

Fragments

Vol. 2/1

January, 1975

FOOD FOR THOUGHT (2)

by

Charles Joel

FOOD FOR THOUGHT (2)

by

Charles Joel

Copyright 1975 by Charles Joel

Published by the author

San Francisco, California

Printed in the United States

of America

In less than 30 years after the end of First, the Second World War had erupted. The atom bombs dropped on two Japanese cities made this war appear as the war which should forever end all future wars.

After both wars, despite material destruction and enormous bloodshed, no depression and frustration but a dynamic hope enlivened all. The hope for a better and abundant life caused the reconstruction of cities and industries in a flash of time, and - in Germany and Japan which were totally destroyed - richness and prosperity have blossomed by an "economic miracle".

But today, 30 years after the Second World War, we are living through the Third World War. I am not referring to the series of so called "small wars". Those local conflicts took place far away from Europe, in Vietnam, in the Middle East and recently on Cyprus. I am referring to the bombs that explode almost everyday in London, Paris, Brussels, or in the cities of Italy. I mean the whole Western World which became a stage for the acts of terror. The hope that enlivened all during the first post-war years vanished and has been replaced by frustration. The question is, who carries on and against whom is this underground Third World War carried on?

If we exclude the Arab terrorists who try to solve their conflict with Israel on an international arena, we must

A translation from the
Polish magazine "Kultura"
NO 10/325/1974 published
in Paris, France.

© Copyright 1975 by Charles Joel

Published by Correspondence Home Study
of Languages
Sutter Creek, California.

Printed by the Essicc Company
Sutter Creek, California.

state that this Third World War in Europe, both Americas, and Japan, is not led against the Soviet Russia but by ourselves and against ourselves. Even in England where the tradition of devotion to law and order seems to be intangible, we talked recently about "private armies" which should defend us when need be. Talking about those "private armies", one doesn't mean a defense against the attack of the Soviet army but about a defense against the danger from within.

One is under the impression that the system of parliamentary democracy is unable to recognize the fast growing changes and to confront them with concrete reforms. I wrote on these pages about the danger that threatens Socialism at the time of its victory.

The Trade Unions have as a goal defending the interests of workmen and representing the "pressure groups" in relation to the conservative or socialist governments. In dispute on the new role of Trade Unionism the question is often raised: who governs England - the Parliament, or the Trade Unions? The Trade Unions cannot govern because if they would take over, even in part, the functions of a government, they would cease to be the Trade Unions. Were the TUC (Trade Union Congress) part of a government body it would be necessary to create new Trade Unions which would entirely take care of workmen's interests. This situation arises because a government, especially in socialistic states

which handle enormous sector of national economy, is the greatest and most powerful employer and as such doesn't represent the interests of an employee. This characteristic is perfectly illustrated in the communist states where the Trade Unions are made into "transmissions of a government" which is the only employer and a capitalist. Naturally, in such case, the Trade Unions defend the interests of capitalists instead of workmen.

Democratic Socialism doesn't depend on the Trade Unions functioning as a government, but upon the cooperation, compromising and negotiating in all confrontations on the issues involved between the Trade Unions and a government. Belief that the interests of workmen are always and with no exception in agreement with the interests of the democratic socialist government is a naive utopia. There isn't system in the world in which the interests of employers and employees agree and for this reason in every system there must exist a fully independent Trade Union which is neither a government nor a "transmission" of a government.

True Socialism may appease and in part harmonize the interests of employers and employees, but, with the exception of war or other universal catastrophe, bringing the interests of all social groups down to one conflictless denominator would be possible only by force used as a legal instrument that would sanction and freeze the existing grievances.

The ultimate interest of State is always proclaimed by all those who insist

That what's good for Ford - is good for America. It isn't certain whether all that's good for Ford is good for America, and less certain whether it's of any good to all workers. Identifying the interest of a State with an egoistic interest of any specific corporation, group, or social class, is a cause as well as a result of conflicting characteristics of human societies.

There are 3 seemingly unconnected phenomena which to a great degree affect the contemporary climate in politics, social and economic life of a country; a climate which for the first time in history causes frustration on the world wide scale.

The satellite countries have many reasons for frustration. But, from what I hear in the news each day, I gather that the climate of frustration covers the entire Western Europe and America. For some time now, the crises, bankruptcies, the fall of civilization and democracy, are expected. At the same time the Western people never had it so good as now. Many times a day we are assured by the communication media that England is on the verge of collapse, chaos and bankruptcy. But the Britishers eat, drink as never before, millions spend vacations abroad, there are more cars and TV sets, and not a minority but the majority of people earns better wages, every month brings to them higher paychecks. It seems to me that never in the history of Western Europe so many had it so good, and, at the same time, the feeling of frustration and catastrophe has never been so universal.

The first cause of this state of people's minds is the devaluation of written and spoken word: Nobody takes seriously the words of the politicians, economists and experts. The communication media have produced an inflation of the crises. Everyday we hear about the crises of Watergate, in Cyprus, in the Middle East, in Vietnam, in Brussels, in NATO. Of course we hear about the crises in every branch of industry, we talk about the energy crisis, about the crises caused by the industrial pollution of air, soil and water, and, when those problems are exhausted, we talk about the monetary and stock exchange crisis, etc., etc. The question arises: How it is that - living with these numerous crises in all areas of social and economic life - we have the high standard of living and the millions of cars speeding on the superhighways of the Western world seem to indicate that the oil has never flown so abundantly as now in this time of the energy super-crisis?

The inflation of the true and imaginary crises causes a phenomenon which I would call - the indifference to information. People listen to the flood of catastrophic analyses and prognostics as if they were listening to the fantastic reports from another planet.

The second point to which I wish to draw the reader's attention is the slowness of thinking. The incredible speed of communication is incomprehensible to human brain. The computers perform complicated calculations and analyses in a few seconds, but the brain works as slow as it did 2 thousand years ago. This

ever increasing, -like lightning speed of collecting and transmitting information combined with the speed of transporting people from one continent to another, creates conditions in which many people in key positions must make many more decisions in incomparably shorter time than ever before, having the same slow brain that their great-grandfathers had in the epoch of stage-coaches. Consequently, the danger arising from making wrong decisions is proportionally greater than in the past. The constant bombardment of the human brain by mass information and the wrong assumption that the human brain through every succeeding generation is becoming more efficient in competing with computers whose efficiency increases enormously with each passing decade appears to be the main cause of frustration. One may call this predicament the "technological alienation" - meaning that despite our apparent reign over technology, there grows an abyss between the possibilities of machines that we build and possibilities of human brain. The continuous increase in the number of heart failures in men and recently in women of the "managerial" age of 45 - 55 years, is caused by tension, overcharged brains and nerves. Although improbable, it would be interesting to know, to what degree the present world crises may be blamed on objective reasons, for example, on the hunger for energetic fuel, and on the growing number of wrong decisions that are made by the overworked, tired brain of people in the key positions.

And, as the 3rd most important cause

in our analysis of frustration we should discuss the problem of morality.

Ex-President Nixon was forced to resign because he had lost support of not only his party, but also of his cabinet members, including Dr. Kissinger. Nixon lied, bribed, illegally attempted to cover up the Watergate scandal but to the last moment insisted that he acted in the interest of the country. Most explicitly it has been illustrated by one of his close associates J. Ehrlichman, who said that there are situations where the private morality must give up before the morality of a higher category, meaning the interest of the country.

Putting aside the fact that believers in the "morality of a higher category" invariably identify their own personal ambitions, egoism and greed with public interest, the acceptance of this kind of morality would be equal to the acceptance of the idea that the end justifies means which in theory and practice contradicts any morality. The acceptance of the "morality of a higher category" liquidates the basic difference between the Free World and Communism, because the rule of "end justifies means" agrees with Totalitarianism but is in obvious disagreement with Democracy.

Of course everywhere - including England - bribes happen. There were cases where ministers lied to their premiers and parliaments, for example the Profumo affair, but none of these gentlemen, who were exemplarily punished, claimed that they were acting in the name of the "morality of a higher category".

Even those who repel religion and morality, even those who proclaim that politics has never anything in common with morality, must, at the end of an objective analyzation, conclude, that Democracy cannot exist without morality. Defending the poor against the greed and power of the rich is not dictated by economy, but by morality. The principle that all citizens are equal in the face of law and every social group irrespective of the wealth, color of skin or religion have the right to representation, is born from the sense of morality not from any economic pressures.

Although it may sound pathetic - one may objectively say that the degree of authentic morality is in direct proportion to the degree of moral sensitivity of a society. For this reason, every act that violates the basic moral principles is, in fact, anti-social and by the same token anti-democratic.

In one of my previous articles I confronted my readers with the similarities of Christianity and Democratic Socialism. The church, dreaming about State Christianity, had missed the importance of those similarities, and as a result, at the turn of XIX and XX centuries had lost a great percentage of working class to the secular Socialism.

In the XIX century not Marx but the Church should have taken a hard and uncompromising stand in defense of children and teenagers working in mines and factories. We learned from Freud that the "guilt complex" quite often demonstrates itself in many strange ways. To what

degree does the naive Vatican's *Ostpolitik* reflects its "guilt complex" toward the working class?

* * *

A great majority of the Western press after Nixon's resignation evaluated his foreign politics as extremely advantageous.

"Watergate is not the subject of my deliberations in this writing, but I would draw my readers' attention to certain characteristic details which, perhaps, they have missed. *The Guardian* which employs a staff of experienced correspondents in Washington reported on August 12.74: The resignation has been forced on Nixon by his closest associates. In the game participated two of his lawyers, James St. Clair and Fred Buzhardt, and Gen. A.Haig and Dr. Kissinger. All four threatened that should the President not resign, they would immediately announce their own resignations and reveal the causes of their decisions. The magnetic tape of June 23 has been unquestionable proof that Nixon had ordered the cover up of Watergate in the 6th day after the break-in and that during the following 2 years he had lied in all his press conferences and in many TV appearances. What's more important, that he had lied to his personal lawyers, to Gen. Haig and to Dr. Kissinger.

At this moment let us be interested in the person of Dr. Kissinger. Some time ago I remarked on these pages that a

sudden crisis unmasks even the most reticent people and makes us to understand the mechanics of their behavior better than observing them through the thousands days of their usual performances.

According to *The Gurdian* Dr. Kissinger argued that Nixon must resign because a prolonged presidential crisis may be dangerous to the position of Brezhnev who has engaged all his political prestige in a dialog with Nixon. The President should resign in order to save his own deed, meaning the politics of *détente*. Brezhnev must immediately receive assurances of a new President that the politics of *détente* hasn't changed a bit. On the other hand, the trial and sentence would not only disgrace Nixon but also bring the bankruptcy of *détente* which would politically destroy Brezhnev.

The American Secretary of State has shown great care and has actively striven for upkeeping the Soviet satrap in the saddle. The same satrap who exiled Solzhenitsyn. But, Solzhenitsyn represents the values which should be defended by Kissinger - the helmsman of Western politics. As we know, Brezhnev is an irreconcilable enemy of these values. On the other hand it is difficult to accept the view that Kissinger doesn't understand this. The present Secretary of State is a refugee from Germany and was beaten several times by Hitler's henchmen when as a little boy he was coming from school. Kissinger experienced very deeply the drama of Second World War, especially the extinction of millions of Jews. Doesn't "Gulag Archipelago" remind him of Hitler's concentration camps? Hasn't history derived

mercilessly all those who were looking for "*détente*" with Hitler? And, hasn't history shown that there is an organic relationship between internal and external politics? When someone practices the rule of "end justifies means" in internal politics, we can be sure that he will apply the same rule to the external politics too. Kissinger, a historian, undoubtedly understands it perfectly. Where do we look for a key to his reasoning?

It seems to me that an appropriate key word in solving this problem would be the term "peace". Why the *détente* for any price? Because there is no other alternative. The liquidation of *détente* would mean the politics of confrontation which at any time may change into an open conflict and war. In comparison with nuclear war the "Gulag Archipelago" would look like a *kindergarten*.

Only in the frame of *détente* is it possible to play with small wars without evoking a world armed conflict. Kissinger thinks that if America and Russia played the politics of confrontation, every small war could become a threat to the world peace. So, if - figuratively speaking - the price of peace is the support given to Brezhnev not to Solzhenitsyn, this price should be paid because there is no other alternative, or, the alternative is so dreadful that it cannot be even thought of.

In my opinion *détente* neither lessens nor increases the possibilities of war. As long as America has the potential of atomic revenge, Russo-American war is maximally improbable regardless the politics

of "relaxation". Not the summit conferences and photographs of Brezhnev with Nixon, but the American nuclear arsenal guarantees peace.

Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski of Columbia University in "Deceptive Structure of Peace" (*Foreign Policy* NO 14/1974 and in an article published in *The New Leader* (August 1974), as well as the authors of an exceptionally well written work: "Dé tention: An Evaluation" (*Survey* No 2/3 1974), proved beyond any doubt that the politics of "relaxation" amounts to saving and supporting the Soviet system. The Soviets are not forced to apply any reforms or liberalization to their economy and social model, because America helps Stalinism to flourish in its present totalitarian form.

The authors of the above mentioned works quote many examples which illustrate the problem. From this dreadful gallery I am choosing one which seems to be very characteristic.

The lack of highly advanced electronic technology is a very serious weakness of the Soviet system. Numerous catastrophes in the internal Soviet Airlines, undisclosed to public opinion in Russia and abroad, indicate the primitiveness of computerized air traffic control. But, as it comes out from Prof. Brzezinski's information, the American Department of Commerce has begun to modernize the Soviet system of air traffic control. American computers and technological know how will enable the Soviets to organize an efficiently functioning "air bridge" to the boundary of China.

To many readers of immigrant groups, in contrast with native Americans, *détente* represents the politics of one-sided concessions on behalf of the Soviets. Those readers may be interested in my attempt to find the answer to the question: Why do the Americans do it?

The most common opinion in formulating the answer to this question is that a great number of Americans is ignorant of Russian problems, and, as a result, its political thinking about Russia is often marked by naiveté. There is something in it, nevertheless the term "naive" doesn't fit Kissinger. Dr. Henry Kissinger might have many imperfections but certainly he is not naive.

Shortly before his resignation from the White House Nixon announced that "we cannot interfere in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union (Jewish immigration) because we wouldn't like to have anybody interfering in American domestic affairs".

Although from the dawn of history powerful nations have always intervened in the internal problems of weaker nations, the principle of non-intervention, though universally violated, enjoys international respectability. The whole problem of our relations with Russia relied and still relies upon the fact that Russia violates this principle.

The most noble principle that doesn't allow for exceptions becomes impracticable and often fatal. Let us imagine as an example that in West Germany there appears an extreme rightist leader. There come to life a new para-military organization

a new uniformed and disciplined party proclaims totalitarianism and revenge; Democracy in West Germany is threatened by complete destruction: A new Germany throws in a dustbin all her international agreements and arms herself with nuclear bombs. Should one in the above outlined situation, despite all historic experiences, insist upon the principle of "non-intervention" in internal affairs of this powerful European State? Personally I am convinced that Russia and America, as well as France and England, would never allow for the creation of a new fascist regime in Germany. Germany has the right to live in peace and freedom without any intervention from the outside, but has no right to burn the world for the 3rd time.

There is no need to look for such a hypothetical example as we may illustrate the problem more realistically. I don't agree with the idea that under every bed in England and France there hides a Russian spy. But we cannot deny that the Soviets attempt to infiltrate all institutions and organizations in the West. The Soviets don't deny that *détente* in their interpretation doesn't weaken, but to the contrary, sharpens the clashes among social classes on the world wide scale. The goal of these clashes - which also is no secret - is the overthrowing not only of Capitalism but also all systems related to it because everything that isn't Communism in the Soviet version, is a bourgeois offspring which should be destroyed.

I don't believe that people of Brezhnev's or Kosygin's kind are ideologists. Brezhnev is a pragmatist and

imperialist who identifies the interests of the Soviet Union with the interests of Russia. On one side Russia borders with hostile China and on the other with the West whose historic traditions and structure represent an antithesis of Sovietism.

The Kremlin believed that the miniscule liberalization of Dubczek (Prague Spring of 1968 -Ed. postscript) threatened the Soviet empire. What is one to say about the great Western Democracies? The Soviets infiltrate all the Western institutions and organizations, supply arms to terrorist groups not in the name of some revolutionary call, but in the first place in the name of the same policy that had destroyed Dubczek. The West threatens Russia not militarily but as a main breeding source of all the currents and ideas of freedom which have always been a menace to Soviet imperialism in all its forms.

Conducting the politics of their own security the Soviets attempt to sovietize us. Sovietism doesn't mean "dictatorship of proletariat", kolkhozes, lagers, etc. Above all, it means the strangulation of truth. Truth is the core of freedom. In Soviet Russia the truth is what is given as the truth by Big Brother only; anything else is false. "Relaxation: with the Soviets is possible only for a price of at least partial acceptance of this principle. The politicians and the press of the Soviet Union have never denied that the real enemies of relaxation are those people who defend men such as Sakharov or Solzhenitsyn - men with courage to challenge the Soviet authorities. Following the Soviet

leaders' thinking, in order to buy *détente* from them we needn't turn our western systems into Communism, but we must accept the principle which proclaims that in the affairs of imperialistic Russia the truth lies only in all what the Kremlin dictates. The acceptance of this line is the only way of showing friendly attitude toward the Soviet Union.

It seems that Kissinger and Nixon don't realize that in the democratic system it isn't possible to use two scales of evaluation. The fact that 70, or perhaps 80% of the educated Russians think differently than Brezhnev isn't important because in Russia what counts is not public opinion but the political line that is set up by politbureau. To the contrary, in the West what counts above all is public opinion, or the opinion of the voter. If Nixon had the support of public opinion he would still be in the White House today.

I'll refer once more to Solzhenitsyn because he symbolizes the whole idea. On one side we have fresh in our memory numerous photographs in the press and on TV films, showing Nixon with Brezhnev in a cordial mood in Moscow and Camp David. On the other, we remember the frank, open hearted, enthusiastic reception organized by the Western press, radio and TV, on behalf of Solzhenitsyn. In Brezhnev's fight against Solzhenitsyn, nobody could doubt in the least whose side Western public opinion took.

If Solzhenitsyn were just a ballet dancer, or a modernistic painter, the

situation might have taken on a different character. One would say that the "king" has thrown out a useless "jester", as it has happened so often in history. But Solzhenitsyn faced the world with his monumental "Gulag Archipelago", as an analyst and prosecutor of the Soviet system. He has built his accusations on Western and Christian values. The irony of this situation is in the fact that Solzhenitsyn in building up his accusations based on our moral values did a task which should have been done by ourselves instead of fraternizing with Brezhnev and practicing the politics of *détente* at any price.

I wrote several times on these pages that neither super-power has actually any internal politics in the old fashioned meaning of these 2 words because whatever happens in Russia or in America concerns all the world. This means everything which happens in internal politics, including politics of *détente*. The apparent successes, declarations, summit conferences - all of it makes sense only under one condition - that *détente* may be discounted in the political market of America.

The balance of Nixon's foreign politics has been received by the immigrant press almost enthusiastically. But, in my opinion, besides the selection of the photographs of Nixon with Brezhnev, America in politics against the Soviet Union cannot be proud of any successes. The war in Vietnam has been lost and the defeat created desire for an apparent success. Should the Americans have won the war in

Vietnam there would be no need for *détente*, there would be no need to persuade American voters that "personal diplomacy" is more important than the real facts. In all South-Eastern Asia the Americans are in retreat. The highly advertised "personal diplomacy" of Kissinger in the Middle East didn't save the free world from defeat caused by Arab oil politics. In Greece and on Cyprus, so far, the Americans cannot boast about any success either.

The Vietnam war should have been ended because the Americans were not in a position to win it, moreover, a great majority of American society questioned the moral basis and methods of this war. I think that the "personal diplomacy" of Kissinger shouldn't have been made into a substitute for victory.

The Russians constantly develop their armed forces on land, in the air and on the seas. Despite this, the believers in "relaxation" try to convince us that owing to the politics of *détente* we are not under any threat. The Americans try to talk themselves into believing that if they "had won" the Vietnam war, similarly - owing to *détente* - they cannot lose against the Soviets.

Kissinger believes that the peace may be preserved by lengthening the "balance of power" and for this reason we should try not to worsen the internal situation of the Soviet regime because that regime, no matter how unsympathetic it may appear to us, represents the basic element in the system of balanced power. Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov (and all that they represent) are not an element in the power balance, to the

contrary, they are a threat to it and to the politics of *détente*.

In reality, however, *balance of power* is not a system but a fluctuating and changeable situation. Presently, the *balance of power* enables the Soviets progressive development of their war potential in a climate of political and moral moratorium created by *détente*.

There always appears the super-question: What is the alternative? It should be openly stated that there isn't any good alternative. But, the politics of energetic restraint applied against the Soviet imperialism and a categorical refusal to compromise on the issues that are basic in our Christian civilization - this kind of alternative appears to me to be more worthy of the name of *Realpolitics* than *détente* which, in fact, is nothing but a warmed over and always catastrophic politics of appeasement.

Juliusz Mieroszewski

Fragments

Vol. 2/2

Feb. 1975

IN AND AROUND THE SOVIET PRESS (2)

by

Charles Joel

"Here in our Soviet Motherland everybody can choose his vacations according to his taste" - so sublimely begins an editorial in the *Soviet Kultura*. This is an axiom. No need to prove it. In the Soviet Motherland one can choose whatever one wishes.

Accordingly, an article in *Pravda* about the elections to the Supreme Soviet appeared under the title: "The Victory of Soviet Democracy" - 99.99% of Soviet citizens have shown surprisingly similar tastes - all voted for the candidate who had been proposed to them.

However, the latest characteristic of publicity is the stress on "choice" of the leisure time. It looks like a first class campaign whose symptom is the increased pressure against stupefied public and its hopes for more freedom. This pressure is many sided: the Central Committee of the party in June 74 decided to "increase lecturing on social sciences" in institutions of higher education. Social sciences include the history of the communist party of the Soviet Union, marxist-leninist philosophy, political economy and fundamentals of scientific communism (in the department of mathematics social sciences are given 12.7% of total curriculum time); to these, undoubtedly, in the near future will be added "marxist religion", and the net of party lecturing will be enlarged by propagandizing seminars, etc. Nevertheless, the main stress is directed on the subject of "free time", meaning the time that's left after work. "Free time" - instructs

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" No. 9, 10, and 11/1974 published in Paris, France.

Published by Correspondence Home Study of Languages, Sutter Creek, California.

Printed by the Essicc Company
Sutter Creek, California

Leonid Brezhnev - "is not a time which is free from the responsibilities of a citizen toward the Soviet society". Because of this the Central Committee of the party enacted "the principles of organizing the leisure time of the students and pioneers. This gradual "improvement" of leisure time is reflected in organizing work that is "beneficial to the society" during summer vacations. Orders are issued to involve the students in work at kolchozes, sovhozes and other enterprises. Some of the Soviet citizens try thoughtlessly to rest during travel time to and from work, but the party finds them even then. A *Pravda* correspondent from the Lvov district writes that on the bus that transports hundreds of workers from far away villages to the construction site of the city of Novy Razdol - "there is always present one activist of propaganda"; two hours of travel to and from work are used for "transmission of propaganda". There is no escape even after one's returning home: One must listen to Brezhnev. Since the first of July for only 50 kopeck, one can (or ought to) buy the recording of Leonid Brezhnev's speech which he delivered at last komсомол meeting. We must stress that the price is not excessively high. For example, a similar recording of the Beethoven costs 2 rubles and 50 kopecks, and, say, for a recording of the Beatles one must pay on the black market at least 120 rubles. We can see that, as far as the price goes, Brezhnev can successfully compete with all the recordings of the West. It is interesting to note that since the days of Stalin - no one knows why - the leaders have not made a practice of recording their speeches. Even Josif Vissarionovich Stalin did it only during the pre-war period. But we must say that he was doing it with

appropriate grandeur. His magnificent album with a recorded report on the constitution of the Soviet Union contains not only the recording of the text but also 2 recordings on which are recorded - on both sides - only applauses which the representatives of Soviet peoples had given to the greatest genius of all times and all nations.

On the recording of Brezhnev there is only the text of his speech to which the Soviet citizens may now listen in every minute of their free time. This recording seems to be another example of increased pressure on citizens, and the returning to the concept of The Leader.

In the Soviet Union, so far, there is no polling of public opinion with regards to the popularity of national leaders. Who is the most popular is decided by the politbureau. One may recognize the results of this decision by counting the number of voting districts which "demand" that such and person should be a candidate to the Supreme Soviet in the coming elections. About half through the campaign when some 740 districts "have chosen" their candidate there are publicized announcements of the leaders who decide their choice of the districts. From these announcements one might learn that Leonid Brezhnev had been "wanted" by 115 districts, and his close associate Kosygin and Podgorny by 60, Suslov by only 33, etc. After closing the polls, all found themselves elected without any problems. The first day of newly elected Supreme Soviet as the first speaker appeared Leonid Brezhnev. "Representatives and guests greeted him with boisterous and long-lasting ovation".

Podgorny and Kosygin - as by agreement-received only a "long-lasting ovation". Brezhnev personally proposed to let Podgorny stay on his present job as a chairman of the Supreme Soviet, and Kosygin on his post of premier. George Orwell could say about it all: "All equal but some more equal than others".

But, it could be unjust from the dance around Brezhnev, to conclude that the present General Secretary has the same power as Stalin had. The strengthening of Brezhnev's cult has as its source a deep longing of the Soviet leadership for a strong hand, and an imminent need of having a landlord. For the outside use (meaning outside of the Central Committee, or for the use by common citizens -Ed. post script) it is explained by the danger of war threatening the Soviet Union. On the 4th of June, at the meeting with voters, the Defense minister of the USSR a member of politbureau Marshal Grezko said this amazing sentence: "The danger of war is a severe reality of our times". *Pravda* on July 28th had deciphered the marshal's words: "The Peking leadership building up antisovietism unites itself with imperialists against socialism and peace. For this reason it could be a great mistake to think that the danger of war doesn't exist". There is also another potential source of war danger: the leading Soviet philosopher P.N. Fiedosieyev, summing up in *Waprosy Filozofii* the results of the International Congress of Philosophers is angry with all those who express doubts in the concept of "righteous war" and stresses that "peaceful politics of the socialistic camp should be conducted...with full recognition of our epoch's dynamics, first of all with a massive liberating, revolutionary

movement which fights against the backward forces of reaction".

So, in short: If somebody attacks the Soviet Union then it is natural that the Soviet Union may start a "righteous war". Consequently the repressions and propaganda of strong leadership are rightly applied.

The Soviet literature faithfully reflecting the wishes of national leaders has not kept the public waiting very long. A number of writings about strong men is enormously increased. In the first place are the books about Stalin. And each new one goes a little further in praising the leader of nations. The novel of Ivan Stadnyuk "The War" whose second part has been published in No. 5, 6, and 7 of the monthly *Molodaya Gvardiya*, so far, stands in first place in apotheosizing Stalin. The first part of it was published in *Oktyabr* 1970 (NO 12), later in the format of a book, and still later in 1-1/2 million copies by the *Roman Gazeza*. Not satisfied, Ivan Stadnyuk is writing the next part which still does not exhaust the theme. The Soviet satirists Ilf and Pietrov coined the definition: "The art which borders on crime". Stadnyuk crossed that border. He writes as if Russian literature never existed before him. However, "The War" is interesting as a mirror of the newest instructions of the party which explain the recent historic period and the role of Stalin in it. All attempts to reconstruct, even in a hundredth part, the historic truth - that took place during the years 1956-64 - has been definitely erased. All rehabilitations had been re-rehabilitated.

Ivan Stadnyuk doesn't avoid posing questions: Why was the agreement with Germany signed; why did the Soviet Union attack Finland; why was Hitler's attack on the USSR a surprise to Stalin; why was the Red Army defeated and suffered enormous losses in the first months of war? Stadnyuk doesn't avoid posing questions, but he does avoid giving the answers to them. What he gives, are deceitful, stupid, quite often just nonsensical explanations, all with one joint conclusion: It was necessary.

The whole pre-war foreign politics of Stalin, including the pact with Germany is explained as his endeavour to counteract the tricky plans of England which the author sums up in an ingeniously simple formula: "It was in London where the plans of cutting off Ukraine from Russia by Hitler were born". Stadnyuk proudly stresses that only the genius of Stalin could penetrate the cunning calculations of the revolution's enemies who shivered with fear of him; Oh! Yes! Stalin knew them too well. Stadnyuk credits Stalin with the following reasoning: "Hitler certainly is afraid of Stalin...he is frightened of Stalin's iron will and strength of that mysterious character, of his education and talent as good thinker, of his authority among the nations and governments". This quotation is nothing but what Stalin thought about himself. Stadnyuk entirely agrees with him and adds: "The great marxist philosopher, historian, and diplomat who knows how to keep a hand on the pulse of enemies and of friends as well".

It is not strange then that all the defeats during the first stage of the war are explained by Stadnyuk as resulting from the mistakes and abuses of the generals and

in particular of the Bielorussian front commander gen. Pavlov and his staff. Shooting them by the order of Stalin, "a man whose destiny is unusual even in historical terms", appears to the author of "The War" as an act of the highest justice.

Pushkin in his days advised: "Flatterers, fry even in your villainess to show just a shade of honesty". Alexander Czakowski, who also writes a novel about Stalin, tries to keep that distance, but Stadnyuk proudly renounces it.

The crucial scene of "The War" is the conversation of Stalin with his one and only faithful helper, citizen Molotov (the rehabilitation of Molotov is today an inseparable element of Stalin's cult). During the first days of the war Stalin "looks for advice in Lenin's writings" and finds in the creator of the Soviet Union a prescription which he explains to Molotov: "Don't these words of Lenin have precisely a contemporary sound?" - rhetorically asks the leader of peoples - "...each kindling of collective leadership, each interference in one man's power, is the worst evil...Lenin categorically teaches: In practice, the decision making power should be given to only one citizen well known for his strong will, decisiveness, courage, knowledge of concrete thinking, and of great trust...yes, citizen Molotov, this is what Lenin teaches us".

And indeed: Already in March 1918, Lenin stated that "each industry needs a one man dictatorial power...unconditional subordination to one will", and one year later again insisted: "What should be pushed forward is the principle of personal

authority, a moral authority of a certain man to whose decisions all must submit without any hesitation". And finally, in March 1920 he expressed this extreme statement: "Opposing the necessary central power, dictatorship and one man will ... becomes impossible".

The importance of Stadnyuk's novel lies in underlining the completely justified longevity of dictatorship: From Lenin to Stalin, from Stalin to the present, on to future general secretaries. "That's what Lenin teaches". And that's the way it is, and that's the way it will be.

* * *

As we know there are some men who are dissatisfied with leadership in the Soviet Union, some who refuse to trust and to subordinate to it. The best known among them is Alexander Solzhenitsyn. In mid-June 74 he gave his expose on American TV, but not until now (this article was written in Sept. 74- Ed. post script) has the full text of it appeared in the Paris publication *Russkaya Mysl*. In the long and very interesting discussion the writer expressed his views on many problems. "The Soviet repressions - he said - because of their great importance, are not only an internal concern of the Soviet Union. Those repressions are dangerous to the world peace. Gulag still exists but in a different form...from the outside, it appears as relaxation and peace, but inside of our country there is a black stiffening". Solzhenitsyn convinced his American audience that the "persecutions of dissidents in our country is most dangerous to you here".

Nothing new. The laureate of Nobel prize

had expressed these views many a time before. What is new, and what appears to me to be the result of Solzhenitsyn's living in the West is his view on the relations between Eastern Europe and the world. "The kind of situation arose" - Solzhenitsyn stated - "which hasn't been seen for ages: The inhabitants of Eastern Europe - Russians, Hungarians, Poles, Czechs, Lithuanians, Germans, and Romanians, because of their identical experiences, identical pressures to which they were submitted, have at the present some common views, common outlooks on what's happening in the world, especially in the West. And I must say that I have repeatedly experienced the unanimity of my personal views with the views of many other Eastern Europeans. This dialog of Eastern-Western Europe appears to me as if it were overlooked by the West. I believe that it would be extremely useful if the West began to listen to their joint views because the whole Eastern Europe may tell us many very important and very useful things". These words of Gulag Archipelago's author suggest the reply to all who accuse him of nationalism, and indicate that there is a growing understanding among all nations which want to throw away the Soviet yoke.

* * *

All Europeans who visit the USA and write afterwards about their travels, of necessity want to "discover" the new world. The Soviet travelers are not excepted. However, there is a difference: To America travel only the Soviet most trusted men and this is why all of them, at any particular stage, unanimously see exactly the same things. They - we might say - make some sort of collective discoveries. During the 30ties they were

"discovering" the American way of life; during the war they were discovering naive, but honest to goodness people limitlessly loving the Soviets and their leader "Uncle Joe" (the Soviet reporters are enormously moved that Americans do treat with such an affection this great and wise leader). After the war they wrote only about McCarthy, unemployment in the USA and about the apologist of the cold war.

After familiarizing myself with the "current production" of the Soviet travelers in the USA, I found with a certain surprise that today they write about Zbigniew Brzezinski. Some time ago the well known film star, Eric von Stroheim was advertised as a "man whom many people love to hate". The Soviet writers love to hate Zbigniew Brzezinski.

The leading Soviet correspondent, Jurij Zukov in *Znamia* devoted a large article to the book of Zbigniew Brzezinski "Between Two Ages - America's role in the technetronic era". Quoting at most 2 sentences in one paragraph of his writing and applying short cuts, Zukov easily proves that the American professor, director of the Institut of Communist Affairs, has been and is an "anticommunist and antisoviet". Although many comments of Zukov upon the book of prof. Brzezinski are false, they create an impression of credulity by inserting the description of his interview with professor (This Soviet writer is very proud of knowing "personally" such a furious enemy of Communism): "Brzezinski said - when I read your article about my works, my blood pressure goes up...". Zukov conceitedly adds: "Well, I am ready at any time to be useful to the director of Communist Affairs". No doubt that after reading the next "opus" of Zukov, prof. Brzezinski will again have trouble with his blood pressure, though at the interview he categorically stated

"Doctors say that it is good for me".

Alexander Kryvicki is a less known reporter but also a trusted one. *Literaturnaya Gazeta* publishes a series of his sketches. Kryvicki begins his reporting from the San Francisco area. In Berkeley he visits prof. Paul Zimmer and when, to start with, he quotes off hand, the article of Brzezinski in the English periodical *Encounter* (It's possible that presently at Moscow persons departing to the USA must pass exams on Brzezinski's works), prof. Zimmer shouted: "Certainly, Brzezinski gives you a lot of trouble! You made a devil of him..." But Kryvicki knows what to do: after arriving in New York he "personally" attends to Brzezinski's lecture (it appears that, after all, he isn't as trusted as Zukov, having not permission to know prof. Brzezinski "personally"). Having - it seems - some hidden literary ambitions, Kryvicki gives an artistic portrait of the "devil": "Thin, pale, with bird-like profile, Brzezinski evenly, without pauses, delivered his lecture".

The best part of Kryvicki's article is his conclusion: "They (meaning, Brzezinski, Zimmer, and other sovietologists) are in the leading echelon of reaction, performing the role of theoreticians". But, at the same time "The environment in which the activists of Brzezinski's, or Zimmer's type move, is, in the first place, among the liberal intelligentsya and students". In other words - intelligentsya and students represent reaction.

It is well known that wherever there is reaction, unavoidably there must exist the forces of progress meaning people so much loved by the Soviet writers and people who

are "farsighted capitalists", for example, the president of Bank of America Thomas Klausen, or, -say -Mr. Kendall - a great businessman who operates many trade and industrial enterprises (it is he who sells Russian vodka in the USA). Kryvicki enjoyed sharing with Mr. Kendall a bottle of vodka which he brought straight from Moscow and left feeling very happy: "The question of peace and friendship rests in good hands" (*Literaturnaya Gazeta* NO 33).

Jurij Solton, correspondent of Moscow radio and TV has been personally reassured by the Chairman of Soviet-American Trade and Economy Council Harold Scott. In this council belong, according to correspondent, "Such well known personalities in the world of business as David Rockefeller, Armand Hammer, the president of General Motors, the president of Dupont Corporation". The chairman Harold Scott explicitly underlined to the Moscow reporter: American businessmen are so overwhelmed by the idea of economic cooperation with the Soviet Union that in their belief, "nothing can disturb its further development". Mr. Scott shared also his regrets with Solton that "there is an opposition against this cooperation in Congress and somewhere else (Brzezinski?!) but industry is overwhelmingly for it". This "demoniacal possession of American businessmen" is of such a great delight to the Soviet reporter that he ends his article triumphantly: "Such is the atmosphere of today's America, or, more precisely, the majority of Americans..." (*Literaturnaya Gazeta* NO 43).

It is quite possible that in the beginning of the new school year the Soviet students will be forced to learn that David Rockefeller, General Motors and Dupont, represent the real interests of American people. The more, since, as

writes this same Solton, "excitements created by the resignation of R. Nixon calmed down pretty fast. Life is going on as usual". The last hope of the Soviet Union is the American billionaires "possessed by the desire of building Communism".

* * *

The subsequent step in this direction - of building Communism - is published in the USA the 2nd volume of *Memoirs* by Nikita Khrushchev under the title: "Khrushchev remembers - The Last Testament" (Incidentally, it isn't its last volume as the 3rd is being prepared). The question of material used in the book has been - as it seems to me - cleared up: The memoirs are made from the text recorded on tape by Nikita after his dismissal. He recorded not too much but not too little either - just 180 hours. In the preface page someone tells us how the voice of the ex-First Secretary has been recognized by using a cunning device "Voice Print" (this device was constructed by the heroes of Solzhenitsyn's "First Circle", but apparently their invention had failed their expectations which is proven by the fact that the Soviet organs want to buy it from the USSR). According to the information given in the preface to the book the voice of Nikita was accurate in 175.5 hrs, and probably accurate in 4.5 hrs of total recording time. How was it then with the "voice print" - I don't know, but the compilers of the 2nd volume enclosed 30 pages of Russian text copied from the tapes. And here, I think, nobody will have any doubts: Only Khrushchev could talk so unculturally, chaotically losing and repeating himself, and also demonstrating his above average peasant's cunning and cleverness in swimming around all sensitive matters. This Russian text allows us, on one hand to see

the authenticity of Khrushchev's opinions, and, on the other, convince us that those opinions were prepared and introduced in a manner which creates in advance planned impressions not only about Khrushchev but also about other leaders of the Soviet Union.

From the pages of the book - divided into thematic chapters and translated in colorless language - comes out the portrait of a simple, careful, though sometimes rough statesman, who likes jokes and fun. His main endeavour is peace and relaxation, well being of his country and people. The reader who doesn't know history may conclude: If Khrushchev after Stalin, The first Russian leader who could criticize some of Stalin's acts - was such a good man, logically, leaders succeeding him must be of much better character.

To the reader who knows the history of the past 55 years, the book is interesting too. It allows him to understand in what manner and what kind of information the Soviet leader receives; and how the informations enable him to make decisions. The memoirs unmask his narrowness and prejudices in outlook on the world outside as well as inside of the Soviet Union. The Russian proverb says: "Whatever is in the thought of a sober man comes out in a tongue of the same man when he is drunk". Khrushchev even when sober sometimes talks about some very interesting things, not suspecting that those things may look differently. For Example, talking about the most prominent airplane designer A. Tupolev, Khrushchev reminisces that Tupolev had spent 5 years in prison while working all the time on the project of a plane for the USSR army, Khrushchev doesn't condemn Stalin, explaining simply that he doesn't know the reason why Stalin ordered the designer's arrest. But, wishing to point out the difference between himself and Stalin,

he adds, that already in the 50ties Tupolev came to him with a request to erase the sentence from his registration card. To this, good Nikita answered: "O.K. citizen Tupolev! We'll investigate the matter. I think we may order the destruction of any documents pertaining to your arrest so that in future you won't need to mention it in any interview". In this manner the designer of the famous TU received an appropriate award: He was permitted not to remember the years he spent innocently in prison.

A great part of the book is devoted to the outside world, satellite countries, China, the Western nations and the so called "Third World", the countries in which Khrushchev visited, or about which he had heard.

Khrushchev reminisces with great satisfaction on the "good days" of Bierut (who was the first communist boss of the Polish Peoples Republic - Ed. post script), and Kadar of Hungary, who "frankly admitted" that the Hungarian people are happy having the Soviet army stationed in their country, and don't want it to leave. Even marshal Tito very pleasantly disappointed Khrushchev by demanding the immediate intervention of the Soviet army to suppress the contr-revolution.

Among other things, Khrushchev, similarly to Stalin, prefers to deal with secret agents. The frankness of the First Secretary shouldn't surprise anybody: Using the "trusted persons" as a main base of Soviet influence in the subjected nations appears to him so natural that the problems of, say, an ideological or moral nature don't bother him at all. Nevertheless, morality is put forward in all cases where he talks about the Soviet "help" to other nations. As a matter of

fact the entire book is overfull with one idea: The Soviet people unselfishly and with a great sacrifice help the other peoples. In the chapter about India, a reader finds a magnificent formula which explains everything: "We offered India our economic and technological help. One may ask: And what will the Hindoos give us in exchange? Of course, nothing, except gratitude. In its cynicism this sentence may compete with the most impudent statement of Stalin. Khrushchev quite often comes back to this idea. It appears, for example, that after the war when "Ukrainians were dying of hunger, when there were even cases of cannibalism, the Soviet Union supplied grain to Poland". Wanda Wasilewska (prominent Polish communist entirely in the service of the Soviet Union - Ed. postscript) returning from Warsaw reported that Poles eat Russian black and white bread and - ungratefully - still grumble that there isn't enough flour being sent. Khrushchev is irritated by the ingratitude of people who take advantage of the Soviet Union's generosity; what's more, they don't seem to understand that to the Soviet Union "keeping our armies abroad is a very costly business, but a convenient one to the nations on whose territories our armies stay. After all, didn't we pay for the barracks which they constructed for us?"

There is no doubt that whatever Khrushchev did during 10 years he was in power, it was done, in the first place, in the name of fighting for power. There is no doubt that *Memoirs* do not create any basis for the cult of a "con-trite communist", a goodhearted Bolshevik. Rather, from among carefully chosen statements in explaining some of his personal mistakes and more or less careful accusations of Stalin, comes out Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev of 1938 - Stalin's rapacious puppy who insists: Our Motherland is going without stopping on the road to

Communism... we, citizens, have destroyed many enemies but not all yet". This vision of a happy future which "we" will reach "after destroying all enemies" stood in the eyes of Khrushchev to the last moment of his life.

* * *

One may still meet some unfriendly people who think that in Russia there is no freedom of dispute. In reality, there is a theme which truly moves around and occupies the minds of all during the past half century: What is to be done with alcoholism which became a national plague? From time to time a dispute bursts out, newspapers and periodicals fill out many pages with letters of working people and opinions of doctors. Two years ago the Council of Ministers made a special effort reflected in the "Guidelines in the question of strengthening the fight against alcoholism and drunkenness". Some results of this action are already known. In a recent publication of the Soviet Union Bureau of Statistics are quoted - what a marvel! - the data pertaining to the consumption of alcoholic beverages in the Soviet Union. As a starting point the year of 1940 is taken. After 25 years the sale of alcohol increased 283%, in 1970 - 439%, in 1973 - 534%. One might proudly say that even in this field the Soviet Union has overtaken the developed capitalistic countries. The letters published in the daily papers (in a time when the order to start the free dispute was given) contain many recipes for fighting alcoholism. Recently, somebody has proposed to organize special "sober farms" - colonies where prohibition would be strictly observed. There are also some less radical suggestions made: teaching the Russian

citizens to drink a watered vodka (the custom of uncultural Englishmen, or Americans), lowering vodka to 15-25 proof by the State, etc. But what seems to be very interesting is a letter that I found among the letters of those who condemn alcoholics, which simply asks: "But why is vodka on sale?" The question isn't so naive as it appears. The October revolution had won in the country in which there was prohibition declared by czarist government at the beginning of World War 1. But, as soon as the domestic war ended, the Bolsheviks, who had mercilessly condemned the czarist regime for "lushing people in vodka", had introduced the State monopoly of alcohol. Lenin personally demanded it in the summer of 1920. In October 1924, Stalin followed the same line and a permanent State monopoly was established. To some communists of those days the matter seemed to be shameful so it was decided to produce, in the first period, the lower 20% proof vodka. It was called "rykovka" from the name of the Chairman of People's Commissars Council Aleksy Rykov who had signed the decree and who himself consumed a great quantity of this product. As we can see, the present proposal of introducing "light stuff" is just returning an abandoned experiment, which was quickly followed by the production of "normal" vodka - 40% proof. We may add that in 1927 Stalin clearly explained the views of the Soviet leadership on the problem of vodka: "What is better: exploitation by foreign capitalists, or introduction of vodka - such is a problem we face. It is clear that we decided on behalf of vodka because we believed, and we still believe, that if for the victory of proletariat it's necessary to soil ourselves a little, we approve of applying this radical mean in the name of our cause".

One would think that today the "exploitation of foreign capitalists" doesn't frighten the Soviet leaders. Henceforth and with a great success they continue soiling themselves - the sale of vodka grows day by day. We may assume that lushing the nation in vodka is in the interest if of not State, at least of its leaders.

* * *

A letter to editor began shyly and mysteriously: "Dear Citizen Editor, do you know what happened in our Czeremuszki yesterday the 15th of Sept.?" One would think that editor publishing this letter on the 20th of Sept. knew what had happened in the southern suburb of Moscow - Czeremuszki. In any case, all the papers in the world (of course excepting those published in the Soviet Union and her faithful partners in the business of censorship) published a detailed report about the incident. It was possible to do it so easily because among the witnesses were many foreign correspondents. It all began when a group of non-conformist painters - meaning those who are not members of the official Union of the Soviet Artists - applied for permission to organize an "autumn art salon" in a deserted place in the suburb of the capital, under an open sky, with the purpose of showing their paintings to the public. The authorities put off their decision for quite a long time. The artists announced that they wanted to open the show without permission. But as soon as, on the morning of 15th Sept., about 20 painters had spread their canvasses, from nowhere there appeared scores of young husky men in plain clothes, shouting that this kind of paintings doesn't suit them; then they began

picking up their canvasses and throwing them into waiting trucks; there appeared bulldozers, water spraying cars and rollers normally used to press asphalt in road construction. The gathered crowd was dispersed, many were beaten, and on this occasion some of the foreign correspondents received their share too being one by one "fished out" of the crowd by the "enemies of painting". Nearby, stood the policemen observing with great friendliness this phenomenon of the "people's anger". The policemen began their work only when time ripened to conduct the proper arrest of the painters-organizers.

The above description of the incident is an exact replica of the description given by the foreign correspondents. In the letter to the editor, however, took voice the the participants from the other side - let me say - of the barricade. In the Western press those who were beaten wrote. In the Soviet periodical (perhaps it isn't incidental that its name is *Sovetskaya Kultura*) wrote those who did the beating. Each of them confessed his exact profession: a lathe operator, radio-technician, pioneer, electromechanic, etc. We would add what the arrested painters told - after being released - that in police station to where they were led there on the bulletin board hung the order: On the 15, Sept report to duties in plain clothes. It's obvious that our husky men were storm troopers in plain clothes. Let's see what they wrote: Suddenly there appeared "some slovenly dressed, nonchalant individuals who began spreading some strange, colorful, framed canvasses...these paintings had - in our opinion clearly anti-artistic character and did arouse in us nothing but disgust; they were just a mockery". It is understandable that the true connoisseurs of art couldn't

stand it any longer. More! From somewhere came some foreigners who "began ostentatiously taking pictures of all this turmoil and actively participated in it. That's not all: The foreigners began fighting with our men..." In short: On demand of the true connoisseurs of art "intervened the troopers and at their request - the police." It appears that all of it harmonized very well with the generally known maxim: "People don't care for modernism. Public opinion just repels it". Those are the words one may read in *Nasa Savryemyennik* (NO 4/1973) written by S. Moznugyan in an article "Pro-jection of Modernism".

But, coming back to our story. So far everything went along the prescribed track: The theory and practice worked hand in hand. But suddenly something went wrong. The arrested painters were freed, receiving sentences to pay some fines which they promptly refused. Two weeks after the "people's anger" in Czeremuszki the Soviet authorities permitted organization of the paintings' exhibition, the same paintings which "arouse disgust and mockery"; the place allotted for the exhibition was in another part of Moscow in the park called Ismailovo. In this way on 29th Sept. the first of the last half century event took place. The event that a short time before was disapproved by censorship. "Four hours of Freedom" - this is the name given to it by one of the painters. Several thousand people visited the exhibition; they were discussing somberly with artists, asking questions and talking like humans.

Perhaps, the importance of the "autumn salon" shouldn't be overestimated, but, on the other hand, it shouldn't be underestimated either. In the creative years of the

Russian writer of XIX century Ivan Gorbunov he used to tell an anecdote: The crowd gathered in the street. What is this meeting for? - asks a passerby. Well - he is told - a tailor wants to fly balloon. What's wrong with the guy? - cried passerby. - One cannot fly away from a good life!

Not because of the "good life" did the Soviet authorities permit the exhibition of modernistic paintings which were hated by them. They were forced to do so out of fear of the West's condemnation of their acts on Sept. 15th.

The permission for this exhibition is just another confirmation of a new situation: The Soviet Union is forced to take under consideration the public opinion of the West. The authorities are manipulating the internal affairs in the face of a question: What will the West say about it?

On one side repressions are increasing: Attempts are made to kill, or to bring to insanity in separate cells Wladimir Bukowski and Valentin Moroz; in May a historian of literature and translator Gabriel Superfin received a sentence of 5 years in Gulag and 2 years of deportation. On the other side - if the West begins to shout too loud - somebody is let to go free, or receives permission to leave the Soviet Union. Under the pressure of the US Congress, it seems, the Soviets agreed to set a sufficient quota of Jewish immigration. The four hours freedom stolen by nonconformist painters confirms the effectiveness of the previously tested formula: Courage in defending their rights by more or less organized minorities (Jews, painters, political prisoners) plus a massive and active support by the West.

Adam Kruczek

Fragments

Vol. 2/3

March 1975

S - 2620 AND SU - 1974

by

Charles Joel

S - 2620 AND SU - 1974

by

Charles Joel

A story as motto:

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 1 & 2/1975 published in Paris, France.

Published by Correspondence Home Study Of Languages, Sutter Creek, California

Printed by the Essicc Company
Sutter Creek, California

© Copyright 1975 by Charles Joel

Three generations of the Slepak family live in Moscow. Old Slepak, a communist, leninist, as a young man immigrated in 1911 to the USA. He came back after the bolshevick revolution was won. He believes in it even now, so that when his son Vladimir, engineer, 45 years old, told him about his intention of going to Israel, the old man said: "To me, you are dead, I no longer have a son." But the Soviet authorities refused to give Vladimir a passport. One day the elder Slepak became ill. Vladimir, though excommunicated by his father, went to visit him at the hospital. "It's good of you to come," said the old man, "but now, go away, to me you don't exist." Vladimir has a wife and a son Alexander, both willing to immigrate too, but the Soviet authorities will not let them. When a senator of the country from which in 1917 old Slepak had returned (oppressed by the idea of building up the system that now persecutes his son and grand-son) announced that the Slepaks would be able to immigrate, Mary Slepak sighed: "My God, what will they finally do with us." Alexander, in real jeans, young, but already experienced, said: "This is too beautiful to be true," and Vladimir who just finished listening to Radio Freedom, added: "Let's live for a while and watch," then he locked all doors and supported them with bars and bolts in case of surprise visit from the KGB.

Actually, the story of Slepaks, could have been written properly by Schelom Aleiheim. But, even the less poetic writers had felt for some time that something was going to happen. At the end of Sept. 74, Henry Kissinger made the longest speech of his career, the only reason being to prove that every attempt of the USA to pressure the USSR may bring just horrendous results. "If the temptation of joining relaxation with the pressure on the USSR"- said Kissinger -"grows, such an attitude will be catastrophic. We'll land in a cold war without strengthening peace and solving any human problems...we must be aware of what can be and what cannot be changed in the question of human rights in the East. We cannot demand that Russia suddenly gives up 50 years of Soviet and several centuries of Russian history..."

Hearing this, the specialists shouted: "Attention! It's coming!" and with a wet index finger kept high, tried to find out where the wind is blowing from.

It has blown from the Eastern direction, or (as rightly observed *Trybuna Ludu* in Oct. 1956) from the "director" of the East. Brezhnev invited Simon, the American Finance Minister who was staying at that time in Moscow, for a supper. By the 3rd vodka, or as the French say, between cheese and a fruit, he played hell with Simon and made all participants at the table shudder with fear. "Intervention in our internal affairs"- shouted the General Secretary -"may seriously damage relations between the USA and the USSR. It's absolutely impermissible that one can

dare to subject the development of Soviet-American cooperation to some imaginary matters which in general do not exist, and, which in any case are exclusively our own matters; our economic relation," threatened Brezhnev, "basically have political meanings, but are endangered by the egoistic calculations of some small political groups whose psychology hasn't yet got rid of anachronic inheritance of the cold war."

Hearing this, the specialists didn't shout anything, but rushed to their newspapers' offices to prepare a package of anti-Soviet calumnies and to write that Brezhnev thinks differently than he talks and that the USSR had ripened to allow for concessions in human rights, even for Jewish immigration, in exchange for trade and financial allowances that are opposed by the Congress, unless the Kremlin liberates its immigration laws. In this context, calumniators added, Kissinger's speech is nothing but a performance whose purpose was to save Brezhnev's somewhat dirtied face.

The worst moment

It all began with *détente*, or relaxation. Kultura wrote a lot on this subject, so let us say in short, that both super-greats desired to build up a system which would efficiently safeguard both against the possibilities of war by misunderstanding or surprise; in other words, a system which would keep smaller nations out of serious politics and serious matters in general. In detail, America wanted to suppress the Soviets' aspirations for world

revolution, to get the Kremlin's help in ending the war in Vietnam, and to limit Castro's missionary ambitions within the shores of Cuba. And the Kremlin - which a long time ago resigned from the proletariat revolution and thinks only about the interests of the Russian Empire, and which long since has replaced Marx and Engels with Marks and Spencer */ -wanted to have a neutralized China, secured *status quo* in Europe, respect for Brezhnev's doctrine, and, above all, a flood of dollars, a Niagara of grain and the ocean of American, and, in general, Western technology.

As we see there wasn't any conflict of interests between the Motherland of Socialism and the Motherland of Capitalism. So, when Nixon and Brezhnev embraced themselves on the summit, the breeze of thawing was so great that even some icebergs of Gulag Archipelago began to float. For example, the Soviet Jews took *détente* very seriously and asked for the right of mass immigration.

But the Kremlin said *niet*. And when a mild persuasion, meaning concentration camps, prisons and incursions of the KGB, haven't helped and the Jews still wanted to immigrate, the Soviet authorities reached for the most effective weapon in the socialistic system, that is for financial stimulus. Actually, the Kremlin in

this case had only improved an already tested invention of Poland, taxation of the brain, a special tribute that under pretext of paying back the cost of education had been forcing the candidates for immigration to pay such big sums, that if they could afford to pay them, they wouldn't have to immigrate at all, having enough to live happily even in the USSR.

Then the world began to roar. Especially the USA, where, as mysteriously described in TASS, some specific circles had long waited for the occasion to mitigate Kissinger's passion for caviar and balalaika and for his travels to Moscow in general. Such an occasion was provided by the Russians themselves as they had chosen the worst possible moment for introducing the brain taxation. While in Moscow the Jews were being stripped to their skins, in the Congress in Washington there was introduced the so-called *Trade Bill*, a basic document projecting the strategy of the whole American diplomacy. One of the paragraphs of this bill authorized the President of the USA to grant the USSR the tariff of the most favored nation. Firstly, it established the application of an advantageous custom duties to Soviet Union on goods imported from Russia, and, secondly - provided that credits given by the American banks to Russia must be guaranteed by the USA government. Without going into details, let's say, that the question of lower custom duties was of less importance, though, for example, the duties on importation of vodka (one of the main products of the Soviet technological and scientific mind) dropped 75%; really important were the credits since

*/ The name of the British trade company used here by the author to illustrate capitalistic practices of the Soviet system - Ed. footnote.

without them all the projects for investing American technological ideas in Russia were doomed to perish in office files.

It was the autumn of 1972 when two American senators of Jewish descent began to think how to help their Russian brothers' escape from the financial mass-acre. It isn't known who was the first to invent a combined transaction: Jews for dollars. Very likely it was Senator Javits who had remembered the lessons of history and knew that already Himmler had thought about selling 100,000 Hungarian Jews for 10,000 American trucks. Totalitarian masters have certain common characteristics, thought Senator Javits, and began to work out the idea. It appears that his colleague Senator Ribicoff was the first one to introduce this "tasty" project in the Congress.

Who is Jackson

Then the name of Senator Henry Jackson appeared for the first time in this context. Sixty-two years of age (looks rather 50), wide-shouldered, strong, Jackson was almost unknown in Europe. In the USA, he has been popular for quite a long time and esteemed highly as a professional Congressional leader. He has had no luck gathering great honors, but he has character. He competed for the vice-presidency in the Kennedy administration, but failed; he rejected the proposition of taking over the portfolio of Defense Secretary in Nixon's administration.

Presently he thinks about running for presidency in 1976.

Jackson, a son of Norwegian emigrants, has a career like a hero in the stories for children. He sold papers, felled timber, for paying schools and studies of law. He was elected congressman when only 28 years old. By now he's spent 34 years on the Capitol and gained a lot of political experience. Malicious people say that Jackson owes his career to his consistency in shaking hands every day with everybody, including charwomen and policemen. Perhaps, but we must remember that this conservative democrat wasn't afraid to fight McCarthy when this Savonarola in caricature was at the top of his power, and, on the other hand, had the courage to criticize Kissinger for his secret agreement with the USSR, and he was doing it at the time when Secretary of State was being acclaimed a superman. Liberal in interior matters - for example, he was for equal rights of Negroes - Jackson is rather distrustful in foreign politics. In Washington he supports the lobby of the industrial-military complex which is so unpopular in Moscow, almost officially representing the interests of Boeing Corp. He went to Peking, while Nixon went to Moscow, and, above all he doesn't trust Russia. In the days of seemingly never-ending flirtation between Nixon and Russia, Jackson quite undelicately but loudly said: "The Russians behave like a pack of hotel rats. They wander through the corridors and try to open every door one by one, trying to get something". To complete his portrait let us add that Jackson was the first American Army officer who in 1945 entered the concentration camp in Buchenwald...

Nothing strange then, that Senators Javits and Ribicoff turned to Jackson for advice in the problem of Jews in Russia and brain taxation. Jackson, a man of experience, pure-blooded Aryan - in other words - a man who shouldn't be suspected of Zionism, a man of great *business* - meaning uncorrupted, supported their project and took over the realization of combined transaction. In a few days the amendment to the Trade Bill NO S-2620 had been prepared. Its text which subjected the clause of the most favored nation to the abolition of the brain taxation by Russia, received the signatures of 76 senators, or 3/4 of the Senate, which meant that the Trade Bill had been successfully blocked.

The White House (Nixon had no respect for the Congress) did not at once understand the strength and the reach of the campaign whose only, but most spectacular mark of distinction was the Jackson amendment. Some individual from Nixon's staff, by the name of Flanigan who, by the way, later became a Secretary, tried to frighten the senators, insisting that blocking co-operation with the Soviet Union will produce great losses to American economy and will undoubtedly create...a wave of antisemitism in the USA. He was laughed at, and the whole question was taken over personally by Kissinger. He didn't threaten, but persuaded.

Kissinger began to breakfast with the senators of Jewish origin (it is said that some breakfasts were kosher) and talked with them like children: Let me talk quietly with the Russians, I'll immigrate more Jews from Russia by secret diplomacy than you using your noisy commotions. Russia won't do anything under public pressure;

She is a very great power and not some Balkan or banana principality.

At the same time *big business* began to shout, especially those of its members who fell in love with interests of Russia to the extent of participation in "Krimtech-nics" - the exhibition of police equipment in Moscow after which the exhibited "gadgets" were sold to the KGB for the glory of democracy and for the development of "Trade-which-builds-up-the-road-toward-peace."

Messrs Kendall, the president of Pepsi Cola who, in his role of a fighter against alcoholism, produces in Novorossiysk 120,000 bottles of this elixir daily and waits for more orders, and Hammer who had already signed the contracts with Russia for about 20 billion dollars, builds hotels and trade centers in the capital of the USSR, and who made his first million there in Russia on the domestic war and hunger in the days of Lenin (he was my great friend - Mr. Hammer says nowadays), threatened the senators that if they block the *Trade Bill* and consequently stop credits necessary for their operations, the USA will lose the Soviet market to their competitors (where are they!?), and American industry simply will go broke. The coalition of Kissinger - Hammer, meaning diplomacy and big business has been joined by so-called "friends". Jackson - they were telling him - try to collect yourself, just take a look at the people who support you: Liberals who are disgusted with the KGB, conservatives who don't like Socialism, Jews who hate antisemites. Can you trust them all? Finally the choir has been joined by the White House itself firmly holding to

the conviction that the pressure on the Kremlin may bring just opposite results and Jackson's amendment instead of opening the door for immigration may close it forever.

Senate is not Soviet

But it became clear once more that the White House doesn't know human nature. The Kremlin's reaction was completely opposite to the one forecasted by specialists. Let's look at the timing of operation. On the sixteenth of March 1973 after weeks of bargaining and the storm over the brain taxation of Russian Jews, Jackson introduces his proposal in the Senate: "There will be no clause of the most favored nation if there isn't an abolition of brain taxation in Russia". On March 17, 1973 Mr. Victor Louis, beloved KGB's journalist, a man for special missions and black market, published simultaneously in 2 papers in London and in ...Tel-Aviv on the same day an article in which he expresses great surprise at what the whole noise is about. After all - says Victor - this is a temporary arrangement, the brain tax is just something incomplete and easy to pass by, *w szom dielo, ssa!* (What's the matter, let's be quiet! - Ed. translation). The bomb exploded on March 22nd. On this day the Jews to whom this very high tax previously applied, leave Russia without paying a penny. In addition, a special unit of American TV is invited to AVIR - passport office in the KGB - where it assists in handing the travel documents of the completely bewildered Jews who fear that - as has happened many times before - after

cutting off the cameras and TV beams, they will be packed for travel straight to Siberia. But, instead, they indeed traveled to Israel where they could watch the TV with themselves as the main performers.

On April 18th, Nixon for the first time invites Senator Jackson for breakfast and communicates to him that Mr. Brezhnev, who is just packing his luggage for travel to the USA, promised, already twice in writing, that the tax actually has been stopped... Dear Colleague - says Nixon - under these circumstances, you understand yourself that your amendment doesn't make any sense, please withdraw it and let's shake hands...

Jackson finished his coffee but didn't shake hands and didn't withdraw the amendment. Only changed it a bit. Just a moment - said Jackson - where are the guarantees? I don't trust Russians; this is now not a matter of taxation, but of immigration and persecution and not only of Jews but of the Soviet people in general too.

And everything started *apiat!*, from the beginning. The White House and the Kremlin consulted each other about what to do to tame Senator Jackson. Brezhnev expressed his astonishment: What kind of power is it that cannot handle a few senators - Jews in addition. We have - he was saying - 2,000 parliamentarists and who hears them speaking? What kind of power is it in which the representatives of the people play politics? Meantime the Watergate affair burst out and contrary to Brezhnev's wishes not the senator but Nixon was forced to resign. And at last the

Kremlin grasped the idea that a small Congress of the USA is not to be compared with the highest Soviet, and that one must give up something, otherwise the clause will land in a trash can.

Agreement without the main signature

One and half years went by since the issue of brain taxation; time that was filled out with many delicate negotiations, but the core of the problem remained unchanged. Neither side, on the surface, was yielding, and the tune was becoming more and more edgy. And finally came the announcements and speeches which were disclosed at the beginning of this writing.

On Oct. 18, 1974, several days after the double exchange of warnings from both sides of the ocean, Jackson called a press conference and announced that after his first breakfast with President Ford, he could disclose the "historic development on the question of human rights". Namely, that owing to a discrete agreement between the White House and the Kremlin, the USSR is going to liberalize its immigration politics and that in exchange the Congress will withdraw its veto against the clause. In other words, several tens of thousands of Jews and non-Jews from Russia every year, for several tens of billions of dollars in credits and American technology.

The agreement is without precedence. The main partner - the USSR - formally doesn't participate in it. The agreement

on the question of immigration from the Soviet Union and credits takes the strange form of letters exchanged between ...Kissinger and Jackson, the Secretary of State of the USA and a Senator of the USA Congress, an immigrant from Germany and an immigrant from Norway. In his letter Kissinger informs the Congressman that he has received appropriate assurances of the USSR government with regard to the question of immigration and human treatment of the candidates for immigration. In his answer to this letter Jackson gives his interpretation of its contents: He believes that 60,000 immigrants yearly is an adequate number in this situation, and that lowering this figure would mean that the Russian side is violating the agreement. Jackson adds that he is hoping for a quick increase of immigrant departures as at the present there are 130,000 Jewish applications on file, and that, after all, the agreement refers to all candidates "independently of race, origin, religion or social and professional background of the candidates." Jackson expresses hope that the Congress will pass the *Trade Bill* without corrections, but he adds - as if reluctantly - that the clause had been approved for an 18 months trial period and if the White House wanted to prolongate it, the approval by the Congress will be needed, dependent - as you can guess - on the Kremlin's behavior...

Now the document itself. The readers of *Kultura* know very well - mostly from their own experience - how "human rights" are being interpreted in the East, therefore they will be able to, properly,

estimate the meaning of the "six commandments" of the USSR guarantees that were pointed out in Kissinger's letter:

1. Persecution of persons who want to immigrate must stop, otherwise it will be treated as a violation of the law.
2. All artificial, bureaucratic obstacles which are contradictory to law that are applied to candidates for immigration, must stop.
3. The applications for passports will be reviewed on the basis of "first come, first served," including all those that are already in the files, regardless of geographic, racial and religious descendency of a candidate.
4. Special tragic cases will be taken care of with special sympathy and understanding.
5. There will be no brain taxation.
6. The American side has the right to point out to the Soviet authorities all cases of violation of the agreement; these cases will be investigated accurately and the American side will receive proper explanations.

This is not all. The agreement pledges that the candidates for immigration won't be "released" from their jobs, neither will they have any problem obtaining a character reference needed with an application for the passport, that a special procedure will be applied to clear up the situation of the "prisoners of Zion" - persons now imprisoned because of their desire for leaving the country, that the candidates won't be, at any time after their application - "incidentally" - called to military duty to complete

the honorable obligation of serving their former Motherland, that under-aged persons won't need their parents' permission, and finally that in relation to persons "suspected" of contact with State secrets there will be 3 years quarantine period applied.

Cocktails without Molotov

Please don't laugh. I know that all this is not a song of tomorrow yet, that had the USSR and all Socialist camps respected all of what Brezhnev promised to Kissinger, there, in general, wouldn't be any immigration needed, there wouldn't be any Socialistic camp, but just simply a Socialism without camps. But, despite this, being fully aware of the abyss that exists between promises and realities (after all Brezhnev is not a suicidal maniac), I firmly declare that Jackson didn't overstate the "historic importance" of the agreement when talking about it. Because, no matter how Russia is going, in reality, to fulfill her obligations (we must remember that already Lenin taught that every agreement - and what there is to say about an agreement that hasn't been signed - is valid for as long as it serves the revolution), the Kremlin's agreement to subordinate even formally its internal politics to the demands of some foreign parliament, and knowledge that the pressure of Western public opinion, to a certain degree affects its politics and customs of the KGB, cannot be lost without a trace in the history of XX century.

I don't know whether the emotionalism of a certain publicist from Times of London is justified when he says that American children in the future will learn about the letters of Kissinger and Jackson just as they now study the Declaration of Independence, or the Constitution, but also the skepticism of others who say that the agreement announced on Oct. 18, 1974 is just a scrap of paper, seems to me to be exaggerated.

When at the end of Oct., 74 Kissinger arrived in Moscow, Brezhnev had been very angry with him. No, not because Kissinger falsified the agreement, nor that he had supposedly promised some unheard of things, but because there had been so much noise around the agreement in Washington, and because Brezhnev engaged all his personal prestige - for "nothing". But despite his indignation, Brezhnev freed the Lithuanian sailor Kudirkø who went to the USA straight from concentration camp to where he had been sent for trying to escape to...the USA. You may remember that when in Nov. 71, Kudirkø jumped on the deck of American ship, he was returned by the officers of USA Navy to the Soviets - just for the sake of coexistence in harmony. To maintain this harmony Washington sent 2 officers into comfortable retirement, and the Kremlin sent Kudirkø for 10 years to the Gulag Archipelago. In the sunshine of *détente* Kudirkø will be able now to thank these officers for 3 years in a camp of special rigor.

At the same time the Jewess Sylvia Zalmason left the concentration camp. She is already in Tel-Aviv, but she didn't leave Russia without visiting her husband

who was in the so called 1st Leningrad process at first sentenced to die and later to life prison for...intention(!) of stealing an aircraft.

When Victor Polski, a physicist, one of the most active fighters for the right of immigration, arrested on the basis of fabricated accusation by the KGB of "hit and run" of a young girl, appeared in the court, some specialists were betting that he'd get a minimum of 3 years. What an occasion for KGB! - they were saying. Several hours later he was leaving the court... free, sentenced to pay only a 100 rubles fine, after the trial in which for the first time in the history of Soviet justice there assisted an American lawyer and an American reporter...

Of course any normal Western democrat, in general, won't understand what this is all about, nevertheless several days later Mr. Hammer signed new contracts. The Russians could, without any tricks, buy 3 million tons of grain in the USA, the Soviet delegation visited Boeing plants (Senator Jackson's district) where they negotiated purchasing (to begin with) 10 Boeing 747 for 300 million on credit, in Moscow there began to operate an American bowling alley with 20 tracks, and forewoman Valentina Bobruk from the Pepsi Cola plant could ecstatically say to an American reporter: "Our workers drink Pepsi regularly and thanks to it, at the end of working day, they feel as if they were just starting it..." If you don't believe it, read the *New York Times*.

Nothing stranger than that in this atmosphere, after the visit to Japan, where

security precautions as never had been seen, were applied (25,000 policemen guarded the airport, 200 "guerillas"- the person of the President) all the American team relaxed and thought about the weekend in Vladivostok. Some correspondent from Brussels remarked at this occasion that the USSR is the only country where the President of the USA is truly popular, and where he really may feel safe. Then it is natural that he preferred to drink cold vodka in the company of Molotov who had just been rehabilitated by the Great Soviet Encyclopedia, instead of running away from the cocktails that carry this famous name...

Real and moral - politics

Please relax. The true value of the agreement will come out in practice. Only practice will bring the answer to the question of to what degree this is a matter of trying to turn about, and to what degree this is a matter of a little swindle; whether Russia finally comprehended that it is impossible to build up a modern, nuclear epochal state using people that are treated as slaves from the epoch of the pyramids, or whether Russia again tries some of her "Small shop-keeper's tricks." Naturally, Sakharov is right saying that for him the agreement of Oct.18th is only a little step forward, and because he knows better than we do the meaning of Soviet laws in practice, he rightfully demands legal guarantees, right of appellation in the case of refusal of the passport, right of returning to Russia for those who may

become disillusioned with the "Garden of Eden" of the West, or of Israel. The Jews in Moscow, to whom the past experiences tell to be cautious, and who, waiting for the turning point in the immigration question, pray, like Mary Slepak for the health of Jackson, are also right. All this is true, but there is no question that today nothing will be as it used to be before the Oct. 18th; that something cracked in the front of the fight for human rights in socialistic system.

Whatever the plans of the Kremlin and it's intentions hidden behind Brezhnev's assurances needed for breaking through the opposition of the Congress, the concordat Jackson - Kissinger leads to one conclusion; Namely, that, without exaggeration, without demanding of Russia some impossible concessions, without leading the Kremlin into a situation of no way out, without- shortly speaking - pushing Brezhnev against the wall, Jackson proved that the price demanded by Kissinger for relaxation, for American guaranteeing the Soviet *status quo*, for the great plan of the USA participation in building up the modern Soviet Union, for partnership of capital and American thought in refurbishing the Communist system - that this price had been calculated too low; that *moral politics* become more successful than *real politics* or, that in any case both may go hand in hand...

Brukselczyk

Fragments

Vol. 2/4

April 1975

BYGONES & EXPECTATIONS

by

Charles Joel

BYGONES AND EXPECTATIONS

Let us begin with a characteristic episode which took place in 1962 in the garden of J. McCloy in the state of Connecticut. McCloy was at that time the advisor of President Kennedy. This was after the Cuban crisis; the Russians had already taken their atomic missiles out of the island. But the Americans had proved that the Russians had withdrawn their missiles. McCloy, incidentally, ordered McCloy to take care of this matter by approaching the Soviet Union.

BYGONES AND EXPECTATIONS

IN THE SOVIET PRESS (excerpts)

by
Charles Joel

A translation from the Polish
magazine "Kultura" NO 1/329/75

Published by Correspondence Home
Study of Languages, Sutter Creek,
California

Printed by the Essicc Company
Sutter Creek, California

BYGONES AND EXPECTATIONS

Let me begin with a characteristic episode which took place in 1962 in the garden of J. McCloy in the state of Connecticut. McCloy was at that time the advisor of President Kennedy. This was after the Cuban crisis; the Russians had already taken their atom missiles out of the island. But aerial photography proved that the Russians had not withdrawn their strategic "Illiushin 28" bombers. President Kennedy ordered McCloy to take care of this matter by approaching the Soviet diplomat Vasily Kuznetsov.

McCloy invited Kuznetsov to his country estate in Connecticut. Immediately upon arrival, the Russian diplomat said that the conference may take place in the garden only, without any witnesses, and that it could not be recorded in any form.

Kuznetsov heard out President Kennedy's demands given to him by McCloy and announced: "Russia will move her bombers out of Cuba but there cannot be any agreement in writing in this matter. This is the last time America will be able to force this kind of concession upon Russia. In the future it will be impossible."

I took the quoted description of the episode out of the book "The Retreat of American Power" by H. Brandon. I had read this book a long time ago. But the episode came to my mind immediately when I

watched an hour long TV program "The Red Fleet". I watched an impassable "forest"- if I can use this expression - of American warships on Cuban waters. It was something marvellous to look at, and it must have convinced everyone that nothing could oppose the sea power of the USA.

The blockade of Cuba also convinced Khrushchev that the doctrine of the Soviet Admiralty is the right one. A continental power even in the time of inter-continental ballistic missiles - cannot conduct any global politics. Global politics may be conducted only by a power that has warships operating on all oceans and seas of the world.

The numerical status of the Soviet fleet and its specific types of warships is well known, so there is no reason to repeat it here. But we must say that the Soviet fleet is growing faster than the American, and Moscow's target in this area, as well as in total armaments, including nuclear, is on the way toward not only the balance but the superiority of power.

The fleet is a basic instrument of imperialistic politics. One cannot help another with nuclear weapons only, let's say, in the Middle East, in Latin America or Africa. But a fleet that sails the oceans may support every Communist inspired disturbance in far distant countries, supplying arms, ammunition, and what's more important, to block any effort of intervention by the USA.

The Americans might have found a solution to the oil crisis in very short time, had they sent - to the proper

location - 2 or 3 squadrons of warships instead of sending Dr. Kissinger. Several years ago this proposition could have been realistic, involving no risk. But today, the American ships face the Russians. By undertaking a gun boat diplomacy, Washington would lead to confrontation with the Soviet fleet. For this reason, Dr. Kissinger, who is not so effective as a fleet, but safer, is being sent.

The Western press often compares Dr. Kissinger with Metternich, which is pure nonsense. Metternich was a statesman of a small defeated country, while Kissinger is a helmsman for the most powerful nation of the world.

The differences between Metternich and Kissinger are deeper. In the days of Metternich and during the whole nineteenth century, all the powers played imperialistic politics. Owing to this, all politicians could talk the same political language. Imperialism enjoyed popularity among the higher social classes, and few revolutionaries were considered as outcasts and criminals. The term "Imperium" was spoken with pride and imperialistic politics was the only politics worth of a great nation. In other words, Imperialism was not only *acceptable* but also *respectable*.

Today, Imperialism in Western Europe and in America as well, lost its *respectability* and support of all. Economic sanctions are being declared against Rhodesia though Rhodesians don't do anything different or worse than the Britishers were doing in their colonies in the nineteenth century. The mistake of

Rhodesia lies in the fact that she doesn't recognize calendar and wants to preserve the nineteenth century social structure at the end of the twentieth century. The system which Rhodesia wants to preserve isn't respected in the Western world.

Imperialism has fallen down for the same reasons slavery has fallen down in America. Imperialism wasn't destroyed by the victorious Spartacuses but by the Western European communities which found that Imperialism and its methods are in great disagreement with the philosophy of social justice. Symbolic of this may be the acclaimed mass victory of the Labor Party in England after the 2nd World War, and the defeat of Churchill who "didn't like to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire."

It isn't my intention to analyze all the causes of Imperialism's fall. I want only to stress the fact that in Europe of the nineteenth century the majority of nations had been governed by monarchs who practiced imperialistic politics, as Imperialism had been synonymous with patriotism (*Britania rule the waves, Deutschland, Deutschland über alles*). As in a poker game there were some winners and there were some losers, but essential was that both winners and losers believed in the imperialistic poker game that was worthy of a gentleman.

All this has changed radically. The Western European and the American societies condemn Imperialism and don't consider it as a natural, dynamic force of patriotic and political appeal.

The anti-imperialistic trend which we observe in Western world, is, no doubt, an evolution in the right direction, nevertheless the abandonment of Imperialism created a vacuum. The Conservativists in the Continent and in England lost their only ideology. If not Imperialism and cherishing the glorious traditions of the past, then what?

* * *

The democratic system is difficult to keep alive even in the periods of blooming economy. For example, England is a State of medium size, nonetheless she has 104 ministers. Each minister is a head of a regiment-size number of officials. Even if we were living through an era of prosperity, the gigantic State and Trade Union bureaucracies would create really serious problems for the defenders of democratic freedoms.

Those powerful "machines" govern and make decisions that affect our daily lives in spite of the fact that they are not elected by voters. Professional state officials are nominated and the functionaries of Trade Unions are chosen by their membership.

A serious economic crisis, especially the galloping inflation, is a menace for Democracy. Unemployment, strikes, revolutions, break the confidence of large masses in overcoming the crisis and preserving the democratic processes. This kind of situation creates an invitation for "men of providence" from anti-democratic right, or anti-democratic left. It's very

easy to go away from the Democracy but it's extremely difficult to return to it.

The Communist State version of police dictatorship may secure *law and order* in the society much easier and more effective than the Democratic system. But the well functioning mail delivery or a modern waste disposal plant in some city - though very important - are not the indicators of the quality of life. One cannot feel satisfied having an ideal rail-way system and excellent mail delivery if one, after returning home from work, has to read *Trybuna Ludu* or *Polityka* only (the names of daily papers as examples of the only news available to citizens in Poland -Ed. post script). The quality of life depends on the existence of possibilities to fight for social freedom, the right for representation based on free election, right of discussion and free press, and the right to fight against oppression and exploitation in all their forms and appearances.

The prison that is perfectly organized and assuring adequate or sometimes the luxurious existence of the inmates doesn't stop being a prison. It gives, no doubt, the citizens a feeling of safety and *law and order* but for what price? We all know it, but I write about it because the majority of people doesn't realize the fact that the "cost of Democracy" is always very high. We should accept as a sociological axiom the fact that there is no democratic system which would function so effectively as a totalitarian one.

To illustrate the problem more let's add that even if America were flooded with oil, the problem of social justice wouldn't

evaporate; the Trade Unions wouldn't change into a Salvation Army and Congress into a club of mutual admiration. Even if the monetary system were based on a mountain of gold, the workers would demand, as they always do, better wages, vacations, pensions and insurances, and adopting the same tactics as the Trade Unions, doctors, dentists, white collar workers, etc., would take the same course. (Example - the strike of doctors in San Francisco lately - Ed. post-script). And, of course, we would have the same fiery disputes in the press and on TV and a loud cry for the return of *law and order*. During the last months of 1974 the Western European Democracies were in a stage of sharp economic and social crisis. The economic crisis may in time ease down, but the social crisis will be more difficult to solve. I think that the so-called intelligentsia, after discovering the effectiveness of Trade Unions methods, will, in the future not shrink from using strikes as weapons.

The departed year of 1974 has crushed down several myths which were fundamental in conservative thinking. As Prof. Dahrendorf rightly observed in one of his lectures on BBC - in the past we were governed by the doctrine of economic growth and permanent enrichment. Economic growth means an unbroken growth of the standard of living. The process of our lives being governed by the doctrine dies much slower than its causes. The oil crisis has opened our eyes to the fact that plundering Capitalism, indifferent of the consequences of permanently increasing the economic growth cannot last forever, because soon there will be nothing left on the Earth stripped

of raw materials.

Capitalism with its philosophy of permanent economic growth - expressed by unbroken and uninterrupted enrichment of generation after generation - would be upheld if we could discover several uninhabited planets that are rich in oil and other resources. Until this happens, we cannot be richer than the Earth whose resources are limited and diminish with each passing year. Robbing the Earth - we rob ourselves, because neither our technology, nor economy can produce something of nothing.

Another myth that "forces of the free market" (Capitalistic equivalent of the "spirit of history" in Marxism) are unable to adjust is a bygone too. Both, the "forces of the free market" and "spirit of history" have been buried in the cemetery of the twentieth century myths. Yet, the myths though dead have not died in vain, providing that nobody tries to bring them back to life, and that the autopsy of their mortal remains is made objectively and thoroughly.

* * *

We don't live in a world of technology but in a world of *Science fiction*. In every Western country there are tens of millions of people who own TV sets. How many of them understand the mechanics of TV? An ever increasing amount of electricity needed for our homes and industry is produced by atomic reactors. How many of us know how the atomic reactor works?

All the electrical "gadgets" that surround us - the colored TV, stereos, magnetophones, transistors, etc. - are expensive

and innocent means whose purpose is to make our lives nicer. The real possessors of the mysterious menacing *Science fiction* are the armies and navies. I use the term of *Science fiction* deliberately because to hundreds of millions of people on this planet the many headed ICBM's aren't only beyond their understanding, but even difficult to imagine... unless we accept the categories of *Science fiction* and consider that the boundary between reality and fantasia is an illusion.

This potential of absolute destruction is in the hands of the super-powers only.

A humanist, meaning a writer, historian, literary critic, cannot simultaneously be an electrical engineer. On the other hand if he wants to be a real humanist he cannot remain a civilized illiterate, cannot be a foreigner on his own planet, to whom all that's happening around is just black magic. But this problem is for the sociologists or psycho-sociologists. We are interested in the political aspect of the problem.

Is there a defense against the super-powers in whose hands are the potentials of destruction that are taken literally from *Science fiction*? I read that Americans and Russians jointly possess 20 times more atomic weapons than would be needed to liquidate life on our planet. As these potentials are more or less equally shared, we may assume that the Russians have large enough potential for destroying 8 or 10 planets the size of the Earth.

If we accept the fact that the Soviets have an absolute nuclear potential-

meaning that they are able to destroy the life on earth - then we must as well accept the fact that it is absolutely indifferent whether the smaller nations such as, for example, France or England have 8 or 12 atom powered submarines.

If on the moon there were air, water, plant life and gravitation equal to the earth's, Americans and Russians could go there and govern the Earth in an absolutely dictatorial manner. But, as long as they live on Earth, their theoretical potentials are illusory, as one cannot strive to burn the home one lives in.

In our *Science fiction* the supermen always operate from bases located somewhere in outer cosmic space, and - because their lives are not connected with ours - they can deploy absolute power over the planet Earth. And here is the missing segment of our earthly *Science fiction*: The Americans and Russians despite their absolute potentials are not super-men but just men as any other men, sharing the destiny of our planet. The Earth is theirs as well as any other peoples' cradle and grave.

On the background of all this we observe different reactions. For example, the nations of medium size such as England or Germany, try to limit their defense budgets believing that this time the war will be won by Americans and not by Europe with the help of America. Another characteristic reaction is that the potentials of both super-powers do not affect in the least the problems of nationalities and minorities all over the world. The fact that the outbreak of military conflict would lead to confrontation or even to war between America and

Russia is a headache for Dr. Kissinger, but it doesn't bother the PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization). The same goes for Israel. Attacked, the Israelis will never resign from the military defense of their nation even if they were fully aware that their behavior may result in the Russo-American war.

The situation of Israel is much worse than that, for example, of Poland because in the case of Russo-American war Israel will be attacked and sustain mass losses. The reason lies in the fact that Poland's independence is not even considered as a far distant goal of the USA politics, while the support of Israel is, and must remain as one of the priorities of American politics.

Should, in one to five years - the numerous Arab armies, well equipped by the Russians, begin "pushing Israel into the sea" it would mean the capture by the Soviets of the richest oil deposits in the world. After the end of Israel the "oil weapon" would, in a short time, be at the disposal of Russia because the Americans would not hold any beach or sea port in the Middle East. Despite my reluctance in overestimating the Americans - especially their politicians - I don't believe that Washington would remain inactive, watching the destruction of Israel.

Russia doesn't intend to have a head-on collision with America in the Middle East or anywhere else. But the belief shared by Brezhnev and Kissinger that the super-powers will be always able to force their will upon the "client nations", is nonsensical. To Moscow and Washington the Near East represents a chess-board upon which is played

a coldly calculated political game. But to Israel and the Arabs this is not a game but an imponderable conflict in which the strongest emotions and feelings are engaged; those people won't sacrifice anything on the altar of Russo-American *détente*.

The Soviets would like to get hold of the Middle East and for this reason they arm the Arabs. The better the Arabs are armed the greater is the possibility of conflict with Israel. Once it erupts, the Russians won't even try to stop the Arabs because any attempt of restraining them would mean losing their friendship. One may force some "good advise" upon the defeated army, but advising to stop advance of the victorious one is a very different proposition.

Reviewing the situation in the Middle East, let's imagine for a while what could have happened if the October war were won by the Arabs? It's clear that the Arabian oil pump could have been taken over by the Soviets. The consequences of Israel defeat in the future, whether it happens in a month or in 2 years from now, would become analogical.

The Near East is only one example of the phenomenon which we observe on other continents. The possession of atomic weaponry affected only the attitudes of the super-powers. It didn't change the human nature nor the desires of nations and societies. None of the nations which are suppressed or threatened, is ready to resign from its own basic goals because of the threat of atom war. On the contrary, the resistance against atomic hegemony grows and the small nations for their nationalistic goals take advantage of the super-powers' fear

of self-inflicted destruction. If there wouldn't be any atom weapons in existence, we wouldn't have any petro-dollar invasion because the oil problem could have long been solved by military operation. In the pre-atom days it couldn't be even thought of that several Arab sheiks by raising the price of oil 5 times would bring the Western economy to the threshold of bankruptcy. Not America, nor the Soviets - but the Arabs get the maximal profits from the atomic era.

I would like to conclude this article by making certain points out of the above deliberations:

The old style Imperialism is totally disgraced and no longer can be accepted even by the Conservativists.

The Soviet Imperialism helps every freedom movement (beyond the Soviet Empire) and owing to this, in the eyes of a great majority of people in the so-called 3rd World, the Imperialists are Americans, not Russians. Yet, from the time of her creation the USA has been a symbol of freedom and Russia for ages symbolizes suppression and slavery. Wouldn't it be more appropriate if America were leading the freedom movements instead of Russia?

The Communists play an important role in all the freedom movements in both hemispheres, because, though not numerous, they are very well organized. In the opinion of Washington, Communism by its definition is anti-American. This a simplification equally false as a statement that every version of Communism is pro-Soviet. In consequence of this naive arithmetic, the

Americans support the "blackest reactionaries" - not because they sympathize with them, but because in the American policy makers' understanding, these reactionaries must be anti-Communist. This kind of politics gives fatal results and plays into the hands of the Soviet Union. In the 3rd World there would be plenty of room for many parities of the Yugoslavian style if the Americans could fully realize that many leftist movements striving for nationalistic freedom, quite often have no confidence at all in the Soviet version of Communism and in the Soviet Union.

In Moscow's understanding the *détente* is based on atomic terror. This kind of *détente* - as it was stressed many times by Moscow - doesn't weaken but fortifies the ideological war. Americans are supposed to be the partners in *détente* - why then don't they use the same rules of the game the Russians do?

Americans don't use these rules because their "Cosmology" is completely different than Moscow's. "Cosmology" in this context means to me a general picture of the world's political situation. Americans - or strictly speaking Dr. Kissinger - by peace, or *détente*, understands the freezing of the *status quo*. On the contrary, the Russians understand *détente* as a permanent widening of their influence resulting from the *status quo*. The Soviets represent a permanent offensive while Americans are in permanent retreat. The weakness of Israel lies in the fact that, though the Israelites are very brave, it belongs to the defensive camp in whose frame the "Munich" solution is more probable than a decisive victory.

The ideal solution for the Soviets would be Palestine with a neutral Jerusalem zone in the middle. The streets of Jerusalem would be patrolled by Russian and American units as they patrolled Vienna after the war. Those units would symbolize, in the eyes of the world, the status of equality between the Soviet Union and the USA - status which is the most miraculous balsam for curing the ages old Russian inferiority complex. The Russians not only want to be victorious - that's not enough - they want to be equal with that legendary America which has always been admired by Eastern Europe as the eighth and final wonder of the world.

The Americans allowed themselves to lose the monopoly of freedom which they held from the birth of the USA. We observe one of the greatest paradoxes of history. There is still functioning on a very small budget "Radio Liberty" but the majority of all freedom movements in both hemispheres is oriented on Moscow and Peking, not on Washington. Regrettably, everywhere we watch not the anti-Soviet but anti-American demonstrations. The liberalizing activities, similar to dissidents' activities in Russia and her satellites, threaten the politics of "relaxation" which, in the opinion of Nixon and Kissinger, was believed to be a base for peace of future generations.

Both Kissinger and Brezhnev overestimate the stabilizing effect of atomic weaponry. It would seem to appear that the logic is on their side. The powerful have never been so powerful as they are now. For example, the disproportion of power between Russia and Poland has never been greater than now. Russians could "transplant" 10 million Poles to Siberia and what would be left - the

Polish Peoples Republic of 20 million inhabitants - incorporate into the Soviet Union. Lord Avon (Anthony Eden) quotes in his memoirs Stalin's position on the question of Poland: "Why do we always talk about the Poles? They have always been to us a source of never-ending troubles." Why then is it not possible to "pacify" them today - when Russia is invincible? It appears that Poland is "defended" not so much by the public opinion of the West, as, in the first place, by the fact that her incorporation into the Soviet Union would turn away from Moscow all the Communist Parties of the 3rd World and all the radical freedom movements in both hemispheres. The invasion of Czechoslovakia had already created many serious gaps in world Communism. The "final" solution of the Polish problem could be much worse.

But the example of Poland is only a fragment of a larger question. The phenomenon that is worthy of universal psychological and sociological study is the fact that people ignore their own death. If the people were fully conscious of death - there would not be any civilization - because if at any moment each of us may die, there is nothing that would be worthy of our activity and caring. History proves that people passionately build, fight, create - ignoring the death. In fact, the same force makes people ignore atomic destruction and makes them unwilling to resign from the real desires and cultivations - for the only reason that the Soviets and America held the nuclear potential of destruction.

When the first atom bomb was dropped on Hiroshima I was sure that the nuclear weapons will greatly affect the psychology of men and nations. It didn't happen.

All over the world we observe the wars that are anti-colonial and liberating, revolutions and bloody revolts. People fight for their national goals and don't give a damn whether the super-powers have all the potentials and possibilities of world wide nuclear war.

Let's come back to our example of Poland again. If the Russians decided to evacuate several million Poles to the Soviet Far East - Poles would fight regardless of the consequences. The same goes for Israel. If attacked it will fight to the last man, ignoring all nuclear potentials of the whole world.

Today the nations are incomparably more conscious of their rights for independence and freedom than they were in nineteenth century. The nuclear weaponry and the vision of destruction don't diminish the dynamics and vitality of their endeavours. We may wonder at it all - but it is true.

We'll be having not less but more "hot spots" on the globe, in Eastern Europe, Near East, Latin America, South Africa, Vietnam, etc. Neither in Europe nor in any place else (beyond Europe) will the tendencies toward independence and freedom be strangled by any atomic "policeman." Not the nuclear threat but a desire for freedom is today, as always has been in the past, the main explosive material on this planet. As long as these potential desires are not justifiably satisfied - all talks about the peace for future generations (American and Soviet) is nothing more than wishful thinking. It's a boundless naiveté.

We were talking about *Science fiction*. If, some day, the atomic cataclism happens, a historian from another planet will be able to sum up our history in 2 sentences: The peace is of universal and priceless value, only then when it doesn't mean peace and freedom to some and a slavery and deprivation to others. The powerful and the rich on the planet Earth during a period of two thousand years were not able to understand this truth.

Juliusz Mieroszewski

IN THE SOVIET PRESS
(excerpts)

The war isn't ending. War cruel, merciless and bloody. The ideological war which is conducted by the Soviet authorities against all who think differently than they and against everything that threatens the glorious "moral - political unity of the Soviet people."

Not long ago, world opinion was happy because the non-conformist painters were allowed to have their painting exhibition which actually took place in Moscow. But soon after that, the insubordinate artists began to be called "to where they should be called." And 2 of them - Vladimir Ptnicki and Alexander Paustowski were locked in a mental asylum - popularly called "durdom" (madhouse - Ed. translation). The durdoms are the most important instruments in the ideological fight. But sometimes they appear to be insufficiently effective, and then, the old proven methods are applied.

In the concentration camp at Wydrino, died at the age 60 years, the most prominent

Soviet orientalist, buddhist, Bidiya Dandaron. With a short break - less than 1 year - he spent 19 years in the Soviet concentration camps and was released in 1956 because in his case "there were no indications of criminal acts." After his release, while working at the Institut of Social Sciences at Buriat, Dandaron has been busy on translations and writing comments on mid-centuries texts of Buddha. At the same time he wrote books popularized by Samizdat (Underground book self-service - Ed. post script), especially "The Buddhistic Reflections," in which he tried to teach the basics of buddhistic thought using the terminology of the Western philosophy, trying also to interpret the Western philosophy in terms of Buddhism. He believed that the idea of Buddhism and its technics of meditation are needed in contemporary societies. The fame of Bidiya Dandaron had spread all over the USSR and Ulan-Ude - the capital of Buriat Mongolia where he lived - had turned into a place of pilgrimage to many of his followers from Moscow, Leningrad and other cities of the Soviet Union; he had also a very active local group of his pupils. In 1972, in the frame of ideological war, Dandaron was arrested and put into Wydrino camp. Despite weakness - he had broken legs and a hand - he was sent to heavy "general labor" duties. When he complained he was locked in a prison cell.

The death of Dandaron was a painful experience to his friends. On the death certificate is stated that he died of asthma and brain tumour. His mortal remains haven't been given for decent burial to his family.

While all this was happening in the Soviet Union, Jean-Paul Sartre was visiting

a prison where Andreas Baader the leader of the West German "Red Army" was kept. Baader was accused of arson of a great store in Frankfurt and of leading a "group" which had killed 5 men and had attempted to kill 54 more, held up banks, etc. After his talk with Baader, convinced that in his cell there is a radio that is set on the only one program, that he receives papers and books only after they were checked by prison administration, that he can be visited only by relatives and persons who "don't represent any political danger" Jean-Paul Sartre began to publish in the Western press his expressions of indignation caused by "tortures" which he observed, and obviously he had been so much engaged in all this that he had no time to say even one word about the victim of ideological war conducted in the Soviet Union. The more, that the victim was a Buddhist, an enemy of bloodshed, murders and bank robberies.

* * *

The ideological war goes on, of course, not only in the territories of the Soviet Union but also far, far, beyond its boundaries. In the *Literaturnaya Gazeta* of Oct. 2nd, 1974, the chairman of the Agency of the Soviet Union Authors' Rights, W. Pankin, with great satisfaction sums up the results of his office work during the current year. The Agency was created immediately after the Soviet Union joined the World Convention of Copyrights. W. Pankin proudly enumerates all the agreements that were signed with the Writers' Unions of France, England, W. Germany, Belgium and Portugal. In these countries - reassures the chairman - there will be more of the Soviet writers translations published, especially of those works which had already

been translated "at home". Presently "a book published in the West...in its common form popular among the Western readers, will find more recipients than the same book translated and published in our country" - says Pankin. However, we must note another aspect of the problem: In the text of the agreement signed by the Soviet Union Agency with the French Union of Writers and Composers - both parties pledge in particular: "Not to enter into direct connection with a member of another union." We may suppose that agreements with unions of the other countries are identical, which means that the Western writers are agreeing with an idea that the Soviet writers became the property of State and that contact with them must be made through the Agency only. The Moscow correspondent of *Le Monde* doesn't hide the fact that one of the consequences of signing the agreement will be the factual "impossibility of publishing or introducing in France a work of any Soviet author, without approval of the Soviet government. The USSR may file with the French court any case of violation, on the basis of the agreements with the French Writers Union, and that, every Soviet citizen accused of sending his manuscript abroad may be sued by his own government for violation of the foreign trade monopoly." And again, there is no deviation from Marx. All works of men are treated as products. All products belong to the Soviet Union. Illegal sale of a product-manuscript is identical with an illegal sale of, for example, oil.

* * *

There is the ideological war going on in which the West continues to retreat and the Soviet Union continues to achieve victory

after victory. And this is called *detente*. How far the victories of the Soviet Union reached we may estimate reading an article of Arthur Koestler, published on March 10, 1946 in *New York Times* and reprinted presently in London *Soviet Analyst* with a foreword by English historian and poet Robert Conquest the author of a famous book "The Great Terror." In his article, Koestler, with exceptional perception enumerates all the conditions that are necessary for having real peace, and points out all the successes achieved by the Soviet Union during the past 30 years.

Let's look closer at what Koestler wrote 30 years ago:

"In 1938 we were appeasing the Germans who suffered the illusion of greatness, presently we are appeasing the Soviets which suffer the illusion of being persecuted..the Soviet government for the first time in history have developed a complete state-owned monopoly of not only products but also of the production and distribution of ideas, feelings and beliefs. Only when the suspiciousness of Russians vanish, the world-wide peace will become a reality. This suspiciousness may be rejected and conquered only under one condition - that the Soviet government agrees to turn off its switch on the propaganda machine...in the first place, it is necessary that our politicians finally grasp the idea that none of the political talks and trade agreements may guarantee long lasting peace, as long as the world is divided into two camps: One which is seized up by a disease of maniacal feeling of being persecuted and another by a growing fear...The psychological weaponry should become a subject of

international talks and agreements equal to the subject of any talks and agreements in any other kind of weaponry. The agreements in psychological disarmaments should be made with concrete, precisely formulated points - equal to any other agreements in any other kind of disarmaments."

The proposed "concrete precise points" of psychological disarmament by Arthur Koestler, show with exceptional clarity "how much water had flown under the bridge" during the past 30 years. In 1946, Koestler had thought that "Western nations should have demanded psychological disarmament" that would include: The free distribution in the Soviet Union of the Western papers and films, access of Russian citizens to free information about the outside world, free access to Russia for the accredited newsmen and parliamentary delegations, liquidation of restrictions in the free movement of foreigners in the Soviet Union, and the Soviet citizens' movement over the territories of other countries, vacations abroad for students, teachers, writers, professionals and laborers - on the basis of free exchange.

"The demands for the free exchange of ideas across the boundaries - concluded Koestler in his article - the renewal of normal 'blood circulation' in the world system, should be put on the agenda of all summit meetings, commissions and general UNO conferences. These demands should create a base for all concessions of geographical, economic and scientific character. It is moral and completely justified if the Western nations, while

demanding acceptance of their proposals,
used all the levers of political and economic
pressure."

More than 30 years ago...

Adam Kruczek

Fragments

Vol. 2/6

June 1975

"MANKIND AT THE TURNING POINT"

IN THE SOVIET PRESS (excerpts)
by

Charles Joel

PLEASE ACCEPT MY SINCERE APOLOGIES FOR THE
MISTAKE DISCOVERED AFTER PRINTING: ON THE
COVER - VOL 2/6, SHOULD BE - VOL 2/5
EDITOR

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" No 1/328 - 2/329/1975, published in Paris, France.

Editor and translator, Charles Joel

Published by Correspondence Home Study of Languages, Sutter Creek, California.

Printed by the Essic Company, Sutter Creek, California.

This headline is not made by myself; It belongs to the *Second Report* prepared by two scientists for the *Club of Rome* - a loose organization of a 100 scientists from 30 countries. The *First Report* prepared by Dennis Meadow and his team of specialists from MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) and published in 1972, had shocked the industrialized countries, disturbed the peace of mind of politicians and economists, technologists and demographers. In a study entitled "The Limit to Growth," Dennis Meadow predicts mankind's catastrophe which will happen in the second half of twenty-first century, if drastic limitations of economic growth aren't applied by all concerned. The learned prophet from the American institute confronts us with 3 conditions for avoiding the cataclysm: Firstly, the population growth must be stopped; secondly, the existing riches of the world must be divided among, and shared by, all peoples, thirdly - and this is the key condition, mankind must resign from the continuation of economic growth. As all three objectives appear to be unreachable and utopian, the only alternative is a cataclysm of historical unknown dimension... "The Limit to Growth" became an international best-seller, "devoured" in 25 languages in 2.5 million copies. Then, unexpectedly, in mid-October of the last year there was published the *Second Report* which upset the assumptions of the *First*, and for the world suffering from famine, demographic explosion, economic crises and inflation, flashed a little spark of hope. The catastrophe may be avoided...

The cybernetic model of the world

Eduard Pestel, Professor from the Hannover University, jointly with Michailo Mesarovic, Professor of Cleveland University, made a research and concluded that although the world situation is very bad, it is not so bad as Meadow thinks. In the study "Mankind at the Turning Point" both authors introduce a cybernetic model of the world, extending to 2025 year. The study has been made by 40 participating specialists and advisors representing almost every scientific field. The computerized version, or image, of the world is based on millions of numbers and hundreds of thousands of cybernetic equations, while the model of Meadow contains only 250 equations. In the opinion of Pestel and Mesarovic, Meadow based his conclusions on too small number of aggregates, and in his model the world appears as a closed system - something like a gigantic automaton whose performance is difficult to steer by a conscientious human decision. Pestel and Mesarovic criticize the 3 above mentioned conditions of Meadow and state, that resulting from the limitations of economic growth, there will be a freezing of the *status quo* of the present economy, or a permanency of the existing deficiencies, above all, of famine and poverty in underdeveloped countries. According to the authors, it is possible to save the world without making sacrifices and denials that are demanded by Meadow.

Is the vision of both scientists just an attempt to calm down those who are frightened by approaching catastrophe? Their answer resounds decidedly: *No!* They are concerned, in the first place, with helping the responsible politicians in making

important decisions, and giving them a wide range - beyond the current problems - of thinking. Pestel is pessimistic - but towards politicians only. In a crowded Hilton Hotel in Berlin where in last October he presented to the public "Mankind at the Turning Point", he disclosed this comment of some politician: "Have you ever thought about the reaction of my voters when I will tell them to forget about all the near future gains, and to concentrate on the long-lasting perspectives of sacrifices and denials?" And, in fact, in order to save the world, it will be necessary to undertake many unpopular decisions, but to the scientists this is not an argument.

The prognostics of "Mankind at the Turning Point" have more chances of success than the Cassandric prediction of the *First Report*. Pestel and Mesarovic, took, as a starting point of their research, the world not as a hermetic sealed unit, but a world that is differentiated, divided into 10 regions, such as; Western Europe, Latin America, Eastern Europe, etc. Besides, they don't propose - as Meadow does - one universal prescription for all - poor and rich, capitalists and socialists, white and black - their conclusions are made of alternatives from among which the politicians ought to make their choices if they want to prevent catastrophe. The most important is, that Pestel and Mesarovic do not condemn the economic growth as such; on the contrary - they consider it a necessity for underdeveloped nations where the national income per capita is, at the present, equal 1/5th of that in the industrialized countries. In the poor nations of South

Asia this ratio is even 1:20; there, fast economic growth is necessary in order to equalize unjust disproportions. But if the present politics were to prevail, the difference between the standard of living in poor and rich countries will be expressed in a ratio of not 1:5 but 1:8...

The cost of equalization

Pestel and Mesarovic calculated, who should invest, how much should be invested, and where investments should be made in order to prevent catastrophe. The industrialized countries, within the next 50 years, should invest \$500 billion annually in the underdeveloped parts of the world; this would bring the disproportions to a ratio 1:3. But, if the politics of help to these nations to year 2000 remains at the present level, it will be necessary to invest an additional \$3.5 trillion to reach the same level of 1:3 ratio. However, should the industrialized countries, during 1975-2000 period, concentrate their help, they may save a lot of money - in this case it would be sufficient to invest only \$250 billion annually, and owing to this investment, the poor countries will be able to stand up on their own feet by the end of this century.

One of the most difficult problems is food for the hungry world. From 1936 on, the production of food, in general, followed the population growth. But at certain times, the population growth became faster than food production. Meadow noticed this, but Pestel and Mesarovic went deeper into this matter showing the difference in particular parts of the world.

According to their calculations, to produce 1 lb of meat it is necessary to use 7 lbs of grain. If today, the whole world would begin to eat the way the American people are eating, the entire food supplies of the world would suffice to keep alive only 1.2 billion people, instead of the 4 billion presently living. If the decision of fighting famine by imports from the rich countries in some parts of the world were made, it would soon appear, that this proposition is just impossible because the whole American merchant navy would be needed for transporting goods, and despite this, by 2025 500 million people would be dead. In addition, shifting the investments from industry to agriculture would ruin industry and create heavy disturbances in the industrialized countries. The only way to restore the health of the world is through investments in underdeveloped countries during the years 1975 as discussed above. In this way we may equalize the disproportions between industry and agriculture and prevent the death of millions of people every year.

The scenarios from the computer

Pestel and Mesarovic are not dreamers, but futurists who stand firmly in the realities of the world. Their conclusions are original, perhaps frightening, but their method of research arouses confidence. All this is exceptionally well demonstrated in the chapter of their report related to the question of oil prices, in which, "with computer in hand," they prove, that the low price of oil in the past, has been unhealthy for the world economy. They worked out 2 scenarios of oil prices up to 2025 year;

in one scenario the increase of oil prices was slow, and in another fast. They have chosen the year 2025 because from this year on, there will be less dependency on oil in the industrialized countries as the consumption of other energetic materials will be on the increase.

In both scenarios the scientists have tracked how, in different regions of the world, the prices of oil affect the behavior of the gross national product (GNP) and international capital originating from the sales of oil. Assuming that the basic price of oil remained stable during the 1975-2025 period, there will be enormous growth of international capital, because the stable price of oil will be advantageous in comparison with the price of other energy resources. But, if the price of oil were rising, the international capital will accumulate relatively slower and in the moment when this price increase reaches the 50% point, there will begin a fast decline of international capital, and the value of investments located abroad will be smaller by half. All this will be resulting from the fast decline of buying too expensive oil, and from the increase of consumption from the other energetic sources. Consequently, because all the known resources of oil are limited, either the low, or the high - above the 50% "red line" - prices of oil will produce the same results to the oil exporting countries. After a certain time, their GNP and capital will begin to decline fast. In other words, there is some optimal price of oil, and, if so, there should be established the rational politics of price regardless of the current

conjunctural events. This astonishing reasoning leads to a very important conclusion: It is possible to solve the conflict between the oil exporting and oil importing countries to the satisfaction of both sides.

Pestel and Mesarovic do not stop at the above conclusion. They go further, checking whether there is the real possibility of a rational solution of the conflict. With this objective in mind, they divided their 10 region models of the world into 4 groups. In the first they included: Western industrialized nations - North America, Western Europe, Japan, Australia, and several smaller regions. In the second: the socialistic countries - Eastern Europe, the USSR, and China. In the third: North Africa and Middle East. In the fourth: the rest of the countries. As a criterion the GNP in 2025 year for each group was taken.

In the first scenario (the low prices of oil) the development of other energy resources will be slow for as long as there is an oil for sale, meaning to the beginning of twenty-first century. The exhaustion of oil resources will most painfully strike the highly industrialized countries whose economy will collapse despite the long lasting profiteering on the low prices of oil. It is true, that to the year 2000 there will still be noted an unlimited economic growth - the catastrophe will begin in the following quarter century...at that time the decline of GNP, after a period of growth, will engulf also the developing countries, North Africa and Middle East. The exhaustion of oil supplies in the Middle East, will affect the USA in the least, but greatly - Western

Europe and Japan. This kind of situation would be loaded with many social disruptions, revolts, etc.

The second scenario shows quite a different development of economic events. So, there will be the increase of oil prices averaging 3% annually up to the optimal level. Of course, the beneficiaries will be the Middle East countries, their GNP will be much higher than in the first scenario; GNP will be higher either in the socialistic countries. Astonishing is, that the economy of the Western world, in spite of increasing oil prices will grow either, and in 2025 it will reach the higher level than in the first scenario. This means that the high but optimal prices of oil will be profitable for the importing countries and their economical progress will run in a more orderly manner. although some of them will have serious problems around the 2000 year. Those problems will develop in connection with the exhaustion of oil resources in North America and Europe.

Cooperation or extermination

In the example of oil prices, the authors of the *Second Report* show what kind of threat to mankind may arise in the case there was lack of globally organized cooperation. The low oil prices were not healthy because they favoured the fast growing economy, especially in Europe and Japan, which situation could not last permanently. The lengthening of this period of prosperity, sooner or later, would lead to economic stagnation and ruin, or to an economy which would be steered in a totalitarian fashion, in which, there would not be place for the mechanics of free market forces and all

emerging social and political changes.

The energy conflict - as any other conflict that torments today's world - may be solved, if all playing factors were taken into consideration and if the solution to all problems were found through international cooperation. This is the only wise escape that would benefit all. Every fast accumulation of capital in some countries at the cost of some others, will hurt all countries. The final conclusion of scientists is: Unity strengthens, disunity ruins. Today's situation of the world doesn't yet give any reason for optimism, but Pestel and Mesarovic are full of hope. Whether this hope will be fulfilled, will depend on politicians in whose hands is our planet. The choices are limited - further development, of extermination.

Antoni Gutowski

IN THE SOVIET PRESS (excerpts)

In Banff (Canada) the fighters for the Soviet "ideological front" had an occasion to attack their opponents on "enemy territory." The international conference organized in Canada by scientists from the USA, Canada and Western Europe has been dedicated to the problems of the USSR and Slavic countries of Eastern Europe. The Soviet scientists were also invited and participated as a team of 9 persons led by academical A. Naroczny known for his works in collecting historical facts which are to prove the rights of the Soviet Union to

Siberia and the Far East. A note published in Kultura about the conference had a rather purely scientific character. But now, we have some - let's say - more intimate details of the conference. Several newly born emigrants from the Soviet Union, residing at present in the USA, attended also. Among them an ex-employee of the Moscow Institute of History and Art, Boris Szragin, and a famous poet Korzavin. In 3 large articles written for *Russkaya Myel*, published in Paris, Naum Korzavin gives a vivid description of the atmosphere at the conference. We learn from these articles, that the Soviet delegation did not present any lecture, but preferred to participate only in disputes and appraisals of the lecturers. This behavior of the Soviet delegates was a frightening experience for the lecturers. As we know, the KGB keeps all russicists under very close observation and if their performance doesn't suit Moscow, they are simply refused visas for entering the Soviet Union. It is easy to understand the nervousness of the Western scientists lecturing under the merciless eyes of Moscow's representatives. Naum Korzavin, who, as a poet was interested only in literature and who had a seminar on "Memories" of Nadyezda Mendelsztam, tells us how Moscow delegate A. Dymyszyc was intimidating all members who participated in the seminar. "We must frankly admit" - writes Korzavin - "that everybody was afraid of Dymyszyc' erudition and art of converting this erudition into an evil." Korzavin - a new emigrant - assures us that the overwhelming fear of Dymyszyc' erudition existed. It is clear that there were many other things to be afraid of. From Korzavin's description we

get an impression that the Western lecturers felt like freshmen on the first exam, and when, after the seminar in which it was said that Jesenin's works were not published during the Stalin's era, Dymyszyc contradicted saying that in 1940 there appeared a small volume of Jesenin's poems, the consternation of Western professors reached its peak. The more, since Dymyszyc didn't mention the fact that the circulation of Jesenin's volume of poems was comically small, and that the possession of it was sufficient evidence to receive 10 years of Gulag. That the victory of Dymyszyc was complete even to himself we may judge from the following fact: During the seminar Dymyszyc was addressing its chairman - Professor Deming Brown from the University of Michigan - calling him officially "Professor Edward Brown." During recess, Dymyszyc was approached by an unknown gentleman, who said: "Excuse me, Mr. Dymyszyc, I am Professor Edward Brown and it is Professor Deming Brown who is the chairman of the seminar." That, didn't intimidate Dymyszyc: "It cannot be" - he snapped - "professor Deming Brown is sick." In fact, Professor Deming Brown was sick before the conference, and the omnipotent "organs" had evidently informed Dymyszyc about it. This is why he decided not to submit himself to any kind of "provocation." The "Organs" know better which Brown is doing what.

In the *Izvestia* on Sept., 1974, a note about the conference had a victorious headline: "The Crisis of Foreign Sovietology." In it, as first sign of victory is underlined, that "The organizers of the conference affirmed the impossibility of research on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, without the help of the scientists

from our countries;" The second victory is unmasking "in many disputes the bankruptcy of the foreign 'Sovietology' and false information about socialistic countries, popularized by the reactionary nationalistic emigration;" and as a third victory is "the upheaval of the authority of the Soviet scientists among the participants of the conference." We may suppose that Professor Deming Brown, indeed, became ill and went to bed, after he received news that the "organs" decided that he must be ill - that's the measure of rising authority of the Soviet scientists at the conference.

* * * *

As we know, the latest friendly, almost brotherly relations between the USSR and the USA, have turned somewhat sour. The Soviet leaders came to the conclusion, that without any concessions on their side, America, sinking into an abyss of crises, will give them everything they want. The future will show to what extent their calculations are realistic. Meantime, the Soviet press is busy with unmasking (rather carefully - to start with - who knows, the time may come again to switch to praising) some capitalistic realities in the USA: Namely, the new disgrace of the CIA. The Soviet citizens are surprised to learn that in the USA the common people are spied upon, that - as *Literaturnaya Gazeta* informs - "The surveillance of people is very greatly expanded." The Soviet people just cannot imagine this! Their surprise and indignation at the violation of elementary human rights expressed in many letters to the editor, become understandable after one read the unusual document: The decree of the

Central Committee of the Communist Party and The Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union "The ways for further development of the passport system in the USSR."

Surprised that the passport system of the USSR still demands improvement, I decided to determine the exact meaning of the passport. *Little Soviet Encyclopedia* says: "The Passport is a special document which certifies the identity and the right of the bearer to travel out of his permanent residence." So far, it was clear. But the *Encyclopedia* adds: "The passport system was the most important instrument of police influence and taxation politics in a so called police state (look: Police State). The passport system existed in pre-revolutionary Russia...the Soviet legislation doesn't recognize the issuing of the passports." Surprised at this statement I looked at the cover of the encyclopedia and I found the year of publishing: 1930. So everything appeared in order, because passports, most important factor of governing in the police state, were introduced in the Soviet Union in 1932, for the purpose of "clearing the cities and workers' villages from the elements which are unconnected with production and socially useless, and also for clearing the country from hiding kulaks, criminals and others." It deserves stressing that those "others" were the peasants forced in 1932 to become members of kolkhozes. To them passports have not been issued, and for this reason they had no right to change jobs, or moving to another place. Many years before, a prominent publicist wrote: "What is the meaning of the freedom of

movement? It means, that a peasant has the right to go where he wants to go, move to a place where he could feel comfortable, chose any village or a city, without asking for permission. It means, that in Russia the passport system should not be used... the Russian peasant is enslaved to the extent that he cannot move to a city, cannot freely settle down on the soil of his choice. The peasant is like a little child who cannot make any move without permission." When Vladimir Ilyich Lenin wrote these words in 1903, he didn't suspect how true they would be in 70 years in the State which he founded.

From Jan., 1976 on, there will be some serious changes in the passport system of the Soviet Union. The passports and what's in them will be the same, but they won't have an expiration date. Twice in a lifetime - at the age of 25 and 45 - a citizen will report to the militia for changing his photograph in the passport. And then, of course, the militia will have a good look at him and will decide if the photograph may be glued in.

The basic question which occupies the minds of half population of the Soviet Union - meaning all living in vast country, out of cities - is whether they too will receive passports. This matter looks quite foggy in the decree; it's possible, that the leaders didn't make a final decision in this respect. It appears, however, that by the end of 1981 the countryfolk will receive passports too. Therefore, it's possible that at the 65th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, which - as it is generally known - liberated everybody, all citizens of the USSR will finally receive the right of having a passport, which *stricte* regulates everybody's

movement. We must mention, that the duty of reporting to police (at arriving and leaving any place) and penalties for its violations, including imprisonment, remain in force.

Under the headline "About Passports" in the encyclopedia, one is advised to refer to the contents that are headlined by "Police State", which I did, and here is what I found: "The characteristic of the police state" - explains the Soviet encyclopedia of 1930 - "were, supervision by the state, police intervening in all aspects of life, removal of the citizens from participation in governing the state, subordination of the national economy to the authority of the treasury, and the existence of wide bureaucracy."

As we can see, the definition is very precise. Indeed, we should be ashamed to compare the primitive invigilation of American citizens by the CIA, with the almighty system of passports which grows year by year in the Soviet Union. And, when at last, the ideal system of passports is achieved, then the building of Communism will end. The ideal "Police State" may reach the stage of eternal life.

The building of such a state is not simple matter, and its builders should be loved and highly esteemed. The newest Soviet *best seller*, a novel of W. Bogomolov "In August 44..." is dedicated to them. Bogomolov's name has not been, until now, on the list of "leading" Soviet writers. Twenty years ago he wrote a story "Ivan" which was used as a base for a film of Tar-kowski, and another story "Zosia" also used

in a film. "In August 44..." brought great popularity to the writer. The book has been published in series by the monthly *Novy Mir* (issues 10-12, 1974) and simultaneously - which happens very rarely - appeared in a book form. In the popularization of the book are engaged its author and his protectors. And we must remember that the protectors of Bogomolov are powerful. During the war the future writer worked in the directorate of counter-intelligence known under the dreadful name of "Smersh", which after deciphering means "death to spies." We may assume that the permission for publication of the book had been given with no delay. Some fragments of it appeared already in Jan., 1968 in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, but, evidently the time for its publication had not yet ripened then. The novel appears after 6 years and under its title the author placed only one date: 1973.

The motto of the book tells us about the intentions of Bogomolov. The ex-member of "Smersh" - paraphrasing the words of Churchill about the pilots who saved England in 1940 - dedicates his book: "To few, to whom so many are indebted..."

Those "few" are the members of Smersh which was created in 1943 as a special organization under the direct supervision of Stalin. The Leader, to already existing and operating services of MWD and MGB, added a separate unit whose job was the invigilation of the Army and its rear, meaning the clearing up of the territories that were freed from Germans. "Smersh" received unlimited power; its functionaries had the right

to use weapons any way they wanted. In Bogomolov's novel dominates the feeling of everybody's fear created by the little red book on whose cover was printed the word "Smersh," and distaste, or perhaps hatred of the soldiers and officers toward the members of "Smersh." The author is proud of the fear which he and his colleagues from "Smersh" excited: he is deeply convinced that this is the proof of efficacy of this unique "organ."

"In August 44..." is interesting for many reasons. In the first place, for the localities in which the action takes place. The theme of the novel makes an impression of being adventurous: Smersh searches for a secret German radio-station which passes to German Command information about the movements of the Red Army. The operation bears a cryptonym "Niemen" and develops on the territories of Western Bielorussia and neighboring regions of Lithuania, on "the territories of pre-war Poland" - so says one of the heroes of the book. The main enemy of Smersh is the "underground nationalistic organization" whose core is made of "Polish officers and non-commissioned officers of the reserve, landed bourgeois elements and intelligentsia." This is the description of the main enemy quoted by Bogomolov in "In August 44..." However, 30 years later the author adds this footnote: "AK - the underground Armed Organization of the Polish government in exile at London, operating in the regions of Poland, Southern Lithuania and western parts of Ukraine and Bielorussia. During 1944-45, by orders from London, numerous units of the AK performed diversional actions behind the Soviet Army lines: many officers and soldiers of the Red Army and Soviet workers had been killed, there

was spying activity and looting of innocent civilian population. What strikes us in this footnote is the lack of the slightest allusion that the AK could have performed actions against the Germans. On the contrary, there is a statement that there was "spying." The reader must guess that this spying was done on behalf of German Command. The troubles which Smersh runs into on the territories described, are explained by Bogomolov as caused by the "lack of culture of the local populace - Poles and Belorussians. All of them - so called 'Westerners' - are intimidated and backward people. For the whole month we hadn't met in any village a single man who would have been educated higher than 3-4 grade. Our Russian people are more cultural."

In difficult circumstances, among uncultural people the heroes of the novel operate: wise, courageous and smart workers of Smersh. Bogomolov tells us with pride that in their professional gibberish they call themselves the "cleaners" - they clean the country of enemies.

"In August 44..." is an adventurous story about the capture of mysterious radio-station and liquidating the enemies: spies from the AK and spies - the native people. The enemy is not the Germans; they don't exist in the book; I guess, they must have been beaten; who remain, are the Poles and Russians - enemies of the Soviet power. If only this topic was in the book, it could be *per se* very interesting as a reflection of the most actual sign of repressive politics. But, Bogomolov goes further. He shows us the highest authorities, the men on top, the men who use Smersh as the arm of their power. In the first place, there

is Stalin. The leader appears in the novel as a theoretician of action, military swindle and cunningness. "During the first weeks of war" - writes Bogomolov - "during the period of unbelievable tension - he - Stalin - could afford to study very scrupulously all the works of the prominent field commanders and strategists, with special interest in the problems of military secrecy and security against any surprise." The wise leader knew what he was doing: the problem of secrecy, of hiding everything that is happening in the Soviet Union prevails even now. Nobody should know the truth, and how to hide the secrets - teaches comrade Stalin. However, Stalin gives only the theory, general directives, which are executed by "a young general-colonel, Stalin's pet." Bogomolov paints the portrait of the pet with a great feeling: "Big, light haired, with open, somewhat common, but very Russian face." Author, so far, doesn't mention the name of the enormously sympathetic man. But his name is well known to the Soviet, nay - not only to the Soviet - people. It's Victor Abakumov, in 1943-45 the chief of Smersh, and in 1946 the minister of national security, and later - but that was already after the death of Stalin - executed for the so called Leningrad affair, for applying tortures to hundreds of Leningrad Party members and liquidating them by the order of Stalin. Bogomolov rehabilitates Abakumov - executioner "with open...very Russian face." The expression "very Russian" means the highest degree of praise and esteem in the present Russia.

In the book there appear - rather anonymously - some leaders about whose faces it would be difficult to say if they were "very Russian" - the chief of NKVD, Beria,

and of KGB, Mierkulov. Perhaps, for this reason Bogomolov doesn't praise them, though he admits, that they worked pretty hard too.

The delights from the theme of Bogomolov's novel appear in the *Literaturnaya Gazeta* (1/1975) under the headline: "The unknown heroes." The author of the review, B. Galanov, states that there wasn't yet any Soviet literature about smersh-men, who "deserve the deep gratitude of the Soviet people." That's not true. Vasil Bykov in a novel "Deceased don't suffer" brought to life the person of lieutenant Sachno, a smersh-man in all his splendor: brutal, merciless executioner whom the soldiers fear incomparably more than they fear Germans. Grigori Baklanov too, showed a smersh-man in his novel "July 41" - here again, of little intelligence, conceited, brutal yokel overwhelmed with having unlimited power, in front of whom, everybody dies of fear. Literature hasn't missed Abakumov either. Exquisitely written pages are devoted to him by Alexandr Solzhenitsyn in his "First Circle," especially in the chapter titled "Please, Josef Visarianovich, Give us back the death penalty!" where we can see the character of the minister of security beautifully portrayed.

B. Galanov is right only in one point - nobody yet painted the smersh-men so rosy, nobody yet praised them so abundantly, nobody yet made them look as men who secured the victory in the war.

Without a cause - the Russian proverb says - even a pimple won't grow up. Similarly, the dreadful story of Smersh, didn't grow up without a cause. We may guess the

reason for the publishing of the book, and this guess is from nowhere else but the pages of the ex-liberal *Novy Mir* edited by Sergey Narovchatov, ex-poet, presently a Party functionary.

The novel points out the most important enemy: Emigrant (with Poland, Bogomolov, must, apparently, have some old "account" to settle down). The book gives the Soviet youth a new positive hero Tomantsev, a master of shooting in "Macedonian fashion." * James Bond is just a puppy in comparison with him. On the other hand, it's quite possible that there is another reason for the appearance of the book. During the last months, the gossip about Brezhnev's illness hasn't been leaving the pages of the world press. The disappearance of General Secretary for a long time, may be caused by his illness, or, may be, it results from some inside politics of the Politbureau. In both cases, the problem of succession is open. And there are many candidates for successor. Perhaps, the present boss of the KGB, Yuri Andropov will give it a try. In such case, he would, no doubt, try to build up a greater respectability for the organization which he directs. What can be more effective than the active participation in a glorious war? But, putting aside Yuri

* We may rest assured that this definition of shooting on the run with the weapons in each hand, and many other definitions from the jargon of smersh-men, will certainly enrich the Russian language.

Andropov's prospects, we must say that the respectable, "loved by the nation organs" such as Smersh, will become handy for anybody who will be reaching for power during the period of changing the leader.

Adam Kruczek

Fragments

Vol. 2/6

July 1975

by

Charles Joel

Fragments

Vol. 10

1917

THE
FRAGMENTS

THE BALL ON THE "TITANIC" STILL GOES ON...

by

Jerzy Boniecki

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 3/330/1975 published in Paris, France.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

Published by Correspondence Home Study of Languages, Sutter Creek, California

Printed by the Essicc Company, Sutter Creek, California

The first number of Kultura for 1975 brought the review of the "Mankind at the Turning Point" - Second Report for the Club of Rome, by A. Gutowski (Fragments vol.2/5). As we remember, the first report prepared by the MIT of Boston and published 3 years ago as "The Limits to Growth" has really created a shock-wave of criticism because of its conclusions. Its authors pointed out the necessity of radical changes in life of nations and individual inhabitants of our globe if we are to avoid the catastrophic results of crossing the limits of the Earth's physical resources exploitation. They openly stressed the primitive character of their studies; they underlined, that, by no means, they claim to block the economic growth, that, rather, they advocate the change of its direction toward an equilibrium and a just disposition of wealth and resources of the world. Moreover, they insisted many times upon the fact that their report doesn't represent any future "vision of the world", but points out only the consequences of the dominating trends in the world's affairs.

After reading "The Limits to Growth" it hasn't been difficult to detect the agreement of its conclusions with our intuitive appraisal of the contemporary world. It hasn't been possible also to suppress the feeling of pessimism, so far from being realistic was the postulate of full international cooperation that was put forward by the authors as a condition for avoiding the catastrophe. Nothing unusual then, that we greeted with hope and pious thought,

all critiques of the MIT works, and waited for the moment when somebody upsets the apocalyptic predictions. The news of discovering a would-be miscalculation in one of the computerized models of MIT half year after the appearance of "Limits to Growth" (and not proven), made one look like a sinking man who grasps for anything.

Presently, in a similar manner, as it can be seen from many announcements, many people are attempting to interpret the reports of Professors Mesarovic and Pestel.

During the past 3 years "Limits to Growth" was a subject of unavoidable disputes, scientific meetings, and critiques. The weak points or errors have been shown and continued research undertaken; But, the basic findings of the report remained (regrettably) unchallenged. The Second Report - "Mankind at the Turning Point" didn't appear suddenly either. It has been forecasted by the Club of Rome a year ahead of its official appearance. In fact, this report is nothing but a continuation, or a logical consequence and development of the first one. What's more important - its conclusions do not differ much from the conclusions of the MIT report, so that introducing both reports respectively in the categories of "pessimistic" and "optimistic" is not only an unfounded simplification, but completely untrue.

The scientific observation of technological and social development of the world, of trends and consequence in planning the future and avoiding a global crisis is a new field. It would be unjust

to treat it as a one more, exquisite, young discipline. The critical situation of the contemporary world, and, above all, the constantly growing interdependence of all countries and individual inhabitants of our globe, simply, forces us to look upon most of our problems in global categories. Every attempt of applying a scientific methodology in solving these problems, instead - as till now - of relying on general experience and intuition of statesmen and their advisors, is worthy of our attention and support. For this reason only, Prof. Dennis Meadow doesn't "deserve" the sarcasm of Gutkowski when he calls him "the learned prophet."

The conclusions of existing researches show beyond any doubt a very difficult world situation. They fortell the necessity of sacrifices for the sake of (after all unknown) the future. It may seem, that preceding statement justifies the most common tune of sarcasm and forbearing tolerance in criticizing this kind of research works. Nevertheless, let's try to stop talking about those careless, often emotional critiques, and concentrate on learning more clearly about the problems and methodology research initiated by the Club of Rome, and on the world's reaction after publishing its results.

The Problematique

The genesis of the Club of Rome was prompted by the conscience of a deep, universal crisis of the contemporary world and the ambition to make a trial for its overcoming. The crisis covers almost all

areas of our life: unbalanced ecology, raw materials, inflation, monetary system, education, the repulsion of traditional moral values, the abyss that divides the rich and the poor countries of the world, terroristic activities, and many others. In everyone of these areas the existing symptoms have a universal, world-wide character. Beside, all aspects appear to be interdependent to such a degree, that not only the solution, but also the understanding of any of them become impossible without the knowledge of all. Furthermore: The efforts of finding a solution to a crisis in one area appear to be impossible because they deepen the scale of crisis in other seemingly unconnected areas. This applies also to every effort of finding a solution to a crisis within the boundaries of any specific country. It all shows how greatly entwined in one entity is today's system of our globe.

This knot of interdependent problems has been defined by the founders of the Club of Rome as *problems of mankind* (*The Problematique*). The Club itself began in a completely informal way at a meeting of a small number of scientists and representatives of the economic world from different countries, which took place in *Accademia dei Lincei* of Rome in 1968. Hence the name of the club. The following meetings were in Vienna in 1969 and Bern in 1970. The founders of the club, among others were, Aurelio Peccei of Italy - ex-director of FIAT and OLIVETTI, Alexander King from Great Britain - the director of O.E.C.D. (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) in Paris, Eduard

Pestel - Professor of the University of Hanover and several others. The membership of the club has been limited to a 100 persons representing many different countries. To the club belong leading scientists and industrialists, representatives of research institutes, etc., of the world.

As a loose, informal body, that has no permanent personnel or budget, the Club of Rome undertook the task of inspiring scientific research in the *Problematique*, popularization of its results and endeavor to work out alternative directions in development of the world treated as one global organism, as a World System. Naturally, the first step was a choice of the methodology of research.

Systems dynamics

This is the name of their accepted methodology. Its creator is Prof. Jay Forrester from the MIT at Boston. His theoretical assumptions were introduced in an elaboration under the title of *Counterintuitive Behavior of Social Systems* (3). At the base of this method lies the following easy to understand thesis: The human brain has not been adapted to interpret the functioning of social systems. During the long history of the human race evolution, *homo sapiens* had no need for understanding them. Hence, the evolutionary process had not armed him with the ability for the proper interpretation, and, in particular, with skill of understanding the dynamic development of the systems whose part he had become. Those systems are no longer a simple chain of causes and effects, but a conglomerate of many variables

or relationships, reciprocally joined by what is technically called feedback loops. From this short description of Forrester's thesis emerges the usefulness of his method in research of the world systems. He tested his methodology on simpler systems that functioned on the same dynamic principle. They were the systems of great corporations and municipal complexes of the USA. There were many interesting observations made by him during these tests. It appeared, for example, that when in the complicated dynamic systems - in order to solve any specific problem - a fully competent man with good will makes a decision, it often leads to results contrary to the one expected. On this characteristic Forrester based the principle of specific c o u n t e r i n t u i t i v e behavior of social systems.

From here, only one step to typifying a tool which will be used in Forrester's method - a computer model. In this place it would be worthwhile to realize, that all our decisions, in our private as well as in public life, are always made on the basis of the models that are built up by ourselves. They are, of course, models created in our brain and constructed on the understanding of a definite chain of causes and effects which our limited individual imagination dictates. The, as if by compulsion, individual relationships of causes and effects, chosen by us, are never able to comprise complicated situations that are in constant move and development. And, this is why the basic element of all our decisions are our personal experience and intuition.

The logical consequence of the above statement is a fact of enormous weight: even a comparatively simple computer model for researching the dynamics systems is a tool much more perfect, than human brain. It doesn't mean that we must accept blindly all the results of the computer calculations. But, we may see, that a prototypical computer model built by Dennis Meadow, which is the base of the First Report - "The Limits of Growth", comprising only several hundred aggregates, is a great step forward, in comparison with the limited ability of the human brain. The works of Pestel and Mesarovic looked at from this standpoint, are gigantic: there are about 100,000 relationships stored in their computer. It is important to realize too, that the theoretical assumptions of Forrester are the base of both reports.

The Limits to Growth

We must state that this simple title of Meadow's report expresses in full the quintessence of his research.

In the disputes on the crisis of the contemporary world we often hear the argument that many different crises known through history, had, at the end, passed away, so that any excessive pessimism is completely out of order. On the surface, is is a logical and historically justified argument...but only on the surface. Our present days are characterized by the unknown at any time in the past s c a l e of projects and problems and the s p e e d with which all changes happen. Here lies the essence of a special different character of our days.

In order to understand the consequences of this state of affairs, let us stop for a moment at the well known mathematic formula of so called *exponential growth*. This formula is applied in all cases of investment of capital at a definite interest, assuming that the interest is always added to a principal sum. It is interesting, that all of us have something to do with it in our daily life, but very rarely, we think about the consequences of its work from a far distant perspective. So much less, we are prepared to observe its work in relation to great numbers, in a scale of world events. For seizing the meaning of this formula it is worth while to think in terms of *d o u - b l i n g* the principal sum. Examples: An investment at 7 percent annually doubles during 10 years. At 10 percent - during 7 years, according to simple equation - $d = 70 \div p$, where d is a cycle of doubling and p - annual interest.

The intended size of this article doesn't permit me to introduce to the reader even superficially the principles of construction of Meadow's (or of Pestel/Mesarovic) model. But this is unimportant for understanding the results of their research. What is important, is to look at the problems through the prism of doubling the cycles. Only then we may realize the frightening effects of this phenomenon. Let's illustrate it on the examples of population growth and the rate of raw materials exploitation.

In 1600, the population of our globe was 500 million. The doubling of this number took 200 years, to the year 1810.

The percent of growth was increasing constantly and the next doubling cycle lasted only 120 years: in 1930 the world population was 2 billion. The next doubling cycle is much shorter. This year, that means after 45 years, the population will be four billion. At the present rate of growth which is 2% annually, the next doubling cycle will shorten to 35 years! It isn't difficult to realize the frightening consequences of all this. If we wanted to sustain the standard of living of all nations of the world on the level of 1975 - we would need during only 35 years, to double the number of roads, hospitals, schools, houses, jobs, etc., etc., not to mention the postulate of improving the present existing conditions.

Analogous is the question of exploitation of world raw materials. Let's take the example of aluminum. According to the USA statistics of 1970 the known resources of this mineral were 1.17×10^9 tons. At the observed 6.4% rate of consumption these resources will last only 31 years. Indeed, it is difficult to visualize the dynamics of *exponential growth*. Assuming, that as a result of further exploration, the aluminum resources will grow 5 times this will provide the world with aluminum for 24 years longer, which means for 55 years instead for 31! We assumed that the rate of consumption of aluminum will be sustained. It, further means, that the doubling of demand will occur every 10 - 12 years period.

The same phenomenon lies at the base of the present energy crisis, in particular, in blackmail committed by the Arab countries against the USA (as only this addressee counts on the check - board of *power*

politics). The rate of growth of world demand for energy (oil - holds first place) is 5% annually. This means the doubling of demand every 14 years. In 1960, the USA was not only self-sufficient in oil, but even could export certain amounts of it. Hardly 13 years later, in 1973, the USA became dependent on imported oil to the extent of 30%! We wonder often, why the Arabs, had hardly 1 1/2 years ago begun their threats of cutting the oil supplies, and why they did not use this power much earlier? Fact is, that the conditions for using this kind of blackmail came to light very recently - proving how fast the doubling of great numbers dominated by *exponential growth* appear.

Coming back to the studies of MIT, they covered 5 main parameters of the world system: Population, capital, food, nonrenewable natural resources and pollution of environment. The study proved, that all these parameters increase at the rate of *exponential growth* and, that the effects of their increase are being felt in all sectors of world system. The slowing down of the increase in one sector, by no means, solves the problem. Of course, the basic question is the population growth. No need to discuss it wider. But, it is important to note that the postulate of bringing down the population growth to zero isn't limited to the Third World countries only. It is true, that the rate of population growth in these countries is highest and it creates an obstacle for rising the standard of living there. But, from the standpoint of world raw materials resources consumption the lowering of population growth in the industrialized countries is much more important:

each inhabitant of these countries consumes several times more raw materials, than each inhabitant of the poor countries.

Adding up, the report of MIT points out the global limits to growth and postulates diminishing of growth and change of its course. Also, it predicts, that should the present course be continued, the world will face a catastrophe, probably before the end of a hundred years.

It is very characteristic, that from the view point of the discussed problems, there is no real difference between Capitalistic and Communistic industrialized countries. In both, the postulate of maximal rise of gross national product (GNP) lies at the base of economic systems, and is on the pedestal of the highest aspirations of nations and individuals. We are far, that's for certain, from an attempt to deny the citizens of peoples republics the right of having a refrigerator, washing-machine, or car. But, on the other hand, we can easily discover the tragic results of human ambitions concentrated on rising the materialistic wealth in the western countries. This, of course, results from the principles of Capitalism in which human needs are constantly and artificially created, in order to keep the production of materialistic goods on the high gear.

The MIT postulate of lessening the race for the GNP growth doesn't, at all, mean a restraint on economic progress. One can easily imagine, for example, the switch of economic activities from the sector of production to a sector of services.

In closing the discussion on the report of Professor Meadow, I would like to add, that he stressed the permanent, and growing division between the rich and poor countries; that in the global system to which we all belong, this process cannot exist forever; that more sharing of all riches and resources of the world is necessary. In all, it means the shifting a great part of capital, etc., from the industrialized to the underdeveloped countries. The increase of standard of living in the latter will be connected with decrease in the former.

The next phase

The publishing of the MIT report in March 1972 was the beginning of intensive activities of the Club of Rome. Even before the appearance in print of "The Limits to Growth", the results of MIT studies were introduced on the, for this purpose organized, two conferences in Moscow and Rio de Janeiro. The intention of presenting the report to both blocs, was a warning, that the importance of the problems is far beyond the borders of any political divisions of the contemporary world. We all are the passengers on the same ship, and joined by the ties of a complete interdependence. However true and important this statement is, there is no need to prove, how far all this is from being recognized by the world's political leaders!

No doubt, the MIT report made a great impression on all and created a shock all over the world. Many justified critiques and remarks notwithstanding, the report has been the first scientific diagnosis of the world's serious sickness, and its basic

thesis will be difficult to upset. In different countries the local organizations began to act, undertaking the task of studying further the problematique, in particular its consequences in relation to geographical regions of individual countries. In Japan and Holland - countries where, because of the high density of population, the symptoms of the crisis are particularly strongly felt, this activity - finding the alternatives, has grown in force. The Dutch edition of "The Limits to Growth" has been published in several hundred thousand copies - symptomatic for the country of 12 million inhabitants. A special team of specialists made an evaluation of Holland's future in the context of the world crisis, and introduced concrete alternatives of development in a brochure "The Work for the Future" (4). Local groups of the Club of Rome were also organized in the countries that are in comparatively better situation, such as Canada and Australia where soon will appear "Australia Tomorrow" (5) and, at last, in Vienna in 1973, there came into existence a scientific institute "The International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis" (6). It embraces specialists from all over the world and all scientific fields. It is led, in turn, by the delegates of the USA and the USSR. On its forum, for the first time before the publication of "Mankind at the Turning Point", the results of Pestel and Mesarovic research were introduced and disputed upon. It would seem, that, though, slowly, the outline of international cooperation and structural base for curing the world's sickness, are created. No doubt, it is true, but is this process not too slow, not foreclosing in advance eventual action? The race with time is the essence of the Club

of Rome dilemma, of its frustrations, at whose base lie, simply...the centuries old characteristics of human nature.

And, perhaps it is better to bury one's head in the sand.

Along with the phenomenon of popularizing on a large scale the disputed problems, we may observe some tendencies to trifle with, or to disqualify the results of MIT research. Although, at some points, they took the form of realistic critique, in fact, and often the authors of the report were confronted with accusations that were far from the truth and in many instances proved that the critics, simply, did not know the text of the report. Moreover, there were many signs that a great part of the public opinion decided to reject the report's conclusions simply because... it is easier, much easier to put one's head in the sand.

From the research on the results of permanent production of materialistic wealth, there, of course, emerged a postulate, that the GNP idol should be taken down from the economy altar. It has been pointed out, that the countries of the Third World shouldn't blindly follow the steps of industrialized countries and repeat mistakes which led to an unbalanced ecology, etc. From this, the Third World countries concluded, that the whole problematic defined by the Club of Rome, its efforts and proposals, intend to keep the rich countries in their privileged position and to block the development of the poor. In this manner, the latter will never have a chance for reaching even in part the economic level of the former. This position has been strongly demonstrated on the

forum at the World Conference on Environment Protection, organized by the UNO in Stockholm in 1973. The delegates of the poor countries almost unanimously stated that the whole problem of ecological crisis had been cooked up by the rich countries. Only the special efforts of the conference organizers saved it from a complete fiasco. The final resolution had, at its best, a declarative character and didn't, in fact, create any basis for a concrete action. Such in short, was a platform of critique chosen by this group of opponents.

As far as the people whose position would have the greatest influence in starting any positive action are concerned - politicians, statesmen, the leaders of the Western world, not to mention the Communistic bloc, they...simply did not take any position. We may, with only a little exaggeration, state, that the conspiracy of silence has taken the problematic as a proverbial taboo. The fact, that many nations created the departments of environment protection and began to penalize for its pollution, doesn't mean, of course, that the definite steps have been made. We cannot treat then even as some half-measures, because the problems are much more important, many-sided and demand action on a completely different scale. But, for record, we may add, that even in the region of environmental protection, meaning in the easiest aspect, there cannot be noted any real achievement. We pass by the small "victories" on some local fronts.

In all, with not too many exceptions, our leaders ignore the diagnoses that emerge

from the Club of Rome works. We may, however, speculate, that the ignorance of the western politicians results from their fear of the voters' reaction toward advocating unpopular steps; that our leaders are interested in the current problems which do not extend, generally, beyond 3 or 4 years of their mandates. We leave the assumption why similar position has been taken by the Kremlin for the sovietologists to solve. But the fact is that the leaders of both blocs, in this respect, show surprising unanimity. Since we talk about the voters, we must admit that they don't, in the least, cooperate in easing the problems. When in 1972, Mansholt spoke on the problem of slowing down the mad race for accumulation of the wealth in the West, the French Left accused him of representing the interest of Capitalists and of acting against working class (Fragments NOL/7, August 1974 - Editor's post script).

What now?

Meantime in the framework of the program for further studies, the teams of specialists, working in particular fields, endeavored to perfect the method, to widen the numerical base for obtaining more precise results. We cannot, in this article, even begin to enumerate all conducted works.

Facing the indifference of politicians and statesmen, the Club of Rome organized a special meeting in Salzburg, in Feb. 1974. The main objective of the meeting was a dispute on the necessity of joint action for a new "global responsibility" and preparation of unified global strategy. Only the unified

effort of all countries may save the world from the apocalyptic catastrophe. Not counting the Chancellor of Austria, Kreitzky, who was the host of the meeting, there participated the premiers of Holland, Sweden and Canada and the leaders of Tunisia, Senegal, Switzerland, Mexico and others. The membership has been limited, in purpose, only to the smaller countries: Delegates of both super-powers, and also of France, Japan, Great Britain, Germany and Italy, have only been notified about the conference. Perhaps in order to avoid refusal of the invitation, it has been the most skillful handling of the matter. Very characteristic is the fact, that the reviews of the conference in Salzburg appeared in a small format on the far, inside pages of the leading European papers. Their headlines and front pages must have been reserved for the more important news, such as local strikes, a kidnap of a millionaire's daughter, etc.

The last event of the Club of Rome activities was an annual international conference, this time in West Berlin, in Oct. 1974. The most important problem before it was introduction to the public the Pestel and Mesarovic report. There was continuing stress on the necessity for the fundamental change in international relations and obtaining a unity needed for the solution of the predicament of mankind. Either, there were more voices demanding, that not the physical limits, but the socio-political and international obstacles, may, in the last count, become the cause of the catastrophe. There is no question that a man is able to stop the blind, with increasing speed running train. Will he do it?

What's new in the report of Pestel and Mesarovic

Firstly, they perfected the computer model and used in their research a great number of variables. Secondly, they didn't treat the world as one uniform entity, but divided it into groups of countries that are in a similar stage of development and have similar problems. And lastly, they introduced in the method of studies, the options for us, by experimenting with a certain number of variants (scenarios) in specific courses of action.

The "Mankind at the Turning Point" attempts to introduce to us the concrete, constructive (though, perhaps unrealistic?) propositions of solutions. Pointing and constantly stressing the interdependence of the world nations, it calls for the resignation from nationalistic aspirations not in the name of altruism, but one's own interest and need. It puts, as a leading question, the need for mass shifting of wealth from the rich to the poor countries.

In general, however, it confirms the conclusions of MIT work from 3 years before. Confronting us with concrete propositions, Pestel and Mesarovic call for action. Only in this sense, their report may be considered as optimistic. In the preface to their book they resume their conclusions:

We believe that unless the issues treated in this book are mastered, there will be no disarmament of spirit and arms, and the disparities in the world will eventually drive mankind over the brink into a final destruction.

Poland's participation

Poland has taken part in the activities of the Club of Rome for several years. The members of the club are Pajestka and Shaff. Prof. Kalinowski represents Poland in the Committee of the Vienna Institute. Polish Economic Publications published translation of "The Limits to Growth".

Where the term homo sapiens came from

Is a man able to rise over his innate egoism and greediness? Whether, facing the greatest crisis of mankind - "The last judgement on the Earth" - he will find heart for necessary compromise? Is there a hope for resignation from national aspirations on behalf of the global international community? Can we sacrifice our short term, immediate interests for future long term equilibrium? It would seem to appear, that all of us have at heart the well-being of our children; in this sense, every generation should be deeply interested in the fate of the next. But, is it indeed? Shall we avoid nuclear suicide? Shall we be able to work out the principle of new ethics? All this in the name of mankind's survival?

It is difficult today to find a wise-man who can answer there questions. The only exception is...Adam Shaff. As a chairman of one of the conferences of the Club of Rome in Berlin, he proposed the solution to all problems by applying.....Marx doctrine!

Sydney, Jan., 1975

Jerzy Boniecki

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) *Mankind at the Turning Point*, E.P. Dutton and Co., Inc. New York, 1974.
- (2) *The Limits to Growth*, Potomac Associates London, 1972.
- (3) *Counterintuitive Behavior of Social Systems*, Technology Review, Vol. 73, NO. 3, Jan. 1973.
- (4) *Work for the Future*, Stichting Maatschappij En Ondereming, The Hague, 1973.
- (5) *Australia Tomorrow*, by Prof. Charles Birch. This book will appear this year. The author is the professor of Sydney University, leading ecologist and member of the Club of Rome.
- (6) *The International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis*, Background information and provisional research strategy, Luxenburg, Austria, 1973.

Fragments

Vol. 2/7

Aug. 1975

by

Charles Joel

FOOD FOR THOUGHT (3)
(excerpts)

by
Juliusz Mieroszewski

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 5/332, 6/333 - 1975, published in Paris, France.

Editor and Translator - Charles Joel

Published by C.H.S.L., P.O.Box 744
Sutter Creek, California

Printed by the Essicc Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

I

For years, every Thursday, I have bought *The Listener*. It is the BBC's weekly magazine which publishes its best and most interesting articles, putting in print all that was said over the microphone in different broadcasts of the BBC.

The Listener never recalls or corrects anything - because the BBC never reports any news that hasn't been checked at least by 3 different independent sources. Owing to this method and tradition of the highest class of news reporting, the BBC enjoys the exceptional respect of its listeners in Great Britain and abroad.

The facts and figures that are used below are taken from the article "Vladivostok and the Will for Power" written by Lawrence Martin (*The Listener*, Feb. 27, '75).

One could summarize this article in one sentence: The Soviets maintain the dialog and diplomacy of summit conferences and, at the same time act with full vigor in a direction completely contrasting with the spirit of *détente* spending on strategic nuclear arsenal 150% more than the USA.

Are these gigantic expenditures going to bring any concrete political dividends? Martin justly observes that the West, America in particular, wouldn't meekly accept the presence of the Russian fleet - literally anywhere - if behind this fleet were not present the 2nd, or perhaps the 1st nuclear power of the world.

The Soviets helped the oil producing countries to stiffen their bargaining position. They also supported the Arabs, and during the war in 1973, moved the nuclear warheads to Egypt.

Since I haven't heard anything on this matter in any other sources let me quote the Listener: "...now apparently confirmed Soviet movement of nuclear warheads to Egypt during that war..."

A precedence is most difficult to find in any situation. If the Soviets did it once, there is no reason to suppose that they won't do it again in a similar situation. If they had armed the Egyptians with nuclear warheads, there is no reason to doubt that they will arm the befriended Syrians with them too. The matter has a special accent when one considers that Syria and the PLO (Palestinian Liberation Organization) intend to create a joint military command.

It isn't known what had happened with the nuclear warheads delivered by Russians to Egypt in 1973 war. Have they been returned to the Soviets, or do they stay hidden somewhere in the Egyptian silos?

At the time of writing these words (mid-April) Cambodia is dying and the situation in South Vietnam is hopeless. And in the USA, the Congress refuses aid to Cambodia. We watch now on TV the agony of Phnom Penh, the stampede of frightened people, piles of dead, crowds of tattered and hungry children, and overcrowded hospitals. Does it occur to any American senator to think, that the European partners of America, watching the

tragedy of Cambodia may think: this is fate waiting for us when one day Russian tanks start to move. If the USA is not willing to help its Asian allies - what assurance is there that in the case of danger it will help us?

But each coin has its 2 sides. So, the European-American relations have their two sides too. *The Guardian* is right assuming that the source of the present American isolationism lies in the Vietnam complex. This isolationism is expressed in a popular, though vulgar, saying: "*If the sons of the bitches don't want us as world policemen - why don't we save a buck or two?*"

On Vietnam and, similarly, on Watergate, there were thousands of articles and hundreds of books written. But the majority of authors have missed the basic aspect of the Vietnam complex. Aggressive Communism is an enemy of all of us. The goal of NATO is not a collective defense against Japan or Germany, but against aggressive Communism.

During the Vietnam war, Americans - those who were pro-war, as well as those who were decidedly against it - felt and feel even now, that during these bloody struggles they were abandoned by their allies who hadn't offered America anything but a critique often unjust and always venomous.

I'm not and I never was an admirer of Dr. Kissinger's foreign politics. Neither am I inclined to believe, that the summit conference in Vladivostok was a success from the standpoint of American interests. Annoying must be the attitude of the Secretary of State who at a certain moment burst out: "What

in the name of God is superiority?"

Not long ago superiority was a clear cut and precise term. *Superiority* meant that America excelled the Soviets in every area, in particular in nuclear capacity. Today, after SALT I and after SALT II - the term *superiority* has lost its original meaning, mainly because it is impossible to compare the "equal" categories of atomic weapons. It seems to me, that the most objective index in this matter is the figures of defense budgets. During the period of the constant curtailment of the American defense budget, the Soviets' defense budget increased 20-25 percent. The Soviets spend 150% more on their nuclear arsenal than America does.

It is well known that in today's recession, unemployment and other signs of economic depression, are universal. But, we don't realize the fact that the social reactions to those signs must be deeper in rich America than in other countries. Let's take as an example unemployment. England has about 800,000 unemployed out of total population of 50 million. Unemployment as a problem stays permanently on the pages of the British press because Britishers think that unemployment higher than 1/2 million is a catastrophe.

In California, which Americans and Europeans as well, for decades have called the garden of Eden of the Earth, unemployment is 10%. The same 10% unemployment in England would mean 3 million people without work. A British government which would allow this scale of unemployment to occur, wouldn't stay in power for even one month.

In the present economic situation it is not surprising that the Congress of the USA found it difficult to give more aid to Cambodia and S. Vietnam - because the help should be given firstly to millions of Americans who have no work. The isolationistic slogan that foreign politics is impossible and unnecessary, is, of course, nonsense. Foreign politics is not only possible but necessary, but no doubt, it demands gigantic sums. World foreign politics is a costly business and carries a risk of involvement. The Americans, after the Vietnam experience, are afraid of being involved. The polls of public opinion have shown that over 70% of the Americans don't wish to be involved. Both houses of Congress, in this case, reflect the opinion and conviction of a large sector of American citizenry.

The article of Martin in *The Listener* has the title: "Vladivostok and the Will for Power." It seems to me, that the will for power was in the past a base for political action of any world power. Either, it seems to me, it would be a mistake to search for the cause of the atrophy of the *will for power* in the growing number of unemployed or in the energy crisis that is one of the signs of universal economic crisis.

Despite the crisis, America is enormously rich and would be able to fight Communism in Cambodia and Vietnam with money and military-technical help.

The Soviet imperialism which has "plenty of will power" stands on the same ideology in whose name the Communists of Portugal, Vietnam and Khmer Rouge in

Cambodia fight.

There was a time that even America had world ideology. There was a time when President Kennedy declared that the USA will give any kind of help to every oppressed nation which decides to defend its freedom and independence.

The atrophy of the "will for power" in America is a complicated problem. The Congress refuses aid for Cambodia and S. Vietnam not because there is no money, but because the old scale of evaluation has lost its drive. Since Kennedy's times there has been a change of social and ideological climate.

In Cambodia, Vietnam, the Middle East and in certain European countries such as Portugal, we witness the greatest retreat of America in her history. One of the British military commentators expressed his opinion that this retreat is comparable only to the retreat of Napoleon from Moscow.

It is difficult not to be pessimistic in the appraisal of the mass strategic retreat of America. On March 27, the press agencies reported that according to the latest estimate of public opinion, the American Public is against involvement of the USA in Indochina, the Middle East and Europe. The Americans would go to war only and exclusively to defend Canada.

From the politics of Dr. Kissinger nothing is left but ...*détente* - of course, if one believes in that charade. Personally, I don't believe in *détente* but

I don't lose my trust in America. Not to believe in America would be equal to disbelieving in the Free World.

II

In the March issue of Kultura there appeared a very interesting and important article of Jerzy Boniecki "The Ball on Titanic still goes on" (Fragments, Vol. 2/6).

This article is an example of a clear and logical presentation of the complicated and difficult problems, without any deformations and popularizing simplifications.

From the group of problems that are tied up together and reciprocally affecting each other, I'm choosing the problem of growth because I wrote on this subject many times before.

The best way of illustrating the problem of growth, which, as I stressed, is a "sacred cow" of Capitalism, is by comparing the population growth figures.

In 1600 the global population was 500 million. Doubling this figure took about 300 years. The next doubling period lasted 120 years. The doubling period following this was again much shorter. This year, after only an elapse of 45 years, the global population will be 4 billions.

If the population growth continues to increase at the present rate of 2% annually, the doubling period will shorten to 35 years. In other words, in the first decade of XXI century this globe of ours will be inhabited 8 billion people.

The works and studies quoted by Boniecki, especially "The Limits to Growth," have shown that the global system is governed by an interdependence of everything and everybody, so that decreasing the growth in one area is not enough; we must do it in all sectors of the global system: population, capital, food, raw materials, pollution, etc.

There is no basic difference in these issues between the capitalistic and communist countries. In both, the economic growth is measured by the GNP - an idol to which everybody prays.

I'm convinced, that the authors quoted by Boniecki are right in concluding that the rate of growth in every sector of the global system must be decreased and simultaneously there must be a change in the direction of the growth.

What Boniecki doesn't mention is, that if the quoted authors are on right track - the Western world needs a changed culture and a new and different social philosophy. The existing philosophy of progress, based on the assumption that the majority of processes and changes is always leading to a better life, became a base for not only liberal but also for socialistic thinking. The industrial revolution, the successive stages of the workers' fight, all have been pointing to the unbreakable chain of progress and conclusion that the social evolution develops along a proper line.

Professor Zbigniew Brzezinski, who condemned "The Limits to Growth" as the *peasimistic manifesto*, in one of his works, called our

attention to a cultural crisis, especially in the USA.

Of course, progress must not necessarily mean the pillaging of natural resources in the name of fast economic growth. But, accepting as an ideal a zero, or greatly reduced economic growth, we must resign ourselves to accept fewer luxuries of our lives.

The central social idea of today's West is equality expressed by a just share in national wealth. This equality is not static. Several days ago, one of the leaders of the British Trade Unions - in a radio audition - stated that we should build up England which would be able to produce more, export more, and pay ever increasing wages to the laborer.

We shouldn't be surprised at it. The first phase of the industrial and technological revolution that lasted to the end of the 2nd World War, brought enormous profits to capitalists and minimal gains to the working class. Not until after the war, the Labor Party government and socialist governments in other European countries brought radical changes in the situation. The industrial workers - miners for example - are comparatively better paid so that it would be extremely difficult to sell to them the concept of zero economic growth.

And here lies the reason why the *Problematique* Boniecki writes about is in the hands of scientists and intellectuals and not of politicians. Any politician who would include theses of "The Limits to Growth" in his political platform wouldn't be elected either to the Parliament or to the

The American unemployed, or a worker threatened by unemployment, lives in hope that in a year or so the recession will end, the factories will start running "full ahead," unemployment will be reduced to a minimum and wages will increase. Who may wonder that 8 million unemployed in the USA think this way?

The sociologists and economists, specialists in environment pollution, themselves alone, cannot change anything. The large scale process of re-orientation of society is necessary. It isn't enough that some groups of scientists and intellectuals stop to pray to the idol of GNP. The cult of the GNP which expresses conviction that money is a solution to all problems, is a philosophy in which many generations of the industrial West lived. That philosophy would have to be discredited in the eyes of men. The program of re-education of youth and university students would have to be created. Who would pay for it? Surely, not those who like Prof. Brzezinski think that "The Limits to Growth" is a pessimistic manifesto. What's worse, is, that to this category of people belong a majority of the USA Congress.

Where is an escape? If the authors of the works discussed by Boniecki were right, then the facts will confirm their theoretical conclusions. The facts will convince everybody. The pronunciation of facts is beyond any dispute. But often, when the facts begin to talk, there is no time for changing the course of events. Let's hope that this won't happen.

In this complicated contemporary world - on the far edge - is Poland. Poland may be compared with a u-boat that has, for the time being, enough oxygen and food supplies, but whose mechanism for surfacing is damaged.

The Polish Peoples Republic is, and at the same time, is not a State. Sovereignty in the classic sense in the case of Poland doesn't play any important role. In Europe, none of the states has a classic sovereignty. A state doesn't need to be 100% sovereign, but the people must have the constitutional rights of expressing their will. European Community nations, signing the Rome Treaty resigned partly from their sovereignty, nonetheless, the French, German, or English peoples have the constitutional rights of making their decisions.

But, let me at this point say a few words about public opinion. In the Peoples Republic of Poland there is no public opinion - as we know it in the West. Public opinion is powerful when there are independent mass communication media. But, it would be a mistake to think that without the independent media there cannot be an authentic public opinion. Independent public opinion is created by the independently thinking people. Wherever there is a lack of independently thinking people, there is no public opinion.

Only a man who is informed, meaning a man who can see the difference between the seed and chaff, can think independently. In contemporary Poland, an intelligent man has many difficulties in seeing the truth. The talks with visitors from Poland convinced

me, that only a small percent of the Polish intelligentsia knows the whole truth about Yalta, Katyn massacre, etc. All with whom I talked, without any hesitation blame the Russians for the Katyn massacre. But only a minimal percent of them was oriented regarding the evidence on which the accusation of Katyn massacre is based.

Poland is in a much worse economic situation than England. She has very limited possibilities for borrowing capital from abroad, and real wages of Polish workers don't increase, but to the contrary - decrease.

We don't want to prognosticize; we don't wish the Polish people have any crisis; we only state, that if the crisis deepens, if this year's crop of grain and potatoes fails, the consequences of recession in Poland will be deeper and more difficult to handle than in France, or England.

The intelligentsia of the present Poland has no illusion and knows that it will never step forth in mass, never organize any big manifestations, not to mention a strike. From its side comes always a pathetic and rhetoric question: What can we do?

The answer is: Not much. The influence of intelligentsia on working class is almost non-existing. Intelligentsia must recognize the workers as the most powerful social force, and must get their total support. It can be done only by solidarity with workers in critical moments. In 1968, the universities were

at a boiling point. But in December 1970, when the workers' blood was shed in the northern provinces, the students quietly and meekly went home for Christmas vacations.

From my conversations with visitors from Poland, I concluded, that there are two Polands. One, the Peoples Republic, official and belonging to the Party. And another, an incomparatively smaller Poland of people who would like to have independent free elections, Democracy, etc. The Poles of both Polands hate Russia and Russians - this is all that unites them.

The international situation of Poland would be much easier and advantageous if Poles were of the black race. Without any efforts we would have all the Western world on our side. But it would be untrue to consider the color of the skin as a deciding element in this context.

What I want to say is, that Poles don't demand free elections but the black Rhodesians do (very noisily) in their country and elsewhere. In Great Britain, everybody knows that there is a Rhodesian problem, but nobody even supposes that there might be the Polish problem.

The Polish problem must be shown in the international arena. To give life to the Polish problem we must concentrate on one undisputable postulate. We cannot, at this moment, demand annihilation of Yalta because this demand won't find any understanding among foreigners. But we must, loudly and stubbornly, demand free elections supervised

by an international commission. This is a postulate that will be understood by every Britisher and American. Nobody in the West will question the merits of this postulate.

In the disputes with foreign correspondents the Czechoslovaks, always, stubbornly, return to the "Prague Spring" of 1968. Preserving their anonymity, they build up in the eyes of the West a conviction that the Czechs and Slovaks are democrats who wait impatiently for the next round of the fight for the democratization of their country's system.

In comparison with Czechs and Slovaks there is nothing to be heard in the Western press about Poles.

Periodically, many western correspondents visit Warsaw. The job of an active member of the Polish intelligentsia should be getting in touch with them and giving them not only the true picture of the Polish Peoples Republic, but also to inform them about the endeavors of the actively thinking section of the Polish society.

The one percent of intelligentsia that thinks honestly and courageously, should incorporate the idea of union with laborers. Should that not happen, even a very serious revolt of workers will be appraised by the West as a manifestation whose purpose is only to obtain lower prices of food. Only the intelligentsia can give the workers' manifestation a mark of the real political action.

At the time of writing these words (mid-April) the Communists are 45 kilometers from Saigon. How could this happen? When the dust settles down - as the English say - it seems to me the historian will pass judgement that the main culprit of disaster were civilians. When the panic bursts out in one village, then in the next neighboring villages it grows twice as strong. When it reaches one town, simultaneously it spreads twice as strong in another. This is how a stampede of refugees is born. A stampede which in the last stage of S. Vietnam war seized 2 million people. These millions of panic stricken people in towns, villages, at the seashores, and, above all, on the roads and highways, made it impossible to regroup the armies, causing their demoralization; strategic towns were left to the enemy without one shot fired. The Americans estimate that the S. Vietnamese armies threw away in helter skelter run, military equipment valued over \$800 million.

Several years ago I had read an article written by a military expert who said, that if the Soviet panzer divisions crossed the Rhine river there would be a panic of such dimension that any military operation would become impossible to undertake. All the roads would be crowded to such extent that from the military standpoint they would be non-existing.

Vietnam confirmed this theory. There appeared a new element for consideration by the military strategists. This element is a panic, emotional fear of Communist invasion. An army defending a country must have a disciplined, ready to help, civilian people on its side. But, when the people change into a mad mob of millions, occupying airports, railways, sea

ports and highways, the organized defense becomes, simply, impossible.

The Paris Treaty of Jan. 1, 1973 - for which Dr. Kissinger and Le Duc jointly received the peace Nobel prize - had nothing in common either with honor, or victory, or peace. It safeguarded only the release of war prisoners and gave the Communists an assurance that the American forces would be evacuated from Vietnam. Those who insisted that S. Vietnamese would be able to stand on their own without American help - mainly without the support of the airforce and navy - either lied, or were deceiving themselves.

President Thieu received an assurance from President Nixon, that in the case of a new offensive from the North, American bombers will support the S. Vietnamese forces. Nixon was gone and the Congress took a negative stand in this matter.

It has been clear from the beginning that American concern is no honor, victory, but only the extradition from a troublesome situation and safe evacuation of the USA forces from Vietnam.

Hanoi doesn't want to create any kind of "coalition government" in S. Vietnam, but only a unification of all Vietnam under its banner.

On April 13, 1975 China warned Washington that the help in equipment or food and

evacuation of civilians wouldn't save South Vietnam from Communism whose victory in all Vietnam is assured.

Had President Ford - against the *War Act 1973* and against public opinion in the USA - sent to S. Vietnam an expeditionary corps, he could have today on his hand a reaction of Peking, which very probably couldn't have been limited to breaking down the Sino-American *détente*.

We shouldn't disregard the fact either that the gigantic American retreat from S.E. Asia must have been a shocking experience to all Asia, including China. This retreat must have strengthen the Chinese pro-Soviet fraction giving it a new argument: So far, nobody has forced the Soviets to any strategic retreat. Only America pulls out from the entire front, not the Soviets. In addition, the pro-Soviet Chinese may argue, that the *War Powers Act* unables the President of the USA to undertake any active help to the threatened nations of Asia.

China is governed by old men, who, according to biological law, will vanish from the political life during the next 10 - 15 years. Nobody can guarantee whether the new generation of Chinese leaders will not seek an agreement with the Soviets, the more, that in the vast territories of Asia, not America, but the Soviets appear to be the only super-power.

The agreement between Peking and Moscow would create a new global situation. The so called "free world" would shrink to a critical size. It would be interesting to know whether Washington is prepared for this eventuality. It is certain that the American re-

treat from Indochina will make the agreement between China and the Soviets more probable.

The defeat of S. Vietnam and Cambodia occurred during the most difficult time in the modern history of the USA. Watergate was a Waterloo in the fight between the Presidency and the Congress. For the first time in history a "strong" President, elected by the overwhelming majority of the voters, was forced by the Congress to resign. President Ford is a son of this unprecedented historical USA defeat. The critics of Dr. Kissinger should remember that the Secretary of State had lost his operational base - the omnipotent White House.

No doubt, during the talks with Hanoi, Kissinger made many mistakes. Among them, he agreed to permit the stationing of North Vietnamese forces in S. Vietnam. At the time of the spring offensive of Communists in Cambodia and Vietnam Kissinger couldn't do anything because there wasn't a "strong" president behind him.

It seems to me too, that the intelligence on the highest level had failed. It should have made deep and intensive sociological and economical studies whose results could have provided the proper answers to the questions: Why was Vietnamization a complete fiasco? Why was the morale of the N. Vietnamese soldiers overwhelmingly greater than that of S.V. soldiers? This kind of research undertaken on a large scale would have brought to light a strange Vietnamese phenomenon: On one side, Communism frightens and creates problems of a massive stampede of

refugees, and on the other, Communism to millions Vietnamese is attractive and creates the ties of uncomparable loyalty. The question why is the Communism attractive is one of the basic problems of our times.

On April 17, Dr. Kissinger publicly announced that "we will never forget that China and the Soviets were supplying the armies which defeated Cambodia and S. Vietnam," but the *Realpolitik* ordered New Zealand and Australia to recognize the fact that America has nothing more to say in this region of the globe and that the evacuation of Americans from Indochina was an irrevocable and complete fact.

As rightly observed Churchill after Dunkirk - nobody has won a war by evacuations. The Americans suffered enormous military and political defeat, the meaning of which cannot be hidden or diminished.

In the USA, which went into a stage of "licking its wounds," many voices proclaimed that 50 thousand American soldiers who died in S. Vietnam lost their lives in vain. I have read that even President Ford expressed an opinion which could be interpreted along this line.

We should contradict all these opinions with all our might. The American soldiers who had fallen in Vietnam - even if we accept the fact that they defended a corrupted regime - were opposing in the battlefields the Communist tyranny, the gloomiest tyranny known in the history of mankind. Nobody who fights against it and nobody who perishes in this fight - gives his life in vain.

The Fallen Americans in their soldierly graves had not seen victory, but defeat. But this is not the last page either in the 200 year old history of the USA, or in 2 thousand year old history of Indochina.

Cambodia - since the times of Cuba - is the first country that has been conquered by the Communists. Either in this case, or in any other cases - not excluding E. Europe - Communism has been brought by force and is kept by force.

I'm convinced that the danger of Communism's attractiveness is a much greater force in Europe than in S.E. Asia. We cannot, regrettably, exclude the possibility of spreading Portugal's political inflammation to Greece, Spain and Italy. America has shown such a great helplessness in dealing with the Communist conspiracy in Cambodia and Vietnam, that the weakening of American influence must have reflected on the "countries on the brim". The democrats and anti-Communists of Portugal, Spain, Greece and Italy, must have come to the conclusion that America can no longer be considered as the greatest anti-Communist force of the world. America is only the greatest non-Communists force of the world.

Perhaps along with the changes in America there are some changes going on in the Soviet Union too? Perhaps anti-Communism is not an actuality anymore today and is not needed?

Prof. Z. Brzezinski, an excellent professional sovietologist, in his work "America and

the Triple Crisis," writes: *Also the role of the Soviet Union is changing dramatically. Instead of being a symbol of revolution it is today increasingly the symbol of stability and social conservatism in a very turbulent world.*

From the above quotation from Professor Brzezinski's work one would conclude that not Kissinger but Brezhnev is the Metternich of XX century. "...Symbol of stability and social conservatism in a very turbulent world." It is literally beyond my imagination how a learned connoisseur of Communism can make such a statement on the second day just after the greatest defeat of the USA in Indochina where as the result of the Soviet propaganda and supplies of the most modern military equipment - the Communists turned into nothingness years of lasting efforts of Americans who didn't spare money, material and their own blood to stop the red avalanche. If the politics of the Soviet Union in Indochina is "social conservatism" and "symbol of stability" - it would be very difficult for me not only to agree with Brzezinski, but even to try to understand the criteria which allowed him to make such a conclusion contradictory to the realities.

If these opinions are proclaimed by an academician, a "learned in scriptures" sovietologist, then what one can expect from the senators of the USA, who are not learned sovietologists?

The Soviets - it is well known - finance and help the Communist movement in Portugal. It seems very probable that in exchange for their help they will get bases on Madeira and Azores. If the American politics

doesn't undergo radical changes - the "portugalization" will embrace Greece, Spain, and perhaps, Italy. Then, the Soviets, as a bastion of "social conservatism" and "symbol stability" will triumph not only in Indochina, but in Europe also.

The difference between America and the Soviet Union is not expressed in the fact that America is in retreat and the Soviets are victorious on all sectors of global front. If it were the case, the difference could be referred to only as the strategic positions which may change at any time. Regretably, the differences go deeper. The Soviets know perfectly well what they want and consequently reach for their targets. In contrast, Americans stopped being a "policeman of the world" and after resigning from this position, cannot yet find a new role for themselves.

Not the Soviet Union - Dear Professor Brzezinski - but America should become the symbol of *stability*. I trust that it will happen one day.

Today, when I'm ending this article, the Communist flag has been hoisted on the presidential palace in Saigon. The inhabitants of the capital were greeting the columns of N.Vietnamese tanks with thundering ovation.

South Vietnam is a classic example of a nation which was entirely depending on foreign help. Anti-Communism existed for as long as there was money, equipment, supplies - everything flowing like a river from America.

S. Vietnam fought for as long as it had unlimited help.

In the moment when American help ended, the whole concept of independent non-Communist Vietnam fell down like a sand castle.

The conclusion to be drawn from the Vietnam experience may be put in one sentence: Even America cannot defend any nation against Communism. Every nation threatened by Communism must alone defend itself against Communism. And only a nation which really wants to defend itself, deserves help.

In America, there began a general and detailed analyses of Vietnam tragedy. President Ford and Dr. Kissinger proclaimed re-orientation and reconstruction of the global American politics.

Juliusz Mieroszewski

Fragments

Vol. 2/8

Oct. 1975

by

Charles Joel

- Zbigniew Byrski The USA Today
- Brukselczyk
An episode from his "Kissynin and Dobrynsinger"
- D.M. America and Balts
- G.H. From the Czechoslovakian
Chronicle

THE USA TODAY

It appears once more that things don't look so bad, as they could always be worse. Hadn't the USA militarily responded to the capture of "Mayaguez" by Cambodia and put instead all this matter through diplomatic channels of intervention, it would become synonymous with the final and irreparable eradication of America not only as an ally of many countries, but also as a power on which one may count in general. It would become impossible for many to cherish a hope that the nation which was unable to secure the safety of its ship and crew captured giddily by Khmer Rouge, would take a position of an ally in more dangerous situations.

On the other hand, in the performance of Mayaguez recapture itself there wasn't the slightest risk of any international confrontation involved. Behind ideologically unidentified revolutionaries of Khmer Rouge stood nobody who could offer them military help. They could count only on the moral and political support of all the so called freedom or anti-American movements, the Chinese Peoples Republic and on some organs of the European press - mainly French. The only trouble which President Ford could expect was the eventuality of internal confrontation with the Congress and American *mass media*. It seems to me that, in general, Gerald Ford is more afraid of confrontation with the Congress and American press, than of confrontation with the Soviet Union.

Despite the fact that "Mayaguez" affair cannot be evaluated better than of microscopic dimensions, to many Americans who still believe in their country as sleeping giant which will wake up one day - the

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 3/330, 7/334 - 8/335/75, published in Paris, France.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

Published by C.H.S.L., P.O.Box 744
Sutter Creek, California.

Printed by the Essicc Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

recapture of the ship and its crew was a shot in arm of optimism and made them believe that trust in America is still alive in the countries threatened by expansion of Communism and that this trust will be greatly enhanced. This belief, in my opinion, has no foundation of any rational character.

For some time, the American press - the one which breaks loose from the political monopoly of *mass media*, asks the question: "Is it safe to be an ally of America?" Its answer in general negative terms sounds: very dangerous; it is better not to count on America. I think that this press should put forward a more direct question: "Is it safe to be America?" But, since the axiom of American economic and military power still prevails - nobody asks this question. And here an American who loves to measure everything in tons and billions, succumbs to a very dangerous illusion, because the country which has a \$90 billion defense budget and the most advanced military technology but has no will power to fight, is only an illusion of power. It is even more helpless than the poor and dumbfound Kingdom of Siam which protested against using its bases for Mayaguez operation, in order not to offend Laos and the mysterious revolutionaries of Khmer Rouge, who one day might be tempted to evacuate the whole population of Bangkok - the way they did with 3 million citizens of Phnam Penh.

In all, despite the temporary animation and a wave of optimism created by "Mayaguez," the process of disintegration of American society continues.

On May 12, in New York Central Park there

was a celebration of the catastrophic defeat of the USA in Vietnam. About 50,000 young people gathered there to honor the 1st military defeat of the USA, calling it "The Victory of Peace." Since peace has never followed war and, in general, as history teaches (if it teaches anything), the defeats are always preludial to much bloodier wars - one may doubt the propriety of this name. But, one of the characteristics of the leftist demonstrators is that doubts never penetrate their brains. In any case not to the extent which would persuade them to consider how tragic and ominous was the meaning of all this show. Besides, some of them openly celebrated not so much the "Victory of Peace" as the victory of N.Vietnam which was visible in Hanoi and Viet-Kong flags waving here and there. From this standpoint, the demonstration was unanimous, at least it was clear what it is all about.

A few days before the celebration in New York Central Park and the Mayaguez operation, President Ford delivered a speech to the cadets of the Military College in Tulane. He stated that for the USA the Vietnam war is over. He made a mistake, because it is not over, but the mistakes of Gerald Ford were unimportant here. What is important was the reaction of the cadets - the adepts of military art. Their reaction was commented on in the *New York Times* by Mrs. Clare Booth-Luce, a politician of the old generation and the ex-ambassador of the USA in Italy: "The statement of Pres. Ford has been received by the cadets in Tulane with enthusiasm that may be compared with the euphoria of the English people when Chamberlain in 1937 returned from

Munich and proclaimed the peace for the living generation."

The enthusiasm of cadets is more astonishing than the general feelings of American public which by a small majority expressed that it would be ready to fight but only to defend Canada. And that's probably because it doesn't, generally speaking, believe Canada will ever be threatened by war. Either it seems that cadets to whom President spoke were happy not only because they won't be sent to Vietnam but also because they won't be sent to any war anywhere.

The cadets in Tulane are professional soldiers. Besides, the present American army is an army of volunteers who had chosen the military career as profession. If the reaction of these cadets - future officers - reflects the feelings of the whole American army it would mean this army is an army of pacifists. We may have respect for the pacifists especially if they are ready to risk their lives for pacifism. But a professional soldier-pacifist may be only compared to a fireman who, for a high salary and other benefits connected with this dangerous job becomes a fireman under the condition that he will never be called to a fire. The reader has the right to doubt whether the Pentagon - the art of war engineers, not its lower echelons - takes position of an appropriate tolerance in this matter.

The American press, long since describes the Pentagon more or less in the same manner as it does the Moscow *Prawda*, which doesn't need, I think, any further comments. That's why it is worth while to return to a somewhat reminiscent to Mayaguez infamous story of the

spy ship "Pueblo," a unit of the American fleet, which was captured 8 years ago by patrol-boats of North Korea. The crew of the Pueblo surrendered without firing one shot, without even destroying all the secret documents. After a year of humiliating imprisonment in N. Korea, the crew was freed, but the ship was never returned. About a year ago, American TV presented a dramatized version of Pueblo's capture; the guiding motive of the show was that the first and the most important duty of the ship's captain is not - as one would think - the execution of an order, but the safety of the crew. If this motive were accepted as a rule and applied to all armed forces, then the most practical way of protecting the lives of soldiers, would be dismantling all the armed forces, and sending them home to civilian life. A 100% certainty of their safety would be achieved. Of course, TV in the USA may show to the public anything it wants and it isn't the business of the Pentagon to polemize with it. Nevertheless, several months ago, some strange event occurred. All the members of Pueblo's crew, except its captain, who was released from command of the ship and sent to retirement, received medals. This episode resembled slightly another one which happened in France in 1940 where French soldiers who abandoned their positions and run away but somehow kept their weapons in hands - received medals too. It looked even worse, as the Pueblo's crew members had no chance to run away. They could only fight or surrender. Anyway, the Pentagon decided that they deserve the honor of distinction and gave them medals.

It would be unfounded to ascribe to all

the military this pacifistic approach, but the attitude of some of them doesn't in the least collide with the feelings of the American public. True, the overwhelming majority of the public doesn't celebrate "The Victory of Peace" and doesn't brandish the flags of Viet-Kong but, locked in their small circle of daily life - around business as usual, inflation and family problems - falls into a state of indifference. After the Vietnam experience, America, turning away with fear from everything that might threaten her with any international conflict, is, in fact, sterilized of will to fight. In this aspect lies the popularity of *Détente* which not long ago under any other circumstances could have been acclaimed as a cheating card of a gambler.

Let me add that the feeling of defenselessness against the "home made" banditry which, with or without "noble" calls, practices murder in the streets of big cities, corresponds with the feelings of indolence in facing an international threat. More! The indifference of a commuter in the New York subway, before whose own eyes the throat of another commuter is cut open, proves something more dangerous. The indifference of what is happening to the nearest neighbor as long as oneself is not endangered, means the disintegration of the elementary social ties at the base of society.

The present American Congress called by enthusiastic liberals a Congress of "Young Turks", and by others - more appropriately - a Congress of "grave Diggers", unfortunately, reflects in full the profile of American public opinion. Dr. Kissinger is more and more under its influence. After

The defeated *Détente* there is no visible scar left on his skin. On the contrary, with the stubbornness of a maniac, he continues his beloved fiction and has in it the full support of the Congress. It doesn't necessarily mean that the Congress didn't decipher the actual capitulating issues involved in *Détente*. But was there somebody to say that America should not capitulate? The next day after operation "Mayaguez" Kissinger announced that "there are boundaries beyond which America will not be pushed." Where are those boundaries? As Kissinger expressed this assurance in the context of intervention against Khmer Rouge and the rescuing of the American ship, one may be afraid that those boundaries are neither in the demarcation line of Korea nor on the Elbe River, nor on Rhine. With all probability, none of the Presidents nor the Secretaries of State will ever be able to define them. They remain in the behavior of the Congress whose guiding light is not the repulsion of punches, but avoiding them by a retreat to more distant, strategically more comfortable positions. The problem is that these positions are more comfortable not to America and her allies, but to the victorious armies of Communism.

Several American correspondents have stated with a certain surprise that after the fall of Vietnam the so called "domino theory" long since discredited, appeared to be not a theory at all, but a common practice. But the fact that in a few days after the occupation of Saigon there followed the fall of Laos, and present prospects are that it will happen to Siam, Malaysia and, in the not far distant future, may happen to Burma, Indonesia, Singapore and Philippines, doesn't seem

in the least to bother any American. Worried about the high price of gasoline and doctor's bills, living in the homes built of illusions, the inhabitants of cities, towns and villages dreaming of life - far away from the conflicts of Europe and Asia as they always have been dreaming since and including Roosevelt times - forgot that the Globe has shrunk immeasurably and that, in strategic terms, their "potential adversary" as Pres. Ford tactfully called the Soviet Union, is presently much nearer to them than yesteryear's distance between Paris and Berlin.

* * *

The crisis which torments America and all the Western world is not *sensu stricto* a political, economic or social crisis. Mieroszewski, in one of his articles rightly said that there is a need for an alliance between Socialists and Conservatists. But he didn't touch the most important question why there is a sense in talking presently about something which several decades ago was basically considered to be a paradox. If one wanted to explain why there is a practical need for an alliance between those two forces one should define the present "Conservatism" in America.

The problem is not simple because "Conservatism" of the nineteenth century or even of the first years of twentieth century was entirely different that the present one which manifests itself in the adaptation to the political postulates, or perhaps more accurate, in opposition to political trends which dominate the world, is in fact a desperate attempt to preserve certain tradi-

tional moral and ethical values which again in theory and practice were never, and even now are questioned, even by those who in practice departed from them. Among those values I would include the cult of bravery and disdain for yielding to violence in a sense of physical harm as well as of blackmail. Further, the cult of national and personal honor which, of course become highly illusive in any attempt of defining them. Then, the contempt for hypocrisy which in politics, irrespectibly of every political system, demonstrates itself most visibly in flattering the masses. As we know, the Communist as well as Democratic government's, either the bourgeois bureaucratic structures of the 3rd world, flatter the so called common men, in a manner which simply appears to be dogmatic. The public accusation of "masses" of anything "wrong," regardless of the real manner in which they are treated, would, under any geographic latitude, be considered as the worst kind of blasphemy. The restoration of values of the old unquestionable imponderabilia implies the political course of Conservatism in the developed countries. But in reality the cult of honor, or modestly speaking the cult of national dignity, doesn't seem to consider human life to be the highest value which should be defended at any price - even if it would mean the future escalation in human losses. In addition, the cult of honor - is just what the leftist liberals repel. Strictly speaking, there is no one who could without fear of being laughed at, put the "honor" as a value which hasn't lost its proper meaning. In any Western country, a desperado who could have courage to defend this immemorial but never too old imponderabilium - would be drowned in

a flood of accusation of hypocrisy, lies and selling out the interests of masses - including the 3rd world. He would be branded by public opinion as a shameless cynic who from an old store-room of imperialistic values tries to pull out an old instrument which since ages served to deceive and to exploit the masses.

It would appear that the contemporary world, more than ever, needs a leader of Winston Churchill's class. In America and Europe there is a striking lack of really prominent political personalities. However we must remember that Churchill was never able to convince his countrymen about the approaching danger of 2nd World War, although in those days the danger wasn't a camouflaged world conquest which used every possible means to lull our suspicions. On the contrary - it was an open and unceasing challenge thrown in the face of Europe. But despite this, the recovery of the world's senses came at the moment of catastrophe.

It appears that the permanent characteristic of human nature is procrastination of confrontation to the last moment when it is too late, when for disregard of warnings one must pay the high price in received blows and defeats.

Zbigniew Byrski

An episode from Brukselczyk's "KISSYNIN AND DOBRYSSINGER"

Dawn was showing through the curtains of the Kremlin's windows when Brezhnev said:

"Well, Comrades, time to end. Let every member of the Politbureau, in one sentence express what he thinks should be put on the list of our orders which I am going to submit at the next meeting with President Ford..."

"I think" - said premier Kosygin - "that Americans should build for us a complete computerized administration system of our economy."

"I think" - said Gromyko, Foreign Affairs Minister - "that Americans should construct for us a complete communication net for exploitation and transportation of the Siberian resources..."

"I think" - said Marshal Grecko - "that Americans should build for us an entire rocket production industry, of course, for the civilian use only."

"I think" - said the boss of the KGB, Andropov - "that Americans should build for us a full radar control system of our land and air boundaries, of course, in civilian aspect only."

Brezhnev listened, made notes, thought for a while and finally said:

"No, Comrades, I have better idea. I'll simply ask the Americans to build Communism for us..."

AMERICA AND BALTS

In April, 75 the *New York Times* reported a growing anxiety among the American Balts (1,600,000 persons) in connection with the approaching Geneva conference: Does it look as if the USA were going to approve the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, by the Soviet Union? Edward J. Derwinski, Republican Congressman from Illinois, known for his activities in the problems of Eastern Europe, tried to force the State Department to unveil its position in this subject. He introduced a resolution signed by 68 members of the Congress, calling the USA government to confirm once more that it does not acknowledge the seizure of the Baltic States by the Soviets. At the same time, the American Balts began to flood the White House with letters, petitions and telegrams.

The result of these activities was a letter written to Derwinski by K.B.Jenkins, a high official in the State Department. "As far as I'm personally concerned" - he said - "this should eliminate any doubts with regard to the American position on the Baltic States question." Further, Jenkins wrote: "The State Department confirms that the American policy of nonrecognition of the forced incorporation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union, remains unchanged." He added that the American delegation to the Peace, Cooperation and Security Conference will not agree to any formula that would approve of incorporation. In the letter there was also a statement that the conference will probably accept a final document in which there will be underlined the principles of "peaceful changes of boundaries", "self-determination" and "human

rights." All of this was supposed to balance the Balts' disturbing question of "intangibility of boundaries," which too was enclosed in the final document.

Dr. Kazys Bobelis, the chairman of American - Lithuanian Congress, announced: "For years, the Russians have tried to get a formal recognition of the brutal occupation of the Baltic nations. It will be great if the conference approved the principle of self-determination."

One month later, the same *New York Times* published a report of James Clarity, its special correspondent in Leningrad. Here is how it begins: "The USA, through its consulate in Leningrad is diluting the 35 years old politics of nonrecognition of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia's incorporation by the Soviet Union. The western diplomats here feel the gradual but undoubted tendency of America toward factual, if not formal, recognition of the Soviet Baltic States."

The American consulate in Leningrad - the report continues - was opened 22 months ago: From this time, according to western diplomats, American political, economic and cultural contacts with the Soviet Baltic States, grew up very significantly. Joseph Neubert, the American Consul in Leningrad, stated in an interview that American politics of nonrecognition hasn't changed, but he admitted also that in practice he is the Ambassador of the USA in all 3 republics; since his appointment 8 months ago, Neubert visited Vilna, Riga and Tallin, meeting there (of course to keep face) not with the high functionaries of governments and the Party,

but with their assistants. Neubert devotes a lot of his time to the Baltic Republics and it is he, not the American Ambassador in Moscow, who writes reports about the Baltic States to the State Department. Correspondent of the New York Times cites an opinion of American diplomats: The pressure by the Soviets toward the formal change of American politics here is not being felt; the Soviet Union appears to be satisfied with the present state of affairs; the formal recognition will not come soon, but it is inevitable.

Meaningful is the closing paragraph of the report: "The Baltic States governments in exile still keep their official recognized agencies in Washington. Some of the diplomats here point out that the leaders of Baltic immigrants, citizens of the USA, are ageing and in time the opposition against the Soviet control over their native lands will come to an end."

D.M.

The American consulate in Leningrad - the report continues - was opened 25 months ago. FROM THE CZECHOSLOVAKIAN CHRONICLE: On the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the Czechoslovakian Peoples Republic, a group of scholars from the two institutions closed after the invasion of the Czech Republic, The Institute of Sociology at The Academy of Sciences and The Institute of Population Research made an underground polling whose results in typed copies circulate in Prague among oppositional circles. There were 2 questions to answer:

the polling form: "How do you evaluate the 30 years of our Republic?" and "What do you expect to happen after the European Peace, Cooperation and Security Conference?" There were 209 persons who participated in poll during Febr. and March, 75. The number of pollsters by age groups: Half - from 30 to 50 years; quarter - above 50 years and quarter - below 30 years. The composition of pollsters by nationalities: 9 Slovaks, 2 Hungarians, the rest - Czechs; by sex: 151 males, 58 females. This underground polling has been discussed by J. Pelikan in Milano's *Il Mondo*.

The answers of only 115 persons to the first question reflected embarrassment and as if self-restraint; the second question induced more frankness and was answered by 187 persons. About 50% of pollsters 30 years or more old answered the first question, more or less, as follows: "It is difficult to pass a generalized judgement. In the area of socialization results are sufficiently positive, but the materialistic enrichment goes hand in hand with moral impoverishment. The opposite side of some equalization of incomes is annoying decline of all moral values. What has been born, is a contempt of a man toward a man, and the spirit of mutual tolerance is gone. The false egalitarianism has been artificially created: An inefficient but politically active worker belonging to Party, has more to say than people from other social classes." A graduate of philosophy, presently a manual worker, 41 years old said: "Demagogically and unceasingly they are telling us about everything that has been done during the so called Socialistic Republic, forgetting to add that the whole world (including Africa) went for-

ward socially. One would like to have a chance to find out what we could have attained without so called Soviet help, or, if the leadership of our economy were not in the hands of mullets. Watching our neighbor Austria, we are ashamed. It's a pity that in 1968 the world had not understood us. I am still a socialist but I want the Socialism with a human face."

To the second question (What do you expect from the European Peace, Cooperation and Security Conference?) 138 pollsters answered - "Nothing!" Some of them added: "at least as far as we and our country are concerned." Only 33 persons expressed hope that the Soviet garrisons will leave, some normalization of political life will follow, and Czechoslovakia will obtain sovereignty. The following are some individual, characteristic voices: An employee of the Prague transport system, 48 years old: "I think that the only country which truly wants to help us is China, and perhaps West Germany. Americans don't care at all. Wasn't it Johnson who approved of the Soviet invasion?" A high school teacher of history: "When was it that the Russians by their own free will gave up any territory? The West will die of democracy and naivety. In a few years, Austria, Yugoslavia and perhaps some of the Scandinavian states will count on 'international' help of the Soviet armies. Americans will sent a protestation saying that if anything of this kind happens again, they will have to call out a summit meeting. And that will be all." An intellectual, 46 years old: "The conference doesn't apply to us... the exchange of information will be organized in such a manner that the *Voice of America*

will continue broadcasting and the good stations will be silenced by virtue of political agreements." An employee of an air line, 38 years old: "For God sake, don't bother me with these questions. The West will do everything that the Russians want...perhaps only China is frank in her relations with small nations." A laborer, age 27: "I remember too well August 1968; immediately after the occupation, the West had sworn that it will never forgive the Russians. Now, it forgot its oath...dirty business. I sympathize with the Vietnamese people; I think that Brezhnev will soon get the Nobel peace prize." A farmer, senior citizen: "They abandoned us for the first time in 1938, for the second in 1948, and for the third in 1968. And always in the name of peace. Why then the present conference must not legalize the occupation of our country? In the interest of peace of course." A surgeon, 53 years old: "I don't believe that the socialistic countries will back off on the conference. It would be against logic. The governing clique will never give up. Even if the Russians had withdrawn their occupational forces, they would leave a team of special 'advisors' in civilian clothes. On our 'demand' of course. It will be interesting to see who gets the Nobel peace prize." A wife of a political prisoner: "Don't ask me, I can't be objective. I have been sad when Brandt visiting our country shook hands with those who keep my husband, a social - democrat too, in a prison cell. What will happen in Geneva and Hesinki? In sport's terminology, the political competition will end in a tie and the recipients of the first place award will be the Russians."

G.H.

Fragments

Vol. 2/9

Nov. 1975

by

Charles Joel

(Editorial from Kultura) The Seal

(The statement of the Russian writers) The Measure of Responsibility.

Adam Kruczek In the Soviet Press

THE SEAL
(Editorial from Kultura)

On the tenth of July on the inside pages of Geneve's big dailies there appeared the news which may be expressed, more or less, as follows:

The Soviet success at the Security and Cooperation Conference in Europe. 30 years after the end of the Second World War the Conference of the Peace and Cooperation in Europe avows and officially sanctions the boundaries which resulted from the last conflict. 35 nations participating in the conference agreed to "recognize them as mutually intangible." The conference sealed the basic principle of Détente East - West replacing the peace treaty which had not been signed in 1945. From the legal standpoint yesterday's conference on the shore of Lemman Lake ended the last world conflict. The elaborate text created a proper base for calling the general European conference. Moscow's main goal was to extort from the West an obligation that its territorial conquests of the 1939-1945 war shall not be questioned; in other words, Moscow wanted to have the legalization of status quo and received full satisfaction.

It doesn't matter whether the modest and, purportedly discretely published communique from Geneve is read as news about the actual end of the Second World War, or - following Solzhenitsyn - as news about the natural epilog of the 30 years of the Third World War. What is real is the seal of approval of all her conquests which Russia demanded (and received in full) for

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 9/336/75, published in Paris - France.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

Published by C.H.S.L., Sutter Creek, California

Printed by the Essicc Company,
Sutter Creek, California

herself; the reality of this approach is greatly desired by Russia for the formalization of her superiority over the West. About her "ex-potential adversary," one may, using the words of Solzhenitsyn, say: "Another 20 or 30 years of peaceful coexistence - as full of glory as the preceding 30 years - and even the name - The West - will be gone from the face of the Earth."

So, the road to the ceremonial drive in Helsinki has been paved; Ford (with an umbrella or without it) will be able to proclaim proudly *Peace for this generation*, and Brezhnev (with much more substantiated pride) to accept it with clasping hands and a kiss on both cheeks. The introduction to this historical moment in the propaganda style of the circus has not been neglected: the Apollo-Soyuz loving embrace in the cosmos has been performed. In order to eliminate any eventual doubts as to what Ford will say in Helsinki, his Secretary of State considered it as proper, two days after the communique from Geneva, to explain why he advised the President against the reception of Solzhenitsyn in the White House: "I recognize him as the greatest contemporary writer, but such a gesture would today be harmful symbolically and, what's worse, it would be wrongly interpreted by Moscow. The logical conclusion of Solzhenitsyn's political views is the nuclear destruction of mankind." In other words, the seal ordered by Russia from her "ex-potential adversary" should not be tarnished by the smallest crack. It is difficult to find a better confirmation of the old and tested maxim of Chancellor Oxenstiern, or, of more striking proof of the stupidity of a man who in private confessions exhibits his "responsibility for the

fate of mankind" and instantaneously assures his countrymen that "America will not be pushed beyond defined boundaries." She will be, She will be... The seal that has been offered to her for nothing with the accompaniment of the *greatest show on earth*, proves it. The "defined boundaries" of concessions exist in any political or social crisis, but the crisis in which America and the whole West are living is uncomparatively deeper and, above all, it is a moral crisis. When there is no will to fight, when the belief in the importance of freedom and elementary principles of national and human dignity are lost, there is no end in yielding the boundaries of concessions.

In our East-European sector, the seal of Geneva and Helsinki, definitely crushed the remnants of our illusions which though progressively weakening, still lived in our souls despite many new incidents that were incessantly emerging in the countries conquered by Russia and among the political immigrants. The trust in the West and America has been irrevocably destroyed and Brezhnev gave it a first class funeral at the expense of his "ex-political adversary." What remains now is counting on the processes of change in the Soviet Union and the resistance movement in chained to it countries of "limited sovereignty"; a reckoning which for years has been the guiding principle of *Kulturs's* activities. Whoever sees in it a faint or never to be fulfilled hope, let him show us an alternative. Today, after the Geneva seal, it is the *only one* that's left. From now on, in the work aimed at the breaking of this seal, the Eastern Europeans, Free Russians and the inhabitants of the Soviet

republics, shall have another additional anniversary: so called "Free World" led by America.

June 22, 1975

POST SCRIPTUM

The developments at the "maxi-summit" in Helsinki and circumstances connected with it, may be expressed in several most important points:

1. On the way to the "maxi-summit", Ford visited Poland where (according to the great American press agency) the people gave him a "polite, correct, but lukewarm" reception. Passing through Warsaw the presidential limousine planned to make 3 stops for "making direct contact with the crowd." The third stop was called off because the two preceding were not too encouraging. One of the western press commentators wrote that a "frail enthusiasm with which the Poles greeted Ford is worth at least 3 units of political science in Harvard." A noble, but exaggerated comment: the Secretary of State doesn't give a damn for such lessons as the reception at Warsaw, and to the President with an eye on the next election, the Polish stage of his travel to the "maxi-summit" was only a small game (Polish votes in the USA).

2. The quintessence of the Soviet foreign politics has been defined in the Brezhnev's speech in one crucial word: "Humanism." It is "humanism" which motivated Brezhnev to state that the USSR believes in the principle of nonintervention by one state in the affairs of the other. Its interpretation

among the listeners varied: the pessimists talked about a "brutal kick aimed at the third basket," the optimists thought it to be a noninterference in the internal affairs of the "peoples democracies." The American Secretary of State evidently took the side of the optimists as he called the Brezhnev speech "conciliatory" and "moderate." But, already the next morning there was the earnest whisper passing among the American delegation that, the speech was ambiguous. The same day in the *New York Times* there appeared an article that projected 3 possibilities: the speech was "ambiguous"; the USSR decided "to remain a Police State"; the West deceives itself by thinking that there is a change in the basic line of Soviet politics - "what's ours is ours, but what's yours, may be subject to negotiations."

The question has been quickly and brutally decided upon in "Point de réveries, Messieurs!" - the article of M. Zarodov in the *Pravda*.

3. In the speech of Ford there was distinctly felt a tune of apology for the American participation in the "maxi-summit." It appeared to be indirect evidence of the great impression made on the American public opinion by Solzhentsyn's appearance in the USA. Either, it created a completely unexpected but meaningful feeling that for the future there is just a shade of hope and not all has yet been lost by the West.

4. Summarizing, however, we must for the time being cite what a prominent Italian publicist, Enzo Bettiza, wrote about the "tragic-comedy" in Helsinki: "In the name of détente

the fiction of concord is maintained and efforts are made to convince the world that it exists and functions; if, indeed, it exists and functions, then, it seems it leads straight through the death of Europe to the Agony of America."

* * * *

The declaration of Russian writers which follows becomes, as if by coincidence, *symbolic*. It represents an important step forward on the road chosen many years ago by *Kultura* and stubbornly continued since; on the road which determines our future and the future of the whole Eastern Europe which has been prematurely written off from the balance sheet of the troubled West.

August 3, 1975

Editor

THE MEASURE OF RESPONSIBILITY

The date of Sept. 1, 1939 will remain forever in the history of mankind as the date of the outbreak of the Second World War. But, to our nations and particularly to Russia another date - Sept. 17 is more important as a reference point of our national guilt that we owe to Poland. On that day the two totalitarian regimes - eastern and western committed, at the cynical indulgence of the free world, one of the greatest crimes of the twentieth century: the new partition of Poland.

As we know, the West entered the war in the name of Poland's independence. The aggressor was bitten. It would have appeared that justice was done. But regrettably, Poland had not regained her independence, which

meant that for this purpose all made sacrifices were to no avail.

Of course, the main culprit in all this is the political mafia that maintains the bloody dictatorship over the peoples of our country. Crimes are committed by individuals but the responsibility for them rests on the whole nation. This is why today, looking back, we, the Russian intelligentsia, with feelings of bitterness and repentance, must take on our shoulders the blame for all the grave sins committed against Poland in the name of Russia.

The Katyn massacre, the treachery at Warsaw uprising in 1944, the suppression of fermenting revolution in 1956 - all these are unremovable blemishes of our nationwide guilt; it is our historical duty and the debt to compensate for it.

However, being fully aware of our responsibility for the past, today we proudly reminisce upon the fact that during the whole, almost 200 years fight of the Polish nation for freedom, the best Russians - from Czaadayeve to Herzen and Tolstoy - were on its side.

This noble tradition endured until now. In the face of tyrannical dictatorship there takes place a spiritual union of the representative forces of our nation. It is not in vain that at this time of danger which hangs over the heads of Russian intelligentsia - in their defense and as one of the earliest - there resounds the voice of our Polish brothers. And vice versa.

We are deeply convinced that in our joint fight against totalitarian prevalence and lies, there will be born a completely new kind of

relations which will forever erase the possibility of repetition of mistakes and crimes of the past; These are our creed and principle.

Josif Brodski, Andrei Wolkonski,
Alexandr Galich, Naum Korzavin,
Viadimir Maksimov, Victor Nekrasov,
Andrei Siniawski.

The above statement appears simultaneously in NO 5 of the Quarterly *Kontinent* around which all new Russian immigrants are rallied, and whose chief editor is Vladimir Maksimov.

* * * *

I recollect with deepest sadness the event that took place 36 years ago - the fourth partition of Poland. I hope that remembrance of it shall create a base for the joint responsibility for the future of our nations and the whole mankind.

August 21, 1975

Andrei Sakharov

IN THE SOVIET PRESS

In the beginning of June *Le Monde* published a triumphant note: At last all the obstacles on the road to the European Security Conference have been pushed aside, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries made enormous concessions in the only remaining controversial question - the exchange of ideas and people.

After a closer look into the matter one must admit that the Soviet "concessions" amount to an agreement to permit the foreign correspondents to have some improved working

conditions: visas and limited travel inside the Soviet Union. Strange, because just a few days before the appearance of the triumphant note, the same paper (May 11, 75) published the article of A. Solzhenitsyn the "Third World War."

The author of the Gulag Archipelago writes in it: "When after the First World War there came the Second one, everybody was wandering: Is the Third going to follow?...But only a few had the courage to say that the Third World War was already underway and the events which took place during the current year have shown that it had already ended and that the free world hopelessly lost it."

"The Third World War began immediately after the Second ended; it began in 1943 in Yalta and was caused by Roosevelt and Churchill who, hurrying up to celebrate the victory in their countries, naively signed the Yalta agreement thus giving the Soviet Union many far reaching concessions: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldavia, Mongolia, millions of the Soviet citizens sent by force to death and prisons, the creation of the UNO - deprived of any real power. Then later: Yugoslavia, Albania, Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, East Germany - left for unlimited violence...Trying to avoid at any price the Third World War, the West paved the road toward it, destroyed or enslaved 20 nations and entirely changed the picture of the world."

"The powerful Western States, victorious in the preceding 2 world wars, during 30 years of peace, were only weakening, only losing their potential and real allies and with it all the prestige. Territories and peoples were left in the hands of and unmerciful enemy:

The huge China that during the Second World War was one of the most important allies, N. Korea, Cuba, N. Vietnam; and today S. Vietnam and Cambodia; Laos is already lost and danger hangs over Siam, S. Korea and Israel."

Solzhenitsyn predicts: "Another 20 or 30 years of peaceful coexistence - equally full of glory as the preceding 30 years - and even the name - The West - will be gone from the face of the Earth."

And he adds: "I described the situation as it looks through the eyes of an average citizen of Eastern nations - from Poznan to Canton." One of the liberal French newsmen protested eagerly: "...from China to Vietnam, from Cuba to Russia, millions of people dying of hunger stopped being hungry, millions of children who didn't know schools went to schools, and millions of deceived and forgotten have found hope..."

The liberal voice of French correspondent so clearly contradicting the ideas of the West which "lost the Third World War" - has been supported by an authoritative voice of Moscow. On the election meeting there appeared the boss of the KGB, Jurii Andropov, doubtless the most intelligent among the Soviet leaders.

Truly what he was talking about was the internal situation of the Soviet Union, but doing it he painted a picture well known to all inhabitants of the countries "from Poznan to Canton." A picture that would be, perhaps, useful to look at by the inhabitants of many other countries too. The appearance of KGB's boss had a theoretical character; it

was his own deposit in the treasures of Marxism-Leninism. The theme: Socialistic Democracy versus bourgeois Democracy.

The leader of the KGB pointed out that really there is nothing in common between Socialistic and pseudo-bourgeois Democracy. "The Communists" - he said - "never denied that Socialistic Democracy is of a class character." And here follows an interesting definition of this kind of a class Democracy: "All the Soviet citizens whose interests go hand in hand with interests of society, are free to take the advantage of our democratic freedom. A completely different situation arises when these interests are not identical. In this case we say openly that the interests of society, or the interests of working class, have a priority and we think that this is a just principle. The Socialistic Democracy does not mean the rights and freedom only..."

The thoughts of the KGB's leader may be interpreted: "Who agrees with us, is free to do so. But, the one who doesn't, shouldn't have any illusions..."

Jurii Andropov allowed himself to express a slight sarcasm with regard to the unemployed people of the West dying of hunger. "The fate of millions of those wretched people and their families will not change for the better because they can go to the White House or to the Hyde Park and say what they think."

Under a socialistic sky there is no need for one to walk and to say what one thinks: The Party thinks and speaks for all. In the case of "disagreement" - the Party talks through the KGB.

The boss of the KGB expressed the basic principles of socialistic order rather in general, one would say - in theory. The practical side of this order is analyzed in the *Literaturnaya Gazeta* (May 5, 75) by N. Pavlov, the lecturer in the Police Academy of the USSR. This institution was created not long ago but despite this we may even now get acquainted with the philosophy in which its adepts will be educated. The article of N. Pavlov carries the title: "A verdict before a trial is completed." It is devoted to the question which is asked by the Soviet citizens quite often, though rather shyly. It may be formulated as follows: Who determines that a man is a criminal? It would appear that the answer is simple: a trial of a court. But this simplicity is deceptive. A court, in fact, sentencing a man for this or that punishment defines him as a criminal, but only after a decision has been made by someone else. There is a sympathetic common saying: marriages are made in heaven. The sentences in the Soviet Union are announced by the court, but decided upon by more competent organs - though, for sure, not by heaven.

N. Pavlov admits that this practice - sentencing a man before he is brought to a trial - indeed exists. Before a trial the citizens are well informed by the media about the investigation, its results and already declared punishment. He cites as example the criminal cases. But it is well known that the system has been more widely applied in all political trials. So it was in the thirties during the Stalin terror, so it was during the famous trial of Siniaewski and Daniel, so it was quite recently during the trials of Yakir and the others. Presently - announces Pavlov -

there has been accepted a widely popular procedure: An investigator in whose authority lies a case which usually has a definite characteristic of an offence against society, travels to an institution, organization, factory, etc., and there on the general meeting of Collective, he presents all the pertinent facts to the case. Such a meeting usually ends with the enacting of an appropriate decision: The Collective sentences a man. N. Pavlov admits: "...there takes place a real and true judgement by society against the accused - his actual trial before declaring a sentence by the specially created organs for this purpose..." In America, it would mean: "a trial by society" - *lynch*. N. Pavlov stresses also the results of the judiciary politics: "People unexperienced in the science of law think; if one is arrested, it means that one is guilty." An arrest cannot happen without a cause; if one is arrested, it means that one is a criminal. "There is no smoke without a fire." In short - as the author of the article concludes - a stereotype of "thinking" is created.

For over half a century, this stereotype thinking is being hammered into the heads of Soviet citizens unexperienced in the science of law: the organs never make mistakes, arrested man - is an enemy of people. Today in the era of technological and scientific revolution and, in general, a 10 year program of education, some of - still not numerous - Soviet citizens begin asking questions. Enormously "efficient in the science of law" N. Pavlov, answers: perhaps, this stereotype thinking is not perfect. But, we must remember what comrade Lenin said a long time ago: "A court is bound...to take into account all local circumstances. There was

a time when this characteristic quotation could have been entirely sufficient to clear out the peoples minds, but N. Pavlov gives us another argument: "In law (meaning the Soviet jurisdiction) there isn't any concrete directive with regard to the prohibition of the 'pre-trial' publicity, consequently, it will continue in the future."

A long, purposely complicated article of the Police Academy lecturer confirms the basic principle of the Soviet jurisdiction. One of its sides is turned toward the citizens: What is not allowed by law - is prohibited. Another - turned toward the power: What is not prohibited by law - is allowed.

The article of Pavlov is an example of the new style of the Soviet propaganda: facing some serious problems of the country, he tries to answer them by using the verbal equilibration.

In the literature, the most prominent master of equilibration is Yevg ny Yevtushenko. In March, 75, the periodical *Oganiok* (circulation 2,050,000 copies) published the poem of Yevtushenko "A refugee from China." The poet, in a very short introductory note, explains: While in Hongkong as a special correspondent of the *Oganiok* I registered the confession of only one among many refugees from China." So, this is a story of a Chinese running away from China to Hongkong - to Capitalism. Yevtushenko asks him many questions: Why did you run away? Who are Shakespeare, Mozart, Goethe, Tolstoy? Do you respect Mao? Who are the Russians?

A refugee answers (all the time in rhyme):

He ran away because he was hungry; he respected Mao before; he knows "none of the Shakespeares," etc.; Russians - our enemies. Here Yevtushenko asks an additional question: "And who are the Americans? Refugee says: "Better than the Russians but...foreigners."

Y. Yevtushenko wrote about China in 1969 after the skirmishes at the Usuri River. The conclusive idea of his writing in those days was: "Who tramples culture will later trample man." He repeats this motive in 1975: "When there is lack of culture, there are always the seeds of crime." However, this time he dwells on the lack of culture of the Chinese people more elaborately. The lack of culture is visible in deceitful propaganda ("Had you not stupified people - the truth is always one"); The lack of culture shows itself in hunger that cannot be covered by propaganda: "You shout about people, but people are not so stupid as they used to be. Nobody will cook soup for the hungry from what you are shouting about; the lack of culture manifests itself in a fact that the common national Pepsi-Cola that one may buy in any (or almost any) Moscow delicatessen, appears to be a poison of bourgeois society." and finally, the lack of culture menas that in China the peasants' cattle has been taken to kolkhozes.

It is difficult to contradict in any respect the Soviet poet. Doubtless, there are many other things that may be said about China. But Yevtushenko describes everything that is happening in China as the result of powerful Chinese chauvinism - as an invention of China. He comments also that "the line of cultural deficiency" may become a line of fire, which means that uncultural China is threatening the world and the cultural Soviets

become today a "bulwark of culture."

Summarizing, a juggler's trick of Yevtushenko is that writing the most cynical propagandist's line he can always throw in several allusions which the reader may at good will interpret one, or entirely opposite way. There is no doubt that writing "Refugee from China," Yevtushenko understood well what associations in connection with "deceitful propaganda," "Collectivism," and "cult of Mao," may arise in the minds of the Soviet citizens. But, on the other hand, he puts a stress on the fact that he has only China on his mind.

The psychology of creativity is not completely explored. It happens sometimes, that a writer, as if against his own will, says more about himself than he wanted. Yevtushenko gives in his poem an image of himself: "He grasped: not in vain the power values those who are so flexible as she is. He lived - looking where the wind blows from. To him, exemplary are only those who believe in what they believe, though they don't believe in anything."

In the beginning of the thirties, the Soviet writers, I. Ilf and J. Petrov, addressing other writers called: It isn't enough to love the Soviet power, we must do everything to make the Soviet power love us. No doubt, Yevtushenko reached the stage where one who lives watching only for where the wind blows from, at the end, squanders the remainder of one's talent. To reach this conclusion, it is enough to compare Yevtushenko's two creations separated by 5 years.

The poem of Yevtushenko is an example of

the "cultural" Soviet propaganda. An example of propaganda in which the meaning of the word "culture" doesn't exist is Vladimir Biegun's brochure under the title of "The crawling counter-revolution." On the cover, a note: "a book designed for mass reading." The theme of the brochure is a fight against Zionism - "The Crawling counter-revolution." "Some 5-7 years ago many of us had no idea what kind of enemy we were facing, how deep was his influence, how far reached his antennae, what were his main strategic goals, forms and methods of diversional activities." In one of my previous reviews I mentioned Biegun's brochure whose parts then were published in Minsk newspaper *Nieman*. But today in front of us, we have the whole work. And, if one wanted, one would make a complete library composed of the Soviet anti-Zionist literature: "Beware! Zionism," by J. Ivanov; "The fascism from under the blue star," by J. Yekseyev; "Zionism in the service of anti-Communism," by W. Bashlakov; "Zionism - enemy of youth," by the illustrious anti-semitist, I. Kiczko, and many other titles.

The brochure of Biegun deserves our attention for many reasons. But firstly because it is the latest work that gives an image of today's Soviet politics. Thus it appears that the basic sources of information about the worldwide Jewish conspiracy (to take over the whole world), including the unmasking of Moses - taken literally from the "Protocol of Zion's philosophers" - are embedded in Marxism - Leninism. Biegun insists that anti-Semitism is of a class character which fact makes it historically justified and a necessary expression of the "people's anger." This "people's anger has its roots in the Unrising in Bielorussia and Ukraine in the

eighteenth century. It didn't change now, as the world's Capitalism is nothing but the Capitalism of Jewry. To those problems refer - as Biegun explains - "The directive of V. I. Lenin in the question of fighting against the Jewish nationalism and Sionism." Lenin becomes the father of the contemporary Soviet anti-semitism.

Another curiosity of Biegun's brochure are the sources he uses. Comparing the sources used by Ivanov in 1969 for the first theoretical anti-semitic book written, with the bibliography used by Biegun, we may say that both used the same literature. There is a slight difference, however: Ivanov cites the works based on English and Biegun on Polish publications. In other words, the Polish authors, translations into Polish, *Trybuna Ludu* and *Politics* - are the base on which Biegun builds up his writing. It is a clearly visible example of Polish-Russian friendship...

And at last the third peculiarity of Biegun's brochure - the burning, personal hatred of the author toward the object of his "research." Probably for this reason the author of the preface to the brochure calls it a "sharp, offensive publication."

George Orwell, whose foresight cannot be denied, wrote in 1984 about the daily "minutes of hatred." The brochure of Biegun is "an hour of hatred (1 hour is sufficient to read it through) prescribed for the people of the Soviet Union.

We shouldn't be surprised then that in the gallery of the contemporary heroes of Biegun was included a fearless fighter

against the international Jewish conspiracy - the President of Uganda, Idi Amin Dada. Some of his experiences in the fight against Jews are quoted by Biegun from an interview of *Komsomolskaya Gazeta* with Idi Amin Dada. Recently, there appeared a movie about the Uganda President. The scenario, music, were written, and the leading hero's role played by himself personally. This exquisite film explains why Idi Amin Dada is so popular with the Soviet leaders, who are today the main suppliers of arms for Uganda. The strategic location of Uganda in Africa has nothing to do with it. It is, simply, the character of Idi Amin Dada which immensely reminds them the never to be forgotten Leader of Nations. Idi Amin Dada - is Stalin blackened in the fight for Communism.

Adam Kruczek

Fragments

Vol. 2/10

Dec. 1975

by

Charles Joel

Bohdan Brodzinski IN SEARCH FOR BREAD

Adam Kruczek IN THE SOVIET PRESS

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 9/336/75, published in Paris - France.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

Published by C.H.S.L., Sutter Creek, California.

Printed by the Essicc Company, Sutter Creek, California.

IN SEARCH FOR BREAD

And again, the Soviet Union runs about and looks for some place to buy something to eat. From Australia to Canada, but mainly in the USA, the Soviet emissaries work like ants, buying grain, hiring transportation and organizing finances. So far - to the end of July - the purchases stand at 10 million tons of wheat. Of this amount, Canada supplies 2 million tons, Australia 150,000 tons and all the rest is from the USA.

These unprecedented purchases are caused by great deficiencies in this year's crop in the Soviet Union. According to plan, the total harvest of all kinds of grains in the USSR was supposed to bring 215 million tons, half of it in wheat. But the estimates made for the first half year show expected harvest to be 10 percent below the plan (only 95 million tons of wheat). Observers, recently returning from the Soviet Union, inform us that the situation looks much worse and the deficit may reach 25 percent of the plan so that the purchases conducted so far, may represent only the beginning, and soon will be increased.

The Soviet purchases of grain created great anxiety and even panic in some parts of the West. 1972 is still too much remembered by all. Then too, the Soviet Union suffered a large scale deficit and bought 19 million tons of wheat - close to 25 percent of the world export. The deal created sky-rocketing wheat prices, and gravely affected the economy of the West. Occasionally scandals occurred. The middle-men and speculators made a lot of money; the Soviet purchases were partially financed by the American taxpayers;

the Soviets bought more than they needed and could later resale purchased grain at a great profit.

A cry to stop the sale of grain to the Soviet Union appears to be justified. What disturbs the minds of people most, is the fact that grain transactions, such as in 1972, are made secretly. They are carried by great firms, of which only one (*Cook Industries*) is a public company and, by law, is bound to publish the results of its activities. The other companies participating in grain transactions (*Bunge Corp.*, *Cargill* and *Continental Grain*), despite their gigantic position in the trade, have the status of private, one person, enterprises, and as such, do not need to disclose anything. The secrecy encourages disobedience to the law. Not long ago, 13 directors of Bunge Corp. were fined for cheating on the quality of exported grain.

The opposition against the sales of grain to the Soviet Union takes various forms. Some trade unions boycott loading and transportation of grain. The American Senate proposes enacting a law that will prohibit export if it amounts to 20 percent of the harvest; export of larger quantities will demand the guarantees of the government that it won't affect internal consumer prices.

The grain situation in 1975 differs greatly from the one in 1972. The USA government stopped paying export subsidies for agricultural products, which step silenced the accusations of financing the Soviet unproductivity from the pocket of American worker. More important is the fact that this year, contrary to 1972, is an exceptional year.

The worldwide yield for all kinds of grain is predicted to be 6 percent higher than last year's, and about 1 percent higher than 1973 which was a record year. A great part of the surplus is in America which fact reflects on the price index - closer to harvest the prices on grain exchanges went down drastically. Between Oct. 74 and the Soviet buying fever of 1975, these prices went down by 40 percent.

The most fervent adherent for the selling of American grain to the Soviets is the Secretary of Agriculture Department, Earl Butz. Doubtless, that in view of the approaching election, he has to pacify the powerful agricultural lobby in Washington. The job demands stopping decreases in prices and - considering depression - helping the American farmers by increasing their income from the export of agricultural products. Thus, the Soviet deficit appears to be an ideal partner of the American surplus. Mr. Butz insists that even if the total export (including the traditional customers in Europe and Asia) were to reach 30 million tons, the stock next June will be twice as large as that of June this year, estimated as 8.5 million tons. Supporting his chief, the Under-Secretary of Agriculture Dept. R. Bell, states that the USA can supply the Soviet Union with a further 4-5 million tons of wheat without any risk involved in raising the prices on the consumer market.

The shipment of grain that was bought so far by the USSR, demands 500 ships of average tonnage. The Soviet authorities contracted 20 ships which will for several months be sailing between the ports of America and Russia.

This year's purchases of grain will cost

Russia, so far, about \$2 billion. This unexpected expenditure demands financing from special sources. It has been noted lately that on the eve of this great purchasing campaign the Soviet gold appeared on the European exchanges. But, perhaps, more important is the quarrel that burst out between the Soviet Union and Egypt about the payments of the Egyptian debt for arms supplied by Russia. The debt is in the area of \$7 billion and the Soviet Union rigorously demands Egypt to comply with its obligations; it seems, the situation resulted in breaking the relations between both countries. It is thought that the Soviet insistence in demands of payments has been caused by the food situation and the resulting necessity to buy grain.

It is clearly apparent how important is the role of Israel in all of this. The Arab nations produce great quantities of oil which is sold in the West for enormous amounts of money. With this money they buy arms from the Soviet Union which in turn uses it for buying food. Had Kissinger succeeded in vietnamization if Israel, the Arab countries wouldn't be buying arms from the Soviet Union, which deprived of means for buying food, would die of hunger. In turn, had the Arabs stopped buying arms they wouldn't have any stimulus for producing great quantities of oil, consequently, the West would perish because of lack of oil.

There is one more, one would say, ontological argument: Why does the Soviet Union, the biggest world producer of wheat, permanently suffers from the lack of it, and why can the USA which has almost the same number of population as the Soviet Union and only half of its wheat production, regularly export half of its wheat and still have a surplus?

For the answer we must go back as far as the Khrushchev's days. During his educational visit in the USA Khrushchev learned 3 things: First - that if in the country with 200 million inhabitants, there are on the highways 80 million cars, notwithstanding the Stalinists it is nonsense to insist that in Capitalism only the millionaires have cars. Directly after his visit, this nonsense vanished from the official propaganda. Who knows whether or not the Poles owe their Fiats to this "discovery". Second - that an unemployed American is doing better than a fully employed Russian. Khrushchev announced this truth only once and that was in the speech to the Kazakhstan kolkhozes members: immediately after that it was taken out of repertoire. It is possible that it caused the downfall of Khrushchev, which fact in itself becomes the reason that the Soviet Union never understood the truth number 3 - that corn in many respects is of higher value than wheat is.

So the explanation for the Russian grain troubles lies in corn. The Americans don't care much for wheat and produce it in comparatively small quantities. Their main grain is corn whose production is 2-3 times larger than the production of wheat (about 150 million tons annually). The Americans eat corn in the morning, at midday and at evening; they eat it as vegetable, grits, flour, cereal, etc., but above all, they use it as a fodder. The American corned beef is known all over the world. Khrushchev understood it all, continuously calling for the increase of corn production in the Soviet Union, but his words were falling in the deaf ears. While in 1956 the production of corn in the USSR was 8 million tons, today it amounts to only 10 million.

The same level of production has been reached in the same period by several considerably smaller countries, for example, France, Mexico, Yugoslavia, S.Africa, Rumania; some of them began experimenting with corn cultivation for the first time.

The differences between western Capitalism and the Soviet style Socialism manifest themselves in many ways. What is striking in agriculture is, that the West endeavours to have its agriculture well financed, well invested, rich and capable of full production. The Soviet Communism has grown on the practice of squeezing out the last penny from agriculture for the financing of industry, mainly heavy - arms industry. The Soviet ideology looked at through this practice, will much easier accept the death of 10 hungry citizens than the enrichment of one. There is a lot of talk about the climatic changes that cause the Soviet grain deficit. But more important is an institutional climate which prevents the intensification and increase of production in the Soviet agriculture. Western Europe produces 40 quintals of wheat from 1 hectare, the Soviets - only 15. The USA - 60 quintals of corn from 1 hectare, the Soviets - 20. A great ideology change is needed on the Soviet side to equalize these differences.

Some comfort to the present leadership of the USSR may lie in the fact that Genghis Khan and Timur-Leng, in general, never cared for the cultivation of wheat or corn, concentrating specifically on war production and assuming that with military superiority they can grab everything they wanted from the others.

Bohdan Brodzinski

IN THE SOVIET PRESS

In the biography of Brezhnev, July 1975 will be marked in red: There were not too many Soviet leaders who, without giving anything in exchange, could have attained so many diplomatic victories. In the Soviet Union, July passed by under the sign of "Apollo-Soyuz" flight and the European Security Conference.

The daily press, periodicals, radio and TV, have talked only: "The Soviet-American handshake in space," Détente - turning point in the history of mankind...With beating hearts the Soviet citizens watched the start of "Soyuz"; with beating hearts because the Soviet leaders never before had the courage, being afraid of a fiasco, to transmit to the public any starts of Russian cosmic vehicles. Then, there followed: the telegrams from Brezhnev, Ford, from tens of heads of nations, social leaders of the West, South and North, proud statements of the Soviet citizens, poems of Yevtushenko... In short: Triumph! the triumph which should remove forever from the memories of the Soviet citizens the defeats in the race to the moon. The first on the moon were the Americans, but docking of Soyuz and Apollo in space has been proof of equality of both competitors.

It is easy to enumerate what the Soviet leaders gained: the effect of publicity and the certainty of getting acquainted with the leading American technology. But it's impossible even to assume that the American leaders have gotten anything in exchange, because they were losers. That the Soviet Union has been lagging behind America in cosmonautics and

technology in general, was nothing new. This fact was revealed 2 years ago by Leonid Vladimirov in "The Soviet Cosmic Bluff" - a book whose revelations the Soviet leaders were forced to acknowledge with gnashing teeth. Actually the book was written 8 years ago when its author, the Soviet scientific publicist, escaped to the West. L. Vladimirov is telling us the story about the primitiveness of the Soviet space technology, the endeavours of the Soviet leaders to make the cosmonauts, constructors and engineers, serve the will of the Party, about using the cosmic flights for propaganda even at the price of human lives. Today, the western publicist, with certain embarrassment, underline in their jubilant reports one dissimilar characteristic of Soyuz and Apollo: in the Soviet space vehicle, a pilot cannot make any decision on his own - the steering is performed from the Earth; in contrast, the American astronauts do it by themselves. The western reporters point out this peculiarity without any comments, considering evidently as natural that even in the cosmos the Soviet man must be under control and surveillance.

The Soviet Leaders intoxicated by victory decided even to reward the common men. First, they gave them a great show. Although the start of Soyuz lasted only seconds, the TV transmitted this memorable moment for 4 hours. On the market there appeared perfumes under an elegant brand "EPAS" - meaning the "Experimental flight of Apollo-Soyuz," a product of the Revlon Corporation of America, and put on sale simultaneously in the USSR and the USA. Friendship is friendship, there is no doubt about it. In the USA, a phial of EPAS costs \$10, in Moscow - \$50.75.

That wasn't all. On sale went cosmic cigarettes - a joint enterprise of the Soviet tobacco industry and the American Philip Morris Co. At once, in concert with this, there began to circulate anecdotes which perhaps better than any scientific treatise reflect the attitudes of the Soviet people. Anecdotes appear in the Soviet Union in cycles: there were anecdotes connected with "Radio Eryvan," Leninistic, etc. In Stalin's days, for example, popular cigarettes used to carry the brands that depicted the names of great projects, such as "Bialomor-Canal" or "Volga - Don" which were completed entirely by slave labor. A sample: a client asks: give me a pack of "where I was" cigarettes. He was answered: sorry, we haven't got "where you were," but you can have "where you will be" cigarettes. Recently, after the Apollo-Soyuz feat, the subject of all anecdotes was Vasili Ivanovich Czaapayev, the hero of a movie about the civil war, a symbol of the Soviet leader - uncouth and cruel. One anecdote says that Peter, the orderly of Czaapayev reports: Comrade, Vasili Ivanovich! They brought Philip Morris! Czaapayev retorts: arrest Philip, shoot Morris!

One would say that the wrapping has changed, but the contents are the same. And, despite the "successe in the area of cosmonautics," the Soviet citizens began to understand it.

Doubtless, the successes in the diplomatic arena" are today more important than the cosmos itself. After the drive of the heads of nations and governments which signed the final document of the Peace and Security Conference of Europe, Brezhnev attained things that Stalin couldn't have even dreamt of. The West

officially and legally approved the hegemony of the USSR in Europe. A. Solzhenitsyn called the signing of the document by the President of the USA as "betrayal of Eastern Europe," "consolidated reconciliation with enslaving of Eastern Europe."

In the Soviet press, the explanation of what has caused the successes of Brezhnev's politics, is unanimous: The pressure of progressive forces. The Western press, however, cannot explain why Europe agreed to go to the conference table, because it itself doesn't understand why. It is doubtful whether the circulating opinion that all went there in order to please Brezhnev - as without the conference the poor man could have been lost and his place taken by Somebody Terrible, doesn't convince even its authors. Even, the argument that the West received something from the Soviet Union, doesn't carry any weight with the critics. From the published final document it is clear that the Soviet Union didn't give away a jot. Furthermore, the introductory paragraphs underline that the document doesn't have any legal force and doesn't provide for any sanctions in the case of violation of its guiding principles. All this means that even reminiscing on any kind of human rights has no value whatsoever. Let me give an example: On the July 22, when the date for signing the final document had been decided upon, Andrei Amalrik, who just returned from the "Gulag" at Kolyma - where he spent 3 years - asked some foreign correspondents to convey his statement: The soviet authorities forbade him to live in Moscow where his wife resides. They transferred him to Riazan district where once he had a house. Recently some unknown individuals destroyed it. Amalrik, in his

request, calls the behavior of the Soviet leaders hypocritical in view of the paragraph from the Helsinki document which treats the principle of unifying families whose members live in different places and, at the same time "in the Soviet Union a husband is forbidden to live with his wife."

Hypnotized, like a rabbit by a boa-constrictor, the chiefs of the European countries appeared in Helsinki and put their signatures to the disgraceful document.

Not long ago I had a chance to read a book "The Soviet Savoir Vivre" published in Moscow. Among many irreplaceable advices and subtle observations, I found a prescription which may be directly applied to the conference at Helsinki. The author of the "Soviet Etykieta" states: "One goes to a visit by one's own free will." This is a great general truth. In any case, the European leaders went to Helsinki by their own free will. Nobody was forcing them, the way President Natcha was forced to sign a political document in 1938.

Some time ago the cult of one man has been unmasked and it was declared that one man is nothing and the masses - everything. But it appeared again that one man, who has no military power behind him, could spoil the festive mood of Brezhnev. On the day of the "cosmic handshake" A. Solzhenitsyn appeared at the banquet given in his honor by the AFL-CIO in New York, and during a speech lasting 100 minutes was telling the Americans the truth to their faces. We may assume that the consequences of this speech will be long remembered. At any rate, on July 26, President Ford,

in an interview for the New York Times, admitted his mistake of not inviting Solzhenitsyn to the White House. This unusual self-criticism was proof of the great impression made by the author of the Gulag Archipelago on the American people.

Solzhenitsyn didn't discover - if we may use this expression - America. He was repeating only that which was told before him by hundreds and thousands of people over many years. But, perhaps, for the first time people began to listen. Solzhenitsyn began his speech with a "small historical review." I want to remind you - he said to the audience - what kind of system you are dealing with. "It's a system which: came to power by military subversion, dispersed constitutional political bodies, capitulated before Germany - a common world adversary in those days - created CZEKA and repressions without courts of justice, choked the strikes of workers, plundered peasants and when they revolted - finished them in bloodshed, routed the Church..." Such was the beginning of this system. Afterwards, "created the world's first concentration camps; it has been the system that destroyed the remaining political parties... It has been a system that used genocide: 15 million peasants died. It has been a system that invented the law of slave labor - a passport law. It has been a system that artificially created famine in a peacetime. 6 million in Ukraine died of hunger in 1932-33..."

With this system - continued Solzhenitsyn - the western Capitalists made an agreement. "For the past 50 years we observe an unending cooperation of western businessmen with the Soviet leaders who, without the technical and financial help were not able to cope with their

awkwardly and nonsensically run economy. And if today the Soviets have the greatest military and police forces in the country which by the contemporary standards is poor - they have them for the purpose of suppressing the freedom movement inside the Soviet Union. For this situation we are 'indebted' to the western Capitalism." It is - Solzhenitsyn was saying - "something beyond comprehension of the human brain; this burning greed for profit which is beyond the limits of reason and decency..."

The West didn't limit itself to economic help - he was saying - "Already in Yalta - without any need - the West approved silently the occupation of Mongolia, Moldavia, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. The West did nothing for the defense of the Eastern Europe and 7-8 more countries were later given away..." The years that followed the end of World War 2 Solzhenitsyn defines as "the years of continuing concessions and giving away nation after nation." He warned the audience - it is very dangerous to lose the feeling of reality when it begins to sneak upon one's conscience the thought: "Well, let's give it away. And we hear today in the West and in your country the voices: Give away Japan, give away Israel, Formosa, Philippines, Thailand, Malaya. Add 10 African countries - but leave to us our way of life. Give us the possibility of riding in our big cars on our magnificent highways. Give us the possibility of quietly playing our golf and tennis. Give us the opportunity of enjoying our cocktails the way we are accustomed to."

Solzhenitsyn ended his speech with this conclusion: "In the world of today there are 2 most important processes underway: first... is a series of shortsighted concessions - give

away, give away, give away, and perhaps the wolf will be fed up. The second process - which I consider as fundamental and I predict it will bring for all of us a better future - is a fact that under the iron crust of Communism, already for 20 years in Russia and for a little shorter time in the other communist countries, there proceeds the liberation of the human soul, there grow up the new generations which are ready to fight against the evil of Communism and which won't go for any compromise, which prefer to lose everything - money, any existential values, life itself... if we only break, if not stop, the process of concessions and allow for continuation of liberation in the communist countries, we should secure our future..."

As if in anticipation that he will be accused of being the enemy of détente, Solzhenitsyn asks: "Is the détente necessary?" - and answers: "It is as necessary as the air we breathe. It is the only remedy for the troubles of the world. But détente will be real only if 3 conditions are fulfilled." First is the military disarmament. The second - dismantling the machinery of prevalence. In other words, the liquidation of the weaponry that is used to destroy a neighbor and the weaponry that is used to strangle a fellow countryman; détente should be based neither "on smiles," nor on concessions, but on "the rock," meaning that "the other fellow who desires détente must allow for the free society, free press, free parliament." The third condition emerges from the following: "What kind of détente is it if a hateful propaganda called proudly the ideological war is conducted in the Soviet Union? No! Let's have détente. Let's have friendship, but first let's end the ideological war."

Solzhenitsyn described the Soviet system as entirely closed. "It is so closed that here (meaning in the West) it's almost impossible to understand it. Many most educated theoreticians write scientific books and attempt to explain what is happening in my country. They express some ideas which to us - the Soviet people - are just funny;" And he cited: "They tell you that the Soviet leaders had resigned from their anti-human ideology. That isn't so. Or they tell you that there are in the Kremlin 'leftists' and 'rightists' and there is a flight going on between them, and that we should do everything not to jeopardize the 'leftists' efforts. All this is a fantasy. Some sort of fight for power exists there, but in the basic issues they all are unified. Or, again there is a theory which says that presently - owing to the technological developments in the USSR - there technocracy is growing in strength and soon, it, not the Party, will be deciding about everything. I'm telling you that the degree of technocracy's influence on our fate is as high as the degree of our generals' influence on starting or conducting a war - meaning zero. All will be doing what the Party orders."

Solzhenitsyn says that these "scientific explanations" are funny to the Soviet people. But, not long before Solzhenitsyn's speech, the character of the Soviet power had been described in the same manner by a model Soviet man - Roy Medvedev. In an interview published in the London *Observer* (June 15, 75) the author of a monography of Stalinism "Under the Judgement of History," introduced his political

program and his appraisal of the dissident movement in the Soviet Union. The interview had the headline: "How I would govern in the Soviet Union." Roy Medvedyev, before saying how he would govern, described how would the Soviet Union be governed by the best known personalities. About Andrei Sakharov: "I have the impression that he has no concrete political concept...he acts under the influence of moral and emotional impulses. His views are negative. He knows perfectly what he doesn't want. Should Sakharov be the leader of the country - he wouldn't know what to do." About Solzhenitsyn: "It would be a terrible thing to see Solzhenitsyn with his religious concepts, as the leader of the nation."

And what if you would become the leader? - he was asked. - I would - in any case - know what to do during the next 5 years.

How would Medvedyev's 5 years plan look? He said: the means which I would undertake would have as a primary target the "safeguarding of the Socialist system and national property." Above all, he would find new people that would be able to handle the most important issues: "There are many talented, wise Marxists with common sense, who would perfectly well solve many social and political problems. There are many clever men who would find a solution for our agricultural troubles." But, the most important: "There are people who would build up a perfect propaganda machine."

Beside bringing in new people - "wise Marxists," Roy Medvedyev would secure freedom of speech - for example, he would allow for the existence of private publications on an equal basis with the great Party publications,

freedom of association including political organizations, he would allow for the private initiative in the industry of services. "It is necessary" - added Medvedyev - "to have one-two newspapers independent from politics." All this - Medvedyev stresses - "will not in any way threaten the Communist Party... it will make the Party healthier and much more alive."

The program of Medvedyev (nobody, so far, was so clear and precise in expressing political views) has only one goal: He wants to see the Communist Party stronger and its vitality more effective. He compares his own role with the role of Luther and Calvin who endeavored "to renovate the true religion the way they understood it." Moreover, he stresses that in the Soviet libraries today one may find the books of Solzhenitsyn, Maximov, and even the periodical *Kontinent* - but there is no place in them for his "Under the Judgement of History." It cannot be read by the Party functionaries although it is written in Party and Marxist language in which they grew up and which they use.

Roy Medvedyev concludes: "In my opinion, the situation in the Soviet Union may be changed by the Marxists of nondogmatic type, able to create a Socialism with a new face. Our contemporary society will understand them better than it understands the religious men, such as Solzhenitsyn and Maximov."

There is nothing good to be expected from Solzhenitsyn and Maximov - says Roy Medvedyev. However, some of the contemporary Soviet leaders seem to him, in many respects, to be the men of great value. "Some people think" - said Medvedyev - "that after the Soviet Party

Congress next year the great changes in the structure of leadership will follow. It is difficult to forecast anything on this question, but I think..." and here follows his prognosis: "Brezhnev and Kosygin will retain power. The men around them will be replaced by the men from the younger generation and of different character. Intelligent and younger, they will not have the complexes that oppress their predecessors." Who are these "intelligent and younger?" Medvedyev mentions two: "I think that people like Katushev (the Secretary of the Communist Party) may understand better the problems of intelligentsia than Suslov. Perhaps, even Andropov (the KGB's boss) understands them better than Suslov and Kirilenko."

"Besides" - Medvedyev states - "at this time, Brezhnev himself is the best of all political leaders."

I think, there is no need for more comments on the program of improvement in the Soviet Communist Party. It seems that more light on the subject is thrown by the words of the physicist Valentine Turczyn, the chairman of the Soviet branch of the Amnesty International, who happened to be present at the interview: "Nobody in the West imagines to what degree our situation reminds one of the situations described by Orwell in 1984... The regime attempts to destroy all who are able to think independently. The Party doesn't need our kind of people. Our system is unbearable to all who possess just a bit of common sense." How it is possible to reform this system by applying the simple exchange of a few men - remains a secret of Roy Medvedyev who, probably, dreams not only about the laurels of Luther and Calvin but mainly about the laurels of F.D.Roosevelt - the savior of Capitalism.

Several days after the interview with Roy Medvedyev, from which the readers of the *Observer* learned that Andropov is the best qualified to understand the needs of Russian intelligentsia, the open letter of the Soviet writer Vladimir Voynovich to Andropov, was published. In the letter, the writer tells how he was summoned to the KGB, how the functionaries of this respectable institution talked with him, how he was reproached because of the publishing of his works abroad and told to reunite with the Soviet literature. Furthermore, how one of KGB's men "as if lost in thoughts and with sadness said, that the human life is very short, and suddenly added that he would understand me if I were a 70 year old man. In the seventies, life is practically ended, but to end it at only 43... and here, with astonishment he spread his arms

The great honor of being invited to the KGB and to listening to the philosophical lecture about the instability of the human life was bestowed on Voynovich because his book was published abroad - an excellent satiric story "The Life and Unusual Adventures of a Soldier Ivan Czonkin." It is a story about a simple Russian peasant, Ivanushka, who found himself caught in the cogwheels of the Soviet system machinery. One of the KGB's interlocutors assured the author that "Czonkin" would have been published in the Soviet Union, providing the author cancelled only one word - "puks." I inform those who haven't read the book that PUKS - abbreviated Russian expression of "The Road to Socialism" - is (in the book) the name of a miracle fruit which is half potato and half tomato, produced by a village selectionist "under the influence of the progressive

teachings of Michurin and Lysenko." We should, rather, doubt, if the cancellation of "puks" would have silenced the Soviet censorship. At the base of the matter lies an offence against Andropov, which emerges from the fact that Voynovich allowed himself to write about the functionaries of the NKVD - father and mentor of the KGB, and to introduce them most realistically and truly.

Let's read the following sample: By mistake, the head of regional section of the NKVD, Captain Milaga, was taken prisoner by the Soviet soldiers who took him for a German, and, vice versa, he took them for Germans too. As neither the interrogating Milaga Lieutenant, nor Milaga knew the German language, the interrogation was executed in a language which both of them thought to be German.

- "Namen? - the officer was repeating nervously, not being sure if he pronounced the word correctly. - Du namen? Sie namen? ... Ich bin Captain Milag ... Ich bin ist-arbeiten... he thought for a while how to name the institution he worked for, and suddenly found an unexpected equivalent: Ich bin arbeiten in russish Gestapo. - Gestapo? - understanding this word in his own German, the Lieutenant meditated. - Du kommunisten strelit', pif, pag? - Ja, ja, - the Captain vigorously agreed. - Und kommunisten, und bezpartijnem - vsiech razstrelit' - pif, paf - and demonstrated shooting with his right hand.:

It is well known that Captain Milaga was telling the truth. But, evidently, the truth has not been to the liking of Andropov - a connoisseur of intelligentsia problems. In addition, we must remind ourselves that the offence was aimed at the boss of Captain Milaga

- Lavrenti Beria.

Let's add too, that it is highly probable that Andropov knows nothing about the activities of his subordinates and institution. Brezhnev, for example, had sworn to Brandt that he, the First Secretary of Communist Party, knew nothing about Guillaume - the spy planted within the entourage of Brandt.

Adam Kruczek