to fight an aggressor- especially an aggressor who doesn't point a knife at his throat but uses more subtle methods - prefers to be comfortable pretending that he doesn't see any aggressive intentions.

On the other hand the same United States, which in the Middle East had carried the diplomatic-military game almost faultlessly, is continuing to act as an official advocate of that imaginary *DÉTENTE*, which in the case of Europe may be used only as instrument of blackmail in the hands of the Soviets. Western Europe from the standpoint of even the most egoistically understood interests of America is much more important to her than the Arab nations. Even taking into account all the oil implications which so destructively ricochet on the relations between the Western Europe and the U.S.A.

To the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Near East defeat isn't much of a blow. It's simply a step backward; it has happened not for the first time in history of the U.S.S.R. Besides, the Kremlin leaders know very well how to put on a good face at a poor game, especially,

i.e., for their own people to whom the separation of Israel and Syrian forces has been explained as the success of the peaceful politics of the U.S.S.R. During the Nixon visit with Brezhnev in Moscow both gentlemen were extremely radiant as if nothing at all had occurred in the last months and as if Nixon's presence were just a normal continuation of a cordial friendship which began 2-1/2 years ago. But, what Nixon had offered in the name of American producers - from whom he must have had something like *CARTE BLANCHE* is much, much more than a compensation for mis-haps of the Middle East. In the whole matter of the trade contracts, the tariff of the most favored nation - meaning the terms on which Russia may export to the U.S.A. - isn't important because what counts isn't the Soviet export to America but to the contrary, the American export to Russia. 2/

The trade agreements between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. are, of course, not limited to exporting articles of consumptive industry. American businessmen are ready to sell everything from Pepsi Cola to the most advanced electric machinery. No wonder, because their goal is making profit not

2/ Only the tariff of the most favored nation and eventual federal credits demand approval by the Congress. Otherwise the normal export licences issued by the Secretary of Commerce are required. The long list of so-called strategic goods which sometime ago was contained by the export embargo to the U.S.S.R., has been considerably curtailed.

worrying about what will happen to them and their monies in some indefinite future. Those energetic businessmen have the blessings of the President and Secretary of State. They efficiently mend the Soviet economic infrastructure which remains as one of many Achilles' heels of the Soviet Union. Besides telecommunication which will be greatly modernized (knowing the Soviet priorities of issues, no doubt for the need of industry and military forces), Americans intend to sell them the newest equipment for construction of roads. It's enough to take a glance at the map of Central and Northern Siberia to have a convincing idea that the only artery which joins the Pacific Ocean with Central Russia is still the same trans-Siberian railway built by czar (No earlier than 1976 the Soviets will start construction of 1860 mile main railway which will join the Ust-Kut on Lena River with Komsomolsk. The end of construction is expected to be in 1990). All this will be done with the help of *DÉTENTE*.

Nixon's Moscow meeting whose second part had been arranged not in Yalta itself but in its suburb (in order to avoid any unpleasant connections with the old Yalta conference which 30 years ago had been mercilessly blasted by Nixon) was acquitted by him in an empty speech. But, whatever in joint protocols, speeches, and toasts had been said, promised and guaranteed on the question of peace - which is desired by both sides, although to each of them the word "peace" has a different meaning - one fact remains incontestable. In order to preserve the existing zones of influence in the world, it is necessary to have an absolute will

of not one, but at least two, if not three of the superpowers. In any case the will of at least both of the most important partners: The U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.

The U.S.A., where public opinion has a deciding significance, wants to preserve the existing division of the world and is doing everything to strengthen it. The U.S.S.R., where public opinion is worth nothing, insists that it wants it too, but is doing everything to the contrary. The Chinese Peoples Republic, where public opinion is the same as in Russia or even of the lesser significance, proclaims that it does not pretend to be a superpower but really only wants to accentuate its heretical position concerning the present division of the world. The Ch.P.R. declares at any occasion that it is against the present international *STATUS QUO*. China is economically and militarily too weak, feels too much threatened by Russia, and cannot realistically think about overturning the *STATUS QUO* of the world. Consequently, any announcements of Chinese statesmen don't obligate them to anything.

The average American observer of what is happening in world fails to understand one thing: Why the U.S.S.R. with its never-ending list of chronic economic troubles is interested in further expansion? The list of economic deficiencies of the Soviets after almost 60 years of reign seems to be to the average Westerner either incredible, or - if accepted as true - proof of the complete inefficiency of the system.

If the U.S.S.R. struggles with many problems, if despite growing indices of production the industrial margin between Russia and the advanced nations of the West doesn't lessen but grows, it's obvious to the Westerner that the U.S.S.R. should strive for stabilization not for the conquests and expansion.

After Stalin's death, during the period that ended with Khrushchev's departure from the political scene, people still hoped for better conditions of life. It was believed that the political curves and--speaking with subtlety--economic deficiencies of the system were arising not from the system itself, but from the degeneration of Stalin's administration and police. That when one straightens up the other would follow, and the prosperity of the Soviet nation would quickly grow. That was long time ago, but it was true. It means that the hopes were true. However, after years of patching, reorganizing and decentralizing, liberalizing and deliberalizing, it became clear that nothing can be straightened up. Sometimes it looks as if during the so-called economic reform periods the Party leaders wished to sustain the political structure of Communism which grows from the economic base of Capitalism. A dream never to be fulfilled. As a result, the more realistically thinking apparatchiks of the highest rank came to the reasonable conclusion that the Communist system, in order to survive, must remain in the state of permanent instability. Recognition of this truth (of course, for inside use of the political power) had become the cornerstone of Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the 60ties

and 70ties. And on this base the idea - not a bad one - was born that the developed Capitalist countries could perform the function of financing their lame economy by means of investment and commodity credits - from grain and Pepsi Cola to the construction of chemical and car factories. In other words, what the Communist system cannot produce will be supplied by the Capitalists. The latter were given an auxiliary provider's function of the Soviet Union. In all this, the idea of accentuating the war industry is perfectly harmonized. Also, along with recognition of the true, incurable illnesses of the Soviet economy which cannot appease the daily and growing needs of her citizens, the second unquestionable true direction was adopted. It is a fact that the exclusive branch of the Soviet industry - the one which works for war, could show much greater and more effective achievements than the shoe, textile, toothpaste, or phonograph record factories. The products of industry connected with strategic production, have reached the highest standard of quality and quantity in the world. They became the Soviets *SPECIALITE DE LA MAISON* - similar to yesteryear's fame of the Swiss watches. The fact that the Soviet industry could have worked so efficiently becoming an example to the other nations not specializing in the production destructive means, undoubtedly gives evidence of the progress in the Soviet economy because production for war is also an economy. There is no need to deliberate on how it happens or why it happens that the work in Kolkhoze is poor and unpro-

ductive while in the plant of the most sophisticated - infallible in their precision rockets - so effective. The pilots and tank crews of Israel army felt this precision directly on their own skins, and also the American military from the Pentagon - to their unpleasant surprise - felt it indirectly. The fact remains that discernment of the Soviet war industry has been poor. It appears that this is their "key" industry. In the sense that it gives them one of the important keys to dominate the world.

Had the Soviet leaders begun to think about spreading their power over the world specifically for the reasons that their lame system proved to be strong - in this one region in which, as it appears they "caught up and outstripped the West"? We should think rather that already from the moment of consolidating their power they were dreaming about subordinating to them the other nations. During several decades the idea has been unrealistic because being weak and threatened by the imperialism of the West they had to think about their own defense and survival more than about conquests. The old call for the final "victory of Communism" began to take concrete shape when, on the one hand the proper tools - meaning war technology and an efficient weapons industry - were successfully created, and on the other, when the impotency of the Capitalist world, tormented by social problems began to be more clearly outlined. Although those ferments arise from different causes than the economic crisis of the 30ties, nevertheless they make the West more and more helpless in confrontation with the Soviets.

The desire for dominating part, or all world existed always in the minds of monarchs, leaders and dictators. As often as they have an uncontrolled power, as often as they could successfully eliminate their competitors, so often they thought about the conquests, or about widening their influence. Good or bad - according to moral criterion of those day - they didn't care about the fate of their subjects. At most, about their stomachs, and then mainly during the times when they dressed them in uniforms and gave them the weapons to handle. The world of those times was cruel - certainly more cruel than the Soviet leaders are, but it was also the world which didn't know hypocrisy. Nobody was "liberated" - and if so - very seldom. Sometimes there were wars for the "true religion" but on the whole the wars were caused by the desire of bounty. However, if the sovereign wanted to have an obedient and disciplined army, he used to employ mercenaries. They were the best professionals. It was costly, but it paid.

Quite often, the prominent politicians are highly educated connoisseurs of history. This characteristic lasts for as long as they keep their university chairs. But after - as creators of history - they forget about its lessons, making, as I think, one important mistake. To their opponents, who have an uncontrolled power, they attribute, without any basis, the same rationale of conduct as they themselves practice. Owing to this, they forget about an old, well-worn truth of the role which the desire of power plays in human motivation. The desire of

power being a goal in itself doesn't demand any additional reasons. Ignoring this old, elementary rule makes deciphering the USSR leaders' intentions very difficult. The USSR isn't bound by the thousands of considerations that are a headache for their Western opponents.

At this point it's necessary to remind ourselves that public opinion, a factor embracing many strata of populace, as a historic phenomenon is comparatively new. Through the periods of feudal Europe to the outburst of French revolution and even the later, the feudal states fought among themselves without asking their people for any opinion. Those were the wars of monarchs, princes, and feudal elite. The inhabitants of those states being simply a shapeless mass that was unable to express neither protest nor approbate, treated the wars' calamities as they treated elemental catastrophies.

What is most important in our attempt to point an acceptable parallel between feudal past and the Soviet contemporaneousness is the fact - well known to historians - that for ages there wasn't any public opinion which would influence the masters' politics.

PRESENTLY IN THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE COMMUNIST CAMP, THERE DOESN'T APPEAR COMBINATION OF THESE TWO CHARACTERISTICS: MONOPOLIZED POWER WHICH DOESN'T RECOGNIZE ANY PUBLIC OPINION, ACCOMPANIED BY HIGH INDUSTRIAL POTENTIAL. Co-existence of these two characteristics doesn't appear in any non-Communist country.

Socially and economically the Soviets

have come a long way from the feudalism of the czars. But, concerning monopolized power, the Party's despotism outgrows the czars'. This is the logic of a totalitarian state. The Party at the top, besides the police has at its disposal all means of existence. In addition, it is interested not only in what the citizens think, but it does everything to shape their thinking, mainly by means of mass communication of propaganda whose voice reaches the inhabitants of Moscow and of Kamchatka as well.

The fact that the Communist side is able to, so far, efficiently paralyze public opinion and isolate it from participation in power, and, to the contrary, the Capitalist world must depend on thousands of factors, public opinion being first, gives the Soviets and their satellites a superiority in making decisions. It's the obvious price for freedom which neither the governments nor people of the West intend to give up for the price of obtaining superiority over the Soviets. In this situation, more and more people who hold the power in the West conclude that the only escape is the necessity of peaceful coexistence and that this necessity the other side will accept on the basis of international *STATUS QUO*. And, when regaining consciousness they notice that the Soviets agreeing with coexistence are violating it, they try to impose on their opponents their own logic. They think that the Soviet politics of expansion must have at its base their internal problems only. Consequently, they believe that the help given to the Soviets for resolving their

problems will simmer down not only their imperialism, but - perhaps - will cause some softening of the Communist line in dealing with their own citizens.

In this belief they almost make the same mistake that was made by their predecessors in the 20ties and 30ties. They assume that the Soviets, abundantly supplied with products of consumptive industry - meaning with everything that the Soviet economy cannot produce - enriched in addition by modern American technology, will be "tamed" and accept the present division of the world and with it eternal peace. In the years of the Soviets' first 5-year plans we also believed that Communism would lose, thanks to Western capital, its revolutionary spirit.

A revolutionary-offensive State which in the first years of its violent existence could charm many people in the world by the vision of a bright future and the romanticism of battle cry, turned into a bureaucratic monster whose imperialism during these many years has been restrained only by military weakness. Now this weakness has vanished. We must add, however, that the mistake of *DÉTENTE* differs from the mistakes of the previous generations of politicians. The point of difference is that contrary to the early revolutionary expansionism which died a natural death, the present Soviet imperialism *WHICH HAS NOTHING IN COMMON WITH ANY REVOLUTION* will never die. Even with further pampering and filling the chronically lame economy of the USSR by Capitalism in no way will cool down the expansionism because this expansionism doesn't

result from any need. Whenever the problem of *DÉTENTE* in relations of East-West is being discussed, often as an alternative the question of "cold war" is brought up. Revolving between these two alternatives is an obvious nonsense. Even if the "cold war" would be understood as a permanent offensive of the West against Communism, excluding military action, neglecting it doesn't mean a necessity of helping the Soviets in the form of investment credits. The latter, as I have tried to explain, are nothing but supplementing by the Western Capitalism those economic functions that the Communist system cannot perform. Owing to this, the Soviets will be able to a greater degree than now, to specialize themselves in the production of war means which consequently will increase their chances of blackmailing any particular element of the former united camp which is presently broken up into mutually competing members.

Lately, the opinion of Senator W. Fulbright, the chairman of Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate, has been very much talked about. According to him, *DÉTENTE* functions only as a regulator of differences between the two superpowers so that they won't engage in nuclear war. But, if the *DÉTENTE* were reduced to performing such limited functions, it may be said without any reservations, that these functions were carried out by the system of relations which existed during the "cold war".

The different methods of pressure, including terror, applied directly or

indirectly, by using the prospective friends against the West, remains clearly in connection with not only the decay of NATO, but also with the processes of disintegration of Capitalist democracies. What would these processes control and put - especially America - in a state of emergency, 3/ is some imprudent move of the Soviets, such as a completely open act of aggression. But, assuming that time is working for them to progressively immobilize the West by atrophy, the Soviets avoid any drastic move. They are convinced that their patience will be greatly rewarded since the West will ripen by itself to be taken without applying the media of mass destruction (who needs cemeteries?) and even without bloodshed which the West at any price tries to avoid.

The influential publicists underestimate, while fully recognizing the weakness of the West, the obvious trump cards held by the Capitalist democracies against the USSR. It seems that it would be proper to formulate, or simply to re-collect the most important of them.

The basic element of weakness in the Communist system comes to light in repeatedly adapted attempts of reforming the economic structure without infringing upon the monopoly of Party power.

3/ I don't mean the strategic alert that was ordered by the President of the USA in 1973, but the full awareness of all in the face of a formidable danger.

The attempts to shake the structure of this power in communist regimes, occurred, so far, in the satellite countries dominated economically and militarily by the Soviets, which fact, as a rule, forecloses their chances of success. However, if the processes of rebellion would begin to sprout in the U.S.S.R. the results could be incalculable. So far, any manifestations of rebellion by the working masses have been kept very efficiently under control by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. But, although the Soviet working class appears to be passive, it doesn't mean that it isn't apt to absorb the ferments of rebellion; in Russia, they are, and will be acting without any demonstration up to the last moment before an outbreak. This strong possibility arises from the mechanics of totalitarianism which in comparison with, e.g., the present governing teams of Poland or Hungary, strives not only for control of any signs of dissatisfaction but also for making them invisible. Both, the government and the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, continue to believe that in Russia and her subordinate countries the best method for upholding power is to keep the barrel with its fermenting contents tightly corked up. If the Soviets were an economic organism which intends to stay in relative immobility, preserving at the same time the *STATUS QUO*, one would consider whether this method - though risky - is not the only one. But it cannot be used because of the Soviet ambitions which tell them to modernize and develop the economy of at least some selected branches. Just the same way as

sometime ago Stalin's system of power built upon blind terror was in permanent conflict with Soviet economy, so presently, in the era of computerized industry which demands the highly specialized work of labor and technician, the super-political structure of Party monopoly - the alpha and omega of the Soviet system - cannot last forever.

The growing participation of numerous classes of people in the administration of a state whose basic functions are production and services, is simply a product of development of materialistic civilization since at least the middle of XX century. As it couldn't have been possible to build capitalism in its early phase retaining at the same time the slavery, so presently it isn't possible to build culturally and economically a country keeping at the same time public opinion in forced lethargy. These two aspects cannot go hand in hand. The simple logic that conflicts may be suppressed but by suppression not necessarily extinguished, should, in the first place be understood by Marxists. It isn't even certain, however, whether in the countries of victorious socialism there are any Marxists, but we may assume that somewhere some of their heirs live.

The phenomenon of ignoring the forces which threaten the Soviet system from inside of their own society (with simultaneous exaggeration and demonization of the threat from outside) doesn't change the fact that in the upper echelon of power some self-preserving processes are in action. Lately they can be observed in the centralization of their most

reliable mainstay of the State-Party bureaucracy with technocrats and those of the military whose specialized knowledge of destruction is at par with the knowledge of Soviet war technologists. The alliance of these groups, although exclusively elitarian, is, as we suppose, for the time-being safeguarding the present structure of power. It cannot, in the long run, guarantee its stability because it doesn't remove the basic source of conflict that is created by the contradiction between the drive for modernization and archaic political superstructure which curbs the economic growth. Besides, this alliance has no marks of permanency because of the ambitions of groups competing among themselves. And here emerges ever increasing apparent weakness of the Soviet system: namely, that in party politics, decisions are made not by common sense which should make the bureaucrats and apparatchks to submit their individual interests and ambitions to the most important goal - preserving the power and keeping people under control. When facing its people, the bureaucracy puts up a face of unity. But this show no longer deceives anybody. It isn't a secret that since the time of Stalin's death the Communist parties have been tormented by fights among the factions which often get beyond the walls of the Central Committee. This fight for power uncontrolled by any legislative norms, developing in the countries of the Soviet Bloc, is, no doubt, an element of great potential which could be used by the West.

The key problem that emerges from

our dispute and which should be decided upon if we want to save the West from Sovietization, is the answer to the question: Whether the appeasement, and help in unloading the tensions and conflicts inside the Soviet Union, are in the interest of the West, or contrary, whether the interest of the West lies in their inflammation? Of course, the answer should be positively for inflammation. For this reason, the political events that are happening in the USSR cannot be treated as the internal problems of Russia, irrespective of what the legalists of the UNO or President Nixon may say.

It is clear that from the political basis of certain positions, or undertakings to their possible fulfillment is a long way considering the fact of how much the Soviet society is closed to the penetration from outside.

* * *

If, from the not-too distant perspective of the 30ties we look at the present situation of the West in general and of non-Communist Europe *VERSUS* the Soviets in particular, it isn't likely that we will overcome our pessimism. Today, more than before the Second World War, the countries of the West believe in the possibilities of preserving the international *STATUS QUO*. At the root of it lies the conviction that the only alternative that's left is the nuclear war which equally frightens all. Although I may doubt in both, I don't intend to enter into these matters now. But for the purpose of this writing it

would be well to consider a very important factor - the recognition of certain facts which greatly affect the weakening of the West against the Soviet expansion which is not the only danger to the West.

The intentions of the Soviets coincide with the period in which the capitalist countries (including Japan) are passing through an unquestionable crisis of super-civilization and classic methods of economy. The Soviet realize how much all internal problems weaken the resistance of Western nations and rightly conclude that they have now the best chances for "softening" the capitalist democracies. Synchronizing of their plans isn't necessary. Putting it simply, the growth of their military power occurs at the time of internal weakness for the West and the USA. The Soviets act carefully. Their methods adjust to the fluctuating situations in the West so that weakening process would work undetected.

The U.S.S.R. avoids open threats, preferring camouflaged blackmail. It doesn't threaten the West with open war as Hitler long before used to practice against the weaker European countries. To the contrary - the U.S.S.R. presents itself as an unbending champion of peace, organizing during the past 29 years numberless peace conferences, rallies and appeals. It's true that today these two-faced spectacles don't deceive anybody, but on the other hand, they don't reveal any aggressive plans either. Indeed, the Soviets - at least from the days of the adventurous minded

Krushchev, even for the moment think about military aggression because, in their belief, it's purposeless for subordinating the West. Quite to the contrary, war is extremely harmful and risky to them as it may force even the most unwilling opponent to defend himself. The Soviets don't think about the military conquest of Europe and prefer to act upon the parliamentary governments using communist parties whose number in the industrial countries, with exception of England and West Germany, is quite impressive. In the present historic phase, the power of the Party, or its dominating role in the governments of the West doesn't yet mean a changing of their systems. That's why - not excluding the eventual future transformations in the direction of self defense, I think, the West should look outside for help against the Soviet expansion. Firstly, by taking the advantage of international tensions which - as the events in the Middle East had shown - may weaken it. And secondly - inside the Soviet Bloc.

The statement that antagonism between the Soviets and China came just in the right time is a truism. Nevertheless, the fact of the deepening conflict between them that appears in increased uncontrolled potential emotions on both sides, hasn't yet been properly evaluated. China at present stage of the economic development, with her overwhelming number of people working in agriculture, urgently need space. Therefore, it is in interest of the West and Japan to support China in her claim to the territories which many years ago had been

seized by czarist Russia. Along with it, in order to magnify risking preventing war by Russia, it's mandatory to give China all the needed economic and military help. The fact that China is a communist country and that sooner or later she may become "another Russia" is highly possible, but not during the life of present and the next generations. In any case, if, as a result of rigorous discipline and help from the West, China will emerge as an industrial power of magnitude that she might threaten the rest of the world - most probably, her first objective of expansion will be the U.S.S.R. Elimination of the Soviets, not necessarily as a nation, but as a superpower remains to the West so much an urgent matter that it's worthwhile to pay a high price for the risk of creating and supporting a new Communist giant which is hostile to Russia. The paralyzing effects of this upon Russia would be felt during the next several years, giving Western Europe and the U.S.A. a break and a chance for solving their own towering problems. The threat of 800 or 900 million Chinese people - if it ever comes to that - is a matter of the more distant future. Beside, in the present situation, the capitalist countries have no other choice but to juggle among the smaller and bigger dangers.

For the same reason it's time to take a new look at Germany. The partition of Germany into two states is an historic absurdity which won't survive through 2 decades. Perhaps my deliberations will be considered a medicine that is worse than the sickness itself,

nevertheless the realism of the present situation dictates that we should concentrate upon its most challenging aspects.

The German Federal Republic lives under growing pressure of the Soviets. There is much talk in the press about "Finlandization" of Western Europe, and the Soviet "romance" with G.F.R. is considered to be its first stage. Disregarding the future picture of the United Germany we must notice that unification of both German states frightens almost all the countries of Europe, among them England and France. Their fears are unquestionable and well motivated. There is no doubt that the West hates this idea, but I would risk the statement that Russia hates it much more, because the IV Reich, even if it were governed by the Communists, would very quickly cease to be a satellite. Only the weak nations can be made into satellites. What would be most comforting to Russia is a communist government of East Germany which being weak and geographically too badly situated couldn't break her ties with Russia, added to a capitalistic but an obedient West Germany. In consequence of these short remarks I conclude that the time *COMES* when the NATO nations should push the question of a United Germany. From the standpoint of political interests of the West it's better to have *ANY* United Germany than a Germany divided into a Russian satellite - East, and a democratic West Germany, free, but more submissive to Russia in foreign politics. I don't insist that the present situation in Central Europe is already so poor that unification of Germany must take place immediately, but I think that such a situation might arise

in the next few years.

The quarrels and conflicts with future communist, or quasi-communist government of United Germany will begin the day after its installation. They'll result from the mutual relations among the communist nations. We have learned from observation that these relations rely on subordination - when the partners are extremely unequal as in the case of Peoples democracies and Russia, or in sharp and deepening antagonism illustrated by China and Russia. Only the geographical distance that separates Russia from Cuba provides Fidel Castro with a margin of political decision. In all, it appears that a United Germany being too strong to accept the satellite status will become a new antagonist of the Soviets - in this case in the West (as compared with China in the East - Ed. postscript).

The consequences of these dispositions may be very far reaching. They may cause increased chances for defreezing the boundaries, breaking up the governing systems, and liberalization of Eastern European countries, and, who knows, if not Russia and Russian people.

In the American interpretation, one of the conditions of *DÉTENTE* is nonintervention in internal problems of the Soviet Union. This is strongly supported by the Department of State and the President. Senator Jackson who passes for an opponent of *DÉTENTE* and who is a pet of the American Trade Unions, demands limited intervention in domestic affairs of the Soviet Union as a condition of grant-

ing Russia the tariff of the most favored nation, investment credits and access to American technology. Senator Jackson, however, stresses mainly the rights of Russian citizens of Jewish origin to free immigration. As we know the Soviets during the past 2-3 years have yielded substantially in this problem, giving passports to about 50,000 persons who wish to immigrate, to Israel. 4/ The efforts of pressure on the part of American politicians, concentrated on obtaining the rights of free immigration without the rights of returning to Russia, even if successful, in no way will improve the position of Western Europe and America against the Soviets. Nobody questions the fact that the privilege of leaving freely one's own country (with the guaranteed right to return) is a basic right of a citizen, but the whole problem is put on an improper level. People who desire liberalization of the U.S.S.R. for its own sake, should care not only for rights of the inhabitants of the Soviet Union to immigrate, but, at the same time for the rights which would allow them to live free. Winning the rights for immigration in no way improves the fate of those remaining in the country. 5/ In this article I don't intend to consider the liberalization of

4/ On this occasion the U.S.S.R. government had gotten rid of a substantial number of Gruzian criminals who presently create a deal of trouble in Israel.
5/ This problem was pointed out by Solzhenitsyn in an interview on American TV on June 24, '74.

the Soviet system but I dwell upon the problem of security against Russia and from this stand-point the immigration to Israel of several hundred thousand citizens do not weaken the U.S.S.R. Quite to the contrary - those who leave Russia, not only without the right but also without the will to return, represent the element of opposition. And diminishing the number of even the most passive oppositionists only strengthens the Soviet system.

What really is important to the USSR and the rest of the world - is a breaking through the "iron curtain" in the air. Today some European and American publicists write a lot about it but their writing doesn't echo either in Congressional debates or in the political bargaining with the Soviet Union. The American Department of State, most evidently in accord with its interpretation of *DETENTE*, gradually moves toward paralyzing those mass communication media whose job it is to inform the citizens of the USSR and Eastern Europe about all that happens in their own countries and in the rest of the world. Most evidently - which isn't without a peculiar logic of myth-omen of *DETENTE* - this kind of activity is an intervention in the domestic problems of communist nations. Since they don't wish to see the Soviet citizens as having access to information which is different from that supplied by the Party's sources, the functioning of foreign broadcasting stations on behalf of the Eastern recipients is an encroachment in "sovereign rights" of

Central Committee and Politbureau. This principle hasn't yet been declared by the Secretary of State of the U.S.A., but he complies with it anyway. "Voice of America" - the official U.S.A. government agency - has become something like a broadcasting station of the "Society of Soviet-American friendship". The "Free Europe" and "Radio Freedom" - which are under theoretical control of the Congress and in practice by the administration - are increasingly limited in their activities.

Meantime, informing citizens of communist countries becomes more important today than at any time before. More important because the U.S.A. which lost the military superiority over the Soviets in both conventional and nuclear areas, still has a powerful trump card - telling the truth to those who live in the circle of the Soviet Empire.

The consequences of information that flows from the non-communist press of the West, "Radio Freedom" and "Free Europe" intended to serve the Russians, Ukrainians, Poles, Lithuanians, Czechoslovaks, Hungarians and other peoples living in the Soviet Bloc, are difficult to estimate. Although the resistance against communist power in the past 29 years has been rather low, it cannot be denied that at certain times, unexpectedly, the waves of rebellion passed through some countries with a violence that was a complete surprise to the West. Would it have been possible if the inhabitants of these countries were completely cut off from the channels of information? It's difficult to answer the question, nonetheless

it's impossible to deny that the important role of information which goes through the air across the barbed wires and mine fields. If the function of information were not of such importance the communist governments wouldn't have built the gigantic installations of hundreds upon hundreds of jamming stations and wouldn't punish their citizens for hawking and even for possessing printed materials that do not bear "imprimatur" of communist censor. The newer and still improving telecommunication using satellites may, and undoubtedly will, create in the near future a gap in the wall of isolation imposed by the governments of Communist Bloc on their own peoples, against the wide river of information. Ineffective attempts raised 2 years ago by the Soviet delegation in the UNO to pass the resolution which would prohibit using cosmic space for political propaganda proves that the Soviets see the great danger. The invisible but enormously "audible" curtain created in the air appears to be stronger than the iron one. The satellite which on May 29 the U.S.A. put into orbit and which broadcasts educational programs that for the time being are listened to by India and some African countries, is for the communist governments a dangerous omen.

Some years ago it seemed that the peoples who live in the sphere of the Soviet influence could count on the West, above all on the United States, which without war, with only the threat of its power could press the Soviets for a lot of things. That hope is long gone. More

- the situation to a certain degree has reversed itself. America, despite its still imposing materialistic power, weakened by the internal problems, is not able to use her infinite resources until she finds herself facing a direct threat, but it isn't certain whether even then she wouldn't choose to capitulate rather than fight. The legend about the "sleeping giant" who was awakened 33 years ago by the attack of Japanese planes on Pearl Harbor may appear today only as a legend. Under these circumstances, millions of those who for many years have been nursing the delusive idea of help from the West may become the only reliable source of strength and, perhaps, the only chance which remains for the West in the critical times.

No matter how skeptically we may estimate the will of resistance among the peoples living under Communism, the fact remains that one of the most important brakes which restrains the Soviets from the confrontation with the weakened West is the fear of their own people and peoples of satellite countries. Truly, the Kremlin leaders don't know much about them. But one doesn't need to know much about them to fear them. They have a right to fear that in the first days of failure which may cause the break of the iron discipline, they will have against them several hundred million people who woke up from a nightmare.

Zbigniew Byrski