

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 5/1

Jan. 1978

by

Charles Joel

KISIEL

MY PROPHECY

Adam KRUCZEK

IN THE SOVIET PRESS
(excerpts)

Hilij SNIEHIROV

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE
USSR GOVERNMENT

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 9/360, 11/362-1977 published in Paris, France

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

MY PROPHECY

Dedicated to Mr. Zbigniew Brzezinski

I have a prophecy for the Eastern Europe for the coming 30-50 years. I have been induced to formulate this prophecy by reading the declaration of the American expert on neutron bomb, Samuel T. Cohen, in the weekly magazine *Der Stern*. Cohen's interview appeared in *Stern* on August 18, 1977, and I read its reprint in the *Warsaw Forum* on September 8, 1977, and immediately I reached for my pen.

Cohen says that neutron bomb is considered to be a defensive weapon in case the Russians "widening their ideological and political territory of influence" attacked Western Europe, with conventional forces, and broke through the front on the German Federal Republic sector. Well, the assumption that Russia will militarily attack Europe appears to me a pure abstract idea and an absolute improbability; a mistake born from the separation of strategic thinking from politics. We know from

Clausewitz, that war is simply a protraction of politics, politics realized by different means.

My prophecy says that Russia shall never militarily attack Western Europe. She won't do it for two reasons: first, because such an attack would be a great risk, and second, that it is, in general, UNNECESSARY.

The risk involved in an attack may be recapitulated in 3 points: a/ It would destroy all gains of a refined, diplomatic - psychological work of Russia in W. Europe. b/ It would threaten a chain reaction that would lead to a general nuclear war whose final result is always uncertain. c/ It would activate on the Asiatic borderline of the USSR considerable Chinese masses - in a situation of nuclear war the numerical preponderance of population may play a decisive role. Besides - there is also Japan to think about.

The risk is enormous and the Russians will absolutely not take it: They demonstrated many a time that they don't like to risk, that they don't like to lose anything they have gained in long exploits. They are patient, self-controlled, can wait, - all this has been proven beyond any doubt. They are like chess players, and in a chess-game many forward moves are always advantageous. In addition, from the time of Lenin, they know well the Westerners' psychology, their devotion to materialistic values, and system stipulated by parliamentary unsteadiness.

What the Russians are going to do in the European theater during the coming 30-50 years? Nothing. They will, simply, DIGEST. They will digest everything they had gotten after the World War 2. And, they had gotten quite a lot. They have now, the Baltic

countries and the neutralized (or occupied) Finland, they annihilated East Prussia, they gave Poland the western and mid-western Pomerania - in this way getting rid of powerful Germanic nests at the Baltic Sea-shore. They have Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, in my opinion - they have Romania too, as sooner or later the Soviet system will prevail there over the politico-ethnical ambitions. And, finally, - a question of enormous importance - they have East Germany, the divided Germany - "their own Germans."

The revolution in Germany, the Communist Germans, had been a dream of Lenin and Trotsky Rose Luxemburg, Liebknecht, and Radek (sent in 1919 to take charge of revolution in Berlin. They all have worked for years on this problem. But, it was Stalin who finally succeeded - although in the circumstances of war, under occupation, compulsion, isolation, but - nevertheless succeeded. Today, even "behind the Berlin Wall" there exists 18 million Communist Germany; after a period of draconian - like governing, it hardened as a state and economy, gained recognition by the whole Western world, shaped - at first artificially, then later more and more organically - its characteristic profile - unpleasant, but real. And most important, that after years of the military-political division of Germany, there followed the psychological division. "Existence dictates consciousness," and today East Germany and West Germany are two psychologically different peoples, often, especially among the youth, having no feeling of anything abnormal in this division. What contributes to it is the undoubted "East German patriotism", satisfaction from the economic achievements (the first Socialist country with high standard of living) and chauvinism fed with unusual successes in sports - attained with the help

of scientific and highly financed breeding of sports champions, etc. More! The Russians, after many years, succeeded in not only creating 2 species of Germans, but also in antagonizing them psychologically one against the other. We may feel it distinctly when talking today with people from West Germany: Five years ago they talked about citizens of East Germany, as about "our unfortunate brothers," today, quite often, one may hear an epitaph - "these Communist scoundrels!".

Of course, the conditions described are still fragile, and may change any time, especially, if we considered such an obvious show of craftsmanship as the Berlin Wall, or prohibition of travel to the West and the escapes of educated people. The Russians - experienced people - know too well about those dangers, but they also know that the provisional situations have a tendency to become permanent, and that, since there is nothing "new under the sun" time works to their advantage. They need a lot of time to DIGEST, or to consolidate all they had gained, to insure their own sphere against the shocks such as in Berlin in 1953, in Poland and Hungary in 1956, in Czechoslovakia in 1968, and again in Poland in 1975. The Russians know too that they can digest (insure, consolidate, sovietize) without any interference from the West, which many a time in the past had accepted the *status quo* as a condition for peace and quietude - needed for life to continue. It is then possible to them, I repeat, to digest and to stabilize everything silently - nobody from Western Europe will object, quite to the contrary....

And what will the Russians do during these 30-50 years on the outpost or on the small but enormously industrialized peninsula which we call Western Europe? They will

develop a lively activity, diverting the attention of Western diplomacy - giving it opportunity to work (emptily - but who would like to admit it?). A camouflaged activity is one of the arts of the Soviet politics, its unquestionable master was Khrushchev who "meddled" in everything, demanded and threatened in Cuba or Berlin in order to turn the attention of the West from what he had already "pocketed". Resigning graciously from the small and insignificant, and retaining ten of the already swallowed countries - this is prophylactic, careful, psychologically faultless politics. The various conferences, Helsinki, Belgrade, threatening manoeuvres in Berlin and, after them, the propositions of different pacts, guarantees, contracts, disarmament meetings - all this is done for one reason only: To give the Western politicians something to work upon. Why? To let them, in an avalanche of problems, to forget what the West had lost after the World War 2. Besides, the West forgets very easily about all this. Dilletantism, poor knowledge of history, obsolete ignorance of matters connected with East Europe and importance of East Germany - help a lot. The only people who know something about these problems are the Germans (as in the past they had plenty of "mischief" to account for). To a normal Frenchman or Italian, Eastern Europe - not counting Russia - looks like some turbid fiction, and the problem of who governs in Poland or Hungary and how, long ago stopped being a political issue. The blessed ignorance, lets some live in peace and others to digest what they ate or gained. This existence, comfortable to both sides, is called *détente*.

This is how Russia will be politicking during the coming 30-50 years. During the same time, Western Europe - remembering the warning of Mr. Samuel T. Cohen will arm it-

self and take precautions against the Russian aggression. But this arming will be unevenly distributed: West Germany - more experienced and being tied up with America - will be serious in this respect. Unwilling to go to war (remember 1940?) France with her *force de frappe* will be wriggling out of any engagement; Other countries will behave differently depending on inflation and of the results of their last parliamentary elections, and in some of the countries depending on the position taken by Communists. Altogether, as a unit, the Western peninsula will become tired pretty fast (it is tiring to have no sleep every night, waiting for an attack that doesn't come). The Americans, not knowing what they want exactly, will become fed up too; besides, perhaps tomorrow - influenced by their voting power - they will pack their chattels and slip away across the Atlantic. In addition, the Western countries will be eaten from inside by inflation, unemployment, market crises, anarchy and other plagues, which to us, experienced East Europeans, look like child's play, but to the interested people of the West, these issues are dead-serious. And so the situation will be ripening during the 30-50 years until....

Until the Russians decide that psychological momentum is at its best, and say: "Don't you see, Dear; what did you need it all for? You know now that we are not aggressive or imperialistic, that we will never attack you, that a war - especially a nuclear war, is an American scarecrow. Forget the useless and nonsensical arming, let us take jointly the road to peaceful work. We give you our markets, purchasing orders, and propose wide industrial cooperation. Think of how much money you'll make, how unemployment will end, how you'll relax? And we pay cash: Billions of

dollars, foreign drafts, gold of Kolyma - all this is waiting for you. Only stop listening to those crazy and unreliable Americans!".

And all this will happen. Not to mention that the Capitalistic system of the West will be preserved: The Russians know perfectly well that the Capitalistic system produces 5 times more than the Communistic, and as long as it produces for them, everything is O.K.; They will not need any armed forces occupation - persuasion and the jingling of a purse will suffice.

This is my prophecy. Maybe not so much a prophecy as a Russian scenario for the 30-50 years. It is a scheme of their behavior - obvious, perfect; there is no place for any other: Only people that are politically impotent think that too obvious things never occur, similar to some Poles and English who thought in 1939 that Hitler would never attack because that would be too simple. Of course what I prophesized here is an intentional scheme or model of the Russians' behavior, which fact doesn't prove that this model will be faultlessly realized, that some surprises or deviations won't take place. In *Kultura* there was a common way of thinking that those surprises will develop inside the Communist Bloc, that centrifugal forces created in the countries that belong to the Bloc will spontaneously act. Personally, as a pessimist from Warsaw, I don't share this view: We are not the same people here, the new, different generations decide, and the quantity is replaced by quality: for a sausage the people will move, for freedom - no. But, let's not dispute; let's see (said the blind man). There may come surprises in the world of politics, even in

American politics; in our hypothetical assumptions we have indeed isolated Western Europe as if it were alone in the world; after all there still are some global politics that wait aggression not on one front only and, besides, we know what resulted long ago from the "condensed waiting" of Mr. Forrestal's politics. Only a madman would exactly attack at the point where he is expected to attack (though history should consider the acts of madmen - for example, Hitler). In all, it's strange: to mobilize oneself against aggression that doesn't exist, and not to react against aggression where it is already in progress (Africa). I don't understand it. Do you?

The question is, who, in general, is going to win, and where? I would like to live long enough to know. It's difficult to guess everything, including even the question of what I should expect to get from the "big bosses" in Warsaw for writing on these pages.

KISIEL

IN THE SOVIET PRESS (excerpts)

We must, undoubtedly, render justice to the Soviet leaders: The 60th anniversary of the October Revolution began - properly and logically - with the celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Felix Dzierzynski, and with the announcement of "Iron Felix's" heir - comrade Andropov, in *Izvestia* (10.10.1977).

In his article, the Chairman of the KGB

discovers 2 great characteristics of Dzierzynski: First, that he as "an ardent Polish patriot was able to rise above the narrow national interests...". Second, that Dzierzynski "...to his last breath defended the Party..." And, of course, that he was the chief of Soviet Security, who, "from the first days of the October Revolution followed the principle of Socialist justice." Andropov leads his short presentation of the "organ's" history with stressing the need for a merciless fight to preserve justice. "The enemies" - said the Chairman of the KGB - "have maintained that the Dictature of Proletariat can't work hand in hand with justice and obedience to the law. This is a lie". True - admits the successor of Dzierzynski's work - "some years in the past were darkened by some illegal repressions, violations of the principles of Socialist Democracy and of Lenin's directives of conducting the Party and State life... But all of this could not stop the progress of Socialism." It couldn't, because "these violations were rooted in the personality cult".

Thus ends Andropov's short historical review of the security system. What follows now is a story about the glorious days, when he under the leadership of Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, took charge of the KGB. However, this joyous life under the sun of the Brezhnev Constitution was disturbed by the so-called dissidents. Andropov's article covers one full page - 8 columns - of *Izvestia*. Three and half columns are devoted to the "prehistory" of the KGB; of the remaining 3 columns exclusively to dissidents. The Chairman of the KGB states that "the term - dissident, is a clever propagandist trick to deceive society." As we know - he explains - "the word, dissident, means some-

one who thinks differently; inventing the term 'dissident', the bourgeois propaganda tried to convince the public that the Soviet system doesn't like any independent thinking of its citizens, that it persecutes everybody who thinks differently than most people". This picture has "nothing in common with reality" - declares the boss of KGB. In the Soviet Union - as we know - it is possible for one to "think differently; one can "think independently" - providing this kind of thinking is positive and allows the Soviet people to live and work harmoniously, and providing it doesn't interfere with the Party activities. If those who think differently don't like the KGB, then - as its Chairman declares - "let them, in this case, stop talking about humanism".

"Humanism" is a word which has always invoked hysteria in the Soviet leaders - beginning with Lenin and Dzierzynski. In Andropov's opinion, the word - humanism is especially irritating when applied to dissidents. Who are they? According to him, they are the people motivated by "political or ideological schisms, religious fanaticism, nationalistic deviation and personal misfortunes... and of course, in many cases by psychological imbalance."

The article of Andropov doesn't reveal anything special. What new could the writings of the KGB's Chairman contain - even if he were a member of the Politburo? Everything that is new is always and exclusively delivered in the lectures of the General Secretary. What then makes us wonder at Andropov's pronouncements is the amount of space devoted to the question of dissidents, though - in his opinion - there are only "a few persons detached from our society." A few persons, and so much talking?

The explanation is simple: The Chairman of the KGB cannot announce that he has "fished out" all the enemies. If he did, he would be forced to retire. However, this explanation is too simple. Dissidents exist in the Soviet Union, because nationalistic, economic, political conflicts not only didn't vanish during the 60 years since the Revolution, but to the contrary, became more acute. The KGB and the Soviet leaders are in fact afraid that "ideological diversants" will succeed in "undermining, weakening Communist convictions of the Soviet people, and in imposing on them views that are alien to Socialism...". Here is why Andropov calls attention of "organs" to "be watchful", demands "watchfulness" from all the "social and State organizations, from all Communists, from all citizens of the country."

* * *

The most popular serial on Soviet TV is "An investigation is expedited by expert." It's a crime story in which officers of the Moscow police are detecting all kinds of crimes that still occur in the country of developed Socialism. In each segment of the serial there is always a simple Soviet man who comes to the militia and tells everything he saw and knew, providing clues for detection of the crime. The Soviet TV viewers are being taught that "witnessing" is not only their duty toward the state, but it also is a necessary element for keeping their conscience free. The militia-man, an employee of the KGB, is introduced as a confessor. A policeman in a role of a clergyman.

* * *

In Poland there is an old tendency to consider the Soviet Power as a natural, direct prolongation of the tsarist power, and the Soviet Union as its legal successor. Jan Kucharzewski gave this title to his outstanding study of Russian history: "From White to Red Tsardom". The view expressed in this title is presently upheld by many Soviet dissidents in emigration (Alexandr Janov, Boris Shragin, L. Pliushch and others), who believe that since Ivan the Terrible Russia had not changed, except for a telephone in the Kremlin. No doubt, there are many justified reasons for these kinds of views exemplified in the fact that today the book of Marquis de Custine is read like a guide throughout the Brezhnev Soviet Union. Nonetheless, it seems to me that the statements expressing the similarity of tsarist Russia to the Soviet Union do not allow us to see the main problem: The difference between Russia and the Soviet Union. It's a great simplification to say that "only in Russia could develop such a system." It is easy to talk about it that way today when de Custine's book serves as a guide throughout Prague, East Berlin, Havana, Tiran, Peking and Warsaw.

* * *

General Gerasimov writes in his memoirs "Tsardom and Terrorism" about the disdain the Russian society has toward gendarmes. It was generally improper to shake hand with a gendarme. In today's Soviet Union a "Kagebist," - policeman, is a hero, a model for the youth to follow. In the twenties, Mayakowski advised a young man who didn't know what to do with his life to take Dzierzynski as an example. This model became compulsory in the whole "Socialistic camp".

In Moscow there appeared a book "Spies

are Unmasking". It's a collection of stories already published in the press and shown on TV about the Soviet agents who worked in the radio stations "Freedom" and "Free Europe". In our eyes there is a true parade of international spies: A Pole - Chechovich (a fragment with him is titled - "Chechovich was the First"), "Czech - Minarchyk, Bulgarian - Christov, Russian - Marin. Each of them has his own specialty, but, to begin with, each of them is a Soviet man - *homo sovieticus* to whom treachery, perfidy and vileness are synonymous with glory, nobleness and heroism. Initially, in the Soviet Union and following it other countries, spies, cooperators with the "organs" were in general contempt, but now - and this is one of the educational goals of the system - they emerge as the ones who are loved.

* * *

Anatoly Gladilin who not long ago immigrated to the West, published in the *Kontinent*, a novel "Repetition On Friday". The beginning of the book is kind of bizarre: One beautiful night - let's describe it this way - the late Comrade Stalin, lying in the deep mausoleum shelter, opens his eyes and demands the security officer on duty to call certain people to come. Wells wrote a phantasy - "When the Sleeping Shall Wake Up". Gladilin's novel, apart from a fabulous concept, is completely realistic. In the book, Stalin appearing at the Party meeting talks exactly about things the present Soviet leaders are talking about; but he expresses it better - openly, clearly, without any innuendoes. He says: "We cannot forget about the Capitalistic encirclement, which exports spies wrongdoers and murderers to us". Then, most justifiably, criticizes the "almost official

permissiveness in dealing with certain groups of people who want to immigrate". Marxist-Leninist logic clearly says that "every citizen of the USSR, no matter where he is or works, should understand Communism as his own inevitable and inconvertible destiny. Only under this condition can we build a new society". In other words, *homo sovieticus* must have more discipline. Must be led with a strong hand.

In some samizdat papers there appeared information about the conference of editors, that took place in Moscow in February - March, 1977. The lecturer from the Central Committee participating in conference explained the party's position, as follows: "The editorial offices of daily papers, and periodicals are inundated with demands of the Soviet people, to, finally, show some decisiveness in solving the question of dissidents. In this connection, the decision has been made to arrest 50 among the most active dissidents and to punish their sympathisers severely. It's high time to prove our strength, and stop paying attention to what the West thinks".

The KGB acts precisely along this line. For example, in October, the day before the Belgrade conference had begun, the Ukrainian writer Hiliy Sniehirev was arrested (a translation of his open letter appears on the next pages).

In connection with a wide dispute on the merits of the new Constitution, it's interesting to mention the article in *Literaturnaya Gazeta* (NO. 37), of W. Patyulin, Doctor of Law. In it, he answers those citizens who might have some doubts in reference to paragraph 39 of the Constitution, by which the rights of individuals are limited by "the interests of society and state". The Soviet lawyer explains, that the Soviet "freedom" is nothing but a

"free, conscious duty", and all the rest is a pseudo-freedom. We may conclude that the education of *homo sovieticus* gives positive results; that a majority of the Soviet citizens "freely and consciously understand their duty". They fell in love with a policeman.

Adam Kruczek

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE USSR GOVERNMENT

In the following statement I renounce my Soviet citizenship.

I'm making this decision at the time, when you conduct the, so called, dispute on the project of the new Constitution. Newspapers, radio, and meetings shout about the unanimous, enthusiastical approval of all. In the near future the project shall become law - with a general "hurray!". Some should not shout "hurray!": Every participant of every meeting is dilligently spied upon by the KGB and its faithful servants - the members of the Party.

Your constitution is a lie from the beginning to the end. It is a lie that the state expresses national interests, that the whole authority belongs to the people. It is a lie that the ultimate goal of your state is the rising of material and cultural living standard of people. It is a lie, that you conduct the politics of peace and fight for the strengthening of the international security. The statements of the free development of various nationalities, and right of republics to leave the Union - are lies. A lie and disgrace is your election

system which is laughed at by everybody; a lie and disgrace is your crest, whose spikes are imported from the USA; lie and disgrace is your anthem in which you have replaced Stalin with Lenin.

You maintain that you created a society that is truly Democratic. The citizens of the USSR - as you say - have every socio-economic and political right and freedom (Par.69); the citizens of the USSR have guaranteed freedom of word, press, meeting (Par.50).

But:

- the use of freedom and rights by the citizens cannot harm the interests of society and state.

You did, shamelessly, erase the rights and freedom of your own citizens.

Paragraph 156 announces:

- Legal procedures in all courts are public. Closed door procedures are conducted but only in cases foreseen by law.

You deprived me formerly of my rights and freedom, and when you were frightened to hear the truth - and you are always frightened of it - you judged me in closed door sessions. However, at the time when you called yourself a dictatorship, and you did not yet reach the level of ultimate cynicism, I still had a chance to beckon the constitution, and to demand respect of the law and of an open trial. Today, throwing away that mask of dictatorship and calling yourself a multinational state, you call me, brutally, to order: Enough of constitution - you say; your rights and freedoms last until we decide that they are damaging us, our state;

and, if so, - then you will be judged in a closed door trial according to state law provided by us! Do you protest? - Try! You will see the constitution, which was approved by all - including you, at work!

I don't want to be among those who approve the constitution. Your constitution has been dictated by political security, to which, in the USSR, is submitted everything, and, without which, your regime of gulags won't last a single day.

I don't want to be a citizen of the state which after 60 years of existence is forced to enumerate on the lofty pages of law, all the cattle and poultry that belong to the citizens' private households. You made 99 percent of the land into kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and this one percent which remained in individual cultivation produces one third of food products of the whole country. And, how did you rob your own citizens on that one percent of land!! You took away a cow, you implemented horrendous taxes on every chicken, every apple-tree and every shrub of strawberries! Today, you have sensed that the country cannot be fed by your kolkhozes and sovkhozes; you began to flatter citizen, to fawn upon him, to guarantee: don't be afraid, breed your pigs and chickens, we promise you not to touch them. There! - we did introduce a constitution, you just feed us with your one percent, give us now not one third but two thirds of it, because we cannot count on those kolkhozes and sovkhozes - which are nothing, but the monuments of rotten ideology - moulded of dung.

In addition, I don't want to be a citizen of a state which destroyed the elite of my Ukrainian people - the best of peasantry and intelligentsia; you falsified our historic past, humiliated the present.

You deprived my countrymen - Ukrainians - of their national dignity; you brought us up to the point that we are afraid and we want no longer to call ourselves - the Ukrainians. And you dare in your constitution to trumpet about the development of nationalities? You have a lot of cynicism to ridicule my people and at the same time to write paragraphs in the constitution about the right to leave the USSR!

Millions of citizens intimidated by you will humbly and apathetically raise a hand in voting for your constitution. There will be only a few people who, like me, will openly announce that they don't approve of your constitution. I fully realize that my act shall be evaluated as the worst possible crime: I used the right of freedom of expression to *cause damage* to your state. you will be judging me in accordance with *state laws constituted by you*, in a closed door trial.

...That your constitution is still a project? That you might be forced to wait to settle matters with me, until it is approved by the whole nation, and then, you'll apply its text against me? Nonsense! Wouldn't a madhouse be simpler? Or branding me a criminal? Or a road accident? How many more variants of a fast "trial" do you have in your arsenal? ACT!

In 1977, I mail my identity card to ROWD of Lenin Region of the City of Kiev, and from this moment on I stop considering myself a citizen of the USSR.

(-) H.SNIEHIROV
writer

...1977, Kiev- ZZ, ul. Tarsowskaya 6,m.43
SNIEHIROV Hiliy Ivanovich

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 5/2

Feb. 1978

by

Charles Joel

Adam KRUCZEK

IN THE SOVIET PRESS

and

ONE YEAR OF LIFE -

ONE YEAR OF FIGHT

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 1/364-2/365-1978, published in Paris, France.

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

IN THE SOVIET PRESS

When in mid-December I began to gather material for the January issue of *Kultura* I decided to take a look at everything I wrote in my previous reviews in order to reassure myself which events noticed by me or "unnoticed" by the Soviet press of the past year had kept my attention. A lot of reading; every review took 10 typewritten pages. All the reviews taken together give a picture of life in the Soviet Union. Perhaps not a picture the Soviet editors and censors would have liked to give, but a picture which is possible to paint after reading the Soviet press. A picture of a country which doesn't stop celebrating many victories and achievements, and in which eating horse-meat is recommended - because "temporarily there is no other meat," in which there is no limit in talking about the stupenduous freedoms rewarded to its citizens, but in which every day the leaders of the Party and governmental bodies plus their enslaved scribes attack everybody who thinks differently.

What events in "the country of advanced Socialism" had found a place in my reviews? I've chosen the ones which now

in December appear to me most important and deserving our attention.

In January, 1977, the main event was the 70th birthday of Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Marshall, etc, etc. I also noted the efforts of the authorities to force the Russian language upon the non-Russian republics, especially on Gruzija. It appeared interesting to me because almost one year later, at the end of 1977, in the *Kommunist*, the central organ of the Party, the 1st secretary of the Gruzian Communist Party returns to this problem stressing the need for teaching Russian in non-Russian nations. "Russian language" - writes the secretary of the Gruzian Communist Party - "is the spontaneously chosen(?) foreign language which functions exceptionally well in realization of bonds among peoples... Everybody should know Russian - the language of friendship in the USSR, the language of October, the language of Lenin." But because just a year ago I cited certain facts which prove that the point of view of the secretary of the Gruzian Party is not at all shared by all Gruzians, I add now his explicit warning: "Nationalism is a betrayal. Today in our country it has no social value. We may find some isolated cases of nationalistic feelings, but as a rule, they refer to some proclamations inspired by some upstarts or the greed of some imbalanced elements."

In the February issue - again Brezhnev. I couldn't help but write about the avalanche of admiration and adulation that fell on all the Soviet readers. Among the most loyal in expressing admiration are the poems written by Jerzy Putrament in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*. In one of its issue (1977) there was even an announcement that the Polish writer received

a Soviet award, supplemented with an artistic portrait of Putrament - sitting comfortably and reading a paper.

And two more events in the February. review. First - an explosion in a Moscow subway. The next day after the explosion, a well known KGB agent, Victor Louis, announced that it was an act of the Soviet dissidents. Andrei Sakharov protested angrily. To this day the mystery of the explosion remains unsolved. The second event is rather of a common nature. The Soviet TV viewed the first Soviet anti-Semitic (read - anti-Zionist) movie. For the exclusive use of the armed forces there was also shown a movie - "The secret and plainly visible affairs" in which director Boris Karpov presented documentation proving that in all the history of the USSR its main enemy were the Jews. For example, the scene of the assassination attempt on Lenin in 1918 is supplemented with this comment: "Here is a Jewess, Fanny Kaplan, attempting to murder Lenin." A lot of space in this movie is devoted to a certain Lew Bronstein, some time ago known by the name of Trotsky. The documentation pertaining to World War II is preceded by the categorical statement: "Jewish capitalists helped Hitler to gain power." But the anti-semitic movies are for mass education. For the more sophisticated comrades, agitators and propagandists, in 1977 the Academy of Science of the USSR prepared a purely scientific work - the selection of articles titled: "International Zionism - History and Politics." The selected articles, remarkably better, we may say, push forward the ideology of Marxism and Leninism. The main theoretical discovery amounts to the development of well known thesis of Lenin about Imperialism as a higher stage of Capitalism. We understand now that the higher stage of Capitalism is Zionism.

"The Jewish branch of Imperialism" - writes the theoretician W. I. Kisyelev. And also, but in some other theoretical assertions, the Jewish branch of the mafia appears to be a higher stage of mafia.

March abounded in events. First, there was in Moscow a wave of fires. The hotel "Rossiya," some other hotel and the ministerial edifice were burning. In these cases, too, the investigations did not bring out any result. But, above all, March has been marked as a month of the international recognition of the Soviet dissidents. In February, Vladimir Bukowski was exchanged for Corvalan - the secretary of the Chilean Communist Party. In March, Bukowski was received in the White House. President Carter sent a letter to Sakharov. Andrei Amalrik had waited in vain all day for the admission to the Elysée, and the whole week in the French press, radio and TV has been devoted to the Russian dissidents. The reaction of the Soviet authorities was the increased campaign against dissidents, and, especially - the publication of the act of contrition of Lipavski who talked about connections of his friends-dissidents with American Intelligence. As a main character - "main spy" - the arrested member of the Moscow Helsinki Group, Anatoly Shcharanski is mentioned.

The preparation for the "great trial" had begun. From March to December - and according to the Soviet criminal law the inquest cannot last longer than 9 months - the arrests are progressing, the articles containing accusations and even sentences are circulated, and the international public opinion is being sounded by an analogical trial in Prague. The Moscow trial is delayed because - and there is no reason to doubt it - President Carter announced that Shcharanski's trial will be considered as an obvious act of

the violation of human rights. The test of strength between Moscow and Washington has been moved to 1978. On the Belgrade conference - a continuation of Helsinki, - the US does everything possible in order not to provoke the USSR. The astounding relationship of these 2 countries at the Belgrade conference is best characterized by the words of the chairman of the American delegation, Arthur Goldberg. They deserve to be registered for posterity; Goldberg talked modestly and shyly about the violations of human rights in the Soviet Union; the Soviet delegate answered with a story about unheard of violations of the human rights in the US, about the thousands of arrested, etc. Goldberg replied: If you stop telling lies about us, I'll stop telling the truth about you. Only the future historians will be able to answer to the question: Why one must stop telling the truth in order to not to hear a lie?

The April review was devoted to two themes: the unsuccessful mission of the State Secretary Vance in Moscow, and Brezhnev's speech about economic troubles of the USSR. Vance's failure, the Soviet refusal to revise the proposals of the US, appear to result from the Soviet leaders as taken aback. 70 year old Brezhnev and his equally old comrades needed time to think over, to get used to, and to understand the new US approaches. Several months after Vance's visit in Moscow the talks between the USSR and the US were revived. As to economic troubles - nothing has changed in the Soviet Union. They did not vanish; there are the unchanged eternal problems in agriculture and industry.

In May, the Soviet press wrote quite a lot about Africa, about the successes of progressive nations, about the freedom

movements in the countries which had not yet become "progressive." The Soviet readers were taken aback by commentaries that not all the "progressive" countries love the Soviet Union. Somalia, united with the USSR with the ties of friendship and mutual aid - the most progressive republic having a monolithic party wrapped in Marx and Lenin ideas - got rid of the Soviet advisors. Naturally, the Soviet commentators said that it was the Soviet Union, which embarrassed by "chauvinistic and expansionist tendencies which took power in Somalian leadership", called out its team of advisors. However, the readers of *Pravda* remember well the expulsion of Russian advisors from Egypt. Egypt, and before that, its president Sadat (long before his visit in Israel), became the target of violent attacks of the Soviet propagandists.

The expulsion of the Soviet advisors from Somalia demonstrates the character of the Soviet influence. Moscow attempts to create an empire in which ideology must replace occupation by force. It's of course better if both may be used, but if the occupational army cannot be dispatched - ideology must go instead. For its proper introduction, for the education of leaders who would be completely addicted to ideology - the time is needed. Without it, the sphere of the Soviet influence becomes very unstable.

In June, the Soviet citizens were overwhelmed with unusual joy. Leonid Brezhnev presented to them the new constitution. As the editor in chief of *Literaturnaya Gazeta* in French TV explained, the previous constitution of the Soviet Union was good, but the new one will be much better. The new constitution is a phenomenon which demonstrates the

Soviet conflict: The fight of good against the better. Along with the constitution the Soviet citizens received the new national anthem, meaning the old one - without the name of Stalin. At the same time, Nicolay Podgorny - the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet, was removed. Officially, he agreed to resign on behalf of Brezhnev. Today, after half a year, the name of Podgorny may be seen but only in my reviews of the Soviet press. As Orwell said - the ex-Chairman has changed into a *non-person*.

In July, the new Solon - the General Secretary of the CP of the USSR, the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet, Marshall Brezhnev visited in Paris. The creator of the new constitution had not visited in the West for more than 2 1/2 years. I doubt whether the West will have a chance of seeing him again. Brezhnev's appearance there and his behavior evidently convinced everybody that, though he still may be good enough to be shown on the meetings of the brotherly Communist parties, he is not good for showing in the Western capitals.

In August review - the main themes: The World Congress of Psychiatrists in Honolulu, and the International Book Fair in Moscow. In Honolulu, for the first time the majority of world psychiatrists voted that even the country that has ICBM's and 50,000 tanks (in 1977) doesn't fare well, locking in madhouses people who have courage to criticize the politics of their country. The position taken by world psychiatrists Congress created a sharp anger in Moscow and had been explained in *Pravda* and *Literaturnaya Gazeta* as a temporary psychological imbalance of psychiatrists - inspired by intrigues of Zionists. However, more gratifying to the Soviet leaders was the International Book Fair in Moscow. No

wonder! The largest world publishing houses - with not too numerous exceptions - rushed to Moscow, agreeing not to exhibit anything that would not please the organizers of the fair.

The October festivities began with the lecture of a man of great merit - Yuri Andropov. Dedicating his lecture to the hundredth anniversary of Dzierzynski's birth, the KGB boss talked about the glorious activities of the "organs" and pointed out their new target - new victim - dissidents.

The November review covers material which refer to the successes and defeats of the Soviet power during the past 60 years, and to the aid given presently to the Soviet economy by the largest international corporations which discovered an enormous potential for profits in the controlled by Moscow area of production. The fact that it would strengthen the Soviet power doesn't seem to bother the western capitalists.

In December, the main event was the initiative of president Sadat, which brought Moscow to the state of euphoria. Inside the Soviet Union everything went as usual. The Central Committee of the Party and the government had found one more panaceum - a miracle medicine for agriculture: All experienced, politically matured, good organizers - able to handle production according to the principles of modern science and technology, were called to join farmers. They were promised many different reliefs. But it was clear that after such call - repetitious for as long as 50 years - only a chuckle-head would change the city life for the Soviet village. But despite this, the Soviet agriculture somehow succeeded. The Soviet specialists, evidently having not only political education, again deceived the Americans - bought grain at very low

prices. All summer, the American experts, among them the "specialists" of the CIA, insisted that this year harvest in Russia will be excellent and not below 215 million tons. The Soviet specialists said that it will be even higher, but the distrustful Americans replied: You won't deceive us, it will be 215 million. But when Brezhnev announced that the harvest was only 194 million tons (it would be interesting to know the truth), the Soviet Union in most discreet manner bought already 20 million tons of grain in Australia, Canada, US - and even in India.

It's possible however that the most important event in December of 1977, was the press conference organized by Moscow workers. Not intelligentsia, not the Jews; just several Soviet workers who invited several American journalists to a private home and told them the story of proletariat in the country of advanced Socialism - 60 years after proletarian revolution.

Among the workers were: a miner, a locksmith, a plumber and a waitress. We cannot call them "anti-Soviet" people; they are loyal citizens of the USSR, who came to the conclusion that they'll never receive answer to their grievances. All of them had petitioned everywhere including the Central Committee of the Party. As a last resort they use the conference with the American Press. They complained against nothing but the normal Soviet man life. Miner Vladimir Kyelbanov, a foreman, protested against too high plans of output that forces miners to work not 6 but 12 hours a day. At this crazy tempo of work there are many accidents: in his mine only - Kyelbasov was telling - in one year 12-15 men died and 600-700 became invalid. When he protested and began searching for justice he was locked in a madhouse for

4 1/2 years. When Anatoly Poznyakov, a locksmith working in the Biochemic Institute in Moscow and earning 75 rubles a month, asked for a rise, director played hell with him and threw him out. He took this matter to the Party organization and there he was told that his destiny is to eat from a pig-trough. When he insisted, he was thrown out of work. As emeritus - at 39 and epileptic he receives 21 rubles a month.

The American reporters found out that not long ago 38 persons from 24 cities gathered in the waiting room of the Highest Council, and having no reply to their petition, signed a collective statement. According to the Soviet law, they had committed a crime; In the eyes of the authorities there is no worse crime than a collective statement - "an embryo of organization". In this case the signatories of the collective statement had condemned the "unfounded repressions, disdain for the human dignity and terror used for frightening honest citizens..."

It's easy to predict the tragic fate of these workers who told the stories of their lives to the American reporters. The fact that they turned to the West, breaking the fear and distrust toward foreigners, deserve to be mentioned here as an event of the year.

Bulat Okudzava wrote an excellent story - "Master Grisha". In it, he tells us about "our home", in which "there are droughts all over" and "the roof collapses under the pressure of wind". All hope in this house is placed in only one person - Master Grisha: He will come, roll up his sleeves and "fix everything."

"Who is to turn our hope to"? - asks the author. And, indeed who?

Adam KRUCZEK

ONE YEAR OF LIFE - ONE YEAR OF FIGHT

Fascinating book. Or, rather, not a book yet, but a manuscript. The best way to describe it, would be - a fascinating voice. Voice of Andrei Sakharov calling attention of the American presidents, the UNO, the Western public opinion, calmly answering the accusations of the General Attorney of the USSR. In one volume are collected the letters, statements, memoranda, interviews of Sakharov, all covering one year - to August 1977.

The documents collected in the volume are supplemented with short footnotes about unknown to us people and events that Sakharov remembers. Many parts of the text were published already as separate issues. Collected together they speak about the life of Soviet Union, about the fascinating life of one man who is strong solely by his belief in righteousness and necessity of what he is doing.

Being in touch with a phenomenon, with unusual personality, always causes one's desire to find someone from the past for comparison. In the twentieth century, Andrei Sakharov may be compared only to Ghandi - but Ghandi without the millions of believers. It doesn't mean that Sakharov's

name is unknown in Russia. Despite all the efforts of the authorities, despite the fact that his name appears in the press always exquisitely in the company of abuses and political accusations, Andrei Sakharov to many people in the Soviet Union became the last resort: to him turn all whose attempts to fight against the evil failed; when it is no longer possible to bear the burden of wrongs and injustices. The main themes of the documents in the book are the character and the aims of the Human Rights Movement, and the fight of the authorities against it.

Andrei Sakharov wants to be well understood, doesn't stop in every interview with Western journalists and in the letters to social and political activists, to stress that the movement - called "dissident," "Democratic," which he prefers to call a movement for defending human rights, is not a political movement. Its members are not politicians. They don't in their actions expect any change in the political structure of the country; do not seek any privileges for themselves; to the contrary - their lives and the lives of their nearest, became, because of these activities, very difficult, sometimes even miserable, but the fate of every innocently sentenced, they treat as their own misfortune. Sakharov underlines frequently that the movement for defense of human rights cuts itself entirely off from applying and propagation of violence. "Our main goal and our sole weapon" - states the laureate of the Nobel Peace Award - "is our openness and, as far as possible, the true and accurate information." Sakharov in several announcements outlines the history of Democratic movement in the USSR. It is very interesting not only because there is no such a history written yet, but also because its main actor talks about it. He stresses that

during the Khrushchev reign some great changes in the social life of the country had begun, some intellectual ferment, some common reevaluating of many dogmas had occurred. "In the system of a total strangulation of free thoughts there emerged certain gaps which were used by many honest, courageous and talented men. This period had prepared the ground for the creation and growth of the Movements for Defense of Human Rights... To me the date of its beginning is the foundation of the Initiative Group for the Defense of Human Rights in 1969, and little earlier the appearance of the first issues of the *Chronicle of the Current Events*." The organizers of the Initiative Group - says Sakharov - "were prominent people - recently deceased Grigori Podyapolski, and Sergei Kovalev who was arrested in 1974."

After the Initiative Group there followed the creation of the Committee for Human Rights, organized by A. Sakharov, A. Tyverdokhlebov, and V. Czalidze. In 1975, led by Yuri Orlov a group of cooperation in fulfilling the Helsinki Conference agreement was added. Sakharov considers the latter of enormous importance because it tells the world about "judicial and psychiatric harrassment, about inhuman conditions in gulags and other prisons, persecution of religious people, discrimination of Crimean Tartars, threatening extinction of national culture in republics and the problems connected with family reunions and immigration."

The activities of the movement in the defense of human rights is one side of the picture exposed by Sakharov. Another side are cruel repressions carried by the authorities against the members of the movement: The arrests, persecutions

of the families of the arrested, and threats of physical violence, beatings and murders. In many appearances Sakharov talks about a new form of repression which he calls - "the underground, mafia-type actions of the organs." He cites facts: The death in suspicious circumstances of "at least 5 people" - Baptist Biblenko, 2 Lithuanians - an engineer Tomanis, and kindergarten teacher, an active catholic Lukshajte, popular poet and translator Constantin Bogatirev, and unemployed lawyer, Brunov who was killed several hours after his visit to Sakharov.

In his statement of Jan. 12, 1977, A. Sakharov cites the names of 5 people who died in suspicious circumstances. About 2 months later, a driver from Novosibirsk came to see Sakharov. After the visit, he was killed in full daylight by a hit and run car in one of the most busy streets of Moscow; so far, the car had not been identified. Sakharov connects these new forms of repression with the explosion in the Moscow subway, and is afraid it may affect the internal atmosphere of the country, and bring about "the arousal of people's anger against those who think differently."

The voice of Sakharov speaks from the pages of documents about the life in the USSR during 1976-1977 years. However, there is also the voice of the "organs" heard from these pages: First, Sakharov's note from his discussion with the Assistant General Attorney of the USSR, and second - the version of the same discussion given by the General Attorney himself to the *New York Times*. Protruding through all these pages of documents is also the third voice - the voice of the West. More precisely, it is the voice of Western journalists asking Sakharov questions. Every time, journalists ask two sacramental questions: Doesn't the movement for the

defense of human rights hurt the détente? Is the openness, the disclosure of the names of persecuted, the unmasking of repressions, good for the safety of the persecuted? A. Sakharov - with an angel's patience replies: No, the movement may only help the true détente; only an open, mass protests in the West may help the persecuted in the Soviet Union. His answers appear to be unsatisfying. The journalists repeat asking the same questions as if hoping to hear the answer so much desired: No need for openness, no need to disturb Brezhnev; let's stop talking about persecutions and the human rights; let's not spoil the appetite of cannibals.

Sakharov notes a new, enormously important phenomenon - the birth of a "new form of the only movement for the defense of human rights in the USSR and in the countries of Eastern Europe." "I think," - says the laureat of the Nobel Peace Award - "that there are reasons for using the expression - the only movement." He points out the different situations in different countries of so called Socialist Unity: "In the USSR which lived through the several tens of years in an unknown in history terror and political and social abasement of people, the wide masses of workers, peasants, intelligentsia, are, in a great majority, passive, frightened and dependent of totalitarian power." The situation in the countries of Western Europe appears to Sakharov different, because these countries are "historically closer to the West with its humanistic and democratic traditions and traditional respect for individual rights. In some, especially in Poland, there is traditionally great and whole-some influence of the Church; this influence has survived despite very difficult conditions"...

Sakharov believes, however, that "similarities of the goals in the movement for defense of human rights in the USSR and Eastern European countries are in the wide historical perspective more important than the differences." Sakharov wants to defend the human rights and doesn't want to play politics. But in the Soviet Union everything is politics, the more so - the fight for human rights. The collection of documents devoted to this fight, is a political book, and, at the same time a story about the private life of a man who is tormented because he cannot help people who turn to him when there is no place left for them to go - although turning to him may endanger their lives or, at least, cause them to lose their jobs; tormented also because his own family suffers, because there is no money to live on and the house is too small. Many documents show how difficult is the problem of exchanging the apartment of Sakharov for something larger so that all family could live together. This problem is sufficiently exposed in the documents by cut-offs from the articles in the Soviet press and the special statement of the most official source - the TASS.

At the beginning of the twenties, Yevgeny Zamyatin wrote that the contemporary novel-reflecting life, should be both - a fantasy and reality. Fantasy and reality - this the content of Sakharov's book. But, it is difficult to say where is a fantasy and where is reality. Is the challenge thrown at the system by one man - a reality, or fantasy? Is the animalistic cruelty and dreadful meanness of the system - a fantasy, or reality?

Someone said that lucky nations do not need great people. But, really lucky nations are certainly those nations which

in a great need, find a great man. Especially such great man as Sakharov.

Adam KRUCZEK

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 5/3

March 1978

by
Charles Joel

BRUKSEL CZYK

AS SEEN FROM BRUSSELS
AND WASHINGTON

A translation from the Polish magazine
"Kultura" No 1/364-365 - 1978, published
in Paris, France

No part of this work may be reproduced
in any form without permission from
the editor except for the quotations
of brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

AS SEEN FROM BRUSSELS AND WASHINGTON x/

A certain American politician I met
said to me:

"I'm going to please you by citing
your own observation in *Kultura* of the past
several months. The Russians, indeed, are
very much like that lady-driver whose car
has not moved - although the lights at the
street crossing have changed twice from red
to amber to green, and who was politely
asked by a policeman: 'Lady, is it possible
that none of the colors of our lights
pleases you?' Indeed, none of the American
politics seemsto please the Kremlin. In
Nixon days when, as you reminded us, the
Jackson amendment made American credits
dependent on the humanization of Soviet
immigration procedures, the Russians
reacted sharply, froze the already signed
trade agreement with the US, crying that
there cannot possibly be any connection
between trade exchange and immigration or
internal politics in general. But, when
Carter took over the presidency and pro-
claimed the separation of these matters and
proposed conducting independent talks, for
example, on SALT II - the limitation on
x/ Ed.Note: Brukselczyk visited recently in
America. This article contains some excerpts
from his interviews with politicians in
Washington.

strategic nuclear weapons - without connecting them with the position of Washington on human rights in the world, the Kremlin rebelled again, but this time in the name of an entirely opposite principle. Everything is connected, cried Moscow; there won't be any progress in the SALT talks if the US doesn't stop interfering in the internal affairs of the USSR, or, expressed differently, doesn't stop showing an interest in gulags."

"It's nice" - I answered politely - "that you read *Kultura*, and even remember some important observations I made. Not too many people do it nowadays. But, it doesn't answer my question: What do you think about the thesis of Mr. Samuel Pisar, that Carter's politics threatens the *détente*. I spend my hard earned dollars for being impressed not by your erudition, but by your knowledge of American politics."

Big money is involved

Some time ago, Mr. Pisar wrote a book entitled "The Weapon of Peace." In October 1977, adding several currently vogue words used to criticise Carter's politics on human rights, Pisar published a long recapitulation of his book, under different captions, first in the *New York Times Magazine*, and later in the Paris daily *Le Monde*.

The long recapitulation may be summarized very briefly - without any damage to its overall contents. First, Mr. Pisar suggests that Carter's politics threatens *détente*. Why? because - says Pisar - as a result of this politics "a solution to certain problems of a global nature is suspended, if not entirely blocked. Prolonging his moralist enterprise, whose chances are at least dubious (Pisar alludes here to Carter's letter to Sakharov, and to the reception of Bukowski at the White

House), the President of the US may endanger some of the vital goals..."

Second, Pisar believes that only trade may save the world and *détente*. According to him, all the obstacles should be absolutely removed, Sen. Jackson's amendment being the first, which restrain the free flow of technology, goods and *businessmen* from the West to the East (because this flow in the opposite direction is too unrealistic). "Including" - says Pisar - "political terms in our trade agreement with the USSR has not been a good conception..." Why? Well, because - as Pisar insists - "it is in our interest to help them (the Soviets) to produce cars, build freeways ... etc., because only then the Soviet society will become more active, more complicated, more peaceable..."

However, we must remember that Pisar's original article, in several thousand words says a lot about the historic mission of the US in the area of human rights. I think, this is only a smoke screen and - just as in his book - the main postulate of his article is trade and profit at any price.

This formulation of mine, though brutal, has been taken seriously by many of my Washingtonian colleagues. For example, in the editorial office of *The New York Times*, it didn't evoke any surprise, although I dressed it up in, what I thought, a provocative elocution.

"Don't you think, My Dear Friend, - I asked one of the editors - "that you are cheated and manipulated by Pisar and his friends? Didn't it strike you, that in his large article, which you published, he criticises Carter 'from the position' of arguments used by the Russians in Belgrade

and other places, that Carter's position on human rights threatens *détente*, and that Jackson's amendment means the discrimination of trade?"

"I don't suppose Pissar was so perverse" - my dear friend answered. "It's not so easy to manipulate us. Pissar's article was cynical and clever, but it didn't contain too many new ideas. If any ... In a flood of words (the article is enormously long for a work written by a lawyer) there are no revelations. It's, indeed, an abbreviation of his book. But since you asked, I'll tell you, Dear Colleague, where a sort of manipulation is hidden: it's not in the contents of the article, but in its *timing*, meaning, not in what Pissar says, but in *when* he says it. The *stake* is in time, not in the contents..."

"How is it possible, My Dear Friend?" - I ask naively - "What's at stake?"

"Pissar and his friends decided to, publicly, attack Carter at the moment when he found himself in trouble simultaneously on many internal fronts. Carter, for different reasons though, is weakened, questioned in the Congress and in big business. In other words, there is no coincidence in the choice for time of the attack by the proponents of 'trade at any price'! Big money is involved..."

This reasoning, sounded strange on the American market. However, it has been confirmed during my subsequent Washingtonian peregrinations.

Who started?

First, it's not Carter who invented human rights. A certain veteran who turned gray in fights against the East at the conference tables

and restaurants reminded me that the third basket of the final act of Helsinki, and the seventh principle of the first basket (relating to human rights) had been forced upon the Soviets by no one else than Henry Kissinger. It's true that he did it with no enthusiasm, and only because some Englishmen explained to him that without the third basket there wouldn't be any Helsinki Conference as everybody was absolutely sick of preparatory bable in Geneva. The name of Henry Kissinger will remain forever connected with the history of the third basket, similarly to the name of Ford, who had signed it in Helsinki, without - as it seems - greater understanding of the importance of his act. Actually, Carter is not guilty of anything. What he did was improve the procedures, putting human rights not carelessly at the end, not under compulsion and not from time to time, but in the center of his diplomatic *savoir vivre*, and for good and all. And, he began to treat human rights seriously.

Second, it wasn't Carter who provoked the Russians, but vice versa. We, from the perspective of a forgotten European province, do not perceive all the elements of the American-Soviet *puzzle*. In Washington, I visited a certain journalist who just returned from Moscow, and, who was about to take over the foreign affairs desk of one of the big newspapers. "Carter" - he said - "has not yet organized his Oval Office when the Russians decided to put him on trial. Nothing is coincidental in Moscow, neither the fires nor the explosions, neither dismissal of some big personalities because of age, nor arrests. As if in honor of the inauguration of Carter - newly transferred from an idyllic peanut plantation to supermagathon capital, the Russians have begun their anti-dissident offensive. What was the newly elected

President supposed to do? He couldn't, when confronting an open confrontation, afford to keep quiet. He had to answer the letter of Sakharov - after all, the laureate of the Nobel Peace Award; he had to receive Bukowski at the White House, also. Let me remind you: Carter took all the possible precautions, he doesn't even have a photograph of this reception, which, by the way, lasted only a few minutes. Does Brezhnev behave similarly when he receives Angela Davis or Guss Hall - the chief of the American Communist Party? Can you imagine the triumph of Moscow had Carter refused to receive Bukowski? Do you remember what was published in *Pravda* after the arrest of Amalrik at the gate of the presidential palace in Paris? Can you imagine the reaction of the American public, had Carter given up and not let Bukowski in? No doubt, Carter remembers what happened after Ford shut the doors in front of Solzhenitsyn; in America, one cannot receive and entertain with impunity Dobrynin and other delegates of Gulag-Power and throw out its victims, receive Pele or other football players and throw out some great writers or just common but great people."

Third, it isn't the politics of Carter that threatens *détente* and stabilization; what threatens them is a permanent crisis in the governments of Socialist Camp countries. True, in the East (especially in Poland), the authorities are shaky from time to time. "But, it has nothing to do with the American politics. Alas! I could add" a certain prestigious analyst says to me - "Was it the American President who led the Polish workers out in the streets, burned the edifices of the Executive Committees of the Communist Party, or was it blind, impotent, or just plain stupid politics of this Party? Who, in August 1977, evoked the big strike of miners of Romania? The Secretary of State of the US?

Was it the American Senate that drew up the charter of 77? Who publishes *Opinia*, *Robotnik*, *Głos*, *Zapise*, etc. in Poland? The *Washington Post*? Who sells its political prisoners for hard currency? Mrs. Juanita Krebs, the American Secretary of Trade, or the East German Peoples Republic?"

Fourth, the selectiveness of Pissar looks suspicious. If trade and credits, patents and technology, automobiles and super highways were to have such an ennobling influence on the Soviet system and the relationship of the authority and its citizenry, then, why does it exactly happen, that toward Chile, South Africa or Rhodesia, the pressures and sanctions are applied? I like neither Brezhnev, nor Vorsted, nor Smith, but I don't understand why trade has to have such curative influence on the USSR, and it has not on Rhodesia or South Africa. What - from this standpoint - is the difference between the Jews persecuted by the KGB and the victims of *apartheid*?

Fifth, who can cite one example of a totalitarian country that has been democratized by trade? Who knows a totalitarian leader who, under the influence of wearing western underwear, resigned from his position? The big bosses in the Eastern bloc countries don't use other products than those of the best western manufacturers; Brezhnev is known for his proletarian love for Mercedes and Rolls-Royce; Tito wears only the western style ties, and drinks only the best whiskey there is; about the leaders of the Polish Peoples Republic - no need to talk, because their passions are well known to the readers (some fashionable establishments in Vienna could tell us a lot more about it). And what of it all? Nothing - of course. Kruczek, excellent as usual,

recently reminded us that Stalin used to get more votes, the more death sentences he declared on Bucharins, Zinovievs or other "traitors". *Idem* - in relation to trade: we may say, more technology, the more stronger is the gulag system. Why during the Brezhnev reign must the Soviet mechanism function differently than during Stalin? Surely, it's important that the number of victims is smaller, but the essence of the system remains the same. In April 12, 1976, Armand Hammer, the same Hammer who made his first million in 1922 in Russia, signed - as president of Occidental Petroleum - the biggest, I think, contract in the history for about \$20 billion for the production of chemical fertilizers. Brezhnev described Hammer very laconically: "This is a man who helps me greatly, and, who is greatly helped by me..." *Merci*, I have no more questions...

Nothing strange, then, that - and this is our sixth point - as some sober bureaucrat of State Department formulated - "The question in reverse is becoming more and more popular in the US. Not whether American chewing gum will ennoble some of the Party's little Robespieres, but whether the huge supplies of, i.e., grain, not to speak of technology, won't bring reversed results, won't allow the Kremlin to continue its arms race, and enable it to appease the needs for food, without diminishing military buildup or reserves of foreign currency for which Moscow may buys everything, even strategic materials?"

On the other hand, the sober American bureaucrat adds, the Communist indebtedness today increases somewhere from one to one and half billion dollars annually. On this level, as Charles Levinson proves in his fascinating book - "Vodka - Cola," which, like the Bible in the American hotels should be put on the desk of every respectful politician,

- on this level the debtor has influence on everything that happens in the home of a creditor. Like an old joke about a merchant who cannot fall asleep. "Why don't you sleep?" - his wife asks. - "Because tomorrow I must repay one thousand dollars" - he answers. "So what?" - says wife. "I don't have it" - he says. "Then why can't you go to sleep, let your creditor worry and suffer, it's his money, isn't it?" A good joke? But the case of our concern isn't the matter of one thousand dollars, but of billions of dollars. And not the sleeplessness of a one merchant, but of the whole of America...

"Do you remember that the handcuffs Bukowski had on his hands in the plane taking him over for exchange with Corvalan, were *Made in US*? Is this to be the goal of our economic exchange with the USSR?"

Neither clear ... nor strange

Clear? not for everybody. If it would be universally clear, then where does the article of Pissar comes from? Especially, when there still is my somewhat strange seventh point. When in October 1977 Pissar turned to a sharp critique of some of Carter's decisions, the Soviets didn't seem to remember any of these decisions. What had happened?

Was it only just a coincidence that, when Carter repeats that human rights are the center of his diplomacy, when Vance publicly demands respect for dissidents, when Mondale has lunch with Mrs. Shcharanska - banished from the Soviet Union on the day of her wedding and her husband's arrest, when Goldberg continues denouncing all kinds of terror in Russia, exactly - when the SALT

talks begin to move sharply forward, the Russians after years of practicing their "nyet" to everything, agree to talk about the stoppage of all kinds of nuclear testing - even the ones "for peaceful use," about the reduction of conventional weaponry, about the Indian Ocean, etc., - then - exactly in this moment Pissar publishes his article?

Strange? Not entirely, says a connoisseur of the problem. Searching for an explanation, I didn't hesitate to enter the lion's den. I sank into the red arm-chair in the office of Sen. Jackson. Among my interlocutors was Richard Perle. "He is Jackson's Kissinger and Brzezinski in one person." - in this manner he was introduced to me (of course in Polish) by Abraham Bromberg - my host in Washington, one of the best American specialists in Eastern problems, ex-editor in chief of the *Problems of Communism* - the most serious Kremlinologist publication, presently lost in the infinity of the State Department.

"There is nothing strange in the behavior of Russians, in such way we should summarize the deliberations of the US Senate. Brezhnev even shouted at Vance, but he has never raised his voice at the American bankers and industrialists. Nothing strange in this either. What decides about the Soviet politics it's not the letter of Carter to Sakharov, but the balance of power in the world, in which, both - the economic situation of the USSR, and the American supplies and credits, play the basic role."

First, there is nothing strange that the accent Carter put on the defense of human rights has not evoked any enthusiasm in the Kremlin. Even without the letter to Sakharov and the conspired reception of Bukowski, the dissident movement is not at

all a pleasant matter for Brezhnev. No doubt, this kind of Carterian politics - and here we return to our basic consideration - did not, and does not affect *détente*. "The bombs over Hanoi" - my interlocutor reminds me, "didn't interfere with the visit of Nixon in Moscow." Then, even the KGB were under order to be in a "champagne drinking" mood. Kissinger celebrated his birthday at the Kremlin, and received a huge birthday cake. "Be courageous" - laughed Andropov - "you may cut it, but don't touch the center, a microphone is there..." Well, the KGB could rejoice, because it had an entirely justified hope that Nixon brought with him some serious trade and financial proposals.

Five years later, Vance had almost been kicked out of the Kremlin because he brought proposals that were, in the opinion of Kremlin, unacceptable; in addition, before departure to Moscow, he had disclosed them in the US, and to Brezhnev the politics is neither for yokels, nor for newspapers. "I assure you" - my interlocutor becomes serious - "if Vance would come with the promises of annulment of the Jackson amendment, he too, would get a cake with a microphone - even without a birthday."

"I remind you, as we are now in the Senate, that at the end of 1976, the delegation of our senators stayed in Moscow. They were allowed not only to meet the Jewish activists, but even the KGB led them to the meeting place and guarded the privacy and quietude during their discussions. And all this, because somebody, even today we don't know who, said at the Kremlin that the senators came to Moscow to convince the Russian Jews that they should stop demanding the preservation of the Jackson amendment."

The moment of truth is coming...

Even the largest portrait of Brezhnev will not cover the very hard facts in the Soviet government balance sheets. The moment of truth is close. Further decline of the GNP of the USSR is unavoidable. A demographic break-down will create a serious losses in the workforce. In 1977, there was an input of over 2.6 million working hands in the labor market; in 1985 it will be only 300,000. Meantime, even today, agriculture - from which the departure of youth intensifies - suffers not only because of the traditional mess or catastrophic methods of management, but also because of the lack of people who desire to live in the happiness of kolkhozes.

The technological backwardness (despite appearances also in the warfare production) is persisting. And, finally, the USSR inevitably approaches the door-step to energetic deficit.

The Russians have not many choices. It's clear they could undertake a serious reform of administration. But, it wouldn't help, because it would necessitate a decentralization and democratization, or, in other words it would cause a weakening of the power monopoly of the Party apparatus, and the Kremlin doesn't want to commit suicide. They could also reduce military expenditure. "According to our specialists" - a man who has access to sources tells me - "the actual system of the air defense of the USSR costs about \$100 billion. When our Cruise missile soon becomes operational, the whole Soviet air defense system must be thrown in a garbage pile, or must be sold to the Third World countries. In order to find a fast defense against our 'cruise' the Russians would be forced to spend about \$50

billion, and find an appropriate technological invention. It's clear they, finally, will find both, but it won't be easy to spend so much money actually for nothing. Even Russian malaise and patience are limited... Of course, you'll say that this is why the Russians want to stop the arms-race. But the Kremlin, for all treasures of the world, will not resign from everything it considers necessary for maintaining 'the balance of fear' and from such costly adventures as Angola or Abyssinia. The true disarmament is not yet for tomorrow..."

Luckily, there is the USA

"Well" - I ask - "If they don't want to or cannot democratize the administration, if they don't want to or cannot limit their expenditures on arms, but they want to, because they are forced to, develop their country, then, what can they do?"

The answer, I recapitulate again, is not complicated. There is the USA. And this is our final point. The Russians would like to trade seriously with the US and to buy many much needed things. They would but cannot because they have nothing, or almost nothing to sell to America. The Soviet trade with the US is in a colossal deficit. In 1976, the total exchange between both countries amounted to about \$2.5 billion; of it - \$2.3 billion from the US to the USSR and only \$200 million in opposite direction. Naturally, it's not, for a long run, possible to live in such a situation. The Russians know it, and even tried to decrease this deficit at the beginning of 1977 by the reduction of import from the US. The USSR cannot trade seriously.

But what about credits? It's true that

the indebtedness of the East is already monumental. On Dec. 1, 1977, it amounted to about \$50 billion (Poland's indebtedness is about \$14 billion, but this is another story). To 1980 it will increase to about \$100 billion. The American bankers read these statistics without any panicking. In the first place, because Russia and the Communist Democratic Republics are good, reliable debtors. A socialist state cannot go bankrupt; it doesn't live on the tax-payers' monies, but on the exploitation of a cheap labor. And, in the second place, because in the Eastern indebtedness the American debits are comparatively moderate.

But it has been too late

Only a few words of recollection. The Jackson amendment has been approved by the Congress, exquisitely because of the Kremlin's stupidity, or, rather, because of their complete ignorance of the psychology of the West. In 1972, Nixon went to Moscow to inaugurate the *détente* in the name of which he and Brezhnev signed trade agreement very important to Russia. What was lacking was its ratification by the US Congress. But, several weeks before ratification session of the Congress, which, among other things was to grant Russia the status of the most favored nation-expressed in credits and advantageous custom duties, Moscow enacted the, so called, "brain taxation" - charging the candidates for immigration to Israel with a duty of repaying the cost of their education. "If such a tax had existed in Norway, there would be no Sen. Jackson now, because my parents would never have immigrated to the US; you are right" - he said to the delegation of the American Jews who came over to ask him for help to their brothers in the USSR. "There are more important matters than money," and

he added: "We will hit the Soviet pockets." And, that was how the Jackson amendment was born. It subjected financial advantages given to Russia to the annulment of the brain taxation. The Russians, pragmatic people, immediately suspended it. "What's the trouble?" - the special emissaries of Moscow to Washington were saying - "It's just a common misunderstanding, there is no tax; let's forget it." But it was too late. Jackson, who had his own presidential election plans, decided not to resign from such an effective weapon. The more so, because he didn't like Henry Kissinger, to whom the annulment of the amendment was important. "I was" - said Jackson - "the first American officer who entered Buchenwald. I never forget it. The amendment stands for as long as Moscow will not humanize her immigration procedures not only for Jews, but in general."

And, the article of Pissar? "Don't think that it is a *novum* in the whole affair" - said a man from the closest circle of Jackson, and one of the actual authors of the amendment. "Immediately after Jackson's fight for the amendment had begun, the big *business* got into action. Listen to what had been happening then: One day in Sept. 1973, Donald M. Kendall, the president of Pepsi-Cola, who had won the war for the Soviet market against Coca-Cola, and just signed a huge contract with Moscow, sent a secret telegram to 65 presidents of the largest Capitalistics sharks interested in investments in the USSR, proposing a joint demonstration (of course, in the name of the free enterprise) to kill the amendment which was still in the commission and, before the full assembly of the Congress would take care of it. Luckily, however, the text of Kendall's telegram, before it reached its

addressees, had found its way to the editorial office of the *Washington Post* which printed it immediately on the front page under a huge headline: "The big corporations push Congress to give them increased profits in trade with the USSR." The bomb turned into a blank. Today, the telegrams are gone, we have articles in newspapers..."

What model of what kind of "détente"?

"The article of Pisar reflects the dreams of the Russian soul, that it is possible to induce Carter to try to relinquish the Jackson amendment through the beckoning of a scarecrow of a cold war. But presently, the Russians know that this is not the way..."

Brezhnev, receiving at the Kremlin a delegation of American businessmen, shed tears over the fact that - according to his calculations - because of the Jackson amendment American businessmen were losing in Russia over one billion dollars annually. But, he did not say how much Russia was losing.

Russia is losing much more. According to the Soviet experts - very talkative in good American restaurants, Jackson had blocked credits which would enable investing \$30 billion in the USSR. Brezhnev himself - as I was reminded in the Congress - during his only visit in the US, had whispered, as if involuntarily, to a group of senators, a figure of ...\$50 billion. Why exactly 50? I don't know, but I know, that according to professionals, without the US, Siberia, before 50 years elapsed, will not start appeasing the true needs of the USSR. And, it may be too late. In a situation where a median age for the members of the Politburo is 70, such a perspective is little encouraging.

And here is a moral:

"America" - a serious persons say - "is willing to participate in this colossal adventure. We have definite interests in intricate changes in the East and in enclosing the Socialist countries (Carter's visit to Warsaw shows it) in an orbit of interdependence and not only in the Eastern bloc, but in the global system. We have capital and technology; it all may be realized but only in the frame of a true *détente*. True, it means a *détente* different from its gulag-asylum model. *Détente* is a two-sided idea, a two-directional operation. We can offer what we have, but not for nothing. The improvement in human life in Socialist countries is one of the elements of the future peaceful world..."

The State Department of the US is not a madhouse. Nobody here thinks it would be possible, in exchange for a few dollars, to induce Brezhnev to introduce a parliamentary system, to legalize the opposition or to return independence to satellites. The Russians know now, that neither the Congress nor the President of the US intend to resign from the Jackson amendment and to open the cash-box without real concessions from the Kremlin, without some evident improvements in an area of human rights in the East.

Brzezinski in an interview with me stated: "I believe that the historic inevitability of our times is not looking for some mythic revolution, but for a growing decisiveness of a man in demanding respect for his own human rights. I believe that the union of America with this inevitability is advantageous to the United States."

And to me too.

BRUKSELCZYK

Written in Dec. 9, 1977

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 5/4

April 1978

by

Charles Joel

Zbigniew BYRSKI

A YEAR OF CARTER
AND WHAT NEXT?

Adam KRUCZEK

IN THE SOVIET PRESS
(an excerpt)

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 3/366/78, published in Paris, France

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without the permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSIC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

A YEAR OF CARTER AND WHAT NEXT?

It isn't true that Americans, tired of Nixon's despotic presidency, have longed for somebody who would be his complete contradiction; that they have desired a man of open heart, easy of access - well, a decent fellow, who would be a mirror of the American mediocrity of the second half of the Seventies. If it were true, Gerald Ford would have won the last elections; he would have been even better than this ideal, because he was slightly below the average. The fact that 15 months ago Ford did not win, but had been very close to victory, gives us an idea of the conflict in Americans' yearnings. They wanted to have in the White House a president who would be cut "to measure" of their desires, but at the same time, one, whose intellect, will and strength in decision making, would protect America against all the dangers that torment the world. In other words, it was to be a man who would not bend from the traditionally sanctified Democratic-Republican norms, and be also able to match the demands of our epoch. An absurd dream. Neither the American Democracy, nor any other system existing in the world, will ever produce a leader of such a dimension. A conflict character of American dreams, which focusses on the

unrealistic stature of American "leader-not-leader," results from what Americans want, what they do not want, and, above all, from what they are afraid of.

Americans want to live in comfort and opulence, but without any risk. They want to have plenty of cheap gasoline and electricity, but hellishly fear atomic power plants because... an accident may occur. They want not to return to coal, because coal pollutes the air. They want not to limit energy consumption, because it means a lower life standard. If at some seashores of some states there starts an exploratory drilling for crude oil, immediately the local public is mobilized in protest. Not to prevent drilling and searching for oil; but for doing it at their locale. The white Americans, especially the rich, want to be good to their black and Puerto-Rican fellow-countrymen, but prefer to live far from them in elegant suburbs. They want to walk safely through the streets of large cities, but their hearts are too soft to severely punish criminals. They would like to see their children going to schools and learn well how to read and write, but are unable to bring back a discipline and other school rigors in order to give them the guaranteed minimum academic qualifications and to protect teachers and pupils as well against crime and violence. 1/ They want to restore

1/ Recently in New York 7 principals of elementary schools were discharged because of their illiteracy. At the same time, as statistics disclosed, the number of attacks on teachers and violence acts performed by pupils

the delapidated and burned out quarters of New York, but are afraid to reveal the causes of the downfall of this, until recently, nice and safe metropolis. Instead of loud cry that it was brought down to its present state mainly by the blacks and the Puerto-Ricans - badly adapted to living in the civilized societies of the West, the curtain of indifference continues to cover this social phenomenon. The atmosphere of lies and legalized dypocrisy, doesn't differ much from the atmosphere of lies and hypocrisy, that prevails in the Soviet Union. The only difference is that there, a guardian of an official lie is the Party and bureaucracy, and in the US - the public influenced not by law and order, but by the intellectual elite of the country. In the USSR, the lie is totalitarian and official. In the US - Democratic.

Since the times of Johnson, America as an imperial power, has been slowly descending from the world stage. This observation applies also to America as the only power which could threaten the Soviets. If during

on female teachers, increased 7 times during the last quarter of 1977. "The schools of New York are more dangerous than the streets" - the press informed the public, and, it appears true. Then, if the schools are promoting violence - is there any sense in sending kids to them? The public education in the large cities of America is becoming increasingly fictitious. The rich rightly conclude that it is better to send their children to private schools. The latter, though expensive, have an advantage, that being unsubsidized by the state, can hire teachers, but not by an ethnico-racial key, thus guaranteeing the highest qualifications of teaching personnel and, consequently, a proper standard of education.

that period, the USSR developed stupendous military power on land and oceans, and, if simultaneously - knowing that nobody will attack it first - built the system of anti-nuclear underground shelters, obviously, it could do it all for only one purpose - not a defensive one. In this state of affairs, although the American *mass media* do a lot in order to cover the truth, I believe, that these disturbing facts penetrate American even most resistant to the realities brains. Americans, in their long litany of unreachable dreams, desire one more thing (which is of the greatest concern to us Poles): They want to be free of Russian expansionism, but will not do anything that could threaten them even with a shade of confrontation with the Soviet empire.

The annual spectacle of Carter Presidency is, most properly, possible to describe on the background of these conflicting desires and absurd myths into which the American society is sunk. After the capitulatory moves of Ford, Kissinger and Sonnenfeldt - famous for his doctrine of "organic union" of East European nations with the Soviets, the initial declarations of Carter sounded unusually brave. However, it did not mean that they were particularly enjoyable to Poles. On the contrary, there isn't anything worse than the political checks drawn with no sufficient funds. Who pays for them, and very dearly, is not the writer of the check, but a credulous recipient. Nixon, Ford and Kissinger, attempted to decree how the Poles, Hungarians, Czechs and Ukrainians ought to behave in order not to endanger America by creating inflammatory movements in Eastern Europe. Carter, so far, has been giving only hopes for a greater liberalism in these countries.

One would believe that Carter is less afraid of Moscow than were his predecessors (who, together with their advisors and state secretaries, believed a catastrophe can be procrastinated, but only by every possible concession on behalf of the Big Brother). But soon it appeared that he is as much afraid of Moscow as were they. Not Carter personally, but as a good President - in the name of the American people, and, perhaps, a little differently than Messrs. Kissinger and Sonnenfeldt. To me, it means that he is ashamed (also in the name of the American people) of his fear. That's why some time ago it occurred to Carter to announce blusteringly that there are some people who "are afraid even of Brezhnev's sneeze." It made a positive impression on those who continue to long for some changes in this America of ours. The least impressed, though, was Brezhnev, who some time later got sick with the flu. He, surely, wouldn't recover from it, if, instead of presenting the public opinion with presidential jokes, America would cancel some of the grain deliveries, or apply other harmful economic sanctions against the Soviets. But Carter will never do a thing of that sort, because he doesn't like to anger the Moscow Politburo; in his conviction, it would bring some incalculable results.

In the described circumstances, it is worthwhile to consider what practical value the propagation of human rights can have to the nations of Eastern Europe? If think, none. These Poles, Czechs, Lithuanians and Ukrainians to whom democratic freedoms and independence from the Soviet are the matters of the greatest concern, already managed to harden in their skepticism. Since they know that in the past the most solemn obligations and promises were trampled - what effect the

appeals of a nice preacher from the White House may have? Especially, since this man of good will yields to a whole series of pressures, personal obligations, electoral promises and conflicting interests - all representing the reality of presidential life.

Carter, although different from his predecessors, is not cut to meet the demands of our epoch:

Having in his own country 20 million black fellow-citizens, he insists in liberating the blacks of South Rhodesia and South Africa, in order to make their lives a success equal to success enjoyed by their brothers in Ghana, Angola, Tanzania, Zaire, Mali and several other independent republics and one empire - notwithstanding the fact that blacks in these countries lead a miserable life under the whip of their own black leaders. But, if he won't "liberate" them, the Russians will. This means that the Russians will stay there for ever, and block the oceanic routes of America and Western Europe, what, by the way, is their main goal.

Because Carter has in his country a powerful and influential Jewish opinion, he must defend Israel against Arabs, but cannot engage himself too extensively in this issue because, again, the Russians will "take care" of Arabs. Once or twice in the past, the Soviets burned their fingers in an attempt to protect Arabs, but being exceptionally unscrupulous, they, surely, will try again. And here is the reason why the independence for Palestinians became the most important question in the Middle East. In the UNO, the Poles, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Estonians, Lithuanians, Latvians and other nations are no problem, because they have "their states" and

"decide" about their own fate. Perhaps, the Near East has a tariff of the "highest privilege"? I don't think so, because never, for example, has the question of the Kurds become so important as the question of Palestinians presently is, although Kurds are more numerous than Palestinians, and for years have fought for their autonomy within the boundaries of Iraq, without bombs and grenades being thrown on schools and supermarkets of Baghdad. 2/

American public opinion - not only of the Jewish ethnic group, favors certainly more Israel than Palestine. There are many reasons for it. One among them is, that the object of the PLO, the main intercessor of independent Palestine, is the destruction of Israel. So, unfortunately, the sympathies of American public opinion do not represent any value in a sense of protection for Israel. The friendly feelings toward a foreign country cannot counterbalance a feeling of fear of confrontation with the Soviets. That's why Carter, if he hadn't been under constant pressure of the Jewish lobby, would not have hesitated to make many concessions to Arabs - including the creation of Palestinian state. Erasing Israel from the map of the world, would, in his mind, be equal to the removing a solid ground from under the feet of the Soviets, and to the ending the tension in the Middle East. Confrontation with Russia, feared by the US, would be in this part of the world, peculiarly complex and loaded with many risks. Not only

2/ Kissinger and Shah Reza Pahlevi decided that there is no need to help them; they declared that Kurds autonomy is needed, but only to Kurds, which fact is definitely an insufficient reason for creating a world political issue.

because of distance from American shores, but also because of neighboring oil resources that are needed by the US and, mainly, by the Western Europe.

There is a lesson to us, Poles, in the above assertion. A platonic sympathy of the American public opinion does not defend Israel against the Soviets and their Arabian clients. Israel's destiny is protected by a powerful Jewish *lobby*. The Poles, Czechs, Ukrainians or Hungarians do not have any similar *lobby*, and never will. In addition, their political reality - regardless of their geographical position - is totally opposite to that of Israel. In the question of Israel we are concerned with the preservation of an independent state, while in Eastern Europe, with returning independence to several nations. The opposition movements in Poland exists and will continue to exist, and, even grow, but whether Carter will blame the Communist leaders for their disdain for human rights, or - as in Warsaw - will compliment them, expressing joy, that in the Polish Peoples Republic "pluralism" prevails because people are allowed to go to church - shouldn't have any influence on further development of opposition in Poland. The US may become the actual ally of Poland, but under one condition only: When the US and its Western allies are threatened by a direct danger. Then and only then, Poland and the US may have mutual need one for another. The rest is a dream.

However, the fate of America - even America as it is today - cannot become unimportant to the future of the world. The fact, that the United States of the second half of the Seventies is psychologically unable to tame the Soviet expansionism, doesn't preclude the

future possible changes. The "softening" politics and a careful strategy of the Soviets - avoiding too drastic moves - are generally known and don't need any further comments. But, this politics may change at any time, considering the impatience of the Soviet marshalls, or these members of the Politburo who would like in their lifetime to see some major successes of Communism. The attempts of the Soviet Union to subordinate Western Europe, even without an open aggression, would, in the most insensible Western ears, sound like an alarm bell - regardless of how deeply America is eaten by defeatism and fear of confrontation with it. It may happen in case the Soviets, through their overseas engagements, succeeded in capturing sea routes and threatened Europe with cutting off oil supplies. The present Soviet engagement in Abyssinia, and plans they have for Djibouti and Somalia have, no doubt, this goal in mind. The possibility of blocking the Strait of Bah-el-Mandeb, even by leaving a free access to the Persian Gulf, will become a colossal advantage to the Soviets. If they succeeded, they will put their cards on the table in front of the frightened allies of the NATO.

For many years, owing to the thesis of Kennedy that the best defense against nuclear attack is not costly underground shelters, but a means of retaliation, Americans have lived calmly, paying no attention to their own and Western Europe's safety. Retaliation, it was thought, owing to the American technological superiority, shall always secure to them the possibility of a second chance to strike back. It was the, so called, balance of terror. Presently, the balance of terror is no longer possible for two reasons. First, because America contributed to the technological progress of Russia. Second, because Russia,

now, having the technology, is less than America afraid of demographic consequences of war. Not of the war in a general sense, but of its consequences expressed in human losses. Someone may say that human losses are the worst defeat that a war can bring. Possible - but not to the Soviets. 3/ The Kremlin may inform its citizenry, that the future war - victorious (and, of course, defensive) may cost 50 million lives, but none of the American presidents could even utter similar information to Americans... unless such an information would serve as a basis for announcing capitulation. Classification and evaluation of losses in the case of eventual war run differently in Moscow than in Washington. The geography of fear is different. However, Moscow's relative disregard for losses may be, indeed, treated by it as the trump card in the planning of a future armed encounter. But, on the other side, this trump card may be devalued by a fear - a fear for the fate of the Soviet empire or, simply, for the fate of Power. We must realize that in the preservation of Power at least several millions people are personally interested. Those millions are the upper echelons of the Party-government strata of all the Soviet republics and several Communist Peoples Democracies. 4/

3/ Nor to China - to recollect the famous statement of Chou-en-Lai in the early Sixties, when he announced that to the Chinese Peoples Republic, a war may be victorious even if 300 million people were killed, because 300 million will be still left.

4/ I wouldn't risk including in this number the Polish Peoples Republic, but I believe, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and East Germany, doubtless, can be included.

This upper crust of the Communist regimes has no doubts that, if Soviet opponent can't be crushed during the first several days of war, its empire will begin to crack under the pressures of internal, nationalistic and social tensions. Whatever might have been said about the heroism of the Soviet soldiers during the World War II, the truth about the first weeks of the war cannot be forgotten. And the truth is, that not only the millions of the Soviet soldiers surrendered without firing one shot, but that the inhabitants of towns and villages of Byelorussia and Ukraine, greeted the soldiers of the Third Reich with flowers. Hitlerians were their saviors from Communist slavery. Only after 2 months, when the mass murders performed by Germans on the Soviet civilians and soldiers, did the Soviet citizens realize their mistake. Unparallel barbarism of Hitler, turned into the main ally of the Soviets. Without it, there wouldn't had been any "war for fatherland". The Communist Establishment in Moscow and other capitals of the Soviet republics, know all this very well. Who doesn't know it, or, who it seems, has forgotten it, are the American "politologists" and "sovietologists." Knowing the weakness and disablement of the West, they do not notice the weakness of the opponent.

* * *

The Contemporary Soviet Union is no longer inhabited by population petrified by fear. In order to bring the country to such a state of fear, it was necessary to kill 20 million people, and to cover the whole country with gulags. It's difficult to imagine if these times would ever return. At the present there are no people in the Soviet Union, who, as in the Stalin days, are more afraid of the NKVD than of hunger. I don't intend to overestimate the role of dissidents. On the

contrary, I believe, they are not able to create some larger, deeper social base. Nevertheless, with them or without, the Soviet society has changed. Now, the common Soviet citizens who never heard of Solzhenitsyn or Sakharov, have enough courage to, loudly, complain at the inefficiency of food supplies in Moscow, or the empty grocery shelves in provincial towns. They don't hesitate to accuse the authorities of the unscrupulous negligence in work safety. Not intellectuals - desperates - but the common workingmen invite American newsmen to their homes and tell them their grievances. 5/ The workingmen protests are uncoordinated and still far from being mass protests. But, if we consider the dissident movement and the growing, courageous manifestations of discontent of workers, and the actions in the Soviet republics against russification, then, we shall have a completely different picture of the USSR, than it was 20 years ago. The masses which have been humbly accepting the gospel of lie and absurdity have vanished. What is now are the masses undermined with anxiety.

With all this, we shouldn't fall victims of an excessive optimism. An organized political movement - directed against the system doesn't exist yet in the USSR. The protests of dissidents cannot qualify for it. Still, there is a lack of ties and mutual understanding between the two mainstreams. The first - among intellectuals - is self-conscious, and isolated. The second - among workingmen - is spontaneous and concerned equisitively with economic matters. In contrast to the Polish Peoples Republic, it

didn't, so far, take a form of even local explosion. Nevertheless, the present situation in the Soviet Union has ripened enough to let the West to decide to begin a less timorous politics toward the "potential adversary."

* * *

This new politics, however, must not be anything "special". On the contrary, some of the moves of the, so called, "cold war" should be innovated, although cold war, generally, passes for an entirely disgraced method of dealing with the USSR. Indeed, the cold war was a fiasco. The changes that Russia underwent resulted from some internal processes, not from any outside pressure. They happened despite the strategy of the "cold war", applied not in an appropriate time and toward entirely unyielding an opponent. Stalinist Russia, with her terror and hermetic isolation was completely protected against propagandist offensive and economic quarantine. Now, the situation is very much different. The Soviet people are neither so isolated from the outside world, nor frightened, as they were 20 or more years ago. Potentially, the Russian people are completely matured to the point of being susceptible to the offensive of the West. A general, and almost to boredom, repeated truth is that each ton of grain refused by the US and Canada to Moscow, will greatly "soften" the Soviet attitudes. And, this is, simply, because Stalin could afford denying bread to his subjects, but Brezhnev will not have the courage to do so. The Soviet citizens can still accept suffering from some discomforts, but will never accept suffering hunger. In brief, the strategy of the "cold war" - so fallacious during Stalinism - is now well suited as an enormously efficient instrument

5/ *Kultura* - Jan. Feb. - 1978, *Fragments* - vol. 5/2

of action against the Soviets. That's exactly, why Moscow is such a great enthusiast of *détente*. Now, when she is militarily strong, but no longer the Stalin monolith she once was.

The irrevocable liquidation of Stalin terror in Russia is a powerful advantage to the West. It is, I think, West's most important trump card. It should be played skillfully. The Western politicians, - those that are most frightened of the Soviet power, should perceive the ghost that frightens the masters of the Kremlin. This ghost - are the nations of the USSR. They shall, for as long as the empire remains stable, submit to the rigors and discipline of the Party. But the first crack in it will create a chain reaction of incalculable consequences. Then, in order to pacify 260 millions of rebellious citizens, there won't be even time to bring the armies from the border of China and divisions which stay in East Germany.

Zbigniew BYRSKI

New York, Jan. 23, 1978

IN THE SOVIET PRESS

Lew Tolstoy begins "Anna Karenina" with these words: "All the happy families look alike, but each unhappy family is unhappy in its own way." All my life I believed in the truth of this thought, until I read the Manifesto of the Opposition Group. In it, among many other things, are enumerated the

sins of the regime: Losses in time, money, labor, the lacks of changeable parts for machines and cars, unbelievable thievery, appalling growth of bureaucracy, common drunkenness, etc., etc.

In what country does it take place? The citizens of the Polish Peoples Republic easily recognize these familiar problems. Also the citizens of the Soviet Union, Bulgaria or Romania... Well, it appears, that all the unhappy nations that live under the one and same ideology, are similarly, unhappy. The "Manifesto" I'm talking about, has been worked out by an opposition group of "middle and higher functionaries of the German Democratic Republic." Published in *Der Spiegel*, it caused a scandal. Unhappy were - which is natural - the leaders of the German Democratic Republic and also the West German Social-Democrats, fearing that it will worsen the interrelations of both German states. Gossip began to spread that the "Manifesto" is a falsification, provocation and, that it interferes with *détente*. However, judging by the East German security organs' efforts to stop the "Manifesto's" colportage in East Germany, it must be a relatively true picture of the situation in the "first German Socialist state."

A really true picture of the situation in East Germany is especially instructive, because it appears that even the orderly, precise, hard working German became, under the Communist regime - typical to a whole family of the happy Socialist nations - a *homo Sovieticus*. We cannot refer here to the *polnische Wirtschaft*, or typically Russian mess - we talk about Germany. The more so, because, as the principles of a truly scientific research demand, we can study the two categories of Germans: of

these living here, and those living there. The "Manifesto" compares: Why does the production of work increase faster in West Germany, than in East Germany - despite the teaching of Lenin, who said that, exactly, only the productivity is the main criterion of social progress? Why doesn't the wave of escapees from East Germany to the West subside? Why do 94% of East German citizens watch West German TV? (The only figure in "Manifesto" that surprised me: Is it possible that 6% of people views the "native" East German TV?!). Why has East Germany taken first place in the number of divorces, suicides and consumption of alcohol? Why is "Daczism" the ideal life? (The word *Dacza* - as the symbol of the highest life standard of the society, became, as it appears, completely understood - even without translating it to those who speak the language of Schiller and Goethe).

Adam KRUCZEK

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 5/5

June 1978

by

Charles Joel

BRUKSEL CZYK

AS SEEN FROM BRUSSELS AND
FROM ... BELGRADE

A CARD GAME ALLOWED ON THE
GROUND FLOOR ONLY

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 365/78, published in Paris, France.

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

AS SEEN FROM BRUSSELS AND FROM ... BELGRADE

A CARD GAME ALLOWED ON THE GROUND FLOOR ONLY

Edmund Burke (1720-1797) once said (I don't know when), that each political decision is a choice "between something unpleasant and something intolerable." The Belgrade Conference has been unpleasant all the time and often very intolerable. No wonder then that the certificate of its decease, drawn up by the world press, hasn't been particularly cheerful. The lexicography used in the hundreds of necrologies belongs to several kinds of language:

Medical: Agony; dead while living; artificial respiration; usefulness of euthanasia; a state of hibernation.

Theatrical: A comedy of errors; much ado about nothing; circus without clowns; a dreadful cabaret.

Of sports: Checkmate; the dullest world marathon; one step back; stop.

Literary: The market of vanity; under the roofs of Belgrade.

Sentimental: Sadness; humiliation; sourness; disenchantment; lost illusions; adieu; gone with the wind; in the fog of history; in the darkness of oblivion; in the shadow of disgrace.

Gynecological: Barren.

Mathematical: The smallest common denominator.

Metaphoric: A mountain gave birth to a mouse; *détente* ran aground; in the garbage pile of history.

Ironie: Laughingstock of the world; died of garrulity; died of boredom.

Imperative: Kill; thumbs down.

Definite: The last hours; eulogies; mortuary; ceremonial funeral; request: no condolences, please; God rest his soul...

"One minute, Monsieur le Bourreau..." as somebody once (I don't know who and when) said. One minute, I repeat, the corpse is still warm, plenty time for its funeral. Not long ago in Warsaw, a certain gentleman arrived at a funeral at the last moment when the coffin was already down in the grave, and, to everybody's surprise instead of flowers he laid down a large *bonbonnière*. "Pardon me", he said breathlessly, "but the florists were already closed."

At the congressional palace of Belgrade, the most expensive mausoleum in the world (\$30 million - mainly from the credits of the West), I, too, deliver not flowers but a *bonbonnière*, and not

because the florists are closed, but because I want to.

"...that I was against"

Funny fellow, eccentric, you would say. One minute, let's come closer, let's look in the cadaver's eyes. The Belgrade Conference, speaking briefly, had a threefold goal. 1/ To find how the 35 states which underwrote the final act of Helsinki had discharged their obligations, or, in other words, how they had strengthened *détente*. 2/ To discuss propositions for the future, or, to establish how to make *détente* much stronger, and 3/ To decide when and how to meet again, or, how to bring the final triumph of *détente*. All this was to be detailed in a communique, and solemnly accepted, with a joyful music.

As we know, it turned out otherwise. On March 9, 1978 at 18:15, Belgrade succumbed not in a glory, but with jeering. None of the 400 diplomats and experts who had stayed for almost a year in this lively capital of southern Slavs, had spent days and nights in over 80 plenum assemblies, over 300 workshop conferences, thousands of informal meetings, had drunk in our name and at our expense thousands bottles of champagne and plum-brandy, wasted hectoliters of ink and had scribbled on thousands tons of paper, none, I repeat, of these brave men left Belgrade, satisfied.

A miss? On the surface, yes. Nobody of normal mind expected that after the Belgrade Conference the USSR would change into a parliamentary Democracy, withdraw its divisions from Poland or East Germany, demolish the Berlin Wall, free imprisoned dissidents and Jews from Russia and award

Sakharov the Order of Lenin. But, it was hoped that the final communique from Belgrade would, at least, remind us the basic elements of *détente*, established in Helsinki, determine lines of safe cooperation along which the world could move forward.

Instead, the 30 page project of the final communique was not even taken out of the pocket of Arthur Goldberg, the American delegate. All other compromising projects were refuted by Juri Vorontzov, the Soviet delegate. There was also the Kremlin project, but because it looked like a facsimile of an editorial of *Pravda*, it was refuted by the West. Consequently, it all ended in a minimum compromise.

The communique contains 19 dull paragraphs, is indigestible, evidently constrained, puts a good face to a bad business. It foretells, that the next full assembly will gather in September and November of 1980 in Madrid, and it will be preceded by the meetings of experts: in Montreux in Oct. 1978, in order to work out, - just a trifle - the way of peaceful solution of conflicts, in Bonn in June 1978 to prepare a scientific "forum", and on Malta in February, 1979 to discuss the problems of the Mediterranean Basin. Besides, forgetting the oratorical emptiness of the conference, the final communique reflects only on 35 delegations' confirmation of the fact that they were not able to agree on any disputed basic problems, the human rights first...

We could paraphrase the saying of Churchill: never so many did so little to so numerous. Indeed, from the perspectives of the final communique the

Belgrade conference had become a triumph of immobility. Consequently, the following questions seem quite logical: Is it a miss or even a drama and return to the cold war? Is it one more Soviet victory? Is it that the West was ridiculed again on its road to collective suicide?

Remember, please, that I was against it all. None of the above assumptions suits me. I know, I'm exposing myself to ridicule, but I don't consider the results of the Belgrade Conference a catastrophe, and if it is difficult to describe it as a success of Democracy and progress, nevertheless, it is a disgraceful defeat of the Soviet diplomacy. Before I attempt to prove it, allow me, Ladies and Gentlemen, to play hell with you all a little: Only the blind and deaf, naive or ignorant, could have hoped for something serious to happen, that would have resulted from the final Belgrade communique. And now, let me list the offences one by one (succession incidental).

Didn't understand allusions

Only the blind and the deaf can be surprised. The Russians from the beginning of the Belgrade Conference were not hiding the fact that they wouldn't repeat Helsinki show, that this time there wouldn't be any need for applause and firecrackers:

1/ From the beginning Moscow imposed on Belgrade the lowest possible staging. The Kremlin sent Vorontzov - not even an ambassador but an embassy advisor. Vorontzov is a brilliant professional and has a very talented wife, but he shouldn't sit at the same table, for example, with Sherer, the Ambassador of the USA, to say nothing of Goldberg, the ex-Secretary and

Justice of the US Supreme Court.

2/ During the conference the Kremlin appointed Vorontazov to the post of ambassador in New Delhi. It appears that this promotion had not been made to elevate his rank and importance in Belgrade, but to stress that Belgrade was to him just a secondary assignment.

3/ From the beginning the Russians were informing the world that there cannot be any talk about the kind of final communique that would bear resemblance to a list of crimes committed on human rights - no matter where and especially to the east of Elbe.

4/ On Jan. 17, 1978, when after the holidays the works of the conference had resumed, Vorontzov put on the table his own project of a communique, in which there wasn't even the smallest mention of the "third basket" and human rights. Simultaneously, Moscow announced the sharpening of the proceedings and closing of the inquest in the case against Orlov, Ginsburg and Shcharanski - 3 leaders of the Soviet group that monitored the observance of Helsinki provisions by the USSR. All this meant that there wouldn't be any Soviet concession in Belgrade.

5/ Several days later the Russians withdrew their team from the human right commission.

6/ When the conference approached Feb. 15, a date settled for its closing, the Russians called the rest of their men back to Moscow.

Was it possible to convey a more

unequivocal allusions to the West?

Belgrade is not Helsinki

Only the naive could suppose, that it would be possible to repeat the white nights of Helsinki in Belgrade. The climate is different... In 1975 the Kremlin needed a summit illustrated by 4 firecrackers, Brezhnev wanted the document that would be an *ersatz* of the peace treaty. Brezhnev, let's recollect briefly, wanted international avowal of the postwar - Yalta boundaries of the USSR, wanted the West's promise to respect the Soviet empire and agreement for economic and technological aid of a size that would secure to the Kremlin the possibilities of appeasing the most urgent needs in food and industry - without any risk of lessening the military growth and rhythm of expansion in foreign countries. For all this the Kremlin was ready to pay a certain price - agreeing to pronounce some minimal code of human rights.

But Belgrade is not Helsinki. Brezhnev doesn't need anything today, in any case nothing that Belgrade could deliver to him. On the problem of arms balance, nothing or very little can be achieved by the moves of Malta or Liechtenstein, or even by the pseudopowers of Europe. The serious matters are dealt with somewhere else. The four international conferences, in Geneva, Vienna and in the UNO are fruitlessly working on the idea of disarmament. SALT II - the only real military matter - are carried on face to face by America and the Soviets, over and above Belgrade.

A similar situation prevails in economic cooperation. Belgrade or no Belgrade, the Kremlin knows how to move around. Brezhnev, albeit, so sensitive to

any attempt of "control" in Belgrade, had not hesitated to invite Sen. Henry Jackson to Moscow. Mind you, my reader, Sen. Henry Jackson, the blackest American sheep, the author of the famous amendment that made the American credits to Russia dependent on the liberalization of totalitarian immigration procedure of the Soviets (we wrote about it in detail in our report from the USA).

It doesn't matter if the Kremlin cancelled Jackson's visit after senator warned the Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin that he intended to meet Sakharov. Important and significant is that the invitation in general had been the Kremlin's idea. And more so, that during the conference in Belgrade, when the East collectively had been throwing mud on each attempt of "brutal pressure" on humanized final communique, the government of Hungary received from Carter not only the crown of St. Stephen, but also the "clause of the most privileged nation," given by the USA only under condition that the recipient accepts the Jackson "immigration" amendment.

Briefly, Belgrade could not give Brezhnev anything that he would be willing to pay something for, even in unexchangeable rubles not to mention concessions on human rights. Of course, it was necessary - and that was what Goldberg was effectively doing, to fight for every comma, but considering damages which the "third basket" had already caused in human rights of the East, we shouldn't expect any concession in this matter from the Soviet authorities in this moment and in this

exactly place. In sum, we could have had a much worse communique, but never much better. A much better communique could have been hoped for only by hypocrites or nonprofessionals.

As each totalitarianism

Nonprofessionals, because it was clear that Belgrade Conference was only a fragment of a larger whole. Nobody, from the treaty of Brest-Litovsk in 1918 has doubted that the Soviet foreign policy is only a protraction of the internal situation of the Soviet Union. The Kremlin believes that from the perspective of the internal situation, the USSR had paid everything it had to pay for Helsinki. Human rights, *nye znayu*, says the Kremlin, had long changed into the *unthings* of Orwell. Generally speaking: 1/ A majority of the Soviet children below the age 10 today has slanting eyes and tawny Asiatic complexion. 2/ The economic crisis, officially, hurts the USSR. The rise of gasoline prices ("on demand of citizens," - stated the minister of transportation), coffee, etc. despite balancing by a fantastic decrease in prices of rubber footwear, is a classic inflationary and capitalistic an operation. 3/ Ominous knocking is heard in the ideological front. After 60 years of power, the Soviet system has not yet struck roots, it still is, as somebody once (again I don't remember who and when) said, a system without any future, but with a secured longevity. The Kremlin couldn't let the allusions to human rights and humanitarian awakening poison the already restless atmosphere of the USSR. Vice versa, as each totalitarianism, the Kremlin turned toward nationalism and chauvinism. In the Convention Palace six

thousand officers of the Soviet elite corps for several minutes applauded the name of Stalin - the well known defender of human rights, twice interrupting the speech of marshall Ustinov, delivered on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the red army. It wasn't by mistake that the Soviet TV blasted these applauses all over the Soviet Union. The Kremlin is cautious, attempts not to overstrain the cord, nevertheless it did not hesitate to "arrange" Angola, Ethiopia, interfere impudently in the West's disputes on neutron bomb (have you noticed how indifferently the Western press treated the letter of Brezhnev in this matter, can you imagine what would happen if Carter wrote such a letter...).

Yes, in the framework of the Soviet general strategy of aggravation and expansion, Belgrade could not pass in an atmosphere of mutual admiration.

As for a hunchback

Well, considering it all and excusing the blind, deaf, naive and nonprofessionals, Belgrade should be evaluated as a relative success. A certain catholic priest was telling the children a story of how beautiful man is created by God in his own image. "And I, Father," asked a slightly hump-backed lad, "am I beautiful too?" - "Well, my dear child", - answered the priest - "as for a hunchback, you are very beautiful...".

As for a hunchback, Belgrade Conference is beautiful. Here is why:

First, Belgrade Conference is a complete defeat for the USSR's prestige. As all the press was wrong in the evaluation of Helsinki,

proclaiming the capitulation, treachery and cowardice of the West, so now it is wrong striving for the blackest colors in composing postBelgrade necrologies. As it hadn't been able to anticipate in 1975 the boomerang impact of the "third basket" of Helsinki, so, today it doesn't even try to seriously evaluate the effect of the postBelgrade outpour. *En effet*, never before has the democratic press so poorly attended a great international conference. A conference, which by all means was a continual festival of fear. Here the gloomy allusions fit very well. The deceased, as the French say, was hiding all the time in the Soviet closet. Moscow was so afraid of disclosing the presence of the deceased or, in other words, the allusions to human rights, that it had refuted all the compromising propositions of not only Western states, but also all the "openings" of neutrals (Brezhnev, although he pretends to have a very special feelings toward France, refuted ostentatiously the letter of Giscard d'Estang). Of course, the neutral nations cannot harm Russia, but from the standpoint of the so called prestige - if this word still makes any sense in relating to the Soviet superpower - this is a complete disaster. "Belgrade was to bring the affirmation of respect of the superpowers toward small and medium sized countries; it was to confirm our right and our chances of cooperation in deciding about the future of Europe" - a certain neutral diplomat related to me. "That's what the principle of unanimity is about. But Moscow had trampled it all. Russia doesn't have a right to treat us like that. Now" - the diplomat ended - "definitely, the king is naked."

The dot over the "i" was put there by my acquaintance from Warsaw. "The

astounding reaction of the West to Moscow's *nyet* in human rights" - stated this clever fellow, - "reminds me of the reaction of a certain lady who, seeing for the first time the nakedness of not the king but of her future lover, shouted: 'My dear, I knew you were circumcised, but I didn't realize it is to such a degree...'". Well, the Soviet resistance to all attempts of mentioning human rights, induced the same effect. This is the end of mystification. The Kremlin is definitely naked. Result: 29 states expressed surprise at the Kremlin's mutilation (of the final communique); only 6 East European states continue to admire its (The Kremlin's) shapeliness. It's not a great success of Moscow's supermen.

Don't be disturbed, Sir.

Second, what the press - being so fascinated by the Kremlin's nakedness - doesn't seem to like to write about, the Belgrade Conference, although the circumcised communique doesn't mention it, is a full review of the manner in which the Eastern states with the Soviet Union in lead, were during 2 years violating the provisions of an act they so solemnly had had underwritten in August 1, 1975. Actually, there were no other matters under dispute. It's clear that from time to time attempts were made to discuss some other problems, but, as a result of brutal Soviet opposition, it appeared, that, as in the joke about husband who no sooner than the wedding ceremony was over discovered that he had married not for money but for love, Belgrade assembled in fact only to collect necessary materials for preparing

versatile and merciless accusations against all kinds of the KGB. The act of accusation had not been written, but everyday Vorontzov had been receiving his own ration of shame. He didn't even try to refute it, especially since the international press had not bothered him much, he only insisted that every critique is an impermissible interference in the internal matters of the Sovereign USSR.

Since the argument about interference doesn't impress anybody anymore, this is another success of Belgrade. It has been established in Belgrade that each nation has the right to be interested in the fate of a man in another. Of course, Belgium cannot impose monarchy on Russia, cannot teach good press manners on "newspapermen" who write in *Warsaw Life*. But the same Belgium can in Belgrade be interested in human rights in Poland in general, and, for example, in the human rights of Michnik in particular (Ed: Michnik - one of the leaders of opposition movement in Poland.)

Surely, it isn't all entirely clear to persons from "over there." Recently I published an article about how Ceausescu harasses Hungarians in Transylvania. The article caused a diplomatic intervention in which my interlocutor had not even mentioned the fate of the persecuted Hungarians, had not questioned a single word of my article, he only protested (according to instruction he received) against my criticizing the head of the Party and State. "Let your party criticize the head of our government and our parties and we'll be even," I answered.

A similar encounter occurred in Belgrade. When Vorontzov complained of

"interference", Goldberg said: "Don't restrain yourself, go on, complain. Don't think, if you stop telling lies on my theme, I'll stop telling the truth on yours..."

Vorontzov found a riposte against it. A typical Soviet one: He used contempt - addressing Goldberg - "judge". Only in the USSR, the state of class justice the word "judge" may be an insult. Further, he seemed sorry that the times are gone when not judges but Vishinsky - the General Public Prosecutor had been sentencing in cases of human rights. However, Vorontzov wasn't able to create at the Belgrade conference table an atmosphere of the famous Moscow lawsuits. Also, he wasn't able - despite the stifled final communique - to erase the precedential importance of Belgrade where for the first time the delegates of governments have so tediously worked on the problems connected with human rights. The press has not reported it all because the conference was "boring" - as one of my colleagues told me, but the permanent conclusion is: From Belgrade, none of the serious international conferences will be able to eliminate human rights from its agenda. For the USSR it is a perspective neither enjoyable nor victorious, and it is so despite the triumphant fanfares of the Soviet press and the seeming humiliation of the West.

The delegates in restroom

Third, what had come to the light in Belgrade was a phenomenon a certain diplomat called "the erosion of the collective mentality of the East."

It's a somewhat optimistic view, but no doubt, Belgrade is an important phase of weakening the Eastern-supported "at any price" - unity. The fronde of Romania had proved that it's possible to talk and behave differently than Moscow wishes, and that, in spite of it, the red sky doesn't go in flames. Ceaurescu, although he ostentatiously cut himself off from Moscow several times, has not only survived, but celebrated his 60th birthday in such grandeur that, by comparison, the celebrations of Stalin's and Brezhnev's birthdays looked like a kindergarten party for my children some time ago in Warsaw.

It is a lesson much more instructive than it may appear. A certain acquaintance of mine - a veteran of Helsinki and Belgrade described it to me in this flowery language: "When during the Geneva preparations for Helsinki, the Romanians - at that time, rather cautiously, were opposing the Russians, then the Hungarians were always, as if by incident, in the restroom, and the Poles, Czechoslovaks and East Germans took, without any ado, the side of Russians. However, when in Belgrade a Romanian quite openly criticized the Kremlin, Hungarians - unprotesting, were in the conference hall, the Poles, incidentally, were in the restroom, and Vorontzov could truly count only on Czechoslovaks, Bulgarians and Germans."

Slowly and silently, the Communist Peoples Republics learn how to maneuver on the waves of great international conferences. In this process, we may discern certain special - perhaps useful - "method". For example: A Polish delegate, behind the scenes of the Belgrade Conference proposed the idea of calling

the next conference to Warsaw. The idea instantly failed, but in the minds of Belgian diplomats remained an impression of the "courage" of their Polish colleagues. Not so impressive were the proposals of disarming the West made by some of the Eastern diplomats - including the diplomats of the Polish People's Republic. The latter, distinctly inspired, warned Western negotiators to behave carefully so that Brezhnev - a real democrat and peace lover - would not be perturbed when he repeals the attacks of hard liners in the Kremlin, and that in connection with it, a special stress on human rights - a question very sensitive in the Kremlin - should not be practiced.

In all, it may be too early to make a categorical conclusion that "erosion" in the East is underway, but, on the other hand, it all has a ring that in the West grows a feeling for need of differentiated relations with individual Communist Peoples Democracies.

At the gate of Lubyanka

Nobody with an ounce of brain would have hoped that Goldberg's retorts in Belgrade would open the gate of Lubyanka. Even if Belgrade would have achieved full success with regards to human rights, it would not prevent the tightening of the screw in Moscow - if the Kremlin wished to do so. In accordance with Marxist logic such a tightening should have occurred - just to show that it has nothing in common with the babbling in Belgrade or elsewhere.

That is why I was pleasantly surprised at the fact, that Belgrade has had certain restraining or even "liberalizing" (*pardonnez l'expression*) influence on the

behavior of Eastern authorities. During the conference not a single serious political trial occurred in Moscow, although prisoners were ready - waiting in Lefertov. The Russians' only order to bring action against Lederer and the Chapter 77 was given to Husak. This attempt failed, the reaction of the Czechoslovaks was too violent and the Russians limited their activities to several announcements that they soon will begin trials.

It isn't coincidental, that during the Belgrade Conference, Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia enacted amnesties for political prisoners. It's true too that the Russians during the same time decided to deprive gen. Grigorenko of Soviet citizenship, but characteristically, they announced this decision after the Belgrade Conference ended. Paul Goma, a Romanian writer, told me that when he was in jail in Bucharest, although completely isolated from the outside world, he could immediately feel the changes that had been happening in the West: When it was quiet and no visitors were inquiring about him or other prisoners, then, he was beaten by the comrades from the security police. However, when his name was mentioned in Belgrade or elsewhere and aired by Free Europe, then, he was treated with coffee with cream.

I beg your pardon, I'm not a madman. I know that the trials may begin at any moment, that when this edition of *Kultura* reaches its readers, it may already be that Shcharanski or Orlov are convicted. I know also that Belgrade isn't enough, and if it hadn't been for the strikes of the workers or the Catholic Church's position in Poland, the strike of the miners in Romania, the members of the Polish Committee for Defense of the Workers wouldn't have been

freed from the jails, and Goma wouldn't have been drinking beer with me in a Brussels' bistro.

And here we arrive at the fifth success of Belgrade: The repulsion of human rights has been one of the most short-sighted moves of the Kremlin. I don't know whose personal idea it was, but it was the worst game ever played by Russians. What they wanted to remove from the field of vision in Belgrade, that is human rights, became most visible there. The "reward" for removal of the human rights paragraph from the final communique is its unwritten but universally known presence. By removing human rights from the communique, the Russians placed them, in general, on the agenda of the world situation.

The future belongs to us and depends on us, is in our own hands. We cannot win by writing necrologies. Cynicism of *real-politics* should induce in us no despair but the will to put more demands. We must realize that, in Belgrade, this cynicism produced some remarkable ideas, which were able to pull even the tired and sick of East martyrology opinion of the Western intellectuals out of indifference.

The initiatives that for the first time could prove truly successful were born there. Prof. Lvoff, the French Nobel Prize laureate, came to Belgrade to convince the Conference that there is a pertinency in joining the scientist's work with the question of human rights. He didn't succeed in getting permission to see Vorontzov (who doesn't talk with anybody), but Prof. Lvoff managed, despite the opposition of Yugoslavian hosts, to, from Belgrade, demand a boycott of scientists against the countries which

violate human rights. Prof. Lvoff, who talked in the name of the four international organizations with a membership of over 7,000 scientists, cited examples (not just by incident) of Argentine and the USSR, proposing a boycott against the World Congress of Oncologists in Buenos Aires, and calling on scientists to break contacts with universities and research institutes of the USSR, and, what is most important, to stop admitting Soviet scientists to Western laboratories. "Russia needs us, not we Russia" - he said - "such a boycott will be a success. The Soviet Academy of Sciences realizes it, its members remember how costly the affair of Lysenko and broken ties with Western science was and still is".

The final communique from Belgrade was announced exactly 40 years after *Anschluss* and almost exactly 40 years after Munich... It is a spectacular comparison, but it isn't accurate. 1978 isn't 1938, the world is not doomed to become helpless. I mean, I hope not, because for example, the French daily, *Le Monde* did draw from the Belgrade conference the worst, I think, conclusion, ending its - by the way, very poor editorial, with the question: "Madrid, what for?"

The answer is simple. First, the final communique doesn't represent the whole of what has been done in Belgrade, and the great daily paper should absolutely know it and write about it. Second, Madrid's purpose is to give the West a chance to behave differently - not in the way the West behaved in Munich. Third, the Helsinki act provided only one "examination" conference. In this context, then, Madrid was taken out of the Soviets' hands. Belgrade had not locked, but had opened a new door. This terrific occasion should

be properly used by us and by the press. Sakharov, Kuron, Djilas and Michailov evaluated Belgrade as an advantageous political event. Let the daily press not be more dissenting than dissidents are. If the dailies cannot help, then, they should, at least, stop hurting the cause. Stupid questions won't bring progress...

Once (again I don't know when) a certain gambler turned to Talleyrand, and complained that his partners after catching him cheating threw him out of the second floor window. Talleyrand advised him: "If you must cheat, play on the ground floor..."

The Kremlin must cheat. It plays on the ground floor. If we cannot throw it out through the window, we should learn how to play with it...

BRUKSELCZYK

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 5/6

Aug. 1978

by

Charles Joel

BOHDAN OSADCZUK - WHAT'S HAPPENING IN GERMANY

GUSTAW HERLING-
GRUDZINSKI - DIARY WRITTEN AT NIGHT
(an excerpt)

(W.K.) SPECTATOR - FROM DIPLOMATIC CIRCLES

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" No 3/366, 4/367]978, published in Paris, France.

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

WHAT'S HAPPENING IN GERMANY

The old, frayed notions about Germany and Germans are still in vogue; that ideal harmony order and obedience to law dominate, that insubordination, resistance to revolutionary ideas are outlandish there. Along with it all it is forgotten, that, for example, 3 men - Luther, Marx and Hitler - created lots of confusion in the world history and politics. We could add the two world wars, the first which for the Germans were partially responsible, and the second which was entirely and exclusively of their own making. However, since the last war, which the Germans paid heavily for and after which they were pushed into a new arrangement of a divided Germany, the world has become used to looking at the two Germanys as a stabilizing element of the post-Yalta system. On the background of the two "economic miracle" - the great one in West and the small in East Germany - the people in both, the West and the East got used to treating the German question with optimism. During the last quarter century the German June 1953 and the Polish-Hungarian October 1956 ideological revolts have been forgotten. And when after periods of "cold war" "coexistence," "relaxation" became fashionable and all plans for a united Germany were buried thus strengthening the provisorium of Yalta and Potsdam with a net of agreements of the Federal German Republic with the USSR, Polish People's Republic and East Germany, many people

believed that the German nationalism had become impossible to realize. All the bureaucracies of the contemporary world - except the Chinese - had comfortably reposed, and the postHelsinki euphoria - though for a short time - helped to deepen this feeling.

The simmering kettle of the diplomatic colony of the East Berlin began to boil. On the other side of the Berlin Wall the delegations of all nations began to gather. The allies in the West Berlin vehemently started a liquidation of all their agencies and bureaus which heretofore, had been engaged in the studies of the East German phenomenon. The Americans in the Munich radio stations had done their self-destructing action long before. Newspapers and radio stations from West Germany, and some from West European countries began to strive for the accreditation of their correspondents in the regime of Honecker. Mutual compliments and platitudes were exchanged, mutual realism and loyalty to relaxation were praised, ideological "bruderschafts" were drunk with "Moscow" or Polish "wyborowa" vodka. Whoever, in this inebriation in the vision of the new days that come, did not participate, or, even (what a horror!) tried to spoil the romance by reminding some of the not too nice facts, as for example, psychiatric asylums or gulags of Brezhnev or murders committed at the Berlin Wall, he, automatically, was acclaimed a suspicious character, an enemy of relaxation, and adherent of return to the "cold war."

The surprises of relaxation

The architects of relaxation politics

did not anticipate what impact it may have on the East-West relations in East Europe and, particularly, in the divided Germany. Evidently, they overestimated the resistance of the communist bureaucratic regimes to some of the new developments, which in the opinion of the official theoreticians and practitioners as well, were supposed to be only a side product of the increased cooperation and security on the international platform - without any threat to the stabilization of internal affairs on both sides of the border between the spheres of influence of the systems. It appeared, that within the Soviet zone the interpretations of and practical approach to relaxation of the politically enlightened social groups were entirely different. Pretty soon it became clear that the Soviet oligarchy under the auspices of the Brezhnev group and connected with it reigning satellite establishments gaining, in fact, a guaranteed *status quo* - so much and so long desired - had also confronted the endeavors of various environments which in the new agreements perceived a chance to bring some reforms into the benumbed system, and began to fight for them.

As a result of the agreements of the governing Party bureaucracies in East Europe with West Germany and their flirtation with West German capitalism, the scarecrow of German revenge has been officially burried; we must remember that it was a scarecrow which for 20 years effectively served Soviet propaganda in the USSR as well as satellite countries. It is characteristic, however, that during the workers' revolt in Poland in Dec., 1970, and later in June, 1976, the question of German revenge had not played any role, and the authorities

did not use it either for repression or propaganda. On the other hand it is worthwhile to recollect, that both social revolts in Polish Peoples Republic had burst out almost immediately after Poland's successful attempts of normalization of relations with the German Federal Republic, that is - after Gomulka's Warsaw agreement in Dec., 7, 1970, and Gierek's successful visit with Chancellor Schmidt in June, 1976 - just before the revolts in Radom and Ursus. In both these cases the leaders of the P.P.R. outsmarted themselves by not detecting what effect these agreements with "rich" Germans may have on the psychology of working masses of Poland.

If, however, such psychological changes have developed during the 7 years even in Poland - where the threat of German revenge has been greater than in other, so called, Peoples Democracies, it's easy to imagine how many things have changed in general from 1968. The military occupation of Prague, the "Brezhnev doctrine," and, above all, the position of China toward the USSR, have filled the void created by the ideological indifference of the whole Western political camp, irrespective whether one believed in "relaxation" or not, whether one was in the saddle of power or was in the opposition. The Chinese definitions of "new czars" and of Moscow "Socialistic imperialism" hit the mark. It's not important whether the Chinese model suits the oppressed nations or not. Besides, the Chinese don't pretend to transplant their experiments or failures over to the highly developed

societies of the East and Middle Europe, but it's a fact that the way they relate to Moscow is not only applauded by the opposition in the Soviet Bloc, but - to a degree - helps to build up the morale and courage of the opposition.

Two faces of Loyatism, and the German nationalism.

After the defeat of the US and its allies in South Vietnam, of the 3 divided postwar countries there remain only the two: Korea and Germany. Let's forget Korea, and take a look at the question of Germany. One doesn't need to be a prophet, in order to state that the problem of divided Germany shall be during the coming decades a key political issue of Europe. All the other unattended nationalistic matters in the closed ethnic regions shall, of course, remain actual as internal affairs, and even, considering the Soviet imperialism, a theme of international disputes and quarrels, but, in comparison to the German question - they are and shall remain a secondary problem.

That's why a certain stir in the stagnant German waters - the stagnant waters in which until recently many diplomats and newsmen believed - is the first omen of the new approaching waves.

With all the historic, transitory, philosophic and international deviations, the situation of contemporary Germany reminds us of the situation of the post-partition Poland in XIX century, partially after the Congress of Vienna, and also after the Jan, 1863 Polish resurrection. The differences in these 2 situations might

be an interesting object of scientific studies. Here let's limit our efforts to pointing out similarities, which are plentiful. As with Poland after the Congress in Vienna we may compare the endeavors of the main powers to pacify the German national question in the frame of agreements and on the basis of the double loyalty of the governments in Bonn and in the East Berlin. Even the existence of the West Berlin - of no importance in today's political sense - may be compared to the Cracow Republic under the control of Austria, Russia and Prussia.

It isn't coincidental that the main architect of the American politics of relaxation, Kissinger, considers Metternich his spiritual father. And, Brezhnev's politics has much in common with the politics of the czar Nicolay I, who was recognized by his contemporaries as a creator and proponent of the international cooperation of these times. Of course, what we are talking about is the existence of certain situations which originated from international agreements and their contradictory developments, similar to current agreements that violate the basic nationalistic and moral rights. The two faces of loyalism could act for as long as they served German citizens in both states in the restoration of economy and achievement of a fair existence. This period may be considered as "an epoch of organic work." We may add, that, on one hand, the provisional arrangement without a guaranteed *status quo* allowed the citizens to hope for some changes, but,

on the other, this situation of uncertainty deprived them of the courage to undertake any bold action in the game of European and World Powers.

This strange dichotomy still weighs on the German mentality, expressing itself continually in politics and journalism and even private talks of people who think in political terms.

But a more important derivation from the agreements of the German Federal Republic with the East is that the middle-aged, and, above all, all the younger generations - unburdened with Hitlerian crimes, learn from the middle - Eastern Europe situation a lesson which may produce the destruction of the double-faced loyalism. This process throws light on how new ideas are surfacing in East Germany. It further may be illustrated by a seeming paradox which has occurred and which I attempt to describe. The main advocate and the author of all the plans for the new Eastern politics of Bonn, Egon Bahr, published in 1963 his thesis "The Changes Resulting from Reconciliation" (*Wandel durch Annäherung*). During the subsequent years, owing to the Bonn-East Berlin agreements, many mass meetings of Germans from the East and the West have occurred; of course, these meetings were the result of one-directional movements - across the Berlin Wall. In fact, about 11 million West Germans visit in the eastern part of divided Germany each year, while from the opposite direction only pensioners - men over 65, and women over

60 - are allowed to come across. The purpose of these meetings are not only family matters, comparison of prices or condition of daily life. There are also the heart to heart night talks which are beyond the reach of either the East German security police, or the institutes of public opinion research of the West. It appears that everything that Bahr wrote about in 1963, has come true. Most of the things came out of these meetings, out of the practical aspects of relaxation between the two different systems, and, finally, out of the influence of mass media in Federal Republic, which cover the entire territory of the East Germany, and are the main means of information for its inhabitants. In brief, East Germany, because of the Russian hegemony, the impossibility of free travel to the West and the mass influx of West Germans, became a Piedmont of reborn nationalism and agitation.

The East German regime, following the teaching of its Russian professors, as it appears now, pursued a very risky game, resorting to the banishment of writers, scientists, actors, and unbecoming intellectuals, forgetting that there is a colossal difference between banishing Russians from Russia and Germans from the divided Germany. The present situation in this respect has reached a point at which, a group of the outlawed East Germany intellectuals became sort of a new

party, not literally in a sense of a parliamentary - political game, but in the context of influencing the public opinion on both sides of the Berlin Wall. Under the condition of a technological revolution and the previously mentioned functions of the mass media which in West Germany are not an object of governmental politics but have a wide autonomy, the outlaws from East Germany increasingly resemble the advocates of national affairs. It is an oscillating movement, evading control of the doubly loyal governing powers of both states. Ideas born in East Germany are signaled to the West in various ways, through the millions of people returning from visits in the East, students crossing in masses to the East, or through many other channels. Those ideas or programs, or only inventions and "fuses" return on the airwaves of radio and TV to the German Democratic Republic and turn into a subject of everyday talk not only in the privacy of homes, but also in institutions, factories, offices, etc. This oscillating movement produced the Manifest of Leftist opposition under the name "Organization of German Communists." It represents only one among many declarations of various groups that undermine the *status quo* of East Germany.

The crisis of loyalism

The Manifest evoked a real storm in governing establishments of both Germanys; also annoyed the Russians and

Americans. Communist regimes at once declared it a provocation conceived in the offices of West German Intelligence. Soon after, the leader of Social-Democratic parliamentary Party in Bonn, Herbert Wehner, went along, more or less, the same line in reverse, speaking about the provocation inspired not in the West but in the East Germany, and aimed at the basics of normalization and relaxation politics. It seems to me a strange way of dealing with the history of socio-ideological changes. The gentlemen who expressed such views don't seem to realize that oppositional movement on the bosom of the Soviet Bloc had begun already - using the language of Lenin - as an infantile disease of revisionism, and went along the line that was initiated by Sakharov, and followed by oppositions in the Ukraine, Lithuania, Poland and Czechoslovakia, cutting off the ties with the old model of Party reformism.

After many years of stagnation, the acceleration of the pace of opposition movements in East Germany, has, of course, deeper and larger foundations than those mentioned above. This acceleration results from more than just the transition of one generation to another and dissatisfaction with the postYalta and postPotsdam order. Various tides in the contemporary systems of international powers have effect on it also. The most important force that undermines the loyalty to the occupational powers is, obviously, the influence of ideas

flowing to East Germany from the West, and, in this process, more than modest role play the consequences of the so called open frontier that was established by the 1971 agreement between Gierke and Honecker. We shouldn't forget that across the boundary at Elbe and Nysa millions of Germans and Poles flow each year. And that at the resulting meetings of people there are more than just talks about sugar, kielbasa and gasoline. Mutual fructification of opposition spirit against Moscow and her hegemony, as well as against native satraps, results.

The other side of the question we are discussing is the internal crisis of the communist system in East Germany, similar to that in Poland. It's derived from the politics of consumptive socialism. Appealing to materialistic values, it evoked in East Germany a double morality in government and its agencies, leading to corruption unheard of in German history. There is a most popular slogan: "What is worse? To go to work in Siberia, or to live here - without playing the con game". The regime of Honecker created two types of shops: one selling at prices for the poor, and another - with double prices for the rich. It established within the country a free market for foreign currencies, especially for dealing with West German mark. It gave Party officials a chance to get rich in many possible ways: building dachas, buying yachts, foreign cars, etc. There are 2 categories of people in

East Germany: to one belong those who own foreign currencies, thieves, con men; to another, those without foreign money, clumsy and naive. Between these two categories there still exist a third - probably the most numerous - group of people recruited from the dissatisfied, frustrated, wanting a change. This picture of the internal situation in the circumstance of the divided nation ties up with nationalism and the drift toward the unified Germany. However, the people who are mature and able to act politically represent only a small fraction in relation to the governing clique. We may say that a new historical phenomenon is in the making, that from the sum of internal contrasts, there grows an oppositional tendency exemplified in the afore mentioned "Manifest." It has surprised the government in Bonn and the Christian - Democratic opposition. However, both political camps are so much entangled in quarrels pertaining to internal troubles, such as, terrorism, unemployment, approaching elections in federal "lands" - corresponding more or less to the Swiss cantons or states in the US, - or in the still unattended social problems like pensions and welfare of elders. Consequently, there is no time in the parliament and within the political parties for discussions on wider national issues. However, a main characteristic of this picture is the lack of any serious concept in relation to the other part of the German nation, and, hence, to the East Europe in general. Loyalism leads to stagnation

which becomes universal; it refers not only to the government, but also to the opposition which in all basic political debates avoids answering the more important questions.

Bohdan OSADCZUK

DIARY WRITTEN AT NIGHT
(an excerpt)

Boris Suvarin published in 1953 a sketch written jointly with Valentinov - Volski, *Caligula in Moscow, casus pathological of Stalin*. On the basis of confidential conversations with high ranking Soviet functionaries (supposedly collected by Valentinov - Volski, and old friend of Lenin), Suvarin analyses a "paranoic psychosis" of Stalin, a diagnosis of which was made probably in 1937 by 2 Kremlin doctors ordered shot by the despot a year later.

But who was Caligula? Son of Germanicus, successor of Tiberius, according to legend, lost, in his childhood, his parents and two older brothers because of Tiberius. Soon after the ascension to the throne he became seriously ill. Barely after recovery, he began a "Caligula" carousel of trials for treasons, acts of cruelty and despotic whims. He ordered the killing of a prefect of the pretorian guard to whom he owed his enthronement. Announcing claims to Divinity he ordered the erection of his many monuments. Drusilla, his idolized

sister, received post-mortem the title of Divine: the first case of bestowing this kind of honor on a Roman woman. Her widower perished on his order. Caligula died assassinated. Many people ascribed his crimes and madness to the psychological effects of disease. In other words, it has been suspected that the fight against death during his prolonged illness had inoculated him with some form of insanity. Historians are skeptical at some of the proofs of "Caligula" madness, for example, they made a legend of a true story that Caligula nominated his own horse a consul.

Worshiping the Divine has not been just a sign of family platonic love; Drusilla was sister and lover of her brother. This historical fact became a literary axis for Camus' *Caligula*. In the author's introduction to the American edition of this drama, there is a statement about "the world, which at the death of his sister - lover became for Caligula an object of poisoning disdain and hatred"; about the shock that brought the emperor to the "repulsion of friendship and love, common human solidarity, good and evil."

It would be - and for how many reasons! - an abuse to go too far into the problem of a literary relationship of Stalin and Caligula, but we shouldn't entirely overlook the role which the suicidal death of Nadyezda Allilulyeva in Nov. 1932 played in the life of the Moscow despot. We know little about it. Even if we, *cum grano salis*, approved a story of Svyetlana in her *Twenty Letters*,

there is, in addition an episode quoted in the biography of Stalin, written by Deutschner, which, I think, came out of some credible sources: Stalin only once after the demise of his second wife, tendered his resignation from the position of *gensek*; the resignation, of course, was not accepted.

And now, I run into another contribution to the problem, a small one though, but very significant:

There appeared recently a book in English of Alexandr Gladkov, *Meetings with Pasternak*. The most interesting thing in it to me is a long introduction written by Max Hayward. The English russicist digs up a 1958 article of Koryakov, unknown until now. "It seems certain" - writes Koryakov - "that the pathological side of Stalin's nature had been deepened by the tragedy in his personal life, the suicide of Nadyezda." Maddening paranoia "that overwhelmed him in 1937 and later in the postwar years, could have been rooted in this experience." In 1953 the "personality cult" was blossoming for good, so that the communique about the death of Nadyezda (false - the cause of her death was reported as an inflammation of peritoneum) produced an avalanche of stereotype condolences. A stereotype condolence also was the letter of the Soviet Writers Union, published on the first page of the *Literaturnaya Gazeta*. Pasternak did not sign it, but enclosed his own statement on this matter: "I share the feeling of comrades. Yesterday (before the dis-

closure of Allilulyeva's death) I thought deeply and intensively about Stalin; as a poet for the first time. This morning I read the news. I have been shaken, as if I were there, living at his side, as it I saw it." According to Koryakov these words must have had awaken superstitious feelings in Stalin, that Pasternak as a great poet had a gift of magic vision. Further, Koryakov believes, that this fact induced Stalin to spare Pasternak's life and to display a peculiar protection over him during the years of persecutions.

Two years later, in 1934, Stalin made a telephone call to Pasternak. We know the exact course of their conversation from the reports of Achmatova and Nadyezda Mendelschtam. Stalin informed Pasternak that his and Achmatova's intercession on behalf of Osip Mendelschtam (through Bucharin) had succeeded. Pasternak added that he would like to see Stalin and talk with him face to face. "About what?" - asked Stalin. "About life and death" - replied Pasternak. Stalin hung up the receiver.

Gustaw HERLING - GRUDZINSKI

FROM DIPLOMATIC CIRCLES

The recall of the US ambassador in Warsaw, Richard T. Davies has been received in Poland with mixed feelings. He held this post after the transfer of resourceful diplomat Walter Stoessel (who later became the US undersecretary of State and the US ambassador in Moscow and Bonn.) Richard T. Davies has been

known in Warsaw since postwar times, when during the "Mikolajczyk epoch," he performed various functions in the US embassy. In his 4 year tenure as ambassador, at unquestionable social valors and with good mastery of the Polish language, he distinguished himself by his unusual compliance with the decisions of authorities of Polish Peoples Republic, and by a dislike toward any opposition against them. In his loyalty to the Polish government he was known for his opportunistic advances and even blunt neglect of obvious - one would think - moral and propagandistic interests of the US. For example, he allowed the Polish press not to mention a word about the fact that the US granted \$500 million for grain purchases. The Polish press ignored completely the first phase of the transaction which amounted to \$300 million (as it appears, the negotiations in this matter were conducted in Warsaw by Sen. McGovern in August, 1977), and its second phase that was realized by undersecretary Juanita Creps, who, in November and December was in Warsaw, preparing for Carter's visit to Poland. The president's reference to the question of a loan on the well known press conference was camouflaged in the Polish press in such "artful" manner, that nobody in Poland could even guess what it all is about. Ambassador Davies did not react to this "boycott" by the Polish press, nor did he consider it important to reveal the acts of the Polish censure, which issued an order of prohibition of writing about the bicentennial of the US independence.

However, after being informed about his recall, ambassador Davies decided to show a little of the dignity and backbone, which he had shown during the New Year reception at the residence of the president of the Polish Council. He ostentatiously left the ceremony because the speech of the dean of diplomatic corps, the USSR ambassador, S. Pilatovitch was begun with: "Dear Comrades!" (this was documented in the multilingual callendar.) "I'm not a Comrade." - ambassador announced, and left the reception in the company of his wife. Indeed, in view of what we said above, it wasn't the most important among many possible protests.

The successor of R.T. Davies in the US Warsaw embassy will be William Schaufele, a man, we hear, of great intelligence, but also a man who didn't get accreditation in ... Greece, because in a reckless speech he granted Turkey one of the Greek islands. We hear that Richard T. Davies is trying fervently (and has a chance) to get the post of the director of "Free Europe" and "Liberty," radio stations whose activities he frequently criticized and held in contempt. His success in getting this position, would further diminish the US prestige in East Europe which draws the only objective informative material accessible in daily life from these stations.

(W.K.) SPECTATOR

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 5/7

Sept. 1978

by

Charles Joel

Jozef LOBODOWSKI

ALEXANDR GALICZ

Edward MOZEJKO

SKETCHES RELATING TO THE

PHYSIOLOGY OF

CONTEMPORARY DESPOTISM*

*/ Efim Etkin, *Zapiski Niezagoworszczika*.
London: Overseas Publications Interchange,
1977.

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 5/368/1978 published in Paris, France.

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

EDITOR'S NOTE

The author of "Alexandr Galicz" - the article you are about to read, in his post-script says: "Some parts of my translation may appear to the Polish reader rough, not too diligent. I think immodestly, that the blame for it should be equally shared by the author himself and the translator. Restless, constantly changing rhythms - controlled more by the technique of guitar playing than by the traditional verse construction, create continual difficulties. The imagism of Galicz is greatly capricious, often touching surrealism; associations, almost always remote. The same may be said about assonances, so incomplete that they most often pass into dissonances. Polish speech is much less flexible than poetic Russian for attaining the full power of expression of Galicz's songs. After weighing all the pluses and minuses, I consider the translation as hardly satisfactory. If I knew how to play guitar, perhaps, the translation could have been better."

In view of the above, I'm afraid that a full length English translation of the material selected by the author (translated from Russian into Polish) would further darken its beauty, therefore, I'm choosing only a few short excerpts - hardly affording the reader a glimpse at the whole meaning of A. Galicz's songs.

C.J.

ALEXANDR GALICZ

Alexandr Galicz, the Russian writer and minstrel died tragic death. He was born in 1919, therefore he lived 58 years. Initially he was engaged in writing dramas and in the movie industry. However, his best creations had been censored and never saw the lights of theatre. At the beginning of the Sixties, Galicz took to poetic singing with guitar accompaniment, and soon became the most popular singer in the whole Soviet Union. His songs recorded privately (illegally) have been passing from hand to hand, and became universally known (similarly to the songs of Balat Okudzave, famous Gruzyn, creating in the Russian language). Soon Galicz and his guitar became an object of KGB attention. It couldn't be otherwise.

Almost all of his songs contain sharp political accents, satiric critique of the Soviet way of life, moral contempt expressed sometimes in a form of comical grotesqueness, and most often in caustic, unmerciful pamphlet. To one of the collections of these poems-songs he gave a meaningful title: "The Generation of Condemned." I think it would be interesting to quote some fragments from "The Guitar of Galicz" - the preface to this collection, written by A. Droz:

"In their wholeness these songs are... an encyclopedia of our contemporary Russian reality. In the songs of Galicz - the whole of Russia. The Russia which is active, and Russia inactive. Active - the one that chooses as it has been choosing through centuries: Freedom, or denouncing. Many choose the latter... And the others? The others are dying in the gulags of Norilsk and Vorkuta, cry in desperation, cry from the

harms endured, from pain, from hunger, lose their wits and end their lives in a suicide...

"But in the poems of Galicz there is also another Russia - Russia the inactive, people who do not choose anything: neither a dacha in a countryside, nor the death in Kolyma - people who just live on our globe where everything for one reason or another now goes 'obliquely'. They haven't done anything to be blamed for, and do not understand anything; they simply found themselves between the grindstones of history, which have broken them down, mutilated their lives and their personalities, erased every meaning of morality, virtue and sin. Yes, a madhouse became the best place to relax in this 'automotive century': 'In a madhouse - there is life beyond expectation! You want - you go to sleep, you want - you sing!' And automatically you ask yourself: where actually is this madhouse? Is it within its walls, or outside them?"

It was, of course, too much for censors, fawners, denunciators, executioners - once for all stigmatized in Galicz's songs. Galicz was thrown out of all the organizations to which - because of his works he belonged: from the Soviet Writers Union, movie makers organization, Literary Foundation (before him, the same "distinction" was awarded to Solzhenitsyn). Subjected to continual persecutions, in 1974 he was forced to leave Russia. He died, as I mentioned, prematurely, in a tragic accident caused by an electrical wire short. What remained after him are his songs. It's of no importance that they don't reach audiences in the West; it is important that they continue to

resound in his country, and, as we know from many sources, are listened to - always illegally - by thousands, hundreds of thousands, principally by the youth.

These songs resound in this tragic country, where - according to the Galicz's lyrics - in order to forget the reality you must drink a full bottle of vodka on an empty stomach; and you have also a rope to hang yourself. "The sevenstring guitar - a charmer" has sung about terrible things. Not falling into despair, but accusing. In the hands of an artist it has been a high velocity weapon.

"The Generation of Condemned" - a collection I just have mentioned is poetically very rough. I suspect, although I'm not sure, that Galicz has been often improvising and didn't care much about giving spontaneously created songs an appropriate polish. But I think this was connected with the kind of art he practiced. A very interesting phenomenon itself, and it's a great pity that it has passed unnoticed by the West. In the most totalitarian, police, militaristic country there was reborn something like the institution of medieval troubadours, bards, minstrels, minnesingers... But those, a long time ago, sang about love, real or imagined, glorifying the beauty of princesses and castellans' daughters and sometimes the deeds of mighty protectors. Their heirs in the Soviet Union are the poets of protest and uncompromising flight.

Oh yes! - you would say - here in the West there also exists and flourishes a song-protest immersed completely in social problems. Famous Atahualpa Yupanqui, South American Indian who sings to the

accompaniment of a guitar, isn't he a counterpart of Galicz? Undoubtedly, but only to a certain degree, because there are the differences - the most fundamental differences. The Western songsters, even these who are most revolutionary, appear in public without the slightest hindrance, their recordings are legally sold by thousands, they make fortunes, none of them is under repression, none of them is banished. They practice their art without censorship and actually enjoy unlimited freedom. In the capitalistic West the song-protest brings fat earnings; in the "fatherland of proletariat" - prison, labor camps, the madhouse, and, at best a forced banishment. There is no chance of putting the equality sign between these two situations.

"The Generation of Condemned" is divided in "I Choose Freedom," "The Clouds Over Abakan," "Erika Makes Four Copies," "Ballades and Poems." In the latter the crown should be given to "Kadysh" supplemented with author's note. "Kadysh is the Jewish mourning prayer which a son says in memory of his father." And further: "This poem is dedicated to the memory of a great Polish writer, a surgeon and pedagogue, Jacob Goldschmidt (Janusz Korczak), who perished together with his pupils from the Warsaw Orphanage, in the extermination camp at Treblinka.

*I'm tired of repeating it stubbornly,
That I fall and return again as if coming home.
I'm not able to pray - forgive me, Lord God.
I'm not able to pray - forgive me, Lord, and help.*

*

"I don't wish anybody anything wrong, I simply don't know how to do it..."

Janusz Korczak "Diary."

.

Echelon by echelon departs from Warsaw,
The ghetto becomes deserted, brightness
changes into darkness
and, a star winks through the window...
saying farewell, echelons depart,
and I say farewell to my own self.

.

Seven days for us created God,
and the devil - the seventh string...
and not in vain it occurs
that this number from other numbers's
chosen,
because, please look: even the rainbow
is woven of the seven hues...

.

I'd always done what I could have,
I didn't rebel against my fate
and I'll answer in my last confession,
if God will be a childish God;
- O Lord, I don't ask you for anything,
whatever I desired, you granted...
but, please - deliver me from hatred
because hatred is not a part of me.

.

Echo'll call me by my old name,
like in a fairy, earth covered by snow -
and I'll again be a child,
in a world of joy and sunshine.

When I'll be a little cloud
and again a little bird,
when I'll be a little boy,
and snow'll smell its freshness
When they'll bring me-half asleep down from
the porch
and I'll wake up to the creak of a sleigh;
when I'll be a little boy
to discover the fascinating world.

.

In the Orphanage there lived a little girl, Natya. After a long illness, she couldn't walk, but, instead, she could draw pictures and compose songs. Here is one of them:

A SONG OF LITTLE NATYA ABOUT A LITTLE SHIP

.

Let the thaw roar in the spring creeks,
then on the bluish, on the deep waters
my ship'll sail to the island of Salvation,
where there are no wars, where there's the
sun and peace.

I pasted my paper ship,
I sang like a finch -
In vain my dreams,
My ship disappeared.
Not in the dreadful waters,
neither in the hell of storm,
but during revision
trampled by soldier's heels...
But let the thaw roar in the spring creeks
and flight of cranes will end all sorrows
to sunny shores, to the island of
Salvation

.

Jozef LOBODOWSKI

SKETCHES RELATING TO THE PHYSIOLOGY
OF CONTEMPORARY DESPOTISM

In the review of *Stalinism* (Ed. R.C. Tucker; among the authors we find also the name of Leszek Kolakowski), published in the last number of *The Times Literary Supplement* of 1977, Geoffrey Hosking wonders to what degree the contemporary Soviet system corresponds to the sociological definition of a totalitarian state. A definition, which theoreticians had given to it, establishes: 1/ a rule of one omnipotent dictator; 2/ the existence of one mass party whose duty is to unite and mobilize society for realization of a certain goal; 3/ avowal of one ideology as official, and, in connection with it, applying heavy control of the state over the education system and all media of information; 4/ and finally, terror by unceasing purges¹ to which everybody - from the highest ranking functionaries that are close to dictator, to the "meakest peasant" - are subjected. G.Hosking compares this scheme to the contemporary situation and doubts if it corresponded to it: there is no longer an omnipotent dictator, terror has eased (*though not disappeared*, hastily adds the author), purges had been replaced by a relative stabilization of bureaucratic

1/ To be more precise in regard to these purges, there are definitely visible two different interpretations. Some people are inclined to consider them a sign of Stalinistic effort to prevent the stiffening or bureaucratizing the party apparatus, which is a prototype of "cultural revolution" known to us from China; some others explain them as the wish to get rid of the Lenin party cadres, which eventually could have opposed Stalin in creating his own concept of Socialism.

apparatus, controlled and one--directional media had been challenged by the underground literature, "samizdat" and "tamizdat." Well, where is that totalitarianism? Does it exist, or not? Have we really left the damned "kingdom of exigency" and stepped into the garden of Eden of freedom proclaimed by Marxists?

I dwell upon the doubts of Hosking - however typical to many Western intellectuals - because they are in a two-fold association with an excellent work of Efm Etkind the *Notes of Non-Conspirator*^{2/}. First, the observations and remarks of Etkind are often directed at the Western reader, and are as though an answer to his doubts which most often emerge from his lack of discernment and naiveness. Second, Etkind opposes abstractive theorizations and creating speculative schemes and brings into the question disputed a most valuable in this case thing: a concrete concept which springs out of his own experience. In this, we recognize a flaw that's well known from the literary works of this prominent critic; his analyses of poetry often force us to revise common theoretical opinions, and lead us to new meditations and generalizations. It's good, that this characteristic is a base, a common denominator of *all* literary activities of Etkind. "Unfortunately - writes Etkind - 'we don't know our society: sociologists have no means to research it, writers, of presenting it in a novel form, historians and philosophers, of evaluating its normalcy. A starting point for all of them is not reality which remains terra incognita for them, but some ideal scheme

2/ Ed.: Excerpts from this work appeared in
FRAGMENTS NO 3/9-10/76

prepared in advance. As long as society remains unresearched, there is nothing to build up in it; and starting from a scheme (either idealistically beautiful, or idealistically repulsive), we shall promote some more or less tempting solutions, which to the same degree will appear utopian" (p.22-23). This remark, although it refers to the Russian intelligentsia, retains its force also in reference to a large fraction of Western intellectuals. Most of all, the complicated, manifold theoretical schemes constructed by the latter, instead of brightening, darken the problem. Meanwhile the truth - and no one else but Marxists insists on it - is real and there is no way out of it. Everyone who comes from the East experienced it more or less on his own; and perhaps it would be wise here to recall a certain concrete situation which would illustrate the well known and universally practiced operation in the Peoples Democracies of changing a label or a wrapping on a certain product. A product becomes a rarity, in time vanishes from the shelves of a shop, and reappears later under a different name or in somewhat changed wrapping, and, of course, at a higher price. People are indignant, grumble, but in the end, having no choice - accept. The State sells - its citizens *must* buy. Well, in this case we deal with a hidden compulsion. On the other plane and in a somewhat different way, the book of Etkind describes the same operation of label changing, or, more precise, what is hiding behind this operation on the higher level of the state machinery, what cosmetics are applied to make it more attractive. Briefly, Etkind describes not what some time ago had carried the name of "dictature of proletariat," but what is today so

beautifully named "socialistic righteousness" or "socialistic democracy." It isn't a question of zeks, of an open terror and lawlessness of the Stalin times when killing was done "in darkness and in silence," without a trial, but of jurisprudence and lynch-law organized with precision and apparently logical, oriented toward the gray, daily existence of a citizen, in order to chicane him, to frighten and, by the same token, to keep him in a slavish obedience. The accused has the right, for example, to call his witnesses who would testify on his behalf, but at the same time these witnesses are exposed to the sanctions of the trade, party, and employers' organizations (Etkind describes such a case in connection with the trial of I. Brodsky: when Etkind appeared as the witness in Brodsky's defense, he was reprimanded by the Union of the Soviet Writers). With all this, in comparison to the past, there is the difference in form: presently, the victims are taken care of in gloves, - "according to..." etc. What is, however, common to both the past and the present? A feeling of omnipresent FEAR soaring above human consciousness.

The work of Etkind gives us a sound analysis of social relations in the Soviet Union in the circumstances, or, if we may use this term, "peaceful" and stable existence of the system. The times are gone when during the nervous breakdowns there perished hundreds of thousands, millions of innocent people; now, it isn't a matter of mass deportations and the liquidation of imaginary or unimaginary enemies, but of exterminating the "parasites" on the spot, in their, let's say, own environment. The nightmare of the past,

however, is deeply embodied in the collective memory of the people and helps the functioning of the "new righteousness" which managed to work out its own, greatly stabilized methods of intimidation: blackmail, falsification, demoralization, fraud, demagogery, organizing "public opinion", employing scum to exterminate every valuable element of society. The repertoire of methods used by the security organs is already well known.

At this point, Etkin's book touches much wider matters, its actuality goes beyond the borders of the Soviet Union and covers the whole geographic territory that we call in short East Europe. That's perhaps why we read his book with such a great interest, in one breath from the first to the last page. If indeed there is somebody who may have doubted the talks about the gradual sovietization of Poland, let him read the book and find out. What is sovietization? First of all, it's the relation of the government to its own citizenry, a relation marked by disdain toward an individual, country, its history and traditions. The main device - humiliation in every possible way; its practical aspect is the obtrusion of decisions that are made up at the top, without any consideration given to the collective disposition of people (a typical example: introduction to the new constitution of the Polish Peoples Republic of the clause about the necessity of conducting friendly politics toward the USSR). However, there is another aspect of this process of obtrusive decision. It is instinctive self-defence, which most often amounts to the acceptance of half-truths, living in an atmosphere of lies which demands constant compromising if one wants to survive, attaining the right to live and

act among one's own kind of people, one's own culture. To get it all, one is often forced to pay high price - the price of one's own dignity. Inasmuch as it is difficult to write about it, Etkind doesn't hide the truth, writes openly and doesn't try to justify his own acts, doesn't wash his hands off, but writes from the position of a participant in just this kind of life.

The main hero of the book is the author himself, the history of his dismissal from the post of a professor, in conjunction with losing all his scientific titles and removal from the Soviet Writers Union. The description of fantastic stupidity and ignorance mingle with unimaginable absurdity. Let's illustrate it by an example taken at random: the author is accused of hostile activities, and the "Etkind case" is fabricated. Initially, the author doesn't believe it, refuses to accept the way his acts are interpreted, doesn't understand what it is that makes a "case" against him; briefly, he doesn't feel guilty of anything. But this state of mind doesn't last long, because in a letter to the secretary of the Leningrad writers organization the accused himself uses the term "my case". Hangman and his victim use the same terminology; there is nothing to talk about; the case becomes real and must be taken care of. Isn't it a Kafka in a realistic edition?

Etkind complains, that contemporary Russian literature is deprived of chances to write about the "feudalists" (the members of the leading hierarchy of contemporary Soviet Union, such as for example, a rector of a university, an editor of a publication) and apparatchiks. It would be useful here to refresh our knowledge of the Russian

tradition of the "natural school" and its physiological sketches. Partially, Etkind does it himself. His book contains lots of people from a great variety of state institutions. Indeed, it is a colorful picture, especially important in the situations where he gives characteristics of hirelings, common pawns who, inspired by stupidity, cynicism, jealousy and sometimes life's necessities, perform the dirty jobs of exterminating chosen victims. The author shows great care in evaluating the moral attitudes of these people, attempts to penetrate the reasons for their behavior, to individualize their silhouettes. It appears that servility or submissiveness was not always dictated by one's ambition for a career, sometimes behind it were hidden much deeper personal reasons. We can see here a full gallery of Soviet critics and professors of the humanities. The official picture of the Soviet critique is brought down to earth, its inside is cracked so that it becomes nearer and clearer to the reader.

Etkind doesn't observe chronological order. The different periods are mixed with each other, which gives an occasion to introducing important events in a chain of constantly progressing destruction of culture by the authorities and the party. For example, we read the history of J. Brodsky's prosecution and the steno from his trial; the description of vandalic destruction of the prepared by Brodsky two volume anthology (25,000 copies) *The Masters of the Soviet Poetic Interpretation*, just only because the ending sentence of its preface stated that "during the well known period, the Russian poets, deprived of chances of expressing themselves in

original creativity, talked to the reader in the language of Goethe, Shakespeare, Hugo..."; the description of Etkind's hopeless fight for publishing his six hundred page long manuscript *The Subject of a Verse* (it will, finally, appear in the West), and several other episodes. A permanent component of Etkind deliberations is also the motif of antisemitism. In the repertoire of the means of discrimination and intimidation, antisemitism plays quite a substantial role.

Ending this writing, I would like to add a few words about the polemic between Etkind and Solzhenitsyn. The author of the *Notes of a Non-Conspirator* warns about disregarding the attraction power of Marxism. No doubt, Marxism has lost its power as a constructive theory, but it still has a certain attraction and audience among these people who want to destroy. Underestimating this threat is theoretically unrealistic, and practically it may become dangerous. Etkind, despite great respect toward the author of *Gulag*, doesn't believe in the efficacy of his moral imperatives as a means against tyranny. He argues: Three years have gone by since the proclamation of Solzhenitsyn's program, but among the two hundred fifty six million people, there is only a miniscule number of people who would accept his simple and uncompromising postulates. In Etkind's opinion, Marxism is a scientific theory and must be contradicted by a consequent, but also scientifically constructed program. What then does he propose? He sees a chance in education, in the role of teachers in education of the future generations. In other words, his is a long range positivistic program, everyday work beyond the basics, hard and persevering.

Here, we may clearly feel the influence of the French rationalistic tradition. Not denying the validity of his reasoning, we find somehow difficult to accept the fact, that Etkind, in such a light-minded manner strikes out the moral uncompromisingness proposed by Solzhenitsyn. First, in today's situation, a certain extreme of formulated programs should be considered natural and understandable. Second, formulating new proposals should not be done at the expense of the already existing programs. The point is, that both these programs should not preclude but complement each other. The future will show which of the proposed roads is the most futile. The educational program proposed by Etkind is also unthinkable without civil courage and a certain idealism of moral intentions.

The book of Etkind is written colorfully and with a verve. There is in it the artistic narration mixed with a newsman's reporting, internal monologue with document, reality with artistry. All of it subjected to one goal - demonstrating the mechanism of despotic activities in the "first country of soyuzes," unmasking a certain manner of existence, a style of existence based on uncertainty.

Edward MOZEJKO

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 5/8

Oct. 1978

by

Charles Joel

Dominik MORAWSKI CORRESPONDENCE FROM ROME
(an excerpt)

Gustaw HERLING-GRUDZINSKI DIARY WRITTEN AT
NIGHT
(an excerpt)

BRUKSEL CZYK AS SEEN FROM BRUSSELS
(excerpts)

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 7/370-371/78 published in Paris, France.

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

CORRESPONDENCE FROM ROME
(an excerpt)

In the second half of 1923, Lenin unexpectedly received the calling card of a Hungarian catholic priest Victor Bede who, dressed as a layman, arrived in Moscow and requested an interview. Lenin remembered him well from Paris, where, as Bede later recollected, they had enjoyed "frequent and hearty personal contacts revolving around the profession of reporting which both practiced." Bede, a coworker of *Osservatore Romano* between the years 1920-1927, described his talks in the Kremlin, in an article titled: "Lenin's Thoughts About Catholicism (personal recollections)"^{1/} The article appeared seven months after Lenin's death (Jan. 21, 1927). The author explained that it appeared in connection with Lenin's testament whose publication had turned the world's attention to the

^{1/} *Pensieri di Lenin sul catholicismo (Ricordi personali)*, *Osservatore Romano*, August 23, 1924. This article which bears no signature, is preceded by editor's note: "A priest, a coworker of our paper, well known to us, sent us his records; there is no need to draw the reader's attention to their importance."

"peculiar personality of the famous creator of Russian Communism." I think, however, that it is more probable that the article for different reasons had rested in the files of editor: The sensational prophecy of Lenin, which is the main subject of the memoirs, agrees with the interests of the Vatican diplomacy of those times. The Moscow diary of the Hungarian priest appeared, for certain, during the time of preparations for the meeting in Berlin of nuncio Pacelli (the future pope Pius XII) with ambassador Litvinov (to be advanced soon to the post of commissar of foreign affairs of the Soviet Union). We may add that parallel to these activities there was also Mussolini with his anti-Vatican campaign and his flirtation with Moscow.

Lenin received Bede in his quarters in the Kremlin. "Did your pope send you?" - he asked. Bede denied it. In his article, however, he stresses that Lenin, besides of the wish to see his old friend, also had in mind a talk with a priest who had just arrived from Rome. The Vatican of those days has been delicately probing the Soviet government for the establishment of official relations. Already in 1919 cardinal Gasparri, the secretary of state of Pope Benedict XV, approached Lenin and caused the release from prison of the catholic archbishop Edward Ropp. In Geneva in 1922 there was the first contact between the chief of the Russian delegation, commissar of foreign affairs, Cziczerin and the plenipotentiary of Vatican and future cardinal, Pizzardo. Resultant of this

contact was that Moscow allowed the papal mission of help to starving Russians to arrive in Russia.^{2/} At the time of Bede's visit with Lenin, that-mission still stayed and acted on Russian territory, and the echo of the trial of 15 catholic bishops and priests, among them of abp. Cieplak, still sounded.

Father Bede states in the beginning of his article that having "perfect papers," whose acquisition he owed to Lenin, he could visit him several times without any problem, especially, since his priesthood was known only to the "omnipotent dictator." The article expresses his admiration toward the dictator, whose "simplicity and openness reminded me rather of an old friend and a reporter, than the leader of the most dreadful revolution in history." In these intimate face to face talks, he writes, "I've got the impression, that the man known universally as a cruel tyrant, was also the victim of his own social concept; he was, against his own will, and by simple common interests of the State, forced to apply mass murders." And, he adds: "despite all this he still is a man of mild disposition,

2/ Monsig. Ratti, Vatican nuncio in Warsaw, also tried to intervene in this matter. But, when he turned to Lenin for permission to travel to Moscow, suggesting that European Russia is a territory which also belongs to his mandate, he received this answer: In Moscow - wrote Lenin - you would be forced to stay at home "avec une sentinelle à la porte, sans la possibilité de voir rien, ni personne." Monsig. Rotti, thereafter elected pope, undiscouraged, has continued his endeavors to build relations with the Soviet regime.

exactly as I knew him in Paris." According to him, it all is a characteristic of men who suffered persecution, years of deportation in Siberia, misery of exile from their own country. In other words he absolves the tyrant in the name of the "common interest of the state," and insists, that "his is a mission carried even to a political mysticism, which restrained in him personal feelings, and made him a dictator who is destined to save mankind by extending all over the world the Soviet system in whose goodness he deeply believed."

"Would you believe me? - he asked one day - although I loath it all, I am compelled to apply radical means for the removal from our society of all hostile elements. You can't deal reasonably with them; you can't reason with a viper which bites you; you kill it! Alas! Many people are ignorant or corrupted, unable to understand the necessity of renouncing their excessive wealth on behalf of the masses; this is why inexorable expropriations and exterminations are applied against these who are against us."

The theme of another conversation was the future. "You see, he told me another time, mankind inevitably moves toward Sovietism... It's only a question of time. In a hundred years there shall not be any other form of government among civilized countries... However, I think, that on the ruins of the present institutions the catholic hierarchy shall survive; it shall, because it systematically educates the men who are predestined to govern the

others. Until recently there was quite a number of men who were born a prince, king or emperor, but there was no one who could come into this world a bishop or a pope. To become a leader or governor in the catholic church, one must prove to be peculiarly talented. The great moral strength of Catholicism as a system lies in its profoundly thought through organization (in the original: *sapienti institutioni*); it enabled Catholicism to survive through many storms in its 2000 year history, and it will make it invincible in the future. The strength of your church is an exquisitely moral one, not compulsory. So, I see - he ended, stressing this sentence with a loud voice - I see that in a hundred years from today the only form of government: sovietism, and the only religion: Catholicism... Only pity, we won't live to see it happen."

Not a hundred, but 55 years have passed since Lenin's prophecy. The Vatican continues its vain attempts to arrange relations with Moscow. Today, the diplomatic contacts are more frequent, but they do not bring any improvement in the situation of, for example, the Ukrainian or Lithuanian catholics. Mystificatory "ecumenical dialog" too, did not bring any results. In the meantime, the pronouncement of a historic meeting on the ruins of the old world beings to be gradually realized in Italy, in the form of a so called historical compromise. Italian communists from Gramsci (Italian counterpart of Lenin) to Berlinguer, with stubborn consequence, move toward reconciliation with the Church and the catholic world. Berlinguer in his famous letter to bp. Bettazzi (known as the "red bishop") plainly

suggests agreement with the Church,^{3/} and states that the party is not atheistic, leaves the freedom of choice of ideological beliefs to its members, and stands on the platform of a secular state. The strategy of Italian communists considers as its first task the "dialog" and reconciliation with the Church - the second in history since the fascist *conciliazione*. The accuracy of Lenin's prophecy will be decided in Italy during the immediate years.

Dominik MORAWSKI

3/ The patriarch of Venice, cardinal Luciani (Ed.: the late Pope John Paul I) commenting on this letter, quoted, without mentioning his real name, a statement of a certain member of the Polish episcopate: "Watch yourself; this is a classic move. We know it very well here. Communists are trying everything possible to break the unity of episcopate. When even the smallest crevice appears, they drive a wedge into it. You (Italian bishops) are now the most exposed to this kind of action. Suppose, one of you comes off a little bit from your group, hardly mentioning something about "respect" - even with some reservations - for the Communist party? Immediately, in the press there will appear a likable voice of 'progressive catholics', 'socialistic Christians', the readers of the communist

DIARY WRITTEN AT NIGHT
(an excerpt)

Kennan, the inventor of the *containment* doctrine and some time ago the U.S. ambassador who has been ousted from Moscow, recently became a pet of the Soviet press. *Pravda* extols to the heavens his book, *The Clouds of Danger*, as a "wise" book, the fruit of "the evolution of the author's convictions toward common sense," recommends it to the libraries of the State Department and the White House. Miraculously converted, Kennan draws his present wisdom from various sources. The two of them, strictly connected with each other, decide about the proper direction of the ex-ambassador's evolution of convictions: First, the USSR has undergone many colossal changes, the country had shaken off the inheritance of Stalinism and is governed by a man who is "moderate, conservative and peace loving." Second, the portentous American "Right" composed of "military enthusiasts" and obsessed by the Soviet military threat, unwilling or not knowing how to detect these changes, continuously chicanes the proponents (within and without the government) of "widening the range of the Soviet-American cooperation." It is rather Russia, not America, that is having reason to fear.

press. The Polish episcopate opposes this tactics with an iron discipline and unanimity. This is our strength."

The unconfessed but strongly felt conclusion of the new doctrine is isolationism. A small sample: Kennan admits that the West has every reason to demand that the USSR comply with the Helsinki accord on human rights, but he wonders if it would be wise to move too far in this direction. And almost in the same breath he adds: "I won't yield to anybody in my admiration toward Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov. I consider them the greatest Russians of our times. If I would be a Russian, I would feel the deepest gratitude for them and I would give them my complete support. But, I am not a Russian."

Gustaw HERLING-GRUDZINSKI

EDITOR'S NOTE

The following are the excerpts taken from Brukselczyk's long article, in which the author, on the background of 1978 soccer world championship finals in Argentina, discusses sports and politics, the "wisdom" of boycotting matches by public and demanding of players to demonstrate a proper political attitude, and other problems emerging from, or related to sports and politics. Although they may appear somewhat loose, the excerpts, I hope, will project to the reader the main idea of Brukselczyk's article.

CJ

AS SEEN FROM BRUSSELS (excerpts)

Soccer playing is a common profession in the East and West, over there official, here, unofficial. It brings monumental profits, demands monumental investments and effort. The playoffs for the world championship began 4 years ago on 5 continents with 106 countries participating. It is the biggest and longest sport show in the world. The gold cup, the work of sculptor Silvio Gazzaniga, weighs only 5 kg. and is only 36 cm. tall, but the money connected with this cup is beyond any comparison with its dimensions.

The French soccer players, belonging to the world's poorest, received only \$4,000 each for participating in the first playoff, not counting \$10,000 each for advertising boots, shorts, etc. The Dutchmen will receive \$900 each for every playoff won and \$15,000 each for winning the world cup. The Scotchmen have gotten \$10,000 for participating in the final match only, not counting premiums for successes (if they occur). Of course, the West Germans look better than the other European Common Market members. Each soccer player or German Federal Republic will receive \$30,000 each for winning the cup, and \$25,000 for the second or third place, not counting substantial earnings from ads. The oil rich Iran has a gesture: its players will receive \$4,000 each for...a draw, winners in a playoff would get \$7,500 each, and if they get

into the second tour (fantasy) - \$12,000 per head or rather per pair of legs. The most prosperous are the Latin-American players. In Latin-America soccer is not only a profession, but a religion (of course without ascetism). Each Argentinian soccer player receives \$3,000 per month during training season, and, in case the cup is won, each will receive \$24,000. Everybody, I hope, understands that all these sums are in addition to the normal salaries, which in the case of a star player are over \$100,000 a year. I don't know how much the Polish or the Eastern players ordinarily make. Basically the career of a professional soccer player, excluding the learning of a normal occupation, is short lived, and for this reason financially greatly rewarding.

* * *

Because my job is not the preparation of reports to the Internal Revenue Service, but the contemplation of world problems, my position on sports and politics is clear: Demanding of professional soccer players that for the sake of refined moral considerations, they should resign from kicking the ball, is not serious, and cannot be effective. Let us leave them alone. All the great tennis champions most often resign from the Davis cup, on behalf of the highest paid tournaments. The soccer players, when it comes to money, are the same as tennis players, only they play using their legs not their arms.

The same applies to great businesses

which bear the main burden of preparation for the finals of the world cup competition and other finals. The boots and dress shown on the TV screen in 120 countries to billion of watchers have colossal commercial value. A certain European firm has supplied footballs for the final matches, and even paid for this privilege. But it is paid back: from the beginning of finals, it has sold 3,500 balls....daily. The businesses having enormous advertising budgets also have a great political influence, and having prospects of making big profits on championship games, they will not support a boycott directed against the sport. The tennis tournament in Paris, not the biggest and not the richest in the world, has just ended. It cost 3.5 million francs, of which 2.5 million went for premiums and prizes. All the cost was covered by the ads. Borg, Villas, Connors in 1977 made over 1 million fr. which is about \$200,000. And who knows how much did the corporations who financed the tournament make? Truly, it isn't a field for practicing boycotts.

* * *

Sports has always been political from the first ancient olympics to the arrest - for speaking openly what he thought - of B. Wyszowski, democratic activist in Gdansk, ex-medalist and the winner of second place in the world rowing championship, to whom the silver medal had not provided security from the police. There is no time and place now to analyze the phenomenons of sports and politics. It will suffice to say that Moscow is organizing the olympics not for the

propagation of the noble idea of sports competition, but to sell to the world the beautiful tinsel of the Soviet life. To the East Germans, the calculated breeding of champions is the only way to enter the salons of an elegant world; in all the totalitarian countries, sports allows many people to legally let steam off, and legally unload antiregime and anti-Soviet feelings. The waterpolo final between Hungary and Russia in the 1956 olympics in Melbourne, was the only possible public revenge for the blood bath in Budapest. The hockey final of the world championship between Czechoslovakia and the USSR in Prague in 1969 became the publicly expressed hatred and feeling of revenge for the invasion of August. The soccer match Honduras vs San Salvador, was a signal of the real war. In contrast, the China - US ping-pong match opened the Peking door for Kissinger and Nixon.

Naturally, the fact that the final match for the soccer world championship is played in Argentina has political meaning. In connection with the final match, Argentina invested about \$700 million. It is a staggering sum of money. Even if we take off the cost of all the permanent construction such as the airport, colored TV installations, freeways and arenas - the deficit should be extremely large. A member of yountha, Admiral Lacosta, did not hide the true nature of the investment. "This is", he said "a political operation. The importance to Argentina of the final match cannot be measured

by the money alone." The Admiral is right. Following his reasoning, the government of Argentina hired the services of Bronston Martelles, a big American *public relation* Corporation. Its diagnosis leaves no room for doubts: "It's an enormous political operation; in approaching it, political criteria must be applied. The behavior of teams has nationalistic character, it engages nations, states and governments.

However, we shouldn't oversimplify these matters. The fact that the final match has political meaning doesn't automatically mean that kicking the ball in Argentina helps its dictator, and that a boycott of the match would automatically weaken the dictatorship. It all depends on us. Hitler succeeded in cashing in on the olympics in 1936 in Berlin not because he had cunningly organized it, but because the democratic West had behaved like an idiot. Every show of such grandiosity hides the potential for enormous profits, one must only want....

* * *

The atmosphere of final matches and at the olympics is reflected in the world largest shop-windows and stagings. The peoples of 120 countries watch the show. The soccer players should kick the ball; newspapermen write and have their eyes open,

asking not only how is the kicking going on, but also, listen to what's happening around. The Soviet authorities demanded \$100 million from NBC for a monopoly on transmitting the olympics in 1980. This staggering amount went down to \$25 million on the condition, that the cameras would be manned solely by the Russians. In other words, the Russians, albeit poor, are inclined to pay \$75 million for limiting the movements of the TV cameras to the situations chosen by them. The Russians know what a free TV camera is. In 1972, the first time Nixon went to Moscow, he went without his own team of TV technicians. And what? It was a dull meeting. In 1974, he went again, but this time he went with his own cameras, and it was then that, among many things, there appeared *also* the first free interviews with Russian dissidents.

In Argentina, a similar situation may develop. It all depends not on Videla, but on the gentlemen of the press. Even the Monteneros proclaimed a cease fire in order to enable the newspapermen to watch the movements of more than just the ball. If the barrier of silence should be broken, Videla may expel one or two newspapermen, but he cannot expel all of them, because then, all the finals would amount to nothing. No sooner than the finals had started (I wrote these words only one week after the playoffs have begun), Videla announced the list of 3,500 political prisoners, about whom their families knew little, and the list of 250 "vanished" who were in prison, but alive, about whom their families knew nothing. If it were not for the world finals, they would never know about their

relatives' fate.

* * *

Never in the past has the world talked more about Argentina, than now on the occasion of soccer world cup play. About Argentina and soccer and also the Argentina of concentration camps and tortures. Strange that no one remembers that 13 countries (which?!) had boycotted the olympics in Melbourne as a sign of protest against the pacification of Hungary, but everybody remembers the 2 black Americans, the champions in the 200 m. dash in the olympics in Mexico, who, on the podium, during the national anthem raised their black fists. Why (so far) has nobody in Argentina raised even one black leg? On the opening day, because some director of some Spanish sport club has just died, there was ordered one minute of silence. The Hungarians played their first match with black bands on their arms, because in Budapest, Boscik, a pillar of soccer team of the Fifties, died. No doubt they were the men of great merit on soccer field, but what had prevented the French team to appear (in fact, somebody suggested it) with black bands on their arms as a sign of the homage paid to 25 Frenchmen kept in prison by the regime of Videla. If it

didn't happen, it was only because the politicians wanted it not to happen. We shouldn't make the soccer players responsible for the moral state of the world. It would be inelegant and shortsighted. Soccer players should not mend the troubles of the world...

Who should do it, however, are artists and scientists. There are, for example, soon to open the congresses of oncologists in Argentina and geneticists in Moscow. From soccer and the presence of 200 soccer players, Videla's of Brezhnev's (pardon me) prestige will not increase. From the presence of 5,000 scientists, among them many Nobel laureates - certainly yes. The basic differences are: For playing soccer nobody has gotten shot yet (though some for playing it badly deserve it). But, thousands of intellectuals went to various gulags, lost their freedom or life only for thinking independently, differently, that is, for something that is the sense and substance of all the scientific congresses.

The scientific boycott is much more real and effective because: 1/ It strikes directly. It is possible to play soccer without Belgium, but it's impossible to move forward in the physics without Americans. 2/ It is conducted without the pressure of the fans, without any audience in front of the TV cameras; 3/ There is no gold rush. The scientists can be uncorrupted, don't make a living on showing their underwear that bears the name of an

advertiser; 4/ The only losers will be the scientists of the country which violates human rights; it is so, because the lack of contacts with scientists from abroad will affect their own researches and we must remember that the scientists, in the USSR for example, represent a strong enough group of pressure, which cannot be said about soccer players;

5/ It is difficult to invest moral criteria in legs, but it is easy and it behoves one to connect such criteria with the posture of scientists and their cooperation. It's difficult to punch the ball from a corner in the name of human rights, but it's possible and it behoves us to connect the scientific exchange with the idea of respect toward freedom. In other words, when Holland plays soccer in Argentina, its players should not be treated like the partners of Videla. When Doyna plays in Prague, he shouldn't be treated like a partner of Brezhnev in the invasion and normalization. The Dutchmen and Poles who play soccer have the same feelings of distaste toward Videla and Brezhnev, but they shouldn't be expected to take an active political stand on the occasion of a boxing match or a cross country run. It does not behove us - it would be quite comical - to demand of them to meet with the imprisoned or persecuted players.

But it is possible and it behoves us to demand of doctors who participate in the oncologist congress that they ask where a 100 of their colleagues who "disappeared in unknown circumstances" in Argentina is. Also, it's possible of the

true scientists who visit in Moscow that they go and see prof. Sakharov, ask about prof. Orlov, take part in illegal seminars organized by the Jewish scientists thrown out of the laboratories, and who want to leave the USSR.

And, we should demand of scientists that they at least boycott congresses in the USSR, Argentina or anywhere else; stay home, loudly say why, and advise the others to do likewise. It all would be morally justified, and practically effective. Behaving differently, sitting quietly here and over there, putting their heads in the sand like an ostrich, shouting - "we are scientists, not politicians," scientists practice the worst politics there is in the world, behave not only in undignified manner, but also stupidly, betraying their double vocations - of men and scientists. Neither mankind, nor science will benefit from it. Not even the scientists themselves.

BRUKSELCZYK

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 5/9

Nov. 1978

by

Charles Joel

Zbigniew BRYSKI

THE SINO - AMERICAN
RAPPROCHEMENT

From Editorial
Staff of
Kultura

THE GHOST OF KATYN

Jozef Lichten

A LETTER TO GERALD GREEN */

*/ Fragments Ed.: This title is my own
invention.

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 9/372/1978 published in Paris, France.

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSIC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

THE SINO - AMERICAN RAPPROCHEMENT

From the beginning of his tenure, President Carter declared human rights the most important item in his internal and foreign politics. Although at different times, depending on many conflicting circumstances, Carter played this tune louder or softer, human rights has remained an official mission of America. Thus, the new president was supposed to inspire his country and to free it from the cynical pragmatism of his predecessors.

All of this would look like an immensely beautiful idea, save for one characteristic: Carter applies his human rights mission selectively. In this regard, at least two questions come to my mind: First, what are the criteria for choosing the countries which are to become the objects of the American human rights mission, and, second, how does the American public at large react to it? I'll begin with answering to the second question.

The American public at large, afflicted with inflation and the decline of the value of the dollar, unheard of in the history, is not excessively interested in ideological and the religious wishes of the president. It's worried mainly about the taxes, the rising cost of living, crime and the lack of safety on the streets of their cities. And, because the public doesn't see any connection between these problems and the number of people arrested in Chile or Cuba, it appears, it doesn't take its president seriously. There appears in the eyes of the average American, a picture of an unsteady man who, dreaming about leadership of America in the world, can't even handle his own

coworkers whom he brought to the White House from Georgia, and who give him a lot of trouble. Along with the public at large there is also the other narrow sector of intellectual elite - roughly over half million of newsmen, politicians, bureaucrats and non-bureaucrats, scientists-humanists and others. Here, more and more distinctly, two fronts are shaping, which judge the politics of selective human rights according to their own sympathies. These 2 dominant groups are antagonistic in relation to each other. This division, of course, is not sharp, because almost always in such matters the divisions are slightly blurred.

In general, the first group are Liberals of various leftist learnings. The second, Neo-Conservatists. I don't put much weight into the question of how much or how far "neo-conservatives" are conservative and "liberals" are liberal. What we need here in our deliberations is just a working nomenclature of this political division.

The reactions of these 2 groups are easy to predict: Liberals use their old argument in the form of a question: Why Carter does want to deprive the Soviets of American technology in revenge for sentencing Shcharanski and Ginsburg and the persecution of dissidents, and closes his eyes on the dictatorship in Chile and cruelty of general Pinochet? Why does he condemn Cuba for being a Soviet arm in Africa and supplies Saudi Arabia with planes and approves of the barbarism of Shah of Iran? Of course, the people who ask these questions know the answers very well, but they want to put the president into an embarrassing situation and

hear him say what is actually going on. But he doesn't want to answer and in most cases doesn't answer. And, if he does, it doesn't sound too wise. Not personally, but by the words of his assistants.*/*

The Neo-Conservatists point out to their liberal opponents, not without reason, that to tolerate dictatorships which had collapsed during the past 15 years, is a different matter than to tolerate the communist-totalitarian dictatorships. The latter demonstrate imposing durability that is proven in the fact that none of them had collapsed during their long existence. And, not necessarily because of the Kremlin's control, but, as in the case of Cuba which is thousands of miles away from Moscow, for other reasons. Nobody will accept the argument that the Cuban totalitarian system is durable because the Cubans like it.

In spite of the fact that the Neo-Conservatists' common sense reasoning seems to be more convincing, it's impossible not to give some justice to liberals that their suspiciousness of Carter's dreams about

/ As an example, here is the answer of one of his subordinates: "Since we cannot reach the powerful countries and force their masters to respect human rights, we apply our pressure there, where it has a chance of being effective. In other words - in relations to the weaker countries, which must rely on us more than the others." Of course, the above mentioned principle, which was justly condemned by Solzhenitsyn in his Harvard speech, is highly immoral. When applied to internal matters, it would, for example, mean that a big and influential thieves should be forgiven, but the small "fry" furiously exterminated.

human rights is justified. Actually, everybody is suspicious of it. Only that some would prefer to see the liberalization of Chile, Argentina and Iran, and... never mind the rest. Some others, the liberalization of the Soviets and their satellites, also not caring much about the fate of south American neighbors, much less the Persians or Philipinos. With the greatest relative discretion and reserve, both sides look at People's Republic of China - the most totalitarian country in the world (if we omitted Cambodia where unlike systematic totalitarianism, a gigantic, though chaotic, slaughter is in progress).

Until recently, the most extreme American conservatists were demanding that the same severity directed toward other totalitarian countries, should be applied to China, but now, even they have calmed down. And rightly so. Because everybody knows well what this is all about. Conservatists as well as Liberals, and Zbigniew Brzezinski most of all. The latter, not long ago, after his visit in China, in a short radio interview, said "that in our times we are concerned with neither the doctrines nor ideologies but the freedom of a man" (I cite from memory, but this was the sense of his statement). Brzezinski said it directly after he offered credits, American technology and other possible aids to People's Republic of China in the name of the US government. He deserves our highest appreciation for it. We may forget the rhetoric of freedom. Prof. Brzezinski is the most determined advocate of maximal close rapprochement with China, which made the Soviet governing authorities

furiously. Brzezinski, who just one year ago was brooding over the question of how to pull America out of the "hostile world" in which she found herself, came to the right - however, long known - conclusion, that it is impossible to do it without the People's Republic of China. If then, the People's Republic of China - the most totalitarian state in the world - cannot be an object of the human rights mission of the US, it is proper to conclude that the whole of Carter's philosophy on freedoms is either a smoke screen or a resultant of, on the one hand, the dying but still powerful influence of liberal Left, or, on the other, the growing with each passing month recognition of Soviet ambitions, and a gradual riddance of illusions. Personally, I think, the "smoke screen" theory is too primitive to be accepted. And, that's why I believe that Carter's behavior - his sharp anti-Soviet speeches which at the very next occasion he tries to mitigate, are determined by two factors: 1/ a growing recognition of the Russian threat and feeling of America's own weakness. 2/ a fear of the liberal opinion of America and Western Europe, indefatigable in its efforts of moral and military disarmament of Western nations.

The paralysis of America, unable to defend herself, appears to be something more than the consequence of post-Vietnam "shock" in which some incorrigible optimists believed. It has its multifarious causes, typical phenomenon during the periods of certain systems' withering. The Chinese leaders know it. Carter should know it, and all the sensible people should perceive it, including even those not endowed with the

visionary spirit of Solzhenitsyn. Rapprochement with China, which, I think, will never take the form of an official alliance (because of Taiwan), will, once and forever, erase the global plans of the Soviets and, perhaps, save the world from the Third World War. It may, because the lowering of the Soviet prestige and power will cause an increase of centrifugal movements within the Soviet empire, bringing its deterioration at the same time preventing worldwide catastrophe. It is an optimistic alternative, nevertheless, it has the marks of probability.

Many a critic of the idea of an alliance with China consider it exceedingly cynical, undermining all Carter and his advisors' human rights rhetoric. With the eventual existence of the alliance, 800 million Chinese, kept in iron discipline, will become for the American war technologists something like "cannon fodder," ... At least until the Americans find that in defending their own freedom, the American or Western European blood is not more precious than the blood of Asians. It doesn't matter whether one calls it cynical or barbarian; the point is, that the realists in Peking understand perfectly well its exigency. They do comprehend the situation of the West with its highly developed technology and also its indolence and incapability of self-defence. The common enemy, the Soviets, must be destroyed, otherwise what waits for us is the grave, or, unimaginable in its monstrous helplessness, slavery.

The need of taking into account the liberal opinion of the West, which doesn't want to perceive the danger of the Soviet imperialism, forces Carter to make some moves, which, at the approaching spectre of world enslavement, look like pure nonsenses. These moves induce him to keep such unbelievable personalities as Andrew Young; they dictate him economic sanctions against Rhodesia and Argentina. These moves prove that Carter is still far from fully recognizing the Soviet threat as basic question to which all other questions of the American foreign politics should be subordinated. The division into the Liberal Left and Neo-Conservatists which separates one American from the other, is reflected in the split personality of Carter. The President of the United States is undergoing an evolution, is still not able to perceive the true face of the Soviet imperialism. It isn't difficult to notice that prof. Brzezinski strengthens the realistic approach to the Soviets, and Cyrus Vance, Marshall Shulman and their helpers-professionals in the bankrupt *détente*, are the proponents of hiding one's head in the sand.

Carter and those of his advisors who soberly watch the Soviet plans, support the dissidents in the Soviet Union not only because they sympathize with them, but also strictly for practical reasons. True, that the trump card in the American strategy is China, but the opposition within the Soviet empire should also not be neglected. So, it appears that dissidents in the Soviet Union and satellite countries are going to play the role of the "fifth column," which will help to break the Soviets in case the

Kremlin decided to take the road of military confrontation or tried to cut off the oil supplies from the West.

It is difficult at this moment to envisage all eventualities and yield to too easy analogies. However, the history of World War II left memories of some valuable experiences that are important, this time not only to Poles, Czechs and Hungarians, but relative to the arising conflict, to the whole of Europe. China - a giant populace, which slowly moves toward industrial development, unobstructed now by some fantasies of "cultural revolution", may, in the future, with the increasing help of America, aspire to the position of the most powerful nation in the world. With the demographic potential, great laboriousness and undisputable talents of this nation, such a perspective is entirely possible. Then, it may be, that at the turn of the XX and XXI century, China will present the West with the bill, similar to the one which Russia presented after World War II. This time, however, relative to the new accomplishments, the price won't be the domination over the Eastern Europe, but the domination over the Eastern Hemisphere. In spite of the possible and even highly probable risk involved in the anti-Soviet alliance with China, I don't see any other alternative remaining. The West, by its own doings eradicated all the means of defense against Russia. Even 15 years ago, with the obvious weakness of the Soviets, the West could easily shorten the Soviets global appetites. Not a chance for it now. The West must act in concert with the powerful nations of the Far East. As an insurance against the power

of China, we should consider Japan, one of the allies of the West, culturally much closer to Europe than any other Asiatic nation, recklessly disarmed by Americans after the World War II. The Role of Japan, the problem to which prof. Brzezinski in his writings devoted a lot of attention, is too wide and cannot be considered in the frame of this article.

Zbigniew BYRSKI

THE GHOST OF KATYN

In a most unexpected manner, because of the unexplained action of a certain Pole who appeared in the role of the defender of Stalin and KGB's innocence, the Katyn Massacre revived recently.

The affair came to the light because of columnist, Jack Anderson from the *Washington Post*. Anderson's specialty is the publishing of sensational indiscretions drawn out of the files of governmental institutions. His column appears in 60 provincial newspapers.

The column was titled: "The Katyn Massacre Censored," but its subject wasn't the censor in Warsaw but of the *Voice of America* in Washington.

It all began from the dispatch of Ron Penstein, the Warsaw correspondent of ICA (Information Agency of the US government), in which he reported about the Congress of Writers in Katowice and a courageous speech of Andrew Braun against censorship practices

in Poland. On the long list of forbidden items, Braun included also the "Katyn shock." The American reporter, for the use of those listeners who are not oriented in this matter, put it in this elucidative context: "As an example of censoring Andrew Braun cited... the mass murder of the Polish officers by the Soviet Union in the spring of 1940." His speech, informed Feinstein, "met a standing ovation of the writers, and an attack on them by the party bureaucrats."

According to Anderson, the correspondent radioed his dispatch on May 5, 10 a.m. The same day at 22:32 hour the censor of *Voice of America* "erased from the above sentence everything that pointed out the USSR as culprit". First erased were the words "by the Soviet Union." Then later also, the year - 1940. The final version of the sentence was: "Braun mentioned the murder of the Polish officers during the World War II."

Anderson quoted literally all the instructions of the Polish Peoples Republic censorship, which prohibits any reference that would blame the Soviet Union for the death of the Polish officers in Katyn, and, specifically, the giving of the date of the murders as not earlier than August 1, 1941. In this manner - concludes the American columnist - the editor of the *Voice of America* supposedly representing the freedom of speech in America to the outside world, had strictly conformed to the rules of communist censorship.

Anderson states that the incident had spontaneously evoked two protests of the Poles. Eleven Poles from the Polish section

of the *Voice of America* wrote a collective letter to Hans Holtzapfel, the manager of the American division of VOA. The second protest was made by the opposition in Poland. From the latter protest, the *Washington Post* published only one sentence. That sentence must have been traveling for a long time since its publication did not appear until June 21, that is, 6 weeks after the censored dispatch of the incident in Poland. The affair created a storm in Washington circles. Several hours after the appearance of Anderson's column, John E. Reinhardt the director of ICA and Peter Strauss, the chief of *Voice of America*, received about a hundred calls from senators, congressmen, reporters, common readers and listeners. In the plenary session of the Senate, Senator Robert Dole delivered a long speech. In connection with the Katyn incident, Dole remarked that the programs of *Voice of America* are adjusted to the official line of Moscow and East Europe, instead of serving the information needs of its audiences. For example, cited Dole, in the program transmitted in the languages of the nationalities of the Soviet Union, the problem of russification is scrupulously avoided. Conservative Senator Dole was immediately supported by the representative of the Liberal wing, Senator McGovern. A resolution demanding that VOA should serve as an absolutely reliable source of information was unanimously accepted, and Anderson's article had been included *in extenso* in the "Congressional Record."

The management of ICA, facing the threat of investigation by the Congressional Commission, has adapted skillful tactics.

Before the appearance of Anderson's article, the chief of the central editorial office of radio news, Bernard Kamenske, stated in a discussion with Anderson, that the censoring of the dispatch from Warsaw had been an outrage and violation of every possible principle of reporting. Then later, in the letter to Sen. Dole, the chief of ICA, Reinhardt, took a similar position. The distortion of news, he stated, did not evolve from the policies of VOA, but it has been a regrettable error of judgement of a certain employee of the radio station, unmentioned by name. For proof Reinhardt mentioned the fact that the correspondence from Warsaw had been broadcasted without any change in Gruzyan and Ukrainian (Ed.: Why not in Russian?).

Rud Irvine appeared in defence of VOA in an article inspired undoubtedly by the radio station management, (*The Globe*, July 6, 1978). Irvine stated the facts given by Anderson were correct but incomplete, and conclusions false. The author of the censored sentence about Katyn wasn't the management of *Voice of America* but a Pole from the Polish section, who convinced his American superiors that the Soviet Union's responsibility for the Katyn massacre had never been legally proven; unfamiliar with the facts the American editor of the radio news yielded to the arguments of the Polish expert.

And finally, the New York *Nowy Dziennik* (Ed.: Polish New Daily) came to the conclusion that the explanation of the whole affair is in the public interest. In its editorial, the readers were informed that the anonymous culprit of the scandal was Felix Broniecki, assistant to M. Woznicki, the chief of the

Polish section of VOA. *Nowy Dziennik* made a comparison of the two Poles, Andrew Braun and Felix Broniecki. Indeed, very saddening in its message a comparison. The appearance of Braun in the Congress of Writers in Katowice, was an act of heroic courage; he knew what fate was awaiting him as a consequence of his act. Felix Broniecki who lives in comfortable, safe employment in Washington, did not risk anything.

The whole affair found its epilogue on the higher level on July 10 at Vance's press conference. Answering a reporter's question, in regard to the *Voice of America* scandal, the Secretary of State said, or rather confirmed, that, truly, the US government had never taken an official position in the matter of who was responsible for the massacre of the Polish officers, but inquiries had been made by the US Congressional Commission, and the Commission had categorically concluded that the crime was perpetrated by the Russians.

The Polish signatories of the protest to the management of the VOA (at least some of them) do not share the position of their superiors who laid the whole blame on Broniecki. The name of their colleague had not been mentioned in the protest which wasn't intended for publication and was to remain an internal matter of the institution. They think, Broniecki was overzealous in relation to his American superiors.

Broniecki, to everybody's surprise, promoted not long ago to a post of an assistant director of the Polish section,

wanted, at the beginning of his new career, to show great care for the interests of the institution.

A LETTER TO GERALD GREEN

To The Editor of Kultura

Rome, June 24, 1978

Dear Editor,

In the June edition of KULTURA (NO. 6/369) there appeared an unsigned article-note "Holocaust in American TV", sharply criticizing TV scenario of the program written by Gerald Green. The note, in sharp words expects "from our Jewish and Polish-Jewish friends that they give a lesson on the newest history of Europe, to the creators of 'Holocaust'".

I'm concerned with the presentation of the behavior of Poles toward Jews during the occupation. Since I belong to the second category of friends, I wish to inform you that today I'm sending the following letter in English translation to Mr. Green (translation mine):*/

Dear Mr. Green:

Allow me to begin with my own life story. I'm an American of Polish-Jewish */ Ed: The readers may guess that having no original letter which was written in English, I am retranslating it from Polish.

descent. I lost, during the last war, all my family in the concentration camps and gas chambers and only by a miracle I saved my own life. I studied "Holocaust" for many years. I think it all proves that I draw my knowledge of the events not only from the books, but also from my personal experiences. Time, almost 40 years, had not in the least soothed my pain and sadness. I write about it because I want to underline the weight I attach to this letter.

Unquestionably you deserve only praises for writing the story of the Jewish tragedy during the last war. It was important and urgent to remind the older generation and to teach the younger about the Holocaust. But why in this noble effort did you consider it proper to include so much prejudice, if not hatred, toward the other nation that also suffered under the nazi yoke and as a result lost its independence? I have in mind the Polish nation. Why had you devoted so much time, space and effort, to get acquainted with the facts and events which led to tragedy and which were the cause of it, but you neglected to penetrate into the history of Polish-Jewish relationship? After all, when the so-called western civilized nations banished the Jews from their countries, it was Poland that had taken them in. One of the greatest rabbis, Moses Isserless from Cracow wrote 400 years ago: "If God had not given us this land for shelter, the fate of Israel could have been impossible to bear." During the insurrections in nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the Poles and Jews fought shoulder to shoulder against the common enemy; also in our century they

fought jointly for Poland's independence.

And how does this problem look in the present? I have written an unaccountable number of times about the anti-Semitism in the prewar Poland and anti-Semites during the occupation. Also in this letter, I don't intend to deny their existence. We all know well about the hyenas - as our fellow countrymen called them - denunciators, swindlers, spies, collaborators, who acted during the occupation. We also know about many who, perhaps, affected by fear, were not able to rise above the mentality of the average bread winner. But, there were also thousands of those who have risked their lives in order to save the lives of Jews. There are many examples possible to cite in this respect. As one, I cite the activities of Committee for Help to Jews, better known under cryptonym ZEGOTA, which had 12 branches in various towns in Poland. It paid monthly assistance to many Jews, supplied them without any charge with all kinds of false documents, identity cards, certificates of birth, wedding, baptism, etc. I'm not certain if you ever visited Pan Yad Vashem in Jerusalem. If you did, however, you have undoubtedly seen the trees planted in the "Avenue of the Just" in honor of Poles who saved Jews.

On the background of these briefly described events, the shocking blunders of your views are much too much visible. Because I live in Rome, I didn't view the TV programs, but I read your 400 page book *The Holocaust*. Very probably, you'll

reproach me that it is difficult to evaluate a program without seeing it. But I assure you that on the basis of the book and a great number of interviews and talks I conducted with people who viewed the program, I have a realistic picture of the whole scenario. For example, I know for certain, that in the program, the Polish soldiers in Polish uniforms with Polish eagles on their caps, cooperating with the SS, shoot the Ghetto Jews. You had, Mr. Green, in your hand a delicate instrument - a TV movie watched by 120 million people and despite it, you did not care to verify beforehand all the facts. The Polish soldiers were the enemies of the nazis and the Polish soldiers in Polish uniforms presented by you simply did not exist during the occupation.

Similarly, you wrote in your book: "Lovely are the conditions for Jews to travel the dirty road in Poland. They don't mark the roads with kilometer signs but with anti-Semites." Funny or witty, it is not. Those "dirty roads" were marked rather with Polish - and Jewish blood, shed by the persecuted who resisted a common enemy. Similar "comments" may be found on other pages of your book. They do not explain anything, only darken the flow of your writing.

I don't think it would be too much to propose to you the erasing of the susceptible sentences from the future editions of *"Holocaust"*.

I shall be glad to receive your

answer to this letter.

Sincerely,

Jozef LICHTEN

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 5/10

Dec. 1978

by

Charles Joel

Sergey FEDOROV

THE POLITICS OF RADIO
LIBERTY MANAGEMENT

Gustav HERLING-GRUDZINSKI DIARY
WRITTEN AT NIGHT
(an excerpt)

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 10/313/ 1978 published in Paris, France.

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

THE POLITICS OF RADIO LIBERTY MANAGEMENT

The united radio stations Free Europe and Liberty have a new general manager. Dr. Glenn Ferguson is the ex-ambassador of the US to one of the African countries, and before his ambassadorship, the president of two, in succession, American universities - from among those smaller ones. It means that Dr. Ferguson is by profession a bureaucrat in academic administration and a diplomat in his spare time. It is said that he is well rounded fellow, full of good will and, to some degree, despite his age of 50, of great merit. What other values Dr. Ferguson has - we don't know. But we know, that he knows neither Russian nor any other Eastern European language, that until recently he hadn't been too preoccupied with the problems of the Soviet and East European countries, and, that he does not have much in common with journalism or radio broadcasting. It means that he has to learn how to work in radio communications; he has to get acquainted with the psychology of the "new Soviet man", because there are many of them now in Munich, Paris, New York. We should then wish Mr. Ferguson success in his difficult task. We should also have hope that after a year or so, he wouldn't be transferred to another post, and his place wouldn't be taken by some other professor or administrator who will be forced to start everything from the beginning.

The acting till now general manager,

Mr. Sig Michelson has been a professional journalist and even a professor in a school of journalism, but all this didn't help him much. He was discharged at the end of June. Actually he was performing his duties to December 1977, when he suddenly left and his place was taken by Mr. Alexander Buchan. Mr. Michelson was undoubtedly a very colorful personality. In the memory of us - just common workers of radio stations, he will remain a man, unusually energetic and well disposed toward his old friends. The first thing he did after taking office was to advance a whole bunch of people to higher positions in the Washington head office. These positions, after a comparatively short time, had to be liquidated, because it became clear that a large staff of highly qualified advisors and directors had been neither provided for in the budget, nor needed. Besides, Mr. Michelson liked to travel in order to "sustain contacts" in London, Paris, Berlin. Whether they were or were not useful - we don't know. In any case, it's clear that Mr. Michelson didn't help to bring order in the radio operations either in Washington or Munich. It is said he doesn't know much about financial matters and that in his time non-existent money had been spent.

We cannot accuse his successor Mr. Buchan of any of such things. During his reign in Munich - even before the removal of Mr. Michelson, many restraints were introduced, that were quite often damaging to the work of our radio stations, and the politics of economizing were widened. The travels, and consequently, the coverage of events were limited to a minimum; in general, spending money on

representations and even on normal contacts with the press was forbidden, cut in subscriptions to newspapers and magazines ordered, the number of personnel employed frozen, that is, no new employees were hired even for the posts that were vacated by the death or retirement; telephone conversations brought under strict control; even the old and deserving employees were forbidden to travel first class by train. What's more important, there was a serious cut in expenditures on the programs usually submitted by the so called *freelancers*. All this has, during the last several years, caused reduction in number of original and interesting programs. I'm talking here, first of all, about the Russian programs. However, I know that similar limitations were also applied in non-Russian sections. For example, it's generally known that many kinds of economizing and other administrative decisions led to a serious worsening of performance in the Polish section which suffers now because of the lack of qualified personnel. But I don't intend to write about the non-Russian matters as I don't feel I'm sufficiently competent to do so.

Let's return to Mr. Buchan. He is a mystery man to a degree, because he happened to appear among us no one knows how and for what reasons. He knows nothing about Russian problems. He is not a journalist. Nothing allows us to admit that he has ever had anything to do with international politics. One distinction that he has is, that on every occasion possible, he talks a lot about some theory of *management*, or administration without which no institution can function. If the essence of his theory is to look at every

dollar four times before it has to be spent, then there is nothing new in it. What is the art of managing of such very special institutions as Radio Liberty-Radio Free Europe, neither Mr. Buchan nor his predecessors ever seemed to have a clear idea.

Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe exist over 25 years already and, what must be stressed, perform (unfortunately much worse presently) useful function of informing peoples that remain behind the iron curtain, about what's happening within their own countries and in the world. It is obvious that even a modest work of these institutions is not tolerated by the Soviet leadership. Moscow, by every possible mean, tries to compromise RFE-RL, and tends to preserve the information monopoly in her hands.

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are, therefore, being constantly attacked by the Soviets: almost daily in the soviet press, in radio broadcasts from Moscow and the capitals of satellite countries, in every possible language, particularly in recent times, when under the so called *détente*, the Soviet leadership undertook an all out offensive.

We must state that from the beginning of the RFE-RL existence the American government did everything possible to make the work of 2 teams difficult. First of all, it put them under the auspices of the CIA, which fact made Moscow shout to the world that RFE-RL are simply a branch of CIA, a spying center. It was a mistake, the more so, because it wasn't really necessary,

though understandable to a degree. But only to a certain degree and for a certain limited time. We can imagine that under the circumstances of the postwar occupation of Germany, when the relations with the Soviet Russia began to deteriorate (the beginning of 1950s), the organizing of such enterprises as radio stations, could get, in a somewhat normal manner, into the hands of the CIA, most probably because their life was assumed to last for a limited time only. But time was passing by; illusions were vanishing one after another. Radio "Freedom" slowly took the shape of the more neutral Radio Liberty. It implied certain change in ideology, the changing of intentions connected with the Dulles theory, not only in a sense of containment, but also of the so called *roll back*. Since then, that is, more or less, since mid-1960s, it became completely clear that our radio - I mean Radio Liberty - must limit its role to an honest and objective information broadcaster. We must state, that with changing success, such a role, indeed, the Radio Liberty attempted to play during the past 15 years, seldom sinning by aggressiveness, to the contrary - most often applying exaggerated precaution. I know from my own long experience, that the presence of CIA in Munich had not been at all felt, and only the so called *monitoring* of radio-phonetic conversations in the Soviet Union, performed by us, had been organized specially for the American Intelligence community. It was a clearly technical function, known only to a few people. Our reports were sent to Washington for analyzing. And, of course, the CIA, as well as many other governmental institutions, universities, scientific

institutes etc. used the results of our research on the Soviet press.

Unfortunately, nobody cared to make a proper evaluation of the circumstances described above. Radio Liberty and, to a certain degree, Radio Free Europe, continued to work as semi-secret organizations, that is, as if they were sitting under the table and pretended not to be there. We used to have our press bureau, but it differed basically from the press bureaus of other organizations: instead of informing the Western press about our usefulness, it was persuading Western reporters to write about us very little, or not at all. This tactic is practiced with almost no change, even now.

This game of blindman's buff has at last ended with great noise and scandal, unneeded in radio work and damaging to it. At the beginning of 1970s, by an initiative of several misinformed (I express myself very mildly here) American senators, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe have been acclaimed the "obsolete remnants of the cold war", organizations which obstruct normal relations between, on the one side, the Soviet Union, and, on the other, the United States and other Western countries.

The acclamation has been immediately blown up by Soviet propaganda, and the Soviet leadership intensified its offensive against us. As a result, both stations were almost closed down, and, finally, it had been decided to do a thing which should have been done long time ago: the stations were taken from under the control of CIA and subordinated directly to the government

and the Congress. Then after, there followed a number of crises - financial, organizational, personnel - which continue until now. We must admit, however with a great displeasure, that the work conditions at both stations have worsened since the end of the CIA wardship. There is not enough room for both stations in the building they are located in. The management went into the hands of people less experienced, less wise, than before - which doesn't necessarily mean that the managements of the past were excellent. I stress at this point that I'm talking about Radio Liberty. Between the Board of International Broadcasting which was nominated by the President of the US, and the actual management of both stations, a conflict arose. It ended in 1976 by the joining of both stations into one organization. Then followed basic difficulties in financing and receiving funds. Presently, the budget is voted by Congressional Commissions, and approved by the Senate and the House. Radio suddenly fell into a position of a poor orphan in the great jungle of Washington, unable to find the support of any lobby, under an impotent management that was not even able to prepare a sound financial budget. Result: misery and already mentioned complications.

In one word, the past several years has been a period of misunderstandings, crisis after crisis, and a mess, especially on the higher level of American decision making. Here is a typical example: After both stations were joined in one unit, or perhaps just before it, in Washington some-

body cooked up a project of moving the Munich teams to the States; it was supposed to produce an improvement in the progress towards economizing the operations. The main reason behind it all, was the fact that the value of the dollar was constantly declining; thus, it was necessary to vote additional budgets on radio activities in Germany, and because the procedures of budget making are enormously complicated, constant difficulties have been resulting.

The transfer of radio station to Washington threatened the cutting the sources of information from us, and a loss of a certain number of employees, those who wouldn't like to move to America. It could have been - for many other reasons - a fatal move. But soon, the authorities, evidently under the pressure of persuasion, decided against it, and the whole initiative, it seemed, died a natural death. However, at the beginning of current year, investigations into this matter have been revived and disputes are still rolling on.

All these financial crises and personnel changes - conducted or intended - the fight for influence within the American radio leadership, limitations and reductions, create in Munich the atmosphere of uncertainty or, even, fear. Besides, each section has its own problems, and the Russian section has most of them. Between 1970 - 1975 a certain number of people employed retired or died. Their places were filled by people about whom, we cannot say - speaking moderately - they are people of crystalline character and best manners. I'm talking in general. Luckily, there are some exceptions. A majority of these people came to radio work via Israel and most of them are

Jews. It's no secret to anybody that they aren't the best human material possible to find. If the management could have waited a little longer for some new groups of refugees to arrive from the Soviet Russia, it would have been possible to find much better candidates for work - Jews or no Jews. But the management was in a hurry, and not too selective. "We must engage them, because if we didn't, our budget for next year will be cut down". - this was the reason for the haste, a strictly bureaucratic one. There was also another one: seeking frantically for support in Washington, the radio management had in mind earning the trust of the powerful Jewish lobby. It partly explains the haste and some other moves of the management, for example, the creation of regular Jewish auditions in the framework of the Russian program.

That peculiar invasion of Jews induced the reaction of the "old" employees, among whom *nota-bene*, because Radio Liberty has never been anti-Semitic in hiring, was a certain percentage of Jews. Consequently, there were demands for making the program "truly Russian" and not "international". There were persons who wrote letters of complaints to A.Solzhenitsyn, to American senators to German and other European newspapers. Among the "new" employees were found some who walked to the American Consulate in Munich, or wrote letters to the US Embassy in Bonn, accusing their colleagues of anti-Semitism and suing them in the German courts of justice, etc. There were also the collection of signatures, special meetings, threatening letters - in one word, everybody was having good time. The, then, manager of the Russian

section, officially favored and supported the newcomers and even fought together with them against - the real or imaginary - influence of Russian Nationalists' organization which has in the Radio Liberty its unofficial but quite strong representation. On the other side, from group of the so called, Russian patriots there were protests against "foreign influence", which was presumptively deforming Russian programs.

Looking at it all soberly, we must state, that there was aplenty of unnecessary exaggeration on one side or another, however, it is true that some problems existed and still exist. Who first of all is to be blamed for this "mice war" is the American management, which couldn't for a long time, afford strong reaction, that is, the immediate dismissal of the men who had puffed up all these conflicts; conflicts really so greatly damaging to our prestige, that one is inclined to suspect the participation in them of the Soviet agents. It is a well known fact, that all the Russian refugee organizations were always exposed to the special penetration of the Soviet intelligence. Radio Liberty, being first of all a Russian organization under American management, certainly is not an exception in this regard. The directive of the Russian authorities is clear: if we can't cause the closing of this radio by the means of propagandistic and diplomatic pressures, we must rout it from within.

The described conflicting situation in the Russian section continues in a slower gear, underground. During the current year it came to a sort of standstill, nevertheless the Russian program doesn't look as well as

it should. Some presentations are very well edited and important, for example, the ones which are written by prominent writers who are presently living in the West, such as Siniawski, Maximov, Nekrasov, Gladilin and others. I don't think there are enough presentations of the latter category, again, because the management does not like to spend money on them. I should praise the initiative of creating a section of East European problems. The Polish, Czechs and, in part, Hungarian programs are regularly and very competently commented by a well known writer and social activist, Natalie Gorbanyevska who lives at the present in Paris. But many programs are simply boring and unnecessary. The Russian program of Radio Liberty is poorly directed, overloaded with disputes over the Russian Orthodox religion and critique - of nobody's interest today - of Marxism-Leninism. There is too little lively polemic, discussion, reporting from the international conferences. One would say, the internal affairs of the Soviet Union are, more or less, properly commented upon, but the international affairs, the life in the Western democratic countries, much, much less. The late news, that is, the radio news broadcasted on the basis of material supplied by agencies such as UPI, Reuter, etc., recently worsened. The reason: after the union of both stations, the *News* - the independent department of Radio Liberty was liquidated, and several persons who are still left, do translations of everything that is benevolently supplied by a group of young men working in the so called *Central News* which exists unchanged since the days of Radio Free Europe. The young men who work there - if I'm not mistaken, mostly

Australians - don't know much about the Soviets and the problems of RFE-RL in general, and the personnel of RL doesn't have access to the telegrams of international press agencies, and further, it doesn't have the right to make its own news for listeners in the Soviet Union. This is a system that is copied from the BBC; this circumstance however, doesn't change the fact, that it is inappropriate, simply nonsensical in the condition in which RFE-RL work. BBC has one news department for all, and it can be perfect, but only under one condition - that those who work there are professionals. In our case, the *Central News*, either should be handled by professionals under proper management, or the system should be abandoned, that is, the Radio Liberty people should have the right of producing their own news bulletins.

I could write much longer about the faults and deficiencies of the Russian program and about its good sides, which undoubtedly exist. I'll return to these questions. In the meantime, I want to touch the most important matter, a matter on which the future of Radio Free Europe - Radio Liberty probably depends. It is censorship, or most properly, autocensorship. I mentioned at the beginning of this writing, that our radio was forced to limit its role to that of an objective information broadcaster. Well, I ought to state with all certainty, that at this moment, our radio does not conform to this role. Information does not mean the late news only. The opinions of prominent people, comments on new books, pronouncements of Russian writers abroad, disputes that are

continuously published in English, American, French papers on the subject of relationship between Russia and the US - all this is also the information which, beyond any doubt is interesting to our listeners. Even the so called speculative articles, the ones in which different suppositions and speculations are expressed, are also most often very interesting information. There is no reason at all why all this cannot be accessible to our audience. We cannot deny it the right of information about what is going on in the world, because in the world there are not only facts, but also opinions, problems, changes in political and cultural climate. All this can be explained and, if need be, given an interesting background, but there cannot be practiced covering of any part, any choosing of only these items which agree with a certain political line. And, this is how the Russian program is prepared. We'll find in it an abundance of voices talking for the so called *détente*, but very few which would strongly criticize the present foreign politics of the Soviet Union. We continually try to prove, nobody knows to whom, that we are not the old fashioned remnants of the cold war, that we are not against good relations with the Soviet Union. Even from the reviews of the daily press, the hints from the articles of Bernard Levin or Lord Chaltont in the *Times*, are cut off, because they are consequently against Soviet Union politics. The London *Daily Telegraph* became a *bête noire* of the establishment of our radio.

The radio management tries to comply with the so called desiderations of the *State Department*, is afraid to offend it,

forgetting that we are (at this moment, however, only in theory) an independent institution, albeit, financed by the Congress, and that we ought to talk about those things which for certain reasons the Voice of America cannot or doesn't want to talk about. Then, is there any difference between us and the governmental broadcasting stations? If there were none, there is no basis for our existence as a separate organization. It's all simple: We are to be a broadcasting station of special character, mainly for informing our listeners exactly about the matters they need to know about, special ones - those which are not included in the broadcasting activities of BBC or Voice of America, because these stations are created for informing the world about America and Great Britain. Since we cannot discharge our duties in this way, then, we are, simply useless. I could cite many examples of censure, censure entirely unneeded and damaging, but I'll limit myself to only one: several months ago, one third of very interesting audition-discussion between the 2 Russian writers, Nekrasov and Gladilin was cut off, only because these 2 gentlemen allowed themselves to be slightly ironical ... making Brezhnev a new member of the Soviet Writers Union. The method illustrated in this example cannot encourage anybody's cooperation with the Radio Liberty.

The main guideline of Radio Liberty seems to be: "Stay in Line - don't step out", and this is why here in Munich talks are going on, not without irony, that *détente* is coming to its end everywhere, but here, it is just beginning. It is

incomprehensible, wild, damaging. Each reporter knows that not everything is suitable for publication, and editor's decision in this respect should be based on generally known and accepted in democratic countries journalistic practices, not on some fancy of cowardly bureaucrat. And, this is how the Americans who decide about the Russian program, look. They are the people who think only about their own interests, not about the interests of the organization they are supposedly managing. Instead of defending the independence of radio, they yield passively to Washington's directives, and most often, not to directives, but to nonexistent formally - their own "line". They remind us of Checkhov's "reticent man", that poor school teacher who always carried an umbrella and wore galoshes in summer time, always in fear of something, nobody knows what.

This is a picture of the present management of RFE-RL. We know these people and we don't have any illusions as to their stature. We know that they will never muster up the courage for independent thinking and decisive action, that is, for doing what they are authorized to do by the special statutes of our organization.

It's all sad, and not only sad, but demoralizing to the personnel of our radio. Everyday, this personnel receives the lesson of cynicism from the people who should give them the example of good political and journalistic manners.

What Mr. Ferguson will say to it all?

Sergey FEDOROV

DIARY WRITTEN AT NIGHT
(an excerpt)

Does Carter think he is Saint Louis? Does Jimmy the Crusader believe he has the power to convert the infidels? In the name of what Gospel? The Gospel of Helsinki? Just fantastic "in themselves" questions. Much more fantastic when put by historical novelist *del'Académie Française*, a deputy from Paris, ex-minister, in brief, Maurice Druon, a guest writer in *Le Monde*. I received today a clipping from it of his article, and my hand, before throwing it into the waste basket, stopped in mid-air. Incomparable French "clarté", unbelievable precision of political conservatism and realist who is angered at all kinds of "crusaders", simpletons - attempting to disturb and poison the Great Politics by some "principles"! This one column in *Le Monde* can replace several hundred pages of Kennan's *The Cloud of Danger*. In *Pravda* there won't be needed any abridgement of the French academician-minister argumentation; his little article can be translated in full into

Russian.

Druon's bad humor has been caused by news, that after the recent sentences in the Moscow trials, Carter is proud and talks about repressions, threatens the stoppage of export of the technology needed by the USSR for oil drilling. "Would he be thinking that the foreign politics is conducted by the method of small ads in some small provincial papers, in the section: the perfect drilling machinery offered for the release of dissidents?" He should know the situation. In 50 years, the USSR will be risking transformation from the exporter into the importer of oil, for itself and the Warsaw pact nations. Had America stopped supplying modern machinery for exploitation of enormous resources of Siberia, the Soviet Union would have been forced to turn to Japan, or to escalate the "strategic control" of oil supplies and routes to them; that means, moving deeper into the Near East and Africa. Then, America will understand the problem, but it may be too late. The continental blockade had not been a successful move of Napoleon. Does Carter intend to throw the Soviets on their knees, proclaiming anti-Soviet economic blockade? "There are provocations whose making should be avoided." Oh! What a delight will be induced in *Pravda* by the word "provocations" - twice used by Druon! And how the Soviet commentators will rejoice in his penmanship when he, immediately after "provocations," paints the picture of the military power of the USSR! The USSR does not want war, but is not afraid of war. The Western democracies do not want war, but are afraid of war. "Human rights is a beautiful idea; the survival of mankind, though, is reality which deserves some consideration".

Wouldn't it be better to forget human rights, recognize the fact that they stop at the Elbe-Nysa line (only? Are they respected in E. Germany?), accept another fact that the famous "third basket" is meaningless to the USSR? "The USSR government has clearly declared that it is the Lord of its own possessions, that oppositionists' place is only in jails. The recent sentences were distinctly pointing it, and the American declarations had, probably, worsened the fate of the sentenced." What moral lecture may be deducted from all of it? "It is well known that Carter has a good heart. He owes his career to his heart muscle. But there are multitudes of peoples with good hearts. We suffer rather of a lack of men with strong heads."

No! We, in the West, cannot complain of the lack of people with strong heads. Of course they know it in Moscow, and Druon will be - and justly so - highly honored there: what a Strong Head! And the Soviet bosses in Moscow will think, laughing heartily up their sleeves, about the entirely different part of the body of the Member of the French Academy.

Gustaw Herling-Grudzinski

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 6/1

Jan. 1979

by

Charles Joel

Adam KRUCZEK

IN THE SOVIET PRESS
(excerpts)

Bohdan OSADCZUK

A LETTER FROM SHANGHAI
(slightly abridged)

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 10/373/78 and 12/375/78, published in Paris, France.

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

IN THE SOVIET PRESS
(excerpts)

The hunting season in the Soviet Union is still going on: the wave of trials, which began in July, continued through August and September. In August, Alexandr Podrabinek received a 5 year deportation sentence for his book devoted to the problem of insane asylums used as a means of fighting dissidents. In September, there was a trial of American businessman, Francis Crawford - but about this, more details little later. The main accused in September was China. She has been publicly on trial, in the press, radio and television. About dissidents' trials one might have read only some short notes in *Literaturnaya Gazeta* (NO 30), which began with these words: "As we generally know, in our country there were recently 2 trials of some of the Soviet citizens." And further, a remark, that criminals happen to be on trial everywhere; for example in France, where in July some Breton autonomists were prosecuted (the author of the note, of course, didn't mention that they were punished for their terroristic activities); in all, there is nothing to dwell upon anymore. However, China has been talked about everyday; the travels of Hua Kuo-feng in the Balkan states and Iran were observed with fearful attention. With a greater attention and a greater fear, because on August 12 the Soviet Union suffered a heavy diplomatic blow: China and Japan signed - as it was described in *Pravda* - the, "so called,

agreement on peace and friendship." The article of B. Oryekhov in *Pravda*, appears under the title of "The Risky Step." The Japanese diplomacy, observes the author of the article, "for a long time had not succumbed to the attempts of chaining Japan to the anti-Soviet charriot." The situation had changed radically" after Brzezinski's visit in Peking and Tokyo." After explaining how Japan allowed herself to be "chained up" - Brzezinski has forced her to do so!! - B. Oryekhov states: "Our country does not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. This is foreign to the principles of our politics..." But... "the substance of the agreement signed in Peking clearly transgress the frame of bilateral relations. That's why facing this event the Soviet Union cannot remain indifferent." And here, Oryekhov shakes his fist: "Our sovereign right is to undertake in this circumstance steps which we shall consider fit to defend our interests."

Immediately after the signing and ratification of the agreement, Hua Kuo-feng began his travels. TASS in daily communiques repeats (referring to Western press) one and the same story: the Western press "put a special stress on China's attempts to sneak into the Balkans" (8.28.78); the travel to Macedonia had been appraised by correspondents "as a bet on the aggravation in the relations of the Balkan socialistic countries" (8.24.78); *Pravda* also published its own commentary signed by a "reporter" and entitled "Shortsighted and Dangerous Politics." The "reporter" unmasks the "true plans of the Chinese leaders": "This is an attempt to build an anti-Soviet alliance, breaking the unity of socialistic nations,

torpedoing the achievements of relaxation in Europe..." (8.24.78).

The article of the "reporter" hasn't been the last word said in this matter. The news about the Politburo meeting on the international situation, published on 8.27.78, sounded like a verdict. As we know, the public announcements of the Politburo decisions take place only in rare situations.

The Politburo of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had perfected its position in international problems after the "friendly conferences" that took place on Crimea between Brezhnev and the general secretaries of comparties, Husak, Honecker, Kadar, Gierek, Ceausescu and Cedenbal. Several of such meetings were conducted during the July-August period: Brezhnev vacationing on Crimea has been receiving his vassals. Once a week on the front page of *Pravda* there appeared a photograph made by W. Mussaelian: a table; on the left, Brezhnev with the new favourite, the secretary of the Central Committee and candidate to the membership of the Politburo, K. Czernyenko, then somebody unknown; on the right, one of the vassals. They were so much alike that if it were not for the titles, it would have been difficult to know who is who; above the photograph in large letters: "Friendly Meeting" - and below it the text of a statement. These texts, with one exception, were all alike, ending in the words: "The talks were conducted in a friendly, hearty atmosphere and had the mark of unanimity of views in all disputed problems." The only exception had been the summary of the meeting with

Romanian Ceausescu, about which was said only that" the meeting was conducted in an open atmosphere of friendship."

Politburo's announcement, without mentioning any difference in the participants opinions, describes the politics of all the Crimean guests as being evaluated "from the perspective of the near and far future". A little hint about NATO, about the "record military budget of the US," fell incidentally, as something of little importance. One thing is important to quote: "The politburo of the CP of the USSR underlines the great danger which threatens the cause of peace and Socialism, created by the activities of the present leadership of China."

From the evaluation of China politics protrudes bitter grief, that the "present Peking leadership" resigned from the politics of isolationism, which was predominant in China during the so called cultural revolution. We may then assume, that Moscow leaders had had hope, that after the death of Mao, the most radical of his proponents would have stayed in power. "Different personnel changes in China leadership," according to *Pravda* (8.27.78), appeared to be a very unpleasant surprise to Moscow.

However, the "affair" of the American businessman Crawford is one of the most interesting spectacles that were produced in Moscow during the last several years (we may suppose that Crawford himself, arrested in the street, after spending 2 weeks in Lefertovo prison and "visiting" the KGB regularly during

several months, has a quite different opinion about it all). One beautiful morning, the respectable businessman, representant of the most respectful corporation dealing in agricultural machinery, is dragged out of his car and accused of a fantastic crime: an illegal exchange of dollars for 20 thousand rubels.

By a strange coincidence, he had been arrested on the second day after the US detained two Soviet agents caught in the flagrante delicto of spying.

At the trial in Moscow, in the presence of foreign correspondents, Crawford had easily proved the entire falsehood of accusation. Let it be understood that it did not make any impression on the judge, and the American received a 5 year prison sentence, but - as the judge formulated - because Crawford had been raised in a nightmarish capitalistic system, and the machinery of Harvester International which he sells is needed by the Soviet Union, the sentence is conditional. Next day, the unlucky businessman left the hospitable fatherland of Socialism.

The spectacle had been a remarkable success. In the Soviet jurisprudence, the method of "matching a criminal" is widely used. For example, somewhere, a serious, shocking crime, say, a rape or murder is committed and the organs cannot find the criminal. In this case they receive an order: match a criminal. A man who should have committed the crime is arrested: poor worker, undisciplined, criticizing the authorities. The age of the "candidate" is important, because the sentence is

educationally more effective.

And after, the criminal receives 15 years of gulag or the death sentence. Many stories about such cases appear in the Soviet press; always about making up for the harms done, always about rehabilitation. It's easy to imagine how many criminals in this category remain unrehabilitated.

As to Francis Crawford, only the corporation he works for tried timidly to defend him; other American businessmen in Moscow (and in the US) not only had forgotten to help their colleague, but also had begun to compete against the contracts of the Harvester International.

I have been writing many times that the strongest mainstay of the Soviet Power is Capitalistic America. Never before has it been so clearly demonstrated, than during the summer of 1978. The arrest of Crawford had occurred as though it were ordered by American industrialists. To them, it served as a perfect argument against timid attempts of Carter to apply economic sanctions against the Soviet Union. Immediately after he vetoed the sale of a computer and had announced possible prohibition of selling the oil drilling machinery to Russia, Armand Hammer, the best friend of Brezhnev, a millionaire, the Knight of the October Revolution Order, appeared in Moscow. On August 25, he arrived on Crimea, and the news about his reception by Brezhnev appeared in the space in which normally only the "friendly meetings" with Communist leaders are printed. Not long before the visit of Hammer in the fatherland of proletariat, a correspondent of *Literaturnaya Gazeta* wrote stories about his

meeting with Hammer, and also with other millionaires in the US. These stories (in NO. 31, 32, and 33) look like the *Who's Who* among the friends and defenders of the Soviet interests in the US, and are sparked with delight everytime he writes about their financial power: "Investment of \$3.6 billion" - this refers to Pepsi-Cola which during the coming Olympiad in Moscow will ease the thirst of millions, and next year will begin production of orangeade "Fanta" in the USSR; "Investment of \$82 billion" - in reference to the Bank of America which "has close connections with American organizations"; "Investment above \$4 billion and sales turnover over \$6 billion" - this refers to comrade Armand Hammer who told a reporter that "he was very much moved at receiving such a high order as the Order of October Revolution (which is often bestowed on the western Communists, but which had never been bestowed on a foreign businessman) and the letter of Leonid Brezhnev. He is the most prominent leader, and also a simple, warm human being..." In my opinion, there is only one Communist leader who talks in such high terms about Brezhnev: the man is the general secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party, comrade Zivkov...

Hammer's father, one of the founders of the American Communist Party, had probably dreamed, that he would help the Soviet Republic by organizing a revolution in the US. His son had found a much better, more effective way of helping Russia. We may rest assured that, if Papa Hammer could have succeeded in starting a proletarian revolution in the US, his son could never have succeeded in signing the "transaction

of the century": a contract with Russia valued at \$20 billion plus cheap credits.

The Soviet press abounded in news about sustaining a uniform front of the American bankers and industrialists and the country of "mature Socialism." Under the headline, "A speech with which president of the US should get acquainted", *Literaturnaya Gazeta* (NO 30) published excerpts from the appearance of the US vice-minister of trade, in which were expressed the "tempting prospects of cooperation with the Soviet Union." It is not precluded that Jimmy Carter after reading this article took the advice of *Literaturnaya Gazeta* to his heart, and permitted to sell oil drilling machinery to the Soviets.

The crowning argument of the Soviet propaganda, relating to the "development of cooperation between the US and the Soviet Union" is: Cooperation - trade with the Soviet Union - is needed exclusively by the US; Moscow does trade with Washington and obtains American credits, only in order to help the American proletariat and American economy.

The Soviet Union doesn't need anything. The country of mature Socialism had reached its summit of prosperity.

* * *

The Francis Crawford trial allowed foreign correspondents to write many articles about a strange thing, the Soviet rubel: they discovered that rubel is the only currency in the world, which is not accepted in its own country for goods and services (evidently, these correspondents hadn't yet seen some of

the other Socialist countries). Everything that one cannot buy for rubels, is easily bought for dollars, marks and other foreign currencies. Indeed, this strange fact, until recently unknown in Capitalism, allowed foreign correspondents to arrive at an unanimous conclusion, that the American businessman is innocent. Normally, when they inform the public about the trials in the Soviet Union, there is always in their reporting a shade of doubt: perhaps, however, who knows, according to the law of the country... But, this time, foreigners who live in Moscow, knew for certain: a normal man (and even the Soviet judge had not had any doubts about the normalcy of Crawford) will never buy 20 thousand rubels for which he can buy practically nothing.

And about what one can buy for rubels in the Soviet Union, one can read in an article of *Literaturnaya Gazeta* (NO 36) published one day before the Crawford trial. Among many things, you cannot buy, for example, mustard and thread. But, although all readers complain at the shortage of modern clothing, it appears from the article, that the problem of taste of individual buyers, is in the hands of 2 million researchers. In this region of achievement, the country of "mature Socialism" is the leader of the world. It's possible that fashion is a subject of study of more people than in all the countries of the world taken together (strictly speaking, it is one among many explanations for the lack of unemployment in the Soviet Union). With difficulties in buying such simple things as mustard or thread, there are the temporary difficulties with potatoes. But here

again, *Literaturnaya Gazeta* announces that "for the last half-year the editors receive letters about potatoes (NO. 30)". It is one more proof of the real democracy that exists in the Soviet Union: each and every citizen has the right to give advice what to do about potatoes, how to harvest them, how to preserve them and how to sell them. That is not to say a word about the fact, that in the framework of mature democracy, each year in September and October, millions of city folks - from a common laborer to a doctor of science - are obligated to go to kolkhoses and sovkhoses to dig potatoes. Of course there won't be any potatoes in the groceries, but one will have the right to write to the papers about it. Some time ago the editor of *Literaturnaya Gazeta* said that his paper is a "Soviet Hyde Park". One can freely complain in it about little deficiencies which still exist. After complaints appeared in print, the shortage of potatoes, thread and mustard becomes easier to live with. And there is a hope: perhaps Armand Hammer, beside the building of chemical industries will take care of the Soviet agricultural economy.

Adam KRUCZEK

A LETTER FROM SHANGHAI (slightly abridged)

Immediately after a few steps on the Chinese soil one is stricken by difference between yesterday and today. Three years ago, Shanghai had been bursting with an uproar of cultural revolution. Red flags were fluttering, drums drumming, flutes

squeaking, and youngsters beating cymbals. There were marches days and nights; to and from factories, to villages and back. Waiters and cooks in a hotel, driven out in the morning into streets for collective gymnastics, had been, before serving meals to hungry guests, partaking in ideological lectures, and then, tired, with obvious disgust, were throwing meals under the noses of tourists. Three years ago, Shanghai was the capital of maddening forces, which in defiance of history and psychology, common sense and the feelings of working masses, not to mention the trampled views of intelligentsia, attempted at any price to perform a fantastical experiment. China, separated - with exception of Albania and N. Korea - from the rest of the world by the double wall of political and ideological, self-imposed isolation, had been scuffling under the pressures of contradicting forces and concepts. On the one side there ran an offensive whose target had been not only the creation of a new myth, but also a new model of Socialism, entirely different from those existing in the Soviets or Yugoslavia Socialisms. It had been the concept of a permanent cultural revolution, unceasing shuffling of people from one place to another, permanent and complete equalization in a sense of universal poverty, uprooted traditions in culture, arts and philosophy. Mao, growing old, had finally supported this concept, although very likely - being detached from realities and because of sickness unable to travel over the country - had not realized what had been happening. On the other side, the opponents of the cultural revolution, led by Chu and Teng, had been too weak to counteract the fatal results of experimenting that was approved

by the Great Chairman himself. They could do only one thing: in cooperation with armed forces they stopped increasing chaos in administration and economy. Also, they succeeded in saving the Chinese historical memorabilia from the destruction by the run wild masses of youth.

I walk the streets of Shanghai and I simply cannot believe that several years ago those things had taken place here.

All of it had vanished. On the holiday of Chinese revolution there is more linen growing dry on the strings running across the streets, than the red flags. Yesterday, there was a concert in a giant, round sporting arena under a great arch. In the first row, in front of the oval stage, sit the new leaders of the Party. My interpreter, a Chinese, discreetly describes to me who and where sits, who was persecuted and when, who remained on a job after the political earthquake. What strikes the eyes of a visitor is that beside civilians there are among the leadership members 3 generals and 3 admirals. Although they do not wear any distinction of military rank, those superior officers are recognized by their age, cut of uniform and the quality of footwear. Interpreter doesn't talk about them in terms of generals or admirals, but of "commandants of military units." The audience - a multicolored crowd. In one enormous wing - soldiers in green and sailors in white uniforms. When, as though it were by a command, they take their caps off, all this wing changes into a beautiful green-white chess-board dotted with little black poppyheads. Behind me, 2 rows of guests from Yugoslavia. In their honor, a famous Chinese prima donna sings

song very popular here, "My Sarajevo, my Bania Luka," and is applauded clamorously. But before her performance, just as she enters the stage, everybody rises, and a long and frenetic applause follows. As I was told, she was, during the cultural revolution arrested and thrown into prison for her opposition against the abolishing of the traditional Chinese music art.

Following the fate of the cultural revolution, there vanished also that terrible, puffed up, artificial style of talking. Presently, the Chinese people talk normal human language. They don't moralize and boast like their northern neighbors, Russians, that everything in their country is best and noblest. Presently, even at the official Party-military-administrative meeting there is less of the stiff ceremony, that in other governed by Communists countries. Rather, it looks more like a fair. And, on the wide boulevards, under the plane trees, crowds are waving silently, freely, even nonchalantly. Colorful lampions and colorful women's dresses. No more monotonous blue clothing. The traditional pants still remain (though on receptions one may see Chinese ladies dressed in brocade gowns), but blouses are glistening with variety of colors and patterns. Girls had gotten rid of obligatory pigtailed and parade now wearing Western hair-dresses. Here and there a flower in the hairs and a coquetish gleam in the eyes. The whole edifice of shortlived puritanism is tumbling down in my eyes.

In an enormous complex of the old

"Great World," where before the revolution reigned disorder, gambling, opium and, what was commonly called the "Salt and meat" (salt - sailor, and meat - prostitutes), swarms of young people. The Palace of Youth has been opened here and overnight it became so popular that one can get inside only by a special system of admission. For 13 million population of Shanghai, even this large place is like a drop in a bucket - so I'm told by the management of the Palace. Entertainment is rather simple, combined with learning practical and intellectual skills. One of the games seems to be a macabre: There stands a big hydraulic press and under it are placed rubber heads of the ultra-leftist leaders - "the gang of four"; the press is computerized and running it demands a lot of dexterity. A person who can handle it properly becomes the main leader in the game. When the press goes down, it slowly smashes the heads of the four - Mao's widow first. The crowd applauds with jeering laugh and loud epithets.

At night, the sky is full with cascades of fireworks and a roar of firecrackers. And here too, the return to tradition. At dawn, around the hotel, formerly a complex of elegant apartments changed during the cultural revolution into party offices, and presently housing foreign visitors - a choir of cocks. To many of these songsters it is the last occasion to compete in singing, because at evening they will appear in a different form - as a delicious dish on a plate. I watch from my balcony a mass slaughter of ducks,

chickens and geese, in the courtyards, porches and terraces of the surrounding houses. The 3 day holiday celebrating the revolution is approaching. The Chinese people discover anew their love of culinary art and now they practice it even to the extent of spending their monthly wages on this one celebration.

With caring for the palate, which is very important sign of normalization, competes the rediscovery of beauty in arts and the aspects of daily life. In the Shanghai Art Museum, one of the most beautiful in China, the exhibition of history of Chinese writing had just begun. In show-cases, the exponents of writing from the first to the present signs. Old and young look at the ingenious, often magnificent instruments for preparation of inks, brushes of various size, the first rolls of paper and the model of an ancient room-library of some unknown philosopher or mandarin. And here too, an entirely different atmosphere than 3 years ago, when its scared clerks moved around like ghosts, and the inscriptions above the works of art were composed of propagandistic nonsenses. Presently, it is the most normal museum with good collections of art. All the propagandistic - revolutionary words were removed, and the custodian and his staff need not be afraid. But, what is the most important, is the behavior of visitors, their solicitude and admiration of the great history. On weekends, the whole schools (the same goes in Peking and Nanking) come here for practical lessons of the Chinese history.

On a holiday the masses of youth go

to the Garden of Mandarin or - as this wonder of architecture and art is called by citizens of Shanghai - the "Park of mutually inflicting pleasures". This garden too had been closed for several years. Presently, behind its walls decorated with carved heads of snakes, amidst pagodas, lakes, artificial rivers and creeks, under the roofs with ridges ornamented with jaws of dragons or the whole collections of figurines of men and animals, the young Chinese delight in photographing one another. And nearby, in one of the pavillions four gentlemen who, judging by their manners and the knowledge of foreign languages, remember the old good times, sell antiques now: old china, drawings, fans, figurines, jewelry, and no matter whether you buy something or not, they give you a little gift - an elegant print of all the Chinese dynasties. And everything is done with such a dignity, that I, a visitor fed up with vulgarity of Bangkok or Hongkong, afford myself a great gesture and buy for my wife a trifle from the heirlooms of one of the Chinese emperors' concubines.

Several kilometres farther, in another park, where until now the seedlings of trees were raised for reforestation and cities landscaping, the old art of cultivating ornamental miniature trees in most diversified species and shapes is in its full operation; all the trees in small

vases with inscriptions of old poetic texts. And here, in niches, ovals, the youth of Shanghai enjoy photographing. Some girls managed to have gotten a pink hat, and now take turns in making snaps, wearing it. Or boys: they have only one cowboy hat and one tie, so each of them, in succession, poses in a hat and tie for a snap on the background of a Chinese garden panorama, traditional in subtlety and extravaganza. I wonder, how it all could happen, how all that powerful - as it had appeared to me 3 years ago - wave of ultrarevolutionism had vanished without a trace.

At evening of the same day - one more confirmation: I succeeded in obtaining a ticket to an old Chinese ballet about the love of a philosopher and a goddess, which had been prohibited for 12 years. In it, appeared the artists from the Shanghai Opera Ballet School, and almost all in the audience - youth, sitting as in some special divine service. The drive toward the learning about the not long ago prohibited tradition and arts is so universal and spontaneous, that even the most devoted Communists in the new leadership can do nothing but to go along with it. In this way, the gentlemen who govern in Peking and Shanghai are growing in popularity which, no doubt, increases with the lifting of economic and political restrictions and, further, with the opening the gates of China to the West. However, the cultural and spiritual revival within the country appears the most important of all the factors that link the governing authority and the society at large. The revived tradition

in culture and civilization plays more important role in China today, than the role of religion elsewhere in the world; it explains why the Chinese did not recognize the full meaning of the election of a Pole to the throne of Pope in the Catholic Church. As I found on one Sunday, the baroque Catholic church in Peking is deserted. But despite this fact, in the honor of Karol Wojtyla, I was invited to the temple of Buddha made of green and white nephrite, to the same temple I wanted so much to see when I was here 3 years ago, but about which none of the officials of Shanghai of these days wanted to mention a word to me.

Bohdan OSADCZUK

\$1.00

Fragments

Vol. 6/2

Feb. 1979

by

Charles Joel

Ryszard JAGŁA

OPTIMISM OF A PESSIMIST
(excerpt)

KISIEL

A CRY IN THE WILDERNESS
(excerpt)

Gustaw HERLING-GRUDZIŃSKI

A DIARY WRITTEN AT NIGHT
(excerpts)

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 12/375/78 and NO 1/376 - 2/377/79, published in Paris, France.

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

OPTIMISM OF A PESSIMIST

One of my friends from Warsaw told me a while ago that now he is ready to die. He can die because he knows for certain that the political "degradation" of the Soviet Empire will soon come.

Truly speaking, I have known it for a long time, but despite this knowledge, I don't claim to be an optimist. There are two factors which will determine the "degradation" of the Soviet Russia as one of the two main powers of the world, to the position of a second class power. The first, of course, is the international role of China. Its growth became obvious at least since the visit of President Nixon to Peking in 1972. The fall of Nixon has later obscured the China question in the eyes of a wide international public opinion. But in recent months it reawoke in a most spectacular manner. In Peking appeared Brzezinski and other American statesmen. And after, there followed the Sino-Japanese treaty, which brought to light the inevitable (actually since 1972) trend in international developments. The Russians have paid a high price for their imperialistic dogmatism in the question of the Japanese Kurile Islands. But, that wasn't all. It appears that between the USA, Japan, France and the West Germany there undergoes something like a race to Peking, a rivalry in

economic influence in China. It's difficult to envisage which of the most industrialized countries of the world shall become the main cooperator with China, but it is certain, that China shall move toward industrialization in "big leaps," if we allow ourselves to use this Chinese expression. The Soviet gerontocracy must suffer many sleepless nights because of it. It suffices to read Russian press to get rid of doubts in this matter.

Ingenious in its simplicity, always hard, imperialistic and aggressive foreign politics of the USSR, endured one blow after another during these last several years. The Sino-Japanese agreement certainly hasn't been its only defeat, but, it created a possibility of the most dangerous long-range developments. Let's add to it the awakening of the West. Carter, still not too popular, slowly pushes forward. The great propagandist cry of the Soviets had not helped them much and Carter has ordered the production of neutron bombs - having in this matter the support of the main allies of America. Carter also carried out a part of his energy program. America strengthened her position in the Middle East by working toward the Israel-Egypt peace agreement. In general, the West had visibly taken a much firmer stand during the last 2 years, while the Soviets turned to defensive.

Beside the causes of an international character there are also very important causes showing on the internal front, that foretell the "degradation" of the Soviet Empire. And here comes to mind a very old anecdote: What difference is there between the crisis of Capitalism and the

crisis of Socialism? The answer is that the crises in Capitalism are periodical and the crisis in Socialism is permanent. After some hesitations during the Khrushchev era, the Russians decided for strictly political reasons not to push for any big reforms in their ineffective economy. They thought, reforms would lead to a greater independence of the non-Russian republics and were scared of such a possibility. In addition, the Soviet governing class has been convinced that more serious reforms would threaten its power, transferring the decision making authority into the hands of specialists, and consequently, weakening the so called political - economical apparatus, that is, the Party. We must give justice to this reasoning. One cannot imagine a reformation of the Communist system, which would not bring serious political consequences, first of all, personnel changes in the power elite. Considering everything, the Soviet leadership follows the line of being against reforms in the Soviet Union and the countries of the Eastern Bloc. This line of internal politics was observed with an iron discipline for as long as 15 years. Naturally, in time it proved to be a very costly decision. The economy of the whole Eastern Bloc, despite some differences between individual states, is, with each passing year, becoming more disorganized and less effective. The crisis in Poland, appears only as a symptom of a disease that eats the whole Eastern Bloc. Characteristically, there is only talk about the crisis in Russia which has a lower standard of living than the satellites. It is one of the many paradoxes of the communist system. The people don't get anything for themselves from the imperialism of their

country. Permanent exploitation of satellites serves, first of all, the expansion of the whole Bloc. Sometimes, in some sectors, the people of the hegemonic state envy the peoples of dependent and exploited states.

Until recently, East Germany was the most privileged state of the Eastern Bloc, but there also some signs of economic troubles are plainly visible. We should not have any doubt that Communism will fall; it is economically ineffective and irrational. The Communist parties in the countries in which they are in power are still strong enough to strangle eventual revolution and force the citizens to suffer the consequences of economic disaster, they - the Parties created. This situation exists now and will, perhaps, continue to exist for some time. But permanent crisis and other growing disruptions in the Eastern Bloc are the reasons for continually increasing the distance between it and the economically developing countries of the West. There is only one area, arms production, in which the Russians do not want to be outdistanced by the West, and in which they also attempt to balance their less advanced technology by quantitative superiority. And here, we must admit, the Soviet leadership has reached a point at which nobody will gain by going to war against the USSR. The communist propagandists write (not lying in this case) that in the case of atomic war, independent of its political results, each and every human being on the globe would be killed 15 times. The influence of the military complex in Russia is enormous. We shouldn't forget that men who are managing this complex must not necessarily be Soviet doctrinaires; never-

theless, they are equally as imperialistic as the Party leadership is. In this respect it suffices to recollect a great euphoric manifestation at the conference of USSR military elite when Stalin's military genius was mentioned. I don't share the views of many Western political scientists who think that the increased influence of the military complex after Brezhnev's death will bring some positive changes in the pragmatism of the system. We may judge this wishful thinking by the example of China. There, the reigning system also undergoes a pragmatic evolution, but this fact doesn't make it less imperialistic. The same might happen with the Soviet system. If the Soviets managed to sustain a relative arms balance with the West that would permit them to blackmail the world with the eventuality of a holocaust, then they will never resign from their imperialistic appetites. And this is also because only the incessant attempts to expand and maintain their possessions allows each succeeding Soviet governing elite to justify the poor results in the handling of internal problems, absolute dictatorship and holding the peoples of Eastern Bloc in captivity and poverty.

As I mentioned, the Soviet expansionism has evoked a partial "awakening" of the West, first of all the USA. From among the "greats" of the West, France, the country most vassalized by the Soviets, not so much awoke as turned her attention toward China, smelling chances of economic profits. What is astonishing, however, is the compliance, if not the servilism of the West German Republic government. Apart from the not too clear plans for neutralization of Europe invented by Egon Bahr, the German Social

Democrats seem to cherish some illusions about Russian concessions in Europe, which would result from Russians' fear of China. In Moscow, the reasoning goes along a completely different line. A classic example of it is the question of the already mentioned Kurile Islands. The Russians consider, that if they returned something they had stolen, then a precedence would be created for subsequent demands so that they would be forced to return everything. It is clear that since they did not return the Kurile Islands, they will never return East Germany. Otherwise, it could mean a future independent Poland, the Baltic countries and, perhaps all the countries of the Mid-Eastern Europe. The politics of compliance of some of the Western powers is not the way of obtaining concessions from Russia. What is needed, is a change of the whole attitude of the world powers, a change which must be completely to the disadvantage of Russia. Personally, I think, this change is in sight.

Undoubtedly, despite the naiveness of the West and its politics of smiles toward the cold and brutal gamblers of the Kremlin, time plays against the Soviets. Their area of influence will be shrinking profusely with each passing year. The Russians got themselves into a trap of their own making. If their governing class applied some rational reforms in the country's economy, it would be forced to share power with the men of competence in various fields, and perhaps in time even lose it. On the other hand, if it doesn't implement some far-reaching economic reforms, the whole Soviet Empire will be on the road

to "degradation" caused by the constantly growing economy of the West and the East. One way or the other, the end will be sad. However, in case the reforms are implemented, some kind of natural evolution of the Soviet system might follow, perhaps even without any dramatic shocks. In case of a gradually progressing "degradation," Soviet Russia may become a terrain of sharp internal confrontations, and also, when trying not to lose face, she may - more or less subconsciously - cause a conflict on a world wide scale. The "degradation" of the Soviet Union without great internal and international shocks would be a winning bet for mankind in the lottery of history. And, that's why, although I look at this problem with moderate optimism, and I believe in the inevitability of the Soviet Empire's fall - similar to the fall of every empire in world history - I see that the dramatic historic context of that inevitable fall seems to speak for the philosophy of pessimism. Even those Europeans who are the most pacifistic and humanistic must admit that war is inevitable. None of the empires in the world have ever fallen without shocks. The fall of the Soviet Empire without war is possible, but it would demand the long-range, rational and coordinated politics of those world powers which are interested in the "degradation" of the Soviet Russia. Alas, it isn't easy, if not impossible to attain this kind of politics, and, in addition, it would have had to be extended for a long time. Knowing how all this will end, and seeing today with clarity all the internal and international precursors of the Soviet Empire's fall, we have little hopes that all this will take place in our generation.

This is both my optimistic and pessimistic vision of what is inevitable and what is oscillating between a catastrophe and the proverbial finger of Providence, or, if you prefer, just pure luck.

Naturally, there is one more factor to be disputed in our dilemma. It is the social fluctuation in the countries of the Soviet Bloc. Most vogue in the West are talks about dissidents. We should, however, realize that in the dynamics of the internal situation of Soviet Union, dissidents do not play a key role. True, there is a lot of noise about them because their persecutions are connected with repressions against Jewish minority which has strong support in the West, especially in the USA. The processes of internal disintegration of Russia grow in strength mainly not because of the dissidents' activities, but because of the nationalistic aspirations of the non-Russian republics of the Empire. In second place I would put the anti-communistic character of neonationalism in Russia herself, connected to the renaissance of the Russian Orthodox Church and many other religious sects and movements. In other words, although dissidents play a very important role in the propaganda of the West, they are actually not the leaders of the internal front which moves toward the disintegration of the Soviet Empire. The centrifugal forces of nationalistic origin in the USSR will become, in the next decade, a main problem of the internal politics of the USSR. The Soviets cannot afford to apply the ever efficacious terror of Stalin times against them, because the need for economic cooperation with the West dictates them to

keep a façade of moderation and to create an impression of being a civilized country. The West, though, is very eager to believe it. However, the nationalistic questions are swelling to such a degree, that dealing with them in the present manner will no longer be possible. This is, with all certainty, one of the most important assumptions that the inevitable fall of the Soviet Empire is coming closer. Usually, nationalistic problems carry an enormous emotional load and very seldom are possible to be resolved without serious shocks. No matter from what angle we look at the Soviet Empire's problems we must always detect the possibilities of danger of almost apocalyptic dimension. Past experience teaches us, that when the internal structure of the system is breaking down in Russia, there, indeed, follow the events of incalculable proportions. The Western governments practice courting the Russian bear, forgetting that the flow of water in a river cannot be reversed, and that colonialism, successfully liquidated in the Third World, cannot be triumphant in a large part of Europe and in the USSR.

The internal opposition in Poland is entirely different than that in Russia. Its main strength - the Catholic Church - represents a highly refined nationalism, in a great measure enlightened and, at present, very humanistic. In practice, the Church, being in opposition, defends the rights of all. We cannot compare this situation to Russian nationalism, that is the one which is represented by the old Russian opposition, which, as it appears, is aggressive and unfriendly toward the minorities in the USSR and the peoples of

captive countries as well. In order to avoid any misunderstanding it ought to be stressed that we talk here mainly about the nationalistic tendencies which are not crystalized and organized, but, which appear as a very strong internal undercurrent and the main enemy of Communism.

Returning to the situation in Poland, we should notice the far reaching meaning of the cardinal Wojtyla election. The Communists understood it well, and their confusion and their inconsistent reaction to this event is one of the most tragicomic spectacles in the history of the Polish Peoples Republic. For example, the most stupid interpretation of cardinal Wojtyla election is, that he was elected because the Polish Peoples Republic has a strong position in the world. But in fact, he was chosen, because the Polish Church has resisted communist pressure, proving to the world, that despite persecutions it is possible to preserve the unity of the universal church, and Western culture, and, in addition, to have such inflexible personalities as cardinal Wyszynski and cardinal Wojtyla - the present John Paul II. No one doubts that the recent election of the Pope thrown the Communists down to their knees and this truth cannot be masked by any of their farcical grimaces. However, what is important is not only the actual meaning of this event, but also its dynamic role in the future, which, simply, cannot be overestimated. The Polish Pope will revive Catholicism not only in the whole Eastern Bloc, but also will revive the other Christian denominations and the problem of religion in Russia. John Paul II has specifically admitted, that the latter is of great concern to him, and it is so in

an entirely different context than it used to be to Casarolli and the whole recent Vatican Eastern politics. The politics of John Paul II will not be an adventurous one and will not do anything that would worsen the situation of religions in the Eastern Bloc countries. But, it also will not be a politics of timid bowing to despots who do not want to give away anything. The Pope knows them. The last several years of Communist activities toward creating division between cardinals Wyszynski and Wojtyla, and the other senseless provocations had ended in an embarrassing defeat to the Party and the Bloc.

Another part of the opposition in Poland, which calls itself - not always properly - Opposition, Laic Left, has been strengthened by the event of the Polish Pope's election. I have in mind The KOR (Ed. The Committee for Defense of Workers) and The KSS (the Students Self-Defense Committees), though the latter to a lesser degree deserves the title of Laic Opposition. In fact all of it is nothing but Democratic Opposition unconnected with the Church.

In sum, the growth of the Church's position and the reinforcement of opposition composure in the society create absolutely negative prospects for the further sovietization of Poland and, I think, the other countries of the Eastern Bloc, and sooner the Russians understand it, the better for them. However, pessimism suggests to me that because the Russians have already understood this message, they will not stop their efforts in the direction of the sovietization. They don't believe in its effectiveness but they also know that, if

they let something slip out of their hands and move toward liberalization, everything would fall apart and they would lose control over the countries of the Empire.

There are some other causes of Soviet Russia's and the satellite countries's fall but we won't discuss them here. However, opposition is - beside the new international constellations and relatively increasing distance between the Russian and other civilizations in the world - a third force that prognosticates the end of one more system of violence and oppression in the world history.

Until the yet unknown but inevitable "degradation" or even the partition of the Soviet Empire occurs, we shall live through unusually difficult times. It is certain that Poland, during the nearest years, will remain in disorganization and economic impasse, unless, speaking generally, some drastic changes of unforeseen consequences happen. Also, it is certain, that the governing team of Gierke is not able to deal effectively with the situation and remains in power by the force of inertia. Neither Warsaw nor Moscow can see any general solutions, or a new political team that would implement them. The whole efforts of the present leadership of the Party concentrate on creating some appearances of stabilization, and gravitates between the pressure of dogmatic opposition within the Party and the tendencies of society that are expressed continually by the Church and Democratic Opposition.

There are two ways of losing. Either

one concludes a wise compromise, or plays to the end using a gambler's deck of cards. Some time ago, Hitler proved, that totalitarian systems usually choose the latter.

Ryszard JAGŁA

A CRY IN THE WILDERNESS

Warsaw, November, 1978

The election of a Polish Pope, which wasn't expected by anybody, has evoked a shock of souls and minds: Through the lulled, stupefied country ran a thrill, an authentic mass upheaval after decades of passive gulping of dull propaganda, lifeless, ceremonial, "dignified" eloquence, reports from the official "appearances", meetings, conferences ("in the matters of extreme interest to both sides"), congratulatory telegrams, worthless galas with obligatory photographs on the front pages of the abominable newspapers. And then suddenly the Cracow Pontiff becomes the Pope. The winds of history fluttered along the country where, one would think, history had halted at one point 30 years ago. People woke up in one hour, and the Party functionaries who, accustomed to mechanical, unemotional, official parades, had not yet seen any authentic mass manifestation, looked at it completely flabbergasted. The deceitful "elite" of the apparatus, comprised of opportunists, hirelings, smart alecks and schemers, found itself lost, facing the awakened society. The nation has appreciated the importance of the event,

demonstrated freely, without fear. This nation is still alive, although it has been for long years fed with ingeniously cooked falsehood and misinformation, delivered from all the loudspeakers, screens, or printed pages. The first revelation from the West for many years had become understood with the speed of a thunderbolt. The Holy Spirit, as it should, appeared wiser than all the world politicians taken together.

And with it all, it has been also a showcase of the international democratization, forgotten by the "elite": What can be more democratizing than the road from Wadowice to Rome? Without superfluous babbling, without misleading explanations? Yes, the Church too has its ceremonial language, but how warm and direct it is today, in comparison to a cold, inhuman hogwash, jargon of schemes which falls on our heads. The secular pseudo-preachers of propagandist tactics and mind captivation specialist, detached from social life, suddenly received the message that they were useless and helpless. All the network of artful, psychological personnel intrigues which had been a mainstay of the so called "Catholic politics" had broken down in one second and became worthless in confrontation with the fact whose blinding brightness and simplicity nobody, absolutely nobody, had foreseen. How little brain is needed for governing this world, and how difficult it is now to pull a good face to a bad game, attempting from the fact of the Pope's election to make one more publicity stunt for the benefit of the government and the Party?!! The human comedy - but in this case impossible to stage, because the public will not buy it! *Habemus*

klapam */ said Gierek after receiving the news from Rome.

KISIEL

A DIARY WRITTEN AT NIGHT
(excerpts)

In the book of Cardinal Wojtyla *Segno di Contraddizione* (a collection of meditations spoken in March, 1976 at the recollections for Paul VI and his coworkers) I read: "Terrible is the picture of human life in the totalitarian systems, in which a man is deprived of his basic needs for existence as a human being: the freedom of his own opinion and action. There is no lack of literary works which give a sad testimony to our 'progressive' century, that it became an epoch of a new slavery, concentration camps and crematories. But, even in the liberal systems where people are sick of affluence and too much of freedom, human life also represents a sad picture of all kinds of abuses and frustrations. Aren't these things confirmed by the existence of narcotism, terrorism, highjacking of innocent people?"

It pairs well (together with adjective 'progressive' in quotation marks) with the Harvard lecture of Solzhenitsyn, which had so greatly irritated the Western Left and */ Ed. In Polish idiom "klapa" means a shameful loss, or a complete disaster of intended action, etc.

its appurtenances, by the "sin of simplification." We ought to "simplify", we ought to insist on "simplifications," since one of the methods of asphyxiation of minds is the complicating of things which are dramatically simple. Like the one, that the main conflict is taking place between totalitarianism and liberal systems (with their sicknesses). All the rest must be forgotten. For example, the problem of Socialism perpetually rolling on in the Western Europe, which - although it managed to save to a certain degree its liberal structure and fragmentary conservatism - is already ploughed over with numerous reforms and institutions of more or less socialistic nature. And who else besides the invalids of Marxism, takes seriously the old belief in the "historic mission" of proletariat and in its socialistic palingenesis of mankind? Anthony Burghes surely exaggerates in his *Year 1985*, painting a dreadful vision of England under the dictatorial governments of the Trade Unions. But we must give him justice on 2 points: When he states that Orwell wrote his *1984* while having his heart poisoned by the disbelief in "prolets"; and when he put the menace of totalitarianism before the social questions.

On the occasion of the election of Cardinal Wojtyla to the Pope's throne, Revel remarked that all the ideas of any value arrive sooner or later in the West from the East. All, we should add, can be actually expressed as only one: the knowledge of totalitarian alternative. This knowledge entails an apparent paradox: People who demand freedom in the East, simultaneously criticize its

excess in the West. In their relation to freedom there is something like the caring for a frail treasure. "We who learned from our experience what it is to lose the freedom, direct to you this double warning: Don't believe too much that nobody will ever take it away from you, don't listen to the fatal instigations, that being the freedom, it must be, absolute and limitless."

* * *

China, a hope of Communism on the left of the fatherland of the world proletariat, moved decisively to the center, making a great jump back, in order to catch up with the destructive results of the original long jump forward. A maneuver worthy of our praise and for many reasons of great historical importance, first of all, because in the fatherland of the world proletariat, it has raised the temperature of the "yellow danger."

The leader of the world proletariat has postponed his universally expected demise, and ever increasing number of speculations is being connected to this fact. Dubczek had supposedly announced, that a certain secret promise of "rehabilitation" immediately after Brezhnev's death, has been conveyed to him. However, he must hold on in opposing Charter 77, so says the condition attached to this promise. They say also, that Ceausescu relies strongly on the demise of Brezhnev. He was promised a fast equalization in family dissonances after the funeral

dinner, providing he stops flirting with Hua and Teng.

* * *

Hardly fifty days has passed by since the John Paul II election, and already doubts are raised whether *papa Wojtyla* is not, by any chance, destabilizing. At the Bologna meeting of the Catholic and laic intellectuals, devoted to this interesting question, the majority had opinioned that he is. There was at the meeting a certain scientist from Poland, whose name has not been disclosed in the press reports. He asked for the floor and said: "Why are you so much afraid of destabilization in the Communist camp?". The question has been disposed of with an embarrassing silence. The new Pope is liked very much by the "people" in the West; but, much less by the politico-cultural "elite" which discerns anxiously in him some sort of a spiritual disruption of Yalta order. The caring about "stabilization in the East is followed inseparably and in the shadow of the blessed Yalta, by the growing "destabilization" in the West. It seems to be quite natural and understandable.

Gustaw HERLING-GRUDZINSKI

\$1.00

Fragments

Vol. 6/3

March 1979

by

Charles Joel

Tymon TERLECKI AMERICAN EXPERIMENT

OF

"MULTICULTURE"

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 1/376-2/377/79, published in Paris, France.

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

AMERICAN EXPERIMENT OF "MULTICULTURE"
(abridged)

Not long ago *The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions* invited me to participate in a discussion on *Cultural Pluralism and Education*. I would like to repeat in this article what I said on that occasion, but giving it a wider form based on an open historical background. I think it will be useful to write briefly about the circumstances that caused my appearance in the discussion.

LABORATORY AND FORUM

The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions is perhaps the only one of its kind. It may be described loosely as - if I may say - an uncontrolled organ of social consciousness uninspired by anybody. The Center founded in 1959 conducts continual, face to face meetings of this consciousness with the contemporary world, with its problems and possibilities, threats and promises. It does it in many ways.

One of the main ways is calling upon people to think and talk collectively on a definite, urgent matter, to step forward to challenge the questions that often emerge or appear hazily on the horizon. It takes place on gatherings that bear different names: a dialog, seminar, symposium, conference, convocation. The practical boundaries between these definitions are not rigid. Here are a few issues that are debated upon in the Center: *Pacem in Maribus, Urban Crime and Conflict, Poverty and the Welfare System.*

Another form of the Center's activities

is a great variety of publications: from the *discussion papers* through an *occasional paper* to a many volume work such as *Pacem in Terris* - a diary of several world conferences on the peace in the world. General circulation of these publications - six million copies. Beside books, the Center publishes 2 periodicals which appear alternately each month: *Center Magazine*, and *World Issues*.

The accessibility to published material is one of the main reasons for its wide popularity. Each word spoken on the initiative of the Center is recorded on tape and delivered to nearly 500 radio stations, interested institutions and even individual persons.

The whole concept was a brainchild of one man Robert Maynard Hutchins. He was a genius. When only 30 years old, he was chosen the president of one of the leading higher education institutions, *The University of Chicago* and he held this position for almost half century. He was a philosopher and a critic of education. His views have caused many passionate quarrels among educators, because Hutchins has never retreated from a position once taken in controversial matters. He was against one-sided specialization in teaching and the sports cult, ardently demanded the maintaining and widening of Western cultural traditions. Eloquently defended nonconformism and right to oppose, seeing them as driving forces of social progress. In 1947 he presided over the *Commission on Freedom of the Press* and remained a *magnum pavers* of the important report on the "free and responsible press."

After taking leave from University life he devoted himself to the two great enterprises. One has been the monumental series

the *Great Books of the Western World* (over fifty volumes) and its supplement the *Great Ideas: A synopticon* - a guide to synoptical reading and index based on 102 great ideas, with 3,000 subtopics and 183,000 references to material in the set. Another enterprise crowning his life is the *Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions*. For its headquarters he chose Santa Barbara in Central California.

Hutchins died 2 years ago. Before his death he opened the *Chicago Program* of the Center. Not violating the rights of the Center, this branch has attained a high position in a city which has several universities, several colleges, many research institutes, libraries, complicated conglomeration of populace and, of course, quite a bouquet of problems. Mentioned at the beginning of this writing dialog about cultural pluralism and education has been one of the latest initiatives of the *Chicago Program*.

I was brought into the Center by my friend Mark Krug, professor ordinary of the *University of Chicago* and distinguished visiting professor at the *University in San Diego* (he stays 3 quarters in the former and one quarter in the latter). Krug is a Jew without complexes. Born in Vienna, he grew up in Poland (graduated from the high school in my hometown Przemyśl, reads and understands Polish, if he doesn't talk it - it is by an excess of modesty), lived a heroic period in Palestine under the British mandate, attained high scientific position in the United States. He is a man of 3 cultures, perfectly harmonized, socratical personality, open toward people and for the people, an excellent pedagogue.

I owe Krug my initiation into some aspects of American life and guidance in lecturing, but for the opinions I express in this writing, I, solely I, bear the responsibility.

SOME OF THE MORE OR LESS KNOWN FACTS

First of all, there is a truism which is worthy of our attention and study: "America is the country of immigrants," "only immigrants live in America". It is true. Not counting a small, dramatically residual Indian minority, there are no autochthons in a 200 million America.

Immigration to the enormous north American subcontinent, an expanse of great and, what some time ago would have had appeared, inexhaustible riches, was begun in early 17th century by Spaniards, followed by the French and British. In the second half of the 18th century the possessions of these 3 nations were more or less equal. Complex economic, religious and political causes in various proportions were behind the immigration to American continent.

As a result of wars, political and financial transactions, the French estate on the other side of Atlantic has been reduced to the Canadian Quebec, which presently keeps the attention of the world. In the US, only some names remained after the French: Louisiana - honoring King Louis XIV and sold for cash by Napoleon, mercilessly anglicized names of places, for example, Fond du Lac ("Pondulak") or Terre Houte (Terrot) and the mark of luxury car "Cadillac," originated from the founder of Detroit and the governor of Louisiana, Sieur de la Mothe Cadillac (by the way, Detroit now pronounced in English

originates from the French *Le detroit* - the strait).

Even the Spaniards pushed out from Florida lost all the political titles, but survived as a nationalistic and linguistic problem about which we will talk more later. Who remained were the arrivals from England supported by immigration from the western and northern Europe from the German language territories, Holland and Scandinavia. This amalgamation represented the First and the Second America, America Colonial and America Republican. It was a farming country, which still used an ancient Roman plough; it was a mixture of peoples, attaining comparative uniformity, of great dynamics and political consciousness, moved by a powerful vision of progress realized by practical means. The first federal census of population in 1790 calculated it as 4 million.

The increase from that figure to the present one took place more or less in two stages. The first ended with a 31 million population at the beginning of the Civil War (1860). This increase was made up by England and Scotland, in a lesser degree by Netherlands and Scandinavia, and also by the two great waves, one caused by *potato famine* in Ireland and another by political disturbances in the German language speaking part of Europe. Also, to the outbreak of the Civil War, there was a large scale importation of black slaves from Africa (4.5 million souls).

But the real great immigration epos was begun in the second half of the 19th century. Between 1880 and the beginning of the First World War two subsequent waves of Atlantic had thrown on the Eastern Seaboard of America 35 million people, mainly natives of East and South Europe. It has been a gigantic influx

of average 1 million persons each year. These people spoke some forty languages and dialects, had various religions, and brought different historical inheritances.

The people thrown on American shores by these ebbs filled the coal and iron ore mines, steel factories, shipyards and meat packing industry, mills and breweries, sawmills; built railways across the country and bare-handed cleared lands before the first farming machines appeared. These immigrants were the people who built the Great Industrial America (which before the end of 19th century outstripped Great Britain in the production of iron and steel). The present superpower stands up on their anonymous hardship. In front of the Capital and the White House eternal torch should illuminate the words: TO THE UNKNOWN IMMIGRANT.

The founders of the Third America were passive and dumb masses; recruited as white slaves by agents and contractors, often illiterate, not knowing language, unconscious of the peculiar law of the New Country, they brought their strong muscles and backs, the power of meek working animal. They held out to their families, group and church, native tongue and custom. They relied on themselves, which meant in practice reliance on willingness or unwillingness of their exploiter, until against the industrial kings: Oil king Rockefeller, steel king Morgan, the knights of Labor stood up. In 1886 they organized one thousand strikes involving 600,000 laborers.

When they learned how to read in a foreign language, they understood the meaning of Emmy Lazarus' sonnet, whose closing verses are engraved on the Statue of Liberty in the port of New York, offered to America by the French people.

*"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to be free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!"*

For years, several times a week, I used to walk in the downtown Chicago by a Victorian house of brick and wood blackened by age. Now it's tightly surrounded by the cement and iron jungle of the *Chicago Circle*, one of the campuses of the university, maintained by the State of Illinois. This antiquated, anachronistic edifice bears the name of Hull House and even today seems to radiate its warmth from within. In this house, a grandiloquent, exalted phraseology of the late romantic Emmy, was put into practice by another astounding old spinster, Jane Addams.

In partnership with her companion, she bought Hull House, began to assemble people of similar ambitions and to take care of immigrants, of all the misérables of the great city. Around the main building there grew up the *Settlement* - several structures nonexistent today (they gave way for bulldozers to create space for modern steel and cement blocks). In this settlement used to live people infested by the spirit of Miss Addams. Practicing their usual occupations of lawyers, doctors, artists, businessmen, they gave their free time to the needy and neglected, teaching them the language, system and customs of the country, orienting them politically and socially, giving them the feeling of being cared for, assuring them of cultural pastime.

In time the "Settlement" became a center of social problems research, workshop of legislative projects and a model for the whole, so called, *Settlement Movement*. The

contemporary welfare legislature originated from it and although it is not perfect, it, no doubt, transformed the face of the Third America. *Magna pars* of it all was the work of the indefatigable Miss Addams. She presided over many international and American organizations, supported the English suffragists, wrote several books, delivered unaccountable number of lectures; several years before she died she received the Noble Peace Award.

Jane, a giant of will and action, her coworkers and followers were all people who worked for the Americanization of immigrants, and were inspired by humanitarian impulses.

WASPS versus FIGS

Along with the positive impulses described above, with similar, if not greater strength, acted negative impulses. This phenomenon is expressed in a double acronym, made of letters in the headline of this part of my writing. Its first half in full words is: *White, Anglo, Saxon, Protestant*. The letters of the second stand for: *Poles, Italians, Greeks, Slavs*.

America has long since been an abode of xenophobia and nativism, aversion toward foreigners, and self-admiration. Puritans, the first settlers on the Atlantic Seaboard, rejected Catholic Irishmen - the first historical American minority, only because the latter had not arrived from England and were Catholics. For a long time it was a common thing to see beside the warning - Beware Bad Dogs, another - "No Irish Need Apply."

From this posture originated the *Hooded Americanism*, named as such in the book under

the same title written by D.M. Chalmers (1965).

Its anger has been directed at the Irish and catholicism, considered hostile and foreign, unamerican in ideology and character. During a few decades before the Civil War the anti-catholic and anti-Irish agitation had been conducted by the hooded *Know Nothing Party*. Its name (changed in 1845 to the *American Party*) originated from the fact that its members, bound by an oath similar to the free masonry oath, were hiding behind the statement, that they know nothing about anything.

Later, after the Civil War, the anger turned against the liberated Negroes who still did not have civil rights. The *Ku-Klux-Klan* and other similar secret organizations conducted strange ritual actions of terror for the political and social supremacy of the Whites. These phenomenons, paradoxical in a Democracy and morally repulsive have disappeared, though not entirely: The *Ku-Klux-Klan* surfaced after the first and even the Second World wars.

Nativistic tendencies, feelings and impulses were provoked by the industrial immigration at the end of 19th and the beginning of 20th century. Statistically speaking, it might seem justified or at least understood: Resulting from the continuous influx, the number of immigrants from the East and South of Europe increased to one third of the total population of the Industrial America. Proportion of 60:35 million in the annoyed minds of some reached almost apocalyptic dimension. This is how the American racism, doctrinal, orthodox "wasplism" came to life. It's based on several myths and idle fancies. Let's look at them little closer.

The first is the myth of racial purity and superiority. It's expressed in the saying: *Anglo-Saxon vs Alpine Mediterranean*. This contrariety doesn't stand up to critique from the standpoint of anthropology and history.

Historically, the racial purity of "wasps" is even more obvious nonsense. Colonial and Republican Americas were created by the English and the, so called, *Scotch-Irish*, original *Scotch Highlanders*, large mixture of Germans, a small mixture of French (Hugenots) and equally small mixture of Swiss, Swedes and Dutch. About the role of the latter speaks the fact that New York originally was called New Amsterdam until the king's government in London enforced upon it the English name together with a governor, prince of York, the brother of Charles II, and under this name had later become the capital of the United States, that is, to the year 1860 when the function of the capital was taken over by Washington, D.C.

Of an entirely irrational character is the belief in the supremacy of Anglo-Saxon culture. The sense of having an exsistive ownership of the whole American continent with everything that was, is and will be - appears a usurpation in the light of the gigantic population growth and economy at the turning point of the last 2 centuries. This kind of usurpation might have had been maintained, but only by treating the builders of the industrial America as a lower race, as servants, as a human litter.

Louis Adamic, Slovenian by birth, the author of 2 books *Nation of Nations* (1945) and *Laughing in the Jungle* (1969), a sharp observer of American life and courageous speaker on immigration problems, in the second of his books said very distinctly and

painfully: "Some time ago immigrants in America were called 'dung' - it is a proper name for them. They were the dung that was feeding the roots of the contemporary and the future greatness of America. They never stopped being a dung. The roots of America continue to take nourishment from it."

The crowning point of usurper's posture, or at least its most striking *porte-parole*, was Madison Grant, the author of an alarming book *Passing of the Great Race* (1916). An anthropologist and the chairman of the Zoological Society in New York, bearing the name of a famous general and president in addition to the first name of another president, he excluded from the American Commonwealth not only the Negroes, Indians, Spanish-Indian *mestizos* and Jews, but also all the newcomers working for American greatness. He opposed mixed marriages and the participation of new Americans in society. He proclaimed America as a monopolistic ownership of the "pure" Anglo-Saxons, an *apartheid* before its invention and practical use. He branded the democracy of Miss Lazarus and Miss Addams as *maudlin sentimentalism*.

We shouldn't delude ourselves that Grant's position has passed into history and become entirely forgotten. His book has had many editions. The last one appeared in 1970, or for all practical purposes, yesterday. Evidently it must have been in great demand; in America nobody publishes books which are not for sale. The editor and commentator of one of the last editions, Henry Fairchild Osborn, a professor of zoology, has underwritten Grant's views in their full extent. Consequently, we are free to talk about the stereotype deeply implanted in consciousness and subconsciousness of many people.

MELTING POT FOR PEOPLE

To compete with this stereotype there appeared another concept known as the *melting pot*. It began as a slogan thrown at the public in 1909 from the stage of a New York theater by the British Jew, Israel Zangwill. It's difficult today to explain what logical road this idealist of Zionism followed, how the creator of an epic of the Jewish ghetto in England conceived the idea that America is a place chosen by God, in which the mixing of all races is going to take place and produce an alloy of high quality, resembling nothing yet in the world.

Two guesses come to my mind. Perhaps Zangwill wanted to break the barrier of "waspism" and to overcome anti-Semitism proclaimed by the Grant's kind of people. It's possible too to suspect, that he has read too much of Nietzsche and mixed up Hebrew prophets with the Nietzschean idea of superman. The diatribe of the main hero of the play sounds like a prophecy: *America is God's Crucible, the Great Melting Pot, where all the races of Europe are melting and reforming... God is making the American... The real American, perhaps, the coming Superman.*

This puzzle from the psychology of creativity is not important in our discourse here. What is important, however, is, that the metaphor, the America-melting pot, has made a fantastic career, permeated colloquial language and remains in it till now with a double tinge: negative and positive also. Even the infamous memory Spiros Anagnostopoulos *vel* Spiro Agnew, ex vice-president - swindler, once solemnly

stated: "We are the *melting pot* nation, which in a little over 200 years has *distilled* something new and, I believe, something *sacred*."

Not immediately was it realized, that the idea which catapulted into orbit by an act of Zangwill now completely forgotten, is the exact contradiction of Americanization in a sense of the noble thinking liberals of Hull House and understanding of racists' as well. Americanization originated from the belief of absolute superiority of culture that was shaped on the subcontinent (even today the term Anglo-American is in use, overlooking the presence of French in the North and Latinos in the South). The concept of the *melting pot* has been based on the assumption that all the cultures transplanted on American soil are elements of the same weight, to be made into an amalgam of a new synthetic Americanism.

The slogan shared by both concepts was: *For Whites only*. Climbing over the rim of the melting pot in order to get into it wasn't for the Negroes, to say nothing of the Mexican minority, and minorities of Asiatic origin: Hindu, Chinese, Japanese. Besides, there wasn't any need to bother, since for example, in 1880 in the United States there lived only 148 Japanese. Today they number close to 300,000 (not counting the same number in Hawaiian Islands) and are the superminority, surpassing with their wealth all other minorities, including the "Anglo-Saxon".

"Wasps" did not hurry to the *melting pot*, on the contrary, they fought against it and in this we must give them credit. Grant considered the *melting pot* a catastrophe for America. He rejected the idea of "waspization"

of immigrants from the Eastern and Southern Europe, demanded their Amerization on the principle of second class citizenry, members of the lower race. His ideal was the preservation, in unblemished purity, of the type of native Americans of colonial descent, old stock Americans as the master race. It's difficult to imagine something more anachronistic and unharmonious with American ethos.

In the naive, unconsciously demoniacal idea of Zangwill there was something deeply anti-humanistic, anti-cultural. At its base stood an image of a man not as an organic entity, but as a thing, as an ore to be mechanically transformed. It has also overlooked culture as a product which grows up in certain defined conditions, perpetuated by tradition, delineating a certain view on the world and life, a certain style of existence.

CONTROLLED PLURALISM

Americanization, spontaneous or enforced, Anglo-Saxonization, *Melting Pot* - all these ideas and their practical application, brought only partial, often dubious and sometimes entirely negative results. How did all this work is unveiled in the book by 2 authors, the second of whom is one of the most dynamic and colorful figure of contemporary America, Nathan Glaser and Daniel Patrick Moynihan's *Beyond the Melting Pot* (1963).

What seems to be the real thing projecting from all these pulsating ideas is the demographic pluralism. At one time, when the industry demand for labor importation slackened, when somewhere in the depth of the

hastily constructed economic machinery there appeared the first signs of approaching depression, entered the legislature with the regulation of the new immigration influx. After several attempts or probing balloons (in 1917 and 1921) the Congress of the United States with the votes of both political parties declared in 1924 the famous *Immigration Act*. It limited in an ingenious and characteristic manner the number of immigrants allowed to enter the United States: Its yearly quota was going to be 2% of the existing number of inhabitants for each ethnic group. The results were obvious: of the total immigration number the Anglo-Saxon group received 3/4, all other groups - 1/4, which was split into small, sometimes insignificant fractions. The act of 1929 approved, even sharpened these regulations. It all meant closing for several decades the *free entry policy* and its replacement by the *closed door policy*.

More accurately speaking it was pluralism - relative, controlled, regulated in the spirit of racism. It was a post-mortem triumph of Grant and other nativists like him. The principle inspired by them has played a dirty role by supplying lobbyists and, through them, the legislators with arguments about inferiority of all races except the mythical Anglo-Saxon race. To illustrate how far these things went, I'll cite two "expert" reports from the shameful literature on this subject: "The passengers on the lower deck," one of them says, "arriving from Naples show an oppressive frequency of appearance of low foreheads, small and knobby skulls, weak chins, deformed faces, open mouths." Author of another, an M.D., specialist in eugenics, supported with statistics and diagrams a generalization that "Italians, Poles and

Jews are biological degenerates unsuitable to productive life in a free democratic country".

STEP FORWARD, STEP BACK

Mark Krug called my attention to the simultaneousness or at least chronological proximity of the two phenomena: the regulating of immigration and cultural pluralism. It may be explained very prosaically: when the threat to "the great race" has been averted mechanically and bureaucratically, it was possible to become extravagant and even to take a risk of letting the non-Anglo-Saxon citizens have the right of human identity.

As a promoter of the pluralistic posture one may consider William James, one of the creators and leading figure of pragmatism, excellent psychologist, the author of fundamental *Principles of Psychology*, philosopher of religion, the first American who attained fame as a philosopher. His last work has the title of *A Pluralistic Universe* (1909). This work develops a basic belief that the world is a multiplicity of many things different, that it is not the *universum*, but *multi-universum*, a pluralistic universe. The parts constituting reality are dependent only on the neighboring parts, permeate them reciprocally; are independent from the whole universe. Consequently: there is room in the world for freedom and creating new values. And another: Both, the world of ideas and the world of things deserve *fair play*, loyal and respectful treatment.

From this metaphysical pluralism, I think, originated cultural pluralism. Its father is Horace Kallen, the author of *Culture and Democracy in the United States*, and *Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea* (1956). He

was the first or perhaps one of the first who pointed out that not only the purity of the Anglo-Saxon race is a myth, but more, its cultural purity is inadvertent mistake. If at the genesis of America there is visible a bond of various cultural influences, there is no good reason for not recognizing the process of their multiplicity and the final result of the multiplicity in its contemporary form. He put his findings in the motto - *Unity in Diversity*. He indicated that the bond for uniting lies in the "American Idea", in the heritage of values, organizational principles and norms, which brought forth the liberation from colonial dependence and the creation of the Second America, Republican America, to the Declaration of Independence, Constitution, *Bill of Rights*, and the frontier tradition. But Kallen too omitted the Negroes and the Latinos. He did not want America multiracial; postulated the rich, attractive, deeply rooted, but singularly American culture, a "continual permeating of dominating culture into the cultural minorities".

The posture taken by Kallen did not go without opposition and is not generally accepted. "Unity in diversity" continues to frighten the lurking or ignorant racists.

An opponent of Kallen, relatively enlightened and moderate, is John Higham with his book bearing the title that refers to the inscription on the New York Statue of Liberty: *Send These To Me - Jews and Other Immigrants in Urban America* (1975). Higham considers pluralism as a posture which deepens differences, a parochial one, potentially dangerous to America and - immoral, because it seems to limit the independence and freedom of the Second and third generations of immigrants.

In the place of pluralism Higham introduces the term *pluralistic integration*. When one attempts to measure this idea to concrete situations, it becomes clear, that it's only an alusion, a screen for the "*dominating society*" and "*dominating culture*". Ethnic groups should have only *limited functions as identifiable entities*. A hazy terminology of Higham appears to be surpassed by precise and honest formula of Polish-French sociologist Hyzy in *L'integration Sans Identification*.

These 2 voices - among many, indicate how difficult it is to break through the obsolete bad habits of thinking or to overcome atavistic dispositions. The idea of cultural pluralism has no doubt took roots in America, but its recognition is still insufficient. Each step forward is followed by a step back.

(Conclusion - next issue)

Tymon Terlecki

\$1.00

Fragments

Vol. 6/4

May 1979

by

Charles Joel

Tymon TERLECKI

AMERICAN EXPERIMENT
OF
"MULTICULTURE"
(conclusion)

Gustaw HERLING-GRUDZINSKI

DIRY WRITTEN AT NIGHT
(excerpts)

KISIEL

A CRY IN THE WILDERNESS
(an excerpt)

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 1/376-2/377/79, published in Paris, France.

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

AMERICAN EXPERIMENT OF MULTICULTURE (conclusion)

Life has intervened in the toilsome developments described on the preceding pages.

The strongest intervention was the appearance of Michael Novak, professor of philosophy, theologian, commentator of Slovakian descent, director of the Ethnic Million's Political Action Committee, and his book *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics* (1971). It is angry, bitter book and its main lasting quotable is: *"What the immigrant's son wants to forget, the grandson wants to remember."* By this "grandson" he means a hyphenated American of Polish, Ukrainian, Serbian, Lithuanian, etc. descent, who appeared and appears resistant to every temperature and every kind of processing in the melting pot, and who did not and does not let himself be melted - is *unmeltable*.

A much greater role in the making of the "new ethnicity" was played by two processes: The cultural emancipation of Negroes and the aggressive pressure of the *Latinos* - Spanish speaking inhabitants of American South. Since the Civil War and the equalization of Negroes, the American cultural vision did not recognize the black color, although it is the

color of the skin of more than 10% of American population. Also beyond the *spectrum* or at least at its farthest margin were the *Latinos*. It seems, that the latter's patriotism, their awareness of being a partner in the ownership of American South has been revived by the memories of Spanish colonists who in the 18th century outstripped the English settlers in the south, and pushing along the shores of the Pacific Ocean, reached San Francisco long before the conquest that moved through the Central Plains toward the West.

In the wake of the emancipation of Negroes and political awakening of the *Latinos*, all other non-Anglo-Saxon ethnic groups acquired a different specific weight, had validated themselves. Similarly in Canada, the movement for the separation of the French Quebec opened the door to other minorities, of which, for example, the Ukrainians, threatened by genocide in their own native country, have made spectacular use. Grant and his followers, even in their most megalomaniac dreams, never imagined the situation created by "new ethnicity" and "ethnic restoration." The tolerance of these developments by the Anglo-Saxon group is, perhaps, a tactical maneuver, a defensive reaction, or a sign of deepening awareness; most likely it expresses all these three suppositions.

No matter how one is looking at it, ethnic pluralism grew up - speaking more carefully - grows up, may grow up, attains a weight of historical necessity. All other means of shaping the nation, effective to various degrees, are becoming the relics of the past, obsolete weapons which should be placed in the museums of antiquity.

In the light of the discussed developments even the means of less dubitable morality, than the morality of Anglo-Saxonization and the *melting pot*, appear anachronistic. I'm talking about means that have the legitimacy of noble intentions, such as the quota system which gives special privileges to the Black minority. My appearance in *The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions*, has been met with a vivid approval of the Black disputants (there were four of them among the sixteen present, and one of them was a state senator). But the questioning of "quotas for harms endured in the past," and guaranteeing quotas (for example at universities), was passed over as if unheard, or discreetly overlooked. Insisting on preferential quotas may lead to "reversed discrimination" and to the damaging of pluralism. It does not benefit the Negroes, because it doesn't cultivate their ambitions, it cultivates passivity and the feeling of being handicapped.

The "new ethnicity" is not at all a simple matter. To many, it may appear something automatic, something which doesn't warrant a need to care or to fight for; to many, it has the meaning of conventionality, of insipid tradition. This kind of people falls into category which Michael Novak justly described as *Saturday ethnics* (corresponding more or less to the meaning of the French *peintre de dimanche*). Also, there are many to whom the new ethnicity is something embarrassing, uncomfortable, pushed down into subconsciousness, diminishing their individuality. A disgusting example is Spiro Agnew, whom Novak described as: *One of the most malleable of ethnics, an easy specimen to americanize*. There is no need to

worry about such losses, but there are losses in all ethnic groups that are difficult to put up with; in the Polish group very great indeed, of the kind which will never be brought back by the revival of ethnicity. All this is more probable because, according to some observers, the *new ethnicity movement* is beginning to loose its drive.

Despite these predicaments, ethnic pluralism appears to be an irrevocable fact. It has been officially recognized in the *Ethnic Heritage Act* passed by the Congress in 1972, after long and complicated deliberations, which fact invoked 40 states to undertake the dispute upon this matter in their legislature. In order to set the Ethnic Heritage Act in motion, the Congress proposed \$15 million; Nixon Administration had demanded only \$2 million; Carter Administration went further down, crossing out this position in the preliminary budget for 1978, and a fight against this strange decision continues in the Congress.

Here, the step forward, half step, even a whole step back, is measured in the number of dollars. Process has begun and its goal is plainly visible.

"MULTICULTURE"

What presently appears as historical order, is a possible universal, possible dynamic, possibly diversified configuration, in which all the cultures transplanted on the American subcontinent could coexist with one another on the principle of equality and reciprocal respect - all: older and younger, larger and smaller. This kind of Democracy or conglomeration is difficult, if not

impossible to comprehend, if one assumes that there is among the equal cultures, one which is - using the language of Orwell - "more equal" than the others, that it dominates, leads and subordinates to itself the others. Even without it, the Anglo-Saxon culture has, based on the history or on the rights of the oldest settler, a peculiar position, but its bearers should muster the courage to admit their humility, or, simply, their belief that their culture is not the highest or oldest. On the American soil there exist cultures higher and older than Anglo-Saxon, such as the Greek and Latin; the Spanish culture is not much younger than the Anglo-Saxon, etc. A long time ago, America became a school of religious tolerance; her calling of today is the creating of an authentic cultural tolerance. The country of free enterprise has in its system and its experience everything to make her the country of free cultural enterprise.

We may define this sketch of a general perspective as "*multiculture*". This neologism, which serves to describe an unusual or new thing, is a carbon copy of the English term *multiculture*, which, although currently in use, doesn't appear in the latest *Random House Dictionary*, (it recognizes quite a number of words that have the prefix *multi-*, but among them are not seen the words *multiculture* and *multiuniverseum* of James).

It would be self-delusive to imagine *multiculture* as Arcadia, as an idyllic conjuncture. On the contrary, it entices dramatic tensions, especially in its preliminary stages; these tensions may be observed in some of the oppositional movements against pluralism. We may expect that

legalized cultures will collide one with another, permeate, cross, enrich one another reciprocally. It may become comparable to the processes of a rising temperature, inducing blood circulation, hastening cell multiplication in the human body.

In all this lies the fascinating uniqueness of multiculturalism.

TWO GOALS - TWO VIEWS

What are we talking about here is not the abstract conceptualism, or daydreaming. It is the way of thinking which Hutchins commended, practiced and organized when he founded "The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions."

Multiculturalism is able to fulfill far reaching, even contradictory endeavors we learned about in the preceding pages, proclaiming not a racial bond, but the bond of cultures. Being a positive force, it surpasses all the obsolete, negative concepts of M. Grant and the melting pot. It doesn't reject anything, it doesn't destroy anything; it wants to preserve, to universalize everything; it doesn't suppress, it electrifies.

Contemporary United States has much greater troubles. Unemployment, inflation, energy, arms limitations, and defense of its superpower position. But there is not a country in the world, even so great, rich and vital as the U.S., that could get along without a vision that reaches beyond its actual horizon, without the dynamics which play in the far reaching perspective.

The main uniting idea of the Republican America was the freedom of an individual, equality of all human individuals in the face of the law. In Industrial America this central idea was supplemented with an idea of an unlimited materialistic progress. These ideas may not suffice to conduct life in the America of tomorrow. In the subsequent, I think, unavoidable test, it may become necessary to have a different, stronger cohesion. Here lies the historical chance for the cultural pluralism to act in today and tomorrow's America. Antagonistic tensions between the official culture - a culture which attempts to have the right to exclusiveness - and the unofficial cultures, will change into a coexistence and creative cooperation of all cultures.

Cultural pluralism represents this chance yet in another closely related aspect. The Third America, built mainly by the immigrants from the eastern and southern Europe, became the leading industrial power of the world. It is this power that decides about the position of America in the world. But, the higher a civilization is, the more severe are the dangers it hides; it carries, partly unavoidable, partly created by recklessness, the destruction of the natural environment: of soil, water and sky. Also, it carries within itself, something which by analogy may be called an internal environment - a psychic world. In cultural pluralism, in the number and diversity of cultures, lies an almost unlimited potential for creating a diverse, dynamic, spiritual power. A deadly, empty, unattractive mass culture, which impoverishes life and takes away its charm, may be counteracted by the richness, diversity and attractiveness of the cultural pluralism. Cultural pluralism may become a natural means

for the prevention of social illnesses which are so obvious in the movement of American *hippies*, terrorism of West Germany and Japan, in Italian "Red Brigades."

Multiculture represents a possibility of saving the gains of the Second and the Third America for the future Fourth America, Pluralistic America.

ON THE ROAD TO REALIZATION

This perspective and its numerous variations, may appear to one a bit of romantic dreaming. It would be unjust to look at it this way. The starting point of our reflections is a concrete one and we may close them in an equally concrete manner.

As a result of the legislative act of 1974, more than 40 American states have begun bilingual education, under the independent *Federal Office of Bilingual Education* which takes care of seven hundred programs. Basically, all these programs intend to give the children of the new immigrants a good start in the new country and language. These activities, still very primitive, meet often with misunderstanding of parents involved, and stumble over the bureaucratic muddle-headedness.

From the standpoint of our deliberations what is more important in all this bi- or multilingual education, is the lack of uniformity. For example, the disproportion between the number of Spanish language classes and the Polish classes in the Chicago secondary schools is enormous. This situation has not changed during the last decade, despite the fact that this was a decade of

restored ethnicity. It leads to a paradox, that the children of Polish origin learn Spanish, and doubly or trebly, denationalize themselves.

This specific case leads us to the more important question: the language of multicultural in its proper meaning. The many scores of different languages do not appear on the American soil in an even distribution, but - perhaps, with the exception of Spanish enclaves in southern California and in Florida, in various degrees of dispersion, which is on the increase caused by the characteristics of industrial America, locations of industrial centers, mobility of workers, and the necessity and easiness of moving from one place to another.

In our times, perhaps for the first time in the history of the U.S., has appeared a phenomenon of an official bilinguality not in schools, but outside of their walls. In Chicago (and very likely in other places) side by side with English there appeared Spanish inscriptions in public busses, offices, and even under the art exhibits in the *Art Institute* (which *nota-bene* is proud of having after France the second greatest collection of French impressionists). It would appear logical if in the "capital of American Polonia," in "after Warsaw the second largest Polish city," where there lives a legendary million Polish Americans, some demands were made that the Polish words appear along with the Spanish. The lack of them suggests a measure of difference between the strengths of the both ethnic groups. On the other hand, we should assume, that the Polish demands would be followed by the demands of next, subsequently other numerous ethnic groups and, thus, the

chain reaction would begin.

This case, known from experience and direct observation, allows me to make some conclusive remarks.

The linguistic polarization, competition of 2 languages for influence, do not act in the interest of multicultural. Once begun, such polarization would be dangerous to the unity of multicultural, similar to the threat of danger to Canada visible in the separatist movement of Quebec. Multiculture in America, demands a common denominator, one common language code. This is my first conclusion.

And here is the second. The order of equal treatment of all the ethnic languages imposes itself with great force. Language is a basic element of every culture, it is its articulation instrument. In language we think and feel, in language we express our feelings and discernment. Consequently, in the American multicultural - if it is going to be a living creation, the languages should have rightful place in the cultures which they articulate and express.

In this context, multilingual education acquires its proper and full meaning. Each particular ethnic language should be not only a bridge that helps to cross to the English language, but also, included in the *curriculum* of elementary and secondary school, should, jointly with the English language, shape a multicultural man who will be permeated with consciousness of his own value and be open-minded toward the value of other man, tolerant and absorbing, rich and enriching his environment.

THE CLOSING THOUGHT

The oft-quoted *unmeltable ethnic* Michael Novak sourly states in the two passages of his book: "America never squarely confronted the issue of her diversity." "Nobody yet invented an image, not to mention, a political system in which there would be the possibility of *living in a genuinely pluralistic way*." These words sound like a call for precaution, but also, they are an incentive for the courageous thinking ahead.

Experience of the past, even summarized in such a superficial manner as I did in this article, shows pluralism as a fact, an inevitable and untamed fact, as a historical necessity and a historical chance. It creates an unprecedented situation, in regard to its greatness and possibilities, as well as of its complications and difficulties. What I said in this writing is something, both real and idealistic. Multiculture is a challenge, one of the greatest among these challenges, which America is confronting in her astoundingly short and astoundingly successful existence. Looked at in full perspective, that is, realistically and critically, it introduces itself as the only experiment of its kind that is being made on our planet by the modern man. Multiculture is an experiment of incalculable consequences for America, for the free world, and for mankind.

Tymon TERLECKI

DIARY WRITTEN AT NIGHT (excerpts)

The history of Charles Manson and his gang has been taken too superficially. So it seems. Only one attempt of analyzing it has reached deeper into the problem. It is a

sketch by John Joseph Szczepanski *The Fifth Angel* in a volume titled *Before the Unknown Tribunal*. Briefly: A gang running away from under the power of traditional authorities. A yearning for the Great Seducer or Leader, who will sanction existence that is above good and evil, a trance of total negativeness in the name of unlimited freedom, mysticism that goes back to primordial religion of fear and magic, a cult of demonism. Society: Indulgence for the extravagances of youth, but indulgence which doesn't originate from the educational impulse of tolerance, but rather, from a hesitation as to whether it is worthwhile yet, in view of the crisis in the traditional assumptions of civilization and social life, to have the right to judge the limits of freedom. Of course one is entitled to talk about the problem in such terms, but only at the moment of discovering the murders in Los Angeles. After it - a shock! It was cured with gentle persuasion, making the affair by Manson and his followers an example of monstrous, pathological exception.

Now, when the wind blows terror from Guyana, the diminished shock revives with a hundredfold force. We are drowning in a deluge of questions hypotheses, interpretations. What dominates all of this, is a demoniacal motif, but now (thank God) considered without an ironic smile not like it was after the discovery of Manson's gang activities. Lucifer or Carrier of Light. *Vox Diaboli*. The shadow of demon. Somebody writes about *The Possessed*, recollecting Shigalev's saying: "After leaving absolute freedom, I arrived in the domain of absolute captivity" (Dostoevsky should have supplemented this sentence with the words: "and to absolute despotism"). Here, we are

touching the truth. But, a lot is offered to think about by the fact, that until now, *The Possessed* was interpreted exclusively in the Russian revolutionary context (not counting the Soviet war edition of the book supplied with the preface about "the premonition of Hitlerism"). We may say that *The Possessed* - the real one had, for the first time, crossed the Ocean.

* * *

In August 1888, the *Lyceum* theater in London staged the theatrical adaptation of Stevenson's story *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. The story in the book form had appeared 2 years earlier, but it was from the stage that it reached the wider public. It happened this way, because one day, soon after the premiere of the play, in the neighborhood of the theater, the body of a prostitute, whose stomach had been ripped open had been found; the first one in a series of twelve; fastened to each of them was the visiting card of *Jack the Ripper*. The theatrical spectacle had invaded real life. A generally accepted version was that the murderer (who, by the way, was never found) was a respectable London doctor, that, indeed, the creation of Stevenson's imagination took the body of an authentic Jekyll and, as Hyde-the Ripper, with a knife in his hand, ran wild at night all over the city.

The atmosphere of fiction copied immediately by life, suppressed the real, deeper meaning of the book. But perhaps, more important in *The Strange Case* was the Victorian mentality. What was the apex of interest of readers was the imaginary coat of man's duplicity, in which, supposedly, good and evil coexist independently of each

other, on separate planes. Of course, this wasn't what Stevenson had in mind. What he was uncovering was the evil in action, the evil which grows more aggressive with each metamorphosis of man, up to his complete possession. He puts in the mouth of Jekyll this confession: "I have gotten rid of the instinct of keeping balance, which helps even the worst men to shun the evil temptations; in my case, to be exposed to temptation meant an immediate surrender." He named Hyde a "son of the devil," and his attacks of destructive fury a descendance of "demon's spirit". In the solid and moralizing Victorian epoch with its optimistic vision of man, the true voice of Stevenson could not have been heard. A fleeting spasm of excitement was all that expressed the approval of his story. But it deserved more, much more than this. We were entering the times of "strange" metamorphosis of modern man. A quarter century later, Kafka's kind-hearted salesman Samsa woke up one morning in bed, as a monstrous cockroach.

Gustaw HERLING-GRUDZINSKI

A CRY IN THE WILDERNESS (an excerpt)

Quite often, during my lectures in England, France and Scandinavia my Polish listeners reproach me that I bear a grudge against the West that I do not understand it, that I have a dislike toward it, etc. I answer to it all, that, in general and in principle, I thrive on opposing and criticizing, this is my *métier*, my steady occupation - wherever I go: In the East, I criticize the East, in the West - the West. I like the life in the

West very much and, for this reason, I often try to visit in there. I love the West, because one can live there normally, that is, in a bourgeois style, and whoever is not a bourgeois yet there, dreams about becoming one: there is no other universally desired ideal, no matter what the communistically inclined intellectuals are trying to make us believe in. As a matter of fact, in the West, despite all the machinations of politicians, the ultimate, deciding instance is the people with their ballots, and since the people are by nature conservative, empirical-consumptive and easy-going, and have no interest in ideas and revolutions, they leave the latter to refined intellectuals. Everything there is bourgeois or normal, everybody strives to become a bourgeois even while cheerfully calling his system (as he does so often in Scandinavia), "Socialistic." I, personally, love the West and willingly spend my vacations there. But despite all this, I don't believe the West can help us. We shouldn't expect too many good and positive deeds from the West, because the West is not a political unity: it appears, but only to us, that the West SHOULD be a unity. But, it isn't; and it is so, because the West is normal, and unity is an abnormal thing that becomes the countries which are queer and underdeveloped.

Another observation: putting its head like an ostrich in the sand, and hiding behind a barrier of complete disinformation and ignorance of contemporary history, the West likes to create an alibi for itself. Such an alibi is supposed to be created by celebration of the coming 10th anniversary of 1968 Czechoslovakian incidents and the noisy demand for the "withdrawal of the Russian army from Czechoslovakia." All this is a hypocrisy, because consciously or

subconsciously it ignores the simple fact, that all the East of Europe had been given in 1945 to Russia (by whom, you can guess yourself), that the Russian armies are in all the Mid- and East-European countries and that today's peace and prosperity of the West rest on this benevolently performed and shyly covered fact. The only curiosity in the Czechoslovakian question is, that 20 years were needed to make the Czechoslovakian russophiles see the things in proper light, while the historically wiser Poles and Hungarians learned their lesson much earlier and also much earlier began to revolt (and not bloodlessly), and later, to adapt themselves to the realities; these facts were and are easily forgotten by the West.

If we don't help ourselves, nobody ever will, because nobody understands us or does not want to understand us. This is conviction with which I always return from the normal (in my understanding) West to the abnormal (in my understanding) East. However, one may question what is and what is not normal. Some time ago, who tried to explain it to us, was no one else, but the great Boleslav Piasecki - in person. Persuading us to accept the postwar realities, he said: "You don't want to accept everything that is happening in our country, because you think it is abnormal; but, is there any objective criterion of abnormality? Everything that happens, is, by the very fact that it happens, normal; the rest are surprises which make history!"

Antoni Golubyev, the author of "Boleslaus the Brave," put this matter differently. He stated that all mankind in

its long history was driven by prevalence, violence, perfidy and eccentricity; an EXCEPTIONAL test was the 19th century liberalism and sensible democracy, which had reigned for several decades in some of the countries inhabited by "white people", among the others on a small peninsula, known as Europe. Well, on the basis of these 2 elocutions, I cannot find reason for historical optimism and for accepting as valid norms a few exceptional situations.

Considering then, that a greater part of our globe lives without democracy and information, without stabilized material values, in a queer manner, under mafia type systems of various terroristic groups or "ideologists," one may question my idea, that the Western life so much loved by me is normal. But, who knows? Perhaps, what exactly is normal, is everything that the majority of people experience, not the life style of a privileged minority? Perhaps, for example, for me to write for the native readers and under the eyes of a censor, is more normal than to write everything I can dream of, freely, for the Poles, scattered abroad, who, in most cases, had not seen Poland for many decades, and hang in the interplanetary or international void? And, allow me to remind you, that we all are, at least by education and tradition, Christians, and Christianity commands suffering, and assumes, that a man who suffers is normal, not the one who is prosperous.

In view of what has been said, there is no way to deny, that for the author of the *Cry in the Wilderness*, writing in Poland, seemingly about nothing, is an occupation more normal than writing about

everything while visiting abroad. In *Kultura* - an experiment, in the *Popular Weekly* - a norm! Staying in the normal West is a time of real vacations and escape from life; staying in the abnormal East - is the only true life. Wouldn't you agree?

KISIEL

\$1.00

Fragments

Vol. 6/5

June 1979

by

Charles Joel

W. LEDÓCHOWSKI

A LIGHT AT THE END

OF A TUNNEL

A translation from the Polish
magazine "Kultura" NO 5/380/
1979, published in Paris, France.

No part of this work may be
reproduced in any form without
permission from the editor
except for the quotations of
brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

A LIGHT AT THE END OF A TUNNEL
(abridged)

The purpose of this writing is to show
to the reader an actual image of such
intricate problems as: the thermonuclear arms
race, a prostitution of science, the inter-
national arms trade, and a position of
Christianity, especially of the Catholic
Church in regard to them. It's enormous
theme may be possible to exhaust but only
in volumes of writing. Consequently, being
tempted to dwell on it, I'm forced to take
short cuts and to be selective.

In my deliberations I concentrate
mostly on the Free World. Not that I would
think, even for a moment, that the Soviet
Union is not a mirror of the same problems,
but only for the simple reason that we have
not gotten reliable sources that pertain to
them. The matchless - in relation to other
systems - quality of Democracy is its
publicness, and, in case the latter is
absent, the freedom of bringing into the
daylight any, even the most shameful, case.

With regard to the thermonuclear arms race there is presently a relative silence in the media, a fact which illustrates a drop in the interest of public opinion in our chosen subject. We read, however, about the SALT II negotiations - almost hammered out, according to Carter's and Brezhnev's assurances - intended to replace the existing SALT I, but we don't attach too much attention to these developments, because we know, that since both superpowers' expenditures on armaments increase greatly every year, these talks in no way will stop the arms race. So, all of us have, and this is on a worldwide scale, a feeling of helplessness, worse, even distrust toward politicians who talk incessantly about disarmament.

Another reason for the lack of public interest in these matters is the atmosphere of surrealism that surrounds disputes on arms race. It is beyond the capabilities of a common mortal to understand what all of it means. I cite as exemplary: the concept of "retaliation" which occupies the minds of many strategists, translated into the language of mutual relations of both superpowers, may be reduced to the question: How is either side, without reaching out for nuclear weapons, going to convince each other that there are certain irrefutable circumstances which may force it to use it. ^{1/}

1/ From the essay "The Strategic Calculations" of Dr. Harvey Wheeler, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, Calif., published in *Unless Peace Comes*, Allen Lane, London, 1978.

It is not strange then that, confronted with such an absurd concept, the average reader gives up, yawns, puts the newspaper aside and reaches for the comic strip.

And, I would mention an astonishing fact, that our psychology, with enormous easiness has gotten used to the idea of absolute threat, such as one's own death or the Last Judgement. The sword of Damocles that hangs over mankind is not taken seriously any longer, because the cord it hangs on still holds, or, it became, like a chandelier, a decorative part of our home furniture. All the warnings of such Titans of human thought as Albert Einstein or Russell, which some time ago were a cause of many sleepless nights to many people, today seem like the senile babbling of incorrigible prophets of extermination.

The true meaning of thermonuclear weapons has been most precisely defined by A. Koestler in his last book, "Janus" ^{2/} which sums up the forty years of creativity of the writer. According to him, August sixth, 1945 - the date of the dropping of first atom bomb on Hiroshima - has opened new era in the history of mankind. If in the fulfillment of instinct of self-prolongation we have tried to add our own thought or creativity to the immortal treasures of mankind, from that date on such ambition seemed to us deprived of any sense.

A circumstance that justifies ignorance and resulting from it indifference of the public opinion is reflected in the already

2/ Hutchinson, London, 1978

mentioned fact, that discussions and arguments of strategists had long since reached the level of purest surrealism. Even nomenclature developed in their work proves it. Such terms, as "balance of terror," or "permissible level of destruction" measured in mega-deaths^{3/}, or finally, the *strategy of mutual assured destruction (MAD)* would rather fit - and this is what the average mortal concludes - the production of insecticides, for example, to fight against the plague of locust.

Is it possible that billions of dollars are spent every year just to play the game of surrealism? What is the *real* cause of it?

In an attempt to find a solution to this puzzle, let's imagine a dialog between a politician-strategist and a naive commoner, which we all are in the eyes of a politician-strategist. It would read, more or less, as follows: *Question*: What is the true cause of the arms race? *Answer*: The defense of our ideals. *Q.*: How shall we defend them? *A.*: By convincing our opponent that his aggression will not benefit him. *Q.*: And how shall we convince him about it? *A.*: By having our retaliation power equal his (and ours) extermination. In it lies our newest strategy, which we name MAD. *Q.*: Then what's the use of our ideals, since we all be dead? *A.*: It won't come to this finality. The proof of our strategy effectiveness is, that we continue to exist. *Q.*: If, however...? *A.*: Then it would appear, that our

^{3/} Indeed, a very practical unit for calculations, because a bomb of one megaton causes one mega-death.

strategy was wrong. Fortunately, there wouldn't be anybody left alive, who would come to such a conclusion.

It cannot be denied, that the surrealist game, reminiscent of a chess game between two opponents, each of whom knows everything about the other (because the mutual spying by satellites doesn't allow any of them to move a platoon of bicyclist-soldiers from village A, to village B) has some sense, verified by the fact of our existence, but only as long as there are only 2 persons playing, and if they - as an additional condition - remained mentally sane. Obviously, those 2 players are the President of the United States, as Supreme Commander and the Secretary of the Russian Communist Party, bearing on such an occasion the title of Generalissimo. Everything comes down to their decision. The developed by both sides computerization of gathering and digesting information, and also of reactions they are expected to create, is a mixture of automatization that precludes human intervention (DDC - *Direct Digital Control*) and elements of System (SC-Supervisory Control), leaving the *final* decision to choose between the options of pushing red button or reaching for the receiver of the "hot" line, to only these two persons.

The game is complicated enormously, when there are more players at the game table. Apart from an astronomical number of military-politico-psychological probables, the very fact of a great number of players increases the existing risk, that one of them will have one too many drinks, or will suffer a nervous breakdown of Jones type^{4/}.
^{4/} Allusion to the mass suicide of 900 followers of Jones' sect.

in effect, will become temporarily irresponsible.

II

Writing now about the responsibility of a scientist toward society, responsibility whose decay I called prostitution, it seems appropriate to accurately describe, what should be understood by this word.

The first step in this direction is to realize the division which exist between exact and applied sciences. While the former, discovering and formulating fundamental laws that rule the universe, can maintain its neutrality and be objective, the latter, applying these fundamental laws and harnessing them in the service of man, cannot.

And the second step is to believe that the social conscience of the scientist is based on his evaluation whether the direction of research on applying discoveries of exact science chosen by him, is beneficial, neutral, or dangerous to humanity. The problem appears simple and easy to decide upon, in practice, however, it may be enormously difficult. The difficulty emerges from the fact, that a scientists' choice of, for example, work on the *atom for war* has a different moral meaning than his choice of work for the *atom for peace*. We can see the conflict illustrated better in the development of neutron bomb. It is difficult to find a unanimous answer to the question whether the neutron bomb is an invention of positive or negative value to humanity. A scientist, invited to cooperate in its fabrication may refuse it, saying that his

participation in the production of weapon which is deadly to humans and relatively harmless to inanimate objects - is, by its nature, against his moral conscience. But his colleague, accepting the same invitation may reason that to him, the neutron bomb is a long expected turning-point in surrealist thermonuclear arms race; to him the neutron bomb by its restrictive qualities is not apocalyptic.^{5/}

The growing complexity of problems given to applied science to deal with and purposeful darkening by the military - political summits of the true aims of research, favor the decay of responsibility growing among scientists.

In contrast to the present, a very complicated situation, the Great Debate on this subject, which began forty years ago and resulted from the works of O.Hahn, Ferni, Bohr and others, appears from today's perspective to belong in a different epoch, unspoiled yet by the original sin which humanity committed by the construction of atom bomb.

The Debate cannot be understood if one

5/ There are many other possible justification: or, vice versa, condemnations of the neutron bomb, from the moral standpoint. For example, according to E.Burhop - the president of the World Federation on Scientific Workers, the neutron bomb is a weapon *par excellence* aggressive because it allows an attacker, shortly after dropping it on enemy city, to occupy it. But Kissinger in an interview described in *Encounter* of Nov. 1978, had dismissed it with contemptible shrug.

doesn't realize the exceptional circumstances in which it took place. This exceptionality lies in time impendence between the discovery of a law of nature and its application - the fact unheard of in the history of science. From the works of Hahn to dropping the atom bomb on Hiroshima only seven years elapsed.

Another exceptional circumstance was the outbreak of war and the fear connected with it, that scientists who remained under Hitlerian power construct atom bomb for the use against Western Democracies. This threat influenced Einstein who - not without long and painful hesitations - finally concluded, that *for the good of all humanity* work on atom bomb must proceed. His evaluation of the existing situation, with which all the scientists of the Free World had agreed, removed any doubts of ethical nature from their conscience.

And, finally, the third circumstance evolving from the two described above was the fact, that *dramatis personae*, that is, the participants in the debate belonged to the most illustrious brains of scientific world.

Such was the beginning, a prelude to more specific debate which glowed in full when the American intelligence (1944) affirmed beyond any doubt that the German scientists with their research were several years behind the American and English. This disclosure has weakened the general feeling of threat and, by it, opened anew the question of the moral aspects of work on the construction of the atom bomb, and later the hydrogen bomb, a dilemma upon which each scientists must have decided

in his own conscience.

The dramatic story of struggles within the conscience of many prominent man, is written by R.Jungk in "Brighter Than A Thousand Suns," a bestseller two decades past. From it, I recollect only that these struggles took quite a number of victims. Extreme nervous breakdown bordering on suicide of O.Hahn, the meteoric rise of the career of R.Oppenheimer, ostracism of E. Teller as the "traitor of science", and, finally, the sensational treachery of Klaus Fuchs are among the most known examples.

The debate on the social responsibility of a scientist had reached its summit at the time of Truman's decision to begin work on the construction of hydrogen bomb. Still strong in the sixties because of the unlucky engagement of America in Vietnam and resulting from it student revolt, it seemed to quiet down after peace engulfed the battlefields and university campuses.

The silence we witness now does not mean that the prostitution of science has disappeared. To the contrary, it is rather proof of its universalization; a universalization beyond any possibility of restraint, which results from the departure of protagonists of the Great Debate from the stage, and replacing them by a generation of young scientists, about whom, perhaps with too great pessimism, writes the American psychiatrist S.Kubie: ^{6/} "Would it be possible" he asks "that we are witnessing a rise of a generation of indifferent, amoral, bitter and disappointed scientists? If this

^{6/} American Scientist

were so, the progressing improvements of more and more deadly weapons render a comfortable escape for their destructive instincts." 7/

Indeed. It is to them, to the young, cynical generation of scientists to whom we owe the avalanche like progress of technology which brought us the idea of *overkill* unknown in the "idyllic" days. In the days of the first hydrogen bomb's construction, its creators thought that two such bombs will suffice: one to be dropped on Moscow, and another on Leningrad, and it was for the simple reason, that in the enormous expanse of the USSR, there were no other targets worthy of such colossal power of destruction as these bombs could deliver. The invention of ICBM's and the answer to them in the form of ABM's had deprived this naive arithmetic of its sense. Into the strategists's calculations, these developments brought an element of uncertainty: How many of our missiles reach their targets? There is not a strict answer to this question. It depends on the efficacy of enemy's ABM's protection which is known only to him. Here lies the cause for the increased number of hydrogen bombs from the incipient two, to today's thousand or more. 8/

7/ Their cynicism is illustrated in a statement of the inventor of napalm, who in a discussion with the press, asked whether he has had any scruples knowing that his invention will make hundreds of thousands of human torches, said: Let the others worry. I do what I'm told to do ... personally I have no qualifications to opine in the matter of morality. (*Encounter*, August, 1978)

8/ "The Outlook for Nuclear Explosives" in the collection of essays titled - *Unless Peace Comes*, Allen Lane, London, 1978.

Concluding this part of my writing, I may say: To the multitude of prostituted scientists we owe a strong feeling that, each of us having the right to expect to be killed in the first strike, will have the doubtful pleasure of being *overkilled* several times over.

III

Writing about the third of problems under our dispute, that is, about the arms trade, I would like to stress its dependence on the other two. The bond is so complete, that a liquidation of any one of them would endanger the other two.

Everything I'm talking about is clearly projected in an excellent book "The Arms Bazaar" by A.Sampson, the most prominent expert on the global intertwining of interests whose existence is generally known, but whose principles of action are hidden to the eyes of the public. The work of Sampson is a deep source of information on the arms trade from its dawn to its explosion during the Nixon-Kissinger reign, when the leading principle of Western world economy was the so called "recirculation of petrodollars" which consisted in the offer directed to the Arab sheiks and the Shah of Iran 9/ to buy everything the Western World had for sale, the modern weapons in the first place. Fact remains, that since the Israel-Egypt war in 1973 and resulting from it OPEC revolt, the arms trade had reached such dimension that it became the main element in shaping internal and foreign politics of many nations, first of all of the United States.

9/ The Shah's expenditures on arms in 1975 were over \$20 billion.

The epitath "The merchants of death" used by A.Sampson is, in my opinion, not expressive enough, not insinuating enough. Engaged in arms trade multibillion concerns, employing swarms of highly specialized salesmen, who in the waiting rooms of the world potentates spread their colorful brochures and praise the effectiveness of weapons offered for sale do not sell death only. They also sell to their patrons props for tyranny; in consequence, the sellers sentence oppressed people to poverty, hunger and ignorance.

On the margin of it all, let's add that the hunger in the Third World fed with guns instead with bread is best illustrated by these figures: in 1975 the world spent \$900 billion on arms, a sum which would suffice to feed all the hungry of the world.

Giant institutions, no matter whether they grew up, like the arms production on cynicism, or like, for example, the Catholic Church - on noble ideals, have one thing in common: Regarding their livelihood they argue, that it is both rational and ethical. The well-being of Rome, as well as of California depends on continual existence of the Church and arms production, respectively. Every attempt of their liquidation would translate into a sea of tears and misery.

IV

I trust, this presentation has evoked the reader's curiosity in the question: what is the reaction of great religions to this complex of problems, considering their vocation of guardian of public morality? If not religions, what other social forces are going to protest, to express condemnation,

to encourage a counter-action, etc.?

Certainly not governments. "To expect, that governments will bring the disarmament of the world is equally naive as to expect that elephants will cultivate a vegetable garden." This was a statement of McKeown, an activist of International Fellowship of Reconciliation ^{10/} the worldwide institution working for peace, at the special disarmament session of the UNO. This institution, without looking back at governments organizes public opinion, and the fact that its delegate is allowed to participate in the UNO sessions is, perhaps, not a breakthrough yet, but an unquestionable success. Its consultant is Philip Morris, professor of atom physics at MIT. Here is how he encourages the membership of I.F.O.R. to hold on the chosen road: "Do, whatever is possible to do; try everything possible. For a long time there won't be any response. But it shouldn't discourage you. Continue to work and then...most unexpectedly ... for the reasons you won't be able to comprehend, everything will begin to happen." ^{11/} The Professor is right. There were many precedents in world history to support his conviction.

However, in order to successfully mobilize public opinion, we ought to look everywhere for support. McKeown, in the conclusion of his speech in the UNO said: "If the great religions would be willing to

^{10/} *International Fellowship of Reconciliation* is a non-government organization, cooperating with other similar organizations, among them the Catholic *Pax Christi*.

^{11/} *Bimonthly, Fellowship*, July/August 1978

state clearly, that war (atomic) is an act against the will of the Creator, ipso facto, they would greatly strengthen the forces that work for the world peace."

This statement gives us a lot to think about. Is it possible the great religions are not, so far, able to condemn those who threaten the destruction of humanity?

The answer is not easy. I'll attempt, summarily, to answer it, scanning the position of Catholicism in this problem: the first striking fact is the scarcity of Catholic literature on the three-headed complex of problems, the theme of this writing, in comparison to the abundance of books, symposiums and declarations of all kinds of scientists, moralists, philosophers and sociologists (among them, several Nobel Prize laureates). In the Great Debate, about which I talked in the second part of this writing, the Catholic Church did not generally participate. Pius XII did not notice that the atom bomb had been dropped on Hiroshima and passed entirely in silence over this fact which was recognized, as we remember by A. Koestler, as a doorstep to the new era in mankind history. This is particularly interesting of the Pope who has had an enormously sharp sense of mission in interpreting in the light of the Bible all the problems mankind was facing, especially problems created by progressing technology. There are volumes of his pronouncements: from cinematography, radio, TV, the press, judiciary systems, to advertisement and childbearing. About the nuclear arms, arms race and prostitution of science, there is practically nothing except generally formulated warnings addressed

to governments.

The first breach in the position of Church was the Enciclic "Pacem in Terris" of John XXIII (1963). We find in it, formulated in a very circumspect manner, condemnation of the arms race and total war. Two years later the Vatican Council II went much further.

Many commentators on the texts of the Pope and the Council debates are shocked by the vagueness of declarations with regard to the questions connected with nuclear arms, in contrast to the precise, very detailed elaborations on such questions as, for example, sexual morality or the celibacy of priests. Careful study of the reports from the disputes of the Council ^{12/} explain at least in part the cause of this temperance: A group of American Cardinals and bishops, led by Card. Spellman, directed to the Fathers of the Church a letter of protest against the texts. We read in it, that "condemning the use of nuclear weapons, as immoral, the Council would ignore the fact that the possession of these weapons by America had secured the freedom of a great part of the world...." The intervention of American bishops, who were supported by many European bishops, meant that the question of nuclear arms should be handled very carefully, because every stronger position taken on it would do damage to America as the only obstacle on the road of Communist conquests. In other words: the mark of equality was put between the interests of Western democracies and Christianity.

^{12/} Details are taken from *The Rhine Flows Into The Tiber*, by Rev. R.M.Wiltgen; Augustine Publ. Co., 1978; commentary on Vatican Council II

I don't write about it just to criticize the Church. If the Pope and the majority of Church Fathers (many bitter words of truth were spoken by the minority of the Council) considered, that the vigor of the Soviet expansion, which reached its peak in post-war years, is the biggest catastrophe in the history of Christianity, and the only obstacle to its spread are the nuclear armaments, then, they should share this conviction with a great majority of the Free World, to which they integrally belong.

V

During 15 years that elapsed from the Vatican Council till now, the world situation of Communism had undergone a radical change. Its ideology, marked in the past by a colossal drive, stiffened, changed into a vehement conservatism unable to create a new idea, in contrast to which, Christianity appears an unexhausted source of eternally alive and eternally renewable beliefs.

The example is supplied by Poland, and what's more important - by Russia herself. Russia, where the awakening of religious yearnings reached a level which allowed many Western observers to estimate the number of practicing Christians as greater than in the West. Ethergaray, the Archbishop of Marseille, writes beautifully about this rejuvenation: "What is the strength of the Church in Russia" - we read in his report from the visit to the USSR - "is the unmoved by anything cheerfulness of her people, which continually inspires them, regenerate them spiritually, thus leaving the stigma of their religiousness on the polluted by

the aggressive atheism everyday life."

In comparison with the increased withering of the Church in the West, where hundreds of churches (England) are on sale, where seminaries are empty, where twelve thousand priests (since the Vatican Council) took to laic way of life, these news coming from the East have their meaningful accent. The questions arise: Is the pendulum of history going to lean toward the extreme position, meaning that the center of Christianity moves from the West to the East? Is the awakening of yearning for religion observed in the East and reaction to forced upon people materialism, going to *outstrip* similar reaction in the West where materialism, albeit, imposed by a life style, is, at final analysis, only a matter of free choice?

Perhaps, it is too early for overbold motion. Today, however, we may state, that thirty year epos of the Catholic Church in Poland has proved:

- 1/ that in confrontation with Communism, the Christianity has enormous chances to win.
- 2/ that the Catholic Church can exist and grow in any socio-economic system - not excluding Communism.

In the not too distant past, during the papacy of Pius XII, such *motions* as above would have been considered extremely naive. Their formulation today, appears obvious, although it will take some time to make them universally known. Once popularized, they will play most important role in forming the position of the Church, first, with

regards to the questions moved in this article. The restraints which prevented the Church telling the whole truth about the three-headed *monstrum* that threatens humanity, shall vanish.

These hopes were expressed by the Cardinals assembled at Conclave when they chose one of the main architects of this turn in the posture of Christianity.

W.LEDOCHOWSKI

Johannesburg, December 1978

PC

\$1.00

Fragments

Vol. 6/6

August 1979

by

Charles Joel

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 6/381/79 published in Paris, France.

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

OPPOSITION IN THE COMMUNISTIC SOCIETY

Using the term "Communitistic Society" I have in mind the Soviet model of society. The introduction of Communism in other countries has, of course, caused the appearance of some variants and modifications of this model, but its basic characteristics remain unchanged. Following are some of the important and inseverable features of this model of the society.

The means of private ownership of production doesn't exist; its nationalization is total. The total and unified system of government took over and permeated the whole society, all its branches from the top to the bottom. It's self-sufficient and able to self-regenerate by the cooptation of desirable persons chosen by higher authority. Although this is an authority which does everything possible to appear an elected body, in fact, it is not elective. In the whole country there exists one economy model characterized by a strict, mutual dependence of its branches, one planning, lack of a free market and free competition, one state price politics etc. The society becomes segmented into standard socio-productive cells which perform ordered from the top and strictly controlled tasks. Standardized are life conditions in production units and

other areas of human activity. Individual members of the society are assigned permanently to the place of their work and residence. All aspects of social life are under the control of a collective. A complicated hierarchy of socio-productive units is established, which fact leads to the creation of multiple-step ladder of jobs and social positions for individuals. Society is divided in privileged and unprivileged classes. The differences in the standard of living within these classes are enormous. Special organizational units control every aspect of the citizens' life. The monopolistic ideology of the state plays its own great role. The schools and educational activities as a whole are unified and standardized. Earnings depend strictly on the social position of an individual.

I didn't at all exhausted the list of general characteristics of the communistic model of society, but I believe, what I wrote above will suffice to give the reader an idea about the object of my concern. I purposely omitted such phenomenons of the communistic system as repressions, lack of citizen freedom, the low standard of living of a majority of the population, ever increasing incompetence, thoughtless spending of money on a show of power, career-mindedness, briberies, alcoholism, etc., because these things are the result of the functioning of the communist system, and not its structural parts. Leading groups of this society, for example, do not consciously endeavor to produce goods of inferior quality, interfere in the growth of production, protect swindlers, bunglers and upstarts. All this happens against their will, as an unavoidable result

of social life in the system.

Social relations are basically stable or even petrified for a number of reasons, of which I'll mention a few. A monumentally overgrown system of administration and control permeates all forms of social life, so that a citizen is literally ensnared by the system. An impressive number of people who belong to the privileged class of the society, are directly interested in its consolidation and preservation. If we omitted various anomalies (though they are neither consolidated nor isolated), then all the active members of society, are, in one way or the other, chained to some basic collective organization and through it give their work to the society and from it receive all their dues. We can see then how each person has his own interest in being agreeable toward the norms of coexistence and demands of society. A collective provides its members with a certain minimum of defense and support in difficult situations. The work regulations, as a rule, are relatively light. Although the standard of living is comparatively low, minimal needs such as a roof over one's head, food, clothing, entertainment, hospitalization and possibly vacations are - better or worse - fulfilled. Between the individual members and a collective there is permanent mutual dependence, so that in the end, all are interested in the stability of the everyday routine. Obeying orders of an official appointed by the top is less humiliating than obeying orders of a private contractor. It is more so, because on the lower steps of the ladder these officials are local people who often continue to live in the community of their birth. The advantage of this arrangement

is obvious in critical situations (for example, during the natural disasters).

People have quite a number of opportunities for the betterment of their living conditions by using their official positions and relations (malversations, mutual favors, bribes, taking advantage of having acquaintances in higher echelons). Briefly: looking without prejudice at the realities of this society, we observe thousands of threads that tie millions of people together and make them into a monolith, which is what the Party wants to have and see. Let's add the pedantically imposed system of schools and ideological education and we can see a stereotype of the citizens' behavior that is binding every (with very few exceptions) member of the society from leaders to street cleaners. Although the communistic society is a society of people who are dissatisfied with their lives, an overwhelming majority of these people are not able to live under other conditions and consider as natural the conditions in which they now live. The opinion that the communist system stands only on violence and falsehood is naive. It is true, violence and falsehood permeate every segment of this society but it is not because they are imposed by the authorities; violence and falsehood are the fruits of the citizens' everyday activities, are a means of self-defense and adaptation to life.

We shouldn't think that there is harmony in the mutual relations of individuals, groups and teams. Always and everywhere a fierce fight goes on. This society literally foams with rage.

Everyone quarrels with one another: the leaders, and professors, and small officials, and generals, and writers. The fight among them is an unrestrained element of normal life in this society. It is conducted in forms and manners approved by the whole society. It does not at all weaken the society, and in only very rare situations becomes a source of some opposition against the system. The conclusion is simple: Not every sign of dissatisfaction and not every kind of conflict in communist model of the society may be considered a sign of opposition against social system and an act of aggression against it, or against any real part of it.

The communistic society, similar to other societies in the world, gives its citizens an entirely natural reason to be dissatisfied at existing living conditions, which fact inspires in them a desire for change. But, each type of society has its corresponding type of dissatisfaction and different dreams about changes. For example, in the Soviet Union you can find a lot of people who are dissatisfied because private ownership of production and private initiative in the economy are abolished. You can also find people who would like to see the return of the monarchy with capitalists and landowners. Can we take them seriously? Of course not. The overwhelming majority of the USSR population (including the most qualified) are decidedly against the return of private ownership of factories or institutions in which they work. Here, private initiative is a crime, and people enthusiastically approve its persecution. The perspective of the return of monarchy evokes a good laugh.

On the other hand, everybody in the USSR has something to be dissatisfied with. Everybody is criticizing everything. The dailies and periodicals are filled with critiques. As far as the criticism of the Soviet way of life is concerned, the official literature doesn't differ much from the dissident, sometimes it goes even further. It is difficult to find a Soviet man who, in one form or another, wouldn't grumble at the Soviet orders and means of power. How do we understand this fact? There are some people who insist that the days of the Soviet power are numbered and the people would overturn the system if given a real chance to choose the type of government and way of life. Well, it is too late to think this way; the time when the first Russian emigrants had been sitting on their luggage and hoped that the Soviet system will fall any moment is long gone. Today, when we hear similar opinions, we may see in them only a sign of sickly incapability to evaluate the actual state of affairs, or even a desire to flatter at any price some of the Western opinion makers. We can understand it, but there is no way to justify it. I believe, it is high time to look into the eyes of the truth, and accept the idea that the communist system has very deep roots and a durability which cannot be ascribed to the gullibility of citizens and violence inflicted on them by some evildoers. This is the system considered by millions as entirely natural and lawful, a system which through generations recreates its substance and shapes (by selection and education) a type of man suitable to its needs. I don't say that this system is good, much less, that it is better than any Western system, that I like it... I state only the facts.

I repeat, quite a remarkable dissatisfaction with the conditions of life is visible in various segments of population. And here, we must find an answer to a number of questions: How strong is this dissatisfaction? Is it strong enough to make people reject all forms of their existence? Are there any chances for a plain (that is, noticeable by the whole community and by the authorities) demonstration of this dissatisfaction; is there any chance of its popularization and coordination on a possible wide base and in anticipation of a long fight by those persons dissatisfied for better life? Is a fear of government suppression the only and the main reason for the absence of mass protests?

Answering these and other questions that pertain to the problems disputed in this article would demand many serious and fundamental, sociological studies. That's why I limit myself to only several remarks. What are the things people in any system are dissatisfied with? Low standard of living, poor working conditions and limited possibilities for personal success. In the communist system, the fulfillment of human needs depends by principle on the general situation of the country and the system of national income distribution prescribed at the top, a fact people know about from their cradles. There is not a single person, who could be considered really responsible for all the troubles, so the people try to improve their personal situation exquisitely in a framework created by the domineering system, and they do it individually (or in very small groups). The tensions caused by dissatisfaction seldom reach a critical level, because

through each generation the people are used to living on very low level. The enormous power to stifle any sign of an open dissatisfaction is in the hands of the factory administration, local organs of authority, militia, security organs, and armed forces. People simply cannot afford to live long without any work. The state decides about accessibility to every means of making a living. But, that isn't all. The social structure of the populace excludes any possibility of a spontaneous birth of a large and sufficiently strong groups that would be unauthorized by the authorities. The whole routine of daily life with no exception pushes the people to strictly negative associating, associating whose purpose is the suppression of dissatisfaction of their brothers. Their own dissatisfaction appears only in dispersed forms and, at best, may be seen in a passive opposition (dishonest work, poor craftsmanship, cheating on superiors, alcoholism).

I stress, that in order to understand the situation of dissatisfied people in the Soviet Union and their perspectives, we ought to consider not only the separate facts of protest and some absolute figures (the number of dissatisfied) but the position of these dissatisfied in the community they belong to, how this community relates to them, and their own future in case they were thrown out of the community. There may be many millions of dissatisfied people in the country, but they are scattered and plugged into various jobs in such a fashion that it brings their dissatisfaction practically to a stage of stagnation. In other words the appearance of dissatisfied people in significantly large groups is rendered impossible by life itself.

I would like to draw the reader's attention to one more circumstance strictly connected with the problem of opposition in the communist society: the actual meaning of personal freedom and bondage in the society. Saying that it is possible to live in any society and be at the same time independent from it, is a banality. We know, that even slaves and peasants of socage had had a certain amount of freedom, without which the life would be impossible. So, we must define in what sense an individual in a society is free, and in what - dependent. From this standpoint, it would be a great mistake to describe communistic society as a kingdom of an absolute slavery, or absolute freedom. Also it would be a mistake to consider a lack of freedom as the result of some dreadful intentions of some evil people, and the existence of freedom - as a sign of someone's nobleness. In consequence, a fact, for example, of chaining people to the place of their employment is not just a premeditated obstruction of freedom and a sign of oppression. After all, what is expressed in this is strictly economic necessity to make a living in this manner, felt by a great majority of the populace. On the other hand, there is a limit to the power of a collective and its managers over an individual member. The working day is regulated evenly in the whole country and cannot be wilfully violated by local authority. The same may be said about wages, vacations, a certain amount of living area, and many other matters important for living. There is a slight possibility for changing one's place of work and looking for a better paid one. One may even quarrel without any risk with a director of a factory. It isn't easy to sack a worker. If it cannot

be proven to him that he is a criminal or dissident, his coworkers and social organizations will defend him. In one word, an ordinary member of the communistic society is deprived of personal freedom, but it is so as a result of a defined system of objective conditions which make life bearable.

But the communist countries take part in the process of human history and are a part of planet's mankind. Exactly from this historical "context" (not from some prehistoric human nature) have some of the citizens of these countries gotten the idea of human rights as the product of centuries of civilization. To the majority of them this idea has only a literary valor, is a passive element of culture; the overwhelming majority of communist societies do not feel any need for these rights, their way of life doesn't afford such a need. And this is why they do not have these rights. Speaking brutally, these rights are needed by them like a dog needs a fifth leg. Only a very insignificant number of people in the communist countries feel the need of human rights - knowing, besides, that this is completely unbecoming to their social life.

With all this - as proven by the facts - an open opposition is possible in the communistic society. There is no place here for abstract theorizations over this subject. Let's state only that there are three forms of opposition, all a product of specific, communistic reality.

Historically, the first kind of opposition was anti-Stalinism. Born in the

prewar years, it has deepened during the World War II; it was suppressed directly after the war, but despite suppression, it grew up, and reached its peak after the death of Stalin. Characteristic of this period is that a fight against Stalinism has been conducted by the principal organizations of the Party. The famous Khrushchev report was not a starting point of this fight; it was its demonstration, its result, or, one of its forms. In this period, Stalinism has been considered a desertion from the norms that were obligatory in the life of the communistic society. The fight was for the preservation of these norms, for the integrity and personal security of people who were completely loyal to the Soviet system. This fight brought the desired results, first of all, to the Party leadership and to many thousands of officials and functionaries - holders of responsible positions in basic organizations and society at large. Although the fight was begun and conducted by the victims of Stalin's regime, the first who benefitted from it were the masters of the Society. For the first time in the history of the Soviet Union these masters have felt that they are rightfully in the saddle and, finally, that nothing can threaten them. Also, the whole populace of the country benefitted. Life became definitely easier and more peaceful.

The next form of opposition was liberalism of Khrushchev period. It is rather difficult to put it in some definite category. In this period, in every important area of Soviet life there appeared people of a new type, different than their predecessors and competitors regarding a higher level of education,

greater abilities and drive, better manners, greater tolerance in ideological matters. Tending to achieve their personal gains (career, better life conditions, fulfillment of ambition) these people brought into public life a certain appeasement of daily habits and a revival of Western European forms of culture. They supported the development of criticism of the system and themselves cultivated it. But, at the same time, they were loyal to the system, acted in its name and on its behalf. We may say that their only care was to make the most of their positions in the system and to make the system more bearable. If the first form of opposition I mentioned (anti-Stalinism) was directed against the extremes of the communist system, then the second (liberalism) was against provincialism, stagnation, mediocrity of daily life. And, we must admit that in this respect the Brezhnev's period (despite all) is a combination of Khrushchev's, with one difference, that liberalism has been put into a more comfortable frame, or, has been used more advantageously.

The third form of opposition - the dissident movement. I think it is the most remarkable phenomenon in the whole history of the Soviet Union, in this sense, that with great power it confronted the world with the problem: what really is the communist society, and, that for the first time in the chronicles of this society it gave us an example of opposition against the system as a whole. This movement, just by its existence has proved that there are possibilities for opposition and its effects on the life of a society. The movement arose during the last year of Khrushchev reign, and reached its

maximal stage during the seventies.

Participation in the movement is very diversified: scientists, writers, students, lawyers, religious leaders, people who desire to leave the country (Jewish immigrants) etc. Diversified are also the personal motifs of participants; their views and goals. However, there are reasons which make us see this movement as a certain unity. Let's mention among them a common fate which unifies many members of the movement, how the official society relates to it, a tendency toward a joint ideological and organizational forms, personal relations and the reaction of the West to it. Based on all this we may consider the dissident movement an opposition different from other known oppositions.

Meritoriously, the dissident movement demonstrated in practical way, that some facts which are officially recognized as unimportant and coincidental defection from the norms of the Soviet society, are, in fact, playing key role in the life of this society. The behavior of the members of the movement has helped too to shatter the framework of norms acquired by custom, tradition, and, sometimes, by law. What I have in mind are the public protests, "samizdat," conveying true information to the Western press and radio, public protests, etc. It's generally known how the authorities, official organizations and certain definite social circles react to them. People who, in one way or another, decided to join the movement, were losing their social positions and jobs. Many received prison sentences or were sent to psychiatric asylums. Many were forced to immigrate. To complete the picture it must be added

that many colleagues and coworkers of dissidents were helping the authorities in persecutions. Repressions, however, did not stop the movement, to the contrary, they helped it to grow, to deepen, to intensify. Owing to the repressions, rapproachements between individual members of various fragments of the movement and the appearance of basic elements of organizational order, followed. Gradually and in more visible manner the movement began to show a unified ideology, its common denominator being the fight for human rights. And although this common denominator appeared (as we are free to assume) spontaneously, it became the main goal of the movement; what it expresses is a protest against oppression and enslavement of human individuality in the communist society, an individuality understood in the spirit of the highest values of the Western Democracy. And, because the human rights are inseparably connected with just this understanding of human individuality and are representing something that doesn't evolve from the principles of the communist system, the whole dissident movement appears directed not against any particular area of the communist system, but against its very basics.

The dissidents took advantage of the formal declarations of the Soviet authorities and formal regulations of the Soviet law regarding citizens' rights, and because of this, the movement arose and continues to exist legally. But it isn't a secret to anybody that these declarations and "rights" (for instance these in the Helsinki Declaration) are empty words that have no real connection with the nature of

the Communist society. From the pure sociological standpoint the movement is an expression of a protest against the actual situation of an individual in the communist society, which situation depends on basic conditions of life in this society. If we declared this movement a form of fight for human rights, then, we may conclude that it is sentenced to die - because the communist society which guarantees individual rights is the same kind of nonsense as a capitalistic society without capital and profit. If, however, we would let its ideological form alone, that is if we would look at it regardless of whether the human rights are realistically reachable, then we must admit its effectiveness and farsightedness. No matter what ideological form it would take, it would be a result of structural conditions in which people of this society live. A suppression of these conditions is equal to abolishing the social system itself. As long as these conditions exist, there will be a revival (in one form or another) of opposition against them, opposition which now exist as the dissident movement.

An evaluation of consequences of the dissident movement, the power of its influence over people and how people react to it is, I think, a most complicated problem. Each view on this matter may find its base in some well known facts; for example, that the movement is numerically small and weak. And, that it is powerful and massive. And the one, that its influence is enormous. And that the people do not support it. And that it enjoys enormous support. The fact of matter is, that all these evaluations are relative; there are no general and absolute criteria for

comparisons, there are no reliable measures, and objective studies are impossible (the authorities won't allow them and people asked won't give the true answer to an enquirer, etc.). As a result, a researcher must rely on his own experiences, on second hand information, on his knowledge of the general situation of the country and disposition of its inhabitants. Accordingly, I am inclined to accept not a quantitative evaluation (which uses such terms as "big," "small," "strong," "weak") of dissident movement, but a qualitative one. Under the Soviet sky, an action begun by a single man may be as great as in other countries is an action of a whole political group or even a party; and a unanimous condemnation of such a single man even by the whole population of the country may not affect the real vestige which his action had created in their souls. That's why it's not coincidental, that the dissident movement in the USSR is identified with personalities, that it associates rather with the names of activists, than with the names of groups. Very often a quantitative evaluation will not at all correspond the actual state of affairs.

Just the fact of the birth and long existence of the dissident movement is a phenomenon of historical value. Once and for all the dreams of the Communist Garden of Eden on Earth are blown assunder. It became clear that the future history of communism will not be a history of idyll and harmony but of a scuffle. The dissidents always behave in a dignified, exemplary manner. The example set by the dissidents has really worked. Any, even the smallest, event that has something in common with

dissidents, is important, often the most important subject of discussions and thinking in various circles of society. Just for this reason, no other phenomenon in the area of spiritual culture attracted so much attention during the last decade. Some of the cultural reliefs which were implemented by the regime during last several years occurred because of the dissident movement's existence. Even then, authorities - owing to dissidents - could, finally, get to know some things about the real situation of the country; *volens volens*, they must apply some of the more elastic methods in administration. And finally - without moral and financial support of a great number of people - this movement wouldn't last even one year. Of course, the West tries to help too, but we should not overestimate the meaning of this help, to the detriment of the internal base of the movement. Without internal base the help from the West would be totally impossible. The dissident movement influences the way of thinking of some definite segments of the population of the USSR, and through them spreads over wide masses. It would be a naiveness to expect quick results of this influence, to hope that results will be visibly in line with the ideals of the movement. We cannot yet practically explore the mechanism of this influence and envisage its consequences. But it is not necessary. The historical experiences of mankind give us enough reasons for hope.

In summary, the review of the historical experiment known as the Soviet Union allows us to state, that there are 3 types of opposition: 1/ Against the excesses of the regime; 2/ Against stagnation and conservatism; 3/ Against the lack of human

rights. These types, of course, are connected and reciprocally permeate one another. Owing to this, the critique of a mass repression during the Stalin era transformed itself in a critique of a real model of the communistic society in general, and the reaction to the repressions turned against the defenders of human rights - brought the first type of opposition. The differences between particular types of opposition, however, are sufficiently distinct and real in many respects.

I wish to stress in conclusion, that the division of the world in a domain of communism and a domain of something which is a contradiction of it - is not a geographical division. What is happening in the Western countries does not need explanation; communistic tendencies there are visible too. What is important is that, in the communistic countries alone, the line of division appears too. These countries too, in various ways, attempt to stop the communistic avalanche. I have an impression, that the defenders and leaders of communism are not happy with their own successes, and seem ready to stop them. It wouldn't be strange if the communist avalanche escaped human control. The role of internal opposition in the task of putting this avalanche under even partial control - is irreplaceable.

Alesander ZINOVIEV

(Translated from Russian by Michal Kaniowski)

\$1.00

Fragments

Vol. 6/7

Sept. 1979

by

Charles Joel

Zbigniew BYRSKI

THE NUCLEAR FEARS OF
AMERICA
(slightly abridged)

Adam KRUCZEK

IN THE SOVIET PRESS
(excerpts)

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 7/382 - 8/383 - 1979 published in Paris, France.

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

THE NUCLEAR FEARS OF AMERICA (slightly abridged)

In the United States recently there appeared T shirts with the print: "I survived the Three Mile Island accident." Of course, it relates to the accident which occurred last March at the nuclear reactor in Harrisburg. A visitor from some distant planet would think that it must have been a monstrous catastrophe which involved hundreds of thousands of victims - and here now he sees a lucky man who came out safe. In reality, as we know, there wasn't any catastrophe, though it could occur. The accident in Harrisburg is nothing new as an example of potentialities it involves. It is something new, only because it took place at the nuclear reactor. According to the HEW Secretary Califano, the number of potential victims oscilated between ten additional cancer caused deaths during

indefinite years and several thousands of deaths of people who could have perished in case the plant technicians failed to cool the nuclear fuel. The whole matter, if measured by the number of potential victims (as there were no real ones) should not have evoked such a panic in public opinion as we have witnessed. It shouldn't have - if we considered the experiences of the past. The cost of civilization measured in human lives and health, which America and Western world enjoy, are, in general, pretty high. These people who oppose the continual growth of nuclear energy know well that sacrifices, which are and were involved in coal mining, are not measured by the number of miners who died in gas explosions and flooding of mines, but by the millions of premature deaths by the coal dust poisoning of lungs. They know that hundreds of thousands of workers in their fifties retire in the auto industry because of lead poisoning. They know, that among the 300,000 Americans who will die of lung cancer in the next few years, at least 200,000 could prolong their lives just by stopping cigarette smoking; that each year 50,000 American motorists perish in car accidents, and that this number might be greatly reduced by not granting driver licenses to the persons below 19 and introducing more severe traffic regulations.

But all these arguments repeated ad infinitum, which would dictate more rational and, in any case, less hysterical reaction to the Harrisburg incident, amount to nought. They do not affect the minds of a certain portion of American people because the truth of the matter lies elsewhere.

There wasn't any explosion in Harrisburg. The explosion occurred only in minds of some sectors of America society, because the incident at Three Mile Island had, simply, functioned as a detonator - or, if you prefer a more civilized definition - as a pretext. It had released nostalgic and not at all extinct dispositions and feelings of the '60s and the last years of Nixon's presidency, when a considerable segment of middle class, not to mention the intellectual elite, had been engaged in war against the American *establishment*.¹

I/ The explanation of this socio-pathological phenomenon (essentially the fact, that circles dominating in the system accept self-consciously the role of the grave-digger of the system) should be a graceful theme for the writings of sociologists and historians. Marginally I touched it in the article "About Revolution and Terrorism" in NO12/375/78 of Kultura. I stated there, that the lack of social stimuli in the young generation of people whose parents had obtained materialistic optimum in the existing system, has been the cause for the hatred toward the democratic capitalism. It seems, that this is sufficient and understandable a motive for alienation within the class which has been traditionally the warden of the system. Nevertheless, the mechanism of the entire process and its psychological implications demand separate study.

In many advanced capitalistic nations the blind hatred toward the system in power, combined with the lack of program, looks for the road of expansion. In Japan and France, the demonstrations of the defenders of the natural environment are a substitute of fight against the system. In West Germany and in

George Will, the American columnist, formulates this problem in *Newsweek*, in this manner: "Many opponents of nuclear power flinch from endorsing coal. So they speak of 'alternative life-styles,' meaning less economic growth, fewer comforts. Such talk issues from people comfortably supplied with the fruits of economic growth. Many of these people see themselves as in governing class; their largest disappointment with America is the weakness of redistributionist impulse in politics. For them, a slow growth is not a problem, it is a political program, a way of shifting society's attention from creating wealth to redistributing it."

The opinion of a conservative publicist expressed here, although it brings us closer to the central point of the question, is excessively careful. The temperature of negative attitude toward the system is much higher, and the egalitarian obsession of the sworn opponents to the nuclear energy is much more violent. In fact, they are not only against the coal alternative.² They

Italy - these functions are performed by terrorists. In America there were also such attempts, but failed. That's why a part of the middle class had found a more convenient instrument which better fits the humanitarian sentiments of this country: It "defends the country" against nuclear energy. It is better than terror, because it doesn't endanger people, but, to the contrary, - "it protects them against the radioactive death." And, at this occasion it pushes the system deeper into the abyss of energy crisis.

² Even in the form of applying the new technology, developed by the government of the Republic of South Africa. This technology protects people and environment against

are against all alternatives except solar energy. And, because the technology of direct utilization of solar energy is presently in the primitive stage, there should be no doubt, that the aim of the most active oppositionists of nuclear energy is not a concern for more safe sources of energy, but further weakening of the USA, by the liquidation of the nuclear reactors which presently supply 15% of America's electric power.

The fact that the group of people I'm writing about desires to destroy the capitalistic system of democracy - without having any other alternative and without any concern about the consequences of their actions, gives evidence of more than the height of their feelings. It is also proof of their astounding historical blindness. If, as a result of their actions (in company of other factors), the whole system collapsed, anarchy would be short-lived. For the post-American heirloom there waits a pack of hungry wolves - the countries of Latin America, many of which bear deadly grudge against the USA - just because of its successes. But, these countries wouldn't share in the post-American inheritance. It's the USSR which keeps an eye on it. It holds in leash its well trained wolf - the Republic of Cuba, under the government of Fidel Castro. In case of catastrophe, the honeymoon of these who want to destroy America would not last a month.

pollution that results from the burning of coal, because by very expensive (but not higher than the OPEC's prices of oil), chemical processes, it produces oil of energy higher than that of petroleum.

However, I am not suggesting to the reader anything that would be a great simplification of the problem, that the whole of multimillion masses, demanding the closure of nuclear plants consciously want the destruction of the country in which they live. Obviously, many of them piously believe that they defend mankind against the threat of radioactive death, and recklessly do not think about the consequences of their would be victory. I'm concerned with these fully engaged activists who, simply, consider the existing system an enemy of the American people - and the whole world. Considering the unquestionable figures from many sources - among them quotes by Edward Teller (known as the "father of the hydrogen bomb"), it is difficult to suspect the activists and leaders of the movement of naiveness and ignorance. Not so. They are determined and they know exactly what they want. According to the data introduced by Dr. Teller in the *Chicago Tribune* of Nov. 4, 1979, the 72 nuclear reactors operating at that time have supplied America with energy equivalent to 3 million barrels of crude oil daily (126 million gallons), which represented 1/3 of all the import from the OPEC countries. If the anti-nuclear *lobby* succeeded in legalizing its postulates, all this must be struck off from the energy inventory of the USA. In the presently unstable situation of America, the loss of 15% of the electricity for cities and industry would bring unforeseeable, serious consequences.

Although the opinion of George Will quoted by me doesn't hit the heart of the question, it shows quite clearly which of the social circles in the USA are most engaged in the anti-nuclear campaign, and

why they can afford to conduct it. With all their highly publicized idealistic sympathy for the "suffering poor", they aren't very much moved by the eventuality of diminished global production of consumer goods - inevitable result of energy deficiency - because the size of their own share in consumptive processes protects them against the effects of the reduced production. Putting the question simpler, one may say in conclusion, that in the capitalistic democracy only the rich and idealistic abnegators are the most inclinable to contradict the every move of the system. Somehow, these two categories complement each other almost completely. Moreover, the abnegators in the last few years have been most easily found not among those who suffered dearth, but - surfeit. "Abnegators," though, very often appear periodically, similarly to the once abundant hippies. Many of them, after months of resignation from the benefits of civilization, used to return as prodigal sons to the bosom of the *establishment* - or, more accurately - to the bosom of their well-to-do families.

The problem George Will wrote about is better put by Mrs. Thatcher - the premier of the newly formed conservative government of Great Britain: "There are some people within and without our Trade Unions, who want to destroy our traditional, ages old freedom by postulating the distribution of material wealth in the form absolutely transgressing our economic possibilities. In order to divide justly, we must produce more. Following the postulates of these people, we would have to produce less and less."

The whole offensive of the frustrated opponents of the democratic *establishment* is, of course, nothing new. It only took some special tints and some fresh dynamics after the incident at Harrisburg. This way, the curse thrown on nuclear explosion as the source of energy, was turned immediately into political issue - a delight to the American *mass media*. Not only as information to the viewers, listeners and readers, but as a means of intensifying hysteria Nostalgic lust for bringing public opinion into the state of utmost tension went into their play, building suspense. "Harrisburg became a new symbol" - wrote Z.Bau in the New York *Nowy Dziennik* (Ed. - Polish New Daily). The choice of this term was not just coincidental, since to the millions of people a catastrophe which had never occurred associated itself with Hiroshima and thousands of dead or slowly dying victims of a nuclear explosion. Television doesn't stop at information and commentary - wrote Z.Bau on April 18. "As during the Vietnam war and later - the Watergate affair, we are witnessing a phenomenon from the fantasy literature, which reminds us the beloved metaphor of Argentinian writer Jorge Louis Borges, about a picture infinitely reflecting itself between 2 mirrors. Similar interaction connects a TV report to anti-nuclear demonstrations that multiply in chain reaction manner.

Just at the time of this writing, in some of American cities demonstrations take place, in number of which demonstrators attempt in vain to break in the nuclear reactors and destroy the installations. The one in Washington several weeks ago, however, has been the biggest of all. In

front of the White House there appeared about 100,000 demonstrators, some arriving even from the most distant corners of the country. In overwhelming majority they were people of entirely definite political creed, which was easily discernible in the shouted slogans. According to the press - they were the middle class whites. Among many groups bearing the banners was one of special aggressiveness, under the name: "The Youth Against the War and Fascism," - a group known, however, as the branch of the pro-Soviet American Communist Party. What has the nuclear power plant in common with war and fascism? One may wonder? Evidently there is something, because the youngsters shouting against "fascism and war" have been demanding the closure of the nuclear plants, not in the whole world, however, (that is among the others not in the USSR and East Germany - where their nuclear power extension just started), but only in America. Not because they were after all Americans demonstrating in front of the White House, and not in the Red Square in Moscow, but because the capitalistic nuclear electric plants are dangerous, and socialistic nuclear plants safe like the candles on a Christmas tree (long before, the world has been informed about this by the TASS). However, we shouldn't overestimate the participation of communists in the anti-nuclear campaign. In fact, they were only a small fraction. The main tone in the whole campaign is played by those, who under the slogan of care for the safety of American people threatened by radioactivity, fight not against Carter, not against bad administration, but against the institution of the capitalistic state; they hate it passionately because there is no other alternative left for them. Thus, they

attempt to multiply the fear to which the American public very easily succumb. If we are going to beg Arabian sheiks to sell us oil at lower prices, I prefer this than the atomic death - stated on the New York TV a certain gentleman as he was leaving a quite impressive limousine. The view of Americans on their knees, begging for oil - only in order not to use nuclear energy is certainly very picturesque and would make many sheiks' hearts beat with joy. The trouble is that begging has very seldom been successful. In most cases, the beggars get a kick, which happens now and will happen in the future.

Americans were always considered to be courageous and risk loving people. If all this is not a legend, we should only hope that they won't lose the remnants of courage. They could presently realize that there exist groups which in their passion for making war against the hated system attempt to spread the cult of fear. Fear begins to be a national virtue of the nation which a century ago was acclaimed a prototype of conquerors and adventurers. Of course, the propaganda of fear is not conducted ostentatiously. Nobody proclaims how beautiful it is to be a coward. This would be too heavy a dosage to digest. To the contrary, the American TV programs continue to show courageous, positive heroes in their traditional roles. But all this is not for real, only a fiction created by producers. In daily life there prevails cult advocating a risklessness in society. It isn't called fear, but the care for human health and life. In this context it is a virtue and in many instances it really is. Alas, when this

care crosses a certain critical temperature, it becomes a dangerous obsession, which pushes the nation to the edge of an abyss. Americans do not want to risk. Not even in the defense of ideals, but even in the defense of their beautiful cars, charming residences - in one word in the defense of all comfort of modern life often attained by heavy work. And, at the same time, as the recent weeks of energy crisis show, they do not want to resign from anything.

This situation should not surprise anybody. People deprived of bread or elementary rights, could and can fight to the last. Like fanatics they are ready to shed blood for illusions, or, even, false goals, often inspired by hatred. But these, who reached wealth and full materialistic comfort, or, using a metaphor, overgrown with fat, are not able to fight or to sacrifice anything. History has proven many a time the validity of this bitter truth. And here appears the formidable dilemma of the nation whose destiny determines the future of our civilization.

N.Y., June 2, 1978 Zbigniew BYRSKI

IN THE SOVIET PRESS
(excerpts)

For many years the American kremlinologists did not indulge themselves in such fun: The May first celebration on the Red Square in Moscow has been pictured differently in different papers. In the photo in the *Wyechernaya Moskva*, Victor

Grishin, the secretary of the Moscow Party Committee, advanced one place closer to Brezhnev, while Kirilenko vanished entirely. But in *Pravda*, of May 2, Kirilenko surfaced again, and Grishin jumped away from Brezhnev. Byzantine customs of the Kremlin leaders give us, undoubtedly, very interesting material for observation. In 1953 they allowed us to foresee the fall of the omnipotent Beria when he didn't show at the theatre, where he should have been. The American observers see in the game of the Kremlin photographers proof of an existing fight for Brezhnev's throne. No doubt this fight has gone on for a long time. The manipulations of photographers at the May first parade are more interesting because they very well describe the psychology of the Kremlin leaders. The principle of socialistic realism - demonstrating a desire instead of reality - became the basis of their thinking. Thus, comrade Grishin, having, so far, no chance for changing reality, changes its picture. Uses magic charms.

It is very doubtful whether these kinds of magic prank would destabilize the Soviet leadership. During the last decade, Brezhnev succeeded in casting all the "Youth" out of the Politburo: In 1971 - G.Voronov (61), in 1975 - the "Iron Sasha" - Shelepin (57), in 1977 - D. Polanski (60), in 1978 - K.Katushev (51), in the same year F.Kulakov (60) died suddenly (they say he shot himself), in April 1979 - J.Ryabov was removed from the Party Central Committee. To meet Carter in Vienna will travel a sick, 72 year old Brezhnev, representing his equally old partners who among themselves will choose

the new General Secretary.

How this kind of elections will develop, what other factors will be deciding in them - those are the questions which preoccupy the minds of all the politicians of the world.

* * *

The Party doesn't intend to resign from its domineering position. In 1979 it began its successive offensive. The decision of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union "about subsequent reinforcement of ideological politico-educational work," - announced in *Pravda* on May 6, 1979, is calling for the strengthening of the role of the Party, first of all in the conscience of society.

In each subsequent ideological offensive, the basic program is the same: "Shaping the communist consciousness of society," - "Forming a new man." Subjects of change are only the enemies, which helps as an instrument in the work-out of the "new man." Each ideological campaign gives material to subsequent "lessons of hatred," described with such precision by George Orwell.

The current ideological campaign employs 2 books for its enhancement; they deserve to be called "the manuals of hatred." "The White Book" is devoted to the question of dissidents: The preface to it written by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Soviet Union, Lew Smirnow,

the interview with the vice-minister of Internal Affairs of the USSR, Boris Shumilin, the report on the trials of Yuriy Orlov and Wladimir Slepak, delation of S.Lipawski on Aleksander Shcharanski - all these materials appear to prove one thing: All dissidents are Jews, the agents of the American Intelligence. In order to illustrate this point, there are enclosed photographs of the American newspapermen working in the USSR and recognized as the agents of the CIA. The book was printed in 150,000 copies but only a small number had been put on public sale. Most of them have been distributed as a scientific help for the KGB personnel, militia etc. However, the "Short Political Dictionary" published by the "Publications of Political Literature", appeared in 300,000 copies and is designed to serve the common Soviet man. "Political Dictionary" appears regularly in the Soviet Union. Each new issue reflects the changes in the leadership and enumerates new enemies.

The first issue of the "Political Dictionary" appeared exactly 10 years ago. In it, as well as in the present edition, we read: "The Dictionary gives the explanation of words, terms, meaning of the socio-political views that appear most often in periodicals, radio and TV auditions." Comparing the contents of both issues, first, this conclusion comes to my mind: The Soviet Union must have many, many new enemies. In 1979 issue there were found words whose existence has never been suspected by the authors of the 1969 issue. In the first place appears unknown 10 years ago definition "dissidents". Impossible not to cite it: "The word dissidents is used by imperialistic propaganda for describing

individual renegades who broke off from the socialistic society, meaning persons who work actively against the building of socialism and move along the road of anti-socialism, who break the laws of the country and who have no support of society, who turn for help to foreign countries - to imperialistic circles reputed for subversion, propaganda and spying." As the nail to the dissidents' coffin there is included the quotation from the book of L.I.Brezhnev, describing dissidents as the "partners, if not the agents of imperialism." All paragraphs of the "Short Dictionary" are printed exactly in the same format as the paragraphs of the Soviet Penal Code. No doubt, the Penal Code will soon be supplemented with an article "Dissidents." Among the new paragraphs - new enemies, are: Maoism, Eurocommunism, New Left, Sovietology. In the "centers of slanderous propaganda" category and on the same level as the "Voice of America", "free Europe," (which had been printed in the previous issues), are now radio "Liberty" which "conducts subversive activities against the Soviet Union." The definition of "Zionism" is enlarged. It is introduced as "bankrupt, in the scientific meaning of the word" racism, connected with imperialism and anti-communism. In the 1969 issue, under the entry "Cannibalism" are cited several examples of it - from the annihilation of Indians, and the lynching of Negroes, to Hitlerism and racism of South Africa. In the new edition are cited only 2 examples: Hitlerism and the politics of Israel in the occupied territories. Included in the "Dictionary" for the first time is the definition of "third basket," with comments: "The imperialistic circles of the West

attempt to utilize it ... to interfere in the internal affairs of socialistic countries and in ideological diversion."

The new edition of the "Short Political Dictionary", depicts the fear of the Soviet ideologists of the world new phenomenons and concepts - new enemies. The dictionary may serve as an excellent material for psychiatrists who specialize in paranoia. A paranoiac shows aggressiveness toward the environment, convincing himself, that he is surrounded by enemies, conspirators and traitors. He concludes, that he can save himself, but only when he is the first to attack. In the 1969 edition there was the article "Psychological Warfare." In the new one there is something new added: "The Ideological War, the War of the classes." But in each edition the main position is held by a call to fight, fight, fight...

* * *

The Soviet writer Sergey Davlatov, who recently received permission to leave the Soviet Union, after arrests, psychiatric asylums, gave us an important contribution to the ages old quarrel on the theme of optimism versus pessimism. To Tiflis - relates S.Davlatov - arrived the editor of the monthly *Nowyj Mir*, Sergey Narowchatov, known as the first person to congratulate Brezhnev for the Lenin Literary Award. Appearing in front of the Gruzian writers, Narovchatov was telling them a long story about the happy and joyous life, about the coming bright future. He ended his talk with, "I'm an optimist". Then, one of the

Gruzyans stood up and said: "May I ask you a few questions"? "Of course, please do" - kindly answered Moscow *litteratus*. "Was Byron young"? - "Yes" - answered Narovchatov - "When he died he was only 36." Was he handsome"? - "Yes, we all remember his portraits". "Was he talented"? - "Undoubtedly, he was genius". - "So" - concluded Gruzian writer. - "Byron - young, handsome, talented, was a pessimist and you, old, ugly and with no talent - are you an optimist"?

S.Davlatov did not say what was Narovchatov's answer. But he could have said: What is an old loathsome, untalented - though powerful and authoritative - man supposed to do, if not to believe in a bright future.

Adam KRUCZEK

\$1.00

Fragments

Vol. 6/8

October 1979

by

Charles Joel

Jadwiga KWIATKOWSKA

DAILY LIFE IN THE
POLISH PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

KISIEL

A CRY IN WILDERNESS
(an excerpt)

BRUKSELCZYK

THE ORPHANS OF HELSINKI
(an excerpt from
Brukselczyk's "As seen
from Brussels")

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 9/384/1979 published in Paris, France.

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

DAILY LIFE IN THE POLISH PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

I. *Why this report is needed*

Researchers investigating Poland's contemporary totalitarian system, commonly known as socialism, usually pay more attention to general aspects than to the details of daily life. It's well known, that a common man in Poland is under constant economic, propagandistic and social pressures, but the description of these pressures is rather like a bird's eye view, without consideration of the so called trifles of daily life. This applies to every sector of public life: economy, sociology, socio-political journalism, even literature which more often employs a general metaphor than a detailed description. From this perspective, a priceless exception is "Artificial Respiration" - a beautiful poem of Stanislaw Baranczak, which circulates in Samizdat, and recently, published in *Aneks*, appeared in the West.

The press (official and unofficial) isn't able to undertake such a task as the detailed description of daily life, either. The official press, though, may describe some particular sectors of public life but, because of the main obstacles (mostly censorship), it cannot describe everything it would like to. Only when you read several chronicles of such magazines as *Polityka* or *Kultura*, you may, more or less, grasp a general idea of the problem of your interest. However, this kind of jigsaw reporting is an unusually tiresome task. The independent press, on the other hand, is more concerned with problems that

demand immediate intervention than with a systematic description of social life; moreover, its possibilities are limited by technical difficulties, necessity to economize on paper, etc.; as a result, it must concentrate on actual matters.

As a newspaperwoman who for years is officially engaged in watching the events of public life, I feel I am authorized to write this article; the more so, that I lead the life of a woman whose earnings are average, and who is sentenced to fight against the difficulties of daily life, like any other ordinary citizen of our country. I live in the capital of a province, but because of my profession I travel all over the country. It's natural that I have a chance to compare the situations of many regions. The picture which I submit to the reader is characteristic of life in large municipal agglomerates, in Warsaw, Cracow, Poznan, Wroclaw, or Katowice. In small provincial towns the conditions are much worse.

II. *Not just a state paid wages.*

In order to get oriented about how they make their living, I polled 40 young (average age 30) married couples. In more than 30 marriages both, husband and wife work; in several - only a husband; in latter case, husband's earnings are completely sufficient to cover the living expenses but, as a rule, he must hold an exceptionally well paid position of, for example, a popular journalist, actor, exceptionally talented engineer or scientist. In all other cases, the earnings of both marrieds are, almost always, lower than the finances needed

for living, so that the necessity of an additional work "on a side" arises. Most commonly practiced are works on special order of the same institution one is working in. Usually, a contract for this kind of work is signed by a substitute - a friend, and, notwithstanding official prohibition by law, is performed during the normal working hours, and at that, a manager of institution pretends that he doesn't see these practices. More often, however, this contract work must be performed at home. The earnings obtained in the described manner, are a second take-home pay (not infrequently higher than the regular every month received pay). The necessity of making "a buck" on a side constitutes a serious restraint on time theoretically designed for resting, causing permanent over-fatigue. Another way of additional earning is private tuition. Many married couples are helped financially, by their parents.

Disputing this problem we should remember, that for every young couple in Poland, the objects of special luxury are such things of daily life as a good refrigerator (over 2 average monthly wages), a good TV (2-2 1/2 a.m.w.), a good men suit (1 a.m.w.), not to mention such extravagant luxuries as a good western stereo set (about 10 a.m.w.) or a small Fiat (about 25 a.m.w.). For comparison, in the West, a new cheap car takes about 5 average monthly wages, a respectable suit may be bought for value of about 25-30 hours of work, taking as a base of our calculations a wage of unqualified laborer, as \$3-4 /hr. in the USA. Polish average wage is about 4,000 Polish zlotys.

III. Working conditions, shoppings, market supplies.

Most often, young couples live in the new housing projects - far from the place of their work. Travel to and from work takes 1 1/2 to 3 hours. Because of enormous deficiencies in the transportation stock, you travel in an unimaginable crowd. True, the famous "grape clusters" on the steps of busses and trams have vanished, but this was the only effect of technical progress - a driver cannot leave a stop if the automatic door of a vehicle is not locked safe. The crowd inside busses and tramways is twice their nominal capacity. Passengers are angry, under strain; quarrels about most trivial things abound. During travels to and from work people's aggressiveness grows and unloads itself in every possible way on their fellow passengers.

Because the system of goods supply in the new housing project is poor, (there is not enough grocery shops and these which are, as a rule, are having very small assortment of goods), supplies must be most often brought from downtown. Many people try to shop during working hours (especially employees of offices, news agencies, etc.), but mainly, shopping is done after work. In some comparatively well supplied butcheries, you must stand in line for 1/2 an hour, often longer - even one hour; buying, for example, such a delicacy as veal, is a long remembered happy occurrence. Shopping in self-service markets (not for meat) at the rush hours takes 50 minutes, often more. There is real hunting for fresh eggs; recently in Cracow there was not butter and cooking oil; often there is shortage of fresh

pastries and bread, vegetables and cheeses. It is a pure utopia to get, without standing in line, some sausage or ham.

After shopping, with bags full - traditionally this is a duty of a woman - you climb in overcrowded bus or tramway. If you had a bit of luck, after walking from a bus stop, you may find some of the articles which you forgot about while shopping downtown, at a grocery of your housing project.

The choice of food articles is so greatly limited, that comparing it with the same choice at any average grocery in the West, borders on a cruel joke. Not long ago, in one of the smaller towns, I visited a grocery. All I could count on the shelves were: 5 kinds of macaroni, 2 kinds of cheese, second grade (small) refrigerated eggs, 3 kinds of melted cheese, 1 kind of tea ("Popular" - mainly tea dust, leaves rarely visible), several kinds of canned fish and powdered soup, sugar, stale bread, barley grits, several other trifles and...16 (sixteen) brands of vodka. I looked for a coffee which, of course, I did not find.

No one knows why there vanished from commerce such meats as liver, lungs, kidney, and other kinds of half-products, that is, products that are comparatively cheap and good as a base food for the poorest families.

It would be interesting to bring some of these food articles, especially preserves, and take them to some food research institutes of the West. What is sold as meat preserves in Poland is a fascinating puzzle to everybody here.

IV. *New house, or a natural calamity.*

Obtaining - after 10, even 15 years of waiting, a new home is a great joy but a joy that hides many unexpected exhaustive experiences. The people who take the possession of a new home, must adapt it to their own needs and tastes. The first toilsome job is to remove all the rubbish laboriously scraping of the thick splashes of cement off the floors, and do other similar chores. The second job that must be done immediately is the tightening of windows and doors, and installing the real locks. Then the third stage may follow: hunting for craftsmen to have them install properly the existing but unfunctional heaters, sinks, baths, lavatories, gas-ranges, etc. Of course, it all costs money, quite a lot of money.

All of this is just the nice beginning of evil. You must have furniture. You bought a kitchen table but without chairs. Then, you got chairs but they don't match; you took them because they just "happened" to be "in stock." In front of shops, or, as proudly the press call them "salons" of modern furniture, long lines are forming - early in the day in which, as the advert said, some new fashionable type of furniture is on sale: speculation increases; there is a spontaneously invented profession of paid standers in line on behalf of someone who can't afford time. Furnishing your home and bringing it to the state of usefulness, takes more or less 1 1/2 years. What is important in all this is that it is absolutely impossible to work up a sensible plan of expenditures, because you must buy things, which are found, exactly

- by a law of coincidence - on sale. People are getting desperate, forced to borrow money unexpectedly. But whatever it is, it is better than the previous situation, where in expectation of obtaining a house of your own, you had lived in a rented apartment: the rentals for an apartment or a house skyrocketed beyond the limits of decency - a one room with kitchenette apartment, in Cracow, Wroclaw or Warsaw costs now about 4,000 zlotys per month, an equivalent of average take-home pay.

V. *Children*

A child for a young marrieds is both a blessing and a sort of natural disaster. It often appears before a house is obtained by a family. No need, I think, to write about the nightmare of living 3 persons in one rented room.

But, this is not the biggest problem, although we must admit, that the appearance of a child in these circumstances is, very often, a cause for divorce. Not long ago, the *Zycie Warszawy* (Ed.: Life in Warsaw) had led a noisy campaign for the proper supply of things for infants ("An infant is human being too" - is a discovery, indeed, worthy of the second half of 20th century). This action died natural death, problems remained unsolved. And there is shortage of everything: Diapers, a proper milk formula, a carriage, clothing, olives, nipples, powders, bottle-heaters.

Whoever has a relative in the West or himself can visit in the West, tries to get everything that's possible to get. Several articles for infants may be obtained through the PEWEX (Ed.: Polish Trading Corporation's

enterprise). In this case, the hunting for American dollars must begin (about 130 zlotys for a dollar on the black market), a process which itself consumes a lot of time, let alone the money.

Of course, as in many other circumstances, you can - because you must - manage along. To your assistance rush in the members of close and distant families, friends and acquaintances. Quite often, at least some of articles needed are "inherited" after the other children had grown up. The chain of self-help for infants, is very well developed, and usually begins its functioning long before a child is born.

Next problem is getting a place in a child-care home or in a kindergarten. The nightmare of scarcity of these institutions, especially in larger cities, cannot be compared to anything; the place in a kindergarten (a mushrooming industry) costs 2,000 zlotys per month - an expenditure not too many people can afford. I must add, that not everybody has a grandmother-pensioner or some other member of family to do baby-sitting. In the families that don't have this advantage, a mother is forced to take a 3-year leave of absence without pay. Consequently, a husband is burdened with additionaly on the side job.

VI. Cultural life

As already mentioned, the housing developments are, in general, located far from downtowns. There are no movies nor theaters, so that a project of going to a theatre or a movie means literally the organizing of an expedition. Usually it ends (considering the fatigue, lack of

time, and an additional hunting for tickets), by watching a TV program. The level of programs doesn't need any comments; it is well known propagandistic yelping. We must admit, however, that there are a few programs (for example Television Theater), which are on a high artistic level. The trouble is, that the ambitious and really interesting programs are aired at late hours, or at the time of other programs which show something very competetive (for example soccer match).

The situation on the book market is the worst ever. Getting hold of any valuable book by someone who has no "friendly" bookstore is practically impossible. It refers to the books of native and foreign writers, to prose, poetry and philosophical works. In Poland there is unquestionable, enormous hunger for printed word. Valuable positions, especially from humanistics, vanish from bookshelves during one or two days.

The same applies to newspapers. In an hour from the appearance of *Przekrój* or *Polityka* on a newstand, they just evaporate. As a rule, there is not a chance even of seeing such papers as *Literature in the World*, *Wies*, or *Znak* or *Tygodnik Powszechny* on a newstand. They are, similar to *Tworezosc*, sold almost exsquisitely from under the counter. There were many talks and written articles about the need for increasing of circulation of some of the papers, and reprints of the most important books, but all to no avail. There is one more aspect of this whole problem, which is of great importance and should be mentioned: There are multitudinous publications that for years, covered with dust, rest on the bookshelves of stores. Literally hundreds, if not thousands positions that had eaten the

mountains of paper - supposedly in scarcity for printing valuable books; various brochures, speeches of communist party leaders, the poorest literature of just graphomania, disproportional to its value quantity of translations from Russian - all this appears to be a consciously planned endeavor to destroy the Polish culture. Surely, it would be very educational to find out about the amount of paper used to print this rubbish.

And once more, I would underline that everything I write here about concerns large cities. In the countryside the situation is much worse - to the extent that we may talk about the paralyzing of every sign of cultural life.

VII. *Political Mire*

Atomized, deprived of spontaneity and authenticity social life in Poland of the seventies, is immersed in a political mire, in some sticky liquid of propaganda in which everything moves in disorderly coincidental and deprived of any sense, a manner. I'm talking here about the daily life of millions of people who vegetate from day to day, without feeling of any solidity and continuity of their existence, uncertain of what may happen in a week, filled with an undirected aggression, afraid of the functions of even the smallest of governmental offices and officials. These people, even if they knew about the opposition movement, are not supporting it - at best, they act like spectators, like football fans, ready to applaud wildly their team when it's winning and turn their backs on it when it's losing. These are exactly the people whose behavior dictates the life

climate of Poland.

They are immersed in that sticky mire of propaganda, that, more or less visibly, surrounds them every day. This mire is not just the party and all the media of communication propaganda. It's also in the gashed, disfigured language that is vomited by the press, radio and television; some sort of stammering which is absorbed by the masses, a stammering of sentences in which it is often difficult to depict a subject or predicate, in which words are being disrobed of their true meaning. It'll suffice to recollect a general consternation at the level of written and spoken language of the high school graduate who enter universities. An average high school graduate doesn't speak his own language, cannot write anything out of his mind, talks using linguistic carboncopies.

All this is not amusing, though often it may sound humorous. The language - the basic connective, is decaying. It's replaced by some sort of a new speech undreamed of even by Orwell. It is not only the disfiguration of language; it is its destruction by the pressure of omnipotent system.

Jadwiga KWIATKOWSKA

A CRY IN WILDERNESS (an excerpt)

The Pope John Paul II brought us magnificent gifts: He gave us Nine Days Which Shook Poland. The nine days of different life, different language, different spiritual upheaval; nine days of Poland-historic and European. Even the official, party owned,

peasant, consumptive-minded, cynical Warsaw, in short two hours, took off assumed Eastern crust, became herself, once again true and alive. And after, Gniezno, Czestochowa, Oswiecim (Auschwitz), Nowy Targ, and millions of people on the flooded with tropical sun, colorful Cracow Blonie. It was the unprecedented pilgrimage: A dialog with Fatherland, in which the forgotten, put ad acta, history, had risen suddenly from the dead - in all its richness; The seal of silence, of petrified party politicians' gibberish, had been broken. The youth comprehended where it lives, perceived the falshehood in which it was entangled; even the foreign reporters understood what Auschwitz was really about - and what the communistic propaganda during 30 years wasn't able to explain to them.

Yes, the lazy and dull pace of history in the country had succumbed to the exciting acceleration. It will never be forgotten, it will result in the impossible to erase psychological storm, priceless in the revival of national consciousness and identity that were lulled to sleep and blotted out from our daily life.

And the immediate political results of the Pope's visit? For the time being, none; the Church, to be sure, will not replace our normal political life, so after the departure of the Pope Wojtyla, everything returned to normalcy: Censorship sharper, dullness - duller, the authorities - more arrogant. A night is darkest before dawn - somebody said. But, how will it be - this dawn?!

Naturally, this writer too, returned to pessimistic examinations of international affairs, looked at through the prism of our press commentaries, which is an especially

masochistic pleasure. Warsaw press is full of joy because the elections to the West European parliament had failed. Of course, this is a purely Russian or Soviet joy: No patriotic Pole will enjoy the reckless dispersion of Western Europe, caused by the different views on the prices of tomatoes; he will not like the fact, that the only conscientious and strong people there, are the West Germans. As *L'Aurore* of Paris, justly wrote: "European enthusiasm - which by the way, suffered the two most painful wounds inflicted by France: the rejecting in 1954 of the proposal of European Community Defense, and withdrawing in 1963 from the integrated Command of NATO - had had experienced its own Waterloo..." And West Germany's *Die Welt* says: "It was clear that from the beginning, when Europeans, by their own free will, have resigned from joint defense and made of this basic element of unity of our continent a tabu whose mentioning has become an act of 'indecency', the whole construction had to break apart."

And again, there remains the problem of that Warrior's Spirit I wrote so often about. It remained only in Germany and Russia, two countries between which our Poland lies. Wouldn't it be possible to transport the whole of Poland to Australia or Canada? They say - "Poland is nothing but a heart" and the heart transplants are quite common today".

Another event that greatly enthuses our press, is the meeting of Carter with Brezhnev in Vienna, and the signing of the SALT II agreement. I've read and reread the contents of this agreement and I don't see any reason for optimism. The number of hydrogen, cobalt, and God knows how many other kinds of nuclear bombs which many a time can destroy our

globe, remains unchanged; the agreement relates only to the question of nonincreasing the number of delivery means (which are plentiful at the present); the agreement then, has economical, planned for the future, meaning. During the last war there circulated in Warsaw a joke, that because of high cost of gasoline, England and Germany made a secret agreement, on whose principle the English pilots had, for economical reasons, to drop their bombs on London, and the German pilots - on Berlin. I see something similar in the SALT II agreement, but I don't see any chance for the increasing of security of Poland. Had the atomic war begun, one little bomb would certainly "touch" Poland, and according to experts, it would do a perfect job; at our system of water resources and a lack of proper technology, the contamination would be total, and then - God be with You, Brave Nation!

So, the Vienna agreement - expressing economic advantages of the superpowers, does not help little nations at all. Interesting, however, are POLITICAL advantages, so much insisted upon by the Ruskis. The political importance of the SALT II is, as always, the same: The Russians retreat in the area of imagination, and receive concessions in the area of realism, in this case one more sanction of *status quo* and the right to do what they wish in Asia, Africa, Latin America. Everything, exactly, as described in "My Prophecy" (Kultura Nov., 1977, Fragments - Jan. 1978).

The Russians have made quite a number of agreements to sell "the Brooklyn Bridge" - in return for something real. Khrushchev brought rocket installations to Cuba, removed them, and for this favor received American

affirmation of Cuba's immunity. The very same Khrushchev threatened to make a separate peace treaty with the East German Democratic Republic, and for giving up this project, despite the Berlin Wall, received affirmation of the four-sided status of Berlin. Because of SALT II, the Russians let out (not for nothing) five dissidents, which fact made the Americans so happy that they forgot about 100 millions of East Europeans who, not necessarily wishing to immigrate, would like to live in democratic conditions. Always the same maneuver and nobody yet learned anything of it: The selling of the Brooklyn Bridge goes on. For nuclear peace in Europe - a free hand in the whole world! True, the Americans have a free hand too, but do not use it; they have the Congress, free press, gasoline shortage, and millions of pacifists. The Russians have none of these, but instead, they have Cubans, secret experts, stupefied revolutionists in many countries, Leninism for export, and realistic world politics. As a brake, there is only China, totalitarian too, and (at least for the time being) anti-Russian.

Brezhnev didn't hesitate to warn the American senators not to vote against the SALT II agreement, although it was the distinct "interfering in internal affairs of other nations." Exchanging kisses with Carter surprised people much more than a kiss of the Pope with president Jablonski.

So much about the goodies of this world of ours. And, what we in Warsaw, left to ourselves and to the lazy history, can do? Totalitarianism, like a castor oil, cleanses without breaking our sleep. Here, we feel more like a madhouse, than in a penal institution - but Hitler and Stalin were much worse. Zinoviev writes, that life in the

East is simpler than in the West and that's why people are getting accustomed to it: The best defense against bed-bugs is to love them. We are getting accustomed to the absurd, to censorship, to senseless speeches, to the photographs of Dignitary in every daily paper (don't we know how he looks?!), to serials and news on TV overfilled with falsehood, to production measured in kilograms, to the inconvenient names that vanished from the news, even to the shocking commentaries of Kusmierek (of course, unprinted) about the nonsense of our economy. We are getting accustomed, we are lulled to sleep. Even I am lulled to sleep, although I'm still writing.

KISIEL

THE ORPHANS OF HELSINKI
(an excerpt from Brukselczyk's "As Seen from Brussels")

Eliot, the English writer of American birth, the "Nobel" of 1948, didn't expect to be so much forgotten. Fifteen years after his death (1965) Western Europe does everything possible to prove, that it doesn't feel any responsibility for the common culture, which under political pressures desintegrates more and more.

I write these words on the fourth anniversary of the so called final act of Helsinki. *Prawda* celebrated this day, in its own peculiar way. It recollected only, that the document from Helsinki talks about "the principles which regulate mutual relations between governments", and that "all other things should be credited to the black forces of war and reaction, which to a great degree held up the realization of

the final act, and which through their false interpretations and picking at random sentences from the context, interfere in the internal affairs of governments." The vice-minister of foreign affairs Anatol Kuznetsov was angry at some of the Western journalists for this "picking up from the context," and said, that the "clause about human rights should not be put higher than other clauses of the final act of Helsinki." Mr. Kuznietsov is right, with this little correction, however: Human rights should be put neither higher nor lower. Meanwhile, the Soviet authorities put these rights not only lower than other principles of Helsinki, but actually did put them nowhere, simply, threw them out of existence. They, not the ones who "pick up from the context" broke the delicate balance of the true final act of Helsinki.

SALT II and kisses at the summit, the Vienna negotiations - hopelessly desperate but not broken yet, over \$50 billion of Western credits, tens of millions of tons of grain sown in Kazakhstan and harvested in Kansas, technology for industry, hotels, airfields, computers for the olympics, this modest extract from inventory proves, that the West fulfills principally the postulates of the first two "baskets" of Helsinki, pertaining to international security and cooperation.

But, in regard to the basket NO 3, pertaining to human rights, if you excuse me, Mr. Kuznetsov, the situation is different. Here is, also a very modest extract: The USSR: A series of Moscow trials, 321 persons arrested during 4 years since Helsinki, for activities in defense of human rights. East Germany: laws propagating cold war,

prohibition of interviews with Western press; giving away information which is decided upon by the police as "damaging" costs from 2 to 10 years of prison; Heym and Havemann facing trial. Czechoslovakia: The biggest chase since Stalin's time; the biggest trial since Stansky's trial; Charter 77, or, in other words, several paragraphs of Helsinki in a stage of impeachment. Romania: The largest gulag of the East; according to Goma "the worst occupation is in Romania: by Romanians." Poland: Bartoszewski, Baranczak, Micewski, Wozniakowski and several others, refused passports, I think, in the framework of the free movement of people and information...

BRUKSELCZYK

\$1.00

Fragments

Vol. 6/9

Nov. 1979

by

Charles Joel

Jan NOWAK

THIRD WORLD WAR - A
CONTINUATION

Henryk GRYNBERG VERSES FROM AMERICA

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 11/386-1979, published in Paris, France.

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

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.

THIRD WORLD WAR - A CONTINUATION

My article "Third World War" was written at the beginning of Carter's Presidency. It appeared in two parts, in the 1977 March and April issues of *Kultura* (Ed.: Fragments vol. 4/3-4, 1977). In them, I attempted to prove, that the USSR may break up the system of postwar alliances, isolate and even defeat the United States, without armed confrontation between the two superpowers.

During the first 2 decades since the end of World War 2, the US had an overwhelming military superiority over Russia. Despite this, the area of influence of the Western powers has been seriously eroded. During the same period, the Soviet expansion has steadily progressed. The politics of containment created some obstacles to one adversary's moves, slowing their tempo, forcing him to pause and, sometimes, to retreat. However, never any of these small setbacks did force the Soviet Union to miss any opportunity to enlarge its possessions or diminish the area of influence and the power of the USA.

The politics of containment could have been partly successful for as long as the superiority of the American nuclear power over Russia existed. The situation changed radically when the Soviet Union attained

parity and eventually superiority over the US. The Western powers are no longer capable of preventing - by a threat of direct nuclear force - any Soviet local conquest by proxy.

How have the events developed since I wrote my article almost 2 years ago? Searching for an answer, I studied the American press of recent weeks. I began with the article of Clayton Fritchey in the *Washington Post*. He opens his writings with an ironic statement, that "the conquest of the world by Russia, long since prophecized by the critics of SALT II and ardent promoters of increased defense spending had, again, been postponed." Fritchey ridicules Brzezinski's *arch of crisis* - an arch of threat that extends from Afghanistan, through the Persian Gulf to Yemen and the African Horn, saying that it is exactly the same product of the imagination as the Noah Arch. According to him, the rebels in Afghanistan defeated the Soviets by taking most of the country. Even before this happened, the Soviet plans of creating a coalition of Somalia, Ethiopia and Yemen, subservient to them, had fallen down. The Soviets lost Somalia, and with it, the military base Berbera, built to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars, at the outlet of the Red Sea. In Ethiopia, Russia had entangled herself in domestic war. Moscow did not succeed in subduing North Yemen. The greatest defeat, insists Fritchey, had been the previous loss of Egypt and Sudan, the weakening of the Soviet influence in Syria and Iraq, and the growing conflict with the Khomeini regime in Iran. In a word, there is nothing to worry about; the Russians appear to be lousy imperialists, who help the Americans by spoiling everything with

their own hands and rude, unskilled politics. Even Kissinger, writes Fritchey, had warned not to think of Russia as a giant 10 ft. tall. Alas, Brzezinski did not listen to this wise advice, and continues to see the imaginary Soviet giant.

It appears that the American public prefers to listen to the so called "liberals" of the Fritchey class. In general, the sounds of alarm disturb nobody.

The role of Cuba

Two years ago, the landing of Cuban forces in Angola, with the participation of the Soviet transport planes and ships, became a prototype of conquest by proxy. A scenario has been set, and what remained was the question where and when this scenario will be repeated. The *Washington Post* recently produced a map of South America, Africa and the Middle East, marking on it places where the Cuban forces stay. Today, the Cubans have "military advisers" in 3 countries of the Western Hemisphere (Jamaica, Grenada and Guyana) and in 14 countries of Africa and the Near East (Angola, South Yemen, Iraq, Syria, Algeria, Tanzania, Mozambique, Congo-Brazzaville, Zaire, Guinea, Ecuador, Sierra Leone, Ghana). Cuba maintains contingents of regular army in Angola, Ethiopia, Algeria, Syria and South Yemen.

Naturally, the countries which welcome Cuban advisers became the clients of Moscow. However, they can at any time - as the examples of Egypt and Somalia demonstrated - turn about face. But, the presence of a 20 thousand strong Cuban army in Angola, and

16 thousand strong in Ethiopia, insures the Soviets against such eventuality.

Since 1962, Cuba had supplied arms and trained the Sandanist partisans in Nicaragua, and witnessed their victory in 1979. In a similar manner the movements which are readying themselves to overthrow the governments of Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras, are supported. Of course, arms and help in other forms do not originate from the Cubans' own stock. The value of the Soviet direct and indirect help to Cuba amounts to \$3 billion per year, and this is independent from the free supplies of military equipment. So far, the American strategy has not found a means to counteract the Soviet expansion conducted from behind the screen of Cuban intermediary.

Oil

Until recently, Iran, Pakistan and Turkey - 3 countries allied with the US - represented a portion of the shield that protected the Persian Gulf and secured the flow of oil to the free world. The overthrow of the Shah meant pushing Iran out of the American orbit and a grave weakening of Turkey and Pakistan. Saudi Arabia and the neighboring small Arabian countries had lost a policeman that had guarded their safety. The former Secretary of Energy, James Schlesinger, and the former Undersecretary of State, George Ball, attempted to make the public realize the extent of the danger which results from this state of affairs.

The road to conquest of Western Europe - states Schlesinger - leads through

the Persian Gulf, or more precisely speaking, through the Strait of Ormuz, whose navigational channel at its narrowest point is no wider than 3.7 miles. Through this channel flows 60% of oil supply to Western Europe and Japan. Only yesterday, the United States had commanded this strategic region so that a threat to the Persian Gulf countries or the presence of the Soviet army could not have occurred. At the present, the situation is reversed. The whole military potential of America and her allies became dependent on the uncertain, internally undermined, politically changeable Arabian countries. There is nothing in view that would prognosticize a stability of Khomeini government in Iran. The supply of 3.4 million barrels of oil daily from Iran, may be broken by a renewed outburst of internal fights, strikes and sabotages. Some of the pipelines have already been destroyed by the Arabian saboteurs, instigated simultaneously from 3 sides: by radio propaganda of the Soviets, Iraq, and PLO. In the oilfield region there lives a 1/2 million Arabs. The Soviets, applying open agitation and hidden operations, fervently organize a leftist front under the auspices of the communist party Tadeh, this time aimed at Khomeini. In addition, the Soviet propaganda incites the Kurds, Arabs and Aserbaijanis.

The revolution in Iran, showing the helplessness of America, had undermined the effectiveness of the protective shield she provided for the governments of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Emirates and Sultanates on the Persian Gulf. These countries, producing jointly 14.3 million barrels of oil daily, suddenly found themselves surrounded and threatened. The presence of the Soviet and

Cuban advisers in South Yemen, and the threat to North Yemen, evokes understandable anxiety of their neighbor - Saudi Arabia (about half million laborers from North Yemen work in the oilfields of Saudi Arabia). The report of the German weekly *Die Welt*, about the Soviet air bridge, with which, supposedly, the Russians had transported 40,000 troops to Aden, had met with the denial of the officials of American Administration. But, at the same time, they admitted that Russia has the capability of airlifting substantial military forces within 36 hours to Aden. The American press, however, citing as a source the Israeli intelligence, reported that the elements of 7 parachute divisions stationed in southern Russia and Bulgaria had been airlifted to Ethiopia and South Yemen.

Ethiopia, with its 220,000 army and 20,000 Cuban expeditionary corps, represent to Russia a booty that overcompensates the loss - perhaps only temporary - of Somalia and the strategic Soviet base at Berbera. Ethiopia together with South Yemen can close the strait of Bab-el-Mandeb - the entrance to the Red Sea and the Suez Canal.

Either situation on the northern flank of the arch of crisis does not look so rosy as in Firtchey's writings. Since Hafizullah Amin replaced Nur Mehemet Taraki, the Soviet parachute unit at the boundary of Afghanistan is in the stage of constant alert. The Russians are prepared to intervene militarily in case the presence of 3,000 Soviet advisers in Afghanistan were not sufficient to uphold Amin's dictatorship. The invasion of Afghanistan would be costly to the Russians, mobilizing the moslem world, especially of Iran and Pakistan. This is why the Soviets

treat an open military intervention there as a last resort, and will try to avoid it.

Evaluating the whole situation in the region of Persian Gulf, George Bell warns that, with all probability, during the next 2 years, the political or military events in this region may disturb or completely cut off the flow of oil from the main producers in the Middle East; and Schlesinger points out these consequences:

"The loss of access to oil supplies at the Persian Gulf would unavoidably lead to the dissolution of alliances, changing the face of the free world, that existed since the World War 2. ... We observed during the Yom Kippur war in 1973, how the short-lived oil embargo evoked sudden change in the politics of a majority of the countries of Western Europe. Had the Soviets succeeded in capturing this region, Japan and West Europe would not have any choice but accommodation, which may cause the dissolution of alliances that existed for 2 generations." (James Schlesinger, *The Washington Quarterly*, NO 3, 1979)

The African strategic minerals

The absence of politico-military stability is not limited to the region of the Persian Gulf; the picture would not be complete if we omitted Africa. Today, the Soviet Union has four clients in Africa: Angola, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Congo-Brazzaville. Prof. Bohdan Szuprowicz from New York, an expert on trade with Africa, in "The Russian Endeavor to Seize Strategic Materials," an article published in the

Australian press, stresses, that the southwest part of the Black Land is the main source of supply for the free world with cobalt, chromium, platinum, diamonds, vanadium, germanium and uranium. Beside Africa, only the Soviet Union has vast resources of these minerals, and so far, is independent in this respect. Szuprowich underlines the fact that continued widening of the Soviet influence in Africa may facilitate the creation by Moscow a cartel of producers of strategic materials. Such cartel, much more threatening than OPEC, would - having the support of Russian power - dictate terms to buyers from America and West Europe.

Comparison of military capabilities

The whole contemporary system of alliances has been based on psychological elements: On the belief in the United States' military superiority and its will to use it not only in its own defense, but also in the defense of its allies; and not only to defend their territories, but also their vital interests. Belief in the American protective umbrella wavers now not only under the influence of American helplessness that the US shows in the face of the progressing Soviet expansion, but also under the influence of facts relating to the American military readiness, exposed almost daily by the press.

The Soviets are becoming a power with global influence. This is only logical if we consider their continual drive to perfect a system of transportation of their well equipped forces, to a degree which would allow them to reach speedily even the

remotest corners of the world. Meantime, the chiefs of the American Air Force do not hide the fact that they don't have an appropriate number of transport planes. Besides, this is not only a matter of planes. There is also a question of the availability of bases that are suitable for landing and refueling of planes. The only plane, which would make a nonstop flight to the Middle East, with a load of tanks, artillery and men, is Lockheed C5. However, the wings of this plane proved not to be strong enough, and now the Pentagon must spend millions of dollars for their reinforcing. The other intercontinental transport planes, such as the Lockheed C130 and C141 cannot refuel in flight and must land on their way. No better is the transport ship situation. The USA has an adequate number of amphibian ships to conduct a landing of 40 thousand troops either on Atlantic, or Pacific, but not sufficient number to conduct simultaneous large landing operations on both oceans. According to the US Admiralty, in 1969 the US had 153 amphibians, and the Soviet Union, 103. After 10 years, in 1979, the Americans have only 65 amphibians, and the Soviet Union, 100. During the same period the American fleet of troop transport ships fell from 112 to 61, while the Soviets increased theirs from 56 to 147.

The transportation, though, is not all that is needed. First of all troops are needed. Nixon's decision to abolish compulsory military service, made to attract voters, became disastrous. The press, having no scruples in denouncing even the greatest military secrets, informed the public that the army doesn't have enough manpower to handle the needs of the first

phase of war. This conclusion had been reached after last year's war games *Nifty Nugget*, which were conducted in order to find out how fast the US can react to Soviet attack on Western Europe. It appeared that after 30 days from the outbreak of a conflict, the Army will have only 25% of the trained soldiers needed to handle artillery and tanks. As Senator Nunn stated, the defficiency in manpower is of such gravity, that the Army of today would not be a match in such a crisis. The Pentagon plans anticipate 60 days for mobilizing 100,000 men from the reserve. In reality, the mobilization of such a strong reserve will demand at least 6 months. Further, it means, that the US will be forced to bring into action all its available forces, without a nucleus of trained reserve left.

The situation on the seas doesn't look better either. In 1969 the American Navy had 950 units; presently, 398. At least 600 units are needed to secure the defense of sea routes on both oceans. The needs of the Navy demands a new aircraft carrier this year, and 2 more during the coming 5 years, and the building of 25 war ships yearly, or a 100 during the coming 5 years. Approved credits foresee the construction of only 46 to 1985. The budget economy, in effect, reflects in a fact, that during maneuvers of NATO forces in Germany, the crew of a tank may fire only one round of amunition; the most modern fighter planes are grounded because of the lack of spare parts.

There remains the nuclear weaponry that eats a large part, if not a majority of defense budget. The critics of the SALT II

accuse the US government of signing an agreement which was made on false assumptions. Because only the Soviets may become an aggressor that would use an element of surprise, the balance of power, expressed only in dubious figures, will not suffice; in order to survive the first strike, the US must have a decisive superiority. A scenario published by Nicholas Santelli, an engineer of the Navy Department, is constructed on the Soviet potential expected by the end of 1984. It simply states: Should the Soviets, in the first blow use 1/5 of their nuclear submarines, they would fire 200 ballistic missiles equipped with a bunch of low flying projectiles. There should be, at best, only 8 minutes till those projectiles reach their targets, certainly not much of a warning time for the American Strategic Command. In these circumstances, not more than 45-50% of American nuclear bombers will be able to leave airfields. On their way to the targets in the USSR, they must penetrate a dense anti-aircraft defense, which by 1984, will probably have Backfire bombers equipped with the most advanced projectiles able to shoot down the American planes even before they reach the Soviet earth-to-sky defense missile system. The number of the Soviet nuclear missiles SS18 in stock will permit them to drop 3 missiles on each American minuteman. Even after firing this first salvo, the Soviets will have a sufficient supply of heavy ICBM's - now kept in hiding. (SALT II regulates the number of launching sites, not missiles.) The American answer to the first attack will encounter many difficulties; most critical is the first phase, when a missile goes up. Even a far distant nuclear detonation may push a missile out of its track. The Soviet submarines can fire missiles which will

explode high above the American launching sites, causing delay of the firing of minuteman until the Soviet more precise projectiles appear. In addition, according to the former chief of joint staff, General Maxwell Taylor, the Americans won't know which of the Soviet launching sites are already empty, and which still unloaded. Firing a salvo at either - empty or loaded - launching sites, the Americans must lose a great number of their missiles. An advanced airforce base of NATO will be warned 15 minutes before the Soviet missiles strike their targets, but it won't be of much use; these bases will be neutralized by the enemy's human nerve paralyzing gas. In 1984, Russia will have at her disposal a fleet of satellites that would locate the precise position of aircraft carriers and destroy them by ICBM's whose flight will be guided by other satellites.

The year of 1984

Experts estimate that the Soviets will reach the summit of their superiority in the first 5 years of the next decade. In the same period, if inflation (fed by the increasing prices of gasoline) isn't checked and recession avoided, the social conflicts within the USA will become more acute. The press, ringing their alarm, fears not so much a nuclear war, as a further loss of American influence - erosion and disintegration of alliances. The USA, turned into a besieged fortress, deprived of allies and the importation of raw materials, will not be able to survive.

These pessimistic prognoses are, of course, unilateral, showing only one side of the coin. If America, compelled by its energy crisis, develops proper research to find new

energy sources - and it doesn't seem likely - the economic situation, and with it, perhaps, military capabilities will improve. Meantime, the situation in the USSR will be worsening and, perhaps, the second half of the next decade will bring serious crisis, if not catastrophe. Maintaining gigantic armed forces takes 15 percent of the national revenues, and must have a great effect on Soviet economy. The Soviets will stop being a self-sufficient country with regard to raw materials. Perhaps, they will be even forced to import a lot of oil. The men in the Kremlin certainly realize, that after 1985, the time will be working against them. This is why the next 5 years may become a most dangerous period. It's difficult to guess what may occur during these 5 years. According to some prominent doctors - specialists, who have had an occasion to observe Brezhnev at close range during his visit in the West - he has only a 50% chance to survive the coming winter, and almost none through the winter of 1980/81. The average age of not only Politburo members but the whole Central Committee is 70. Is the demise of Brezhnev going to produce only insignificant personnel changes, or the departure of the whole gerontocracy? Are the successors to power going to be predisposed toward economic and structural changes, or will they choose to take full advantage of their adversary's weakness and continue to pursue hegemony at a cost to their own people? Any attempt to find an answer to these and other questions leads only to guessing. Nevertheless, the future of the world and literally - of each of us - will depend on this "other side of the coin."

Putting on paper these pessimistic thoughts, I have been in conflict with

myself. *Kultura* reaches a wide circle of
intelligentsia of our country. From my own
war experiences, I know that opposition, even
in the pure moral meaning of this word, is a
result of hope. Is it worthwhile to weaken
this hope by the not too nice perspectives
for the nearest future? Alas! The same
experiences tell me how dangerous it is for
a society to live in dreams and detachment
from reality. Then, looking somberly at it
all, we must rely on the fact, that the events
we disclosed in this writing, may not only
bring an increase of tension in international
relations, but also a radical shift in the
system which emerged in Europe and in the
world after the World War 2.

Jan NOWAK

Washington Oct. 6, 1979

VERSES FROM AMERICA

Henryk GRYNBERG

DIFFICULT TO BELIEVE

*It's difficult to believe that those born on
the day of our graduation
have themselves graduated
and that these who today die in uniform
could have been our sons*

*that we pass and change nothing
being only ourselves liable to change*

*that most of these who govern us are the same
little swindlers and big liars
and in addition the blackmailers and cowards
multiply in an alarming manner*

*it's difficult to believe that no one is
embarrassed
either to blackmail or to funk
or to steal or to lie in the eyes of
live television*

*It's difficult to believe that we pass
and there is nothing left even to argue about
when there is a scarcity of soil, air and
water
for the legitimate and illegitimate
children of history*

*that promethean fire subsides
and the devil around us vigorously
sets hell on fire
leaving us with nothing much to lose*

*furthermore it is difficult to believe that
nobody
gets the attention of cowards
blackmail is only a dirty trick
but cowardice compared to blackmail
is the crime against humanity*

*and the most difficult is to believe
that nobody even wonders*

WE MUST PAY

Because long ago simpletons were proclaiming
the words of god
for centuries we have prayed for our daily
bread

until today
surrounded by the hydras of
omnipresent cannons
and the dullness of automatic guns' muzzles
we know that prayer's concern hasn't been
the bread for our animal bowels

we multiply faster than bread
faster than water faster than air
and much faster than the spirit -
daily food for the spirit was intended
in the original prayer

we multiply faster and faster
but as usual there are too few people
only ever greater multitudes
of human-beasts
tighten their ranks around us

we try to domesticate them
in hope that at universities
it's possible to make a man out of a yokel
we feed them with civilization
and they gulp it wholly-including the plate
we serve them knowledge
increasing their vulgarity by knowledge
even the feeble defenseless culture
we throw to the dragon's den
where it is raped again and again
collectively obstinately joyfully

thanks to our civilization
our culture and knowledge
it is easier for them
to salt the ulcers of our stomachs

to poison spleens livers
to finish us with heart attacks
to terrorize from land sea and air
to stab without using a knife
and for it all we cannot blame
even ourselves
because this is the usual price
that a man must pay
for his willingness to remain a man
this is the usual price and only inflation
makes it
seem that we pay much more

so let us be prepared that in the end
we must go underground again
and let us look carefully around where to
hide the human seed and the words of god

Washington 1974

GOD IS...

Dedicated to Leszek Kolakowski¹

God is like an english queen
He is but has no power
we may obey Him or not
Love Him or not
we may even kill Him
in us

because He is not above us but in us
only we can decide what to do with Him
similarly to what we can decide to do with
ourselves
(without the least illusions that He
would want to help us out)

¹ Professor of philosophy at Oxford
University, England; renowned authority on
Marxism and the Soviet Union.

and there is no need to ask for His favors
or forgiveness

even without our asking He always forgives us
He says: you are weak small foolish
i cannot be angry with you
so for the trespasses you do unto your
neighbor
repent not before me but before him
which will help you to comprehend
why you shouldn't commit trespasses

having no power
since He gave it to us
as free will
He doesn't interfere in or control
our affairs
and to our prayers and petitions He listens
with our own ears
(because He is in us)

He is our creator but creates us
with our own hands
which we use to punish ourselves
and to reward ourselves
and to lift us from our knees
and sometimes to put us above ourselves
which seems very high

we do it all alone
but it wouldn't occur to us
if He were not in us

like an english queen
He has no power - but is

and this ought to satisfy us

Maryland, 1974

\$1.00

Fragments

Vol. 6/10

Dec. 1979

by

Charles Joel

Michał HELLER

ARE THE RUSSIAN AND THE
SOVIET LANGUAGES IDENTICAL?

KISIEL •

CRY IN THE WILDERNESS
(MAGIC WORDS OF THE NEW
MIDDLE AGES)

Antoni POWOLNY

A LETTER FROM WARSAW
(an excerpt)

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 12/387/1979, published in Paris, France.

No part of this work may be reproduced in any form without permission from the editor except for the quotations of brief passages in criticism.

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.

ARE THE RUSSIAN AND THE SOVIET LANGUAGES IDENTICAL?

In one of the American science fiction films, a cosmic ship from some far distant planet lands on earth. Music appears the common language which allows men to make contact with new-comers - the carriers of an unknown civilization. We continue waiting for the arrival of living creatures from the depth of the cosmos, without realizing, that in the meantime, that different civilization has already appeared on our globe. Half century ago, in 1928, ten years before his death in the dungeons of Lubyanka, Nicholas Bucharin stated: "We are already in the process of creating - and we will finally create - the civilization which in comparison to the present capitalistic civilization will look like a polka compared to the Eroica of Beethoven.

We may think of the Soviet civilization in various terms, but there is no question that this civilization has already been created. This civilization has its own

language, the Soviet language. People of the West, politicians, intellectuals, common tourists visiting the Soviet Union, often complain that they don't understand the Soviet people and Soviet politics. The reason is simple: There is an overwhelming belief in the West, that in order to understand the Soviet people it is enough to know the Russian language. Not so. For this purpose, you must know the Soviet language.

The Soviet language is the language all the Soviet people, regardless of their origin, must know. It is the only appropriated to the State language in the world. From among all the monopolies the Soviet power holds, the most important is the monopoly of the word. In the Soviet Union only the authorities decide about the meaning of any word, even its right to exist. A dictionary became a powerful weapon of this monopoly.

The Soviet language began to emerge soon after the October revolution:

It wasn't just a coincidence that its leaders were publicists, professional word-users, entirely conscious of the power of word. "A great majority of people" - wrote Lenin to Inessa Armand - "don't know how to think; they know only how to memorize someone else's words..." - ("Collected Works" - Russian edition, vol. 48, page 242).

After the October revolution, the citizens of the Soviet republic begin to receive an increased number of words to "memorize". This is called a process of popularizing slogans. A slogan, a catchword of concise and primitive substance, becomes a cornerstone of the Soviet language. Its

main characteristic is precision which precludes any misinterpretation. It doesn't leave any room for doubt, it has been given the one-only-precisely-scientific meaning.

And again, the theoretical base for its creation is the work of Lenin. One day, one of his closest comrades pointed out to Lenin the necessity for a reply to an article of Kautsky. Lenin said: What for? Kautsky will reply, we will be forced to reply again, and it will never end. We must revile him as a renegade and a traitor of the working class. Then everybody will understand what it is all about.

As at the creation of the world, at the beginning of the Soviet language there was the Word. But this word was a lie, a lie never before heard.

The Soviet language began as a tool of the Party, and its most important function is forcing definite ideas upon the minds of people. A word becomes a charm.

Another characteristic of the Soviet language is its usefulness for the masking of thoughts. The revolution brought in a system of fictitious elements which are treated by the new language as real, and real elements which are treated by the new language, as fictitious. Babel talks in one of his stories, about the "mysterious curve of Lenin's straight line." Yevgeny Zamyatin in 1929 proved in his novel "We", that the function of the Soviet language is but the deprivation of a word of its sense. A word loses its usual, immanent meaning. It is just an empty shell which

the Party fills with meaning - according to Party's will and needs. Thirty years after Zamyatin, George Orwell will bestow the classic definition on this paradox of the Soviet language, on the paradox of curved simplicity and simple curve. In the newspaper (the State language used by the heroes of "1984") hunger bears the name of abundance, war - peace, slavery - freedom. A word in the Soviet language is a camouflage for falsity, because it is empty. Its sense changes in dependence of who pronounces it and when.

The process of originating a language is complicated and long. The Soviet language was taking shape and grew purposely and in accordance with plans and demands of "linguistic politics." A young linguist, Gregory Winokur wrote in 1928: "Linguistic politics is a system based strictly on scientific intervention of a conscious will in the structure and development of language" ("LEF," 1923, No 3).

The foundations for the Soviet language were laid by Lenin, but it was Stalin, his best pupil who perfected it. No one else than he, knew better about the power of word-charm, word - mask. Stalin became an invincible master of the semantic game, which fact was a deciding factor in his victory over all his rivals in the fight for power. Stalin always describes a fight against an enemy, as a fight of the just against the unjust, harmful, hostile; as a fight of the word of truth against the word of falsity. Long before he became the master of life and death of the Soviet people, he was the master of political vocabulary, and later, a master on Any Human Vocabulary.

The Germans used to talk about Hitler: the Führer thinks of us! The people used to talk about Stalin too: The leader thinks for us. And he did, because he talked; His word performed the role of a disgraceful brand, a verdict - the subject of immediate execution. Here are several examples of word-verdicts chosen at random: Ex, late, one-time, parasite, deviationist, mendelismorganist, geneticist, cybernetic. What was important was that Stalin injected these words with criminal meaningfulness, made them into one-word acts of impeachment. If one has a monopoly on lexicon, one may do anything one wants.

In 1950, when the Soviet Union, recuperating from the war which took 20 million Russian lives, was hardly beginning to stand on its own legs, when hundreds of towns in ruin waited for reconstruction, when hunger dominated everywhere, Stalin took to the problems of lexicography. Subsequent madness, this time of linguistic nature, seized the whole country. From academicians to semi-literate kolkhoz members, everybody began to study linguistic problems. However, there was a method involved in this madness. Stalin concluded, that the Soviet language had reached such a stage of development that it would allow applying the theory of conditional reflexes of Ivan Pavlov (evoking desired reaction in man to definite signals). The signals were some slogans, some verbal messages.

Fortunately, the Soviet language didn't replace the Russian language, yet, but coexists with it.

The arm of its expansion are text

books and vocabularies. Jargon of the newspapers of the Soviet Union became the basic source for text books and vocabularies. The language of a reporter - the Soviet language - is forced upon life, and is given the status of literary language - the language of the cultural people - language which is better than the common, daily life language of uncultural people. Strictly codified, authorized Soviet language is placed higher than other languages; it's driving them away.

In 1956, Alexander Jaszyn, in the story "The Cranes" gave a testimony to the threatening victory of the Soviet language, the most horrible, I think, in the Soviet literature. In one of the fragments of the story, several inhabitants of a kolkhoz members of the Party, gather for a meeting. The leader of the group is delayed so in the meantime, there is frank and care-free talk going on; everybody talks in Russian. Finally, the late-comer arrives and opens the meeting. And suddenly, as if the light went off, everybody switches to the Soviet language, and talk changes into the cranes of the Party machine. The meeting ends, the light is on again, cranes change into the common people, and, again, everybody talks Russian.

The parallelism of the two languages, the necessity for switching from one to the other, the consciousness that one - the Russian - is the more beautiful, but that the other - the Soviet - is more useful, must reflect on the psychology of the Soviet man; even if he realizes what is going on, he is helpless; his psychological profile changes.

Dr. Jekyll changes into Mr. Hyde, only after drinking the devil's elixir. But, in time, the metamorphoses occur independently of his will. Dr. Jekyll can free himself from his own tyrant, only by committing suicide.

If the matter were limited to the ill-fated Russia, the Soviet language would, in the end, become an object of specialized research, solely of interest to linguists. But the fact is that the Soviet language became universal, some sort of esperanto for all who have hope for "glorious future." The history of the past 60 years clearly proved that "the Soviet language" is a permanent component of totalitarian ideology. In 1947 the German linguist, Victor Klemperer, published an unusual book - "Lingua Tertii Imperii"; It is a diary of a philologist who watched the birth of Hitlerian language, as it had been forcing the traditional German language out of existence. The similarities of the processes of originating both - the Hitlerian and the Soviet languages are striking, because in both the same mechanics of totalitarian ideologies are acting. History had created a certain monstrous system, in which, however, there exist conditions for conducting experiments whose scientific character cannot be doubted. Here is a country that is divided in 2 parts. Thirty years ago, in either, people spoke one language. Today, in one part, the German language continues to flourish, in the other - beside the German, there appeared the so called SED-Deutsch. Everybody knows the paradox written by G.B. Shaw: What divides America and England, is the common language. Today, the paradox

became reality: What divides the West and the East Germans, is the language.

The Soviet language came to life and is striving now not only in the countries where the "glorious future" is under construction. It is used as the spoken and written language by all who want to see the "glorious future" spread all over the world. The power of the Soviet language is monstrous: At a time, it convinced the West that in the USSR there are no gulags and that the standard of living of the Soviet people is very high.

What may attest to the power of the Soviet language are the whole libraries of books, in which the heroes, coming to the West, tell the stories about how their eyes had opened, when - after the Moscow trials in 1937, or after the Hungarian revolution in 1956, or after the liquidation of "Prague Spring" in 1968 - they looked in a mirror and found their skin covered with strange hair, that they have fangs sticking from their mouths, that they were exact pictures of comrade Hyde.

However, the dictatorship of the Soviet language within the Soviet system, didn't proceed unopposed. The revolt in the name of freedom began in the Soviet Union, as a revolt against the monopoly of Word. All the true writers - from Solzhenitsyn to Yeryfiyev - each from a different platform, and each in a different manner (which in themselves are the acts of blasphemy), demolish the fossils of the Soviet language, and ipso facto, create the fundaments for hope.

Michal HELLER

CRY IN THE WILDERNESS

MAGIC WORDS OF THE NEW MIDDLE AGES

Our world is engulfed in a psychological war, whose weaponry are words. This war, undoubtedly, brings many successes for the Soviet Union; It's natural, because the Soviet Union, living in the climate of ideological and verbal New Middle Ages, attains, by juggling words, an absolute supremacy over the pragmatic and, ipso facto, dialectically naive and awkward West. The instruments of success here, are popular words of high esteem, but which in reality are not too clear, of great versatility, with which the Kremlin Russia juggles any way it wants, deftly, like a circus magician. The god-natured, quakerish Americans, absolutely cannot grasp it all, nay, don't even suppose that the verbal battle is of such importance, that it may decide the fate of the world. The strategy of platitude may foreclose the question of

our existence, which subject is beyond the comprehension of the American senators, puffed up with statistics. The serious matters are often treated nonseriously, and nonserious matters may appear most serious. President Carter, playing hell with the Soviet troop bivouacking on Cuba, accepting with a great relief an explanation that it does not intend to invade the United States, that it is there to train the Cubans for wars in Africa, is unspeakably comical, although he doesn't know it. Just as comical is an American politician who insists seriously, that world impoverishing sales of enormous amounts of grain to the Soviet Union, has nothing in common with politics, because a grain, being grain, is a product of land, and politics is something that is conducted by governments, and not by farmers (I heard it with my own ears). Also, unbelievably comical are the editors of the world press, who wonder, with great seriousness, if the Rhodesian Bishop Muzorewa has been elected in a really democratic manner, while an idea cannot penetrate their minds to ask, what kinds of election are existing in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania and ten other countries of Europe. Only we, from the other side of the barricade, recognize that comicalness, when our large, silent, Eastern audience, immersed in darkness, watches the historic operetta of the West, an operetta which is being played in the floodlights of the free press.

But perhaps it isn't an operetta, perhaps it is a tragi-comedy? May it be that those artists of the Western politics perform their grotesque leaps, shuffles, hypocritical countenances, simply out of fear, because they fear the ATOM? Perhaps. But, why don't the

Russians fear the same; continue, without a blink of an eye, their refined juggling, their psychological offensive, conducting it expertly with absurd staggering words? Why? For such precise transmutations of the meaning of words one must have a presence of mind, solitude, certitude, and extreme discernment of the degree of naivetté, or impotency of an adversary. A frightened man would not be able to juggle with this alchemy of words. Why then are some frightened, and some others are not? Perhaps the confidence in the New Middle Ages encourages the latter?!

Allow me now to give you a few examples of word-tanks, word-rockets, word-nuclear missiles: PEACE - obviously in Europe where two armies ready for battle face each other; obviously official, affirmed by the oaths of the US president. Naturally it must have nothing in common with any civil wars, internal wars, even the bloodies ones, wherever they happen, because they are holy wars which in the name of progress can and must be supported with weapons, experts and the Cubans. SOCIALISM - a magnificent word, because to each of us it means something different, and only the silent public of the East knows, that for the communistic and comunizing countries, this word means total economic and political slavery. THE LEFT - it is perfectly well in this world if one appeals to it, even if one lives in a system that is typically rightist, dictatorial, void of free dispute, press, elections, pluralism, but endowed with the most effective instrument of enslavement: the appropriation of every possible means of production by the state. And in addition, with such a

typical European leftists as Josef Stalin still appearing on signboards! IMPERIALISM - American, of course; about somebody who after World War II subjected to himself half of Europe, forcing upon ten countries his system and his politics, nobody remembers and mentions; presently, on the world's agenda there are Salvador, Palestine, maybe Basque province, maybe Ireland, maybe Nicaragua. Millions of people are unimportant, the old enslavement doesn't count, the navel of the world, or its inflammable point moves around here and there, in accordance with the Geography of Fear, whose map for the affluent and gratified people of the Western countries, is illuminated from time to time by a magic word of the Great Psychologist and Magus of the East. HEGEMONY - Chinese, of course; no other would exist in the world. The conscience of the world sobs obediently when the one who claims to be without a sin, clear as a tear, appears on the Forum of Nations, as a plaintiff. MARXISM - word-charm. Its contents unimportant: Who would remember, that it was thought to be a medicine against a stout capitalism, as today it is applied in the underdeveloped countries of Asia and Africa, in which there is not a trace of that capitalism? Who would remember the tangible, absurd, to the point of unbelievable, magic of words, pictures, visions that are spread by the priests of the New Middle Ages; who would have courage to mention capitalistic prosperity of Japan, South Korea, Philippines, Australia? And, the last of our magic words: GUN BOAT POLITICS. It does not, of course, refer to tanks that rode into Budapest and Prague. There are no gun boats over there, and in the Mid-European countries there are no seas...

Let's face it. The Soviet misery and backwardness, an absence of "human rights," brutal international infringements, bankruptcy of the whole Eastern Bloc, all absurd peculiarities described thousand times, interest nobody; but the export of versatile words makes tremendous appeal: Peace, socialism, left, fight against imperialism, revolutions - who would refute them in the New Middle Ages? Aren't the values of words, dogmas, visions, suggestions, more important than the values of real life, colorless to the eyes of those thirsty for ideological effects? The psychological war has its own laws: words - tanks, words - planes, words-rockets, all flow from the East, flow unopposed, because the West has neither courage to decipher and to disarm them, nor the knowledge of how to undertake a counter-offensive, even an offensive in the Dulles' style of the old days. In order to carry on psychological warfare, one must perceive its goals and understand its methods; it's difficult task for the managers of practicality, accustomed to the idolatrous loyalty to materialistic and technocratic measures in the redeeming therapy of economic cooperation and affluence. They make ropes for their own necks, as Lenin had predicted, and cannot grasp the importance of the counter-offensive of words. It's true that the Chinese and Strauss cry that the "king is naked", but they are not taken seriously; instead, they are proclaimed as imperialists and nationalists - again the terror of words - resulting from psychological magic implanted by the East, sown cleverly and effectively. Since this "sickness of words" had seized a majority of Western intellectuals, who is to represent the West in the psychological war?

Cowardly and narrow-minded technocrats, whose thinking doesn't go beyond business and compromise? And, mind, you, in the matter of the invasion of our globe by the New Middle Ages?!

Some time ago, Hitler said, that if the Germans lost the war, Europe will have to suffer defeat and history will lose its sense. Europe lost not because Hitler lost, but because Stalin had won, and because without one totalitarianism the other totalitarianism could not have been beaten. Sick, Roosevelt did not understand the weight of this truth; Churchill, already helpless, had guessed it; The Poles understood it, but who would listen to a bunch of lunatics from the country upon the Vistula river? McArthur and Forrestal, were also acclaimed as lunatics, the latter because he jumped out the window, imagining the Russian squadrons loaded with nuclear bombs, flying over Washington. It seems that he was the only sober man of those days, and he had gone mad seeing that the whole world was getting mad in its comfort and naiveté. Today, the naiveté of the old days translated itself into dollars: billions and billions of dollars that since 1948 had been put into nuclear weaponry. A 3 year nuclear truce by the honest quakers did not help the world - quite to the contrary...

But the nuclear squadrons need not, today, fly over Washington. Psychological bombs will suffice; squadrons of words that fly unopposed over the whole world. Why doesn't the West find a defense against this? Because its modern, materialistic structure is not prepared to meet pressures of the New Middle Ages. What dominates in the West is the well-being of the common man who wants to

live comfortably and who is not concerned with the universal, world shaking issues. But in the East, there - disregarding the lives of their own people - govern the self-serving autocrats - powerful, mysterious, locked in their offices and palaces, but - what a paradox! - throwing into the disoriented Third World, "noble" ideas. This is a peculiar illustration of how each side exchanged roles and history. The powerful, rich West stands helplessly, because in its arsenal it has no magic words and challenges, except its prozaic affluence; clever scoundrel, Fidel Castro, feeds his people with speeches and tells them to go across oceans to fight wars (which are not called wars), drives them through continents, locks the empty grocery stores of Cuban towns, and stiffens the growling stomachs with speeches...

Who actually, is populist and who egalitarian, who is democratic and who aristocratic, who is modern and who is backward?!

And who is going to win in the New Middle Ages approaching like a dark cloud?

KISIEL

A LETTER FROM WARSAW
(an excerpt)

Instead of talking about historic compromise in Poland, we should rather talk about the opportunistic compromise of the West, of the USA above all. About this USA which did not recall its ambassador from Czechoslovakia, after the trial of the advocates of Charter 77. Carter could and should do it, especially because, as one of the State Department officials stated, America doesn't have any major, common interests with Czechoslovakia. The American ambassador should, ostentatiously, depart from Prague, leaving behind a second rank diplomat. The apostle of freedom and human rights - Carter, however, did not feel like doing so. We, in Poland, are very sensitive to everything that is happening in the area of Western diplomacy, because our lives are at stake.

Let's go back to our main problem, to the democratic opposition, which is most interesting to foreign reporters - because they look for sensation, and to Poles on emigration because they live in hope. Is opposition going to play any important role

in politics of Poland? I would answer, that it already does, because it enlightens and teaches society and creates its authentic elites. This is a great role played by the democratic opposition. It is especially important, because Americans in Warsaw do not hide their intention of moving radio Free Europe to the US, supposedly for economic reasons. It is very unfortunate, because actually, the Free Europe has a larger influence on people than all the factions of opposition taken together. Even after 10 years, the clientele of opposition will be equal to only a small percent of the permanent listeners of radio Free Europe. Thus, the Americans make a subsequent error of catastrophic consequences, not the first, and not the last. However, this state of affairs doesn't diminish the role of the opposition. If, in the coming 3 years, the opposition doubles the number of writers and publicists who are connected with it, then, finally, the new true intellectual cadres will appear in Poland, which fact will have enormous significance for preserving the basic Polish national identity. Let's say it openly and brutally: prewar and war intellectual elites within our country, are old and slowly dying off. It is equally true with regard to immigration. More often than ever, and with great sorrow, we read about the death of many among the immigrants. Compared to Emigration, the opposition within Poland is in a better position, as it may always be supplemented with "young blood." This is its great, and I don't hesitate to say, historical advantage. What may be more important for the enslaved people, than education, spiritual uplifting, and the strengthening of their political back-bone, and, above all, informing them?

In Poland, there is such great hunger for information that even the regime publications evaporate from the newstands, and obtaining *Kultura* or the *Information Bulletin* of the Committee for Defense of Workers, is a long remembered experience. Hence, such people as Kisielewski, Michnik, Kuron, who risk publishing their works in the West, are surrounded with universal respect and admiration, regardless of whether one agrees or not with their convictions. We, in our country, want to read, and to listen to radio, and we do our thinking on our own. We are not conservative-liberal leftists, or divided in the catholic or laic, Left, because all this kind of thinking belongs to the fortunate people who are professionally engaged in political writing. We, meaning, society at large, or rather its nonpolitical majority, are divided in many differently oriented groups; we are, indeed, pluralistic.

Antoni POWOLNY