

Fragments

Vol. 3/1

Jan. 1976

by

Charles Joel

Leszek Kołakowski -

ON THE MARGIN OF THE LATEST
A.SAKHAROV'S BOOK.

Brukselczyk

TÊTE A TÊTE WITH A MUMMY
(excerpts)

Gustaw Herling - Grudzinski -

DIARY WRITTEN AT NIGHT
(excerpts)

ON THE MARGIN OF THE LATEST
A.SAKHAROV'S BOOK*/

The manifesto of Andrei Sakharov needs no explanation. Neither is there any need to explain why its text is important to the world; important for its contents as well as for who has written it and where it has been written. It is important to the West, to Russia and us Poles - as our future and perspectives are, obviously, linked with the fate of The Russia which extorted itself from captivity of the mind.

The name of Sakharov has been known in the world-wide arena for eight years. During those years, tormented by an unceasing chicanery and persecution, Sakharov became one of the most important symbols of freedom and intellect that holds out in the fight against the overwhelming violence or the apparent omnipotence of despotism. His presence in itself is a hope for the world. It is also an unpleasant thorn which penetrates the curtain of phraseology that withholds truth behind which so many manipulators of publicity are hiding - as if avoiding the knowledge of what it is that the fate of the world mostly depends on.

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 11/338 and NO 12/339/1975, published in Paris, France.

Editor and publisher - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company
Sutter Creek, California

*/ This article is an introduction to the book of A.Sakharov, "My Country and the World," which will be published by Kultura in the Polish translation by M. Kaniowski. In the USA it has been published in brochure form by the Russian Kronika - Press; its several fragments appeared in Time; in full it has been recently published by A.Knopf Inc., of New York

What matters above all - and I doubt if I misinterpret the thoughts of Sakharov seeing in it the mainstay of his appeal - is that the Soviet Union is not alone their "internal matter" that can be, without any fear, entrusted to its inhabitants' contemplation, but is one of the fundamental indicators of the world situation. Strictly speaking, this statement is a trivium, but, by all means, it doesn't pass for such: quite to the contrary. Even from the standpoint of the formally recognized criterions of international understanding, the violation of human rights is not an "internal matter" of any country; all nations that agreed to sign the Charter of Human Rights - even if their own systems would, in most obvious manner, defy the entire contents of this beautiful document - by the same token agreed that disregard for the indispensable rights of people in any country - in the Soviet Union or Chile, in Indonesia or Czechoslovakia - is the subject of international control and is a matter of public concern of the whole world, regardless of whether there are means for compelling the governments to obey the rules written in the charter, or not. In fact, there is plenty of evidence from which we learn that, although moral pressure can neither itself cause a change in any system, nor force the governing class to give up its privileges, it isn't at all ineffective and, in some particular cases, it is helpful in extorting various concessions.

The Soviet system is not just an "internal matter" of Russia in one other way about which Sakharov writes: namely, that the system of governing is directly and in the most obvious manner causally

connected with the Soviet imperialistic expansion which under certain conditions may become - regardless of the present intentions of the leadership - the fuse of a global war, the ruin of civilization and, perhaps, extermination of mankind. If one accepts (and there are not many who would have courage not to) a rule which would put the question of protecting mankind against a global war as an absolute - above all matters - priority, one would easily notice that the internal Soviet regime, in relation to the world, represents a matter of importance incomparable with the regimes of any other country, because the possibility of a world war being caused by the internal tendencies of the system in any other case (China, the USA and smaller powers) doesn't even remotely exist.

The Soviet system, in fact, not only fortified (or, perhaps, saved) and perpetuated the expansionism of the czars, supplying it a new ideological substructure, called, depending on the circumstances, Marxism - Leninism or the internationalism of proletariat or eternal friendship of nations or war for peace. Moreover it created ways never before known of mobilizing all the possible materialistic and social resources as instruments of expansionism, and this ability to mobilize is, in turn, called the liberation of the working people from exploitation (means of production, including people, are the property of nation, the nation a property of party and party a property of leaders) or democratic centralism or a moral unity of society or God knows what else. One of the most important and inevitable instruments of mobilization is the monopoly of the communication media and deprivation of the citizenry of information about the world, or simply, keeping the people in the dark. The ignorance of the multimillion masses that inhabit a giant of a country and their

isolation from the world is, for obvious reasons, an additional factor increasing the danger of the world war; people deprived of means of independent appraisal of events and news about events, are physically and morally helpless in confrontation with their government. It doesn't seem to be possible that the principle of the free flow of information verbally acclaimed at the festival in Helsinki, could, in the very near future stop being what it is - a paper ornament that quiets the conscience of the western constructors of *detente* which is endowed with falsehoods; freedom of information can be widened but only under the pressure from the outside, because the present well-being of the Soviet Union depends on the ignorance of her people and on an entire system of misinformation. And, such outside pressure is not impossible, and it certainly causes a diminution, not an increase of the war menace.

These conclusions somehow easy to explain, are difficult to accept - though not for the same reasons - by the governments of democratic nations of the West as well as by the non-communist western Left (not to mention the communist Left). In the first case, what causes an aversion and a fear of "interfering in the internal affairs" of the Soviet block, is not the piling up of the many economic and social problems in these countries, but a comfortable delusion that the Soviet Union's imperialism will be satisfied and will quiet down (as it promises) after all its present conquests are accepted. Finally, however, we always have this argument: "after all, we won't provoke a world war because of the suppression of Ukrainians or enslavement of Czechoslovakia!" - as if a world war were the only possible alternative to the

previous acts of cowardly *appeasement*. As to the moral aspect of this problem or to the violation of human rights, there are always many less dangerous possibilities: the protests against the tortures in Chile or the executions of Basques in Spain have the advantage that they are cheap; it does not mean that they are unnecessary; the point is that moral indignation against despotism, with a peculiar regularity, burns most hotly there, where the despotic systems beside being despotic, are also weak in the international set-up of power or do not have any means of retortion against the governments or moralists who condemn them.

As to the non-communist and non-governing Left, we may say that it has some additional reasons for self-deceit (not without some few exceptions, one must add; I include here, for example, a New York group that publishes *The Dissent* - one of the most honest periodicals that I know, whose guiding ideological principle I share.) This non-communist and non-governing Left divides the world into leftist and rightist - never exhibiting the exact criteria of this division - and it places the Soviet Union system unclearly "despite everything" on the left ("of course, we know that many errors, even crimes have been made; there are many deficiencies, but..." It isn't known what exactly that 'but' means; the most courageous try even to suggest meekly that the Chinese system has not yet reached the state of perfection, but there aren't many of them). This "despite everything" is the core and a summary of all the leftist thinking; "despite everything," the Soviet system, as history has proved and as the Left had scientifically discovered, has a higher potential than the democratic systems of the western world, where, after all exist private

industry and land ownership. By the same token we have the principle of distribution of moral indignation: persecutions of the Basques in Spain is well suited as an object of awe. But what about the Irak Curds about whom Sakharov in his proclamation talks? Nothing, of course. Who knows how many Curds were slaughtered during recent years? But, Irak, by definition is a "progressive" because it is governed by the anti-Zionists (by no means, not the anti-Semites; mankind's progress as we can see, is so great that anti-Semitism has vanished completely from our hemisphere; let some of the leftist moralists show us one anti-Semite! There aren't any; they have vanished, to the relief of mankind. Instead, we have the numberless anti-Zionists and all of them are immensely - how immensely - progressive). By coincidence, Irak belongs to the block of nations that export oil, so that it is difficult to expect the political leaders of the western democracies to be preoccupied with the fate of Curds. There will always be a certain small despotic country which has neither oil nor is in alliance with the Soviet Union or China, but which will cry about conscience. However, the more efficient and consistent is despotism, the less is known about its internal structure, a fact which helps a lot in the distribution of moral indignation: everybody knew about the tortures and persecutions in Greece under the government of colonels, because despotism in this case had been less efficient and the control of information very indolent, but who knows what is really happening in North Korea?

It is true that today we seldom hear from the leftists about this amazing nonsense which Trocki to the end of his life fed himself and his followers with: In the Soviet Union the working class had been politically

dispossessed, deprived of elementary rights, crushed down and enslaved, but this same working class continues to rule in dictatorial manner, because the industry and the land belong to the nation. Nonetheless, a great majority of the Left is ashamed to admit that sovietism is an absolute and despotic system of governing which upholds class privileges by the use of violence and which has an extraordinarily strong built-in imperialistic tendency. All the characteristics of this society about which Sakharov writes - the tormenting poverty of people, the hopeless life, the social, national, cultural and religious oppression, violence as the main tool in all internal and international matters - are "in principle" known. What isn't "in principle" known, is how this country which could secure for its population all the blessings of life - rich in any imaginable raw materials, every variety of climate, having enormous spaces of land that is uninhabited or little inhabited, rich and differentiated cultural tradition, prominent brains and talents - became a nightmare and cannot even, as the traditional imperialism could, take advantage of its imperialistic power for improving the life condition of its own people, but uses all of its resources for the endless extension of a military and police machine of expansion and oppression.

The falsehood of a great majority of the western Left, its double standard of evaluation, its systematized "fears of not to mention," and a chronic spontaneous illusions-all of it - creates a situation in which all those living witnesses to the communist world, or those who experienced the realities of the communist world, cannot come to an agreement with the western Left. Either, there exists an unavoidable suspicion and distrust toward all leftist formations which produce democratic

declarations, but overabundant with fragmentary "stipulations" or cover with silence all that is relevant to eastern socialism. The most typical in this respect are the so called "liberalized," communist parties, especially Italian. Of course, the loss of full control over the communist parties, the ones that don't belong to the "block," by Moscow, is a fact of great significance and importance. It is also significant that the Italian communists declare their avoidance of the multi-party democracy, free election and press, as not the "tactical" but "strategic" assumptions (which presumably means a promise that they will last for a long - not for a short time, if the communists were to take over). We may add one more significant observation: the Italian communists do not want to be credited for such incidents as, for example, the invasion of Czechoslovakia. Despite all this, one must be reluctant in taking their declaration literally. It isn't, by any means, a matter of subjective conviction of the communist party leaders; it isn't even - on the other hand quite rational - a matter of confidence in past experiences (whenever communists gained power, all the privileges of the citizens and democratic institutions were destroyed with no exceptions to this principle; so, why should we presently expect that something different will happen?). Rather, what's real is that the Italian communists, having their objections to some of the other moves of the Soviet government, continue to consider themselves as followers of Lenin (who has promised to destroy the democratic institutions, and kept his promise) and as a segment of the universal "movement" whose other segment is represented by the Soviet Union. In all this, there is no reason to suppose that they would renounce the sacred faith in the Soviet political system as "historically of a higher grade" and a progressive form of social structure which

despite this or that "unjust" decision, deserves always a total support in any conflict with "bourgeois" democracies. Their criticism of a particular "mistake" may appear extreme but only on the background of the once prevalent principle of unconditional and absolute enthusiasm and admiration for every word of the Soviet leaders and every blow of the historically progressive cudgel.

Such criticism cannot evoke any confidence, since the Italian communists are not able to recognize the Soviet system for what it really is - an instrument of totalitarian prevalence and a state which, from the standpoint of citizens' rights, the standard of life, abilities for creating progressive technology, accessibility of people to information and cultural productivity (or, from the standpoint of the most important characteristics that may serve for a proper evaluation of any social organization), stands remarkably lower than all the "bourgeois" democracies of the western world, with all their troubles, deficiencies, corruptions and inequalities. This is, of course, an admission of a fanciful possibility, since the communists, going so far, would stop being communists, and, in any case would cut off themselves radically from Leninism or all that they inherited from Lenin.

* * *

Granting the Nobel Peace Prize to Sakharov in Oct., '75, should be greeted with a great appreciation not only as an extremely deserved homage to his indefatigable fight, but also as a proof that the threats and blackmails of Moscow are not, in spite of all, entirely effective. We may compare this act with another Nobel Peace Prize: the one, which in 1936 was awarded to Karl von

Osietzky, then awaiting death in Hitler's prison. As we know, this award forced Hitler to issue an order forbidding, from that time on, the Germans to accept the Nobel prize awards. The comparison of these cases separated by almost 40 years may be a subject of various reflections which, however, for the time being, we may be excused for.

To us, the peoples of the Soviet area of power, the Sakharov appeal is particularly important because of our nation's situation. In every form of fight for citizens' rights, democratic institutions and the right for national self-determination in the Soviet region of power, our bastion of support are neither the governments of western democracies, nor western Left and Right; rather, it is a common partnership of peoples that live within the Soviet area of predominance. The governments of western democracies not only accepted the post-war boundaries between the blocks (not, simply, between the nations) as a permanent European order, but are also more interested in the stabilization of the Soviet system, than in its desintegration. It is unimaginable that Poland separately from the other countries dominated by the Soviets, would regain the right for self-determination and democratic institutions - with everything else remaining unchanged. Turning away from Russia and the Ukraine, indifference toward their problems and aspirations, is damaging to us as well as to the Russians and the Ukrainians; it would amount to surrendering to the official soviet propaganda all the problems and issues that are vital in relations among the nations that live and will live as neighbors. What exactly the Soviet masters want is, that the Poles, Russians and Ukrainians would understand one another, but would do it exquisitely through the power machinery

and its propagandistic slogans - no matter whether one believes, or not, in them. The Russian people are not the first victims of the imperialistic expansion in which they are used as a tool. Many of the Russian people know it and consequently realize that they cannot break out from the oppression for as long as the Soviets have the power over the other - non Russian nations. These Russians who take seriously the principle of national self-determination - relative to the dependent nations - the Poles, Czechs, or Hungarians as well as the nationalities of non-Russian republics - are not only our allies, but the most important allies we have. It isn't true that the historically rooted hatred divides us by an uncrossable wall. Such hatred is curable under conditions of freedom and free communication necessary if a rational understanding were to drive it away. It's hard to find better historical reasons for mutual hatred than those which divide the French and English peoples, but - although the traces of some traditional dislikes still may be found on the both sides of the Canal - it's visible that it has lost its strength as a stopper or a brake in their cooperation. Surely, the Polish - Russian and Polish - Ukrainian relations are more complicated not because the past history made them so, but because they are under the constant pressure of chocking lies, and the official slogans of friendship do not weaken but strengthen the traditional enmity - since all know that the so called "Russo-Polish friendship" is nothing but a phraseological expression which sanctions the fact that Poland is not a sovereign country, but a country under the control of a foreign power. The riddance of the question of our relations with Russia and Ukraine from the field of our vision means surrender to

the pressure of an institutionalized lie; understanding the unofficial Russia and Ukraine and friendship with them, are the main condition under which the common cause of bearing social and national oppression has any chance to win. The alternative possibility is the desintegration of the Soviet system that would result from some violent crisis jointly with a chaotic multi-nation massacre, and much greater danger of a global war; this perspective opposes what is wanted by both Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov despite the differences that exist between them. It also weakens the hope that the European civilization will survive the pressure of barbarism.

Leszek Kołakowski

New Haven, Oct. 26, 1975

^ ^
TETE A TETE WITH A MUMMY
(excerpts)

Not long ago the Russians signed the biggest deal in the history of world grain trade. For the third time during the past 12 years, the Americans saved Russia from catastrophe. In 1964, Brezhnev received about 40 million tons - as a result of transaction initiated by Khrushchev; in 1972, the Russians bought quietly at below market prices, about 20 million tons, creating a colossal jump of prices in the USA, and presently there isn't, generally speaking, any reliable indicator as to how far they will go with the purchases of grain in the USA, because their grain deficit appears to be gigantic. In any case, already before signing the long term agreement for

the purchase of 7 million tons annually, they bought in the USA more than 12 million tons and, I think, no lesser amount in all the other countries of the world, whichever can sell a few kilograms of wheat, rice, soybeans, peas and everything that can grow on land and can be eaten by a man or a cow.

I write these relatively accurate details, in order to inform you about two things: first, about the fact that the West, in the spirit of the "second gift basket" of Helsinki, is trading in every possible way with the USSR, and, owing to this, it helps Brezhnev, Gierек and all the other secretaries to boast about the successes of the communist parties in rescuing their citizens from - in the framework of consecutive five year plan - famine.

Second, that violating the spirit of the "third gift basket" of Helsinki, Brezhnev did not permit the press to print a single word about the successes of the second gift basket. In effect, the Russian citizens are regularly informed about the crimes and racism in the USA, bankruptcy of New York, unemployment, inflation, about (from only one article of *Izvestia*) wire tapping, confidential files of secret police, persecutions of citizens for their political convictions and political murders ... in the USA, but, on the basis of the principle of "ideological war," they are not informed about the real fact that while eating their TV dinner and watching the beautifully constructed programs of Soviet TV, they eat American bread. And when the Free Europe begins to talk meekly about it, Moscow deafens it out, because this kind of news circulation is dangerous to the world peace.

When many philanthropic organizations, many different desperados - like the American helicopter pilot, or various smugglers (paid piece work), bring freedom for some of the victims of the East - Germany's socialism, then all this, through the mouth of Moscow or Berlin is, a bloody act of aggression, not to mention the tearing to pieces the document of Helsinki. But, when the East German Democratic Republic arrests 20 million people, cutting them off from the rest of the world by a boundary made of several hundred already killed and 900 kilometers of electrical barbed-wire, a 550 kilometers mine-field, 150 kilometers of automatic weaponry nests, 320 watch towers, specially trained dogs and, *last but not least*, a modest Berlin wall, then all this is called the objective ideological war.

When the West is flooded with tons of literature whose purpose is to disgrace Sakharov and to convince the sublime, uncorrupted West-European Left that the Nobel Prize laureate is a "friend of Hess and Zionism," this is ideological war. But, when 5 young Poles send to Sakharov a telegram with congratulations - saving by this act the honor of Warsaw's intellectuals - then, this is a diversion, an attempt to break down socialism and the spirit of Helsinki.

When the remnant of western conscience in agonizing voice, cries that Czechoslovakia is like a cultural Biafra and Pliushch's deportation is a common crime, then all this is a scandal, a diversion, an inflammation of cold war. However, when Czechoslovakia and the USSR call for the communists to take over the government of Portugal or for overthrowing

the regimes of Chile or Spain, this is the ideological war. Yet, Spain and Chile, although repulsive dictatorships (not the only ones...) do not propose that the world take their regimes as the only way for finding solutions to our epoch's problems or as the inevitable end to the objective ideological war - which is the subject of unceasing warnings sent to all of us by the Eastern regimes, in the framework of free exchange of ideas, of course.

Brukselczyk

DIARY WRITTEN AT NIGHT (excerpts)

Threatened by blindness, the wife of Sakharov had finally managed, after almost a year knocking at the doors of Moscow's offices, to arrive in Italy on the invitation of the director of the Clinic of Ophthalmology in Siena. On the twentieth of August (75), she arrived in Florence and simultaneously was surrounded by journalists. All their attempts of asking "political" questions were put off by her decisive *nie odpiecaja* (no comments - transl. C.J.). The only political confession, if I can use this term, I found in her talk with a reporter of Milano *Giornale*. She repeated this latest remark of her husband: "We would like to have just a little Democracy in Russia; this Democracy which the West seems to be fed up with."

On the 24 of August the *Giornale* began to print the segments of a new 100 page essay of Sakharov, *My Country and the World* (Sakharov worked on it for 7 months and intends to close his amateurish writings with

it). Since then, when I return home in the morning from the news-stand, the Sakharov's segment is the biggest thrill of the day.

* * *

Sakharov doesn't seem to realize how strong the complex of "non-intervention" in Russia's internal life is in the West - supposedly an inheritance (that turned into a conditional reflex) of an unsuccessful post-revolutionary "intervention." This complex affects even the best people with values which are admired. Sakharov would be surprised at the following fragment of Orwell's preface to the Ukrainian edition of the *Animal's Farm* (1947); of Orwell, the participant in the domestic war in Spain and the author of a beautifully written book, *In Homage to Catalonia*: "Better than ever before I understood the negative influence of the Soviet myth on the Western socialistic movement. I have never been to Russia, my knowledge of her is limited to what one can read in books and newspapers. Even if it were in my power, I wouldn't wish to interfere in the Soviet internal affairs; I wouldn't contempt Stalin and his partners for their barbarian and undemocratic methods of governing. It is quite possible that even having the best of intentions they were unable to act differently in the conditions prevailing over them. But, on the other hand, it has been very important for me that the people of Western Europe saw the Soviet regime in its real stature... This is why during the past 10 years I remained faithful to the conviction that the destruction of the Soviet myth is necessary if the socialist movement were to survive."

It is entirely possible that to the end of his life, after a race with death for four long years, during which he was writing 1984, Orwell remained faithful to the conviction that one may be free to "interfere" in Spain, but not - heaven forbid - in Russia.

Gustav Herling-Grudzinski

Fragments

Vol. 3/2

Feb. 1976

by

Charles Joel

Adam Kruczek

IN THE SOVIET PRESS

"

BRIEFLY ABOUT BOOKS

Dominik Morawski

CORRESPONDENCE FROM

ROME (excerpt)

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 12/339/75 and NO 1/340-341/76, published in Paris, France

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

Published by C.H.S.L., P.O. Box 744
Sutter Creek, California, 95685

Printed by The Essicc Company
Sutter Creek, California.

IN THE SOVIET PRESS

Granting the Nobel Peace Prize to Andrei Sakharov wasn't a surprise to the Soviet leaders. Truly, they hoped that the prize would be given to the President of Finland, Kekkonen, as a reward for his hospitality shown in Helsinki to the enthusiasts of detente, but the Commission of Norwegian Parliament decided otherwise. In any case, in Moscow, everything was ready. The fight against the previous laureates of the Nobel Prize had proved to be very educational - there was a ready made scenario for an "anti-Nobel Prize campaign."

What does the scenario look like? "The information about new reactions" usually comes from abroad. From a "progressive" or openly communist paper, the Soviet press reprints an article which expresses indignation toward the laureate. The first one that revolted against awarding Sakharov was the Humanité; its revelations were immediately reprinted. Because its style didn't differ much from what is normally written in Moscow, there was no problem in making changes in its translation.

After the "information" period, follows the ideological argument of the campaign. Its sense is always the same: the award had not been given for what it had been given, but for something quite different. Pasternak had not received his prize for his novel "Dr. Zhivago" (the Soviet Writers Union decided that Pasternak isn't a good prosaic, so the award couldn't have been given to him), but for slander of the revolution. Solzhenitsyn was awarded not for his writing (an appropriate decision on this subject had been made too) but for his anti-Soviet views. Andrei Sakharov - writes the Literaturnaya.

Gazeta (Oct. 15.75) - received his award not for his scientific works (the author of the article pretends that he doesn't know the basic principle which says that the Nobel Peace Prize is not awarded for scientific research), but for many years of anti-Soviet propaganda which by the Nobel Prize judges was blasphemously called "the fight for peace."

In short: Awarding the Nobel Peace Prize has been a "political move" which in the Soviet language means an unfriendly gesture toward the USSR.

As the Marxists teach: a theory without practice is equal to nothing. So, the "ideological argument" must be put into practical use. Initially, the letters of indignant citizens flow. For example, A.Sakharov's award has been condemned by 72 Soviet scientists, representatives of a flower of the scientific world, the colleagues of the laureate from the Academy of Science. The next stage is the meetings of "common Soviet people" - the builders of the country, in factories and kolkhozes, expressing protest and contempt.

Then, follows the finale - solution: Pasternak is forced to refuse the award, Solzhenitsyn is exiled. And Sakharov...

So far, the "scenario of anti-Nobel campaign" has been played perfectly, although the Soviet leaders have not decided yet how to solve Sakharov's problem. What we know is, that he wasn't permitted to go to Oslo to receive the prize, because "he is in possession of the State secrets." We may suppose the Soviet leaders do indeed think that all this is true, though, on the other hand,

Sakharov, from 1968 didn't do anything in the scientific field, specifically in the armament area. So, a solution in the "Solzhenitsyn's" style cannot be considered. What remains?

Elena Sakharov, the wife of the laureate, presently in Italy for health reasons, announced for the first time that she is afraid for her husband's life.

On the other hand precedents do exist. Exactly 39 years ago, in the world press, there circulated a photo of a small, meagre looking man in prisoner's garb, standing at attention in front of a giant SS man. The man in a prisoner's garb was the laureate of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1936, a German reporter, Karl von Osietzky. Imprisoned for accepting the award, he was, under the pressure of world opinion, released in such state that he died immediately. Many similar cases are known in the Soviet history. Inconvenient men often were destroyed. For example, Frunze in 1925, under the scalpel of a surgeon, or Michaels in 1948 - under the wheels of a truck.

Recently, some strange news is coming out of the Soviet Union. Vladimir Voynovich, the author of "Unusual Adventures of a Soldier Ivan Czonkin" (look Fragments 2/10, page 21 - Ed.), who, in May 1975, was invited for a friendly talk with the KGB, was ill for a long time afterwards. A doctor found that Voynovich was poisoned. In Nov. 11, 1975 some of the foreign correspondents got acquainted with a letter of Gruzian writer E. Hamsahurdij, in which he said that his home in Tyflis was smoked with some strange poisonous gases. Here too, are some precedents. Jagoda, the boss of NKVD in the thirties, just loved to study the effects of

poisons used on humans.

No doubt, Sakharov's life is in danger. Hitler responded to the award of Osietzky, decidedly and simply: he issued a decree forbidding all Germans to accept the Nobel awards. The Soviet Union, it seems, doesn't want to apply the same solution; they prefer to be ready to allow the acceptance of Nobel awards, but only if the awards are given accordingly to their own list. It is better - from their standpoint - to let the candidates for awards know what kind of fire they play with in accepting an award. That's the reason why Sakharov's life is in danger.

However, the anti-Sakharov campaign, played according to the accepted and repetitiously applied scenario, has certain specifics which make it look different than the anti-Splzhenitsyn or anti-Pasternak campaign. It is less intensive. Reprints are made of some comments from the communist press abroad, for example, from *Vos proletaria* in Colombia, but, in all, comparatively, there aren't too many of them. The ideological "explanations" appear too, but mostly in small print. The letters arrive, but not flooding. Even the signatures of 72 academicians don't carry much weight if one considers that the Academy has 245 regular members and 448 fellow members (among the 72 who signed the letter are members of both categories).

One cannot avoid this conclusion: The Soviet leaders are convinced that today there is no need for organizing such diabolical saraband as Khrushchov organized in 1958 - relative to Pasternak's award, because the citizens of the victorious socialism are sufficiently prepared to react to the signal given: The Nobel Prize had not been given

to the one who deserves it.

The Russian physiologist, Ivan Pavlov, who invented the theory of conditional reflexes, has illustrated in the experiments with animals how the first system of signals works: reacting to a repetitious sound or light signals made during a meal time, a dog, after while, begins to produce saliva - even when there is no food. At the end of the forties, Stalinist physiologists developed a "science of the second system of signals (voice)." They found that a word repeated with sufficient frequency, may cause a man's reaction that is desirable by an experimenter. In 1950, Stalin wrote his ingenious works on linguistics, pioneering the road which was later taken by the Soviet propagandists: creating words-signals that evoke desired reflexes. In the arsenal of these words "Nobel Prize" occupies a very important position. A spoken word - a button pushed - and an appropriate reaction. It doesn't, perhaps, always happen with prescribed accuracy, nevertheless, there is no denying that the successes of the Soviet propaganda are substantial.

The enthusiasm with which the Soviet press greeted the decision of the UNO that proclaimed by 72 votes that Zionism is Racism can be explained by a great joy of receiving a new signal-word. The Soviet press has reasons for its exaltation, because it was in the Soviet Union where for the first time the equation mark between Zionism and Fascism was made. No doubt, in 1967-8, it was popular in Poland too, but the "honor of the first place in this respect must be allotted to the big brother. But, that's not all: Racism - to the moment of the UNO resolution - has been one of not many synonymous words in the

repertoire of the Soviet propaganda. Nobody had ever doubted the meaning of this word.

The ideological victory of the Soviet Union on a world wide scale, obtained through the help of such great humanists and Democrats as Idi Amin Dada and the king of Saudi-Arabia, has a definite practical meaning. From now on, there will be no need for a pretext to arrest the Jews who want to immigrate to Israel. Paragraph 74 of the Penal Code of the USSR prescribes imprisonment up to 3 years for "propaganda or agitation whose purpose is creating racial or nationalistic antagonisms". And, above all, the word "Zionism" may be today used for building up the system of necessary reflexes. Till yesterday - it has been necessary to dress anti-Semitism in an appearance of the Marxist doctrine. Today it is superfluous.

For quite a long time the Soviet Union lecturers in appropriately assembled audiences have been proclaiming that the main goal of the Zionists is reaching world dominance by year 2000, and that the maps of the "Great Israel" presumed published by Israel, show its boundaries running south from Kiev. The lecturers have been warning that the fight against world Zionism will be much bloodier than the War against Hitler's Germany. In Novyi Zhurnal (NO.118), M.Augurski published 2 articles of anti-Semitic (read anti-Zionistic) character. In one of them he proposes publishing a special newspaper that would have a motto: "Death to Zionistic invaders."

Today, all the calls, all the signal-words, may be put in front of the widest audiences. One is free to talk openly about the awful enemy that threatens the USSR - about Zionism. To talk openly - as it is

talked in anti-Semitic articles - that Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn are the agents of Zionism, who help Israel to colonize Russia. There is no need to be afraid of being accused of anti-Semitism - 72 nations voted that Zionists are racists. The Soviet propaganda celebrates its victory: at any time it will be possible - so far, in the orbit of the socialistic camp - to push the button-signal and to begin the fight against "Racism", carrying it in the desirable dimension: persecutions, arrests - or if necessary - "Death to Zionistic invaders."

The Soviet ideologists know very well that obtaining a desirable reaction to the signal-word, is not always possible. Some misfortunes, break-downs happen. Hence, it is important to keep the populace properly adjusted or conditioned; doubtless, keeping the people in a state of permanent drunkenness is helpful in this process. Only by the consent of the Soviet authorities one can explain the dimension of alcoholism in the Soviet Union, the individual extreme cases of drunkenness kept under control by the usual methods of increased penalties, notwithstanding. In the same issue of the Literaturnaya Gazeta in which Sakharov is "under judgment" (Sakharov in his latest book accused the State of lushing people in vodka), are quoted some official and shocking statistics. Those statistics were passed to the special session of the Supreme Court, devoted to the "fight against alcoholism and drug abuse."

In 1974, 600,000 drivers were penalized for drunk driving. In each case, by principle, the resulting sentence was "gulag." In the mentioned session of the Supreme Court, as a sample, the results of research on the problem of alcoholism in only one region of Lithuanian Republic were under consideration.

In 1963, the average consumption of alcohol by one inhabitant was 8 liters a year, in 1973 - 38,5 liters. Every inhabitant of this region spent 280 rubles per year on vodka, and on books - 2 rubles. Evidently, taking into account the fact, that the increased price of vodka may diminish its consumption, the State officially permitted the local production of alcohol (in addition to the State monopoly of alcohol production -Ed.). Participating in the dispute, a delegate of the Health Protection Dept. of the USSR, stated on this occasion: "Cheap alcoholic beverages of local production do not technically correspond even to the lowest standards. Those beverages, which in contrast with 'moonshined products' are being produced and sold legally much faster than vodka, lead to a great degradation and induce various psychological effects."

So, vodka, in comparison with those "legal beverages" appears to be a balsam. They - "lead faster than vodka..." The delegate of the Health Protection Dept. added that they also begin to "lead" much earlier, defining this process in 2 words- "alcoholism rejuvenated." According to his statistics 75% of the boys 15 years old, 80% - 16, and 95% of 17 years old, drink alcohol. Soon, it will be possible, together with the graduation certificate to give a certificate of mature drunkards, in most cases with 3 years experience.*/

*/ In comparison with a benevolent and liberal approach to alcoholism, the regulation against the drug addicts and drug peddlers, are much more severe. Not long ago, a bill "strengthening the fight against narcotism has been enacted. It provides 15 years of gulag for drug peddling. The Supreme Court devoted much of its time to this problem. It has been

"Alcoholism rejuvenated" and its connection with an army of those in prisons has rejuvenated too. In Nov. 75, notes from a diary of A.Marchenko, 39 years old author of "My Confessions" in which he describes the horrors of Khrushchev's gulags, leaked to the West. Marchenko had been sentenced for 4 years of gulag; the journey in a prisoner train from Moscow to Czuma, allowed him to spend some time in larger transitory prisons on the most famous road to the gulags - Moscow - Vladivostok. In Novosibirsk - Marchenko writes - in cell NO 11, of about 120 square meters area were 163 prisoners. "In the daytime" - tells the experienced zek - "one could somehow live, but at night!! I don't know how many cells like NO 11 were in the prison, but the other prisoners assured me that the prison can accommodate 25-30,000 men. Possible. No official statistics are available. I can only say what I saw myself: the prisons which I passed through, were overcrowded with young people.

* * *

stated that: "Despite the fact that the number of drug addicts registered by authorities is insignificant - in comparison with the shocking statistical figures of the West - we conduct a heavy battle against this phenomenon..." We should note that quoted is the number of "registered drug addicts." The number of "unregistered drug addicts is growing very rapidly. The Soviet authorities do, indeed, conduct an unconditional battle against the drug problem: They defend their monopoly of poisoning their own people with a poison of their own choice. Not to speak that poisoning the people with vodka brings the State - enormous monopolist revenues.

Propaganda, based on the "application of the science of the second system of reflexes" for obtaining desirable reactions, has another medium, beside the already mentioned media. It is always possible to get rid of a word which became unwanted or which evokes undesirable reflexes. Not long ago, from East Germany's dictionary, words such as "election", "eligibility" and the like, had been deleted as unnecessary. The Soviet dictionaries and encyclopedias are systematically cleaned-up of the names of writers and political figures that are inconvenient to the authorities. But, as usual, the Chinese - pupils - surpassed the Soviets - teachers. It appeared, for example, that the Chinese Peoples Republic, stopped using the hieroglyph "sulim" which means the Soviet Union. What is left in the Chinese language - so far - is the hieroglyph "suliu" which means the Soviet revisionists.

It is easy, then, to understand the fury of an author of "The Hieroglyphs in the Service of Anti-Sovietism" (*Literaturnaya Gazeta*, Nov. 29. 75) in which he attacked not only Mao-Tse-Tung, but also the whole system of Chinese permanship, which, in the hands of Maoists, became an instrument that narrows the reaches of ideas and hammers into the people's conscience only the Maoist vocabulary - exclusively the kind of thinking that brings comfort for the Maoists.

The author of article is outraged because things might have been quite different: at the start of the twenties, Moscow Institut of Scientific Research on China, had developed a Chinese alphabet based of the Latin language. As we know, in a similar way, there were prepared the alphabets for all Central-Asiatic Soviet Republics. But, at the time when those republics switched from their Arabic alphabet to Latin,

immediately, the Latin was substituted by the Russian alphabet. Evidently, the same project existed for the Chinese language too.

It is easy to imagine what the possibilities could have been for shaping a "proper conscience," if 800 million Chinese people, waking up in the morning, would, as a first activity of a day, grab for PRAVDA in Chinese language written in Russian alphabet...

Judging from the article in the *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, the Soviet leaders still have some hope... Meantime, one may ravish on the successes of the campaign against Sakharov and secure a new and rich possibilities in the formula: Zionism = Racism/

BRIEFLY ABOUT BOOKS

In the spring of 1974, the two American newsmen, Marvin and Bernard Kalb, published "Kissinger" - a biography of the American State Secretary. When in the summer of 1975 I had read this book in the French translation, I already knew what had happened after its publication: the escape of Americans from Vietnam, the Helsinki conference, misfortune and the following success of Kissinger in the Middle East. But, the book about Kissinger is still actual not only because of the character of its hero, but, above all, because it represents a very interesting analysis of the American foreign politics in the span of five important years - 1969 - 1974.

The authors of the book gave a very detailed biography of Henry Kissinger - a German immigrant, American soldier, professor at Harvard, the Secretary of State of the USA who accepted the demission of the American

President; a vain man, possessed by desire for power. One of his coworkers said: "Henry admires power, he admires it absolutely. For him, there is nothing in diplomacy, but the power." In the sixties, while holding a professorship at Harvard and writing quite a number of books on foreign politics, Kissinger wrote: "To us, an agreement has a legal, not only a utilitarian meaning; it represents a moral, not only practical strength. From the Soviet standpoint, a concession is only a stage in the conduct of the fight." In 1966, about the war in Vietnam, he said: "the victory of a third grade communist nation over the USA, will greatly strengthen the fighting power of the Communist movement in the whole world." Kissinger's views are changing radically at the time of his nomination as Nixon's advisor on foreign politics; very soon he becomes the actual leader of the foreign politics of the USA. The turning point of American foreign policy which took place at the beginning of the seventies, Kissinger explains as caused by the basic changes in the "nuclear power balance" between the USA and the USSR. After forced removal of the Soviet rockets from Cuba, the USSR - according to American records - had managed to overtake the USA in the production of rockets and nuclear weapons. Nixon and Kissinger decided to adjust themselves to this fact. The stimulus of the new Kissinger's politics - though it sounds like a paradox - were the revolts in Gdansk in December 1970: "After the revolts in Poland Brezhnev had comprehended, that he may lose his power (as Polish Gomulka did) if all internal problems of Communist society - economy in the first place - were not put in order. He had understood that the old abacus must be replaced by a modern computer and the commerce and financial relations with abroad must be properly revitalized. He had had no other choice.

So, Kissinger, assuming that to Brezhnev the West is a necessity, already in the Jan. 9, 1971 sends to Kremlin a letter which formulates the principles of the new American foreign policy: the USA is ready to help in modernization of the Soviet economy if the USSR "becomes more elastic and will express a desire to talk with us about important matters." The politics of *Detente* thus begins. Politics, whose peripatetics are well known. From the 540 pages of the book emerges a silhouette of a diplomat who carries negotiations with the Communist opponent, entirely unaware of what his opponent represents. Characteristic is this confession of Kissinger: No sooner that in the third year of negotiations with North Vietnam he came to understanding what the N.Vietnamese actually want - the help of the USA in getting rid of Thieu. Signing the agreement with N.Vietnam, Kissinger was convinced that he had succeeded in defending Thieu. We know how it had ended.

The book ends with a quotation of the beloved American State Secretary: "Henry Kissinger once used to quote Metternich: I know what I want and I know what the others are capable of; that's why I am completely ready." The book of American newsmen shows that, perhaps, Kissinger knows well what he wants, but realizes not at all what the others are capable of.

* * *

From the other books I have read lately, two are specifically illustrative of "what the others are capable of." The first is the biography of Maurice Thorez, written by French historian, Philippe Robrieux, who had once been the leader of French Communist youth movement. Robrieux did a very detailed research in national and private archives,

interviewed many people who used to know the leader of French Communists, among them, his wife "staunchy Stalinist" Jeanette Vermersch. "Maurice Thorez" is the first scientific - meaning, based on determinant evaluation of facts - biography of a communist leader. The book is interesting not only to the readers who like the history of France, but also to these interested in the history of the USSR. The history of Thorez's life is a history of the conversion of a smart, young Frenchman from the working people's environment, into a Stalinist bureaucrat, who in every respect, absolutely in every respect - in looks as well as in life style and behavior - doesn't differ from other Soviet Party bureaucrats. The history of this metamorphosis strikes us as the answer to the persistent announcement of the Western Communists: "it will be different in our country." The book of Philippe Robrieux proves on the basis of documentation that everything will be exactly as it is in the Soviet Union. In order to support this opinion, it will suffice to point out the fantastic story behind the autobiography of Maurice Thorez - "The Son of the People," that has been published in million of copies. Philippe Robrieux, on the basis of documents in his possession, proves that everything in Thorez autobiography is a lie; from the beginning to the end. Thorez himself didn't even touch it; he simply ordered it to be written by a specialist of propaganda, who, in turn, passed it to a literary "expert"; and the "expert", having a sense of humor inserted some acrostics in the text. A cautious reader can decipher from a poetical expression in a sentence on page 36: "Freville wrote this book." The transformation of Thorez into an obedient servant of Stalin was a 10 year job for a delegate of the Komintern, a slavish Communist, Eugen Fried. Without his approbate,

Thorez could not say a word. Everything, like in Moscow.

* * *

The second book "Without the Country and Frontiers" of Jean Valtin, is an autobiography of a Communist. The story of the transformation of a German laborer-sailor into an activist of the Komintern. From 1918, when as a boy he had been distributing leaflets in Hamburg, to 1938, when looking for shelter against pursuing Gestapo and NKVD, he ran to the USA - Richard Krebs, alias Jean Valtin, known to the police of many countries, under many names, believed that he fought for the freedom of working masses. A German Communist, who participated in 1932 in the Hamburg revolution, Jean Valtin, after a period of special education in Moscow, becomes one of the most important links of the Soviet secret service which with the help of Komintern covered the whole world. The history of the J. Valtin's book is as equally astounding as the history of its author. Published in 1948, it immediately met with violent attacks not only of the communist but also liberal newspapers. Entirely forgotten, it appeared again in France in 1975 and, immediately, hit the Court of Justice, which demanded deleting 10 of its 716 pages; the 10 pages on which the author tells about the French Communists - cooperators of the NKVD.

With great literary talent, Jean Valtin discloses the machinery of the NKVD - the Komintern, a monster of power, cruelty and ruthlessness, operating in every continent, and tells us about tragic adventures of its agents. Everything that in 1948 had appeared as a fabrication, a blackmail against the

Soviet Union, becomes presently true. But, the actuality of J.Valtin's book lies somewhere else: Long and loaded with details, passages of the book unveil the story of the Komintern's actions in Germany at the beginning of the thirties when Communists had directed their forces to the destruction of the Weimar Republic. "The blind hatred toward Social-Democrats" - writes Valtin - "found its fulfillment in the secret instructions of Dimitrov, dispatched in Jan.1931. All the leaders of German Communists were ordered to organize a joint action of the Communist party and Hitler's movement, for accelerating the destruction of Democratic block which, then governed Germany." Jean Valtin recollects what resulted in Germany from the instruction of Manuilsky: "In order to deceive the masses, Social-Democrats advertise Fascism as the main enemy of the working class. It isn't true that Fascism of the Hitlerian type is the enemy..." Today, when the Soviet press conducts the campaign against the Portugal socialists, these words sound eminently realistic.

Sent to Germany for an underground job, after Hitler gained power, J.Valtin had been arrested by Gestapo, inhumanly tortured and kept in a concentration camp. And, there, he receives an order of the Party to begin to cooperate with Gestapo. Faithful soldier of the party, fulfills his duty. From the conversation with Gestapo he learns how greatly esteemed are its competitors. "Inspector Kraus talks with great respect about NKVD. We learn very much from them. Everyday, we learn something new." Doubtless, the NKVD too, had been drawing in handfuls from the treasures of the Gestapo.

* * *

In the latest book of English writer, John Le Carré, I found an elegiac description of the KGB - yesteryear's NKVD. The author of the famous spy novel, "A Spy who Came From Cold," returned to the same theme that had brought him fame, and to his old hero, an English master-spy John Smiley. The story told by Le Carré is simple (though the action is very complicated and the solution, as usual, found in end: In the heart of the English Secret Service is planted a Soviet agent, a "mole" in spy language. Le Carré is a master of writing these sorts of novels and his last one is read with great interest. It's interesting for other reasons: It is a picture of the internal psychological degeneration of Great Britain. I don't know any other book that would convey to the reader the tragically sounding conviction that everything is lost, that the ruling class of the country had lost its raison d'être.

In the last chapter of the book, John Smiley unmasks the spy. It's his ex-friend, lover of his wife, a man of Smiley's social class. Smiley understands the spy, and finds explanation for why Bill Haydon has been for a long time betraying his country, even becoming a citizen of the Soviet Union: Haydon deceived. As a lover, pal, friend; as a patriot; as a member of the priceless group that is called the high society. He deceived in every respect. Haydon openly strived toward one goal, but secretly wanted to obtain something different. Smiley knows well that even now he had not yet caught up with the dimension of his frightening double-dealing. And there was something inside him that grew into a notion of defending Haydon. Wasn't it that Bill had been deceived too?... with tormenting clarity he visualized a man destined to greatness, to governing, dividing and conquering, a man whose dreams and ambitions'

were driving him toward a game of the world's fame. But his real life had been limited to the ill-fated Island whose voice had been merely heard on the other side of the Canal."

What is left for us? In the USA, young men are recruited by posters: "Want to see the world - join the Navy!" Perhaps, pretty soon in the West, this style of advertising will be seen on the posters of the KGB.

Adam Kruczek

CORRESPONDENCE FROM ROME (excerpt)

Everybody who had occasion to meet personally the wife of Andrei Sakharov, during her 2 months visit in Italy (where she underwent serious eye operation), was under the spell of her unusual personality, courage, intelligence, simplicity and common sense. Your correspondent met her for the first time on Nov.12, at a great conference in Rome, in which a large group of parliamentarists of the Italian Christian-Democratic Party, participated. By coincidence, the conference took place at the time when the Soviet agency TASS disclosed information about the refusal of granting A.Sakharov a permit to travel to Oslo to accept the Nobel Peace Prize. The occasion of Elena Sakharov's and the chief editor of *Kontynent*, Vladimir Maximov's appearance at the conference, brought "on the spot" invitation to the panel of the 2 representatives of Eastern Europe: the ex-deputy of Czechoslovakian Christian Democratic People's party, Bahumir Bunza, and me. The combined Russo-Czech - Polish four had the duty of enlightening the audience in the problems of Marxism, answering the (sometimes very naive) questions of the Catholic members of the

Italian Parliament. The conference had been opened by the Christian Democratic representative, then followed a rather dull lecture on "Marxism and Democracy" (the conference had been planned long before) by the editor of *Civiltà Cattolica*, a well known organ of Jesuits.

Elena Sakharov was answering without beating around the bush. She did not hide fears that the refusal of a permit for her husband's departure could cause a new series of chicanery toward Sakharov and his family. To the question whether she'll go to Oslo as a substitute for her husband she retorted straight off: "Why instead of this question don't you use every possible pressure to get him out, why you so easily and quickly capitulate?" The decision of refusal, she declared as the violation of Helsinki agreement signed not long ago, and added, that "whoever today criticises the Soviet regime is automatically accused of opposing international relaxation." In order to, properly understand how this relaxation is interpreted in the USSR, one has to - in her opinion - track down the fate of so called dissidents, read the Soviet press and realize the fact that the military education in Russia begins for the child of 8." Public opinion in the West and the governments of the European countries can - she believes - cause a concrete relief in the USSR through "maximal publicity" around the individual cases of political prisoners in gulags and madhouses. Among others, she mentioned Leonid Plyushch, Ukrainian mathematician, who is "systematically destroyed in a psychiatric asylum in Dniepropetrovsk, Vladimir Bukowski, Andrei Twerdochlebov - the secretary of the Moscow *Amnesty International*, and biologist Sergei

Kovalikov - a friend of Sakharov arrested a year ago in Vilna for help he had offered to the Lithuanian Catholics.

"It isn't enough to sign an appeal" - she stressed - you must also demand a reply to it," and as an example of the lack of consequences she described the great manifestation in Paris on behalf of Plyushch: "instead of demanding the answer to the appeal" - she stressed again - "the French government continued the exchange of official scientific delegation, as if nothing happened." With a tune of irony and perhaps bitterness she criticised the behavior of the West that "acts in the great Christian spirit - sharing bread with those who want to destroy it." To the expressions of admiration for her, and to the solidarity of the audience with her position which involves her personal safety she answered: "If you don't stop acting only as the passive observers, I risk saying that I won't ever go back home."

The chairman of the conference, summing up its developments in *Democrasia Christiana*, stated: After Elena Sakharov's appearance, we have been left deeply moved and overwhelmed with profound feeling of guilt.

Dominik Morawski

75c

Fragments

Vol. 3/3

March, 1976

by

Charles Joel

Zbigniew Byrski

ABOUT THE AMERICAN
NEO-EGALITARISM
(Excerpt)

Among those few American intellectuals who perceive the fact that their country - and with it, the rest of Western World - slides down an inclined plane, grows concern about approaching catastrophe. But they do nothing in order to prevent it. In any case nothing is done in this respect by the man who holds an exposed social, political or scientific position.*/

To the depressing symptoms characteristic of the present course of decay

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 1/340 - 2/341, 1976, published in Paris, France.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

Published by C.H.S.L., P.O. Box 744
Sutter Creek, California, 95685

Printed by the Essicc Company
Sutter Creek, California

*/ With certain exceptions - as wrote Patrick Buchanan in TV Guide of Sept.8,1975 (on the edge of dispute over the CBS program of Don Rather, one of the leading newscasters of this public stupefying broadcasting station). Under dispute was the IQ test which on the basis of certain number of questions detects various faculties of persons that are tested. In the program, the IQ test was attacked from a defined ideological position - the cornerstone of contemporary egalitarianism - completely omitting the elements of genetics and ascribing the result of the test to the elements of environment - a very disputable question which for a long time - at least from the birth of the evolution theory - has many opponents and adherents. Lately, professors Jensen, Herrnstein and Shockley, who suspected that there is a correlation between hereditary traits and intelligence, found that it isn't easy in a country of "free exchange of ideas," to bring their findings into the light of public dispute. Based on principles reminiscent of the late Russian Prof. Lysenko and his protectors, that all digressions from the "line" are reactionary and racist, there was an attempt made to

that eats at America, we may add one more - hopelessness. Just as the South Vietnamese who tried to save themselves from Communism not by fighting but through a panicky and disorderly flight, a few groups of learned Americans, instead of fighting, and, following the example of Solzhenitsyn, putting all of their names into shouting for *The Truth*, fall into a state of prostration. They are like the representatives of Western nations in the UNO - self-scourging for "injustices" inflicted on the Third World and putting their own necks into the yoke of the

prevent Prof. Shockley from delivering his lecture in the New York University. "The freedom of discussion" which the New Left in its years of triumph had enjoyed, returned again to the old venerable institution. Finally, Prof. Shockley, despite the noises and affrontery of Law School students, under the police protection, managed to deliver his lecture. What was the circle of some members of the faculty and students afraid of? If Prof. Shockley was wrong, there wasn't any reason for fear. "What has been feared" - writes Patrick Buchanan - "and what had frightened some of the scientists and students of NYU, was, that he could show the truth to the audience." Perhaps, not necessarily the truth, I add from my side. Perhaps, the fear of evoking some doubts in the listeners' minds that the evangelical theory proclaiming that environment shapes the personality of the human being, was sufficient reason for fear. The official thesis supported by the panel of the TV program whose chairman was CBS's favorite commentator, Don Rather, pronounced that the IQ test is a most perverse fraud which, in the hands of American Middle Class, became an instrument of oppression aimed at Afro-Americans, immigrants from South America

deceptive ideology of egalitarianism.*/ "Equality" - contrary to what Prof. Brzezinski proclaims - became not so much a "moral stimulus of our time" as absurd blackmail. Cynicism with which the totalitarian masters of the Third World demand an "equal" share of the wealth, goes along with the invasion of lies and misinformation in the USA - to which, unconsciously, like an ox led to slaughter, the average American surrenders. The truth is of no value anymore. The American "free exchange of ideas" owing to the real, though never decreed, dominance of *mass media*, managed to kill the truth almost as effectively as the Soviet system did.

In 1960 the *New York Times* published an announcement of a group of student activists opposing the attempts of the administration of the State of Alabama to prevent the Black population from receiving equal rights. In general, the Alabama State government intended not only to preserve the existing 100 year old racial division, but also, discrimination, obviously harmful

and the White Poor. "White Poor" has been added as a spice for taking away from "anti-racist" thesis its racist smell. It is no coincidence that in the context were omitted Asian minorities which, although discriminated against, are not afraid to take the IQ test that serves to maintain the "ethnic classes oppression."

*/ The situation, in this respect, had improved radically owing, mainly, to the uncompromising declarations of Daniel P. Moynihan, the USA Delegate to the UNO, who, in contrast with his predecessors and his chief, Kissinger, did not varnish his position with empty rhetoric and, above all, did not look for the applause of the representatives of the Third World and Communist delegations.

to the colored people. A statement published in the *New York Times*, however, contained several slanders directed at Sullivan, a high ranking state officer under whose administration were the state police and fire department. The State Supreme Court recognized as justified the claim of Sullivan against the *New York Times* and adjudged on his behalf a half million dollars compensation. The *New York Times* appealed to the USA Supreme Court, and obtained the annulment of sentence.

The most striking aspect entailing incalculable consequences, was not the verdict itself, but the motivation of it by the USA Supreme Court. The Supreme Court agreed that accusations printed in the *New York Times* contain lies and slanders, nevertheless, it refused the first verdict on the basis of the first amendment to the Constitution, which in the Court's understanding, gives an absolute and unconditional right to criticize persons that play important roles in public life, even in cases when the freedom of critique is abused (Italics - author's). (Opinion of the Court, page 298, October Term, 1963 376 U.S.). In an explanation of the verdict, Judge J. Goldberg stated: "The freedom of critique cannot be restrained by the possibility of defamation." The only limitation - as resulted from the further deliberations of the Supreme Court panel - is a slander committed consciously. In other words, a slandered person who desires to, legally, obtain satisfaction, must prove the slanderer's ill-will. As in practice it is impossible or almost impossible to prove that a slanderer is acting with ill-will, the American mass media were given by the Supreme Court of the USA a "green light" for lies, slanders and misinformation. And, one must admit that, with the exception of a few reporters, they

use it widely. In this manner, the first amendment to the Constitution - the cornerstone of the freedom of the press - has been changed into the privilege of having a lack of responsibility for the printed or spoken word.

* * *

Racism is so scandalously and widely abused by American newsmen, that we ought to explain at least some of the misunderstandings that emerge from a rather foggy meaning of the word "racism."

According to previous discussions, the thesis about "equality" of races or individuals is as nonsensical as the thesis about their "inequalities." It doesn't mean that groups of people classified according to their national or racial characteristics, would be incomparable, meaning, that we wouldn't be able to ascribe certain typical talents or imperfections to some and refuse giving them to the others.

Whenever we are confronted with a statement that one race or nation is "worse" or "lower" than another - we consider this statement as wrong, but there is no reason to consider it as racist - the point which I'll attempt to prove.

For example, Gypsies have a talent as well as a love for the nomadic life, which many other nations lack. However, it doesn't prove that Gypsies are a "higher" ethnic group than other groups. On the contrary - the nomadic life style greatly hinders their adaptability to living in modern civilized societies, and for this groundless reason, many people consider them to be more inferior than many other nations. The lack of social discipline that

is a plague of Americans - and some time ago - was a characteristic of Polish people, one may contrast with the discipline of the Germans which, hand in hand with their organizational talents, doubtless, surpasses other nations. Nonetheless, the same characteristics which facilitated their recovery after World War 2, had brought, because of their blind obedience to barbarian authority, the unforgettable results to them and to the rest of the world. What I want to say is, that all the so called nationalistic "good" or "bad" qualities should be looked at from a standpoint of their relationship to a defined social status or historical circumstances. Although nations, races and groups have, undoubtedly, certain characteristics which in certain conditions put one national or racial group in a more advantageous position than the other - there isn't any absolute criterion that would allow us to recognize one nation as "better" than the other, because - among many other causes - there is no ideal social covenant which would make a typical characteristic of one nation a universal value.

There is no question that the average adaptability of the black population to American Capitalism is lower than the adaptability of the White or Asian race (many Negroes, for this reason only, oppose the American capitalistic *establishment*). But this fact doesn't entitle anybody to insist that Blacks are "lower" than Whites. Better adaptability of the Black race to tribal life is unquestionable too. We may suppose that for this reason and not for the reason of their colonial experiences, the functioning of new nations in Black Africa encounters many difficulties. However, should one insist in saying that modern nations are better because they represent higher forms of government than

tribal communities, then we should ask - why? "higher" - for what reasons since voices against super-civilization and its deadly results appear to be well substantiated? If the capitalistic and communistic systems based on accumulation of capital, are recognized as damaging systems, then the lack of adaptability to them may be treated not as a disadvantage - but as a healthy reaction of human individuals. Of course, one may agree, or not, with this point of view.

A racist, according to definition is one who persecutes a group of people on the basis of ethnic or racial differences, or one who propagates and advises this kind of action. Believing in one's superiority may, but not necessarily so be a reason for one's anti-racial behavior. Hitlerians, adopting the creed of Nordic race superiority, were murdering Jews. The extermination of Gypsies (direct descendants of the Indo-Arian tribe) didn't have anything in common with inequalities of the races. They were destroyed because by the Nazi ideologists' definition, they were socially obnoxious. The governments of South Africa because they believe in superiority of white race over black, discriminate against Blacks, but a racist and a notorious murderer of his own fellow-countrymen, the President of Uganda, Idi Amin, drove all Asians - settlers for many generations - out of the country not because he considered them a lower race, but, because at the attempts of creating modern economic organism in Black Africa, Asians had proved their better adaptability and could show that they were more successful than the natives of Uganda. Similarly - though less brutally - for the same reasons, the President of Kenya, Jomo Kenyatta, behaves, with regards to Asian minorities.

In several western American colleges the Chinese American applicants must meet a higher entrance requirements because if given the equal chance, they would create a rapid increase of diplomas for the representatives of yellow race in comparison with Whites or Blacks. This is a sign of discrimination which, in America, is not much talked or written about.

In conclusion, one must agree that, first of all, racism is not one or the other false theory that proclaims the superiority of one human group over the other, but practice which, of course, may be sprinkled with some pseudo-theory, as it has been shown in the example of Hitlerian Germany. Secondly, a racist practice may arise not from the conviction that one group is more superior than the other, but, to the contrary - from the recognition of one's own inferiority. Of course, pride or national or racial chauvinism makes many believe in their superiority and never allows them to admit publicly that they are inferior in relation to those whom they persecute.

* * *

Neo-egalitarianism is only one of several causes of the present nihilism that the USA is sinking into. Although it is difficult to attempt to make a thorough diagnosis of this phenomenon, I think, that, at least we can describe certain attributes which determine the present degeneration of contemporary America. They are, the unrestrained abuses of the glorious ideological mottos which mankind - particularly the peoples of the West - had fought for one and half century. Presently, following the post industrial revolution,

world wide immigration, increased chauvinism of those ethnic groups and nations that in the last century had never had any chance for proving themselves in the eyes of the world - those glorious mottos became their own caricature and contradiction.

About equality - or neo-egalitarianism and its social impact I have written enough. In turn, it behoves me to devote a few words to such matters as the right to work and strike and the abuses of freedom. The right of strike, which a citizen of the dictatorial and totalitarian regimes is dispossessed of, in the USA became an instrument of blackmail used by selected groups of employees of services, transportation, municipal police and other services less vital to the existence of modern society. Worthy of our attention is that: 1/ Strikes, in many cases, are organized not by low paid groups of workers, but to the contrary, by the highly paid. The level of their wages results neither from the qualifications obtained through years of learning, nor from any exceptionally heavy work. If we take as an example an employee of a municipal garbage disposal department in a great metropolitan area - we can clearly see that his pay-check is a function not so much of "heavy laboring", as of the consequences that may follow his refusal to work. In greatly populated cities the stoppage of transportation, cleaning streets, fire fighting or police protection, may result in catastrophe and, as we had experienced, already did. 2/ In the old days when Capitalism was blooming, labor strikes were directed against exploiting capitalists. Presently, many strikes which pretend to be aimed against an employer (which in many cases is a state or a city) is actually aimed against society. Society - not the state or

municipal government is an object of black-mail. Those groups of strikers, knowing their power, use it in a manner unlimited by any social consequences. They back off, but only when the consequences of their actions may turn against them. Several strikes that occurred may be considered not as just an alarm bell, but, rather, as a post mortem toll to everything America has been able to create in the past. If, taking as an example, the firemen's strike in Kansas City which was accompanied by a greater number of fires than before the strike - started by the firemen-arsonists - as a weapon to force the mayor of the city to capitulate; if the strike of San Francisco policemen whose wages during the past 5 years reached the level \$24,000 per ann (greatly exceeding the actual cost-of-living) forced the mayor to capitulate unconditionally - then, there is no place for illusions of what the right of strike has become in America. Till now - and such was the situation in those parts of the free world where the right of strike existed - its costs in the form of subsidies for strikers and their families were covered by Trade Unions. It seemed fair and just, because it was a manifestation of working class solidarity. But recently in two American States - New York and Rhode Island - a new law was enacted. The strikers, irrespectively of terms demanded by an employer, receive unemployment benefits or Social Welfare. In other words - a worker who quits working of his own will, is supported by the tax-payers. The American Trade Unions are trying to expand this law over the whole country. Leonard Woodcock - the President of the Automotive Industry Workers Union (not a member of AFL-CIO) in one of his speeches asks demagogically: "Why punish the children because their fathers take the advantage of the legal right to strike?" ("Memo

from Cope," NO.19-75, Sept.15, 1975 - a communique of the Public Education Commission AFL-CIO). Indeed, innocent children don't deserve punishment, but why, for the right to strike which in many cases is abused, should those who quite often earn much less than the striking workers pay? Social justice - for which the American unions and leftist political organization fought, changed into a cultivation of laziness and consciously chosen unemployment. Any doubts one may have in this respect are dispersed by another quotation from the same periodical of AFL-CIO: "Meany and Woodcock stress in unison that welfare should take care of all the needy *regardless of the causes of their difficult situation*" (Italics - author's). So, it is clear: A cripple, an invalid, aged, a deserted wife burdened with children has the same right to benefits (for which society must pay) as has a notorious idler or tramp - or, according to classification of psycho-analysts - a "frustrated" man. George Meany, a passionate enemy of *Detente*, is, evidently, blind to the fact that a certain popularity among the American people attributed to this suicidal policy, is solidly tied up with changes in the American people's attitudes - with their growing timidity, love of comfort, lack of discipline and unwillingness to work.

In present America there is a multitude of 8 million of unemployed. However, there is "another side of a coin" to this phenomenon. Namely, that many jobs are vacant because there are no volunteers to take them. It pays better to be unemployed and draw benefits or to be on welfare.*/

*/ both types of help are exchangeable in many states; moreover, after half year of working one is entitled to draw benefits

To what unimaginable limits will the abuse of freedom go in the USA? One would write without bounds. It will be sufficient to give the reader several most striking instances - one which gives the American *mass media* the right to discriminate and slander I already described. It appears that "freedom" although an abstract idea in comparison with a loaf of bread, has some of its characteristics. Whenever a certain "chosen" part of society has too much of it, the remaining part suffers its scarcity.

It would be an exaggeration to insist that American TV viewers, radio listeners and readers of newspapers are the captives of misinformation and ignorant press commentaries whose authors enjoy the privilege of having the lack of responsibility for the printed or spoken word. After all one may not listen to or read the commentaries, and in the lecture of papers limit oneself to picking up only information about world events which, in comparison with the Communist press, are given him in plentitude. Nonetheless, the "monopoly" of *mass media*, even if not taken literally, says something more than just the plain facts. The monopolization of information has its roots in the ease of American life, in the reluctance and laziness of the American receiver of information to take pains to repudiate

during a 15 month period; in New York State the maximum weekly benefit cannot be higher than \$95. It isn't much, but many people prefer to get less without work, than to work and earn more. The philosophy of cultivating or even glorifying unwillingness to work yields fruit for the whole nation.

all that is easily offered for free by TV or radio. Is there, after the day's work, any need to look for a better product if there is plenty of rubbish - for nothing? The Soviet or Polish viewer, if he didn't lose completely his sense of critique, knows that he is deceived and searches for the truth. An American living in the country of freedom, doesn't realize that information and interpretation of the events by the leading Radio and TV conglomerates, are tendentious - marginally commenting on some, and extremely enlarging other problems - solely for the purpose of shaping recipient's mind in their own image. Even if a recipient detects any scantiness and primitive camouflage that are applied by the champions of Liberal Left of Radio and TV - he is too lazy to search out for the truth.

Of course, the American *mass media* profusely informs the public about everything bad that happens in America. We shouldn't blame them for this. It is natural that mass media should report everything. But the gravity of their sin lies in the facts that: 1/ In publicizing the contemptible practices of American government, especially its agencies the CIA and the FBI, they don't attempt to widen the recipients' horizons of knowledge of what is really happening all over the world. 2/ Their passion and sensationality as well as unproportional amount of time devoted to scourging America, points to the pathological symptoms of masochism - to, what Prof. Brzezinski calls a "syndrome of self-inflicted hatred toward one's own country," seen among people working for the American *mass media* (Commentary - July 1975. "America now: Failure of Nerves," page 27).

The impoverishment of the American for knowledge of world affairs is only one sign of a formidable phenomenon of abuses of freedom. Another which is very important is solidly connected with neo-egalitarianism and manifests itself in motion that freedom to a certain category of Americans means the want of discipline that leads to violence and crime. Some time ago the immunity from crimes committed on Blacks was held by Southern Whites. Those times are gone. But the situation did not reserve itself. Instead, it changed for the worse in many directions making millions of people of different ethnic groups captives of fear and terror - always with the preponderance of aged, women and physically indolent. Millions of people are victims of crimes committed by those who, as in the other parts of the world, breed in the lowest strata of the populace. Liberal Left glorifies the poor^{*/} as the victims of the system. Perhaps it is true in certain cases. Some of the ethnic groups being poorly adapted to modern capitalistic system, are indeed pushed down to a level - which in the economically underdeveloped countries means wealth - but in the USA - poverty. What is it that makes a young man rob an 80 year old woman, mind you, not a pawn-broker from the novel of Dostoyewski, but an elderly person living on retirement pension? A normal individual who believes in elementary moral values, revolts not against masked bandits holding up a bank, but against local teenagers who, without any

^{*/} It isn't an exaggeration. If you have any doubts, just think about the fashion of tattered and flabby clothes - purportedly produced by industry - worn by many people that take pride in having an honorary status of belonging to the "poor" class.

risk and in full daylight snatch away from a blind person who sells papers on street-corner his, or her, daily take. But this type of criminal in the USA enjoys something like a double status. From the standpoint of law, he is a criminal and goes - at least from time to time - to jail. But from the standpoint of the present neo-egalitarianism's morality, he is treated as a victim of the system. And, because many judges believe in this kind of morality, they apply an "easy tariff" - analogical to a tariff used in schools and in application for job (the one who has no "ethnic title" to take the advantage of - is discriminated against). What does that morality do? It locks inside their homes or apartments all the old and invalid people - potential victims of youngsters' crimes. Too much of freedom for some - in this case, freedom to commit crimes and murders - has caused bondage for the others.

Among many problems connected with crimes there is one most obvious: Penitentiary systems should serve to protect society against criminals, not to protect criminals against the consequences of their acts. Further deliberation upon the problem leads us to the question of what kind of system, what social covenant and to what degree justify the lawbreaking. There is no answer if Liberal Left cries noisily that applying severe methods of punishment against street lawbreakers, burglars and murderers, is a discrimination of the "poor" because millionaires almost never commit this kind of crimes. We must agree with the latter part of the above sentence - yes, a millionaire won't rob an elderly woman and won't hold up a bank. But, is the Liberal Left able to produce any alternative social covenant - without millionaires and bandits?

(Bandits, whose only justification for crimes are "difficult childhood", troubled adolescence and short, but sweet, stay in jail - if ever) All this, today, after 30 years, reminds us the grim statement of Winston Churchill, who said that Capitalistic Democracies are very bad systems - with a little stipulation - that the other systems are much worse. We all ask for a better system, but, so far, no offer has been made. What we have, are only negotiations and imprecise ideas.

The present state of affairs in America and Western Europe excites well justified pessimism. A key to this situation is neither economic crisis, nor financial, energetic and strategic weakness of the West. Rather, it is found in human attitudes and domineering currents - a reverse scale of traditional and human moral values which have been known for ages

What is possible to do is, to search in Western societies, particularly in the USA, for social forces which may become not so much a springboard for revival, but at least, a source or ignition point of social ferment that would shock America and in this not too attractive way make the American society turn back from its suicidal road. I believe, that a reservoir of this kind of social forces which would show signs of an open rebellion against the present American elite's tendencies, does exist.

It isn't against "equality" which is absolutely and everywhere considered to be a politico-moral dogma, but against the practical results of its abuses, that the descendants of - presently a part of American middle

class - American Proletariat */ - protest. American Middle Class is not uniform sociologically. It is made of laborers as well as small businessmen, farmers and in a great part of white collar workers. It has many traditional flaws of all small bourgeoisies. It is narrow-minded and short-sighted in its egotism, and ready to defend by all available means its gains. It is afflicted with xenophobia - or rather, because of heterogeneity of the USA - with many xenophobias. It is influenced by isolationistic tendencies which have always been a creed of the overwhelming majority of Americans. Despite all these characteristics reminiscent of middle class of the past eras, it is not, by any measures, an image of it. The majority of the American labor movement opposes the politics of *Detente*. Not because it wants confrontation with Russia, but because it has deeply rooted instinct of self-preservation which motivates its distrust toward anybody who notoriously breaks agreements. The paradox of the present outlook lies in the fact that while the intellectual elite of the USA becomes a carrier of misinformation and imposes on American pluralistic society its leftist-liberal views, American Middle Class remains the only social force which would oppose all the social pressures that lead to the USA decline.

*/ If one considers the etymology of the word "proletariat", one will find that contemporary American laborers in industry, transportation and services - because of their high standard of living - are entirely unconnected with this definition - despite the fact that their role in production, since creation of modern capitalistic economy of the USA, has not changed.

American Middle Class has neither its own party, nor leaders, not to mention - theoreticians. Moreover, it is not able to and it has no ambition to step forth with a program of preservation of the traditional social order that would effectively block neo-liberal invasion. To the peripheral groups of the middle class - especially the small businessmen group - the vision of America is, still, the - impossible to restore - America of the fifties. In effect, the middle class is deprived of elements which would attract new generations and vigorously drive them to saving America from final decline. As the twilight of the former New Left was a result of its lack of political program, so, presently the political weakness of American middle class - in proportion to its multitudinous and social weight - results from its ideological emptiness. American proletariat which for years has been taught that its only goal is to improve its living conditions in the existing system, surely, came out better on its "apolitics" than workers of the countries in which their main goal was a fight for a new "classless" system. Nevertheless, that apolitical road to prosperity or even richness, now bears sour fruit. A sense of its social weight, a conscience of any mission to fulfill never germinated among the American working class. Until recently, there wasn't any need for it. But now, when America and with her the Western World are in a situation - not only critical, but catastrophic - there is this need, but it found American workers completely unprepared. Their role in confrontation with the invasion of many radical movements is purely defensive. That's why, despite the unquestionable fact that the most powerful element of the middle class are workers because their leading force is made of peripheral elements only, the middle class

found itself in a state of desperation. Tired - the more that it cannot break off from the absurd situation - it is exposed to the numb voices of TV pseudo-intellectuals and authentic university intellectuals, financial aristocracy from the old American families that have an unhealed complex of guilt for their fathers' and grand fathers' sins committed on colored people... Those, residing in mansions, far away from the stinking of crime and polluted air, metropolises, support all the egalitarian integration experiments. The absolution for their ancestors' sins is achieved at the expense of others - which reminds me of an old anecdote about Towianski who, seeing a beggar at a sidewalk, wrapped himself tightly in his fur-coat and ordered his lackey to take off his winter-coat and give it to a beggar. Radical Leftist tendencies grow up at the top and at the bottom levels of American society, and the number of radical millionaires and half-millionaires increases frighteningly.*/

*/ As a classical example of super-liberal millionaire who, during the blooming years of leftist traits, quickly changed face leaving the Republican Party, may serve John Lindsey, the mayor of New York in between 1966-1974. During his cadencies he increased a half billion dollars deficit of his predecessor to three and half billion. It all happened at a gigantic increase of the New York expenditures. New York's money resources became a spring from which millions of slugger drank. The liberal mayor and his council supported them by numberless educational enterprises and agencies that were profitable, mostly, to organizers - generously distributing fat jobs among friends. These performances - much more than unemployment - contributed to the increase of crime.

The process of "therapy" of American society has been going on for quite a long time. It goes on without diagnosis and at the expense of the middle class. Under these circumstances there are many candidates for a "Man of Providence" - ready to save America by the application of a reversed prescription of Liberals, but so far, none has come to public light.

Zbigniew Byrski

And, because all this enterprising was taking place at the cost of all inhabitants, the richer taxpayers, including policemen, were moving out as far as possible from the City, which, in effect, caused the diminishing of tax revenues. The poor couldn't afford the luxury of living beyond the boundaries of the City. They stay put, because they were forced to do so. Meantime, the revenues of the City were diminishing and expenditures were increasing until the moment of bankruptcy and liberal New York State Governor Carey's threat of using troops against revolting citizens, if the federal government were not to assist New York City financially.

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 3/4

May, 1976

by

Charles Joel

ANGOLA

by

Brukselczyk

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO.3/342/76, 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

Cuba, no! Angola, no! Rossia, si!

"Shall we go fishing?
I can't, I go fishing.
Pity, because we could
go fishing."

Place of action: The Kremlin, Moscow, Conference Hall of Ministerial Council of the Soviet Union, long, rectangular, gloomy...

Time of action: Jan.21, 1975, 11 a.m. Moscow time.

Through the hall runs a long rectangular table covered with green cloth. On it, the bottles of Pepsi-Cola, a USSR production.

Brezhnev and Kissinger, followed by Gromyko, advisors and interpreters, enter through the left side door. Through the right side door enters a group of American reporters. "You have 5 minutes," - they are warned before admittance. Flashes of camera bulbs, floodlights of TV jupiters. First question.

Reporter: - Mr. First Secretary, will it be a discussion on Angola?

Brezhnev: - Angola doesn't interest me, it isn't my country.

Kissinger:- Certainly, Angola will be discussed.

Gromyko: - Agenda of the conference will be settled jointly.

Kissinger: - There will be talk about Angola.

Brezhnev: - Mr. Kissinger, you better talk about Angola with your advisor, Sonnenfeldt. Both of you will be in accord. I have never heard about any disagreements between you two.

Kissinger: - I hope this statement sounds much more pleasant in Russian than in English...

Afterward, all reporters were thrown out. Through the right side door. Behind it, waited an official of the State Department, who handed reporters confidential instruction on how to behave while staying in Moscow. It contained 5 points: 1/ All telephones are bugged. 2/ All your living quarters are bugged and all conversations recorded. 3/ All your chauffeurs know English and report daily. 4/ All your luggage in the hotels was inspected by the KGB. 5/ All scraps of paper in waste baskets are scrupulously collected and read...

Brezhnev appeared in a grey, steel colored suit, with 4 stars in both flaps of his jacket. He was right - regarding his 4 stars - I don't know that much - but regarding Angola (by the way, is there somebody who knows why he sometimes wears 2, sometimes 3, and this time, 4 stars; maybe he wanted to impress Kissinger).

Several hours after Kissinger's departure, a sort of communique was issued in Moscow, in which there was nothing said about Angola. In its English text it was said that beside

discussions on SALT or strategic nuclear balance "there was an exchange of views on some other urgent matters." For several hours, the American reporters were triumphantly explaining to their public that "other matters" meant Angola and that Brezhnev had to give in. Their triumph was short lived. At the time of his landing in Brussels - straight from Moscow - Kissinger received the Russian text of the same communique. The Russian TASS and *Pravda*, simply deleted from their text the word "urgent"; thus depriving Kissinger of the illusion that certain words sound much more pleasant in Russian than in English. I went, together with several hundred other reporters, in rain and sleet, to the Atlantic suburb of Brussels for a 15 minute (literally) press conference of the Secretary of State. What we heard were only generalities and rude remarks that sounded really unpleasant in French, English and Russian too - as if it were the press to blame for the fact that with the exception of Sonnenfeldt nobody in Moscow really wanted to agree with Kissinger.

First real colony.

Let's be serious now. Of course, there was a discussion about Angola. But, it starts as a dialog "of deafs" cited at the beginning of this writing and suggests that Brezhnev was being, simply, tied up tactically and, if we may use this expression, ideologically. Tactically, because the time for serious talks on Angola had not come yet. Ideologically, because at the time when in Russia there is a great demand for those trivial

80 million tons of grain to balance deficit food supplies, it is difficult to explain to the Soviet people that nothing else but Angola, a black territory several thousands kilometers from Omsk, Minsk or Bratsk, was a subject for conference over the green cloth at the Kremlin. How the Soviet citizens who stand in long lines for bread and meat be convinced that they must share food and, perhaps, destiny with Luanda? What is it and where is it - that Luanda?

Angola, twice as large as France, is the last Portuguese colony and the first, perhaps, Soviet colony in Africa. But, whatever is happening there is neither new, nor strange; it is, simply, sort of - on (for the time being) a somewhat different scale - combination of Biafra and Vietnam. The weapons are from the USA, USSR, France and China; the expeditionary corps from Cuba, Zaire and South African Republic; the cruelty - tribal and fratricidal. And all this entwined in an immense mobilization of human conscience and diplomatic machinations.

However, there is only one small but very interesting difference. Although there were colossal forces engaged, Vietnam had been neither a threat to the world peace, nor, in fact, to the *Detente*. Quite to the contrary. For example, when in 1972 the Boeing 707 with Nixon aboard was landing in Moscow, Boeing 52's were bombing Hanoi and mining the port at Haiphong, destroying on this occasion the ships and killing seamen of the Soviet Union. But these facts did not interfere with drinking champagne and hugging. Brezhnev and Nixon fell in love at the first sight (till death - on the part of Nixon).

This time, however, despite Kissinger's popularity on the Red Square, because of his unhealthy interest in Angola - he was given a cool reception in Moscow. As a result, the Soviet-American relations turned worse not better after the tenth jubilant trip of State Secretary to Moscow.

According to some observers, Brezhnev's innuendo to the Kissinger-Sonnenfeldt partnership was political too. It might have been understood as a critique of unhealthy and irregular proportion of racial minorities in the leadership of the American foreign politics.

Gynecologist in power.

The colonization of Angola by Portugal lasted 500 years. This territory, 14 times larger than its mother country, was discovered by the Portuguese sailor, Diego Cao, in 1482. When on November 10, 1975, his successor, Admiral Leone Cardoso, the last commissioner of Portugal, was folding up his flag in the fort of San Miguel in the Bay of Luanda, it became clear that Portugal had no time for preparing a sensible formula of decolonization. So, at the moment when Cardoso was sneaking away - stealthily, with the flag under his arm - from Luanda, the colonial war ended, but there was also an immediate beginning of a much bloodier war for power and control over the capital.

Three movements were knocking at the gate of the presidential palace. All domestic, all patriotic and all for independence. There was only one insignificant difference:

the color of the new flag or ideology, the color which for all practical purposes is expressed in the color of money.

The first movement carries the initials of MPLA, or more accurately Popular Movement for Liberation of Angola. It is the oldest movement. It was born in 1956, organized by young Marxists, the alumni of different colonial schools and European universities, with help of some of the graduates of Lumumba University in Moscow. Obviously, from its beginning this movement had the support of the USSR and has a talented leader. Dr. Agostino Neto, gynecologist by profession, a poet and a politician by passion, literally covered the globe traveling in search of support for the independence of Angola and himself. When on April 25, 1975, Fascism in Lisbon suddenly fell, the MPLA appeared to the world as the main force in Angola, and Dr. Neto as the main candidate for a leader of the new nation.

In 1962, there came to life a second independence movement in Angola. It is called the FNLA - National Front of Angola Liberation - it has a tribal base of Bacongo tribe. Chief of Bacongists is Roberto Holden, the bearer of Liberal-Democratic ideas, which fact brought him the support of the USA, making him an adversary of the USSR, which fact brought him the sympathy of China; he is also something like a brother-in-law of Mobutu, the President of Zaire, which relationship let him prepare for war in Kinhasa under the eyes of instructors from N. Korea, in relative military and physical comfort. The dark glasses which make him look rather like a friend of Maffia than of Mao, did not hinder

Holden's abilities for securing the trust of certain world megathonic powers.

But because, as we already mentioned, Holden has favoured the Bacongo tribe, one of his officers, a Jonas Sawimbi, broke away from his chief in 1964, and founded his own UNITA or National Unification for the liberation of the whole country, making clear for everybody that the goal of the other competing movements is only a partial liberation of Angola. Sawimbi too ("God is in heaven, Sawimbi in Angola" - is proclamation slogan in his capital), based his movement on Owimbudus tribe which fact gave him a regional power in the vicinity of the boundary with South Africa and has secured for him a rather unusual sympathy and military support for black people by the white republic of apartheid. Sawimbi too, traveled all over the world, mostly in his own jet, but he found a peculiar sympathy in the Elysée Palace of Paris. Maybe, it was his liberalism that has caused this sympathy; maybe, it was, simply, the last Angolan movement free to be taken care of...

Well, making it short, we may say that the war for possession of the capital was horrible, without pardon, no prisoner taken. After 10 months elapsed, Luanda was in ruin, thousands of dead littered the streets, the economy was turned back to nineteenth century, 400,000 Portuguese colonials left the city and surrounding countryside. MPLA had won and gotten rid of its competitors from the capital. In the corpse of Luanda Neto stuck his flag and proclaimed himself as the only president of Angola. He couldn't, however, occupy himself with the reconstruction of the country,

because, along with the victory in Luanda, the domestic war began rolling...

Domestic? It sounds too modest. Whom don't we see there!

Strange civilians with cigars and carbines.

A country that spreads from the Congo River to the edges of Kalahari Desert, could have been a garden of Eden on Earth, could become one of the mightiest powers in Africa, if not... if not what? Or, perhaps, if not who? Or, perhaps, if not both - what and who?

Officially, the forces of Dr. Neto had begun military action in 1961, but actually, no sooner than in 1966 from the Angolan jungle the first Russian Kalashnikov shots were heard and black *gerilleros* wearing the uniforms of dead Portuguese soldiers appeared. But this was the amateurish phase, let's say, some sort of exercise.

Angola, we must in this place say - regretfully - is, frankly speaking, a masterpiece of the Soviet operativeness. It is the largest and the most precise action of Moscow in the African continent and generally, perhaps, beyond Europe; it declares Moscow's departure from awkward and tragicomic handling of its African policies. It is the first action of such a magnitude conducted with such precision and so far from its shores, that it must mean, beyond any doubts, a change in the Soviet strategic philosophy. In short, it means a transition from continental to global, world-wide Soviet imperialism.

On November 11, 1975, Angola proclaims her independence. Next day, the USSR recognizes the government of Dr. Neto as the only legal government of the republic. Luanda announces that "in the frame of bilateral relations between two nations, the USSR gives additional help to Angola." Additional or not, it doesn't matter. In any case, already at the festive independence parade, through the remains of Luanda there rumble the Soviet made armoured cars, not to mention a parade of automatic weapons, mortars and Katyushas. In the already liberated harbour anchor the ships that were sent from the USSR long before the proclamation of Angola's independence, and the airfields are crowded with planes which unload equipment and advisors.

Kissinger is angry, it's clear. "The USA," he announces, "will not tolerate the USSR's adventurism in territories distant from its shores and in interests foreign to its tradition." But Kissinger is wrong. Firstly: America will remain indifferent. The Congress of the USA fascinated by its own belly button and paralyzed by the Vietnam shock refuses to provide anything that would create some sensible and efficacious counter-action, and the White House which is completely engaged in election year activities, but which did not recover yet from the Watergate sickness, is not able to oppose the Congress. Secondly: Angola is not far from Russia and it is not foreign to her traditional interests. In order to prove it, Moscow conducted a very precise and complicated operation. Double, so to speak: first, military - logistic and humane. Second, political - ideologic and diplomatic.

Men and equipment straight from the sky.

Several days after the proclamation of Angola's independence, Ambassador Afanassenko with numerous "diplomatic" staff, arrived in Luanda. Then, on every accessible airfield followed the landings of Antonov 12's and 22's - the same planes which saved Egypt and Syria in the Yon Kipur war in 1973. A real air bridge over Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Algeria, carries gigantic amounts of military equipment. On the airfield at Maya Maya at Brazzaville the Soviet technicians assemble and immediately dispatch the equipment to the front in Angola. What arrives now, are not only Kalashnikovs and similar small items, but the tanks T-54, artillery, SAM's and, even the MIG-21, and, of course, radar systems to direct the air traffic.

Some people wonder who is going to shoot all these weapons; who will do the servicing since in Angola there is only a few hundred Soviet technicians, and Dr. Neto's men, although devoted Marxists, are still far from being capable specialists in military electronics. The answer came very soon... Along with equipment from Russia, flew in its attendants. From Cuba.

The first Cubans arrived in Angola long before the proclamation of its independence. Quietly, on the night of June 25, 1975, fifty *campaneros cubanos* appeared in the streets of Luanda. The first instructors, but not in the farming of sugar cane. In August 1975, to Dr. Neto's office the real high level delegation from Havana walked in. "We were informed," they said, "that you need qualified

and disinterested advisors. We have them, some are even black - for them it will be some sort of return to the land of their fathers who some 500 years ago were deported from here; they speak Spanish, it will be easy to communicate with them."

In the autumn of 1975, in the streets of Luanda, one may see more strange civilians carrying Kalashnikovs. Young, bearded, of different skin colors, speaking Portuguese poorly with a distant Spanish accent, smoking fat cigars and telling the unenlightened natives not the African epopees, but the history of Che Guevara, instead of the tomtom of the African jungle, beating the rhythm of the cha-cha of Sierra Maestra.

In Sept. 25, 1975, the Cuban ship "Vietnam Heroico" discreetly transfers to the Angolan ship "Luanda Luanda" 120 military personnel, 20 armoured cars and 30 trucks. In October there is no need for secrecy. By ship and plane arrive the soldiers from Cuba and equipment from Russia. The race between manpower and equipment becomes so acute that in November the old "Britanias" and IL-18's are replaced by the modern IL-62's. The air bridge from Havana works faster and faster, bypassing the embarrassing refueling stop in Barbados and Azores.

When the London *Times* explodes its bomb: "The Cubans are landing in Angola," it's too late. The "bearded" are already in the front lines on some sectors fighting almost alone, but they are winners, saving Neto from defeat. At the time of writing these unpleasant words, there are 14,000 Cubans in Angola and actually

the complete victory of Dr. Neto appears to be a matter of time. With \$200 million in equipment, the USSR has at its disposal a truly magnificent Cuban expeditionary corps. The operation under the control of Moscow's advisors is led by 2 brothers Generals Zenon and Julio Casas Requiros, both vice-ministers of Cuban Defense Department. In December 1975, Fidel Castro announces to the word: "We are proud of our presence in Angola and in many other places in the world. It is an example of the highest revolutionary heroism and sacrifice. We won't resign from our international mission even for the price of a definite worsening of our relations with the USA. The Americans, at first, wanted to apply an economic blockade against us. Presently against Angola they apply an ideological blockade. We do not agree with them."

We cannot be sure whether Fidel could agree or not, because for Fidel it is a costly adventure and undertaken under duress. Cuba pays her debts to Moscow. According to general estimates, Moscow invested in Cuba \$6 billion and still is investing. The only way for Cuba to repay those billions is not with sugar or nickel, but with blood sacrifices in the places where the Russians cannot perish in person. Angola is such a place. Moscow knows that even the smallest squad of its soldiers fighting in Angola would break up the paralysis of the American Congress and create a sharp reaction of the USA. However, that is nothing new. Such an action had occurred in 1973 on Golan Heights where just before the Yon Kipur war broke out a Cuban panzer brigade in Soviet tanks, naturally, had been observed; a similar plan of action has been prepared for Portugal: Castro offered his brotherly help

to Gen. Carvalho when the latter visited Havana shortly before the November unsuccessful putsch and his own defeat.

Debts notwithstanding, Castro has his own interest also. To him, it is an occasion to show that the spirit of revolution had not died with Che Guevara and that his flag "Cuba si, Yankee no!" is still flying high. Since we cannot, says Castro, export revolution to Latin America - because it isn't in accord with Russian policy in this region, and it has no chance of success - we export it to the other parts of the world. For example to Africa. "Aren't we" - shouts Fidel - "Afro-Americans besides being Latin Americans?" Rightly so. With Che Guevara's words on their lips: "Two, three Vietnams, more and more Vietnams..." the Cubans are dying presently in Angola and are ready to show their "heroism and sacrifice" in many other countries, wherever Russians prefer not to show themselves.

The African Siberia.

So much about logistics. Let's move now to strategy.

Angola is a costly but profitable operation to the USSR. It is obvious. Let's just look at the map (when, à propos, *Kultura* will start printing maps?). The Russian fleet is already in the Indian Ocean where pretty soon some very interesting things will surely be happening. Instead of sailing from Vladivostok or from Odessa to go around Africa, today a jump through the Suez Canal will suffice to get to the Indian Ocean. The difference -

just a trifle - approximately 10,000 miles. Owing to the bases in Somalia, Syria and Iraq, Russia secured for herself the access to the shores of the Persian Gulf, and "heroism and sacrifice" will complete the whole picture of future prospects.

Should "action Angola" succeed, the Russians would, at last, obtain a strong point of support in the South Atlantic, first base south of equator, deep harbour and comfortable air-fields. What for? Funny question.

Her radar, rockets, not to mention her fleet and planes would give Russia the control over a route through which 70% of the oil to NATO countries and 60% of the South African gold go. The Atlantic controlled from Cuba and Angola ceases to be dangerous to Russia.

Furthermore, Angola is some sort of African Siberia. No, not in the sense of gulags yet, but because of her natural resources. Diamonds, copper, zinc, phosphates, nickel, and, of course, oil - nobody knows how much of it. Let's add that Angola is (or has been until recently) the world's fourth producer of coffee, not to say anything about sugar and tobacco. Even if the Soviet masters have not dreamed yet about the colonization of Angolan natural resources, it is worthwhile, in their minds, to do everything to prevent this richness from being grabbed by others.

And finally, this is the first, in general truly successful move with chances of winning in competition against China in the Third World. So far, the Russians were only committing blunders. After a short stay anywhere, they had always "succeeded" in showing

their true face: a white colonizator who cares exclusively for his imperialistic interest, full of disdain toward black natives. In contrast - the Chinese worked hard in Africa, sharing life with the hungry. In Angola, the Russians, owing to the cooperation of Cubans, oppose South Africa - a symbol of Racism and white supremacy, while the Chinese disgraced themselves by supporting the UNITA which, as it appeared (too late) was siding with South Africa. Certainly, the Chinese quickly withdrew from this "company" but it was too late. Fidel was thundering about "repulsive connections of Imperialism, Racism and Maoism," and Moscow cried - "look! who is it that Mao is in alliance with?" Of course, China counter-acted. To Peking, the Cubans are mercenaries, and Moscow - colonists, but this has not helped. Mao's pursuits of the ideological maidenhood of Africa has been broken.

Let's eat cod-fish...

And, what do you say, Sir, to all of this? What does the free world say?

Well, nothing, or very little. First let's look at Western Europe, because it is the easiest thing to do. Western Europe does not care at all. When the Moscow connection appeared in Portugal, W.Europe reacted only slightly and then only after an alarm from America, because Portugal, after all, is almost like home; we all like the holidays there - "*April in Portugal*" - and all these things...

But Angola? Wherever it is, a normal

European, well fed and blind to anything but his comfort, doesn't, in general, know what it is all about. Here, Sir, we have on hand the cod-fish war between Great (?!!) Britain and Iceland, the war over wine between France and Italy, the prices of parsley, condensed milk and butter are killing us; problem of the day (one week's front page news) is not the Soviet-Cuban presence in Africa but the shortage of fried potatoes in Brussels. Some of the incorrigible meddlers who have seen the Soviet SAMS's and Cuban "advisors" in western Sahara make a fuss about one Moroccan Phantom that has been shot down there, but all this is still too far, too difficult for the imagination of Western Europeans. We watch it on TV before a football match or a stupid show; that sea of sand doesn't bother us at all. Let them commit murders, let always the other perish...

And the US? In fact, it cannot do anything. It could have, perhaps, but in secrecy. But secrecy is impossible, because the CIA today is less secret than the novels of Agatha Christie (God bless her soul). Openness, on the other hand, the Congress doesn't permit. Finally, there was nothing left for Kissinger but to admit his defeat in Angola. "For the first time," announced Kissinger, "the US did not react to military action of the USSR behind its orbit." But he warned: "Angola cannot become a precedent. In the future we won't tolerate similar action."

On the face, it sounds funny and only *Le Monde* attempted to deride the warning. The Russians are not naive; they know that the US, even weakened, hysterical, tearing open its wounds and washing its dirty linens

publicly, is very powerful. Psychologically, the Russians, gagged and forced to remain silent, know such a public catharsis is, even, a sign of strength and not of weakness.

The Kremlin knows that it ought not to overplay the game. And here is why, while attacking Kissinger for his slanderous charges, the Kremlin always adds that it doesn't understand what the trouble is about since "there is not a single Soviet soldier present in Angola."

Angola in this context has a double value to Russia. Firstly, it is the most serious challenge for Americans' ability to withstand military and political pressure since the Cuban crisis. Secondly, it is, strictly speaking, all that the Kremlin can use as a main tool of pressure on the US in order to gain in other areas.

In 1962, as we remember, Khrushchev installed rockets in Cuba, 110 kilometers from Florida, and waited to see what would happen. A brawl resulted. Kennedy, young, virile (how virile!), courageous and wise, President of the US, put a blockade around the island, threatened inspection of the Soviet ships, alerted all the US bases in the world. And Khrushchev backed off. The test had failed. It was too far from the shores of the USSR, which then didn't have the means of its realization.

In 1975 and 1976 the situation is entirely different. Brezhnev established himself in Angola and other places not because today's president of the US is not young, or

virile, courageous and wise (maybe he is - I don't know), but because the Kremlin has, at last, necessary means at its disposal. The USSR has a great war industry which allows it to supply arms to all its clients, without weakening its own defenses. Quite to the contrary: having (from the sales of weaponry) obtained gigantic financial assets all over the world, it may use them at will for the purpose of political persuasion, for example in Cuba, Somalia, etc. The USSR now has the expeditionary corps of Cuba (tomorrow, it may be Syrian or Somalian) which may land in many places of the globe avoiding direct face to face confrontation with Americans. And, finally, it has a large long range airforce. All this allows Brezhnev to intervene quickly anywhere he wants. He has, in short, nuclear balance and classical superiority and material means to pass from the continental phase to the global imperialism phase. In all - he has the means for realization of the new Kremlin politics.

Nobody's land, meaning ours.

New? Let's look closer at these politics. Some, indeed wonder. Where these offensive and cunning Russian politics come from?

The misunderstanding lies in the meaning of *Detente* itself. To Russia, *detente* has never meant a freezing of the political situation, but, quite to the contrary, a possibility of destabilization of the balance of power, of course, whenever advantageous to her. It is clear that destabilization should be undertaken, but only when it doesn't carry the risk of direct confrontation with the US. Angola then,

is an ideal example of this reasoning: Since we have all the means and Angola belongs to nobody, let it become our territory. If we are successful - the lip service goes on in the Kremlin - it's a clear profit. At last the true empire... It is true that it has cost Russia about \$200 million already, but the success will be worth it.

But, what if we were not successful? Nothing. In any case, it is worthwhile to try to strike a bargain. Even the infamous retreat from Cuba after balancing the costs, paid handsomely. In exchange for the removal of the rockets, Kennedy promised and kept his promise, not to attack Cuba, which fact enabled Russia to establish the first Soviet type system and her first base in the western hemisphere.

One may ask: where is the profit in Angola? In different things. The Kremlin is indeed ready to pull out, partially of course (it is never allowable to give up everything), from Angola, especially that it cannot, in the long run, maintain the African Cuba. Yes, the Kremlin is ready to make concessions but under the condition that the US will concede in other areas, for example in commerce and credits (grain, and the foreign drafts are running short), or, what is more important, in SALT II, because it is more and more difficult for Russia to keep abreast in the race for nuclear supremacy with America.

Adding up, Angola is an argument of enormous weight for Russia in negotiations on entirely different problems. It is a very serious transaction. If, in January,

Kissinger wasn't allowed to sign anything, it was only because the conditions for closing a deal had not ripened yet. Perhaps - the Russians were thinking - it would be better to send a few thousands more Cubans to Angola or maybe to other places, for example to Zaire. Perhaps, some more so called local conflicts need to be invented, some bloodier wars where Americans and Russians would be killing each other by spilling other people's blood. For these kinds of eventualities everything is ready: equipment, manpower, political argument, even articles for the front pages of *Pravda* are written... What's needed is a new territory. Who is going to be next? Perhaps Djibouti? perhaps Sahara? And, perhaps Europe? And, why not, for example, Yugoslavia at Tito's death?

Afterward, the next agreement on relaxation and human rights will be signed and one may be able to say calmly that "Niger did his job," that the Cuban may go home and the Russian may stay...

Brukselczyk

Fragments

Vol. 3/5

June 1976

by

Charles Joel

M.Bronski - THE TRAVEL OF DE CUSTINE
TO RUSSIA

Brukselczyk - AS SEEN FROM BRUSSELS

A translation from the Polish magazine Kultura NO 3/342 and NO 4/343 - 1976, 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

THE TRAVEL OF DE CUSTINE TO RUSSIA */
(excerpts)

Adolf de Custine (1790 - 1857) is something like Jules Verne of sovietology: his journal of the 3 month travel through Russia of Nicolay I (*La Russie en 1839*, 4 volumes, Paris, 1843) anticipates the Soviet regime as accurately as if the astounding marquis were the contemporary of Orwell or Solzhenitsyn. De Custine wrote several novels, a drama and two other journals of his travels, but only his "Russia in 1839" was a success (during 3 years, about 200,000 copies, including translations, sold) and today it is his only title to fame.

The motive of fear - not only of a moral nature - to offend Russia is one of interesting concurrences with the present times; and our marquis was the first one to point it out. In the appendix to the actual text of his book just before its printing in November 1842, de Custine relates his talks with two

*/ (Editor's supplement). More substantial works on this subject: George F. Kennan, The Marquis de Custine and His Russia in 1839, published by Princeton University Press in 1971. Also, the Clearwater Publishing Company in 1974 reprinted the 1855 edition of de Custine's journal, under the title *La Russie*, in its Nineteenth Century Russia series.

ex-soldiers of Napoleon, who were taken prisoners and spent years in Siberia; their story about the terrors they went through is nothing but a story about a nineteenth century gulag; de Custine was interested why they didn't publish their memoirs. The end of his talk with one of them, an Italian, Grassini, deserves to be quoted:

(Custine to Grassini) " - But why did you, an educated and independently thinking man, not publish any description of your imprisonment? These facts, well documented, would interest all the world.

- I doubt; the world is made of people so much occupied with their own lives that the sufferings of others affect them very little. Besides, I have a family, position, I am dependent on my government which remains on good terms with the government of Russia; my government wouldn't like to see one of its subjects publishing things that are secret even in the country where they occur.

- I'm convinced you paint your government in excessively dark colors; forgive me my frankness, but I think your approach is wrong, you are overcautious.

- Perhaps; but I'll never write that Russians are inhuman.

- If all travelers to Russia agreed for different reasons to act as you do act in keeping silent about the unpleasant facts that should be told to the Russian people and to the men who govern them, then there is no way for Europe ever to know about this perfect jail.

To sing the praises about the delights of despotism by one who is living behind its reach, is a precaution that borders on crime. Doubtless, there is some strange unexplained mystery of it all; If I did not penetrate it, at least I was lucky to avoid being overwhelmed by fear, a fact which I'm going to prove by the frankness of my story."

In the latter, indeed, he succeeded. We might even suspect that de Custine in some parts of his book used the dark colors excessively but this amplification made the book actual a hundred years after its appearance when Bolshevik regime deepened and widened "structural" characteristics of Russian society to monstrous dimensions observed by de Custine. Kennan, writing about the actuality of the book remarked: "Even if we admit that *"La Russie en 1839"* has not been too good a book about the Russia of 1839, we must face an annoying fact that it has been a perfect book, the best of the existing books about Russia of Joseph Stalin, and not so bad at all about Russia of Brezhnev and Kosygin."

And here is de Custine himself:

(On the way to Russia de Custine stopped at Lubeck; an innkeeper after being told about his travel, attempts to persuade de Custine from doing it, telling him that Russia is a "bad country." Then follows the dialog:)

- Do you know Russia? - I asked him.

- No, but I know Russians; many of them pass through Lubeck, and I can guess where they come from by looking at their faces.

- What is it that you see in the expression of their faces which would make me stop visiting Russia?

- *Monsieur*, they have two faces; I'm not talking about lackeys who have only one, I'm talking about the gentlemen: when they stop here on their way to Europe, they have cheerful, free and happy faces; they are like horses which got out in an open pasture, like birds whose cages' doors were opened; men and women alike, young and old all are happy like students on vacations; the same people on their return look sad, sullen and nervous; they talk a little, express themselves dryly; their foreheads show grief. From these differences I conclude that a country which somebody leaves with such a joy and returns to it with such disgust is a bad country."

* * *

The difficulties one encounters on entering this country make me sick, but they do not frighten me; what strikes me are the difficulties a man would have trying to run away from here. The common folk say: "To enter Russia - the gate is open, but to go out - narrow." Despite a vastness of the empire, I do not feel free in it; In the most spacious prison a prisoner always feels locked. Maybe it is only the effect of my imagination, but one must be here in order to experience it.

* * *

What is a law is a country whose government stands above it, where the people groan under the pressure of justice which is shown to them from a distance, like a scrap of meat

that is shown to a dog that has no courage to approach it; like a curiosity which lasts but only under the condition that nobody touches it? What should be told to the Russians is: to begin with, make a law which guarantees life itself, and that would be a great improvement in your penal code. The Russians would answer to all of it; they would state: "Three months of travel in here - he has seen it all wrong." That's true: I have seen wrong, but I have guessed right.

* * *

Return for 24 hours the freedom of the press in Russia and you will hear things which will fill you with awe. Silence is an inevitable element of oppression. Indiscretion, under absolute government is equal to high treason.

If among the Russians one may find a better diplomat than among the more civilized people, it is only because our papers inform them about everything that happens among us; that instead of careful concealment of our pitfalls, every morning we show them enthusiastically to Russians, while to the contrary, their bisantic politics - thriving in a shadow - scrupulously screens from us all they think, do and are afraid of. We move in the brightness of the day, they - in secret darkness; the chances of playing any game with them are not even. Our ignorance of them makes us blind; our openness educates them; we cherish our weakness - garrulity, they draw the strength from secrecy; here is the cause of their successes.

* * *

I take no ill toward the Russians because they are what they are; what I upbraid them with is their endeavours to look as the same kind of people as we are. They are still uncouth - which allows us to have some hope - and also seem to be eaten by an incessant desire to imitate others, like monkeys mocking at everything they imitate. So I say to myself: here are the people that are lost in savagery and unripe yet for civilization, and the thought of Voltaire or Diderot, long forgotten in France, comes to my mind: "The Russians decayed before they matured."

* * *

The greatest pleasure of their lives is drunkenness, in other words - oblivion. Poor wretches! They must dream in order to feel happy. What seems to show their cheerfulness is that when muzhiks are drunk they don't fight or kill each other like our drunkards do; these primitive people turn emotional; they cry and kiss one another. Interesting people, deserving attention...

It would be so nice to make them happy. But, it's difficult, if not, frankly, impossible. Show me the way of fulfilling the undefined desires of a young giant - lazy, uneducated, ambitious and kept in shackles so strong that he cannot move his hands or legs! I have never been able to get emotional about the fate of the people of this country, without a simultaneous feeling of sympathy toward the omnipotent man who governs them.

* * *

I think, among all the countries of the world, Russia is the only country where people have the least true happiness. In our countries, we too have no happiness, but we have a feeling that happiness is something that depends on us; in Russia it is impossible. Imagine for yourself the republican passions (as, I repeat, under the power of the Russian czar there is a fictitious equality) boiling under the calmness of despotism; it is a dreadful mixture, especially with regards to the future it foretells to the world. Russia is a kettle of boiling water, locked tight, but kept on the ever increasing heat of the flame: I am afraid it will erupt...

* * *

(The ending of the book)

One must live in this seclusion without peace, in this perpetual prison that is called Russia if one wants to fully appreciate the freedom one enjoys in all other countries of Europe, independent on the forms of their governments....

Whenever your son is unhappy in France, use my prescription and tell him: "Go to Russia." It is a very educational journey for a foreigner; whoever gets to know this country, will be happy to live anywhere else. It is always advantageous to know there is a society in which no happiness is possible, because, for the reason of his nature, a man cannot be happy without freedom.

* * *

Today, the echo of this book is more stunning than it was at the time of its

appearance: In the present Russia the book is banished again. There were two Russian translations made: one in 1910 and another just after the revolution, but both disappeared from the surface of the Earth (it is said, that there still circulates one underground edition). In the Soviet Union, de Custine is absent to such an extent that the editor of *literary publication Neva* (November 12, 1975) - in which Jaroslav Ivashkevich publishes his essays on Russia and in which, by the way, he mentions our marquis - considered it appropriate to add this informative footnote: "Author of the book '*Russia in 1839*' - a satiric pamphlet on Russia of Nicolay I - translated in many languages." The point is that the book of de Custine is not a satire. And it relates not only to Russia of Nicolay I.

M. Bronski.

AS SEEN FROM BRUSSELS

Whip and gag

Every more or less educated man knows at least three kinds of Marxism. First, of Karl Marx from Germany. Second, of Marx and Spencer from London. Third, of the brothers Marx from Hollywood. When I arrived in the West, I became acquainted with the fourth kind of Marxism. There is nothing left from the first three Marxisms: neither the erudition of Karl, nor the richness of the pair of London merchants, nor the wonderful fun of the crazy brothers. This fourth Marxism born somewhere close to the gulags' creators, is gloomy and

formidable; it is apparent in substitution of arguments by provocations, proofs by calumnies, and a power of convincing by a whip and a gag.

After this theoretical introduction what's needed is a practical demonstration. I beg your pardon if I must write about myself; I don't like doing it and I avoid it, but I promise you it will be short and to a point. After I arrived in Belgium I began publishing, bashfully, my convictions and when some of my comments happened to appear in the local Radio and TV, the Belgian Communist party organ was very angry at me and attacked me, the Radio and TV people, sharply. You would think it was polemics with my views or that the Communists had proved my mistakes and misinterpretations in my commentaries. Not at all. Instead of arguments, my polemicists (not without help of documentation sent by the proper organs) attempted to demonstrate that it was "nothing strange that this gentlem (meaning me) has this kind of convictions and that to him (meaning to me) all this is more a matter of personal accounts to settle down than an objective commenting on the truth."

I wrote then (over here, one may polemise even with the Communists) that all their entire approach appears to be a new and strange kind of Marxism. Strange, I stated, because when I was in Poland, the Polish Communist Party disclosed my political views as reflecting by Yidish origin; when I am in Brussels - in the eyes of the Belgian Communists, those views reflect my Polish origin, and when I am lecturing abroad - local Communist

organizations have no doubt that my political views prove my bourgeois - Belgian nationality. Wherever I went, I failed to convince my Communist opponents that they should polemicize not with one's national and social origin, sex, character, color of skin or religion, but concentrate rather on polemicizing with their adversary's views.

Several questions directed at a certain premier

All this is hopeless; I wouldn't concern myself about it any longer if it were not because of ... the Premier of France. What am I, poor guy, in comparison with the Premier? Well, Mr. Chirac, to my most unexpected surprise, decided to widen the range of the above mentioned new Marxism. He, too, accepted the standpoint that a geographical origin of an opponent discredits the latter's argument and destroys the strength of his testimony. It all came out on the occasion of the press conference with Leonid Plyushch, where the French Premier did not hesitate to welcome with open heart the ex-patient of the asylum in Dniepropetrovsk, stating that:

"France has always been the country of great hospitality. But, those who take advantage of our hospitality are expected to use a certain amount of restraint in expressing their political views. In my opinion, all those who stay in France to conduct political activities that are, among others, expressed in a critique of a country of their origin, behave wrongly. In any case, this kind of behavior doesn't agree with interests of France."

One paragraph, but how meaningful. Let's

analyze slowly, *sine ira et studio* this enrichment of Marxism-Fascism theory. As far as I remember there hasn't been a premier of any democratic country who could provide a similar enlightenment of this theory.

Most surprising is that Mr. Chirac is the Premier of the country which gave the world the ideas of human rights and that Plyushch was telling how the country "of his origin" is trampling these ideas.

Why is it that Mr. Chirac who presumably doesn't like Communism, applies the Communist principle of polemics not with the views of Plyushch but with his geographical origin?

How is it that Plyushch, almost the only witness to the truth about the psychiatric gulags, disturbs - simultaneously - the powers in the USSR and in France?

Is it possible that Plyushch is harmful to the interests of the USSR (as Brezhnev insists) and at the same time to the interests of France (as Chirac insists)?

Why is Plyushch, exhausted and tormented mathematician, sentenced to be silent in the USSR and in France?

Is it possible that Plyushch disturbs world peace, by professing identical views in two different countries - totalitarian Russia and democratic France?

Why was it that when Angela Davis or Jane Fonda, when in Paris telling the most dreadful stories about the country of their origin, Mr. Chirac did not consider "their

behavior as disagreeable with the interests of France." Or Mrs. Allende? Or Mrs. Felicia Langer, a lawyer from Israel, not to mention Palestinians who were attacking embassies and airfields in France. Mr. Chirac did not say a word that their "behavior wasn't in agreement with the interests of France."

Was Mickiewicz opposing the interests of France when he was criticizing the country of his birth? And what about the forefather of Poniatowski - the present minister? Could France have gained anything if Plyushch kept his mouth shut about gehenna in his motherland?

Who is the next "to shave" in the name of French interests? Solzhenitsyn? Maximov? Mrs. Sakharov? *Kontynent*, *Pelikan*? *Maybe Kultura*? Warsaw, after all, insists that the activities of *Kultura* are not in line with the French interests but because many people from *Kultura* expressively criticize the country of their origin then...?

It may be a mistake in one's career...

Enough of these questions - it's all too sad. The theses of the Communists and Mr. Chirac represent, simply, two intellectual approaches of dubious value.

Firstly, it's a blotting out of the differences between the critique of one's country of origin and its - more or less legal - governmental bodies, and the critique of the means by which these bodies hold the power. Accordingly, one who criticizes Pinochet or Amin does not criticize Chile or Uganda, but one who criticizes Brezhnev is criticizing the USSR.

Secondly, it is a dubious premise because it applies a very primitive interpretation of "real politics." Accordingly, if one tolerates criticizing the USA and Israel - countries which are democratic and which respect any critique and which do not send their critics to psychiatric asylums, but to the contrary, do send them abroad for visits and public appearances - one stands on the platform of agreement with the interests of France. But when one criticizes Brezhnev and gulags one is against these interests because Brezhnev doesn't like being criticized either in Moscow or in Paris.

Premier Chirac - still a young man - enjoys the reputation of a clever aggressive politician, - intelligent, quick in riposte - about whom it's said that he prefers better to act than to be loved for inaction. He goes, they say with admiration, like a bulldozer, taking the obstacles at first contact, crushing everything in its way and only after a job he looks back and calculates damages. One is overwhelmed with delight... What he lacks, some say, are the human reflexes. The admirers of Stalin are telling also that his only human reflex was anti-Semitism. Is it possible that the only human feeling of Chirac is dislike toward the people who criticize the countries of their origin?

Wouldn't be better, perhaps, if Mr. Chirac took a look back and calculated damages? President Ford did not let Solzhenitsyn into the White House and is sorry for it now. Wouldn't be worthwhile to think about the fact that 10 months after the visit of the author of Gulag Archipelago to the US, President Ford

solemnly announced that he deleted the word *Détente* from his dictionary, which means that he did exactly what Solzhenitsyn long before had advised?

And what word will Mr. Chirac be willing to delete from his political dictionary if one day it would come out that his criticizing the critique of Plyushch has not been very farsighted move in the career of the Premier? Personally, I understand that the French people owe something to Brezhnev, that in Paris one must not criticize Russia at the time when this kind of critique is practiced even by the chief of the French Communist Party, Mr. Marchais himself. I remember also that the Ambassador of the USSR Czervonenko, during the French election campaign, visited not the leftist candidate but Mr. Giscard d'Estang. But, were not the flowers laid by d'Estang at the Mausoleum of Stalin sufficient proof of the French gratitude? Is it possible that Ambassador Czervonenko received in Paris the authority similar to the authority of the Russian ambassador in Warsaw? Is it possible that the publicly made persuasion of Gen. Haig, relating to the pressure of Communists in the French government was damaging the interests of France, but a discreet pressure of Ambassador Czervonenko, in the question of Plyushch, was not?

The whims of statecraft

All this is a matter of statecraft, says Mr. Chirac. Of what statecraft - I ask? A statecraft which today allows the gagging of Plyushch is politically and morally worth as much as the statecraft which had gagged the

witnesses of Aushwitz, Warsaw Ghetto, Katyn Forest... None of the diplomatic whims can camouflage this truth.

Perhaps there is some sort of misunderstanding. Mr. Chirac is wrong if he thinks Plyushch left the USSR for a tour abroad, for fancy, for reconvalescing in Saint Tropez - after a long time in a luxurious Soviet sanatorium. Plyushch left the USSR because he did not want to keep silent about the truth of Soviet Aushwitzes. Brezhnev and Chirac - for certain - would tolerate Plyushch the martyr, but a silent martyr. There is only one problem: If Plyushch were to keep silent in France, then he could have stayed at home, take the position of agreeing with the interests of France and the Soviet Union, and instead of several years in a madhouse, comfortably drink *chay* and watch Brezhnev on TV lecturing on freedom, Democracy and human rights in the USSR and on cordial relations between governments of France and the USSR.

Dirty snow

At this point I intended to close my writing. I have been disgusted with all this to the state of losing desire for writing in general. But life is stronger and itself provided the proper ending of this article.

As some of us still remember, the International Olympic Committee in Innsbruck withdrew, under a short and stupid technical pretext, the accreditation of seven reporters from the Radio Free Europe. It was a scandal. Even the young men who attended the eternal olympic flame agreed it was just common blackmail

and a swindle of the KGB men of the East used against the stupefied officials of the West who were shaking their boots with fear. Officials who bent down under the Soviet pressure and threw out the "polluters of the air" (to the delight of their "colleagues" from the socialist countries) stated that they were forced to do so in order not to poison the immaculate atmosphere of the Olympiad. If we haven't done it ourselves, they said, the International Olympic Committee could have used the Austrian police.

So what? Pity, it did not. Austria has built up quite a tradition in submitting to blackmail and terror. To the account of Palestinians and others, Chancellor Kreitzky would add now the blackmail of TASS and Novosti. A strange coalition of the Irish Lord Kilianin with the KGB officers raped the last yet unraped circle in the Olympic emblem - the freedom of the press and information. The distinguished Lord admitted in the interview with West German TV that he decided on the deportation of the Radio Free Europe team from Innsbruck to avoid "propagandizing and politicizing the Olympiad." His lordship was wrong: he had stepped into propaganda and politics up to his ears.

I wanted to write a final punch line with some overwhelming point about the blindness of my "free colleagues" from the West who don't seem to understand that the process of "sterilization against polluters" begins specifically with Radio Free Europe, but it isn't known where it will end. But then, life again wrote the finale: It came to my knowledge (9 months after Helsinki!) that Moscow refused the entrance visas to two French reporters who

sought accreditation at the XXV Congress of the Russian Communist Party. So, I stopped writing and said to myself: wait, surely, the French press and above all Mr. Chirac will express their indignity better than I would have mine. It would be clever of him, I thought; at first he played hell with Plyushch and he will do the same with the Soviet authorities. But no! Silence! Nobody cries out! Everything is quiet in Paris. Evidently the position of the Soviet authorities which had thrown out the correspondents from Innsbruck and had forbidden entrance to the French reporters to Moscow is in agreement with the interests of France, while the critique of such behavior would be against these interests.

The last gold medal

What magnificent perspectives! The 1890 Olympiad will take place in Moscow - in the heart of the true amateur sport. What a slaughter it will be! One can imagine the range of action since today in 1976 the KGB is able to - with impunity and without the slightest resistance - remove 7 reporters from Innsbruck and to prohibit the others' travel to Moscow - all because they could write things that are undesirable by the bureau of the press of the Central Committee of Russian Communist Party.

Munich remains in the history as an Olympiad of blood; Innsbruck will pass to the history as an Olympiad of censorship. In Munich in a competition "shooting the defenseless"; the gold medal had been won by the Palestinians. Here in Innsbruck, the gold medal for "gagging the freedom of the press" was awarded

to the Soviet police and the Irish lord.

One more medal - you would ask? Yes, but what a medal?!! It wasn't just a common gold medal, but a medal of cotton like in a gag, and of leather like in a whip.

Just a little more à propos whip

During the solemn ceremonies of opening and closing the Olympiad, Mr. Kreitzky, Mr. Kilianin and millions of fans admired a tasteful show of folkloristic Tyrolian dance in which shooting the whip was the main attraction.

Some of the oversensitive watchers said the show was disgusting. Whoever would think - they said - to put a whip on the Olympiad! I don't understand it. A whip in Innsbruck was entirely proper and the show most educational. If things will go as they are going now, a whip will be applied in all the countries of Europe from Ural to the Atlantic Ocean. Beside of a gag, a whip is most effective device for managing the press and state affairs in general. Of course, under the condition that it's used by the true professionals and not only for show...

Written with disgust on March 8, 1976

Brukselczyk

Fragments

Vol 3/6

Aug. 1976

by

Charles Joel

Zbigniew Byrski - THE SOVIET IMPERIALISM
AND TRANSMUTATIONS IN
THE INTERNATIONAL
COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

A translation from the Polish
magazine Kultura NO 6/345/1976
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

A fight against Communism and a fight against Soviet Imperialism are two closely related but different matters. In the West there exist several variations of Communism - political ideas whose followers call themselves, in distinction from social-democrats, revolutionary marxists.

It has been well known for quite a long time that some of the versions of Communism have been and are still being used as the instruments of Soviet Imperialism and some others were not and never were used; to the contrary, they were and are impeding it. Consequently, my assertion states: We cannot always and everywhere fight against Communism and at the same time successfully oppose the Soviet Imperialism. A priority must be given to one direction or another. I personally believe a priority should not be given to a fight against Communism and all its factions, but to a fight against the Soviets. Communism as an ideology, considering its present heterogeneity, wouldn't have been a menace to the Western democracies - which, though imperfect, are, for the time being, the only structures which preserve values built on the Greek and Latin civilizations - if it were

not for the progress of decay that eats them.*/

Communism in the West, with its numerous faces, is an ideology professed by the millions. Although it operates using simplified schemes which in the present complicated world look more primitive than they looked at the dawn of Communism, we cannot deny its dynamics that shows up, for example, in a multiplicity of factions and furious conflicts among their followers; In other words, it is impossible to deny that it is an ideology - maybe false, pernicious or criminal - nevertheless its incessant ferment and diversity prove its vitality. With regards to its basics, not to its accessories, it looks as something completely different from Soviet Communism. Soviet Communism represents no ideology. It is an institutionalized, state, official doctrine - dead, petrified form officially adopted and forced upon the people by the Party in power. I doubt if there is anybody who professes this "ideology," but a great majority of the Soviet citizens, especially those who seek social advance, must practice it.

*/ What destroys the Western democracies are not the revolutionary movements, but the fall of social ties - a process which covers many years. A progressing paralysis and helplessness characteristic of the West, result neither from Soviet aggressiveness, nor from the internal revolutionary movements. To the contrary, the Soviets appraise with a great perception the apathy of the Western World and adapt their rapacious plans accordingly. Similarly, certain left-terroristic groups act quite often using the most peculiar political sign-boards.

Another matter is a role played by the Communist movements behind the boundaries of the USSR - from its birth. Before Stalin came to power, none of the Communist parties existing behind Russia, functioned as the Soviet agencies. In its first stage of existence, the Soviet Union had allies among these parties - in many cases helping them financially but all this did not mean these parties functioned as Soviet servants. Besides, torn by the oppositionistic movements: rightist - of Bucharin, and leftist - of Trotsky, the Soviet Communist Party was not consolidated until 1930. A similar situation existed in the quarrelsome Communist parties of the West. All this was ended by the monopolization of power by Stalin between 1930-33.

Owing to the penetration of the Western Communist parties by the agents of Komintern - a penetration whose mechanics are not completely known - the Soviets of Stalin succeeded in subordination to them the Communist parties which operated behind the Soviet Union. This applies to the Polish Communist Party too (it did not save its leaders from physical liquidation in 1937-8; but this question is entirely out of the theme of my present writing). Since then, all these parties turned into common agents of the Soviets. Their loyalty to the "international fatherland of proleteriat" manifested itself brilliantly not only in the times of Molotov - Ribentrop Pact when almost every Western Communist party submitted to the directives of Moscow, but even much earlier - several years before the outbreak of World War II - during the tragic war against the fascist revolution of Gen Franco. In those years the Soviets - not so much with their own hands, as with the hands of the Western Communists,

mainly French - attempted to eliminate all the other anti-Franco competitors for power. Every group that was representing the non-Soviet Marxism, was branded as a fascist agency and fought against more bitterly than the Franco forces. (The principle that a heretic is more dangerous than a man of different religion has been known for a long time and was not discovered by the Communists.) The possibility of a victorious end of the war against the rebellion of Gen. Franco, without the dominant role of the Soviet Party and its totalitarian government, or, in other words the perspective of creating a different - more democratic version of Socialism - was a nightmare to the Soviet leaders. This nightmare was regenerated many years later after the World War II. Initially it was revived by the Polich October and later by Imre Nagy in Hungary, and by Dubczek during the Prague Spring of 1968. Epilogs of these events are generally well known.

I reminisce upon these past events because they create a background for better understanding why there wasn't a consolidation of the whole Communist camp but, to the contrary, at the growth of military power of the USSR and its aspirations for the role of protector of the Third World - there slowly developed its isolation from the Communist movements of the West and the East. It is known that frondes and transmutations of the Communist parties began before the death of Stalin, and - a characteristic thing - they started not within the Communist parties of the West, the one which opposed the social structures existing in their countries - but

within the parties which had already gained power and governed some of the countries. The first one was the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, later known as the League of the Yugoslavian Communists. After this fronde there followed one much more serious - the Chinese; however, China's breaking ties with Moscow was less abrupt than Yugoslavia's. In both cases the ideological differences were not the source of the conflict; preponderant were the ownership of power and a complete independence from Soviet domination. Tito - at least in the first phase of breaking off from the Soviets - belonged to a group of the most strongly attacked "revisionists. Obviously, all the accusations about treason toward the Communist ideals were only a facade. The problem of the Sino-Soviet conflict has its roots in the old czarist conquests and unprecedented Soviet brutality in dealing with other Communist countries. In all, it is difficult to say there is an atmosphere of friendship among the Communist countries; what prevails is a reciprocal hostility or a subordination of the weaker to the stronger. How much the so called ideological differences affected the Sino-Soviet conflict is seen in the position China took on the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. From the viewpoint of the ideological criteria, Dubczek, in the opinion of the Chinese leadership must have seemed a more dangerous revisionist than he looked in the eyes of the Kremlin. So it seemed logical that China should have supported the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Pact forces. But, China went in the opposit direction, branding the Soviet Imperialism much stronger than the West did. China did it not because of love for Dubczek

and the "Prague Spring," but because of the hatred toward the Soviet Imperialism. In a manner similar to China's, though much milder and more cautious (because of her boundary with Russia) behaved Romania. In 1968, Tito disposed of the old but still visible remains of liberalism with which in the years of violent quarrels with Stalin he flirted with the West. Presently, both, he and Ceaucescu should be recognized as experienced tyrants who, in comparison with Polish Gierek or Hungarian Kadar - at least until lately - would pass almost as liberals. The so-called "one's own road to Socialism" could have led to political pluralism in the cases of Czechoslovakia, or Hungary, and, much earlier, of Poland before Gomulka smothered it with the help of apparatchiks and the approval of Krushchev who, in this case must have, for sure, been happy that all ended without using tanks. This "one's own road to Socialism" in the case of Romania and Yugoslavia meant a monopolistic power of the Party over the people, without any interference of the Russian ambassadors in internal matters of these countries. In some undefined measure, all it seemed to satisfy was their national pride, the more so as the Balkan countries for ages have been accustomed to living under the despotic governments. All the centrifugal movements of the Communist parties in the satellite Soviet empire or on its peripheries may definitely be tolerated by the Soviets - in the cases of Romania and Yugoslavia - under condition that they will not reform their structures in a sense of pluralism and freedom, for which, by the way, neither the venerable Tito nor the relatively young

Ceaucescu has any desire. As to China, her position, considering of course, her power and potential measured by the multitudinous population, is completely different. China may be destroyed but never subdued by Russia.

All the convulsions that were shocking the Communist camp since the death of Stalin must have affected the position of the Communist parties of the West. Stalin created an edifice based on falsehood and terror, but an edifice which had some sort of internal logic that gave the Soviet system the appearance of solidity and this was because in the society of those days nobody had the strength to blow up Stalin's regime from the inside. This solidity and an iron consequential will have destroyed many people who lived in it, but on the other hand, it even charmed some. The influence of Stalin's stature has, by no means, been limited to the millions of "captive" minds that lived within the boundaries of the empire. It went much farther and affected many people from different circles in the West, who were beyond the reach of Stalin's terror. It isn't easy to understand all these phenomena, but when, as effects of Khrushchev's speech on the Communist Party Congress which tumbled down the monumental personality of Stalin, there followed revolutions in Poland and Hungary that were suppressed with great bloodshed, it was the French Communist Party which had experienced the heaviest shock, accepting with great pain the terrible truth exposed by Nikita Khrushchev. The present Soviet doctrine - reformed after several years - apart from the exposure of Stalin's legend and breaking off from the mass terror - preserved at its base all the lies

about Democracy, freedom and government of the people. The Soviet system has not been liberalized to the extent which would allow for its reconciliation with the West, but, by the removal of mass terror and the softening of the police methods, it was liberalized sufficiently enough to overturn the myth of intangibility of the Soviet monolith. Owing to this there could develop dissident movements - kept in certain limits by the security authorities - a movement which was unthinkable during Stalin's life. However, the loosening of the terror brought up an enormous profit which with great surpluses balanced the damages created by the overturned myth: it brought a gigantic growth of the Soviet military power. During Stalin's era when he, with maniacal passion, was destroying the bureaucracy and the technological elite, such a growth of the Soviet military power was beyond any possibility. The Soviet economy limps and will be limping ad infinitum; nevertheless, in certain chosen sectors, it brought imposing results.

If the Soviet Union finds its clients - not satellites - in the world, if the rapprochement with Moscow is sought for by such potentates and presidents whom the Kremlin had never dreamt about, it is only the result of not the political attraction of the Soviet style Communism, but of its power and the progressing weakness of the West - most of all the U.S. Nothing but both the weakness of the U.S. and the Soviet power that pulls to the empire the clients of the Third World begins to terrify the Communist parties of the West. They could afford the luxury of admiration for Stalin's order of the world, but only then, when the military power of the Soviets did not endanger the West.

Presently the cards are turned. Not only in the proportion of the arsenals but in the readiness for bearing sacrifices. Truly speaking, none of the inhabitants of the Soviet empire ever need to be asked for that readiness - they do what they are told to do, and that's it. Is there anything in the West that would even in a little way equalize this? The West wants peace. Since it cannot be a "Pax Americana," let it be a "Pax Sovietica."

A key question in the new programs of some of the Western Communist parties - especially French and Italian - is a question of declared pluralism that would cancel the thesis of the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat, and let them take their own road to Socialism. A great number of oppositionists to Communism defines this new trend, specifically pluralism, as a tactical move for getting a majority of votes at elections. It appears that the percentage of the votes given to the Communist Parties of Western Europe expresses not so much a desire for the creation of a Soviet type system in their countries as, rather, a prevalent opposition against the one existing there. The others state that these changes reflect the natural political evolution in the Communist parties, initiated by the, once famous, declaration of Togliatti about the policentrism in the Communist movement.

Although - in my opinion - rejecting the principles of the dictatorship of the proletariat and loosening (not a complete cancellation yet) the ties with Moscow, reflect the true state of minds within the Western European Communist parties, we should regard this problem on a different plane. It is not a matter of political evolution of consciences

among the top eshelons of the Western European Communist parties that should be taken under consideration, but a realization of what role these parties will play in case Europe were overpowered by Russia. There are several aspects of this question. Firstly, the parties of the masses long ago stopped acting as political organizations only. This observation applies to the Communist parties as well as to the others - non-Communist - in the free World. The Western European Communist parties presently look like big corporations: they control a great number of trade unions, have their own central and local press, own and develop many enterprises that strengthen their finances, and have a great army of their own functionaries. They remind us of the gigantic parties of the U.S., tied up with banks, industrial complexes and Trade Unions.*/ Of course, there is one difference. Because the "raison d'être of the political parties is politics, the Capitalistic parties accept in principle the social structure in which they exist, but the Communist parties because of their political dogmas, must oppose it.

*/ Besides, it is a historically repeating cycle of institutionalization of certain groups which were born to proclaim these or those ideals but which in the course of evolution changed into gigantic organizations that have the powerful backing of material wealth. These kinds of organizations - be it American Republican Party or Communist Party of the USSR or of France - always try to preserve their ideological "raison d'être," but their practical activities are subordinated to actuality - which means always the existence and the power of the organization as such.

But the Communist Parties of masses in France and Italy - acting within the political structure of these countries - having obtained the status of real giants, not only in political but in economical sense, fall into a peculiar internal conflict. As Communist parties they must "sell the goods" - the fight against the system in which they live, have grown and have sucked its life sustaining blood. What happens when the system they oppose dies? In the answer to this question lies the main aspect of the problem.

Since the role of a satellite wasn't gratifying to any of the Communist parties of the West, since they would accept it but only when they didn't have any other choice, it is difficult for anyone to lean toward the idea the French and Italian Communist parties would adopt it by their own free will. The Western Communist know their Moscow ex-friends better than the naive politicians of the West, stupefied by wishful thinking. The former have no illusions, and this applies to China too. They don't believe in taming the Soviets by applying the Kissinger - Sonnenfeldt method. The Soviet penetration into more and more distant geographically territories, a paralysis of Europe, and an apathy of the U.S. - all a tragic picture of the Free World - result in understandable fear. It was a splendid thing to glorify Stalin or to tease one another with the capricious and rowdyish Khrushchev at the time when both of them were too weak to confront US power. But, less attractive or even more dangerous to the leaders of Western European Communist parties is the perspective of quiescentism and short lived servilism in Europe, eventually conquered by Brezhnev or his successors. Knowing Soviet politics they also

don't doubt that even the dishonorable roles in their political careers which would have been offered to them would have a very short life; that soon they would be replaced by the new ones - more trusty plenipotentiaries of the Kremlin, who in subdued Europe would abandon all the political fussing about. What will happen to them - the people who presently hold the positions of political leaders, enjoy the support of masses, and have control over the whole labor movement and a great influence on governments? Such perspectives cannot evoke their desire for a change which would completely wipe them off the face of the earth. Presently, the luxury of creating his own totalitarian state - with an option of abandoning it at any time - can be afforded by Fidel Castro under whose nose exist the only materialistic power which still can stand up against the Soviet Union. If he were liquidated, his successors would not hesitate to ask for the help of imperialistic America. But such a chance is not available either to France or Italy - not separated from Moscow by the Ocean, but, to the contrary, located in the centre of Moscow interests.

On the basis of what we have already explored, it becomes clear that the conflicting situation of Western European Communist parties - fearing like a plague the "liberation of the West" by the Soviets - still does not allow them either a complete and certain eradication of all they have been proclaiming during a half century, or the final and abrupt break off from Moscow. But this process of breaking off from Moscow has begun and in a more drastic manner than it could have been expected. The absence of Marchais and the speech of Bellinguer at the last meeting of Supreme Soviet of Com-

munist Party of Russia, were sufficiently unequivocal.

Let me stress that the central issue is the growing conflict and a fear on the part of Western European Communist parties that Europe will be conquered by the Soviets. For these reasons and in their self-evident and well understood interest these two most powerful parties desire not only to preserve NATO, but also to pour new life into it. It appears to be a paradox. But in the past one wouldn't need to be a sworn Communist if one wanted to blow up NATO and to weaken the defensibility of Europe. It was done very effectively by a declared anti-Communist Gen. de Gaulle. Had he been a politician with a deep sense of reality, he wouldn't have, during his visit to Warsaw in 1967, asked Gomulka and Cyrankiewicz this question: "Since I liberated France from the domination of Americans, why can't you free yourself from the USSR?" Gomulka hearing this turned completely aghast, but regaining his composure, he mumbled some sort of a short speech about loyalty and love toward the Soviet Union. Cyrankiewicz - as eye-witnesses to this peculiar meeting relate - didn't say a word, but his apoplectic face puffed out much more than usual. Not from indignation, but from a suppressed laugh. De Gaulle, it seemed, didn't learn anything from this visit. Offended, he decided to disregard Eastern Europe, which fact was expressed in his behavior during the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Pact forces. We may say, that this great man lived in a state of permanent dream - as did the Western European Communist parties - but on the opposite side De Gaulle always suspected the US of expansionism which threatened above all his country, even in the days when America was

becoming a shadow of her own power. In a different way behaved the French Communists. They never had any doubts with regard to the Soviet intentions and cherished for quite a long time illusions that America and the allied forces of threatened Europe would save the West from invasion by their dear Russian friends. Presently these illusions are gone. Wouldn't it be the case that the Western European Communist parties have a desire to defend Europe by themselves against the Soviets? My answer is - yes. And there is nothing paradoxical in the Chinese Peoples Republic's constant persuasions and even lately, begging, that America should stop practicing the suicidal installment plan called *Detente* and look into the eyes of this tragic truth.

The conclusions that emerge from the described situation are clear. The anti-Soviet diversion of the Western Communist parties should be supported. In the face of the Soviet threat, these parties become real allies of West. The political sense of the Communists - those who divorce themselves from the Soviet empire - is much sharper than that of the Pepsi-Cola producers and leaders of American technology, whose capabilities for foreseeing are limited by the terms of credit and prospects of expected profits.

How can we, in the described circumstances, evaluate the warnings of Dr. Kissinger who states that the participation of the Western Communist parties in the governments of NATO countries is beyond reconciliation with the ideas and goals of the Pact? As we know NATO wasn't created to fight against

Communism as a political movement, but for the defense of Europe and America against Soviet aggression. The statement of the tired Secretary of State proves his foolishness in the approach to the dynamic changes of the World Communist movement in the context of Soviet power.

His yielding to the Soviets goes hand in hand with his schematism of understanding of all the intricacies of Soviet Imperialism threatening the Western world, the aspirations of China and social movements whose source of power is still the Marxism. What Dr. Kissinger and all the gang of politicians - adherents to unyielding and proponents of *Detente* as well - lack, is the elasticity and skill of instant adaptation to the newly created turns of history which occur in the world. Those people are like generals chained by old military doctrines and unable to find a new strategy in surprising situations. With regard to the problem disputed, their formula is simple: because the Western European Communist parties during the past 25 years - since the creation of NATO - have fought against it, there is no chance even to admit that in their line of action a 180 degree turn has occurred. Meanwhile, the history of the Communist movement shows that such turn-about actually have appeared.

The talent of Kissinger shone forth in its full splendor when a situation and maneuvering with many trump-cards produced imposing effects. The Secretary of State was able to, splendidly, ward off and adjourn certain crises, but couldn't provide a solution to any of them. Here lies the weakness of his short lived moves. People in a position such as Kissinger's

should not mend history. They should create it.*/

The warning delivered to Italy and France that they should not let the Communists participate in their governments, respectively, created irritation of the French and Italian voters, among them neither America nor, particularly, Dr. Kissinger, enjoy great popularity. The effect of the warning may be opposite to the one intended. Whatever happens, the rigoristic approach which excludes the Western European Communist parties from participation in governing their countries, motivated by an anxiety about NATO's fate, do more than just delay the developing fronde between them and Moscow; instead of the deepening of the break off and accelerating the process of socialdemocratization of Western Communism - in which direction it undoubtedly moves - the government of the US pushes it back into the embrace of Moscow.

All these problems should be known to Dr. Kissinger - experienced connoisseur of human history. This assumption leads to a justified opinion shared by many people, that the source of Kissinger's and his friends' politics is a deep pessimism about the future of the Western world. In many interviews with foreign correspondents, Kissinger didn't

*/ No one better characterized the politics of Kissinger than Elmo Zumwald, the Chief of Operation of the US Navy, who said that: "Dr. Kissinger has unusual abilities for making strategic defeats look like tactical victories."

deny it. His fatalism in the evaluation of the future, which may be detected in almost his every step, leads to a conclusion that he is ready to pay any price for several dubitable years during which the Americans could calmly enjoy their vacations, watch the football games, intoxicate themselves on presidential elections and in these or those scandals. This solicitude probably dictates his avoidance of anything that may cause an irritation or a panic of the Soviet "adversary." I'm not sure whether because of this thinking (and not because of a faulty evaluation of NATO's future) he doesn't wish to see the Western Communists' participation in governments of France and Italy. In any case, his statement sounded rather enigmatically that the Western Europe under the Western Communist rule would become "a trouble to us and to the USSR, which probably, does not desire the Western European Communists in the governments of Western Europe." */ If this is true, then Kissinger, knowing the history of Communism, should ask, why. What kind of "Communists" is Moscow afraid of? Wouldn't it be, of those who forcing a new version of Socialism - more proper in the tradition and history of Europe - could threaten her domination over the World?

Zbigniew Byrski

*/ "Summary of Kissinger speech to US Ambassadors," New York Times, April 7, 1976.

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 3/7

Sept. 1976

by

Charles Joel

Juliusz Microszewski - CLAUSEWITZ OR
"BIG BROTHER"?

A translation from Polish magazine
Kultura No. 4/90, 1955, 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

FOREWORD

Juliusz Mieroszewski, whose "Silence is not Always Golden", "Bygones and Expectations" and several excerpts from "Food for Thought" have made a great impression on the readers of *Fragments*, died in London, on June 21, 1976, after suffering a long illness from cancer.

In his last letter to the readers of *Kultura* he wrote: *"I hope to God that new surgery won't be necessary and soon I'll be able to return to my normal work. Although Kultura does perfectly well without me, it is impossible for me to live without writing for Kultura to which I devoted the best years of my life."*

These actually were his farewell words to all of us.

At the funeral, Jerzy Giedroyc, the editor of *Kultura*, said: "Over the fresh grave of Juliusz Mieroszewski we want to say that for *Kultura* he was more than its chief and most prominent writer from whose articles our readers used to begin reading our publication during the past 26 years. He was a rare specimen of political writer, a perfect immigrant whose life was entirely devoted to his monthly tribune - always and above all - to the service of his readers. Surely, *Kultura* will go on without him, but not - as he modestly expressed in his last letter - perfectly well. The death of Juliusz Mieroszewski created in our publication a gap which no one else shall fill. With him - part of *Kultura* died."

As editor of Fragments I decided to honor the memory of Juliusz Mieroszewski by publishing a translation of one of his articles, written 21 years ago. I sincerely hope my readers will bear with my deviation from publishing current articles of Kultura. In my opinion some of the political commentaries of Juliusz Mieroszewski were so far-reaching that they belong to the category of political writing which borders - as we look at them today - with fulfilled prophecy.

The article you are about to read intends to support my opinion.

C.J.

CLAUSEWITZ or "BIG BROTHER"?

The author of a three volume study under the title "Vom Kriege" (About War) General Karl von Clausewitz himself never was a supreme commander, or a chief of operation of general staff, or had won a military campaign. Despite all this, it is he from whom the modern philosophy of war began, and his studies have had greater influence on the European strategic thought than the ingenious improvisations of Napoleon.

The Clausewitz theory simply states that a war is an instrument of politics, and nothing more. A war cannot be won without good foreign politics, even if a nation involved in it had material superiority.

The least intelligent pupils of Clausewitz appeared to be his own countrymen. The Germans lost two world wars because their armies - oftentimes excellent - had not been guided by wise foreign politics. Behind the Luftwaffe and panzer divisions of the Third Reich there wasn't any political plan except the crazy, emotional delirium of Hitler.

125 years after the death of Clausewitz his doctrine became (to many) an anachronism. The hydrogen bomb in the opinion of many strategists and specialists has so very radically changed the expanse and character of war, that today it cannot be considered an instrument of politics.

A perfect illustration of evolution in this direction is the speech of Bertrand

Russell auditioned by the BBC, in which he confronted the audience with a series of opinions of the most prominent personalities, on the subject of hydrogen bomb. Most characteristic was the opinion of Sir Philip Joubert, the British Airforce Marshall. His statement may be considered as an end of the Clausewitz epoch. "With the appearance of hydrogen bomb the human race arrived at a point at which the war as an instrument of politics must be abandoned, or find itself confronted face to face with possibilities of complete annihilation."

War is the oldest institution of humans. It is older than any civilization known to us. Abolition of this archaic "ceremonial" of the human race would become an epochal step forward, and its extent would be comparable only with the birth of great religions. But, abolition of war demands the entire reconstruction of traditional political systems which for millennia were based on sovereign nations warring each other at the intervals of 20 or 30 years. So it was from the days of Babylon and Sumer to Potsdam and Yalta.

Those who like Russell would like to erase war from human race programs are not interested in practical politics; they are fascinated by moral issues involved in war. But, in reality, every program - including any moral issue - may be realized only through a collective action - meaning politics. The question arises: Would we be able, generally speaking, to practice any kind of politics, if all of us were to

become "conscientious objectors" against hydrogen bombs.

In my opinion, if, indeed, Karl von Clausewitz became a victim of hydrogen bomb, only World Government or Orwellian "Big Brother" could become his successor.

There are simple facts which commentators minding their income and popularity, conceal from the public, because the price of optimism is high and grows higher with every passing year. When the Republican leader Senator William Knowland delivered his famous speech about nuclear terror, American commentators with Walter Lipmann in the lead accused him of hysteria. In the American press available to me, I found only one objective appraisal of his speech, written by the brothers Alsop. They stated that though everybody mercilessly criticized Knowland, nobody had answered his questions.

One doesn't need to be a professional psychologist to realize the fact that one cannot live forever in a fear for which there is no remedy or answer. The average citizen of the US realizes that in the Soviet Union and in the US as well, there, with every passing quarter, grows an arsenal of nuclear bombs. Every year brings a new, much improved, type of airplane and guided missile, and the nuclear research laboratories work feverishly 24 hours a day.

There is no escape from the logical chain of consequences of the accomplished facts. Coexistence without honest international nuclear power control must

inevitably lead to a world divided in two besieged fortresses, to the permanent emergency state, to strangulation of democratic freedoms, to the overgrowth of counter-intelligences, secret police and all kinds of censorship. If on our globe there are to exist side by side the two super-powers which at any moment may destroy each other - then they may exist but only for the price of their total and reciprocal alikeness.

Today the Soviets have not yet the nuclear and air force potential of a caliber which would give them a chance of 60 percent victory at first strike. But, if we, from now on, are going to live through a 10 or 15 years of coexistence without real international control of nuclear power - Russia will work out, in quiet and security, her nuclear potential superiority.

We should remember that the race for nuclear power has certain upper limit. If nuclear air delivery potential (bombs plus planes plus guided missiles) sufficient to secure the aggressor's a 60 percent chance of victory at first strike is defined as N, it won't have any significance if the USA's potential were N plus 1000 and Russia's N plus 250. In the case of aggression, the superiority of the Americans won't amount to much - because the Soviet potential, though weaker, will be sufficiently strong to paralyze eventual revenge.

The nuclear apocalypse is not yet fully realized because Russia had not

reached the level of potential N, and the US for 10 new hydrogen Soviet bombs can produce a 100 of her own. This disproportionate advantage of America is most visible in the air force. But this state of affairs won't last long. The moment Russia obtains N potential - there won't be an answer to it. A thousand new bombs or a hundred new plans won't potentially increase the safety of the US.

Is it possible to live in an atmosphere of a permanent, deadly threat? Yes - but only in the normal democratic countries.

Politicians, strategists, philosophers who are in haste to bury the doctrine of Clausewitz, in a majority of cases are the people who grew up in the glories of nineteenth century belief in progress. Bertrand Russell believes that if we avoid nuclear war, a bright future lies ahead of us, bringing health, prosperity and longevity for everybody. Lipmann assures us that an atomic "stale-mate" creates for the Free World perfect prospects but under condition that we must endure on the road of coexistence. These gentlemen do not reveal any premises for reasoning that would justify their optimism.

The politics of coexistence in its military aspect is based on the logic that the atom-air force potential of the West will perform two functions: First - it will discourage the Soviets, and, second, that if despite discouragement Russia would attack, the superiority of America would allow immediate retaliation

and bring the Soviets back to order. Because the Politburo is not a club of suicidal maniacs - as it is thought to be - under these conditions the Soviets will resign from risking the war. And because the West will not in any case resort to preventive war - the eternal peace, in fact, will not be endangered.

If between the US and Russia there was an agreement (properly insured) by which the Soviets were obligated not to cross over the 1:3 ratio of armaments - advantageous to America - the doctrine of coexistence, the concept of retaliatory politics and all hopes connected with it, would be fully justified and substantiated.

But there is not and never will be such an agreement. The weakest point in the theory of coexistence lies in the fact (stubbornly kept in secrecy) that the retaliatory possibilities of the West are on a constant decline. In 10 years the Soviets may have at their disposal such great nuclear potential that its first strike - though unable to destroy America - will be of such terrible magnitude that American retaliation won't hurt Russia.

The hydrogen bomb represents a moral aspect only on our side of the "Iron Curtain". In the Soviet Union, the nuclear armaments and all the problems connected with it, are subjected to the official line of interpretation, similar to the interpretation of biology, philosophy, or the theory of literary criticism.

Even a year ago the views of the Soviet government on this question were to a certain degree in line with the opinions of Bertrand Russell. On March 12 of the last year, Malenkov said:

"The government of the USSR is against the 'cold war' because it is the politics that leads to a new world war. At the present state of development of destructive means, a new war would bring destruction of world civilization."

But, on Jan. 11 of this year, in Pravda there appeared an editorial in which the words of Molotov (delivered on the same day and in the same conference in which Malenkov announced his "resignation") sounded specifically significant. Molotov, among many other things, said:

"If the war-mongers have courage to realize their criminal plans, not the world civilization but capitalistic system which outlived its times shall perish."

Here we have the two completely different Soviet interpretations of the "nuclear problem." According to the present one - in the case of war - the bomb which would fall on Westminster or St. Paul's Cathedral would not level world civilization, but only the monuments of an obsolete capitalistic system.

From the standpoint of dialectics - Molotov's (not Malenkov's) interpretation is correct. To a Communist there exists only one civilization - communistic. Anything else - are variations of the

capitalistic system which will be shredded in the nuclear mills of History.

* * *

Personally, I am not sure whether a thousand hydrogen bombs dropped in different parts of the Globe would end civilization, but I am almost sure that Western civilization as we understand it in the second half of XX century - cannot exist *side by side* with warehouses of atom bombs.

The essence of Western civilization is Democracy. Freedom of speech, religion, scientific research, open judiciary system, tolerance, respect for minorities' rights - these are the fundaments of the Western civilization's structure.

I am convinced that a constant threat of the atomic bomb cataclysm will consequently bring ruin to democratic systems. The climate of permanent danger breeds two political trends: of capitulators and reactionaries of the totalitarian type. Toward the burial of democracy march either neutralists, capitulators and semi-capitulators, or politicians of the McCarthy type. The first ones, march the road which leads inevitably to a government "friendly to the Soviet Union", the others desire to make anti-Communism a totalitarian doctrine. In this sense, between the left wing of the Labor Party and the Committee of "Ten Million Americans Mobilizing for Justice," which made McCarthy its Führer,

there appears to be a much smaller difference than we would think. This is so because both the extreme left and the extreme right, in the face of a Communist atomic bomb threat - though by different methods - drift toward the funeral of Democracy.

With every passing day, technological progress brings us to the times which the ex-chairman of the Senate Commission of Nuclear Energy, Sen. Sterling Cole, called the epoch of the "absolute weapon." In his opinion, during the coming 10 years Russia and the US will have transcontinental guided missiles. These missiles will move in the stratosphere at a speed many times the speed of sound and armed with nuclear warheads will become the "absolute weapons" to which there will be no answer.

Regardless of whether ... the opinion of Sen. Cole is scientifically justified, no doubt, we are approaching a moment when both sides will have sufficient technical possibilities of reciprocal destruction. The closer we find ourselves to the "absolute weapon" epoch the bigger will be the international tension, the more numerous will become the proponents of both extreme trends and the more helpless the moderates.

If moderate politicians, during the next few years, will not work out the concrete answer to atomic bomb destruction, the helm of leadership in most nations of the West will be taken over by left wing neutralist and capitulators. World destruction is not a problem that will be cured by passing time. A solution to

it must be found. Left wing neutralist concepts are wrong, but to fight them, a concrete and completely contradictory program is needed. If it were not be found, the only way for the Western societies to escape from this absurd situation will be the acceptance of the neutralists' and capitulators' concepts.

Democracy may exist and survive but only under certain definite conditions. The main condition of its existence is safety. Although we can talk about Democracy in the modern meaning of this word as well as about Democracy of the past 60 or 70 years, nonetheless, Democracy is a result of progress which covers centuries of European history. That's why I believe, a fall of Democracy would consequently bring a fall of the Western civilization in its present form and essence.

There may be neither bombs nor air attacks, there may be not a single brick destroyed in Notre Dame Cathedral and Nelson monument may still dominate over Trafalgar Square, nonetheless Paris may stop being Paris, London - London, Brussels - Brussels.

Those who believe that civilization may be saved by a continual procrastination of finding a solution to the nuclear war menace, are wrong. If the Soviets succeeded in the conquest of the world without resorting to war, civilization will fall without a nuclear apocalypse. If the Western

nations during the span of 15 years - from now to "absolute weapon" epoch - failed to organize a system of international safety, the world will split into the two camps in which Democracy will die even without a war. Europe will be led by capitulators and neutralists whose ideal will be Super-Vichy, and in the USA, cut off from the rest of world, people's souls will be governed by extreme rightists.

The reader may have noticed that the above perspectives are rather more like prophecy than a logical political deduction. In my picture the details are not important. I am convinced that regardless of who will be in the governments of Europe and America - radical rightists, neutralists, or not - at the time when the "absolute weapon" of both camps is even, Democracy will die.

If one had any doubts in this respect, I advise the lecture from the books of James Burnham, about Communist infiltration in the US. This book, with a dreadful pathos, unveils the helplessness of the Democratic system in a fight against a totalitarian enemy.

Increased defense means, above all, increased control. Every step in increasing control is achieved at the cost of liberty and democratic freedoms. We may take it as axiom that full democratic freedom is possible but only at full safety. At the times of increasing threat, the increased safety demands ever increasing control. Maximal threat demands maximal control. If the state of maximal threat and maximal control

were to last for years - Democracy shall pass to history.

If at the time when the Soviets reached the stage of having the "absolute weapon" and the US still had the Democratic system of the Yalta and Alger Hiss days - it would mean the end of the US existence.

All the freedoms which today the American citizens still enjoy are possible to be sustained for as long as the US has the air-nuclear superiority; in this position of superiority the politics of retaliation seems to be sufficiently secured. But, as with every passing year, the threat grows in America there proportionately grows not freedom but control. At the time when the Soviets will have enough long range bombers and guided intercontinental missiles, in a word, when both camps equalize their destructive capabilities and the politics of retaliation loses its meaning - the Democratic system won't be possible. Then, the entire strategic possibilities will narrow to a certainty that the victor will be the one who strikes first. In these circumstances the state of emergency becomes a normality. In facing a threat of this dimension, insistence in continuation of democratic forms of life would be equal to keeping a wide open door for fifth columns, diversants, spies and saboteurs.

Either we dictate the terms to the atomic bomb or atomic bomb dictates the terms to us. Democracy cannot coexist with the prospects of potential exter-

mination, it cannot develop further in the waiting room of ... the end of the world. All civilizations known in human history have fallen down because they couldn't find the solution to a central problem, and always new civilizations have appeared to undertake this challenge.

Russell and his supporters are right insisting that the main condition for survival is the preservation of peace. In my opinion, however, we should revise the meaning of the word "peace".

In the epoch of the atomic bomb and just a day before the appearance of the "absolute weapon", what should be considered as peace and safety is the surrender of nuclear energy to the real international control. Anything else is neither peace nor safety.

The Soviet politicians are fully aware of the importance of this problem. At the base of peaceful politics of the Kremlin lies the question of nuclear energy control on a world wide scale, too. When the hegemony of the Soviet bloc over the world becomes reality - nuclear energy finds itself under a uniform control and the peace will be secured for centuries ahead. Who will be able to overturn the dictatorship of the Communists - the only disponents of nuclear weaponry? Logic of this concept is infallible and may be counteracted only by the uniformly logical and realistic peaceful politics of the West.

The initial step toward this goal should be the action of awakening the conscience of Western society that international nuclear energy control is not just one among many possible solutions, but that it is the only solution. There is no other if we wanted to save not only the roofs of Paris, New York and London, but also Democracy and a civilized way of life.

Thus understood peaceful politics should be undertaken by the US in its own name. On a background of this politics should stay a coalition of the free nations organized on a platform of a clearly defined purpose of building the peace and safety through the creation of international system of nuclear energy control. America has at her disposal such powerful military, economic and financial resources that her diplomacy shouldn't have any lack of strong and convincing arguments. The nations from behind the frame of coalition should be refused any benefits that otherwise would be a privilege of united nations. Presently, during the period of time in which the superiority of the USA in nuclear power is still very distinct - Washington should initiate talks with Moscow and put the question clearly across the board that the purpose of negotiations is organizing the international nuclear power control which must be achieved. It will depend on Moscow whether this goal has a chance of realization by means of agreement or by force.

It would be a nonsense to discuss whether Russia would in this situation go for talks or for ... war. Nobody knows it today in Moscow or Washington. But, if during the next 15 years the US succeeds in convincing Russia that regardless of the difficulties and opposition, the US is determined to organize the international nuclear power control - I am inclined to suppose that Russia would not choose war.

It is obvious that an authentic international institution that controls nuclear energy would, in practice, become the World Government, though it would never adopt this name. Either, it is obvious that strikingly serious consequences of creating such an institution would invoke, among many others, the capitulation of imperialistic Communism.

The plan is gigantic. But the plan of "One World" and eternal peace in the Soviet version is not less gigantic. The difference between both plans is rather simple but real. The Soviet plan is being realized consequently - the Western plan is on paper.

I began my writing from Clausewitz. In my opinion Karl von Clausewitz may have only a wordly burial, or none. It means that from the list of world political instruments, war may be deleted only by an institution of the stature of a World Government. As long as there is no such institution, abandonment of the doctrine of Clausewitz would be equal to capitulation. Without Clausewitz we

won't bury his doctrine - without the threat of war we won't be able to erase it from the history of the human race. Neither America nor Russia has an easy way toward the solution. Somebody must win - somebody must fall. Coexistence is a naive philosophy of those who dream that a match will be decided as a draw ... without a fight.

Juliusz Mieroszewski

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 3/8

Oct. 1976

by

Charles Joel

Włodzimierz Ledóchowski - AFRICAN
PERSPECTIVES

Bohdan Osadczyk - NEWS FROM
THE UKRAINE

A translation from Polich magazine
Kultura No. 7/346 - 8/347, 1976,
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

AFRICAN PERSPECTIVES

Racism is the most dangerous plague, we, humans, have to face in the very near future. It is sufficient to listen to the debates in the UNO in order to realize how great - measured by a hatred which inspires the resolutions of the Third World - is the danger. Of course, we may trifle with it. But history shows that neglecting an apparently weak opponent is not the right attitude. It brings temporary comfort which ends in an unpleasant surprise. A striking example of this rule is OPEC - the cartel of oil producing countries, which dictates today the prices of oil to the whole world, and whose creation was a surprise to western governments and to the experts of oil industry as well. The latter, during the past decades, were customarily neglecting oil potentates who demanded participation in oil price-making decisions.

On the global political horizon, the conflicts clearly begin to take shape: Western Europe *versus* the African continent, the US *versus* Latin America, and the USSR *versus* China. In general, the

basics of these conflicts are: entangled economic problems, balances of accounts between well fed Christians and hungry followers of other religions, between Democracy and despotic structures, between one and other forms of Marxism.*/ Each of these problems, in itself, not easy to solve - is lined with a maze of racial antagonisms which add up to an emotional build up. And, where emotions dominate, there is little room for rationalism.

To us, the inhabitants of the southern cape of Africa, it appears, that Europe is not sufficiently aware of the danger. Perhaps, it is only a matter of the different way one looks at the world. What I mean may be illustrated by an article I read several months ago in *Le Monde*, in which the author tries to prove that the picture of the Soviet Union had never, since the revolution, been so unattractive, so repulsive. Reading it I felt my heart jump with joy, with optimism. At last - I thought - we have been waiting for something like that for a half century. But after a while came the reflection: Yes, it all is true, but only from the European perspective, not ours. Here, particularly now, when the map of Africa begins, in our own eyes, to change convulsively - we observe something entirely different; that the

*/ Although racial antagonisms play an important role on the Russia-China relations, it would be beyond my competence to include them in this short sketch.

picture of the Soviet Union is not at all so repulsive. Never mind the arguments of Solzhenitsyn or Sakharov...! They do not appeal to Black. To him, what's important is that in a fight for liberation they - the Communists - are ready to help, to give money, weapons and instructors. That's what counts. The main reason for Russia's attractiveness here appears to be the fact that she has never been involved in a long and shameful history of exploitation of Blacks by Whites.

"The accumulation of capital - marxist propagandists tell Blacks - needed for industrialization in the West, was achieved at the expense of the exploitation of the Third World. Look at England! Whole cities had grown up on the slave trade, whole industries had come to life some time later in the days of imperialism. Here, under Communist sky, the accumulation of capital has been achieved by squeezing it out of our own brothers - white men. We sentenced them - and this is what the capitalistic West blames us for - to 50 years of eating ungreased gritts and now we can hardly afford to give them a little bit of a sausage. We do have clean hands, unsoiled with your blood and sweat."

As all propaganda, it is, perhaps, a simplified interpretation of history, nevertheless it is greatly effective in arousing Black's sensitivity. Exploitation, which from the European perspective may appear a peripheral phenomenon in our culture, here in Africa is real. The feeling of wrongs inflicted by the West on Colored men is so much alive that none of the apologies based on historical determinisms shall find any appeal annoy them. The more so, that all the univer-

sities of Black Africa implant this idea in the brains of tens of thousands of students, the idea, by the way, supported by hundreds of the self-scourging publications in the West.

Result: Under the pressure of the marxist ideology, we are, step by step, retreating on this continent. Today in Mozambique, Angola, Benin or Somalia, tomorrow in Namibia and Rhodesia. At this moment from the 46 African states, already 30 sided with MPLA - liberation movement supported by Moscow.

Along with it all, day by day, the domain of the white man is shrinking. Almost subcutaneously we feel the last battle comes.

We would think that all the forces of history conspired against us. Ananke or Nemezis? In our understanding - not European - it is Nemezis - a vengeance. History draws us a bill for the sins of our forefathers.

II

We would, at this place, ask ourselves why the history of the past 400 years has entangled the Christian West in a succession of face-changing forms of exploitation of colored people; from the slave trade through imperialism of European or American version, to neo-colonialism which presently threatens our heads with a hurricane.

To answer it, even in the most general terms, would be beyond the framework of this writing. But perhaps we could simplify the matter by accepting a reasoning that a feeling of superiority of ethnic group, tribe, nation, civilization, arises, undoubtedly, when 2 groups come in contact and one insists that physical characteristics or cultural achievements of the other do not fit to its own scale of values.

That feeling of group superiority - universally known in every civilization* / - is necessary but not the only factor for the appearance of attitudes which we call racial antagonism or racism. The second factor is a group ability to turn it to its advantage. A combination of both factors appeared in our western civilization, after the conquest of the new continents by Europe. It opened perspectives for using colored labor force on plantations and mines in the New World on a scale unknown yet in history of civilization. Of no use seemed the resistant forces built into Christianity which equally with Islam was proclaiming equality of every man before God, independent of skin color, but under condition that he will convert to the true religion. To a certain degree, these forces have softened and delayed the process of racial antagonism's growth, but they couldn't effectively oppose it. Especially that as a result of victorious Protestantism in northern Europe, the Catholic Church found itself on the defensive and has been forced to compromise, silently

*/ The Greeks, Romans, Jews, Chinese and many others have had it.

agreeing with many mercantile practices.

In addition, Protestantism, especially the Calvin denomination with its theory of predestination, had brought religious justification for exploitation of lower races which bore a *visible stigma* of not being loved by the Creator. A coronation of this philosophy was the concept of disgrace which white man taking to bed a colored woman, brings over the whole white race.

The differences between Catholicism and Protestantism explain to a great degree the fact, that in Latin America the racial antagonism had not taken such drastic forms as in the Anglo-Saxon America and Europe. Even the slavery in Latin America had had more paternalistic, more human, character than in America and Europe.

It could have been a blessing for the white race if racism had ended with the slave trade. Unfortunately, it went further. The need for rationalization, innate in our culture, has pushed intellectuals to endow racism with scientific and philosophic theories.

After the war it seemed that lessons learned didn't sink into oblivion and the dreadful experiences of Hitlerism had forever cured mankind from flirting with racism. But, no. Mankind took opposite course. After a two decade silence, scientists, at first timidly, then more and more openly, began producing "proofs" of white race superiority over black. These "proofs", based this time on statistics which showed the results

of the IQ factor measuring tests, were hastily supported by psychologists telling that the influence of heredity prevails over the influence of an environment in shaping human personality. Interpretation of these theses is unequivocal: neither materialistic nor cultural advance can remedy the racial inferiority of the Blacks.

Never, since Calvin, the racists had at their disposal such convincing an argument. So it was natural that fascist extreme Rightists gladly accepted it as a proven fact. It fit perfectly to their political credo. Leftists responded by violent opposition, throwing rotten eggs at scientists responsible for the "argument's" creation.

Objective scientific critique seemed helpless. Not denying the credibility of statistics, it pointed to the error in the racist theoreticians' reasoning, found in neglecting a third formative factor - the reaction of environment on hereditary characteristics of a person - sex, beauty, ugliness, charm or its lack - which can affect the reaction even of a small size environment, such as a family, expressed i.e. in relations between parents and children. According to this critique, heredity plays a role no greater than 45% in comparison with 55% ascribed to environment and its reaction on hereditary characteristics of a person.

These disputes on the scientific Olympus, in themselves, bear an embryo of the future catastrophes. One cannot accept *a priori* the exclusiveness of white race superiority measured by one parameter - the IQ factor, because, in the same sense a parameter - for example -

of musical talent, would probably show the superiority of Blacks over Whites. There are more parameters for measuring individuality and a list of them may be very impressive. With a great probability, the results of research on them, would show quantitatively, that the sum of positive differences between races, on one side of the balance sheet, and negative on the other, would have a tendency to result in a zero balance.

Unfortunately, contemporary history visibly favors these races which have greater ability than the others to apply the scientific discoveries to their advantage. It hasn't been always like that in the past and not necessarily must be in the future. For example, we cannot exclude a possibility that a greater resistance against the absence of vitamin B in food will decide in the future about the biological survival of certain races and atrophy of the others.

But in the feelings of the average White the fact of his visible advantage over Black, amounts to a certitude that he is a member of a higher race.

In the face of the demographic explosion which consequently works to the disadvantage of Whites, the scientific theories we have just disputed, may easily, in the hands of demagogues, become a political slogan proclaiming that the rights to the sun and proteins are reserved in nature for the Whites only. Not a great imagination is needed to envisage what

misfortunes such a slogan could bring on humanity.

III

We experience the second, before the last, phase of emancipation of this continent. The first took place in the sixties, when almost the whole of Africa, with exception of its southern cape, obtained independence. Both phases differ in style. Comparing them is greatly enlightening. In the first phase, the departing governors, in hats adorned with bird feathers, were handing to black leaders - equally adorable in dignified robes and powdered wigs - the parchments with declaration of independence. All was done politely, without bloodshed. There was no need for it, because emancipation resulted not from rebellious wars or wars of liberation, but from the pressures of the two great powers rivaling in a dislike toward the European imperialism superpowers: The US and the Soviet Russia. At that time, a great majority of black leaders sided with Capitalism - plus - parliamentary Democracy; firstly because they themselves in many ways were a part of the colonial establishment and were interested in its continuation, secondly because the new system with its built-in neo-colonial corruptcy offered them a participation in *dolce vita* on much higher level than that - in their understanding - of the departing governors. Swiss banks in which, up to this day, grow the private accounts of African leaders, could - if they wanted - say something in this respect. With temptations

of this sort, Socialism, the severe Socialism of Tanzania's President Nyerere, could not, of course, compete.

After 15 years the situation has changed radically. New leaders of Angola, Zimbabwe (Rhodesia), Mozambique and Namibia (S. West Africa), hardened in long liberating wars, educated in Lumumba Universities in Prague or Kiev, armed by Russia - because the West allied with Portugal did not want to supply them with weaponry - even by their attire underline the new style. Gone are embroidered robes and plumes, replaced by jackets à la Mao. No bullet-proof black Mercedeses are used in meetings with crowds of worshipers, but mud-splashed jeeps *made in the USSR*.

There is also a different approach to economics: no much talking about industrialization, but more about agricultural reforms which in the African context mean a change of land ownership from tribal to cooperative.

In the streets of the newly independent nations, huge posters with picture of a boss, proclaim the slogans: Work from the foundations, literacy, re-education of adults, personal hygiene... Introduced are the ways of: Fight against racism, illiteracy and, lately, even the Day of Latrine. A premier with a shovel in his hands, from breakfast to a lunch time, dug out four latrines. Who is going to beat a premier and shall dig out 5 latrines in the same time?

This new style of African emancipation, exquisitely anti-white, loaded

with a hatred, decided to take revenge for all injustices and humiliations suffered from the hands of Whites, and to wipe out from the surface of the continent all traces of colonial past. The blown up monument of Lesseps - his head knocked down in the African sand - which I saw in the fifties at the entrance to the Suez Canal, initiated a long succession of Diases, de Gamas and Livingstons, who met the same fate. At the same time, the names that evidenced the discovery of Africa by European explorers, disappear from the map of the continent. There aren't many Europeans who have courage to say at multiracial conferences that Livingston discovered Victoria Falls, because they know they would be laughed at: - You discovered Victoria Falls?? It only seems to you, White Gentlemen; We Blacks knew of their existence from the beginning of times.

IV

In this situation, the future of Whites in South Africa doesn't look rosy. In the eyes of the whole world we became the personification of racism. Any Black chieftain whose hands are dirtied with the blood of his brothers, scoffs at us publicly and there is nobody to oppose him (those who did, were long time ago removed from the public life). Pressures initiated some 30 years earlier, are orchestrated today in one choir of protest and contempt. Those who govern us, encouraged by the duplicity of Western politics whose official thunders of condemnation had not, by all means, stopped the flood of capital invested in our natural resources - learned how to sneer at the Black threat.

Furthermore, our politicians seem not to understand that they could afford to practice racist politics but only then, when S. Africa was unreachable behind the oceans, deserts and chain of countries governed by friendly colonial powers.

Today, those bastions are in ruin and very soon we shall be surrounded from 3 sides, along a border of 3,000 kilometers, at which we shall stand face to face with the united revengeful Black Spartacus.

There is something deeply tragic in the fate of the Boers - the heirs of western civilization and its idea of racism - that for this idea they soon will be forced to fight their last battle. The last battle, because in distinction from any other colonial European nation, Boers' country is only that African cape from which they cannot and wouldn't know how to, retreat.

They are getting ready, psychologically, for the battle. Their leaders, again and again, call for vigilance, inflexibility and follow the example of Israel.

Maybe I am pessimistic: maybe who is right, are those who insist that the highly differentiated economy of S. Africa, the richest country of this continent, will dictate to the Black - even after he takes the political initiative - the politics of cooperation with Whites, without whom the country's economy would fall like a house made of cards. Taught

by life's experience, I say: Revolutions are guided not by reason but by political passion; they have a predilection to transform the wheat fields into deserts on which very sparingly a new life sprouts.

Włodzimierz Ledóchowski

NEWS FROM THE UKRAINA

No good news is coming from the Ukraina. Everything shows that Moscow decided to burn out, completely, the movement of national and intellectual revival which developed on the ruins left after Stalinism and German occupation. Terror and russification, inseparable tools of oppression in the oldest colony of the Russian Empire, follow, freely the politics of detente and American Sonnenfeldt "doctrine" of integration. The past, interlaces in our eyes, with the present. Two centuries ago, by the ukaz of Catherine the Great, the eastern - beyond the Dnieper - part of the Ukraina, was destroyed; this year marked a centennial of the Emsk edict by which Alexandr II - czar "liberator" - prohibited Ukrainian literature. The difference between the Ukrainian politics of the old and the new rulers is, that the past rulers were more "honest": All their acts of colonization were cruel in performance and results, nevertheless represented clear forms of administrative law. Their successors,

using the camouflage of marxism and internationalism, continue the programs of the past expansionism, physical and spiritual conquest of other nations, but in an atmosphere of lies, hypocrisy and deceit.

Officially, in the spoken and written word, everything goes on in accordance with a federal system and pronouncements of the constitution about the Union of republics, about *Soyuz*, but in daily language - bureaucratic and social, as well, the old czarist idea - "Russia" dominates. Its full rehabilitation took place during the last war: the cults of Ivan Terrible, Peter the Great, Catherine, Suvorov, Kutuzov came out of the closet; Stalin in his famous toast, revived and sanctioned the superiority idea of the Russian nation. It seemed that all the non-Russian nations, the Ukrainians and the White Russians, in the first place, shall forever be drowned into a swollen sea of Russian chauvinism. This large scale plan would probably have had succeeded if not for several occurrences: the opposition of Tito and different model of nationalistic groups' relations in Yugoslavia; the victory of the Communists in China; the outbreak of the cold war with the West; and, *last but not least*, the death of Stalin. Centrifugal ferments on the peripheries of the Empire - in East Germany, Poland, Hungary - forced Khrushchov to call a retreat in a march against non-Russians. A short lull followed. During a 10 year period of thaw - or, if you prefer, of crises and reforms - important developments have appeared: antagonism between Russians and non-Russians, and a drive of non-Russian

nations to preserve their threatened historical, spiritual and cultural identities. Khrushchov's fall, in a great measure was a revenge of Russian chauvinists for his indulgence toward "minorities." One year after, the Kremlin throne was given to Brezhnev - a son of a Russian colonist in the Ukraina. The bet was a success. The new offensive against Ukraina began. Its main thrust has been directed at the numerous young Ukrainian intelligentsia that worked enthusiastically and with great sacrifice in lifting the country from political and cultural slump. Thus began the third - counting from the mid-thirties - pogrom of intellectual and cultural elite of the Ukraina. It has been something more than just settling the matters with the Ukrainian patriots of the old days and nationalism on the Western confines of the Ukraina; those problems were well taken care of by Stalin.

This time those persecuted were the ex-members of komsomols and the Communists, liberals and nationalists of new generation. In Kiev and Lvov, in Luck and Dniepropyetrovsk, in Chernovtsy and Odessa. It appeared that there was, indeed, a new Ukraina which could not have been tolerated.

The balance of these persecutions is terrible; to the Poles comparable only with all that had occurred after the insurrection of November and January (of 1831 - Ed. suppl.) Hundreds of the most ideological young men were deported to gulags in the north; others locked in common prisons or interned in psychiatric asylums. Those who remained free but under suspicion were deprived of work and education

and weeklings who gave way under tortures - have turned into the janizaries of the conquerors.

That's not all. The Ukraina has been cut off from the existing, though frail, but how important! - contacts with neighboring countries: Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Romania (contacts with Yugoslavia were forbidden even during the Krushchov era). It is an irreparable loss because from their neighbors the Ukrainians drew nourishment for their national revival. In addition, laboriously built, but developing ties with Ukrainian immigrants in America and Canada, have been cut off by the orders from Moscow. The rigoristic censorship of all the scientific texts and literature pertaining to the history of the Ukraina has been enforced. Piotr Shelest, a representative of the Communist Party Central power in Kiev - a man of mediocre valors, but, despite it, a defender of "small stability" and an autonomist - had been replaced by Shcherbycky, who at the last meeting of Ukrainian Communists gave a speech to his fellow countrymen in ... Russian. The whole Ukraina is swaddled in the darkness of colonial province separated from the rest of the world.

One year after Helsinki there undergoes a planned action for the full enslavement of a country which after the losses of preceding decades had the courage to begin the reconstruction of foundations for its national and humane existence. The facts that the flower of Ukrainian youth has been arrested and deported, that the Ukrainian poets for their verses (which for their Russian

counterparts bring praises and rewards) receive a seven year prison and 3 year deportation sentences, prove that there is a state of emergency. The Ukraina became a main polygon of the fight against non-Russians. In the West nobody cares about it. The Russian masses look at these "great changes" with indifference, perhaps, inwardly, even enjoying it all. But the most painful is the position of a majority of Russian intelligentsia. The learned Russians - with a few exceptional personalities such as Sakharov, Bukowski or Gorbonyevskaya - don't seem to notice, nor want to notice, that there is a hatred growing around them. Let's not deprive them of illusions: if one day the "balancing of the accounts" developed, this hatred will be beyond control; it won't be directed only against the home grown traitors and plenipotentiaries - apparatchiks - of Moscow. There is a lot to be learned from the history of the Czarist regime's fall. Despite opposition, Russia, from 1905, was moving in a direction of reforms. The Ukrainians could have been active in many ways. There existed a chance for a dialogue - above the heads of official power - with many honest Democrats of Russia. In other words, the load of pretences and accusations accumulated through centuries could have discharged itself in a civilized and controlled manner. But what is accumulating today is a self-restrained hatred against Russians. The Russian intelligentsia should remember all this.

Russification is a key issue in the last quarter of our century; all other questions in eastern and middle-eastern parts of our continent, are its common derivatives. How it all will be solved

depends, in the first place, on Russians: is it going to be a joint effort to avoid an apocalypse of reciprocal slaughter, or a sea of fraternal bloodshed? In the centennial of Ukraina's speech and literature prohibition, in the face of news that come out from contemporary Ukraina, it's the duty of every honest Russian to think deeply about these prospects.

Until we have Russian thinkers and politicians who could undertake a fight against the myth of Russian hegemony, and who would decisively cut themselves off from the methods of conquest and denationalization of other nations, all declarations about joint fronts and cooperation shall remain empty talk. Turning around and declaring that all this is caused only by the Soviet system is a pure nonsense. The roots of the problem are much deeper.

Bohdan Osadcuk

Fragments

Vol. 3/9-10

Dec. 1976

by

Charles Joel

A Statement

EASTERN EUROPE "FREE"

Josef Clapski

JUST A STRIP OF A
FOREIGN SOIL

Jefiem Etkins

NOTES OF NON-CONSPIRA-
TOR, and DIGRESSION
ON IMMIGRATION (excerpts)

Adam Kruczek

IN THE SOVIET PRESS

A translation from Polish magazine
Kultura No. 10/349 and 11/350, 1976,
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

EASTERN EUROPE "FREE"

President Ford performed a miracle: during the second TV debate with Carter in San Francisco, in a few short sentences he "freed" Eastern Europe. "There is no Soviet domination in E.Europe" - he stated - "and there will never be under Ford's administration." It isn't true, he added, that in Helsinki the US sold out all the countries of E.Europe. "I don't believe that Yugoslavia, Romania and Poland consider themselves dominated by the Soviet Union. Each of these countries is free and independent." Carter smiled, and retorted: "I would like to see Mr. Ford during his explanations to Americans of Polish, Czech and Hungarian origin, that their native lands are not under the domination of the Soviet Union."

The so called "goof" of President Ford has two aspects. First, that is was immediately used by Carter calling indirectly all Americans of E. European origin to vote against his Republican opponent. We entirely agree with him. We express our hope that the Poles, Romanians, Czechoslovaks, Hungarians, Bielorusians, Balts and Free Russians - having right to vote - will definately refuse to support Fords's candidacy after

his irresponsible, lunatic, statement. But, we also consider Ford's "goof" as a real one - which is the second aspect of the whole matter. In fact, Ford said aloud (and here lies his stumbling block in the election campaign) what he really thinks, or, rather, what Kissinger and Sonnenfeldt think for him.

We have been accused by some people of exaggeration in our editorial "The Seal" */ in which we heatedly condemned the Conference in Helsinki. Presently, the political line Ford-Kissinger-Sonnenfeldt explains everything plainly.

However, Carter's reply, the smile of the Democratic presidential contender who perceived the mistake of frankness of his Republican opponent and took immediate action in hunting for "ethnic" heads, doesn't satisfy us either. What we expect from Carter is a clear formulation of a *different* political line, free from the seal of Helsinki and the cynicism of the Kissinger-Sonnenfeldt "doctrine". The political line which would realistically help to liberate the Eastern Europe from the Soviet domination.

Signed:

For Poles - *Kultura* - by Ed. Jerzy
GIEDROYC

For Balts - *Elta Press* - by Msgr. Vincas
MINCEVICIUS

*/ *Kultura* NO 9/396, translated in
Fragments NO 2/9, Nov 75

For Czechs - *Svedectvi* - by Ed. Pavel TIGRID
For Russians - *Kontynent* - by Ed. Vladimir
MAKSIMOV

For Romanians - by Eugene IONESCO
For Ukrainians - *Suczasnists'* - by Ed. Ivan
KOSZELIWEK'

For Hungarians - *Irodalmi Ujsag* - Ed. Tibor
MERAI

JUST A STRIP OF A FOREIGN SOIL

In London's Gunnesbury Cemetary, on Sept. 18, there was the unveiling of the monument of the Katyn victims. I did not participate in its construction, nor in the stubborn five year effort of the Polish-English Committee to bring the project to its full realization. I was only a witness at the ceremony of its unveiling. It is almost impossible for me to write about it.

* * *

It is a sunny, windy, autumnal morning; The white veil that covers the monument flutters like a sail. From all sides arrive thousands, literally thousands of Poles from England, America, Germany and France. I know there are many people from Poland too. Many Englishmen, these faithful friends led by venerable Lord Barnby; without them the monument couldn't have been erected over the objections of the British government and its categorical

pressures.

Roll of the drums, and Mrs. Mary Chelmecka, widow of an officer murdered in Katyn, performs the unveiling. The monument is beautiful in its simplicity. A seven meter tall obelisk of black granite, and, on it, with a thin golden thread imprinted the white eagle in a crown of barbed wire, and date of 1940 - the date which says everything.

The date engraved in the obelisk, appeared unacceptable - as being controversial - to the British government. Apparently, the more than 12 protests against the building of the monument, made by the Soviet Union and the Polish Peoples Republic, were effective. The British government had not been represented at the ceremony; it, even forbade the British military in uniforms to participate in it. After consecrating, Bishop Rubin spoke; after him the speeches of priests of other religions: Greek-Catholic, Protestant, Russian-orthodox and Jewish. Katyn is the grave of the Polish soldiers of all creeds.

Why this simple ceremony seemed to me more meaningful than all the other national ceremonies which I had lived through? Its every detail, set in a deep collective experience, appeared to be lived through almost physically by all.

Striking was the silence of the crowd, the concentration with which it received the speeches, and its hetero-

geneity. Beside us the old ones to whom Katyn was a tragedy of our generation, stood people a generation younger...and many children - to them it was history.

The prayers ended, the speeches ended. Big crowd let loose and diverged over greens and paths. I have never seen such a number of wreaths, bouquets and bundles of flowers placed by not only the Polish but many other peoples. Among the wreaths there was one placed in the name of the whole family by Winston Churchill, the grandson of the British war time premier. There wasn't a representative of the British government, but numerous delegations of patriots: Czech, Hungarian, Latvian, Ukrainian, and Free Russians. It seems that all the London press reacted unanimously to this event. From the *Times'* editorial under a title "Stigma of Katyn," to the Sunday Times, which called it a "*Bad day for the honor and prestige of England,*" to the *Daily Mail* which published the violent text of Winston Churchill speech: "My great grandfather never doubted that Russians were responsible for this murder... Absent at unveiling are only base, ignorant and guilty people."

I can't see how it would be possible for me to end this short report on my experience at Gunnsbury Cemetary, but by the citing words of Lord Oswald - one of the speakers and a member of monument's building Committee -

"There are English words, perhaps too often quoted...written by a young

English poet, shortly before his death on the battlefield in World War one: 'If I die, thinking of me, remember that there is such a strip of foreign soil which forever shall be England' - thousands of miles from the place of violent death, this strip of soil consecrated by Bishop Rubin SHALL FOREVER BE POLAND."

Jozef CZAPSKI

* * *

The British government refused to send its representation to the ceremony of monument's unveiling, because it considers controversial the date inscribed on it (1940); the date which irrefutably proves that the murder was committed by the Soviets.

Is it possible to call this position in different words than the words of the Member of Parliament Airey Neave: *Craven attitude* and fear of offending the Soviets authorities by supporting the truth.

It would appear, that the basic works "The Crime of Katyn", published in England, and containing all the facts and documents pertaining to the crime, is completely unknown to the British government.

Either, it seems, the British government doesn't know about the book of J.K. Zawodny, "Death in the Forest."

Is it possible that the latest books of Louis Fitz-Gibbon: "Katyn a Crime Without Parallel" and "The Katyn Cover-Up" are also unknown to the British Government?

I may add, that all the proofs, pinning

down the "authors" of the crime, had been included in the report of the British Ambassador to the Polish government, Owen O'Malley, on Feb. 11, 1944. This report - top secret at one time - is today published on the last pages of Fitz-Gibbons' book - "The Katyn Cover-Up."

J.Cz.

NOTES OF NON-CONSPIRATOR and DIGRESSION ON IMMIGRATION. (excerpts)

Do you know, my reader, what "pokazucha" really is? (A Russian idiom for: to show up, to keep up appearances - transl. editor)

In the Soviet Union there are super-highways reserved for the use of foreigners. They are smoothly asphalted. On both sides of these highways stand rows and rows of handsome cottages, beautifully fenced and surrounded by flower-beds; from time to time a kiosk full of colorful artifacts appears. But, on the background of this beautiful scenery runs a country road, full of mud-paddles. You don't see alongside these roads any colorful kiosk, only, seldom, a village grocery shop with bread and vodka. Foreigners don't see them, they aren't stuck in the mud, and reach their hotels in a full comfort. In Astoria everything is ready for them, as long as they are not in contact with daily realities: There is even Bieriozka - a shop filled with the most elegant

merchandise which may be bought for hard currency only. The location of a hotel is very esthetic and everything may be obtained without any trouble - foreigners needn't walk far, and within radius of their promenade, everything is programmed properly. Two blocks farther, in a butchery, there is no meat, but over here, plenty of fashionable establishments with TV sets and old china - all displayed for making a good impression on a visitor.

This is a show up, or "pokazucha."

It is everywhere. The Soviet Union puts itself on show, flirts with foreigners, covers its cheeks with theatrical make-up and builds the props of plywood.

I felt ashamed whenever I saw a "pokazucha". It seemed to me that it was I who deceived somebody, entirely as if I were putting a wig to cover my baldness when going to meet my beloved woman.

Our street in Leningrad was lined with small lime-trees and owing to them, our dusty, modest alley, had an appearance of charming homeliness, resembling a small, shaded bulwark. One morning, I witnessed an incident of a motorised digger taking away out last little lime-tree, followed by the rest of equipment. I was stunned: Who needed our little trees? Soon, it became clear that in a few days Nixon was going to visit Leningrad, and one of the streets through which ran the route of his cavalcade must be beautified. So, there was where our little trees went. It was May: the trees died soon. But the presidential

eyes must have been charmed by the green leaves, not by stony desert. The other streets that were located on the route had the houses washed up, even painted...but only to the height of the first storey: He won't leave his car - its windows allow him to see the ground floor only.

This is "pokazucha" too. This is what made me ashamed.

At the end of the Second World War, when the Soviet army fought into the heart of Europe, I marched in its ranks through Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria. What a joy and pride was felt by all of us, the soldiers and officers of the army which defeated the Fascists! What feelings were bestowed on us; how happy looked Romanian and Bulgarian women throwing flowers on our tanks! Naturally, I felt proud and happy, because nobody else but we had just beaten Hitlerian hordes; we brought liberation to our friends. But, when the liberators, intoxicated with young wine, were breaking in jeweler's stores and, literally, were pouring watches by the handfulls into their rucksacks - till they moved and tick-tacked as if alive - I felt nothing but tormenting shame and I couldn't look straight into the eyes of the same Romanians whom we were embracing in brotherly love the day before. We liberated them - and we robbed them too.

And when the armies of the Warsaw pact entered Czechoslovakia - I understood my friends from Prague, or Brno, who stopped writing to me or answering my letters: they were convinced that I too responsible for the occupation of their country. Then, the dearest to my heart were the piercing poems of

Twardowski, passing from hands to hands
in an underground publicity:

What to do with an oath and how to
regain peace,
Where are the words to say with be-
numbed lips,
How had greeted us Prague in forty-five,
And how we were greeted in sixty-eight.

* * *

By the same plane, flew with me from
Leningrad, Jacob Milkis, concert-master
and the second violinist of the Leningrad
Philharmonic Orchestra, one of the best
in the world. Every year, this orchestra
gives concerts in different capitals of
the West and East, but Milkis never took
part in them. Why? Nobody wanted to ex-
plain it to him. Somehow, one day he was
told that he has an aunt in Canada, and
Milkis was completely stupified: What
aunt, he doesn't even know her. The Or-
chestra continued to appear in foreign
capitals and Milkis stayed home. That he
is a musician of the highest class - no-
body ever doubted. But, it is always
better - in the opinion of the author-
ities - to keep him in seclusion at home.
Jews are "viscous" they all are in the
depth of their hearts - Zionists, trust-
ing them is out of order. So, Milkis,
Russian artist-musician, for all his
jewishness having only to Russian ear,
a funny sounding name - that "foreign
sound" - immigrated. To an unknown aunt
in Canada. There, he was gladly accepted,
plays now in an orchestra, and his child-
ren are in music-conservatory.

This is an example of sad and dreadful
stories depicting how the creators of
Russian art depart to the West, and how

part of Russian culture goes down the drain.

* * *

If we pulled a thread out of a cloth,
a thread loses its reason for being a thread,
and a cloth begins to rip up. One must leave
this country, when one feels a noose around
one's neck, when staying here longer is dan-
gerous and will not produce anything useful,
when the thread is pulled out a cloth and
nothing and nobody would be able to push it
back where it belongs. But so long as it
stays in its place, in its web, so long as
nothing irrevocable happens - hold on, man,
hold on with all your strength, teeth and
claws.

That's what I was telling myself think-
ing about the future and the present. I
wanted very much to see the West; all my
life I have been involved scientifically in
French literature, but never had a chance
to visit France: I was forbidden to take
even a tourist vacation abroad. For many
years I have been translating German poets
- from Hans Sachs to Berthold Brecht and
Erich Kaestner, but never an opportunity
has been given to me to see Germany, and I
almost lost my hope... I have been conduct-
ing studies on Maeterlinck and Verhaeren
and I wrote quite a lot on them; I stopped
dreaming of a day in which I could see
Belgium.

My close friend, Vladimir Shor, famous
for his works on French language and liter-
ature, loved to make imaginary promenades
around Paris: he knew from memory all its
streets and played his imaginary walks like
an arch-master who doesn't even look at a
chess-board. Many times he tried
to get a permit to visit his beloved France
- all to no avail: "his name dirtied by a

foreign sound," the authorities wouldn't let him go neither as an invited guest, nor for studies, nor as a tourist. He died at the age of 54 and never realized his dreams: he saw Paris in his imagination, or in the movies. For long years I was tormented by a desire of seeing Aix-en-Provence, Paris, Ferney, Lubeck and Geneva, the Isles of Deunion and Brugge.

But, an exile is not a tourist. To explore the outside world - at a cost of renouncing my native air, my own readers, language, environment, students? It all seemed to me a prodigious, impossible thing. And I was ready to fight for as long as it was possible...To fight against all odds - against unlawful treatment of Jews, omnipotence of the authorities, and overwhelming fear which paralyzes even most noble characters.

But soon it appeared that the fight was impossible.

Jefrem ETKINS

(translated from Russian by Michal Kaniowski)

IN THE SOVIET PRESS

About the revolt on the Soviet ship "Starozewoy" the Sweds informed the world many months after this incident. About a pilot who landed in Iran - so far - we know nothing. But quite a lot is written about First Lieutenant Belenko, who brought to America a fantastic gift

on the Bicentennial of her independence. Much less about him has appeared in the Soviet press. No sooner than 9 days after the landing of MIG-25 in Japan - on Sept. 15, of this year - TASS Agency published a long statement under a lamentable title "Who Needs This?" Japan has been accused of unfriendly attitude toward the neighboring USSR, of allowing the "Third power" the access to a mysterious machine, of poisoning Belenko with "narcotics, or other means" which caused his "abnormal behavior" during his talk with representatives of the Russian Embassy. We must admit, that according to the Soviet logic, Belenko is "abnormal". He ran away from the Soviet Union and doesn't wish to return. If abnormal are considered the people who believe in God, read the poems of Mandelsztam, or publish the *Chronicle of the Current Events*, so more abnormal must be Belenko. Anyway, after next 9 days, the Soviet press published a new statement on the case. This time it was signed by "Society USSR - Japan." Evidently, concluding that Belenko is incurable, Japan was demanded only to return the plane. At all events, six Japanese fishing-cutters were caught by Russians, not far from the territorial waters of the Soviet Union.

It's difficult to estimate what secrets will be disclosed by the western specialists after dismantling a legendary MIG-25. It can't be concluded that the specialists have had, rather, much greater expectations than they should have. There seems to be lately in the West sort of maniacal upgrading the successes of the Soviet technology and Soviet life style. Nevertheless, we know that Belekno brought two true secrets. First is, strictly of military value: It appears that during a

flight, the glass-windows of the MIG-25 freeze. All efforts of the Soviet engineers in finding a solution to this problem were fruitless. The matter lies in the fact, that there is a chemical material against a freezing of the glass - it is called alcohol, but all its supplies kept in special containers are drank out by a crew even before the start of a flight. The second is entirely of political nature and it seems that nobody had noticed it. The Paris *Russkaya Mysl* did even delete it from Belenko's statement. First Lieutenant of the Soviet Air-Force, Belenko after landing in Japan, said simply that he escaped from the USSR because its regime is much worse than the regime of czars.

This statement appears very significant. Belenko is 29 years old. We may suppose that not only he but also his parents were born under the Soviet sky. Educated by the Soviet system and Soviet propaganda which insists that it's impossible to imagine a system worse than czars' system. And, here he is: a young 100 percent Soviet man, representing the second, entirely Sovietic generation, concluding that the Soviet system is worse than czars'. He doesn't express other criteria. This one criterion has been given him by the Soviet propaganda and he turned it against the Soviet Union.

The armed forces and their situation always reflect the situation of a country. About the present situation in the Soviet army, one may judge not only by a growing dissatisfaction within it, which is illustrated by the revolt of "Starozewoy" and the escape of Belenko:

The General Secretary of the Communist Party of Russia, Leonid Brezhnev was made Marshall. Marshall's rank was awarded to the C.P. Secretary and Minister of Defense, D. Ustinov. At the beginning of Sept. KGB boss Andropov, and minister of Security, Szczelokowov, received the rank of Army General.

I underlined many times before, that to understand the development of events in the Soviet Union, it's very useful to watch what the Soviet ideologists write about China. Studying the works of Moscow sinologists, one is often under the impression that they write looking in a mirror.

Not long ago, the Moscow military paper published a selection of articles - "Militarism in the Ideology and Practice of Maoism." It's editor, Col. Ju. Ivanov, included in it the articles of: Gen. Maj. B. Wolkogonov, about the basic military principles and practices of Maoism, Capt. H. Szumichin - "Army in the political manoeuvring of Peking," G. Apalin - "Peking, the Ideology in the Service of Expansionism," and articles of others.

From these articles the readers learn that "...militaristic tendencies of marxism ...wearing a 'marxistic robe,' use socialistic phraseology in order to thwart the reader's orientation in its open reactionary character." So, we learn, that Maoists "despite the politico-ideological education of a people, and creating the atmosphere of a 'besieged fortress,' widen the militarization of country's economy. They spend on war preparation about 40% of the budget." Result: "Directing a lion's share of national revenues to expand war industry, pushing up the rate of nuclear

potential growth. Peking leaders ... keep the populace on beggar's rations, sustain a system of stamps actually in every kind of food and industrial product." The reader doesn't need to travel to China to learn it.

A lot of space is devoted to the "incessant fight among different factions of the ruling Peking leadership."

A review of this book, published in the *Krasnaya Zvezda* (9/7/76) ends with these words: "And here is why the fight against maoism, unmasking its aggressive, military nature, is a very urgent matter." This review, in which the Chairman of Chinese Communist Party, is called a cannibal, had been published two days before the death of Mao-Tse-Tung. The Soviet press reported it immediately as a joyous news, but with a brevity which certainly will go down in the history of journalism. The note was titled: "The death of Mao-Tse-Tung," and went on: "Peking 9/9/76. It was announced here that on Sept. 9, on 0.10 hr., at the age of 83, the Chairman of Communist Party of China, Mao-Tse-Tung died in Peking." With a similar lightening speed, the death of another terrible enemy of the Soviet Union - Trotsky - had been announced in August, 1940. But, Stalin knew how to triumph after the deaths of his enemies, especially when he himself had murdered them. He was doing it with a greater dash than the present occupants of the Kremlin. The article about the death of Trotsky was titled - "Sobakye - sobaczia smert'." (To a dog - dog's death - editors transl.)

The Soviet press expressed its joy because of Mao's death, with a clever set-up of articles which were previously published in the West, proving that all the world is happy because of death of traitor Communist cause.

We must say, that in relation to her enemy NO 2, i.e., to American Imperialism, the Soviet propaganda is less violent, than to the enemy NO 1 - maoism. Well, there are plenty reasons for it: It is the Chinese press which discloses that the Soviet Union is robbing its Warsaw pact partners, and tries to change the Third World nations into its colonies, etc. But American President Ford states that "he doesn't think the Yugoslavs, Romanians and Poles consider themselves dominated by the Soviet Union. These countries are independent, and govern their territories entirely on their own." In the spring of this year Kissinger's advisor Sonnenfeldt, explained the same views at the conference of American diplomats in London, and, at that time many had doubted if there were any leaders of American foreign politics who could really share these views. But, today, President Ford officially approved the so called Sonnenfeldt doctrine which says that all the countries embraced by the Soviet empire should love the USSR.

The satisfaction of Moscow which results from the politics of the US, is sometimes disturbed by "some bourgeois ideologists" who "do not intend to resign from the fight against Socialism." On Sept. 29, *Prawda* published a large "Theoretical" article - "Relaxation and a Class Fight," signed by Dr. of philo-

sophical sciences, prof Ju. Krasin. The author is greatly dissatisfied because of a "prominent anti-Communist ideologist, Zbigniew Brzezinski," who propagates "the concepts of politico-ideological methods of pressure on Socialistic countries, calculated on a gradual 'erosion' of Socialism."

Professor Krasin, presently, teaches the official Soviet doctrine of "relaxation and a class fight": The Soviet Union is an ideal society, and, here follows a quotation from Brezhnev: "We created the society of people, entirely free in the widest meaning of this word, which doesn't recognize any privileges attributed to a class, wealth, race, etc., the society which not only declares the rights of man, but also safeguards, in practice, all the possibilities of their use by all." This society: - "Socialistic Soviet Union and its befriended countries - are the only hope for mankind." So - the Soviet philosopher ends his reasoning - "the bet on relaxation is not in the least degree contradictory to the revolutionary strategy of fighting to free the nations from the class and nationalistic oppression; for social progress."

In other words: "Erosion" of Capitalism, transition of power to the hands of Communists - in all parts of the world in which they do not yet hold it - is an objective order of our times." Whoever is against it, even the one who is only dissatisfied with it, is the enemy of the Soviet Union, Communism, and, by the same token of mankind.

* * *

Another Soviet writer, K. Zarodov, represents a stratum of party leaders, who tomorrow or after tomorrow will replace the old men who hold power today. Meanwhile, the young ones, eager to reach for power, draw up plans for "widening the sphere of Communism," and the old men build monuments for themselves.

The building of monuments is the latests fashion in Moscow. In May, Leonid Brezhnev erected for himself a bust-monument in Dneprodzierzinsk. On Sept. 25, there was an unveiling of a bronze-bust of Nicolay Podgorny. On Oct. 3, some amateurs could admire a bronze profile of M. Suslov. In the very near future one can expect to see a monument of Andrei Kirylenko.

After unmasking the "cult of the individual," it was decided that there will not be any monuments built for the people who are still living. But the temptation was too strong to some!! And a solution has been found: according to the new rule, a twice decorated Hero of The Soviet Union, will have a monument built in the place of his birth. Good, but still not perfect. Everything depends on the place of one's birth. For example, Brezhnev wisely foresaw, to be born in a village which in time developed into a large city. His monument may be admired - if they wished - by all who visit Dneprodzierzinsk. But what to do with Podgorny, who was born in Karlovka in Poltava District? Who will ever go there? Suslov - a much worse case - was born in a small village, Szachowskoye in Uliano district. Where Kirylenko was born - so far - is not known. Just recently, he received, for the second time, a star of the

Soviet Union Hero and is looking for a sculptor.

A status of Soviet Union Hero declares the erection of a bust of a hero, but only in the case of a reward of a Golden Star. Somehow, I don't believe, any contemporary Soviet leader will live long enough to see his monument built in Moscow.

* * *

Prof. Preobrazenski, a hero of Michail Bulhakov's book "Dog's Heart," warns his assistant: "God forbid you from reading the Soviet press. Do you know - said professor - that I've made 30 observations at my clinic... Patients who don't read papers feel very well, but those whom I forced to read the *Prawda* lost weight...that's not all; they were losing their nerve-reflexes, appetite, and became depressed." Assistant attempted to oppose: But there are no other papers to read. "So, don't read anything" - said professor.

The hero of Bulhakov's book made his diagnosis 10 years ago, but today it is still accurate: loss of weight, depression. Perhaps, the readers of *Prawda* have an appetite but to satisfy it becomes more and difficult.

However, it's possible that the readers of the Soviet Press, in August, 1976, had lost their appetite too. There were two annoying themes during the beautiful summer months in the minds of propagandists-journalists: The Grain and Namibia. From *Prawda* to *Country Life*, from *Izvestiya* to

Krasnaya Zvezda - all the papers have been reporting about the indignation of the Soviet citizens against the unbearable terror to which the progressive nation of Namibia is exposed and about the demands for freedom of Namibia!! Naturally, from reading this news the nerve-reflexes of the readers must have been worsening: they accepted them with apprehension; the liberalizing tendencies of Namibia ought to be helped - again it will be necessary for them to pay and pay... This state of mental depression has been deepening, the more, as together with the Namibia question, there began to appear the articles, calls, declaration of Leonid Brezhnev about the grain.

Every summer the Soviet press writes about grain and its harvesting: urging, asking, threatening. Every year the Soviet leaders invent the most ingenious methods in order to complete - what would appear a most common task in the world: the harvest. Every summer, the Soviet leaders are seized by a fear: would there be a shortage of grain? And often, very often, their apprehension is fully justified. The last year catastrophe of bad crops was a hard blow to the country's economy. Consequently, Marshall of the Soviet Union the General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, L. Brezhnev, took personal responsibility for the current year's harvesting.

In one of my previous articles I wrote about all the means used by the Soviet leaders during the past 45 years for getting bread, always badly needed. This year, Brezhnev wants again to perform a "miracle", a thing which had al-

ways in the past been a success: "Kuban Farmers" wrote a letter to the Marshall and Gen. Secretary, in which they promised to deliver an even greater harvest than the plan called for. Leonid Brezhnev answered them with a thankful letter. Immediately all the regions, districts, republics of the S. Union, followed a good example of Kuban farmers, raising their obligations. Everyday, the Soviet press publishes this kind of letters. The agricultural workers of Uzbekistan received with great enthusiasm the letter of General Secretary to Kuban farmers. The workers of kolхозes and Sovхозes of Uzbek Republican after discussion on the subject, determined to put a new, higher norms (*Prawda*, 8/15/76). Furthermore, it is disclosed that Uzbekistan, in the current year, will deliver to the State one million tons of grain - "meaning 465,000 tons more than the plan provides."

In Sept. 3, Brezhnev, in a speech at Alma-Ata declared a universal mobilization for the "battle for grain." "This year," - he stated, - "the country will have grain." Brezhnev travelled to Kazakhstan because 22 years ago, as a comparatively young assistant of Khrushchov he was an administrator of the virgin Kazakhstan steps, and because this year a good crop is expected there. So, Kazakhstan represents the greatest hope for having bread. "In the current year," - he continued, - "Kazakhstan will give the country 27 million tons of grain." But, after a while, evidently disturbed that some people might feel under pressure, the General Secretary asked his listeners: "Who of you, comrades, supports this obligation?" And, he heard joyous, enthusiastic

shouts: "Everybody!" Such is the story of how the people of Kazakhstan declared their help to Brezhnev.

The pressures on the Kolхозes is the first plan of strategy in the "battle for grain." The second will be pressure on cities. This is much easier to do. It's enough, for example, to issue the "Instructions for effective utilization of meat and its products for 1976." The instructions foresee a reduction of meat quantity in the sausages (production of sausages amounts to 40% of all meat products). This - confidential! - instruction allows the adding of any kind of ingredient to sausages - under the condition that a smallest amount of meat possible should be used. Then, follows the third front in the "battle for grain," the only one which guarantees victory." The purchases of grain abroad. According to the agreement signed in 1975, the USSR has the right to buy in the US, unconditionally, from 6 to 8 million tons. So far, to August 31, 1976, the Soviet Union has already bought 4.6 million tons of the original figure.

We may suppose that Brezhnev's current year's instructions resulted from some disturbances on the third victorious front: The American economy - writes *Le Monde* (8/31/1976) - shows great anxiety with regard to the payability of the countries of monstrous appetites - the countries of the Communist bloc. The commerce deficit of Socialistic countries, which in 1975 amounted to \$6.9 billion, in 1976, increases at a rate of 20% monthly. No wonder the Soviet leaders are annoyed. What will happen if the Capitalistic West, dying of crises, refused

credit to the blooming by prosperity
countries of socialistic planning.

Brezhnev's decision to take
Kolhozes by the throat proves the
existence of this fear.

Adam KRUCZEK