

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 4/1

Jan. 1977

by

Charles Joel

Brukselczyk

THE HUNDRED FIRST
FLOWER

A translation from Polish magazine
Kultura No. 11/350/76
published in Paris, France.

© Copyright by Charles Joel

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company
Sutter Creek, California

THE HUNDRED FIRST FLOWER

- I. *An official report on the secret conference of the delegates to the XI Congress of the Communist Party of China*

"...In the progress of the secret conference the delegates to the XI Congress of the Communist Party of China have heard out the report of the Chairman of the Communist Party, Comrade Hua Kuo-feng, on "the personality cult and its results". An appropriate resolution in this matter has been taken..."

- II. *An official report on the secret resolution concerning the personality cult and its results.*

"...After hearing the report of comrade Hua Kuo-feng, on the personality cult and its results, the XI Congress of the Communist Party of China, unanimously approved it and entrusted the Central Committee with taking the necessary steps for the complete elimination of the personality cult foreign to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, for the abolishing of its results in every area of Party, State

and ideological activities, and for the absolute obedience to the principles of Party life and collective leadership..."

III. *The secret report of comrade Hua Kuo-feng delivered on the XI Congress of the Communist Party of China: "About the personality cult and its results" (fragments).*

"Comrades! The purpose of this report is not a profound critique of the life and activities of Mao Tse-tung. His role in the preparation and conduct of the Socialist revolution and in a fight for building up Socialism in our country is universally known. Doubtless, Mao Tse-tung rendered great services to the Party, the working class and the international working class movement. Today, we are interested in something different: How it happens that the cult of Mao's personality continues to grow to the extent that he could at certain times become a source of ever-growing, serious violations of the Party principles, Party's democracy and revolutionary righteousness".

A class enemy

...Mao Tse-tung created the concept of "Class enemy". This notion had automatically exempted the authorities from the obligation of supplying proof of guilt of persons with different thinking. This notion permitted the application of the most cruel repressions against anybody who has been in disagreement with Mao Tse-tung, and their physical liquidation. ...The Special Commission has investigated the circumstances in which Mao Tse-tung could have conducted a mass extermination of the members and assistant-members of party's Central Commit-

tee. The Commission researched the archives of the security organs, and found facts proving grave violations of the Socialist righteousness. It became clear that a great number of the Party, State and country's economic activists, had been, during the period of 1947 and 1956, brutally persecuted, although they were not enemies, spies, revisionists, or agents of the bourgeoisie, but to the contrary, they were always honest Communists. The Commission prepared an enormous volume of evidence in this respect, to the Central Committee.

And so, it came out that, for example, in between 1949 and 1956 or, in other words, in the years when people were growing in power, millions of human beings were shot to death or sent to concentration camps, under the false accusations of counter-revolutionary activities. Among them were many Communists and even the members of high Party organizations. They belonged to the, so called, generation of victors, which fact by itself points to the absurdity of accusations. How was it possible to suspect two facedness in men who in the fight for the revolution's victory, quite often, looked into the eyes of death... In 1951 Mao Tse-tung created the Peoples' Tribunals, which in time became the most vigorous tool of country collectivization and socialization of the cities.

All this has been conducted in the atmosphere of hysteria and fanaticism. Mao ordered the creation of public trials, where the role of judges had been played by a crowd. Comrades, how contrasting to our traditions is this public demands for blood, this stirring up of the masses, and all of it with the help of every possible

means of propoganda. Naturally, we are still far away from the exact number, we don't even know if it would be possible to arrive at the truly realistic figures pertaining to the magnitude of losses. At this moment, however, we may ~~share~~ with confidence that according to our preliminary statistics, all the subsequent clean-up operations and unceasing campaigns, from the agricultural reform - gradually taking shape of collectivization - through the campaigns of the great leap forward, all, of course ending in cultural revolution, had taken from 35 to 63 million lives. And where are the victims of the so called "camps of education through work"? We haven't, obviously, any accurate figures in this matter. But, it is sufficient to say, that the organization of these camps was done with a help of Stalin's advisors invited by Mao.

Tibet

Comrades! Allow me to say that the Peoples Republic of China is proud, and rightly so, of being a model of multinational State. Didn't we secure the full equality of all peoples that live within our great country? On this background, the acts of willfulness inspired by Mao and violations of the Lenin principles of nationalistic politics, appear a monstrosity. It's enough to cite, the example of Tibet. Why were hundreds of thousands of Tibetan inhabitants deported? Didn't we promise them freedom and equality? To what purpose did the destruction of the ancient culture and tradition of this peace loving country serve?...

Red Book

Comrades! The personality cult has reached such monstrous dimensions, first, because taking advantage of every possible way, Mao Tse-tung, personally, directed the glorification of himself. One of the most characteristic examples of it is the story of the "Red Book". It's not even worth while to look for other more drastic examples of self-glory, so allow me to say that in this process there was no possibly strong words left for expressing admiration for Mao, and that all the "formulas" used for this purpose were approved by Mao personally and often post-scripted by him. The red book containing - as all of you, comrades, know - mostly banalities, has been printed in over 500 million copies. The question arises: Was the red book so perfect in reflecting the socialistic changes of our country as to warrant such enormous demand? No, not at all. The red book reflects only the thought of Mao Tse-tung; everything in it is connected with his person only. Can a true Marxist-Leninist build in this manner a monument for himself? Can he allow the sky high exaltation of his own person? Even emperors and mandarins had never gone so far....

What is that survived?

Comrades! Mao Tse-tung was surrounded by a clique of sycophants - people without any principle - always ready to perform any task.. Designated some time ago by Mao himself, as his "closest companion-in-arms," Lin Piao (vanished in still unknown circumstances) wrote a preface to the "Red Book." He wrote: "The thought of Mao Tse-tung is the universal truth. Ages passed by in the history of mankind, until happiness arrived with the appearance of

genius so great as Chairman Mao... Everything that agrees with the thought of Mao, is the truth, everything that contradicts it, is false and reactionary..."

Comrades! The personality cult affected our economy and political activities by applying wrong principles. Surrounded by a multitude of sycophants, specialists in false optimism and scoundrels, Mao had been pursuing the most catastrophic goals. A special commission of the Central Committee is presently investigating the campaigns of Mao that are known as "A 100 flowers", "Great Leap forward," and, above all, the "Cultural Revolution". But, before the commission ends its task, we may say, that, first, the "great leap" has ended in failure causing delay in the development of our country, that, second, the "great proletarian cultural revolution" resulted in enormous confusion of ideas, colossal losses in leadership, and the repulsion by the whole world of the China model - an example of victorious socialist revolution - and created increased distance between the industrialized countries and China. From all the victorious "victories of Maoism", there survived only the personality cult and, connected with it, lawlessness.

In these circumstances, we shouldn't be surprised that the present activists show hesitation, are afraid of everything that is new, and lack initiative and a sense of responsibility.

Ho and Teng

It's sufficient to remind ourselves about the fate of Ho Lung, the hero of the Great Walk (this period also demands investigation; as revealed by the unpub-

lished documents, Mao - entirely unnecessarily - sacrificed tens of thousands of people, only for the sake of his pride). After the victory in 1949, Ho Lung, though without any education, was made marshal and a chief of a department. During the cultural revolution, he was trampled in the mud, and died having no idea what he was accused of. His son, similarly to the son of Marshall Chen I - another victim of the cultural revolution - was shot to death in an attempt (maybe provoked) of escape to Hong Kong. Or, another example, Teng Hsiao - ping, a hero of the domestic war, Marshall and general secretary of the Party, was deposed and abused by the Red Guard - inspired by Mao. He returned to active duty in 1972, when the country was at the brink of catastrophe. Made vice-premier, vice-chairman of Communist Party of China, he took over the factual leadership during the illness of Chou En-lai. After the death of the premier, Ten was acclaimed a traitor and agent of bourgeoisie and revisionism. During the ten years of the cultural revolution our best Marxists have perished. We all remember how dreadful was the fate of Lin Shao-tsi, the president of China, acclaimed as "Chinese Khrushchov," deported and sentenced to a slow death in oblivion, if not in disdain. And where is Hsiao Hua, another hero of our revolution? Comrades! No wonder that this kind of treatment given to the best sons of our country, led to nothing but fear and stagnation of our leadership.

Cult

The insane cult such as the one Mao forced upon the Red Guard during and after the cultural revolution, may lead to nothing else but an unpardonable stupor of our

youth. Here is a description of Mao's meeting with members of the Red Guard, designated to be a lecture to youth: "The reception given to them by the Chairman Mao filled the guardsmen with undescribed strength and wisdom... After the reception, a multitude of guardsmen opened the red book, and looking through their tears at the portrait of our great leader, shouted: Great Chairman Mao, we saw you!! Many wrote down this happiest date of their lives, on the cover of the book with Mao's verses, the others on their arms or hands..."

And here, Comrades, is a quotation from the film of the same reception: "Respected and loved above all in this world Chairman Mao, day after day, night after night, we have dreamt about seeing you. And today, we are at your side. There is no word which would express our great love toward you, there is no song which would sing about our joy... From the bottoms of our hearts we wish you life without end...". And here, how our youth was forced to write about these kinds of events: "We shook hand of Chairman Mao. No, we did not, because it was sufficient to touch slightly his hand in order to feel the powerful stream of warmth which overflowed our bodies and warmed up our hearts. It gave us a feeling of power impossible to tame..."

Insanity

Comrades! There is nothing strange that these conditions led to real insanity. Nobody had the courage to show up without the red book. Every article in our press, independently of

a theme, had to be in line with the iron formula: after a short leading sentence there must follow a citation from Mao Tse-tung, and its exegesis. Decisions had been replaced by reading Mao's citations. A fear of improvisations and independent thinking made every meeting changed into a collective reading of citations from Mao; nobody attempted the risk of saying something original, everybody prepared his appearance in advance - never changing the text, even if the facts were contradictory.

The thought of Mao has been appearing as a magic and universal key, as a lever which could move a mountain. A citation from Mao could let a postman decipher an illegible address. A truck driver stated: "I apply Mao's thought while I'm behind the wheel". A garbage collector was telling that Mao's thought has remarkably improved his efficiency and output. A doctor was stitching the cut-off fingers of his patient's hand, owing to "thoughtmaotsetung," laborers, soldiers and ping-pong players were getting excellent records owing to the use of Mao citations.

Miracles

Comrades! Through this kind of bidding in citations we were able to arrive in our Communist - materialist country, to many unnatural phenomena, to miracles. Owing to a citation from Mao the deaf regained hearing, insane - brains. At the beginning of 1969, in Peking, the public was shown an unusual theatrical spectacle: The cured dumb performed as singers, the blind - lecturers of text, dancers - paralytics. And all shouted that they were cured by "thoughtmaotsetung". Or, an example of a group of youngsters isolated

by a flash-flood. According to our press, all saved their lives, because "they didn't give up standing high on a diminishing strip of land, holding high above waves, the portrait of Mao and loudly reciting his teachings". In 1969, on June 13, to be exact, the papers reported that a soldier Heo Ming-fa, did not hesitate to jump into a munition storehouse engulfed in flames. One would think that he did it because he wanted to save the building and the inhabitants of neighboring homes. No, not at all. The soldier jumped into the flames to save the portrait of Mao. When the portrait was in safety, he went back into flames, but then it was too late and he was killed by the detonation of the explosives. After the earthquake in Sept., 1976, the press reported about the heroism of a man who, according to the teaching of Mao, first, helped to save the party members, and when he returned to rubble for his own children, he found they were already dead.

Where we were?

Comrades! You may ask: And where were the Politburo and the Central Committee? Why did not comrades from the leadership step forward then against the personality cult? Why do they do it just now?

First, because many of us actively and faithfully have helped Mao when he was really one of the best Marxist, when his strong will, thoughtfulness and energy, in most cases correctly, set the party line of operation. In this period, his enemies should have been fought against, because they were the enemies of the revolution too. And

afterward, it was too late. To oppose Mao's will meant to become a victim of repression. To illustrate the atmosphere of the personality cult period, allow me, Comrades, to quote the words of one of Mao's closest co-workers, marshal and a member of the Politburo. Some time ago, he told me how he felt after he left Mao's abode: "One doesn't always know where all of us are after meeting with Mao: at home or in prison". Mao, growing older, was becoming more and more suspicious. In June 1976, several weeks before his death, Mao had called several of the Politburo members to appear for a conference. At one time during this conference he said: "Certainly, some of you wait for my death". When I replied that it isn't true, Mao answered: "Surely, there will be one to be found." If we add that during many years neither the Central Committee nor the Politburo ever met in council, that the role of leadership resorts has been reduced to zero and their work totally disoriented, then we can understand how difficult it was for the members of the leadership to oppose this or that decision of Mao Tse-tung.

The task was the more difficult because - as comrades already know - the access to Mao was, in fact, impossible. He was surrounded by a family clique, and also by group of careerists known by the name of the Shanghai group. The security forces, luckily, neutralized just in time the group represented by the widow of Mao, Chiang - Ching, Mao's nephew, the other members of family and also other conspirators - when all were preparing a false testament of Mao, for taking over the power and for nominating Chiang Ching the Chairwoman of the Communist Party of China. The conspiracy ended in a fiasco. The

Army and Security forces remained and shall remain in the service of the Party and the people. Let me, comrades, from this place, express our gratitude to, and confidence in them.

Silence

Comrades! The question of the personality cult should be investigated seriously and to the end. But, none of the information concerned can pass outside, and, above all, nothing should be known to the press. Everything has its limits, we shouldn't supply ammunition to our enemies, we shouldn't wash our dirty linen in their eyes.

Comrades! The XI Congress of the Communist Party of China has shown with new forcefulness the indestructible unity of our party, its will for realization of the great aim: Building up Communism (boisterous applause). The disclosure of a complete discussion on all aspects of the personality cult proves the great moral and political strength of our party (long applause).

We are convinced that our party, strengthened by the resolutions of the XI Congress shall lead the peoples of China to the new victories on the road marked by Lenin (boisterous and long lasting applause).

Let Leninism live - the victorious banner of our party!! (Boisterous, long lasting and turning into a standing ovation, applause, everybody stands up). (Remark: the choice of fragments, titles and subtitles, is the work of editorial staff of *Kultura*).

LV. *A public and my own report about the nonoccurrence of the XI Congress of the Communist Party of China, and about the nondelivery of the secret report.*

The secret report published today exists, for the time being, only in the imagination of the author. the XI Congress had not been convened yet, and it isn't known when it will be convened. But it is known that it surely will be convened and that a secret report, such as the one above or a similar one, will be delivered. It's also known that not a single word from the secret Chinese report published today in *Kultura* has been feigned. All the facts are taken from the history of China and all the statements, exclusive of unavoidable cosmetics, had been taken from the secret report of Khrushchov, delivered on Feb. 24, 1956, on the secret XX Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR, in Moscow.

Of course, emerging from it, the contour of Mao's person is somewhat ludicrous. Every specialist is able to write ad infinitum about things characteristic of Mao and his past, so much easier because up to now there is no book that would contain an official biography of Mao.

He was a brilliant man. He led, without looking at costs, a colossal operation of delivering China from hunger and sickness, from the mandarins' oppression; he made China independent from the USSR and the US, brought her to a position of a super-power which doesn't threaten the security of our world yet, but which

is felt indispensable in our vital problems. Mao was a politician and activist, philosopher and a poet, organizer and inspirator, but, above all, he was a man and a tyrant. But, because Mao, a man and tyrant, allowed himself to be deified during his lifetime, sooner or later he, therefore, shall have to step down from the altar, or, rather, he shall be hurled down from it.

V. *Public report about the necessity of the secret report.*

Truly speaking, Stalin wasn't the only creator of gulags or purges, but despite this, the most serious text about him which was - so far - written in the USSR, was a 100 page secret report of Khrushchov, a secret list of Stalin's crimes. A similar text about Mao must be created too. For two basic reasons.

Somebody must take responsibility

First, because somebody must pay for the mistakes and crimes of the past. As after the death of a boss power is held by the same privileged group, therefore, is not the system and the party responsible for everything, but, at the best, a certain one man, *de préférence* dead one. A dead, but active tyrant, is one of the best inventions yet discovered by Socialism, and the only form and an opportunity to write something under the name of "secret report on the personality cult". In the country in which it was possible to conceal from 800 million people the fact of landing the first man on the moon, the composing of such a report is no less difficult job than anywhere else.

Second, because the tyrants such as Stalin or Mao have successors but do not have the successor, it is natural that hardly a tyrant closes his eyes, *dying, dying* before the fight for power erupts. Democracy has elections. In dictatorships, the successors are made by intelligence, intrigue, manipulations, and, sometimes, like in the westerns, by the speed of shooting from a colt. After Stalin's death there was the troika of Beria, Malenkov, Khrushchov. In the first stage of the game, the second and the third shot the first, and then, the third finished the second. After Khrushchov's fall, there was the troika: Podgorny, Kosygin, Brezhnev. The first two are of no great importance. In China things won't be any different.

The fight for power in Peking burst out immediately after Mao's death. Briefly speaking, in the Chinese leadership the two wings - radical and moderate - are fighting each other, both, by the way, such extremists that to the left of them there is nothing but a wall. The fight is not for principles, but for power, consequently, it is inexorable. At the time of Mao's death, the radicals were on top. In April 1976, they were able to provoke revolts and unleash a purge which resulted in dismissal of Ten Hsiao-ping and making him and his group spies and, of course, saboteurs.

But the moderates were wiser. The funeral of Mao was delayed, the mourning ceremonies had an intimate character, only one million people received permission to the official spasms, and, above all, everything went peacefully - without shooting, even the cadaver vanished and nobody knew if it ever existed.

At the same time Hua Kuo-feng emerged as the chairman of the Central Committee and the chairman of the military Commission of the party, or, practically, a chief of Mao's successors' group. From cablegrams, it appears, that the first to react were the commanders of the military districts sending to the Central Committee very humble dispatches. The most important commander, the one from Peking, added that the "Peoples' Army is ready to defend the revolution at any time and at all circumstances".

Several days later it became obvious what the most important commander had in mind: The army (and the police too) supported Hua Kuo-feng in a decisive fight for succeeding Mao. Sinologists, who for a month paraded in front of the world's TV cameras simply, were mistaken. For a month, when these ladies and gentlemen (mostly ladies were in love with Mao) couldn't stop demonstrating their wisdom concerning the role of the masses in history, unceasing revolution, and eternal thoughts of Mao, in Peking, under a false facade of unity, the merciless fight for power was going on among the factions. Finally, Hua liquidated (it seems, rather, brutally) the partnership of nepotism and career-mindedness. Mao's wife and nephew, and, also, two pretended sons-in-law, were removed, just as, for example the son of Stalin, was removed and sent into alcoholic death, as Adjourbey - son-in-law of Khrushchov, or, as will vanish in the day of Ceausescu's death, his wife and sons with whom presently the Romanian dictator shares the reigns of governing the country.

Of course, the victory of Hua is in accord with the Soviet model (even the

testament has been found). Socialism didn't invent any better model, yet. In China, as in the USSR, as in Poland in December 1970, the party apparatus whose dominating role establishes in a maximal degree the unperturbed growth of the new bourgeoisie was victorious. From all the defeats of Maoism, this one is the greatest: A month after the death of the Great Helmsman, as a result of just a common mafia style operation and at a total disregard for the masses, which, generally speaking, knew nothing, and even didn't have, it seems, interest in all of it, in Peking, the bureaucracy, the same bureaucracy fighting against which Mao sacrificed everything - including China's progress, was triumphant. The clean-up operation is underway, the 5 year plan is being revised (exchange with the West is supposedly to be increased) and in Peking appeared Teng Hsiao-ping again, pretender to Chou En-lai's position, the same who was refuted by Mao for supporting "submission of China to Western technological domination".

From Oct. 9, 1976, Hua is the only authorized interpreter of "thoughtmaotsetung," and of everything that comes out of it. Very beautiful career for an ex-minister of security.

The question is how long will it last. Personally, I suppose that the test of power is only a matter of time and it will take place pretty soon. The army remembers that although Marshall Moskalkenko, personally, on the request of Khrushchov, shot Beria, and Marshall Zhukov saved Khrushchov and his friends (among them Brezhnev) from the anti-party group of Molotov; the nominations of marshalls and generals of the army in the USSR concerns

only the leaders and strategists of the class of Brezhnev and Ustinov and the bosses of KGB, Andropov and Shchekolov. And, as to the collection of works "for posterity" and the crystal coffin (to give to the proletariat something to pay homage to), I remind you, that only 3 years elapsed and Stalin's body was secretly taken out from the mausoleum and thrown under the Kremlin's wall, and that about "Coryphaeus of science" none of the seriously thinking Marxists talks today, unless for anti-nostalgic purposes. In Peking too, tears dry fast and the unavoidable operation of demaocization of China shall begin.

The Kremlin - without mistake.

At this point we should note the 3 kinds of reaction in the world. First, the Kremlin accurately reacted. In anticipation of the old Peking man approaching death, Moscow, for several months openly proclaims that actually there was nothing which would divide the brotherly nations of Russia and China, except the loathsome Mao. According to the Soviet press, only Mao was responsible for the conflict and, at the moment of his demise, there won't be any more obstacles for a really true love. In Feb. 1976, Moscow published a false testament of Chou En-lai, which explicitly said that-according to a commentary of TASS - the deceased premier "was decidedly against further toleration of the impasse in relations between the Soviet Union and China". Kapica, director of Far East Affairs Department in the Soviet Union, stated in an interview for the Italian weekly *Espresso*: We count on the new leaders

in Peking, with them we'll be able to communicate". The periodical *Problems of the Far East* reported that "the question of relations with the USSR was always a source of differences between Mao and his opponents in Peking, who have a vision wider than Mao of China's interests". In April, *Pravda* put a dot over the "i". For Mr. Alexandrov (journalistic pseudonym of the Kremlin's occupants) "Mao was the main inspirator and organizer of anti-Sovietism... the USSR will do everything to normalize the relations with Peking".

When Mao died, despite the continuous and exuberant dirty campaign in Chinese press against revisionists - the new czars, not a single voice was raised in Moscow against China. Only the honorable mortal remains were subjected to attacks and commentaries, for example, on the occasion of the Chinese National holiday, openly offering the idea of reconciliation over the fresh grave of Mao. Even before Mao's body cooled, *Pravda* had discovered, that "the interests of China and the USSR not only are not contradictory, but, even supplementing one another".

Communists try

Another group which accurately interpreted the necrologies in memory of Mao were Italian Communists, and it was despite the fact that the Communist Party of China returned the Italian condolences with a stamp - "recipient unknown". Alberto Jacoviolo, a reporter from *Unità*, a well known admirer of China, the author of a book which several years ago had provoked sharp quarrels among the western Communists, published a short article in *Le Monde* of Paris. The article accuses Moscow of

"taking a susceptible position in view of Mao's death" and expresses his regret that "Italian and French Communist Parties had not talked about Mao during his lifetime in the same manner they did after his death". But, says Jacovielo, the future is important. "The nucleus of the quarrel is the repulsion of Russian hegemony by China... the doctrine of unlimited sovereignty is not an invention of Brezhnev, but the result of the constant practice of the Soviets, from the third Komintern to the invasion of Czechoslovakia through the attempts of overthrowing Tito and economic strangulation of China".

On their knees

And, there is, also, a third group called, as usual in our deliberations, The West, which, as usual, does not understand anything about it at all. Mao himself, an antagonist, but, also, a pupil of Confucius knew that death is in the heart of life. "When someone dies" - said Mao - "we ought to, in a sense, celebrate the victory of dialectics, celebrate the destruction of something old". Meantime, although the death of Mao was near, unavoidable, logical, the West experienced a real shock. The death of Mao paralyzed everybody: with the same sorrow and in the same words through the tears talked about him Marshais and Mitterand, Callaghan and Berlinger, *Humanité* of Paris and *Times* of London....

If long, long time ago, the press had existed, then with the same unanimous shock it would have greeted the fall of Byzantium or destruction of the Jerusalem Temple, the death of Caesar or Alexander

The Great. "Enormous emptiness" - exploded *Le Monde*. "Prominent thinker, poet and military genius" - observed *Guardian*. "Great scientist, poet, revolutionary and soldier" - stated *Spiegel*. "Military genius writing poetry" - wrote the *Evening Standard*.

The statesmen too didn't have courage to soil the sanctity. "A man of great aptitudes and prudence," - President Ford competently described Mao. "The lantern of human thought" - poetically added Giscard d'Estaing. "One of the greatest leaders of the world" - risked Olaf Palme (before losing elections). "One of the greatest figures in the history of mankind" - overbid the Commission of the European Common Market. In the Western choir of mourners there was only lacking the Irish: "Oh! what a beautiful corpse".

Even if someone remembered a little about the two-faced past of Mao, it was only for defending him against slanderers. "Mao wasn't a tyrant" - stated *Times* - "in the beginning of his career he was, even, against shooting the opponents of revolution and his rivals." So, according to the *Times* a tyrant is not someone who shoots others in general, but only the one who shoots his opponents and rivals. The one who shot several million people didn't deserve the name of a tyrant. "Mao eliminated poverty, epidemics and ignorance" - hastily added the *Observer*. And what about Franco? - I'm asking the *Observer* - why is it so, that he who eliminated poverty and epidemics too, continues to be, in the eyes of *Observer* - a tyrant? When Pinochet will have eliminated poverty and epidemics would he become "the lantern of mankind?" The one who could

so brilliantly disable 800 million people that they for a dish of stinking rice lost all the taste of freedom, even, if he writes poetry, is not a tyrant?

And the victims?

Among not too numerous men in the West was, as usual, Ionescu. *Figaro* courageously printed his article "On their knees in front of Mao". Ionescu derided all the creeping before a shadow of tyrant and the Western inferiority complex, writing, among the other things: "We had dealt with the same phenomenon at the time of Stalin's death. However, there is a little difference. At that time the madness was 4 times smaller, as we have only 200 million Russians, and Chinese - 800. Today, only a chieftain of a small African tribe is a contemptible tyrant. The boss of Albania, who rules over 2 million people, deserves a lesser degree of respect. Decisions of Romanian or Hungarian dictator are the subjects of careful considerations. In order to be a giant, a dictator must rule over millions and when he decides about the fate of hundreds of millions of people, he becomes a god..."

Statesmen, who were choking themselves in trying to find the wheedling formula to honor the glorious memory of Mao, refused out of cowardice, to appear at the ceremony of unveiling, in London, the monument of Katyn murder victims. Their absence in the modest London cemetery is saddening, but not surprising. No doubt, in Katyn, only 15,000 Polish officers died. If several millions fell from a bullet in the neck it could have

been quite a different story. Then, perhaps, not only the deified tyrants, but their victims could have been honored.

Of course, only the dead victims,

Napoleon Bonaparte said: "When China wakes up, the world shall tumble".

But then it will be too late.

BRUKSELCZYK

P.S. On the family wreath laid down at the coffin of Mao by his wife were 3 names, one male and 2 female, as we can guess, belonging to his children. In this way, for the first time their existence came to the attention of the public though it's still unknown what they do and where they live. However, we should remember, that 14 years after Stalin's death, his daughter Swietlana took advantage of being on a visit to India to choose freedom and asylum in the US. The last grandson of Stalin was born in California and is an American.

Written Oct. 15, 1976

Fragments

Vol. 4/2

Feb. 1977

by

Charles Joel

Jozef CZAPSKI MALRAUX

Dominik MORAWSKI CORRESPONDENCE FROM ROME
(an excerpt)

Adam KRUCZEK IN THE SOVIET PRESS
(an excerpt)

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 1/352 - 2/353 - 1977, published in Paris, France.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

MALRAUX

Malraux is dead. Now, is it possible to write about him when all the newspapers, radio and TV are full of reminiscences about him, or of the texts taken out from his works?

Is it possible to do it without further contemplations, rereading his books which influenced not just my generation, without falling into generalities written so many times about him? It would be necessary to think over not only his books and actions. (*L'homme est ce qu'il fait* - is his saying), but his deep incentives, contradictions and irresolutions - from his obsession of death, suicide, from the always accentuated agnosticism and his constant returns to metaphysical problems. Some time ago, Malraux, returning to an idea which he called *le sacré*, wrote angrily, "An action doesn't replace the absolute, but it allows one to forget about it". Connected with this was the abuse of religious lexicography, when he talked about art, creating a confusion of art, aesthetics and

religion. Strange, because it is religion about which we may find in Malraux so many brilliant thoughts. What was dominant behind all the motives of his decisions and actions, of all his undertakings - from revolutionary China to Bangla Desh - was, as first, the defense of captive, oppressed, downtrodden man - wherever that man was - and this is what had gained him friends, companions, followers in the world; the warrior Malraux has been imbued in the myths of all times and civilizations, which he knew and always returned to, which he experienced through his multifarious culture and stupendous ubiquity. (Truly, when he reminisced about Prometheus we were never sure if he didn't simply look for a - box of matches" wrote one of his friends). There was also in him a theatre, a theatre that was sometimes unbearably pathetic. This pathos (his speech at the funeral of Jean Moalin, his speech at the Acropolis, etc.), expressed with the emphasis of Sara Bernhard! Those speeches, as it comes to my knowledge now, had evoked and even today evoke among young people - enthusiasm, a feeling that through them they discovered unknown, yet spiratual horizons! It wasn't only a "theatre"; it was a febrific, hasty creating of a myth, prefabrication of reality, lighting-like and so strong, that for the people who witnessed certain incidents and themselves talked to him about them, those incidents in the texts of Malraux were entirely unrecognizable!

But this impulse, this spontaneity and pathos bore evidence of his unending, all transfiguring imagination.

Remembering this combatant in so

many fights in which he always had given so much of himself, I would like to say one thing

- *Never the noble one has been indifferent to me* -

He too, could have had the right to say these words.

* * *

The magic of Stalin, fear of him, persisted in the Paris of those days. There were whisperings about the abductions of immigrants, some people expected, it would have seemed, for the Bolsheviks to swallow France too, the then powerful French Communist party believed in Stalin as in god and Jean Kanapa spoke a different tune than today, calling the opponents of Stalin *vipères lubriques*. At the same time Callman-Lévy, I think, published "The Darkness at Noon" of Koestler. It was a great success, but its publisher was so terribly frightened because of the success, that he didn't want to publish its second edition (those kind of stories circulated in those days).

One morning, sitting in Koestler's hotel room, I was telling him, seemingly too loud, about Stalin, and suddenly we noticed that under the door somebody slipped a piece of paper: "Careful, not so loud, the members of the Soviet delegation stay in this hotel!" "And even here," burst out Koestler, "one must talk about Stalin in whispers!"

In 1945, I visited Malraux for the first time after many years, just after my arriving from the Polish Second Corps in Italy, and I immediately had a feeling which I cannot describe better than a feeling of brotherhood. He hardly knew me some years past, but this wasn't concerning me

personally; what was important is that Poland existed in his imagination; it wasn't a question of the popular French cliché: *La Pologne digne et malheureuse*, nor "Poland fascist country" - a caricature propagated then by the Communists; it seemed that he had touched a hidden nerve and a sense of our history and latest tragedy; he was passionately interested in everything I could tell him about Soviet Russia (another matter that he had remembered and after many years repeated in "*Antimémoires*" a fact which I told him about, pathetically misconstruing it to the extent that I could hardly recognize its origin).

In those first meetings in 45, he told me, among many other things that de Gaulle had in French translations of all texts and books of Pilsudski.

Already then he said: "I am very busy (if I remember well, he worked at that time on "Le Voix de Silence"), but whenever you will need something, turn to me - I'll do whatever I can". We didn't abuse his readiness to help us, but several times, when we asked - he, indeed, helped as much as he could. And, in 1954, when we were thrown out of the house at Maisons-Laffitte and *Kultura* had no place to go and we almost stopped our work, he wrote a text for us which appeared in the press and greatly improved our chances. I quote this text in the Polish translation:

To the Editors of "*Kultura*"

Dear Friends,

The experience which we did not

forget, allows us at once and in a brotherly spirit to recognize in "*Kultura*" the periodical of an "occupied country". You are right in saying that in a fight you conduct you are a group so very lonely as everyone who says "No" to the victorious oppression lonely is; this relative loneliness represents a price of what your well founded pride has a right to express as moral, political and material independence. That "*Kultura*" has been forced to leave the home in which it dwelled for seven years - appears to be a guaranty of it all; the help, with which you meet from Sweden to Latin America - seems either proving it, exactly, because that help is not sufficient; never mind that: the best guaranty for "*Kultura*" is each number it publishes.

If the world inadequately understands your drama, it is, it seems to me, first of all, because it considers the Polish culture a Slavic culture - akin to the Russian. Forgetting that, though there exists a Russian genius, there isn't a Russian culture in a sense in which we talk about the cultures of western nations; rather a tie complicated and ambiguous, from the Byzantium; and that the Polish culture tied up with the Latin world, is one of the cultures of the West. Hence it is the cultural occupation (not a cultural tie!) which hangs over you equally with literal occupation. Hence the historical sense of your intellectual activity.

Defending Poland, neither in the name of Versailles Treaty, nor in the name of Capitalism - because you reject both, pointing out the social injustice whose victim in the name of justice your country became, defending the freedom against occupation which was forced upon you, you are

Like us who defended it against Nazism and Germans; in this you are joined with those who between 1940 and 1944, defended every kind of freedom, and with so many who defended it in the past. You are sending to Poland the book of Orwell, in which action you resemble our Republicans who used to send to France the "Châtiments" - in the hollowed out busts of Napoleon III. And, doubtless, it is time for the West to understand that it should be in union with you, because resistance is a matter of perseverance, and fighting readiness demands spiritual power.

André MALRAUX

Malraux departed, but he did not stop talking to us. In the beginning of the next year, his book "La pérennité de l'homme et la littérature" is going to appear; he delivered this book last year to Gallimard, again, took it back for an entire rewriting; for long hours in the last months of his life he worked on it.

In addition to all that I've said, there was something in this man that I didn't know how to accept: this feverish, as though ever decreasing mastery of verbosity, this unceasing mythicizing of everything he wrote or talked about; I still wonder who this man was who had flashes of a genius, a man of great generosity, who took part in every historic shock of our epoch, who thought so much about what had happened in the world, who wrote about the art of all times and cultures and brought them closer to us.

But, perhaps, most important in

this man was, that he knew how to be a friend.

Malraux who wrote: "An action doesn't replace the absolute, but it allows one to forget about it," a man of febrile acts, living always in a crowd of close people, companions and friends, dying lonely in the hospital, without a woman, without a friend, without a priest, in the *chambre stérile*, to which nobody but a doctor could enter, perhaps experienced a sudden grace of silence and deliverance - man thirsting for the absolute, was, perhaps, afflicted by this silence, and, maybe then, could say words which he certainly knew, as he knew everything - "Lord, I am not worthy to receive you, but only say the word and my soul will be healed".

Jozef CZAPSKI

CORRESPONDENCE FROM ROME
(excerpts)

A well known, Roman socialist daily *la Repubblica*, especially popular in the academic circles, fell victim to the Polish Peoples Republic authorities. In its Dec. 1 issue of the last year, its special envoy, Pierro Benetazzo, describes his experience in the Warsaw airport, after a 10 day stay in the Polish capital. Here is, in short, his report under the title "Polish custom officers in the cold war style": "A policeman, after opening my suitcase orders the custom officers: 'Sequestrate'. In the

suitcase is everything a newsman must have at hand for his job: archival cuttings from the press, notes from talks and meetings. My notes *nota-bene* refer almost entirely to the official talks with trade union leaders, directors of planning commissions, functionaries of the Office of the Religious Denominations, editors of the leading papers, and economists, prearranged by the Interpress (which mediates in all contacts a foreign correspondent makes.) Anything else which could have been of interest to the police (the notes from the talks with the opposition, and the texts of its communiques), had already 'vanished' from my room at the European hotel a few days before. My protests only stiffen the attitude of the policeman who is in charge of the operation; he orders even the seizure of the official reports of the PAP (Polish Press Agency) and translations from *Trybuna Ludu*. Then, they usher me into a windowless room, order to take off all my clothes, search and take everything they find: my personal list of addresses and telephone numbers, business cards, even the hotel bill creates anxiety and discussion. I leave Poland: in my pocket I have only a passport, plane ticket, hotel bill and declaration of sequestration (I refuse to sign it), which says that 'the material will be returned, if the public prosecutor's office considered it appropriate'.

The chief editor of *la Repubblica* demanded that the Italian Foreign Office should make an official protest against "this serious act of violation of freedom of information and the Helsinki accords". Italian *Fedestampa*, the leading organization of newsmen trade union

took analogic position. On Dec. 4, 1976, the local press informed the public that a speaker of the Polish Foreign Office "confirmed the fact of revision and promised an immediate return of the sequestered material". On Dec. 1, it was reported, that the Italian Secretary of State, Forlani (the ex-general secretary of Christian Democratic Party) ordered the Italian Embassy in Warsaw to intercede immediately with the appropriate Polish authorities.

Forlani defined the incident as a "Vivid violation of the Helsinki accords and general principles of freedom of information and views". The Italian State Secretary, in a letter to *la Repubblica*, states: "The Polish Foreign Office confirmed that the Italian newsman asked the *Interpress* agency to help him in the arrangement of meetings with some of the dissidents and that he had met with some on his own initiative resulting from the refusal of the agency to cooperate." A very important admission.

What moral comes out of it all? For the editors of *la Repubblica* it means the end of an illusion with regard to the automatic evolution of eastern "Socialism". No one should doubt that the Polish Embassy in Rome, knowing about the visa issued to the Italian newsman, had sent a warning dispatch to its chief office. As a result, the Polish secret police had trodden down upon his heels, ransacked his hotel room and organized the *show* at the airport. Conclusion: The Polish embassies in the West serve not so much for the diplomatic activities on behalf of the Polish Foreign Office, as for the serving the Polish police. The Polish Ambassador, Sidor, the author of anti-semitic pasquinade and unsuccessful pretender to the post of the Polish state secretary, will very probably cut short his

career here. "He is not an ambassador, he is the agent of the Polish secret police, who knows, if not of the KGB" - stated a very well informed high dignitary of the Italian Foreign office.

Dominik MORAWSKI

IN THE SOVIET PRESS
(excerpts)

The severe demands of the editor and printing office force me to write this review a week before the event, about whose happening the Soviet press has been writing for 2 months, assuring everybody that "with a beating hearts all the progressive people" of the planet expect it to happen. We should guess, that the one whose heart doesn't die in expectation of this event - is not progressive. The event will happen on Dec. 19, 1976. On this day the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party, Marshall of the Soviet Union, Leonid Brezhnev will be 70 years old.

For the Soviet leader, celebrating his 70th birthday is an easy and also a difficult problem. Easy, because there were already two precedences: Dec. 21, 1949, mankind celebrated the 70th birthday of Stalin; on April 17, 1964 - the 70th birthday of Krushchev. And difficult because in each consecutive cele-

bration there is less and less splendor and vigour. In 1949, the Communists of the world collected gifts for the leader of nations, the stage of Moscow Bolshoi theatre could not accommodate all the vassals who gathered in order to pay homage to the genius of all times and peoples. In 1964, there wasn't much splendor and the vassals were not numerous. In 1949, even Mao himself arrived in Moscow, with gifts.

In 1976, the celebrity himself must travel to collect gifts and medals: before the jubilee, Leonid Brezhnev received a star in Belgrad, then, later, in Bucharest (Warsaw will surely deliver it to his home). I was very happy reading in the Soviet press on Dec. 1, 1976: "The Golden Medal of the Peruvian Community to Leonid Brezhnev". Here it is - I thought - how the Peruvian people love Leonid Brezhnev. But from small print of the text I've learned that it was only the Soviet-Peruvian Cultural Cooperation Society that offered the medal, after receiving - of course - the order from Moscow. As we can see, nowadays, one must collect the gifts among one's own kind of people.

However, in the Soviet Union, the preparations for the holiday grow with every passing day. There are the movies made: "The history of a Communist" (of course, we know which one), "Leonid Brezhnev in Kazakhstan", "Program of the People in Action" and "Different Road Toward the Peace" - in all of them, the general secretary in main role. There was also published an album of photographs "Leonid Brezhnev: pages of life, pages of the epoch". And, finally, there appeared the book written by the celebrity himself, under the title: "The Problems of Management of the

Developed Socialist Society". *Prawda* (Nov. 30.76) published a review of the book briefly, but convincingly, under a headline: "A Lesson How to Win". Leonid Brezhnev teaches in his speeches, reports and appearances collected in the book. The review stresses the important characteristic of Brezhnev's "art of winning": "Careful and attentive approach toward the elite". Taking the place of Khrushchev - who considered himself a dictator and a master-landlord - Brezhnev based his internal politics on - immobilism. According to *Prawda*: "Unreasonable shifting and frequent changes of workers, came to an end". Of course, it applies to the "elite" and "managing workers". All of them *expressing* satisfaction, do not spare words of love and admiration for the leader. On the conference of the Supreme Council of the USSR, an actress of Tiflis theatre, S.M. Chiaureli, in the name of all the women of Gruzuya, asked for permission of: "pouring our feelings in the enormous ocean of veneration, gratitude and love which all the peoples of this planet feel for you, Dear Leonid Ilyich! We thank you for our peaceful life, for your fatherly care - we are grateful to you for the smiles of our children".

The gratitude for the "smiles of our children" one may easily explain as being caused by heredity - the actress of Tiflis theatre is the daughter of Michael Chiaureli - Stalin's famous film director. But, how can one explain the answer of Gen. Ivan Shabrov, who, when asked by newsmen what is the source of the Soviet strategy, answered: "It is the leading and guiding role of the party and person

of comrade Leonid Brezhnev"? There is only one explanation: the cult of personality is a foundation of the Soviet system. In relation to this statement, we shouldn't be surprised to read commentaries about "the law for preserving historic and cultural monuments", decreed 59 years after the revolution, and that one of the most important aspects of this law will be the preservation of the monument - a bust of the hero of the Soviet Union and the hero of Socialist achievements, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev; its unveiling in "May 1976, the Soviet people greeted with enormous satisfaction and warm hearts".

I suspect, that on Dec. 19, Brezhnev will be decorated with the third star of the Soviet hero - it will give him the right for erecting his own monument in the capital of the Soviet Union, beside the monuments of Lenin, Marx and Engels - time will show. Stalin after his jubilee held power for 3 1/2 years, Khrushchev only 6 months.

At the end of Nov., when all the preparations for Brezhnev's 70th birthday were in full swing, on the last page of *Izvestia*, there appeared with a 3 day delay news about the death of 78 year old Trofim Lysenko. No one, probably - not counting Stalin and Hitler - has ever done so much damage to the Soviet Union, than this agronomist, one of the greatest mystifiers in human history. Hundreds of monuments were built for him, but the most astounding was the monument - a bench: on a gypsum made bench sit Stalin and Lysenko. But, if in the normal compositions in which Stalin is the central person and all the other people look at his mouth - as if listening to

words of wisdom or thoughtlessly following him - on the bench the leader of Nations attentively looks at the tricks that are shown by Lysenko - transformer of nature.

Lysenko became "a miracle man" who had magic influence on Stalin and Khrushchev, like Rasputin had had on the last Russian empress, only because all of them - Alexandra Fiedorowna, Josif Vissarionovich and Nikita Sergejevich - all their lives expected a miracle. And, when there appeared a man who said, that it is enough to change an environment and the natural characteristic of living things will change too, he was received with open arms. From oats, which Lysenko had changed into wheat, there was only one step toward transforming the ex-citizens of Russian empire into the new Soviet people - the changing of environment Stalin took on himself.

The Soviet readers are so much accustomed to the glorification of their leaders, that, surely, they would feel uncomfortable and lonely without comparing general secretaries to an ocean. However, for a great majority of the Soviet citizens, a complete novelty were 2 matrimonial advertisements in *Literaturnaya Gazeta* (NO. 46). In the twenties and earlier, this kind of advertising had been appearing, and there even existed some private matrimonial agencies. But, during the past 50 years, it was considered an example of capitalistic degeneration. Presently, and quite often, the Soviet press writes about the increasing demographic crisis. "Why Fewer Children?" - is the title of an article in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, in which "a single man, with humanistic

education, leading sedentary life," expresses a desire for meeting "a blond, age - to 35, an admirer of the theatre and symphonic music," and "a divorcee, with a 6 year old child," wishes to meet "a man interested in sports, full of life, and abstinent".

In comparison with 1960, the population growth decreased one million persons a year. Fewer and fewer children. Today, the only question is - why is it so? The Soviet demographers begin to conclude, that the "present birth rate decrease, must be caused by the evident, spontaneous answer of women to the problem of being overworked," an answer of women to a difficult situation they found themselves in. Emanuel Todd, the French historian and demographer considers the birth rate decrease as convincing proof of dissatisfaction with the system. "Silently, but universally, the Russian people propagate the strike against the cradle," - writes Todd, adding, that the absence of the "pill" forces people to, constantly, practicing the traditional preventive measures, which in effect proves the necessity of the "strike".

The Soviet State did not, so far, find any method to combat these "strikes". That's why the fight for increased population growth rate goes on another front. The statistics say, that the number of unmarried men and women is on the constant increase. According to Sonin (Nediela, Oct. 76), almost 25 percent of men age 25-29 and over 11 percent age 30-34, are unmarried. The number of unmarried women is much greater. In 1970, there were 2.26 women verus 1 man. The new front for the fight for increased population growth rate

is concentrated on evoking the increase of marriages. To the question why the Soviet people are not marrying - there are many answers. The one, most popular among demographers, is a fact, that men and women remain unmarried because they have no place to meet. Consequently, a task of the Soviet authorities, which care about citizens as no other under the sun, is organizing matrimonial agencies, or bureaus of meetings - as he calls them. *Literaturnaya Gazeta* rehabilitates the matrimonial advertising, pointing out the authority of the German Democratic Republic where all the dailies print this kind of ads.

In many articles devoted to demographic problems in the USSR, more and more often alcoholism appears as one of the important causes of decreased population growth rate. It is not incidental, that in one of the advertisements printed in *Literaturnaya Gazeta* a woman, citing the qualities sought in a man, mentions - as the main - abstinence. Prof. Sonin admits, that, indeed, addiction to alcohol negatively affect the number of marriages.

The American economist, Wladimir Tremel, analyzing the statistics in "The USSR in Figures", concludes that mortality in the Soviet Union in 1975 increased almost 7 percent. According to his deductions, the average Russian family spends annually on alcohol as much as the average American family spends on a car.

We may also suppose, that one of the reasons of decreasing population

growth rate in the Soviet Union, is the unceasing war hysteria from morning till night probing the brains of people with war menace that hangs over the world in general, and over the Soviet Union in particular. E. Todd, having no statistics of suicides in the S. Union, considers alcoholism a peculiar form of suicide for the Soviet people.

As we know, the average statistics may hide many strange things. For example, the average number of decreasing population growth rate in the S. Union, hide an annoying fact that there is a decrease of birth rate in the Soviet Russia and a high percent of increasing births in Middle Asia and Caucasus. In the very near future the number of Russians in the USSR will amount to less than 50 percent of total population figure and this decrease will progress. One of the most important measures which the authorities are forced to apply in order to contradict the "derussification," is the compulsory learning of Russian language in the non-Russian republics. The chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the USSR, Witali Ruben, writing in *Literaturnaya Gazeta* (NO. 48) in connection with the holiday celebrating the Soviet Constitution, stated that "long time ago, there were many efforts made for the creation of great multi-national empires, beginning from Alexander the Great and ending with the Hitlerian Reich". Witali Ruben, for some undisclosed reasons, considers the multinational empires a dream of mankind, and says: "With the creation of the USSR ... immemorial dreams of mankind have the possibility of being realized". In his ideal empire "there is no official state language. But, the growth of bonds

among the nations leads to the ever increasing importance of the Russian language which became a means of communication of all nations, or nationalities of the USSR". Ruben announces proudly, that according to the 1970 census, the Russian language has been reported the maternal language by 13 million of non-Russian people.

And, how did the Russian language become the maternal language for the non-Russians, asked the Gruzian writer, Rewaz Dzaparidze, at the convention of the Gruzian writers. He cites facts. In the Moscow *Vozitelskaya Gazeta* appeared an article of the Gruzian minister of education, under the title - "Inexhaustible Reserve". It tells about an experiment in the high school at Zugidi, where the medium of instruction of some subjects taught, was the Russian language. The article ends in these words: "During one year, children succeeded greatly in mastering the Russian language". So, announces R.Dzaparidze, the experiment at the Zugidi High School, shall be standardized as a method for all schools and the Gruzian language shall be gradually removed from the Gruzian schools. The university of Tiflis undertook the task of providing lecturers, and calls for the help of the most prominent Russian language specialists. In 1975, the minister of High Education of the USSR, decreed, that all the texts books for the higher education institutions must be, exclusively, in Russian. All the graduate works, all materials connected with them, should be presented in Russian for acceptance by Moscow.

Rewaz Dzaparidze talked about

Gruziya. The same situation exists in every Soviet republic. But there were not many people of courage who could openly oppose the politics of destroying the native languages of the republics.

The French scientist, Henri Gobard, who specializes in sociolinguistics, writes in his "L'alienation Linguistique"; "Rome was never forcing the Gaels to learn Latin - it, forced itself on them. Latin was indispensable for all who wanted to succeed in the Roman society; Gaelic aristocracy learned Latin in order to uphold its social standing... Latin was obligatory in all mercantile practices and contacts. This way, the numerous circles of population became bilingual... But the Romans never forced the Gaels to learn Latin. And what if they did? If they used Latin in teaching at schools and universities?... Very probably the French people today would talk Italian".

* * *

Almost every month brings out new manuscripts from the Soviet Union, published in the West. That river doesn't dry up, but to the contrary, it constantly grows. Among the latest books, the most important seems to me is the diary of Lidia Czukowska: "The Notes About Anna Achmatowa". The excerpts of it were already printed 2 years ago, but now, the Russian publication in Paris - YMCA - Press - has begun publishing its full text which will appear in two volumes. The first volume covers the years 1938-1941. It is a real diary, written day by day during these years. After every meeting with Achmatowa, L. Czukowska, at evening or at night, wrote down everything they talked about. Many times she uses allegories and quite often even the ciphers.

Preparing the text for printing, L.Cz., couldn't recollect whom of the participants in these meetings she recorded under some strange word. But this fact increases the astounding atmosphere of the book: A monstrous world outside the walls of a little room in which Achmatowa lives, a world entirely unrealistic; what's real, is the past and poetry in which lives a great writer.

It seems to me, that nobody yet was able to show the invincible power of poetry, the dominance of the spirit over the unhumanly cruel reality - as L.Cz. was in her diary. The unusualness of the book lies in simplicity of its contents: one's son and the other's husband are in prison; their wanderings through jails, and their half-starvation and their daily life problems. And, constantly the verses written and recited by Achmatowa; mostly memorized by Cz., because making notes of everything is too dangerous. The book about poetry. The book about heroism.

Adam KRUCZEK

Fragments

Vol. 4/3

March 1977

by

Charles Joel

JAN NOWAK

THE THIRD WORLD WAR
(Excerpts)

A translation from the Polish magazine
"Kultura" NO 3/354/77, published in
Paris, France

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

THE THIRD WORLD WAR (I) (Excerpts)

Did the West lose the Third World War?

When Solzhenitsyn raised this question in the Western press and answered it positively - the words of the great writer were received in the Western political circles, as a literary metaphor.

Not until the incidents in Angola, at the end of 1976, did such an important body as the Research Institute of Conflicts in London, look at Solzhenitsyn's thesis, and conclude that the peace of the past 30 years is fiction - dangerous fiction - because it conceals the truth. The director of the institute, Brian Crozier, in a study under the title "Security and the Myth of peace - the question of enduring the Third World War," agrees with Solzhenitsyn, that the world is, indeed, at war, but rejects the fatalistic statement of the writer, that the war had already ended in the defeat of the West.

In order to understand better the enduring course of the "Third World War," let's imagine for awhile, that the map of the world, spread on the staff-table, is a chessboard on which two players play. In short,

let's call them "the West" and "the East".

The game began with the East seizing a half of Europe to the Elbe river and the borders of Greece. In the list of subsequent conquests of the East Crozier includes China, N.Korea, Cuba, Vietnam (North and later South), Laos and Cambodia, and lastly - Angola. The full picture of the shifts on the chessboard of the world clearly appears when, within the perspective of our vision, we include also these "fields", which at the end of the World War 2, belonged indivisibly to the Western sphere of influence, and today find themselves either behind it, as so called "disengaged countries," or, passing in various stages under the influence of Moscow, became her dependents. It is when to these dependents are added the satellites that we, taking into account a neutralized area of "no man's land," are able to fully realize how greatly the Western area of influence with regard to territory, population, economic potential and, above all else, sources of strategic raw materials - has shrunk.

It doesn't mean that the game always looked like an unbroken chain of East successes. Expansion - excessive spread of power and influence - by itself produces separatory tendencies. The most painful blow to the East was the split in the centrally controlled from Moscow Communist monopoly, i.e. the Sino-Soviet split preceded by the break-off of Yugoslavia and Albania. Another symptom of the same tendencies were the revolutionary movements inside the Soviet orbit: in East Germany (1953), in Poland (four times), in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. And the latest symptom is the slowly emerging Euro-Communism.

Sometimes, the expansionist tendencies of the East met with local obstacles, which necessitated the ceasing, seldom the backing-off in one or the other defined point. The local disarrays, even defeats, did not weaken the will for continual push forward, for the taking advantage of every occurring opportunity to widen the Soviet range of possession, or curtailing the extent of influence and power of the adversary.

The West from the beginning resigned from any offensive undertakings which would have led to the defeat of the other side. Facing unending pressure on all fields of the world chessboard, the West complies with the self-imposed rule that eliminates it from the game of counterattack. It limits itself to shielding and defensive movements.

At least until mid-fifties the US had in its hands the absolute monopoly of nuclear power. Several years after Hiroshima, the stockpile of nuclear weaponry was sufficient to destroy in half an hour the Soviet Union, its conventional armies, its municipal and its industrial centers. Never before the preponderance of one power over the potential enemy was so overwhelming. In those years the US by just a threat of using this means of mass destruction could not only push Russia **without war** back to within her boundaries, but also force upon her terms that could have secured the peace and security of the world, perhaps for a century.

The **rollback** - pushing Russia without a war - proclaimed with political fanfare would still have been entirely possible in 1956 at the time of November revolutions in Poland and Hungary. Three years after the first experimental explosion of nitrogen bomb, Russia still did not have a nuclear arsenal which would enable her applying substantial retaliation. The politics of John Foster Dulles, puffed up with threatening phraseology of **liberation, rollback, brinkmanship** exploded like a punched balloon when the Soviet tanks in front of the passively observing West invaded Budapest.

There was, in those years, a lack of **will** and readiness to take any kind of risk. Worse, there was a lack of courage for looking into the future - three, four decades ahead to the moment when the American nuclear monopoly will have ended and be replaced, initially by, a balance of power, and at the subsequent phase, superiority of the adversary. Nobody wanted either to see, or to think about the consequences which,

sooner or later, must have followed. The possibility of applying any realistic preventive measures appeared beyond any reasoning.

The US conducted the politics of restraint at a time when it was still possible to use the politics of roll-back. In 1946, just a foggy threat that the US shall not passively look at the Soviet occupational armies in North Persia was sufficient to force Stalin to roll them back. The war in Korea was accompanied by the publicly declared statement that America will not use nuclear armor against an aggressor. The result: a divided peninsula with a fire-brand of future conflicts. In the defense of West Berlin a, rather unbelievably costly, air-bridge was chosen, instead -as later in the case of Cuba - a threat of using a counterblockade or, simply, a force. The blockade of the exodus from East Germany, effected by the construction of Berlin Wall, was received passively, though it was a violation of the Four Power Pact.

So long as decisive strategic superiority belonged to the West - the politics of restraint was successful. The Marshall Plan put the economy of Western Europe on its feet, and prevented her conquest from within. The creation of NATO and EEC had consolidated Western Europe militarily, economically and politically.

The American ultimatum in 1962 forced the Soviets to pull their secretly installed missiles out from Cuba. Reminiscent of this fact was an American nuclear alarm which prevented the landing of the Soviet parachute units in the Middle East in May, 1973. By then, however, the USSR felt already strong enough to dictate the price: the halt of the US's ally that stood one step from the complete destruction of the enemy. In this case there wasn't, as in Cuba, a humiliating withdrawal of the Soviets, but the bilateral compromise.

Two years later, North Vietnam could allow itself to trample (with impunity) the peace agreement - for which Kissinger received the Nobel Prize - and to occupy South Vietnam abandoned by Americans.

The defeat of the US was a result of limitations which Americans imposed upon themselves.

The American passivity in facing the defeat of their abandoned ally and the symptoms of internal decay after the **Watergate** affair encouraged the invasion of Angola which succeeded with the help of the Soviet ships, weaponry and expeditionary corps of 11,000 Cubans. The scenario of future moves on the World chessboard, from now on, is ready. The question remains, when and where they will be made.

The end of nuclear arms monopoly.

In order to understand the situation at the front in the thirty-fourth year of the Third World War, we ought to be acquainted with the evolution of relations of the forces and the present state of the two opponents.

More or less to 1966 the US had such quantitative and technological strategic weaponry superiority that with one stroke it could destroy the nuclear potential and by the same token baffle the retaliation of the weakened enemy. About 1966, Russia obtained the power of retaliatory nuclear thrust - an **assured destruction ability**. In other words, the Soviet nuclear arsenal increased to a level which would permit Russia to survive through the heaviest attack of the US and to have, after it, sufficient strength to destroy America by retaliatory strike (Walter Slocombe, "The political implications of strategic parity". I.S.S., London, 1971).

This moment, which, by the way, we cannot precisely establish, has decisive meaning. To this moment, the nuclear weaponry in American hands was an element of determent, meaning that it acted only in one direction: against the East. But from this moment on, the determent acts bilaterally.

However, obtaining the "balance of terror" did not demand arithmetic equality of nuclear capability. Russia attained the ability to destroy America, several years before it had reached the numerical

parity. In 1967, the American superiority in ballistic missiles equipped with nuclear warheads was expressed in the proportion of 3:1 or 4:1. The Americans, assuming wrongly, that their own and their opponent's thoughts run on the same track of logical reasoning, were convinced, that the Russians would restrain themselves and stop at a point of obtaining the "balance of terror". Since 400 nuclear missiles in the Soviet arsenal were sufficient to level the US - doubling this number at the gigantic costs, appeared by common sense, aimless. This conclusion made, Americans stopped further production of ballistic missiles and building launching sites. This simple logic in confronting the Russians appeared entirely wrong. The Soviet nuclear arms production was going full steam ahead in the area of ballistic missiles, nuclear warheads, permanent and movable launching pads on land, and submarines serving as launchers. The experts determined from various statistics, that a decision to outstrip the American nuclear arms potential was made in 1964/5 - after the overthrowing of Khrushchev and the taking of power by Brezhnev and his team. In 1970, Russians outran the US in the number of ICBM's (1,300:1,054) but the Americans, owing to the superiority in the number of submarines equipped with MIRV and strategic airforce, still had double the power of destruction expressed in megatons (52,000 : 23,000). But Moscow continued pushing toward outstripping the US.

MAD doctrine

Some time ago the Maginot Line with its slogan *on ne passe pas* disarmed the French people causing their defeat. The American nuclear arsenal now functions similarly. The West, despite losing its monopoly and, subsequently its superiority in nuclear arms, still believed in nuclear umbrella against the Third World War. This concept, however, was replaced by a doctrine of **Mutual Assured Destruction**, in abbreviated form - MAD. Ominous word. According to the Anglo-Polish dictionary of 1959 - it means also "mad of fear".

The MAD doctrine guided the Americans at

the conclusion of the SALT I talks with Russia. Because in Kissinger's understanding, "mutual suicide" was depriving strategic superiority of all its sense ("nobody can win the nuclear war"), America agreed to accept the principle of nuclear arms parity.

The mistake relied upon ascribing to the opposite side one's own intentions, meaning the stabilization of arms on an agreed upon level. But Moscow's intentions were entirely different. SALT I, deceiving Americans, was to become a starting point for achieving absolute superiority.

Affected by the insane MAD theory, the Americans neglected entire defense system of the North-American Continent against nuclear attack. Is there any sense in spending millions of dollars on this matter - it was thought - since the Soviet nuclear attack would result in destruction of both adversaries? The only thing they could think about, was the widening and modernizing powerful electronic radar installations which warn about the approaching extermination at the moment of launching the death-ridden loads by the enemy.

Experts calculate that in the first strike at least 100 million people must die. The anti-nuclear defense of the US and Canada is limited to 374 pursuit planes designed to destroy the enemy's missiles before they reach the target. Hundred anti-ballistic launching sites which were put into operation in Oct., 1975, one month later were dismantled in the spirit of MAD doctrine, by Congressional decision (The Annual Report of the Defense Dept. US., 1976/7).

Meantime the Soviet Union concentrates its greatest efforts on nuclear defense. In 1975, the number of airplanes designed exclusively for catching and destroying nuclear missiles was 2,500 machines, thus assuring 7 times greater superiority over the US. In addition, the Soviet defense is armed with 12,000 anti-ballistic land-to-air SAM rockets, displayed at 1,650 points. The USSR - a colossus of a country, which suffers pathologic centralization overgrowth,

concentrates its efforts on shielding Moscow against nuclear attack. The capital of the USSR is surrounded with a garland of 64 anti-ballistic launching sites (ABM), concentrated in 4 strategic points around Moscow. Each of them is equipped with the Galosh type rockets and tied in with the most advanced warning system of 5,000 radar stations installed along the boundaries of the USSR. Experts say that piercing through this barrage will be difficult, if not an impossible task, for the American missiles. Not a single ABM, as we already mentioned, defends Washington, New York or other cities in the US (The Military Balance 1975/6), while in the military complex of Moscow alone there are 75 huge underground shelters designed for accomodating military and civilian authorities. Some of them are hidden 100 meters under the surface.

Americans estimate that about two thirds of the new industrial potential of the Soviet Union is scattered over a great expanse, away from the great municipal complexes. According to one of the American experts, the Soviet spent, during the past 10 years, 65 billion dollars on anti-ballistic nuclear defense, which is more than half of the American defense budget of the current year.

Too late, just last year, the surprised Americans found that the Russians, by no means, vouch the insane theory of mutual suicide, but feverishly prepare themselves for nuclear war, most evidently believing that owing to their achieved supremacy they will be able to reduce their own losses, and survive.

At the beginning of detente politics, Americans thought, that organic weaknesses of the Soviet system would provide a guarantee for future balance of power and peace. Five years ago, the USSR was 15 years behind America in the area of scientific research and technological progress. Organic unproductivity and wastefulness in production, permanent agricultural crisis - deepened by subsequent years of poor crops, the first signs of opposition - all this allowed Solzhenitsyn to conclude that:

"Two years ago - the Soviet leadership had experienced such great difficulties, that it had been forced to search for the road of escape... I thought this escape will be achieved through evolution... However, today, all the proposed solutions lost their practical importance. During the past 2 years... the West resigned from its position of the World Power, surrendered everything in such a haste, did so much for the strengthening of tyranny in my country, the capitulation (of the West) so quickly surpasses our moral regeneration, that, presently, the Soviet Union can move only in one direction: toward blossoming totalitarianism".

Had Solzhenitsyn sinned by exaggeration? During 1970 - 1976, the Soviet Union and its satellites received credits from the West, often on favorable terms, in a total figure 4 times higher than the total amount of lend-lease received by Russia from the US during the World War 2 (Time Magazine, 9.9.1976 - Elliott Janeway, Washington Star, 8.8.1976). In 1970, the indebtedness of the Soviet bloc amounted scarcely to \$2 billion - at the end of 1976, it had reached \$45 billion. In 1975 alone, Russia and her satellites received record high loans of \$9 billion.

According to the UNO statistics, at the beginning of 1970, the trade balance of the Warsaw Pact countries showed a moderate surplus of \$1 billion. Beginning in 1972, the situation reversed itself. A billion dollar deficit in 1973 to the end of 1975 increased to 10 billion, meaning that in only 2 years it increased 10 times (Carl Gervitz, "The Problems of Raising Debt," I.H.T., 11.8.1977 - Allain Venozes. Le Monde, 8.31.1976). Fast growing imports only in part paid by exports, represent a powerful shot in arm for the economy of the Eastern block countries.

Only just last year some alarming voices began to raise the question: What is the aim of strengthening the industrial potential of a power, which openly proclaims the hostility toward the West?

It may be that the question was raised a little too late? Today, numerous creditors found themselves in the position of a banker who compulsorily continues to loan his money to a bankrupting client, in order to prevent his own bankruptcy. Defaults in paying back capital or interest would create catastrophe for the Western credit system. The credits and grain purchases of many years standing, doubtless, enabled the Soviets to increase the tempo of armaments and scientific research, and, above all else, the buying from the West of **know how** - technical data and licenses.

In several years the **technological gap** - the distance of technological lead of the US over Russia - had been substantially reduced and in some sectors entirely eliminated. Putting in its arsenal the MIRV - nuclear projectiles equipped with multiple warheads, and the long range "Backfire" bombers that can reach the US, Moscow has wiped out the American assumptions of nuclear parity established in SALT I. The "assured mutual destruction ability" has been disrupted simultaneously from two sides: by the extension of a powerful defense system and increased power and precision of an attack.

The balance of relaxation politics

In the declaration signed by Brezhnev and Nixon, first in Moscow and later in Washington, both powers pledged solemnly that neither will attempt to "obtain unilateral gains at the cost of the other".

Again, let's take a look at the great chessboard of the world.

Let's begin with the disposition of the mutual forces. Russia surpassed the US in the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles in proportion of 3:2, in the number of submarines equipped with missile launchers in proportion of 4:3. The superiority of the Soviets in all types of armed forces appears to be expressed in proportion of 3:2. In the number of tanks the disproportion is overwhelming. Russia has 42,000 tanks, the US - 9,000. The USSR has at its

disposal 35-40 thousand armoured cars. The US - almost half as many. The Americans preserved their superiority only in air power. America has 5,000 fighters, the Soviets - 2,550.

On the seas, the Soviets now have 2,441 warships the US - only 496. This proportion looks much better for American side if the units of below the 3,000 tons were eliminated. The relation would then be 451 Soviet ships to 420 of American. The bulk of American naval power is in 14 large aircraft carriers and cruisers of large tonnage. Those units have the lowest chance to endure attack in modern warfare.

The proportion of the US forces versus the Soviets in Western Europe looks no better. According to the supreme commander of NATO Gen. Alexander Haig, the Warsaw Pact countries have almost 3 times greater capability in tanks: 19,000 : 7,000; twice larger in air power. The eastern bloc keeps 20 to 30% more military personnel in full battle readiness.

However, the NATO leadership is annoyed mostly by the character of the Soviet preparedness. A huge concentration of fast moving armor - tanks, attack airplanes and parachute units, betrays the intention of a blitzkrieg. Military experts warn that the Soviet forces may reach the Rhine river before NATO will be able to bring its forces in action. Should the blitzkrieg type offensive attain its aim, the proportion of forces would be radically changed in a few days.

What is most surprising is the feverish haste of the Soviet armaments. The quoted statistics from 1975 are no longer actual. In general the manpower of the Soviet forces in all kinds of arms, according to Gen. Haig, increased 1 million, in Europe alone by 100,000 men. The ex-Secretary of the US Defense Dept., James Schlesinger states that the Soviet armaments surpass the efforts of America by 30%, and in production of tactical airforce planes - by 70%. The Russians build 4 times more warships than America. The present American expenditure on arms consumes a little less

than 6% of national gross income. The Soviets, 15-20%. The Hitlerian Reich, at the time of the highest production, spent 19% of national gross income for defense.

However, the statistics do not reflect sufficiently the real disposition of power. About the power - besides armaments and military personnel, there are two additional deciding elements: a convenient dislocation, and the will. If one of them is missing - the two remaining become useless. The most dangerous means of mass destruction become a disorderly mass of dead matter, if there is no will to fight. Even with small forces one can destroy a powerful opponent if one is able to cut his arteries at main junctions.

One such artery is the Straits of Hormuz which leads to the Persian Gulf. About 80% of Western Europe and Japan oil supplies sail through it. Blocking the Straits would result in immobilization of armed forces of the West in a matter of weeks.

Just for this reason the Russians changed the port of Berbera in North Somalia into another Gibraltar. The heaviest bombers may start from its over three kilometer long runways. Submarines operating from the base at Berbera and from South Yemen cannot only close successfully the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf, but also greatly disturb the situation in Indian Ocean. Somalia, one of the most important clients of the Soviet Union, receives military assistance in the area of \$132 million and in economic help, about \$32 million. About a thousand Soviet "advisors" and 50 Cubans command the largest and best equipped army in East Africa.

The speedy construction of similar bases in Luanda and Lobito in Angola serve the same purpose: cutting off the sea route that goes around Cape of Good Hope and South Africa, and by it, the flow of strategic raw materials.

Ten African countries, so far, have become

the dependents of the USSR. The Soviet "military advisors" act in all of them. The Cuban "advisors" are present, not counting Angola, in Somalia and Guinea. All these countries - to which in the Near East we should add South Yemen and Iraq, are armed by Russia. During the years 1971-76 they received Russian assistance of \$2.2 billion and economic help amounting to \$765 million.

The picture of the other side is just the opposite. At the beginning of last year, the US Congress legalized the withdrawal by Oct., 1977, of all military advisors from 44 countries. The decision was dictated by a fear that their presence in those countries would entangle the US in a new Vietnam. At the same time the American military assistance abroad had been reduced to \$0.5 billion. This economy was dictated by concern about the taxpayers' pocketbook (John W. Finney, I.H.T. 7.15.1976).

To attain the basic strategic aim - the cut-off of life sustaining routes of communication of an enemy - serves the development of the Soviet naval fleet.

At the end of the 2nd World War, the American navy dominated on all seas of the world. During the Stalin era, the Soviet naval forces were limited to Coast Guard units. The decision to develop a fleet on a world-wide scale has been made either after the Cuban incident in 1962, or - which according to experts is more probable - after Brezhnev's taking power in 1964.

220 surface ships and 95 submarines participated in extended manoeuvres under the cryptonym "Okean 1975" operating simultaneously on 5 Oceans from bases, among many others, on Cuba, Guinea, Somalia and South Yemen.

From the standpoint of Western Europe security, the most threatening situation is the Soviet concentration in the region of Murmansk and Kola Peninsula. Murmansk and neighboring ports do not freeze in winter and give the Soviets free access to the

Atlantic. To the already mentioned 180 submarines which are destined to cut the route of convoys sailing from America to Europe, is added a flotilla of 300 warships in which are included, among others, 9 cruisers, 55 destroyers, 22 patrol boats armed with rockets, 200 reconnaissance planes of the fleet and 300 fighters (The Economist 7.17.1976). Recently the Soviet North Fleet received its first powerful aircraft carrier "Kiev". The Norwegian military forces concentrated on the boundary of Norway are represented by 110,000 men: 2 motorized divisions, 1 amphibious regiment and 5,000 marines. In this region there is also the largest concentration of the Soviet nuclear potential. The commander of Northern NATO forces, Englishman, Gen. Sir John Sharp warned last year that "the Kola Peninsula at this moment is the biggest strategic threat to Western allies".

In answer to the Soviet manoeuvres "Okean 70" and "Okean 75", the NATO nations conducted in the autumn of 1976 their own manoeuvres in North Atlantic. 275 warships, 900 planes, over 80,000 men participated in them. It was the biggest military game in the 27 years of NATO's existence. After the game, the commander of the 2nd American Fleet, vice-admiral John Shanavan, announced at a press conference that the naval allied forces must fight battle 2-6 months long before the Atlantic might be open for the convoys with reinforcements and arms from the US and Canada to Western Europe (Reuter, 9.3.1976).

Equally annoying is the situation in another strategically important region - in southern flank of the NATO. Greece and Turkey, until recently were the main points of support for the American fleet and airforce in the eastern part of Mediterranean Sea. Both are like the portals of the gate that, in case of war, closes the access of the Soviet fleet to the Mediterranean basin. The isle of Crete is a strategic key to domination over this sea, but the presence of Americans there and in Greece and Turkey was reduced to a minimum. The Sanda Bay base airfields and radar stations are empty.

Ankara, was for a long time the most faithful ally of the US. Military assistance to Turkey, withheld by the Congress did not result in winning back Greece, but instead, brought violation of the treaty with Turkey and the subsequent closing of all the American installations near the Black Sea. These installations were like a periscope that enabled Americans to spy by the most modern electronic devices on the moves and military preparations in the depth of the USSR. The US, breaking off from Turkey had blinded itself. The embargo laid upon the supplies of arms and changeable parts, seriously deteriorated military potential of one of its most faithful ally. Even if the embargo be withdrawn, the mutual relations will never be the same.

After the 6 years of relaxation politics, at the moment, when for the first time from all sides alarming voices are being raised, the proportion of armaments yielded definitively to the advantage of Russia. The US has today half the number of warships that it had at the end of the sixties, 31% less navy airplanes, 23% fewer navy personnel. The land forces were reduced by 600,000 men, the airforce has a smaller number of planes.

Two interpretations of relaxation politics

From the very beginning the American interpretation of relaxation politics differed diametrically from the Soviets'. On the threshold of **detente**, Nixon announced to the world the irretrievable end of the era of confrontation and the beginning of a new era of negotiations. The famous words of Neville Chamberlain, predicting immediately after Munich and 1 year before the outbreak of 2nd World War, "Peace in our time," found almost a literal echo in Nixon's slogan proclaiming "generation of peace".

It would have appeared, that as in the days of **appeasement** nobody looked into the pages of the "Mein Kampf" so in the beginning of relaxation politics its American architects were deaf to the words of

the adversary.

At the same time, when Nixon proclaimed the irretrievable end of confrontations, the Soviet leadership openly and consistently was proclaiming that relaxation politics does not mean the end of the war against the Capitalistic West, but only a change of tactics and methods which leads to the definite defeat and fall of the Democratic West, **without having recourse to war between the superpowers.** In other words, relaxation only facilitates the final defeat of the US and her allies.

"The peaceful coexistence" - said Brezhnev in 1972 - "is based on a system of principles, which enables us to avoid larger international conflict during the development of revolutionary process within individual countries" (**The Problems of War and Peace**, 'critical analysis of the bourgeois theories', Moscow 1972. Quoted by Foy D. Kohler in his "The Soviet strategy in the 70ties," Miami 1973).

For a better illustration of the problem we may add another citation: The announcement of **Nepszabados** (6.12.1966) the organ of the Hungarian Communist Party - which calls for continual propaganda of the idea that **"the politics of peaceful coexistence is nothing more than a specific form of the international class fight going on in the arena of international relations, which greatly helps in the realization of the ultimate goal... the victory of Socialism in the world"**.

Brezhnev's words, that the goal must be attained without large scale military conflict are not contradicting the feverish tempo of armaments which ought to assure devastating military superiority. The purpose of armaments is not the use of

them, but on the contrary, to attain the certainty that the use of them won't be necessary. It applies equally to the aggressor and the aggressed. An aggressor, mobilizes his power, to force his victim to give up without a fight. The aggressed arms himself in order to deter the aggressor from an attack. The Soviet military superiority or even equality is for obtaining the certainty that there won't be counter-action from Western countries against the progressing "ideological war".

President Carter even before election had assured everybody that he would use nuclear armor, but only in the case of a threat to the most vital interests of the US. As the most vital among all vital interests is the survival of nation on the Earth - these words may be understood to mean only that no President of The United States will be the first to reach for the nuclear weaponry. Also, he will not declare conventional war, having no certainty that the adversary won't change the war into a nuclear duel. When the time comes for making a dramatic decision, any waiver, even as great as West Berlin or the whole Western Europe will be too small in comparison with the total destruction which would be brought by a one hour Soviet retaliation. The same applies to Moscow for as long as the finger which will push the button to unleash nuclear war belongs to intelligent people there. Even if the Soviet defense would allow - as experts say - to reduce the first stroke losses to 10% of the population, this would mean the death of over twenty million people in a few minutes. Only a mad man would take the risk for unpredictable side-effects which would result from the action of such dimension and the universal panic and chaos connected with it. But, why does Moscow need the nuclear war? **"The nuclear war"** - said Solzhenitsyn in front of the BBC television cameras - **"is not needed at all. They can take you, simply, with their bare hands"**.

Jan Nowak

(Conclusion - next issue)

Fragments

Vol. 4/4

Apr. 1977

by

Charles Joel

JAN NOWAK

THE THIRD WORLD WAR
(Conclusion)

A translation from the Polish magazine
"Kultura" NO 3/355/77, published in Paris,
France.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

THE THIRD WORLD WAR (Conclusion)

II

Ideological war

The superiority or even the balance of nuclear and conventional arms insures the Soviet Union against an armed worldwide conflict, and as such allows it to move action to another area - to ideological war.

It's obvious that the term - "ideological war" - is a semantic trick suggesting only a quarrel between the two "ideologies", or a duel of words on the air or in the press.

But in reality, "ideological war" is just what Solzhenitsyn had in mind when talking about the "Third World War". Its arsenal comprises quite a wide spectrum of forms, methods and means. The most extreme method is local armed aggression, led not by the Soviet Union directly, but by **proxy** or a Moscow supported and armed substitute. In Indochina the role of an aggressor is played by North Vietnam, in Angola - by Cuba, in Rhodesia -by Mozambique. In the Soviet terminology a local aggression bears the name of "war of liberation".

Another form of ideological war is evolution and fomentation of conflicts that arise not only from the premises of class-fight, but also from the issues connected with nationalisms, races, religious movements, and even from the differences in views of the present generations.

One of the factions in such a conflict, in return for help in arms and financing, becomes a dependent of Moscow. Victory of a dependent insures a further widening of Moscow's own influence - a step on the road toward the isolation of the main adversary. In Soviet intentions, compulsory weakness or passiveness of the US, means a movement toward a psychological chain reaction, designed to break all alliances built up by the Americans in the postwar era. Once the American umbrella stops being effective against any open or hidden aggression from within or from without - the only way of escape, at the best, will be neutrality or, if worst comes to the worst, looking for an agreement with an aggressor, meaning capitulation on the best possible terms. **Better red than dead!** Such, not the other, was the motto of the people in the Eastern Asia after the American defeat in Vietnam. Today, America still has allies or clients who trust in her. But it isn't difficult to foresee what will happen, when "accidents" of the Vietnam or Angola name are repeated in other places of the world.

The most classical weapon in the arsenal of ideological war appears in various forms of diversion - from financing and arming terrorists, guerrillas and saboteurs, to disinformation, bribing politicians, infiltration of governmental bodies, parliaments and trade unions. One of the well known methods of weakening the economy of the highly industrialized countries is the planting of so called **agents of influence** - individuals planted within the leadership of Trade Unions. One of the main objects of diversion are the forces of NATO in Western Europe, the soldiers of American and German garrisons in particular. Directed by the Moscow underground organizations acting under the name "Soldados Unidos Venceremos" (We the united soldiers shall win) do not limit themselves to instigating agitation, but are also active in selling drugs. According to Gen. Haig, the problem of drugs in the forces stationed in West Germany has grown to a very danerous level.

The embassies of Communist bloc countries have a peculiar role in the ideological war in the capitals of the world. After the removal of 105 employees of the USSR embassy in London, the press reported that, on the

average, the 70% of the personnel of the Communist diplomatic outposts are functionaries of the KGB. Of course, they don't work in espionage only. Their main job is the organization and directing of the diversionary operations we just talked about. The edifices of the Soviet embassies are equipped with the western manufactured eavesdropping devices which can intercept most secret military and political information.

The Communists train their operators in terrorist and guerilla actions in the Lenin Institute in Moscow. Some others, unconnected with Communist movements are trained in Tashkent and Odessa (Detente: "An Evolution," a collective article. Survey NO. 2/3, 1974).

In the ideological war conducted secretly by diversion, sabotage, forgery and blackmail - the main arm of defense for the US is not the armed forces, but the CIA and FBI - services designated to detect an opponent, to fight against infiltration, corruption and foreign intelligence. In the atmosphere of detente the Congress of the US and the mass media did everything possible to diminish the necessary secrecy of the activities of both organizations, to demoralize their personnel, to make difficult the recruitment of manpower and detection of enemy's agents. It seems, the ethic code which might have been appropriate during peace time, has been applied in the situation that cannot be described differently than the war for death or life.

President Carter and his main strategic advisor Prof. Z. Brzezinski, at the beginning of their tenure called for bringing back symmetry to the politics of detente. A lack of symmetry has nowhere been so striking as in the area of the ideological war.

The Soviets, since attaining power, are conducting a system of two track politics, carefully separating the international relations from the activities of organs created to fight against the West. At the time when Brezhnev was tenderly shaking hands with the British premier - I.V.Kozlov, an official of the Fifth Department of the KGB, acting under cover of the 1st secretary of the USSR embassy in Dublin, was organizing the delivery of weapons for shooting British soldiers Irish Republican Army. Almost at the same time when Brezhnev was announcing an

"increased ideological war, which will be taking more and more drastic forms between the two social systems" - Senator Fulbright was demanding that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty be dismantled as relics of the cold war. But at the same time, on the other side of the fence, Russia was developing programs for broadcasting to foreign countries currently as much as 2,000 hours a week, broadcasting in 84 languages. Moscow did not spare any means for installing new powerful broadcasting stations twice as strong as the antennae of both the FFE and RL. These new Soviet stations can, without any trouble, broadcast to the listeners in the remotest part of Africa, Asia and South America.

Independently from the official broadcasting, there has been developed a net of the Soviet "secret" or "private" radio stations which openly broadcast instigating programs that cannot be classified in other way than diversionary war propaganda. The "private" radio "Peace and Progress" appears in the role of an advocate of "Soviet public opinion". It broadcasts in 14 languages. When in 1968, the government of India protested against the activities of the "Peace and Progress" in the pre-election campaign, particularly against attacks on a candidate of government party, and against propaganda on behalf of pro-Moscow faction, - the Soviet government denied any responsibility for the activities of this "private" station. We may remark here, that in Soviet version of the Helsinki agreement only capitalistic countries are not allowed to interfere in the internal affairs of Communist countries.

Radio "Peace and Progress" is only one segment in a chain of private or secret broadcasting. Radio "España Independiente - Estacion Pirenaica" pretends to be an underground radio station operating from Spain. Similarly - "Radio Portugal Libre". In reality, their broadcasting studios and transmitters are located in East Germany. Similarly, the "Oggi" ("Today") concentrating its diversionary propaganda on Italy - broadcasts from Prague. The "Voice of Truth" - designated for "taking care" of Greece, formerly located in Romania, is now operating from East Germany. The "Our Radio" broadcasts to Turkey from the Soviet zone. Bundeswehr in West Germany is an object of

peculiarly intensive agitation conducted by two "secret-revolutionary" stations: "Freiheitssender" and "Soldatensender". After the Bonn - Pankov agreement they were closed with great fanfare in the press. But, 13 months later began broadcasting again under the cryptonyms "939" and "904". Their transmitters are located at Burg in north-eastern part of East Germany, broadcasting the programs also in Greek, Italian and Turkish to foreign laborers in West Germany.

In the western publication "European Radio Union" (1969) there was a quotation of Lenin describing radio as a "avant-garde" of revolution". It is to function as an agitator, propogandist and organizer. But in fact, in the Soviet arsenal of the ideological war the radio plays a rather secondary and auxiliary role. Moscow has the full freedom of the word in the Democratic West. The Soviet propaganda is conducted - most often in a camouflaged form - on the spot - by means of the communistic press of a country of interest, its friends, or bribed elements that have an access to local mass media. Even the complete closing of the official and secret radio stations of the Soviet bloc would not much weaken the Soviet propaganda.

Western radio stations, broadcasting in the languages of the Soviet bloc: RFE, RL, BBC, Deutsche Welle and Deutschlandfunk are the only means of reaching a multitude of listeners in the Soviet bloc. Because total censorship over there makes them the only trustworthy source of information and evaluation they have much greater influence on the audiences than the broadcasts of the opponent has on the Western audiences.

Radio Free Europe in relaxation era

As the director of the Polish Section of Radio Free Europe until Jan. 1st, 1976 - to the date of my resignation, I have had occasion to observe the shocking lack of symmetry in the American politics of relaxation in relation to broadcasting.

In contrast to the Russians, American diplomacy rejected any idea of the double-track approach to problems and principles of Detente. Consequently, improvements in mutual relations on governmental levels have had to reflect on programs, or rather, on the fate of both the RFE and RL.

With the exception of some people of great wisdom and vision, a majority of bureaucrats in the State Dept. and the personnel of the embassies in the capitals of Eastern bloc has been unfriendly toward the RFE, seeing it as an obstacle which renders difficult the negotiations and good relations with totalitarian governments. After the fall of Nixon, who understood the importance of direct dialog with people in the Eastern bloc, the climate of detente provided reasons for discontinuation of both stations, or at least, modifying them in a manner in which the "Voice of America" was modified. Nevertheless, since the defeat of the Fulbright proposal, the demolition has been progressing gradually, in stages, under the pretext of necessary economy by means of the Board of International Broadcasting, strictly speaking, by its chairman David Abshire, the ex-undersecretary of the State Department and his personnel.

The result: During several years, the Polish broadcasting stations lost their most talented writers and reporters, without a chance of replacing them by a younger generation of people with similar qualities.

For fear of the reaction of pressure groups and public opinion, all the reductions were made in the name of watching the pocket-book of the taxpayers. It all doesn't seem to reflect reality, considering that the current budget of both RFE and RL stations - transmitting to the countries or 380 million people - amounts to \$58 million, while, say, one B-1 bomber costs \$93.8 million, and that in view of general US budget which has now reached the astronomical figure of \$300 billion the expenditure on radio-broadcasting is but a minuscule fraction.

Meantime, the government of the Polish Peoples Republic, after the June 1976 incidents, increased by three times the number and power of their jamming. Since mid summer of last year the RFE is not audible in Warsaw, Cracow and other big cities.

Let's add that the Communist regimes discovered a new, more effective way of silencing the two most important Western broadcasting stations than by jamming.

Efforts are being made to extend - not without success - the censorship of the Western broadcasts indirectly, by diplomatic pressure on the American embassies in the countries of the Communist bloc. Among newsmen in Warsaw it is no secret, that the Polish government protests and attacks on any particular broadcasts of the RFE are not only received by the American embassy, but find also support of the embassy and are transferred to higher authorities, with demands for limitations and changes. This way, the diplomacy of the US, contrary to the decisions of the Congress, took responsibility for the programs of the radio stations, which, by the way, were supposed to be independent.

The pressures of a political nature stopped for a while as a result the reaction of public opinion against the so called Sonnenfeldt doctrine. They were not heard about during the presidential campaign, but came back to life immediately after the end of the campaign. In Jan. 1st, one month after the election, new political instructions were issued, introducing restrictions which go much further than the previous directives of 1972. To be sure, the principle that the RFE and RL represent the free press is upheld, but a long list of restrictions remains in shocking contrast to the meaning of freedom of the word.

New restrictions are a unilateral gift to the adversary. No reciprocal concessions of the other side follow.

However, the problem doesn't concern the RFE/RL only. In December, 1976, there was a strike of the personnel of the "Voice of America" against increased censure of news and commentaries by officials of the State Department. Four years ago the French government closed the broadcasts transmitted to Eastern Europe. All the political substance had been removed from them much, much earlier. West Germany cancelled on Feb. 1, 1977, "Deutsche Welle", a station comparatively independent from the government, which has been an object of unceasing attacks and protests of the Communist bloc, incorporating it with "Deutschlandfunk" a station under the full control of government.

Presently, after the union of the FRE and RL, Mr. Abshire puts forward some new proposals that lead toward further fusion - this time with the "Voice of America". The first step on this road is to be the junction of technical equipment of both stations. In the same direction would probably go the project of moving RFE/RL in part or entirely to the US, which is still under consideration.

And, finally, the latest news is, that in accordance with the spirit of detente, Mr. Abshire proposes changing the name of Radio Free Europe, which during its 25 years of existence has won the right of citizenship no less than the initials BBC, to **Radio Human Rights** (David M. Abshire: "International Broadcasting," page 82). To the millions of listeners who from childhood were used to the present name, it would mean its end.

Such is the briefest story of the unsymmetry in the ideological war in the era of detente.

Will the West survive the Third World War?

In 1961 a certain American scientist wrote:

"The United States can't afford another decline of its power. One more 15 year period of worsening of our position, such as we have observed since the 2nd World War, will reduce America to a position of a fortress entirely isolated from the surrounding world".

Since 1961, when this warning fell, 15 years have passed by. Surely, America today is not an isolated fortress yet, but unceasing erosion of her power in the face of constantly increasing power of the adversary, inexorably tends toward this situation. The author who predicted this process was Prof. Henry Kissinger;* this same Kissinger, who 10 years later became the main architect of "relaxation" paid for with unilateral concessions and, consequently, severe weakening of the United States position.

It seems that 6 long years of detente were needed

*H. Kissinger, **The Necessity of Choice**, 1961

to make people fully realize the measure of the Soviet armaments and what might follow. And just after the invasion of Angola the alarms were sounded simultaneously from both shores of the Atlantic: in Washington, in Bonn, in London, and Brussels. And forthwith some publicists and the members of the Congress stepped out trying to slight these alarms as just common, yearly maneuvering of military establishment striving for arms credits. However, this time the warnings were too numerous, the facts too formidably convincing to let them pass without reaction. The Congress voted the largest defense budget in the US history of \$113 billion. A wide stream of funds began to flow into the modernization and production of new weapons, and specifically into research. New revolutionary inventions, which might eliminate tanks and submarines are predicted, like the machine-guns and tanks eliminated cavalry. But this obvious increase in expenditures on arms doesn't go along with the increase of expenditure on the instruments of ideological war. All the three American radio stations continue to be choked under the pressure of restrictions and lack of funds. It all proves, that the American strategists still do not understand the essence and the character of the present conflict.

The process of gradual isolation of the US cannot be stopped by the increased expenditure on defense only. The politics of "restraint" stopped being effective the moment America lost first, her monopoly, and later the superiority in nuclear arms. The situation today is reversed. Today, Moscow under the cover of military superiority or even balance, can apply the politics of **rollback** - pushing their opponent out of one position to another, without recourse to general armed confrontation. The Soviet Union, conducting expansionist politics by means of "ideological war" - including the local wars of liberation, can easily stand on the assumption that no United States president will bring destruction to his own people in defense of any other country in the world, and the American people, after their experience in Vietnam, will not allow sending expeditionary corps to distant parts of the world to defend allies against aggression. The armaments alone will not effectively stop the Soviet expansion.

There is a definite lack of any premises on which we could build a calendar of consecutive Soviet moves. Churchill some time ago was to say, that if Hitler could have attacked Poland not in a few months, but several years after he had annexed Czechoslovakia - England could not have moved a finger in defense of her attacked ally. The Russians are better gamblers than Hitler was. They do not hurry. They know how to wait and, if need be, how to move one step back. **Revolutionary ideas which we proclaim** - said Brezhnev on the XXIV Congress of the CPUSSR - **are not just empty words. Even if full decades pass from sowing to harvest.**

The restoration of symmetry in relations East-West foretold by Carter and Brzezinski, should have begun from the repulsion of fiction built on false hopes and wishful thinking. The starting point must be a recognition of the naked reality of the fact, that the United States and her allies are **de facto** at war, which has been forced upon them and openly declared and that today the aggressor in this war is not far from victory - without recourse to nuclear arms.

Only the conclusions from the evaluation of that understood state of affairs can return the lost symmetry and stop the accelerating sliding downward toward the precipice.

The shifting of the point of gravity by the Soviet Union to the area of "ideological war" demands a parallel shifting in the strategy and tactics of the West. What is necessary is an ideological counteroffensive directed to the weakest point of the opponent. Surely, by a defense voluntarily limited to half or quarter measures, nobody ever won even in a chessgame.

The aggressor openly declares that his ultimate goal is worldwide destruction of the Democratic system and the forces that defend it. The progress toward this goal forces on the West the necessity of endeavor, by all available means - with the exception of armed confrontation - to remove from the Soviet system its built

in mechanism of hostility, aggression and expansion. **A natural ally in this ideological counteroffensive is just born and for the first time in history showing no fear opposition in Russia.** The potential ally are the masses of laborers whose life standard is constantly kept on a level of one third the standard achieved by the working class in the industrial West. Allies also are the peoples of this last colonial empire of the world, who number one half of the total populace of the Soviet Union but are suppressed by the domination of the great - Russian element, and by enforced russification. Ally is an underground revival of religious movements and ferments in Eastern Europe and the Baltic countries.

The increasing dissatisfaction among the 250 million population of the Soviet giant, in general, is taken skeptically in the West. It is a fact, however, that either the political scientists of the West, or dissidents arriving from Russia, or even the organs of the KGB are not able to measure the temperature under the surface of its daily life. Gathering subcutaneous ferments have surfaced in the least expected manner in Poland and Hungary in 1956, in Czechoslovakia in 1968, and again in Poland in 1970 and 1976. The explosion comes suddenly under the influence of incidents or circumstances that function like a catalyst.

No one better realizes how big this inside ferment is, than the Soviet leadership. The evidence of this fact lies in an enormous effort of building a hermetic isolation of people against the influence of the outside world. The monopoly of means of information and censorship are treated by the governing bureaucracy as the condition for sustaining the system itself. In 1971 alone, the jamming of broadcasts of the West took \$300 million - six times more than the total cost of Western broadcasts transmitting to the USSR in that year. Actions conducted through diplomatic, diversional, propagandist channels, against Western radio is sufficient proof of the fear in which the Soviet leadership live. A deadly fear arouses the approaching era of satellite television.

In anticipation of the arrival of the satellite, the USSR in 1972, already demanded the resolution of the UNO,

which would make illegal the transmitting of TV programs to foreign countries, without permission of their governments. Since then, the Soviet Union perseveres unceasingly in feverish attempts to abolish by international law, the transmitting of TV programs via satellites.

These kinds of reactions of Communist government are the best roadsign for the ideological counter-offensive of the West. When at the conference of Polish scientists in Montreal there fell the question: What should we do? - Prof. Leszek Kolakowski retorted: Send books to Poland! The audience answered in a salvo of laughter.

But the Professor was not joking. At the beginning there was the word. Spoken or printed. Not a shotgun and not a nitrogen bomb, but the word. Whole nations were conquered by the words of the creators of religious movements, philosophers, writers; the fathers of new ideas have attracted multitudes of followers, unleashed powerful resources of human energy, evoked readiness for unlimited sacrifices and deeds, armed ones and disabled others.

Lenin, who considered propaganda as the road toward power, before revolution, did not have any other instrument than the emigration publication "Iskra". **Kultura** and its publications which are closer to Polish leaders have had a bigger influence during a third of a century on the elite in Poland than all the Polish periodicals published inside Poland.

The Soviet system is loaded with internal contradictions. There exists an enormous distance between the military power - maybe the biggest in the world - and the internal weakness of the country. The weakest point, probably, is a lack of a mechanism of succession, which fact hides the possibilities of a prolonged fight for power in the midst of leadership. We have seen in the examples of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and presently of China, how easily the fight, which begins within a narrow circle, can widen, when the rivals attempt to draw as their allies the multitudes of intelligentsia, youth movements and the working class.

Time for a summary and postulates.

1/ The methods of the continued fight by Moscow during the detente, demand, beside arms, the elaborating of a strategic plan that would assure the effective defense and victory in "ideological war." Such a plan should, most explicitly, define the choice of the main thrust on which the greatest attention and forcefulness be concentrated.

2/ An ideological counteroffensive cannot be concentrated on the peripheries of the Soviet orbit. The main thrust must be directed into the Soviet Union itself. The freedom movements limited to the activities inside the satellites do not have any chance of success as long as the center of power in the Kremlin is not attacked.

3/ The most important weapons of the West in the ideological war against the oligarchy in the Kremlin are the mass media: Radio, TV, free press and publications. In the hierarchy of the US strategical means, they should be given a proper priority - according to their importance. Radio stations must receive necessary funds for the full utilization of technological developments to, effectively, block the jamming and, for reaching without any obstruction, the great municipal and industrial centers in the entire territory of the Soviet empire.

4/ As exemplified by the Soviets, the instruments of ideological war must be strictly separated from those bodies of state power, which deal in maintaining international relations. The mass media, acting on the population of the USSR and Eastern Europe must be free from their present limitations, bureaucratic control, interventions and pressures of diplomatic services. The TV, radio or publications cannot, under the censorship, function as a convincing free press.

Pluralism - the essence of freedom, - demands maintaining a separate existence of such stations as RFE/RL, BBC, Voice of America, etc. Each of them has a different character and represents a different point of view.

5/ The peoples living under the Communist bureaucratic power must be treated as a political ally, not as an object of American propaganda. Today, one such active ally, is the dissident movement and opposition inside the Soviet bloc, and those activists who - as forced exiles - are in the West. Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are a form of help for all kinds of internal opposition, by serving as not only a liaison and a supplier of information, but also as a conveyor belt between the dissidents inside the Soviet Union and in the West, and large masses of Soviet people.

6/ A proper utilization of the mass media in the ideological war demands a clear realization of their enormous potential and their limitations (underestimated wherever the radio and the television are treated as an exquisite source of amusement).

The question arises whether such a modestly introduced plan of offensive today has any chance of realization? The present course of the Third World War points out that the greatest weakness of the West is not a lack of defensive means and material strength, but a lack of will. Lack of will for bearing risks and sacrifices - even the most modest, have paralyzed during the past 30 years many possibilities of counterattack - even at times when there was almost a certainty of success.

Not long ago, in 1959, a certain American political scientist wrote:

"The Soviet leadership is able to blackmail the West by its power as well as by its weaknesses. We shudder before the Soviet power, but we also fear to take advantage of the Soviet weaknesses. A lack of will for undertaking risk in the West, is the basic source of Soviet superiority in the postwar era, and allows the Soviets to overcome the bankruptcy of their own social system and the lack of stability in the structure of their system."

The scientist, who made such an accurate diagnosis 18 years ago was Prof. Henry Kissinger ("Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy". New York, 1959, page 387).

Either today we face the same question. The question on which the future, maybe not too distant, of all of us depends. Whether at this moment when the clock shows 5 minutes before twelve, America and the whole Western world will find enough will to recognize that they live not in the period of relaxation, but in a real Third World War, and whether, at last, they will muster the courage for a counterattack, conducted, following the example of the adversary, by every possible means - with exclusion of armed confrontation.

The postulates enumerated above and which refer to only one but - who knows - if not the most important sector of the front - are, for certain, a program not for today, but for tomorrow. Today, the leadership of the United States and public opinion still are in the captivity of Soviet semantics. The adversary can openly proclaim that he will increase the forcefulness of ideological war and conduct it to the final victory, while the ideological defense of the West would be, in the eyes of Western public opinion, a return to the "cold war".

However, almost half of a century of cooperation with Americans has taught me, how unsteady this partner is, how easily under the pressures of circumstances he has moved in 24 hours from one extremity to another, how amazingly fast and efficiently he was able to mobilize his gigantic power and resources, when there was a need for so called **crash programs** - instantaneously improvised actions.

There is nothing more effective than a humiliating defeat. It isn't difficult to envisage, that in the near future the West will have to face many a defeat - maybe complete disaster. It would be too early, however, to renounce all hope, that the giant sleeping in relaxation and false perception of security will awake.

The progress of decline reaches a point of no return only when a threatened nation resigns from its plans of self-defense in fear that it would provoke an aggression. Poland in XVIII century was facing Russia in such a position. But the American reaction to Angola, though still eluding the essence of the conflict there, shows that the turning point may be at hand.

If all the hopes for it were to be abandoned the Western Democracies will not perish because of the inexorable acting of the historical law discovered by Marx and Lenin. The cause of their fall won't be the poverty of proleteriat, but to the contrary, the degenerating influence of prosperity and hedonism, which were brought by blossoming technological progress provided by a liberal system. "If a society puts comfort and money above freedom" Joseph Luns, the general secretary of NATO, - not long ago warned - "it will lose not only freedom, but, along with it, comfort and money".

Then, the words of D. Manuilski spoken a half century ago would become prophetic:

"Our hour will strike in twenty, thirty years. To achieve victory we will need an element of surprise. We should lull the bourgeoisie. We should start from developing the most spectacular peaceful movement in the history. The electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions will follow. The Capitalistic countries - stupid and decadent - will be cooperating in the deed of their own destruction. They will strive for any chance of a peace agreement. And, when their vigilance disappears -we will crush them with our bare hands". (D. Manuilski, Speech in the Lenin Academy of Political War, 1930).

Jan Nowak

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 4/No. 5

June, 1977

by

Charles Joel

BRUKSELCZYK

AS SEEN FROM BRUSSELS

A translation from the Polish magazine
"Kultura" NO 3/355/77, published in
Paris, France.

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company,
Sutter Creek, California.

AS SEEN FROM BRUSSELS

Two schools

Absurd by Owellian standards: Keep your mouth shut, or speak out? The West is able only not to agree upon the question of cod fishing or the price of powdered milk - which may, but necessarily affect the standard of living of its inhabitants, - but also on where, how and when it ought to defend its values in confrontation with the East, which will - not *perhaps*, but for certain - affect not only its living standard but, simply life itself.

For many years the defender of "the school of silence" was Prof. Kissinger. This school opposes "the school of speaking out," and brings forth some weighty arguments. According to the theoreticians of silence school, any inclusion of the human rights problem in international politics means, first, that interference in the

internal affairs of foreign, sovereign and sensitive countries, is tactically inapplicable and legally inadmissible; and second, it is a threat to *détente* or relaxation, which is strategically dangerous because it may result in blowing up our planet. After all - the adherents of silence accurately add - we have no other planet. Even President Carter said in his inaugural "interviews by phone" that he wouldn't like to participate in travel to the cosmos - what is there to say then about the common people.

Both arguments which defend "silence politics" are worthy of our attention and we should attempt to find the answer to them. Personally, in order not to try the patience of my reader, I vote "no" for both. Why I do so follows.

Interference is not allowed

We shouldn't interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. I don't like either when someone interferes with my private life. Only, what does it mean - to interfere? When someone interferes? What are my private affairs? When grandma Mary tells Doris - stop smoking! - is she interfering? And when uncle Adam plays hell with Marc - because Marc makes a wrong move when playing bridge - is he interfering? The matter is not a simple problem, but a "complex" one as professionals say ... when they don't know what to say. So, let's be serious.

Was the Soviet invasion of Hungary in 1956, or wasn't it interference in internal matters? And the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968? And the move-

ments of the Soviet armies in Poland in 1956 and the following years? Stupid questions! You, ladies and gentlemen, think that the answer is clear: Of course, there, we have the most classic examples of interference. Not at all. Why? Because all these things were nothing but synchronized actions in the defense of the holy cause of Socialism - which within the framework of brotherly cooperation binds all the socialist parties and states..

And Moscow's imposing on the East European countries the anti-semitic poison, anti-Israel madness, anti-West German hysteria, was it all interfering in the internal affairs? Again, naive questions. It's clear that it wasn't interfering, because all these "episodes" belong in theory and practice to the true proletarian internationalism; they couldn't violate the principles of sovereignty because they were created not in an area of politics, but of ideology which is an object or subject neither of Yalta, nor Helsinki, nor any other conference.

Please, be attentive now. From what I said above, arise certain object lessons, which should be properly understood, otherwise we'll get stuck in a permanent and profound blunder.

Therefore: When the USSR forces the UNO Geneva Commission on Human Rights, (in which, by the way, the seat of Frenchman Mr. Cassin, the Nobel Peace award laureate, was taken by a delegate of Uganda's Amin Dada) to send a telegram to the government of Israel, demanding an explanation with regard to the violation of human rights in Transjordan, this is properly conceived an act of concern about mankind, included

in the scope of the commission and its members.

However, when an American delegate proposes sending a similar telegram to the government of the USSR, asking about the fate of the defenders of human rights in Moscow, this act is scornfully branded by such indisputable defenders of human rights as the delegations of Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Algeria and Uganda as a threat to the future of the world.

When in the same commission, the proposition to express contempt for tortures in Chile is placed on the agenda, the vote is unanimous without argument. But, when the commission has been called to take an interest in certain suspicious circumstances in which bishops, ministers and several entire tribes perish in Uganda, then by the votes of the USSR and its satellites, discussion is brought into naught behind the "closed doors" and, after, put off *sine die* ...

When the Soviet minister of culture forbids the Polish minister of culture to invite a certain Zionist of Polish origin, bearing the name Rubinsztein, and the Polish minister obeys, this is a properly understood concern for the purity of culture; when the Soviet ambassador in Italy, Ryzov, steps forth against the dedication of the film festival in Venice to the Eastern dissidents (in previous years it was dedicated to the oppositionists in Chile and of Iran); when his threat to boycott the festival by all the communist bloc, forces the Italian

Foreign Office to capitulate ("Italy is not like the US," - said the Foreign Affairs minister, Forlani), and causes the dismissal of the festival director, socialist Carlo Ripa de Meana, - all this has nothing to do with interference because it's called the "ideological war". And, according to what Leonid Brezhnev has taught us, ideological war is not only inconsistent with detente, but to the contrary, it even is one of its basic components.

When all the artistic world demands, for example, to set free a famous ballet dancer Pankov, who for several years, persecuted, isolated, without any chance of practicing his art, waits for the "freedom of peoples and ideas"; when an audience in the largest hall in Paris, signs a petition asking that Nureyev's mother be enabled to see her son for just a short while; when the western scientists refuse (which doesn't happen *helas* too often) to participate in the international congress in Moscow if the "internal outlaws" such as, for example, prof. Levich, a member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, sentenced to nothingness because of his desire to immigrate to Israel - were not allowed to participate in it; when thousands of physicians from all over Europe demand the release of Dr. Stern sentenced to 8 years of gulag, formally for the, would be, taking in his 30 years of practice, bribes valued at 70 rubbles 5 chickens and 5 dozens of eggs, and actually because he did not oppose his 2 grown up sons' immigration; when English psychiatrists finally recognized where the truth lies, and after hearing such dangerous madmen as Pliushch, Feinberg and Bukowski, asked for some details, still unclear to them, of medical treatment practiced by their Soviet colleagues - all this is a disgraceful blow to the sover-

eighty of the USSR, clear interference in its internal affairs, and, of course, - worst - the continuation of the cold war.

When Brezhnev, with greatest pomp, receives and decorates in the Kremlin, comrad Corvalan, the general secretary of the Chilean Communist Party (exchanged for Bukowski, about which fact the citizens of the USSR still don't know); when he embraces Angela Davis, American Passionaria and Gus Hall, the boss of American communists or other officially declared oppositionists to the power in their own countries with which the USSR has normal diplomatic relations; when Brezhnev and comrade Marchais, the chief of French Communist party jointly sign a communique which includes the full program of a united fight against the pacts of sovereign and befriended France with other countries; when the Kremlin supports - financially and politically - all kinds of opposition on all the continents - all this is a completely normal fulfillment of the glorious mission of the first socialist nation, and serves the cause of the peace in the world.

However, when President Carter timidly receives - for the 10 minutes, without reporters and TV - Vladimir Bukowski, this is aggression against the USSR and a blow to *détente*.

When the KGB arrests all who have the courage to undertake the risk of smuggling to behind the boundaries of a socialist camp all kinds of printed matter, from the communist *Unità* to the *Kultura* of Paris or the Jewish

bible (in 1976, 50 western tourists were "removed" for smuggling it from the USSR), these arrests are one more victory in the fight against diversion, the defense of Socialism against the poison of Imperialism.

When Western editors publish Solzhenitsyn or Pasternak, Havel or Goma or Polish writers and poets banished from the bookshelves of their own countries, this is ideological aggression.

When, in secrecy even from their own public, the USSR, Poland or East Germany buy millions tons of grain or butter in the West, this is the normal act of international cooperation.

When Radio Free Europe reveals these transactions to Poles - this is an attack on sovereignty and must be fought against by jamming - costly, degrading, and luckily, of little effect.

When the New York lawyer Williams was hired by the Soviet government to arrange the exchange of the Soviet KGB spy who has served a 2nd tour in performing his mission in the US territory after having served his 1st tour in a very comfortable post in the Secretariat of the UNO, it was just banality.

But when the same lawyer Williams is hired by Solzhenitsyn to defend Alexandr Ginzburg in Moscow - a man dying for the third time in the casemate of Lubyanka - this is such an evident and indecent act of interference in the Soviet judicial system, that Williams himself is not surprised why Moscow doesn't let him enter the Soviet Union.

When - in order to close this plainly incomplete inventory - the Executive Commission of the European Economic Community, in a surprisingly stupid and inconsequent manner, annuls a signed and almost executed agreement on the sale of a mountain of butter to the East, for which sale the European taxpayer must pay additional hundreds of millions of dollars, the step Kremlin - this time quite justly - considers this act as discrimination.

Mr. Jenkins, the new chairman of the commission, committed in several days more goofs than his predecessors in 4 years, and owing to this the Kremlin will be able to brand sharply in Belgrade the violation by the West, of the second basket of Helsinki, as an act that is unfriendly and contradictory to *détente*.

However, the West will not be right if, generally speaking, it will find courage - which, according to my sources of information, it doesn't intend to find - to forth in Belgrade, with, albeit, a modest list of violations committed by the whole of Eastern Europe on the basket NO. 3 of Helsinki. That's because, as we already know, talking about human rights in the countries east of the Elbe river, means interference - a thing forbidden to us. "Be quiet, don't touch that coffin" cried Moscow and Paris, Warsaw and Bonn... Once at least, totally contradictory reasons dictate one kind of politics.

Aware of this philosophy, the chief of the American Communist Party, comrade Hall, suddenly proposed to President Carter a cleverly conceived idea that - similar to the reception he gave Bukowski,

intended to get acquainted with the situation of opposition in Russia - he should also invite Corvalan, in order to get acquainted with the situation of opposition in Chile. Although I doubt that President Carter is not oriented in Chilean opposition, but if I were President Carter, I would accept Hall's proposition. Under one condition, though: that on the same day Brezhnev receives Bukowski. Surely, I would.

Polish professor after German professor

So much, briefly, on the first thesis of the prophets of silence. Now, let's move to the second thesis: let's keep our mouths shut because brandishing human rights in international politics threatens *détente* or relaxation. This very wide and powerful front that stretches from the western gentlemen Giscard d'Estang, Marchais and Bahr, to the eastern comrades Brezhnev, Ceausescu and Tito, through the more or less engaged Mrs. Ghandi and the military or petrodollar Amins, Boumediennes and Persian shahs, all of them warn us: Don't speak out about human rights in our countries because it is not a profitable occupation. The noise about dissidents as an instrument of world politics, leads to destabilization, cold war, and changes in international relations.

Let's be truthful that international politics have changed. Not only because Carter opened the same door for Bukowski that Ford had shut for Solzhenitsyn. And not only because the moralization of Carter replaced in diplomacy the real-politics of Kissinger. A change has come, because the principle, the starting point of evaluation and undertaking decisions based on them,

has changed.

Kissinger and his assistant Sonnenfeldt based their political reasoning on a diagnosis derived from their approach to monolithic disposition of relations between the countries of eastern Europe and the USSR. As there is nothing we can do to change these relations or, in other words, to change the satellitarian character of relations between the USSR and the nations of Peoples Democracies - the chieftains of the "Prussian faction" of the White House were saying - we should bind these nations by a more "organic" but less vassal type, or forced and explosive ties with the USSR. It was, supposedly, to bring a better stabilization in the East, reduce a threat of explosion and, consequently, of the Soviet intervention, and would put the USSR in a net of different, frequent and cooperative economic agreements with the West. It was to bring a general nirvana and everything was to be "fine and dandy?" Human rights in general, and the rights of millions of individual human beings in the East in particular, were to come, unavoidably, later.

I don't know if in theory all this was right. In practice - not really. Terror, it's true, has decreased and changed, but not because the US sold grain and European Common Market, butter to the USSR, but because the internal situation of the Soviet bloc dictated changes: Pyramids can be built by slaves, computers - no. With regard to other matters, we may note, that never since Stalin there have been so many dissidents sent to prisons, never (even in the Stalin days) has the empire extended itself so far to distant countries (Uganda, Somalia, Cuba), stabilization in

the East has never so fragile, and the number of occupational forces never so great. Besides, these forces are not in the satellite countries just for preventing the invasion by Luxembourg, Andorra or even by NATO.

Now in Washington there is our ex-countryman, Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski. Some time ago *Kultura* published my interview with him, when Brzezinski wasn't yet fashionable, when nobody could have dreamed that "Zbig" would become Carter's right hand. I titled this interview: "Professor Brzezinski, do you like Prof. Kissinger"? Zbig, as he is called by my American colleagues, answered me by a letter sent from Warsaw, in which he wrote - "I just read *Kultura* in the company of several of your friends," and that the interview is O.K., but he doesn't like its title, because his views are not based on his feelings toward Kissinger, but are a result of analyzing his politics. And indeed, I would say so.

In the hundredth anniversary number of the English Quarterly *Survey*, I think, the most Kremlinologicistic publication in the world, edited and published by a combination of computer and Leopold Labedz, Brzezinski published an article he wrote before he entered the White House, in which, indeed, he expresses no feeling toward Kissinger, but views on his politics and - indirectly - on monolithic states. Brzezinski postulates that a principle of "Communitic pluralism" be accepted in forming American diplomacy. What does it mean? Brzezinski explains: "Pluralism of the Communist world is an indispensable element of more pluralistic world in general... We should, consequently, confirm once more our constant support for independence of such countries as Yugoslavia or Rumania and we ought to

avoid any allusions which may give the impression that the US is an adherent to the idea of the world divided into the spheres of exclusive influences..."

Although the name of Brzezinski is hellishly difficult to pronounce in the West, his concept is clear. He doesn't foretell any American crusade against the East, doesn't propose changes in the political system of the Soviet camp, doesn't wish to arouse any unhealthy and unfounded hopes in the East. Carterian America as previous Americas is equally against intervention in such situation as, for example, in Czechoslovakia in 1968. Carter himself excluded such a possibility even if, - as he somewhat recklessly announced during his election campaign - Russia would invade Yugoslavia to claim the inheritance after Tito's death. But, on the other hand, we may assume, that certain reactions of Carter and Brzezinski would be different than Nixon's and Kissinger's were. *Accident de parcours*, a certain French politician said about the invasion of Czechoslovakia, and Washington - silent and indifferent - entirely agreed with him. I suppose that Carter and Brzezinski would have different opinions and would express them. I don't know if their awareness would save Czechoslovakia from another invasion, as unfortunately, only the history can prove the reliability of political theories - nevertheless the idea of pluralistic Communism has spread all over the world, especially in the East, and became an element of international politics.

Don't mix things!

The differences were not theoretical.

The diplomacy of Kissinger consisted mainly in discretion. We cannot and should not - taught Prof. Kissinger - exert any pressures on the USSR. It's a great power - he was saying - and we cannot push it to the wall, especially the Berlin or a wall made of human bodies. That's why - he was saying - the proposal of Sen. Jackson, subjecting grants in trade tariffs to liberalization of Moscow's immigration policies is aimless. We cannot blend these matters together. As today Giscard d' Estang, Marchais and Bahr insist, so then, Kissinger insisted that *détente* must have first priority, that without *détente* one couldn't prattle not only about human rights but even about men who have no rights at all, - with the exception (and here appears the Kissinger - precursor) of a right to free vacations in gulag.

This view was heartily applauded by Brezhnev. It was exactly in line with his basic idea on the Helsinki conference aims: foremost, the two first baskets - security and intangibility of the boundaries, and economic cooperation, then after, may follow the question of taking care of human beings. We shouldn't mix up these matters because it threatens *détente* and delays relaxation. These words were followed by acts. When the American Congress enacted Jackson and Stevenson amendment which limited the low percentage of credits guaranteed by the US government to a ceiling of \$300 million (That's enough for peanuts" - prophetically exclaimed Kissinger), Moscow exploded.

"Subjecting trade concessions to our immigration procedure is just a vulgar interference in our internal affairs. All kinds of mixing up of such different matters is absurd. This song will not pass because

business is business and the KGB, the KGB" - announced the Kremlin, refuting Jackson's apparent, but Stevenson's factual amendment and suspended the trade agreement with the US. The Kremlin was right. The amendment meant interference in the affairs of the USSR, and its inclusion in the trade agreement was a mixing up of different matters.

But, here in the Oval Office appears Carter. And what happens? The new President doesn't mix up anything with anything, doesn't subject anything to anything. Every question, he says, as if he were reading Brezhnev's thoughts, should be looked at separately. We shouldn't - he says - subject the progress in one kind of talk to concessions in another. Carter, at the beginning of his tenure said that he is interested in, for example, fast progress in a new agreement on limitations of strategic weapons (SALT II), in increased trade exchanges. But simultaneously he announced certain initiatives - treated, of course, as separate problems - for example, in the area of human rights. Then, he answered politely to the letter of Prof. Sakharov - after all, the laureate of Nobel Peace Award, - received Bukowski in the White House, expressed his surprise at the strange manners of treatment applied by the Prague police to the authors of such an innocent document as "Charter 77;" and, in a most unexpected decision, threw out - in absolute independence from other problems - a correspondent of TASS, in answer to the expulsion of correspondent of AP from the USSR.

Rage in Moscow. What does it all

mean? Doesn't Carter understand that everything is connected, that there can't be any successful talk on atomic disarmament with Russia when simultaneously some people rejoice in warning Moscow about the human rights. Less megathons - more human right? Would it be possible that in such a way formulated formula Mr. Carter doesn't discern a threat to *détente*? Or is he just pretending not to?

Now we know, everything becomes clear.

In Ford's time, the peace was threatened because Washington was mixing up different matters and reciprocally subjected them one to another. In Carter's time peace is threatened because Washington doesn't mix up anything and, furthermore, it wants to conduct its actions independently one from another. Where lies the truth? Would it be possible that there is not a thing which would suit Moscow, in the same manner a certain lady at the wheel of a car, who did not move an inch at a stop sign, regardless of the fact that all the lights had changed from red to yellow and to green, and who was asked by a policeman: "Lady, don't you like any of our traffic lights"? Is it possible that Russia is not pleased with any color, and is there a way to please her?

As long as ...

The truth lies somewhere else. In fact, it doesn't matter to the Kremlin whether the White House mixes things up, or not. Russia doesn't give a damn about it. Surely, the Kremlin would prefer it if Washington wouldn't touch certain matters at all; the Kremlin has enough troubles even without Carter's letters. But in reality, the crux of the matter is: Moscow

will practice *détente* for as long as it will suit her interests. When Russia needed America, Nixon was treated fashionably in Moscow, drank champagne and was hugged and kissed by Brezhnev, despite the American bombs that were dropped on Hanoi and Haiphong, killing not only unimportant natives, but also Russian sailors. The priority of American help was of such great weight, that Brezhnev did not hesitate to throw out of the Politburo a certain individual bearing the name of Shelest, because he opposed the line of agreement with the US. Several years later, Corvalan, under the auspices of Moscow, demanded to stop all the help and trade exchange with Chile, until Pinochet begins respecting human rights, in other words - he demanded the application of the exact replica of Jackson amendment that was so rigorously rejected by Brezhnev.

On the other hand, the fact that, in order to please Brezhnev Ford did not receive Solzhenitsyn, did not prevent the sea-land operation by which the Cuban Africa-Corps colonized in the name of the USSR the independent state of Angola. The fact that Carter wrote to Sakharov or received Bukowski will not stop Moscow from buying grain in the US or butter in Western Europe. Similarly, throwing out of Amalrik from the gate of the Elysée Palace or the lesson about the Realpolitics taught him by Bahr will not stop Russia from blackmailing the festival in Venice or from returning the idea of "West-German revenge" to the Polish or Czechoslovakian propaganda.

The indebtedness of the East block

amounts now to \$45 million, of which more than half falls on the USSR; the Soviet-American trade exchange in 1976 amounted to over \$2.5 billion, of which the US sold to Russia goods for \$2.3 billion, and Russia to the US the balance - for an insignificant \$200 million. None of the presidential letters or his receptions will change this picture. The credits and goods will continue to flow to the East (even the handcuffs on the wrists of Bukowski when he was flown to Zurich for the "meeting" with Corvalan were *made in the USA*) for as long as Russia wants them and industrialists will want to trade, notwithstanding what Amalrik writes or talks about. The letter of Carter has no effect on Russia's technological gains in the trade exchange with the West, and only the immanent indolence of the Soviet bureaucracy, chained to the priorities of party dogmas, proves that the progress of contemporary USSR is smaller than the progress of Europe at the time of Marshall Plan.

As long as this enlivening stream flows from the West to the East, as long American presidents can write letters to whom they wish, and beyond the cries in *Pravda*, nothing, indeed nothing, will happen. All Moscow's ideological offensive against instigators is just a common mystification and it may frighten only those, who, even without it, are frightened. Nobody today wants a cold war, nobody sees any reason for it; there won't be any cold war, despite letters to Sakharov and demonstrations of the Dutch minister trying to save in Prague the honor of the West acting like a snivelling child.

Message or Massage

The essence of the question is some-

where else. The Brezhnev's USSR has nothing to say to the world. It represents the most conservative country which has the most reactionary foreign politics in the world. Marshall Brezhnev must have supported the Uganda of Marshall Amin, Brasil of General Geisel and Libya of Colonel Kadaffi, whenever they came in conflict with the US. This aberration has its roots.

First, in ideology. In the East there are no Communists anymore. In the West those who are Communists, are against Brezhnev.

Second, in the economic and consumptive area. The USSR, after 60 years of Communism, not only eats the American bread with Western European butter, but considers as a record of socialistic prosperity such things as smoking Phillip-Morrises, drinking Pepsi-Cola, chewing gum, listening to illegal western records, wearing original American jeans, and smoking hashish as an expression of intellectual refinement.

Third, in technology. While the Concorde is trying for the permission to land in New York, TU-144 (C.J. - The Russian "Concorde") flies incessantly on the secondary routes, without passengers, waiting for engines... of Rolls-Royce, in order to begin its normal service. America must have threatened to implement an embargo on the sale of slightly obsolete computers to Yugoslavia if Tito continued resell them, naturally with profit, - but under the counter, to the USSR. Siberia waits for American equipment,

in order to start thinking seriously about the exploitation of its riches, etc., etc.

There remains only one area in which the USSR has a *message* to deliver to the world. It is not a *message* but a *massage*. It is its military power. As long as détente doesn't threaten the balance of power in the world, as long as the USSR doesn't really feel it is threatened from the outside, so long as we can write letters to Sakharov and talk with Amalrik.

I don't know if mankind, preoccupied with sex and the laziness of the affluent west, has time to note certain interesting anachronism: of all the nations which in between 1939-1941 were in the ties of friendship with Hitler, only the Soviet Union has preserved exactly the same political and social system. Such continuation would have been imposing, if it were not the source of so many tensions. The freedom movements in the East are not - contrary to the Soviet thinking, shared by some leftist intellectuals in the West - a work of the CIA, or resulted from letters to Sakharov, or from the programs of Radio Free Europe, but are a natural reaction of opposition against exactly this shield of sclerotic continuity.

Of course, those who pronounce such views are suspected of immoral intentions. Bukowski, for example, was asked "from which position he evaluates the Soviet system, to which camp he belongs"? Bukowski replied that he is neither from conservative camp, nor from the progressive camp, but from the concentration camp. Well, this is not, according to my opponents, a creative stand; from this position there will not come the deliverance of the world: deliverance will come neither from Carter, nor Brzezinski,

neither from Bahr, nor from Giscard, neither from Sakharov, nor Bukowski, but only from the Euro-Communists. Clean like a tear, absolutely independent from Moscow and Washington, loving Democracy above all else. Only Euro-Communists are able to build a new world. For they are the only ones who have never dishonored the freedom - never having power or occasion to do so - and the only ones who - because they have nothing - have true intentions and true will to make the world absolutely happy.

We must answer to all of it calmly and wisely that, as we learn from the history of the 60 year old Soviet experiment, anything the Euro-American, or Asiatic Communists will do tomorrow - when they will be in power, - absolutely will not depend on what they truly, very truly want today when they have the abundance of all freedoms which the system of bourgeois Democracy (governed by their opponents) can afford to give them.

Both Lenin and Stalin, when they were in opposition to those in power demanded freedom, and had promised that, after gaining power, they would widen it greatly. And they too, were absolutely frank.

BRUKSEL CZYK

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 4/6

August 1977

by

Charles Joel

A - communique from KULTURA - COMMISSION ON
HELSINKI CONTROL

Adam Michnik - "VIVE LA POLOGNE"

Lucjan Perzanowski - THE CUBAN
PHENOMENON

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 5/357/77, and from the RESISTANCE MOVEMENT - a documentary published by the Literary Institute of Paris - Library of Kultura Vol. 276

Editor and translator - Charles Joel

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

Printed by the ESSICC Company
Sutter Creek, California

COMMISSION ON HELSINKI CONTROL

(A communique from Kultura)

Owing to the efforts of Polonia - the Polish American Congress - and the Study of the Polish Questions, took place an "interrogation" of the Polish group on the Congressional Commission of Helsinki Control in Washington, on May 9th. In the Polish group were: the president of Polonia - Alojzy Mazewski, the chairman of the dept. of Polish matters of Polonia - Kazimierz Lukomski, Gustaw Herling-Grudzinski, representing *Kultura*, and Wacław Bninski from the Study of the Polish Questions. Lukomski made his statement and illustrated it to the 5 congressmen and senators. Herling-Grudzinski made comments on the article by Adam Michnik, adding for the use of the Commission several enclosures: a brochure of KOR (C.J. - The Committee for Defense of Workers in Poland) - "In the Name of the Polish Peoples Republic," with fragments of the defense lawyers' speeches on the Radom lawsuits against workers; a communique of the League for Defense of Human Rights in connection with the arrests among the opposition members; a report of Dominik Morawski, on the situation of the Church in Poland, and the report of the Polish Independence League, entitled "The Church and Catholics in the Polish Peoples Republic"; a translation of Stanisław

Baraniak's essay about the censorship in PRL (C.J. - the Polish Peoples Republic); an official list of 188 foreign publications that are forbidden to appear in PRL; description of prof. Alexander Labedz's "question" from the volume of documents entitled *Resistance Movement* published by *Kultura*; and a letter of a Polish student, about withholding stipends for studies abroad in the dept. of Germanistics at the University of Poznan. Questions were asked by Senator Pell (Dem.), Senator Doyle (Rep.), and the chairman of the Commission, Congressman Fasceli (Dem.).

Before the interrogation by the Commission, the CBS Television team conducted a short interview with the Polish group.

"VIVE LA POLOGNE!"

I. During the past several years the government of Poland has enjoyed a so called, good mark in Western Europe. News-men writing about Poland have been stressing her economic progress, describing the modernization of towns, pointing to a relatively liberal administration, observed in the passport policies that allowed Polish citizen to visit capitalistic countries and in the lack of any spectacular repressions against the critics of the regime. Also proofs that the government is aware of the public opinion were met with their great approval. For example, the regime - in the eyes of the Western press - resigned under the pressures of the public opinion from the project of a decree "about parasites" and about enforced medical treatment of the mentally sick.

Despite all this, incidents that took place during the past year show an impetuous

resistance of almost every strata of the Polish society against the politics of the PZPR (C.J. - Organization of the Polish Workers Parties) leaders. How does one explain to the French readers this not too well understood events in Poland?

Let's recollect the facts. From Dec. 75 to March 76, the Poles were observers of the inexorable quarrels around the question of changes in the Constitution proposed by the party leaders. In this strange debate (whose only trace in the official press was a short fragment of the speech made by the chairman of the State Council), against the official projects stood the writers and newsmen, actors and musicians, professors and students. The leaders of laymen, secular Catholics and the High Council of the Episcopate morally protested. According to the unofficial data of the Central Committee, against the proposed changes whose intention was the constitutional guarantee for the leading role of the Communist party and a permanent - eternal - alliance of Poland with the Soviet Union, - were 40 thousand citizens. From the statements of the Episcopate, and from the writings of Wladyslaw Bienkowski and Edward Lipinski, it was possible to see, without any difficulties, the basic line of resistance of the Polish society.

One month after the "constitutional" debates, the student communities were seized by a wide protest in defense of Jacek Smykala, a student of the Medical Academy in Szczecin, who was removed from the institution for asking some troublesome questions during political science lectures and for refusal to submit his declaration of loyalty to the security organs. His removal wasn't a precedence, but what became precedental was the unusually wide wave of student protests. For the first time since 1968 several hundred students signed a joint document of unanimous opposition. It became clear to a competent observer that the

political situation in Poland was entering a new phase. Once more it appears, that demonstrations of the intelligentsia are signal for a total crisis, that the reaction of intellectuals continues to be a very sensitive barometer of general social mood.

This diagnosis had been confirmed by the incidents of June 24, '76. Within one day the leadership of PZPR faced a general strike of workers, and the whole country found itself on a brink of domestic war. Let us repeat our question: Why on June 25th was the secretary of the PZPR in Radom - similar to the secretary of PZPR in December, 1970 - forced to run away from the party Committee building and to hide out from the revolting workers?

II. The team of Edward Gierek had undoubtedly learned a lot from the tragic experiences of Wladyslaw Gomulka. First, we should mention new tendencies in economic policies, seen in the recognition of the consumptive needs of people. Another effect of their December lesson was a proof that severe repressions against those who think differently are useless and help to consolidate the popularity of the people in opposition. Also, the leaders of the party after December learned - which is an event of major importance - that the backing off of the Power from a previously taken position, doesn't necessarily indicate a weakness; rather it proves that they may have some common sense. All of this has nothing to do with the existence of liberal trend (similar to Dubczek's) in party leadership, but it is a symptom of the fact that the Power is able to, correctly, define its own interests and realistically estimate the possibilities of its defense. It is - in comparison with pig-

headed Gomulka - doubtless, a change for the better. However, according to the formula of Tocqueville, to the bad government there is no worse situation than the one in which it tries to correct itself.

The consumptive awakening of the population brought increased demands for the satisfying of human needs. People stopped being satisfied that they live better and more comfortably than six years ago. They want their situation be systematically improved. These desires, whose partial fulfillment had been, just a few years ago, an unquestionable triumph card in the hands of the after December party leadership, turned, in June 1976, against it. Difficulties in supplies and price rises led to a violent eruption and crisis. It is - in its essence - a political crisis. The June revolution had not been a revolution of hungry people, but of people who have had enough of being treated like a flock of stupid, dull lambs. In this sense - paradoxically - the June revolution (and all other events that preceded it) was a reaction not so much against the price rise itself, as against its propagandistic grounds and justifications. It was a product of party leadership politics which understood economic needs and aspirations of society, but did not want even to show interest in them.

Also today - in an hour of politico-economical crisis - in fact the deepest in the 32 years of the Polish Peoples Republic history - the official propaganda talks only about the need for economic reforms. Premier Jaroszewicz, conscious of the unusually difficult situation, appealed in a parliamentary *exposé* to "understand the efforts that are made by the government to normalize the economy and to bring an improvement in supplies of food articles". The development of the in-

ternal politics of Poland during the past 2 years, let us, indeed, believe in the political awareness of the Polish people. It is clear that this time the Polish citizenry will not trust the empty words of the Power declarations, that people will go for a compromise - not for one more promise without any guarantee. In other words the political maturity of the Polish citizens is coupled with the determination and deep conviction that the immediate, on the spot, attempts of the Power to remove the difficulties in food supplies and also, its attempts at reforming the functions of the national economy - this time will not be sufficient. It is clear to all that reforms of the public opinion functioning is a necessity.

III. The framework of such reforms is limited by Poland's partnership in the Warsaw Pact and by the presence of the Soviet armies in the country. The question arises: will the Soviet Union permit any of these types of change in the territory between Bug and Odra?

In analyzing the complex of the Polish-Soviet relations we should first note that there is a confluence of interests in the political leadership of the USSR, of Poland's, and of the Polish Democratic opposition. To each of them the Soviet military intervention in Poland would be a political catastrophe. To the Polish leaders, such an intervention would mean not only a crash of their political line, but also a dethronement or a reduction of their status as the leaders of 34 million people nation with limited sovereignty, to the posts of policemen assigned by the Soviet Power. In turn, the Soviet leaders must have a vivid memory of the international consequences brought about by the invasion of Czechoslovakia;

also they must remember the determination of the Polish workers in the incidents of Dec. 1970 and June 1976. If we add to all of this the traditional anti-Russian feelings of Poles, which *nota-bene* was greatly increased by an official indecent-servilistic propaganda toward the USSR, and if we remind ourselves of the ability peculiar to Polish tradition to lead desperate wars (for example, the Warsaw Uprising in 1944), we must conclude, that for the Soviet leadership, a decision to intervene militarily in Poland, means a decision to enter war with Poland. It would be a war which would be militarily lost by Poland, but to the Soviet Union it would be a political catastrophe; it would be the end of the international politics of *détente* and a factor of many incalculable internal Soviet problems. That's why - I think - the leaders of the Soviet Union and the leaders of the PZPR will do everything possible to avoid a conflict of this dimension. The confluence of interests delineates the area of possible political maneuver and the specific relations of all parties involved will decide the area of possible compromise. All this does not mean that the Soviet intervention in Poland is not a possibility. It may become unavoidable if Moscow, on one side, and the Polish people, on the other, were to lose their sense of reality, moderation and common sense. The Democratic opposition must clearly realize the limits of possible chances, and the Polish Communist party leaders must understand that by repressions against the participants in the workers' and intelligentsia's protests, they are digging their own grave.

IV. The starting point for any change in Poland must be a complete stoppage by the Power of its unwise and cruel politics of repressions, discriminations against striking

workers and protesting intelligentsia. The declarations of the leading personalities of Polish intellectual communities in defense of the persecuted workers and a massive collection of money to help the imprisoned and their families, will remain forever a title to the pride of the Polish intelligentsia. The statements of men of such great authority as Edward Lipinski, Jerzy Andrzejewski, Wladyslaw Bienkowski and Kazimierz Brandys, the actions of the Episcopate Council and of Primate of Poland, Cardinal Wyszynski, the unusually courageous and wise action of KOR (C.J. - The Committee for Defense of Workers) - all this, should, for the leaders of the Polish Communist party, be a meaningful signal that the way out of political crisis is impossible without the total amnesty for imprisoned workers.

A key to establishing a sphere of citizens' freedoms in Poland is the consolidation of freedom of work or the elementary freedom of the working class. "There is no freedom" - we read in the letter of "59", the basic document of the Polish opposition - "when the state is the only employer and trade unions are subjected to party resorts - which in practice hold the state's power. In these circumstances...any attempt at defending the interests of the working class threatens bloodshed, and may lead to very serious turmoils". The formulations written in the letter of "59" appeared prophetic. In the course of the June incidents, the official trade unions appeared absolutely fictional. It is obvious today, that a condition for a relatively permanent compromise between the Power and society is the creation of independent representation of workers, for example, as in the Spanish Commission of Workers. Only the independent representation of workers may lead toward

the effective defense of their own interests, and also, it may lead the Power toward the bloodless solutions of social conflicts. Only this representation may provide a realistic solution because it is contradicting the general belief of men in power in the conflictless character of the Polish society. The vision of a conflictless society is thoroughly utopian and totalitarian: its inevitable result is blood in the streets of Polish towns, and a disgrace to the leaders of the Polish Communist party.

V. Basic transformations are needed in the relations between the Church and the State. In Poland, the people who avow their Catholic views and participation in religious practices continue to be 2nd class citizens. This inequality and official atheism should be categorically abolished. The right of Catholics to participate in public life, should be - according to the postulates of Cardinal Wyszynski - fully recognized. Also, the broadening of the right for publication of the works connected with religious life, should take place.

These questions are linked with the problem of censorship. The nonsensical system of preventive censure should be entirely changed. It's true, that its complete abolition is at this time unrealistic. But, it's also true that the present state of affairs cannot last permanently because it is a situation in which the pencil of a censor has the power to delineate the intellectual and political horizons of the Polish society. Further decay of intellectual life will, at last, induce the intellectuals - responsible for the future of the Polish culture - to take drastic steps; to publishing their works abroad, to hawking their manuscripts, etc. Resulting from it all may be a complete break-

ing off of any chances for an agreement between the Power elite and independent intelligentsia; the consequences of such breaking off are dangerous and difficult to foresee. Let's recollect only that the consequences of the anti-intelligentsia policies conducted by the team of Gomulka and Kliszka in 1968 became visible to them after two years, in the flames of the burning buildings of the party committees.

For the team of Edward Gierek a solution would be passing a law that would in part legalize the censorship - so far an illegal institution - and in part abolish it. One cannot sensibly justify the need for preventive censorship for publications with low circulation, philosophic or socio-literary (*Creativity, Sign, Odra*) or strictly professional (*The Historical Quarterly, Texts, Culture and Society*) periodicals. The prevention in this area should be replaced by a normal legal act, after, for example, Yugoslavia. Besides, in the mass media subjected to censorship, (daily papers, Radio, TV), room for normal political information must be found. Their only function - comforting the hearts of the party and administration workers - should end; the manner by which the Polish citizen must get true and essential information about Poland and the world from *Radio Free Europe* or other Western broadcasting stations cannot be longer tolerated. According to the Helsinki agreement, books published in the West - among them, immigration publications - should be allowed to appear on readers' market.

The leaders of the Polish Communist party must resign from the nonsensical attempts of destroying pluralism in youth communities. Youth, students in particular,

must have the legal right - as they have their natural one - to organize independent scientific associations, debating clubs, etc. The Power itself, by restraining this right, pushes the Polish youth toward the road of illegal and conspiratory activities, and is fully responsible for any violations of existing law.

VI. It appears, that all the issues above spoken to are important to more than just the Poles. On the development of the situation in Poland depends to a certain extent, also, the development of many events in Europe. The consolidation of totalitarian forms of governing in one part of our continent must threaten Democracy in another. Many things may depend on the attitude of European public opinion. The Poles expect nothing from the West, but moral support. The discontinuation of this support and indiscriminate flirting with the governing party elites may affect the attitudes of peoples of Eastern Europe, which process cannot be defined differently than reactionary attitudes, no matter whether the reaction will be explicated in the philo- or anti-communist language.

The relaxation in Europe is a positive fact of supreme importance; also it is a framework for realistic politics. However, this framework does not declare *L'ordre règne à Varsovie*," at all. It allows also for proclaiming a formula well known to the French Left- "Vive la Pologne!".

Adam MICHNIK

Le Monde, Paris, 12.16.1976

The dirty walls of houses unpainted for years, windows patched with cardboards, not numerous shops shining with emptiness. From time to time, the gray deadness of a street is broken by the clatter of an old car - a junk 20 years or more old - which toils over the bumpy roadway. Traffic - lorries, mainly military, "made in the USSR", - and invariably overcrowded city buses. In restaurants - crowds, although the "menu" is the same everywhere: rice with beans in a gray sauce. Banners dominate everywhere - huge, colorful, spread on edifices, in the parks, hanging on the gigantic, specially made scaffoldings.

This is Havana Anno Domini 1977, seen through the eyes of a tourist arriving in downtown Havana from Aeropuerto Internacional José Martí. A visual abbreviation of the Cuban Experiment 18 years after the revolution. A cinematographic synthesis of the first Peoples - Democratic Banana Republic in the history of Latin America; the first - successful! transplant of Sovietism in the Western Hemisphere.

In the Leftist salons of Paris, Vienna and Rome - silence prevails about Cuba. At the bedsides of bourgeois-leftist youngsters, honorary places - beside the lusty pages from the *Playboy* - are taken by the portraits of Ho, Che, Allende, Caurilo Cienfuegos. From the window displays of western-European "Haute Couture Gauchiste" - Fidel seems to have vanished. Yet, there is in the air that roaring symphony of fascination! Still fresh in the memory of people are the comments, reports, some singing in exaltation, some "serious", "weighted", "cooly realistic", but all with a stress on "progress"; with always the same emerging from the verbosity

and sophistry, stubbornly hammering into the brains, the conclusion, that it had been worse, it is better, it will be much, much better! That Cuba, after all, will be something new; that this is going to be Socialism, Humanitarianism, People, a Model to imitate for the oppressed nations of the Western Europe!

A legend-glued together with contradicting facts - has been growing. A legend embellished with the tropical charm of a Caribbean island. A legend bedecked with millions of pictures and posters of tall, manly *muchachos* in open-neck shirts, nonchalantly leaning on palm trees, picture-squely bearded, with a 10 in. cigar in their teeth and machine guns in their hands. Sexy! Even Hollywood couldn't have produced it better.

What has happened then? Where does that sudden bashful silence over Cuba come from?

"Stabilization"

After 18 years of "revolutionary" changes, the economy of Cuba is incomparably worse than it had been before the revolution. The average per capita income is estimated - optimistically - as \$380. (For comparison: In Argentina - \$1,250 in Chile - \$680, in poverty stricken Guatemala - \$350, in Nicaragua - \$440, in Panama - \$750, in Peru - \$539.) Contemporary Cuba is one of the poorest and most backward countries of Latin America. Statistical data are literally depressing: Agriculture and agro-grocery industry produce 59% of the total national gross products. The main products: sugar (*nota-bene* - representing 85% of Cuban global export), tobacco, coffee, rum, textiles,

cattle and meat products. Of all of them, today, only rum is not rationed in Cuba. All the others - from sugar, through coffee, meats, textiles and ending with boots - are available only with coupons. Some of the rationed products, for example cigarettes, may be obtained freely, but only at 10 times regular price.

The average wage earner has nothing to buy for his money. Buying a house or a car - is beyond his possibilities; these things are attainable but only by the elite. Shops are empty. Travel abroad is impossible. In these circumstances, it isn't unusual to watch the long lines of customers at a few better restaurants where sometimes a beef-steak, fish or lobster "rejected for export" appear on the menu. The same at cinemas, especially when it happens to be a capitalistic produced film. In only cabaret in Havana, styled after the pre-revolution "Tropicana," tickets are sold out several months in advance. Briefly - neither *panem*, nor *circenses*. What remains are - rum and the banners in gray streets.

Despite enormous help in cash and goods flowing for years from the USSR and other Eastern bloc countries, Cuba is again on the verge of economic catastrophe.

In contemporary US there is no lack of experts, who, from the above mentioned facts, attempt to draw optimistic conclusions. Among the "havanologists" there exists a growing belief, that the Soviet Union is fed up with losing on such a poor "enterprise" as Cuba, consequently, Moscow is encouraging Cuba to improve its relations with Washington, and that in Cuba itself there "must" follow a change "dictated by common sense" because the existing situation can no longer continue.

It's nothing new. It appears every time whenever Cuban economy hangs precariously on a precipice. There were a few such situations - as effective as the one we observe now - in the past. Today, the main propagator of this belief is Senator McGovern and his political *entourage*. His predecessor was Sen. Fulbright. In every case, the regime of Fidel Castro, somehow, survived "temporary difficulties", without making any changes or serious reforms. The police methods of governing never eased off; to the contrary, they increased after every crisis. Foreign politics, on the other hand, was "evolving" from the smuggling of arms and insignificant adventures to open aggression across the ocean, in Angola, and to interference in internal affairs of other African nations. Contrary to the hopes of naive optimists (and this is a species that breeds pretty fast in our America), the economic crisis had not "forced" Castro to apply any internal reforms and easing of his foreign politics; it didn't even interfere with sending expeditionary corps to another continent although it had been a very costly operation. However, from the Moscow point of view, the profits from the Angola "transaction" covered the losses on unprofitable Cuban "enterprise".

The mistake in the American "havanologists" thinking lies in their inability to understand the most crucial characteristic, the most important "achievement" of the Soviet type system: the ability to survive economic crises, without any concessions of profound or permanent nature on behalf of the citizenry. A superficial glance at the history of the Soviet Union will suffice to point out perfection to which this ability has been brought to. Contemporary Cuba is a *par excellence* Soviet state, applying zealously

- maybe even more zealously that the "Motherland of Proletariat" itself - the Stalinistic methods of totalitarian-police control and infiltration of the society. Doubtless, Moscow helped greatly in organizing and strengthening the police state. However, we ought to render justice to Fidel Castro, that from the first days of being in power, he concentrated on the construction of the police state apparatus that reached every social stratum, to every - literally - village and housing bloc.

Contemporary Cuba is a solid and well established military-police monster able to survive every shock under which many conventional rightist dictatorship would fall. The strategic buffer, which is to safeguard the nucleus of power against a desperate society - presently reached such a hardness and dimension that is able to secure for the group in power and its Soviet sponsors, the margin of safety. Peoples Democracy of Cuba is now on a level of "stabilization" that is as good as the stabilization of Czechoslovakia or East Germany.

Washington at a loss

Cuba has a position of high priority on the list of the US dilemmas of foreign politics. Cuba is no longer a fourth grade state which - because of the coincidental mistakes and circumstances - found itself in the Soviet net. After the African successes, even the original role of Cuba as an "exporter of revolution" to Latin America, which was greatly disturbing the U.S., had worn out. In the second half of the seventies Cuba became a serious and successful instrument of the Soviet expansionism - an instrument of international

proportion.

The methods of "restrictions", applied until now, appeared entirely fruitless. The economic blockade did not pass the test - however, not because the Soviet Union helped Cuba, not because the Western European allies of the U.S. had begun to trade with Havana (when Fidel displayed his purse), and not because the other Latin American countries had begun trading too. It did not pass the test because economic ostracism is not an effective tool in confrontation against a country which does not respect sacrifices suffered by its own people.

The blockade had even helped Fidel in his numerous propaganda activities, serving as an "argument" which explained the deplorable state of Cuban economy. An immigrant who recently arrived from Cuba told me: "Many of us believed in it. We blamed America, that, attempting to destroy Fidel, was destroying innocent people who had already suffered a lot".

Similarly, also the political ostracism was a fiasco. Almost all the allies of the U.S., including Canada and a number of Latin America nations entered into diplomatic connections with the government of Castro. We may add that there is not a thing which would show that Washington's nonrecognition of Cuba, in any degree, affects Cuba's limitations in its activities in behalf of the Soviet expansionism. Some people say that the U.S. nonrecognition of Castro's Cuba has a symbolic meaning - complete separation from the nation which engages in international aggression and adventurism. But, also this is a weak argument. If America were to pursue consequently this "symbolism", then she should cut off all other diplomatic con-

nections, for example, with the USSR after the invasion of Hungary and Czechoslovakia. The effectiveness of such a move would be greatly doubtful from the standpoint of the US interests, as well as of the interests of the oppressed nations which still see in America a little hope for a better future. This dilemma was expressively and pertinently put by one of the well known American publicists, who said: "We live in a world in which we are forced to talk with bandits. The point is, that we should not be allowed for a moment to forget, with whom we have the pleasure...".

One of the problems connected with American foreign politics is the diffused inclination among many politicians and experts to euphoria. Directly after the Second World War we had the pro-Soviet euphoria. In the fifties - anticommunist euphoria of "deliverance". In the seventies - euphoria of *détente*. Now again we have many politicians who are sick of the Cuban euphoria. They seem to forget "with whom they have had the pleasure". In the name of "normalization" - they close their eyes to the internal realities of today's Cuba and to the role it plays in the framework of the Soviet strategy.

Some time ago I read in a reputable American newspaper that Castro "renounced" his politics of adventurousness, that he attempts to regain the international *respectability*, that he has resigned from the ambitious plans of making Cuba a catalyst of Communist revolution and concentrates exclusively on the solution of difficult internal problems of the country. A classic example of euphoristic thinking. Two weeks later the news broke that the Cuban army was fighting in Angola.

Fortunately, euphoria hasn't touched - at least until now - the administration of President Carter. The official announcements on Cuban matters, including the well known declaration of Carter himself, are remarkable for their healthy sobriety. Doubtless, the administration is trying to normalize relations with Cuba - but not for a price of unilateral American concessions. If Carter will hold out on his terms, Cuba - for the termination of the blockade and normalization of relations with the US - must pay with resignation from its adventurousness in foreign countries, and with concessions on the basic human rights in its internal politics. So far - judging from the official tirades - Castro doesn't show any willingness to consider these proposals. Carter's declaration has been received in Havana, as (where have we heard it before?) "interference in internal affairs of Cuba". Castro added - with very strong determination - that Cuba will continue giving support to "democratizing and liberating" movements in other countries. Most evidently - following the experiences of the Soviets - (look: *détente*) - Castro believes that the pressures of the Washington "liberals" will settle the matter in his favor, forcing Carter to abandon terms he proclaimed and to normalize relations on Cuban (meaning the Soviet Union) terms.

To Fidel and his sponsors it would be just a perfect solution. The role of Cuba as an instrument of the Soviet expansionism would not be limited, even formally. There would be no need for a camouflaged internal liberalization (a matter seemingly insignificant, but troublesome - vide: the entanglement of the USSR and Eastern bloc countries in "basket NO. 3 of Helsinki"). And surely, the US - through credits, technical help and trade - would take over the burden of paying

for Cuban military readiness - on behalf of the Soviet Union.

Are Moscow and Fidel going to achieve this optimal goal? The question, for a while, must remain unanswered because we know just too little about the politics of the present US administration, of its ability to foresee and to make proper evaluation of the international situation, and its resistance against the bearers of all kinds of "euphorias".

In any case, it would amount to naiveness to expect that Castro - at least in the near future - will "break down" (or, perhaps, will be "broken down" by Moscow) and suddenly accept Carterian terms of normalization. It is possible though - but only on a road of absolute consistency. We must anticipate that Havana, against Washington, will conduct the politics of waiting and irritation, mingling the war slogans with the gestures of reconciliation (to be used as ammunition by Washington liberals). Cuba has plenty of time. Fidel is not threatened by his terrorized and completely infiltrated population. The only concrete novelty is the present stress on the infrastructure of the tourist industry. In all the US towns the Mexican and Canadian travel agencies freely sell excursions to Cuba (American firms are not yet allowed to do so). Castro plainly counts on dollar profits before any official talks begin. Some cash in hard currency will help him through the period of waiting; consequently, the sudden activity in building hotels in Cuba.

Essentially, Washington's tendencies to normalize relations with Cuba are justified. It is impossible to influence foreign politics - more, even the internal politics - of the nation with which one has no contact. The point is, whether a contact is

thought to be the element of consequential politics - leading to a strictly defined goal, or, whether it is just a coincidence (such as, for example, the internal play of political forces in the US or the pressures of this or that *lobby*).

Everything points to a certainty, that the renewal of the trade and diplomatic relations between the US and Cuba is only a matter of time. It isn't the matter of "whether?" but of "how?". The manner in which the US will solve this question will have a serious effect on further development in international matters - especially, in the area of the larger game of power between the West and the East. If normalization is realized for the price of unilateral or prevailing concessions of America - be it in principles or practical measures - both, the allies and the enemies of the US, will read it as proof, that America continues to be strategically defensive, and is not able to afford active politics - that is effective in a sense of defending her own interests.

Lucjan PERZANOWSKI

Fragments

Vol. 4/7

Sept. 1977

by

Charles Joel

Jerzy BONIECKI WHAT'S GOING TO FILL
THE VOID?

Zbigniew BYRSKI TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION
AND ETHICO-CULTURAL
CHANGES

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 7/348-8 - 8/359/77 - 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.

WHAT'S GOING TO FILL THE VOID?

There are two phenomena which determine the essence of "Eurocommunism". First, that this newly born term means a "special form", a "different path" of Communism, declared by the West European Communist parties. It goes with the proclaimed independence from Moscow and recognizing the principles of work within the framework of the parliamentary Democracy. Second, that the word "Eurocommunism" reflects a rapid growth of influence of the Communist parties or of Communist-Socialist coalition on the masses of the rich industrialized countries of the West. Although Eurocommunism is generally recognized foremost as relating to 3 countries (Italy, France, Spain), the growth of influence we talk about, has much a wider scope. It is not necessarily connected with these countries. Great Britain is an excellent illustration of my statement.

There is some strange paradox, a certain tragic irony in the renaissance of leftist influence, in the appearance of renewed fascination by bankrupt programs and slogans that

affect millions of people in the West. Ideas born in the past century and postulates created in radically different historical circumstances than the present, are on the rise among the masses which enjoy an unprecedented degree of freedom, social welfare, life opportunities and common affluence. Along with it all, the last decades have unmercifully revealed the true nature of the myth of "building Socialism"; seen in Khrushchev's speech at the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist party, Berlin Wall, Poznan, Hungarian Uprising, Czechoslovakia, the revelations of the "Gulag Archipelago," and many others.

Why does it all happen? Where does this "madness" affecting millions of humans come from?

Last year, the world held its breath in expectation of the Italian election results. Although "the truce" in a form of a small "historical compromise"* had been achieved, the possibilities of the main change not only exist, but even widen - meaning that the prospects for an eventual Communist majority government are even better than they were before the elections. Let's try, however, to forget the situation in Italy, where the growing potential of the Communist party is, doubtless, connected with the well known archaic nature of the existing social order. Likewise, we can abstain from entering a discussion on the situation in Spain, because of the peculiar historical phase this country is passing through. Attributing the growing wave of leftist influence to specific countries only darkens the picture and makes

* No Communists' participation in Democratic government, but their cooperation in the precarious plans of "curing the ills".

it difficult to look really deep into the foundation of the observed phenomenon. Doubtless, the "advancing" Left takes advantage of local problems (thus increasing the chances of victory), but the phenomenon under our discussion is much wider and its ramifications have deeper roots than can be judged from the above assertions. France and England - the countries which cannot be classified as poor, underdeveloped or socially backward - may best serve as examples in this respect.

In France in 1976, two years before the parliamentary election, the weight of public opinion concentrated its attention on the question whether Socialist-Communist coalition could come to power as early as in 1978. An observer is under the impression that to the majority of voters, this outcome is only a matter of time. The political forces of the Right and the Center are clearly on the defensive. One's waiting for the proclamation of their victory, is to no avail; at most, only some doubts in an inevitable success of their adversary are expressed. We cannot explain it all just by the traditional influence of the Left in France.

In turn, let's look at another illustration of the phenomenon under discussion - this time in England. Dr. Stephen Haseler, twice the Labor party candidate to the House of Commons, lecturer in political science at the London Polytechnic, analyzes the situation of his country in a recently published book titled "The Death of British Democracy". He sees the parliamentary system endangered by the ever-increasing influence of Marxism-Leninism within the Labor party and without. It's manifested in an open rejection of the very principles of the parliamentary Democracy. Characteristically, it happens in a country in which the Communists are numerically insignificant. Of course, Haseler analyzes the

observed phenomenon from the standpoint of socio-historical problems of Great Britain, and ascribes the growth of leftists' successes to a general apathy of society, or to the unsuitability of the traditional democratic institutions to solve the basic problems of our time. His reasoning and conclusions, again, lead us nowhere in trying to understand the essence of the progressing "plague." Asserting that it is a result of Moscow's infiltration doesn't help much either, even if we assumed that the complexity of the problem includes this element.

Again, why Marxism? What is so attractive to the people who live in affluence, who have cars, tv's and refrigerators, who enjoy the benefits of the hitherto unknown social security and unprecedented - often absurd - freedom, in a 100 year old ideology that was born in the circumstances of misery and cynical exploitation? How is it possible that millions living in an affluent consumer society are fascinated by the slogans and programs which in their own eyes had tragically failed in so many countries? Are the lessons learned from the "Gulag Archipelago", Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia to no avail? I'm not referring even to the threat of the Soviet Imperialism - so obvious to everybody who is not blind. It would appear that the mechanics of the Communist power functioning, the specific party structure of the Soviet model which binds all the Western European Communist parties, should sound a dead warning. Why the naive proclamations that "we will do it differently," that "our Socialism or Communism will take a different road," fall on such a yielding ground? Would it be possible that the average man in the West believes in all of this?

Many of us who, after personal ex-

periences with Socialism, live in the West, observe with sadness all these developments. Let's add that to no one better is the full meaning of this tragic paradox so obvious than to the people who arrive from "over there" for a short stay, to the people who continue to live "there" after a visit of several weeks or months in the West. Those people just cannot believe what they see, and are not sure whether they hear it all right: "Have the people here really gone mad? What more do they want?" Bear in mind, my reader, that the word "more" expresses a culmination of all the aspirations and desires of the people from "over there"; aspirations and desires long achieved in the West. However, we must admit that although this kind of reaction of the people from "over there" is entirely understandable, it contains a great simplification of the question under our deliberation.

A similar simplification is found in the claims of the Western leftist ideologists that they are, traditionally, the agents of reform and progress. It is true there is a genuine core of idealists among the Western leftists. Amid the torrent of absurdities they say and do, one can detect a passionate desire for a betterment of the world. (In this respect, remarkably less may be said about Conservatism; by definition they must oppose any changes). With all this, it is a rarity today to hear leftists call our attention to problems such as: "How to organize a factory?" "How should a local government function?" "What are the solutions to environmental problems?" "How can one use leisure time?", etc. These problems are created by technological progress, subsequent process of labor division, and the whole complex of the "human predicament." The paradox of the successes of the Left lies also in the fact, that it is not the Left, or,

seldom the Left, that initiates attempts to resolve the most important problems of our time. We should remember that the creation of the "Club of Rome" 10 years ago, and its *problematique humaine* had not been achieved by the Western Left at all, although a few of its members had later joined the Club. Quite to the contrary: The slogans employed by the Left and programs it advocates, often reflect old ideas, concentrate on trivial matters, by all means avoiding questions which bear heavily upon our near future. Our expectations that the Left will advocate energy conservation or will call for a moderate consumption are in vain. The Left is not interested in "industrial Democracy" and "worker participation...". Instead, it prefers to dig up the 19th century notions of the ever-conflicting interests of capital and labor. In sum, it would be a drastic simplification to explain the Left's successes by its traditional role of an agent of progress.

Besides, there is also in the West a general disappointment and resentment of the permanent flaws in Democracy and the structural faults of Capitalism. We shouldn't be surprised that the people brought up in the West, who themselves never experienced the "blessings of Socialism," feel rebellious and desire changes when they observe scandals like "Watergate" and "Lockheed". This attitude - being perfectly understood - throws light on the paradox we are concerned with in this writing: That the masses in the West are ready to exchange their realities for the promises of a rancid Marxist ideology; the certainty that affairs of the "Watergate" or "Lockheed" type would never reach the daylight in a Socialist country doesn't seem to penetrate their brains. Likewise, it never occurs to them to ask why there are no strikes in the countries of "Peoples

Democracies". Furthermore, it seems that Westerners are prepared to accept the promises of the "Socialist alternative" from these politicians who themselves are responsible for unsurpassable crimes, who in the past had tacitly approved crimes against humanity - committed in "gulags" by their spiritual leaders. Here again, the ever-increasing fascination by the leftist ideas cannot be explained merely as a dissatisfaction of the masses with existing conditions.

Let us repeat the basic question: Where lies the cause of the discussed paradox? Is it possible that despite the prolific dissemination of information, the West is not aware of the degradation of a man, trampled fundamental human rights by the system which they - the people that live in freedom - want to adopt? Perhaps the people of the West look - but do not see, listen - but do not hear, perhaps they do not want to know...

* * *

It seems to me that the cause of the paradox we search for lies in the fundamentals of the crisis we live in. It's a philosophical crisis seen in the absence of any prevailing answer to the basic questions of "Why live?" and "How to live?"

Jose Ortega y Gasset, in his "The Revolt of the Masses" writes about the old mores and ethics which, having been rejected, are not yet replaced by the new ones. It is not hard to see that his thoughts fit the contemporary Western society well: *"There is no universally accepted philosophy or system of beliefs anymore; there is no*

dominating public opinion". But, as "nature abhors a void - a void must be filled." I think, at this point in ones reading of his book, one seems to be close to the crux of our question: Filling, at all cost, the spiritual void, by religion, ideology or a doctrine - whichever is close at hand. He says further: "Most people do not have their own philosophy, conviction or views; they look for something that comes from somewhere outside so that some kind of spiritual guidance, whatever it may be must reign and the masses - indifferent and without convictions - will accept it."

In a time when changes occur with a speed of light, in a time when nearly every traditional value is destroyed, or, at least undermined - how long can a man withstand psychologically the existing void? Can a state of alienation, powerlessness and a lack of purpose in life, as well as the resulting epidemic of neuroses persist? Obviously, such an unstable state cannot last permanently. What is necessary is the adoption of some new doctrine, an emergence of some new, dominating belief. "Without conviction" - to quote Ortega y Gasset again - "the human community would be in chaos ... without a spiritual power (emphasis-mine), without someone who commands..."

And what in the meantime? How does a man living in a void behave? - He just loots, plunders among remains of the old order. "People and nations profit on living without rules." This statement of Ortega y Gasset embraces not just the permissiveness of our times, but also a general demand of individual human beings to have all rights and ... no responsibilities. A close look at ruth-

lessly looted Great Britain will suffice to confirm the validity of the statement mentioned above. And perhaps here we touch the first reason why millions of people identify themselves more and more with a platform of the Left. It is precisely the Left which calls for more privileges and fewer obligations. It shows little interest in the totality of a conflict of our times. Its full attention focusses on bribing an electorate by offering it immediate gains - often against the obvious interests of a society as a whole. Its most important goal is - gaining power. In this respect, of course, the tactics of the Left do not at all differ from those of the other political groups. However, the Left can avail itself of a "ready" and very convenient doctrine - a most valuable asset under the present circumstances.

Slogans of the Left, the Marxist ideology, pulled straight out of the attic, prove handy not just for profiting from the period of an emptiness. More significantly - they aspire to, and have a good chance of - filling it. In May, 1937, Ortega y Gasset wrote a long introduction to the French edition of "The Revolt of the Masses", stressing the validity of his theses: "A European wants, above all, to devote himself to something which would give a purpose to his life; he wants to escape the emptiness of his existence; it is not impossible that he will forget his objection to Communism and will be attracted by it - at least by its moral appeal, if not by its substance...". He, probably, has never thought how actual his words will be after 40 years. Of all the doctrines, why Communism? Why Marxism? Is it really suitable for filling a void?

It would be regrettable indeed, if history were to answer these questions in the affirma-

tive. However, it is quite likely. Not because of the "Communist conspiracy", as all the rightwingers would readily proclaim - and certainly I am not one of them. Not even because of the rapid and frightening increase of the military power of the Soviet Imperliams.

It all is possible but for two quite different reasons:

First, the void cannot last for long; it has to be filled. We are witnessing a frantic search for alternatives - spiritualism, a proliferation of the new religious sects, occult, environmental movements - all are the signs of this process. Which one of these feeble, randomly appearing movements, could, successfully compete with the existing, ready, coherent and general - but also the convenient and simple - system of Marxism? It seems doubtful if any of them could. Remarkably, - what philosophy, what "system of beliefs" could the Right and the Center offer in order to compete with Marxism?

Man doesn't require his ideas to "conform to the truth"; to the whole complex of his contemporary reality. Once more Ortega y Gasset: "Deeply in one's heart, one doesn't care much if his ideas are true; One employs them as trenches for defending one's life, like a scarecrow - to escape reality." Perhaps, in the final analysis, in order to survive, we all need some form of escape.

Second reason is no less significant. If in our time - so difficult to comprehend - there is a common aspiration of humanity, then, it is that of equality. Individuals in society and nations, in their

relations with each other, aspire, above all, to an equal status. It is "not fair" from the individual or social point of view - especially, since it is not an equality of opportunity that is called for, but an absolute equality. No doubt, the technological revolution is responsible for this state of mind. In rich countries, the masses have virtually acquired a status of *de facto* equality, regardless of the existing individual or social differences. While profiting on the egalitarian trends of the "consumer society", one has difficulties in putting up with any kind of inequality - even if it were against the common sense and logic. In sum, there appears a need for yet another slogan. Unfortunately, the old Marxist doctrine - dusted, with patched holes and carefully polished - also fulfills this need.

What will emerge to oppose it before it's too late?

Jerzy BONIECKI

TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION AND ETHICO-CULTURAL CHANGES

It seems that the revolution in ethics and morality, with its stormy consequences, began in the countries of the West and Japan at the beginning of the Sixties. As many other events, it was born in America.

America in the last quarter century evokes both a feeling of admiration and hatred in the world. Anti-Americanism, which, during the Vietnam war symbolized the "Imperialism of the perishing world" - that is

Capitalism - was an important element, or, at least, a catalyst of arising changes. It wouldn't be a paradox if I stated that the cradle of anti-Americanism and ethnic revolution as well, was America herself. Although the long discriminated ethnic - racial groups were the beneficiaries of ensuing changes, those who were the first sowers of the ferment belonged to the ethnically and socially, privileged classes. Such, by the way, is, and often was, the mechanism of many social ferments, regardless of dimensions they attain or had attained. In the past, their creators and theoreticians came out, mostly, not from the oppressed, but the oppressing classes, and worked for the sake of a dreamy, or a learned-theorized vision of the future.

Do the ethico-cultural changes, so violently affecting the way of life and opinions of Westerners, have some tangible relation with the new page of civilization - the technotronic revolution? I/ Because the technology - changing the face of the world - has chronologically coincided with the ethico-cultural changes, the question arises, whether these two processes, acting

I/ This term is borrowed from Prof. Z.Brzezinski. It covers all the changes which have evolved from technology based on cybernetics and electronics - with all the resulting technological consequences. Technotronics has revolutionized not only industry and services, but also a number of applied sciences such as medicine, architecture, not to mention the modern warfare. The term "technotronic epoch" will be used in this article, interchangeably with - "postindustrial epoch" that is used by Daniel Bell in his "The Movement of Knowledge and Technology."

simultaneously and in such different areas, are parallel, or whether there is a concrete dependence of one on the other. I believe the latter alternative should be suspected, as, otherwise, that striking chronology would appear highly out of place. In favor of this supposition is also the fact that the Western nations - exactly the Western nations - which created this technology, became the victims of ferment that had revolutionized their ethic and culture. On the other hand, the nations of the Communist bloc and some of the countries of the Fourth World (the Third World doesn't, participate or, in a small degree participates only to benefit from those technological innovations) which eagerly acquire new technology, defend themselves - so far, successfully - against the new ethico - cultural streams encroaching their boundaries. It may be seen most vividly not in the Communist bloc countries, but in the suddenly turned rich countries of the Persian Gulf. Truly, we don't know whether computers may serve any practical use in harems, but it is true that some of the methods of invigilating applied by the authorities against crime, perfected by electronics, coexist with the traditional methods of crime punishment - cutting a hand off.

I'm not oriented if there exists any serious literature which investigates eventual relations between the technotronic revolution and new ethics and culture which bloom in the West, but what strikes me is this important fact: almost total absence of attempts on the part of Marxists to show the correlation between these two important phenomena; Marxists, after all, are armed with a "dialectic" that tells them to detect anything of value to them in the mutual relations of these two phenomena, and to show it to

profanes. The fact that Marxists do not undertake any research worthy of our attention in this direction, proves not only that their official doctrine is dead - our extant experiences with it suffice to underwrite this statement; The matter implies something deeper: That Marxism - even free from the administrative - police wardship of Moscow, Peking, Warsaw or Prague - is not even in the smallest degree on a course of becoming a tool for reaching the depth of historical processes.

* * *

Marxists of all shades or at least those whose voice reaches public opinion, are apt to distinguish two streams in the ethico-cultural revolution experienced by the West: First - in the strictly ethico-moral area, connected with the slogans of neo-egalitarianism. 2/ It gains recognition of the official spokesmen of anti-Capitalism, because it is essentially a symptom of a rebellion against the system. Second, refers to the new shocking morality which is seen - citing as example - in an increased sexuality and loosening of morality. It is not just a rebellion against Capitalism, but a *symptom of its decay*. In other words, in the eyes of Marxists, some aspects of the "revolution" which follow the postindustrial changes, are the positive signs of a virtual anti-Capitalistic rebellion, while the others

2/ In America, in recent disputes about an equal chance for all, there was introduced a very real correction: "recompensated change" for the old injustices.

bear a smell of decaying Capitalistic cadaver. However, in the final evaluation, both represent a progressing downfall and bankruptcy of bourgeois society and all its institutions. The changes of moral values are also shocking to the new generation of Conservativists in the West. Of course, for different reasons than the reasons of the diligent, enthusiastic observers of the "decaying process" of Capitalism. In Conservativists' opinion, human nature in itself is a source of the most unpredictable and mysterious changes. They too, don't try to find a correlation between the changes in human behavior and the post-industrial revolution. Because the "liberation of man" from all his ties is "declined through the all possible cases" by the champions of the new moral trends, it's not surprising that hedonism became - if now not generally proclaimed - a practical philosophy of the young and middle age generation of America and the West. It is seen, above all, in the increased sexuality.

In erotic freedom - which in some of the municipal areas makes an impression of growing sex-mad plague - Conservativists don't want to see *even in part* a reaction toward centuries old prudery and hypocrisy that dominated over this sector of human interrelations. I don't intend to justify everything that happens in the *Times Square* New York, at which the Paris Pigalle of the Fifties may look like a kindergarten of sex and pornography. I only want to point out how far this phenomenon goes in such a puritan country as America was for long; in a country where 20 years ago a policeman ran out from a public beach a 4 year old boy naked, ordering him to put on his pants. Of course, it is difficult - at first sight - in an actual sexual lewdness, to detect a source

of rebellion against prudery. However, it was always like that with almost every rebellion that opposed any imposed or traditional social or moral ties, which in time were either degenerating, or, becoming their own contradiction. There is no need to cite examples. They are evident to everybody. However, to a certain group of conservatives who still think in categories of the old, abstract morality, all of it is just a common, emancipation of the primitive, animalistic instincts, and a riddance of all brakes - whose guardians, through the centuries, was religion. Not denying that a *certain dose* of fairness exists in these stereotypes, I think, they are extremely abbreviated. If not primitive. They explain nothing, or operate on the *a priori* accepted assumptions in which a leading position is taken by the Communist conspiracy that supposedly feeds the growing looseness in moralities, consequently leading toward the ever-increasing weakness of the West. The roots of the present sexual freedom are also present in the changes created by the technotronic revolution, which subject will be discussed later in this writing.

As to this sector of social structural changes which is connected with the ethico-cultural problems, in the top position appears to be the highest value attributed to the life of human being, his safety and social rights - at the visible neglect of the other traditional values cultivated in as unquestionable virtues in all societies of the world. I'll cite them in a moment. Before that, I would like to mention that, although the neo-conservatists, having contempt - in my opinion, quite rightly - toward the promoting the value of human life to the highest rank, remain helpless with regard to the explaining the genesis of

a phenomenon whose substance is the shattering of the traditional hierarchy of principles.

I have used this term on purpose: The shattering of the hierarchy - not its liquidation, because the postindustrial era, by no means destroyed moral principles centuries older than Christianity. What it accomplished, was their general reshuffling. The highest value is bestowed on human life. Dignity, courage, loyalty toward professed ideas, loyalty toward society in which one lives - and, above all, one of the highest virtues - speaking the truth, all it, has not been discarded as worthless ballast. To the contrary: in theory, they all continue to be professed and cultivated. With reservation though - making a human life the highest value 3/ - an ideal, by all means, very humanitarian - has led to the degradation of the other already mentioned virtues which the older generation cultivated to such an extent as to sacrificing sometimes a life for them. Those days in the West and in Japan are gone, whether they return or not time will show. In any case, the history of the last decades, the reactions of public opinion, and, above all, the attitude of the most educated people (at proportionally, not numerous, exceptions) confirm, on the other hand, well known diagnosis. This diagnosis may be illustrated by many examples:

1. Most common is the attitude of the Western governments toward all kind of terrorists (not necessarily toward a Palestin-

3/ Most important slogans of the ethico-cultural revolution in the West had been widely discussed in my article: "About American Neoegalitarianism" in *Kultura of Jan and Feb. Editions* (C.J. - and in the "Fragments", Vol. 3/3/76).

ians only), who attempt to get what they want by threatening to kill hostages. Twenty years ago, negotiations between politically inspired or just common criminals were beyond one's thinking. On the other hand, if the highjackers - acting on land and in air - were not aware of the triumph card in their hands: the prime value of human life confessed by their adversaries, these kinds of operations, would be sentenced to become complete fiascos, and a picture of a common bandit or a terrorist, who with a gun in his hand paralyzes police action, protecting himself by a body of the often randomly chosen hostage would be unthinkable. A similar situation is impossible to imagine either in the Black or Arabian Africa or Asia. 4/ Nobody ever heard about any attempt of kidnapping a local citizen of Persia, Black Africa, Northern-African Arab countries or Emirates of the Persian Gulf. Despite enormous wealth of local oil croesuses, there had not appeared a daredevil who would try to force them to pay a ransom or a political concession, by threatening a common citizen - who is not particularly valued over there - or even a member of governing family. The reason is simple: If among the numerous oppositionists in Libya or Sudan or Ethiopia, some organized terrorist group attempted to kidnap any of inhabitants, or what would be worse, a member of administration, the authorities would not hesitate for a moment to destroy the terrorists on the spot, without the slightest consideration for the fate of hostages. In those countries the only possible terrorist actions are those against the ruling personalities (Morocco, Persia, Iraq, Nigeria and others), but never the

4/ Unless this kind of action occurs against the diplomatic posts of Western countries, or against the West-European experts, advisers, financiers, etc.

attempt of extortion by the methods of a threat to human life. A similar situation, with regard to kidnapping, exist in the Peoples Democracies and in the Soviet Union. Cases of highjacking planes with passengers which had occurred there, were dictated not by political blackmail but by the despair of a highjacker, to whom overpowering of a plane was the only way of escape to freedom.

Zbigniew BYRSKI

(Cont'd in the next issue)

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 4/8

Oct. 1977

by

Charles Joel

Zbigniew BYRSKI

TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION
AND ETHICO-CULTURAL
CHANGES (Continuation)

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 7/348-8 - 8/359/77 - 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.

TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION AND

ETHICO-CULTURAL CHANGES

(Continuation)

2. In almost all the leading nations of the West (with exception of France) capital punishment has been abolished. Considering the appalling atrociousness of the committed murders, especially in the US, it seems that capital punishment as deference from crime should be the most effective way of caring for human life. But it isn't so. Not counting arguments unworthy of our attention, there is a perpetuating belief in rehabilitation, proclaiming the innate and innocent nature of man; the nature of man has been warped by society, civilization in particular. At the base of this belief are the old but never forgotten ideals of J.J. Rousseau. On this occasion we may recollect a passage from the preface to his book "Emile": "Nature made me a good and a happy man. If I changed, it is society that should be blamed for it". Rousseau's theories influenced educational trends which followed later (e.g. the educational school of Pestalozzi), and had helped, over many years, to create a myth about good-by-nature character of man whose sins and vilenesses are always resulting from his

environment or his plight for existence. We might say that this philosophy lies at the base of the differences between leftist-liberal and neoconservatist convictions.1/

The conviction of innate goodness of the human being has for years sustained the belief of people of good will - and the stubborn optimists as well - in the effectiveness of "rehabilitation" even of the most cruel and inhuman criminals, justifying their crimes by difficult environmental circumstances, racial discrimination, etc. However, many voices - with no disregard to the above argument - have, in vain, pointed out the fact that during the great depression of 1929-38 and the real discrimination of the black citizens of the US, criminality in society of these days was proportionately much smaller than it is now. This argument, however, was overlooked. Despite bitter experiences and the absurdity of the idea that any kind of "rehabilitation" may be successful in prison conditions even if a prison is a most comfortable place, this belief persists. To the opponents of capital

1/ On the margin of J.J. Rousseau's views, it is worthwhile to relate the remarks in this matter from the book of a prominent American writer and anthropologist, Robert Ardrey - "The Social Contact" (a Delta book, 1971) page 98: "Considering the epoch J.J. Rousseau lived in" - writes Ardrey - "we shouldn't be surprised at his views. Writing his work long before Darwin and the essay of Raymond Dart ("The Predatory Transition From Ape to Man" - International Anthropological and Linguistic Review vol. 1, NO 4, 1973), Rousseau did not know that the genealogy of *homo sapiens* evolved from a certain species of human shape apes, which, because of changes of climatic conditions, passing from vegetarian to meat diet, must kill in order to survive."

punishment there is only this argument: Taking the life of a murderer means taking one more life without bringing his victim back to life.

3. The prisons and concentration camps in the Third World countries are full of hundreds of thousands, if not millions of natives and a certain undetermined number of Europeans-French, German and English. There - estimating cautiously - perish hundreds of thousands of people every year. The leaders in this category of nations are Cambodia and Uganda - the latter governed by a psychopathic murderer. Western governments and the most educated strata of society that influence them, do nothing in order to *express in practice their care about human life*, which, in contrast with the West, has absolutely no value there. The reasons for this behavior are the same as the reasons which guide the Western opponents to the death penalty. When, some time ago, Idi Amin threatened to execute one of the English scientists, and demanded that delegate of Her Majesty the Queen of England beg on his knees for the life of his countryman, the Englishmen, in order to save his life humiliated themselves in front of loathsome Amin. They did not risk any military expedition which would have ended the reign of Amin and saved lives of not only a few or more Englishmen but tens of thousands of natives. I think that the idea of such an action has been outlandish to them not only because of their internal problems and the fact of the changed world situation - pointing to a risk of confrontation with the protectors of Amin. 2/ The reasons,

2/ Israel, which struggles against sky-high internal difficulties, by its "Operation Entebbe" moved the conscience of not only the defenders of human life", but also evoked some common sense of those who are not the candidates for dying with no resistance. "Operation Entebbe" has shown how

again, were the same reasons that affected the whole public opinion of the West. Protection of human life at any price must automatically exclude the risk of death of other people. This principle, which seemed to be obligatory in the American armed forces during the famous affair of the "Pueblo" in 1968, when all the crew of this ship surrendered, without a shot being fired, to the North Koreans, is not, luckily, applied to the firemen and police that guard the public. However, I don't exclude the possibility that one day somebody may "discover" such necessity and will demand dismantling them.

When in 1975, after the Vietnam defeat, Gerald Ford, in order to save the remains of the vanishing prestige of America sent military units against Cambodian pirates to rescue 26 American merchant navy men kidnapped from the ship "Mayage:", during that extremely difficult operation almost the same number of American *marines* was lost. After this incident a great part of liberal American public opinion reacted as if the whole matter were exclusively a statistic between the number of men lost and saved. The question of prestige and honor of the powerful nation which years ago saved the world from the Reich, was of no importance.

Several days ago, the local press reported how West Germany buys every year

moderate can be the "defender of oppressed nations" - the USSR in a situation where it has to deal with a small but ready for anything opponent. The situation of Israel, which, despite geographical position, belongs to Western world, is exceptional and greatly differs from the Western models. The situation of this country and its people is so complicated that it cannot be included in the theme of this writing.

several thousands prisoners, paying staggering sums of money for them. This strange transaction reminds some other - some 35 years ago! - how the Jewish community in Warsaw paid from time to time a ransom to Gestapo men for the promise of sparing the lives of Jews locked behind the walls of the ghetto. Later - when it was too late - it became clear that the ransoms did not assure life, but only prorogated the death.

* * * *

Just as the idealization of a man as a naturally good creature had its beginning in the second half of eighteenth century, so the explosion of prophylactic measures protecting human life in the West against every risk, appeared, at most, in the last 2 decades, giving it a chronological beginning that coincided with the technotronic epoch. In a time which preceded this new page of history, the human life was of the same value in every part of the world. There is no need for recollection of the almost ceaseless wars carried on by feudal monarchs, which were always ending in a provisional division of the spheres of influence, only to allow them to take a break before starting new wars. An illustration closer to actuality is the war carried on during the development of Capitalism when masters of human lives were not the monarchs and a few elites among the wealthy, but a time when public opinion, trade unions and the press became powerful. The First World War - here I remember the well known figures - accounted for 10 million dead and 20 million wounded men. About another 10 million died from hunger and epidemic. During the period between the two wars, with the exclusion of the countries dominated by Fascism and the Soviet Union, public opinion has grown immensely. Despite this, the number of victims - even if we excluded the number of people murdered in the

Soviet gulags and Hitler's death camps - was 3 times higher in the Second World War than it was in the First.

My theory is that the beginning of the technotronic epoch has created a break in the senseless waste of human lives. The reader will surely contradict this statement by citing the nearly 5 years of the Vietnam War (I count its time from the moment when the American regular units moved into the battlefields of Vietnam). However, I think that despite apparent contradiction, the fact of the Vietnam war doesn't collide with my theory, but confirms it. Without going into the details of the conflict which has been analyzed in every possible aspect, we should rely on two important elements: 1/ Not on the number of victims, which, by the way, was no higher than the number of victims in the Korean war *against which no one except Communist party protested*, but on the growing power of opposing public opinion not only in the US, but also among its European allies against the *"American aggressors."* 2/ And on the fact that in 1964, at a time of the famous Tonkin Resolution, the USSR, in relation to the US, was militarily much weaker than it is now. Objectively speaking, the US could have ended the conflict pretty fast by a sea-land strike in the north. Subjectively speaking, however, the US has been paralyzed by public opinion from which came greater and greater opposition against the war. In such circumstances it should have been perfectly clear to the leaders in Washington that, no matter how superior they are over their opponent, they could not conduct the war and save S.Vietnam. The reason is that the Hanoi government and the Party had one weapon that gave them unprecedented superiority over America: That weapon was the *unlimited dispensable use of their soldiers' lives without any humanitarian con-*

siderations. Hanoi led a war according to the models of the earlier times when human losses were measured not in absolute figures, but in an estimate of how big the percentage of losses in proportion to reserves was. This and only this was important to the Party politburo which held N.Vietnam in iron discipline. Entirely different rules were obligatory in the US. Every soldier lost meant increased opposition and a new anti-war demonstration. Under these circumstances, every large scale operation meant the possibility of new losses for both sides, and even if it could have resulted in curtailing the war, it was torpedoed by the pressure of public opinion.

In an interview with David Frost on May 19, 1977, ex-president Nixon stated that the war in Vietnam was lost not in the southeast Asia, but in Washington. This is a mistake. Nixon would have been closer to the truth if he recognized that the war was lost not so much in Washington as in the university centers of America, which together with the *mass media* were the most zealous carriers of the new morality that had colossal influence on the agglomerations of humanity in large cities. And, because neither the government nor the Congress understood the overall situation and the changes in America, they went for the most stupid compromise in the world. Instead of backing out as soon as possible from the conflict and avoiding the defeat, they chose to escalate the war. This method taught their militarily weak opponent, Hanoi, the proper way to conduct a war against its aggressor. On the other hand, the prolonging agony of the Vietnam war caused the delirium of the liberal opposition and the "New Left," whose influence on public opinion progressed with every new defeat of the US. The Washington establishment comprised of dull

politicians for so many years couldn't understand that it was not living in the times of a 3 day battle as for example, the 3 day "Battle of Nations" at Lipsk in 1813 at which several thousands of men died, but in the epoch in which, by Western opinion every human life is precious, while to the polit-buro in Hanoi the same human life means nothing.

* * * *

In turn, I move to the main part of my deliberations: What connection is there between the technotronic epoch whose development began in the West at the beginning of the Sixties, and a psychological profile of societies which created this new technology, and which take advantage of its conveniences? I should mention here that the question of human priorities and rights which a man is entitled to in view of the enlightened societies of the West, I intend to consider in parallel aspects of two phenomena as old as civilization: *Creating and destroying*. It seems to me that on the background of these two phenomena we have to deal with analogical evolution which degrades some of social values and lifts up some others. Frederick the Great, a long time ago, called his soldiers "cannon fodder". But the function of a soldier of yours corresponded to the function of a peasant, and later during early Capitalism, a laborer. Both, a soldier and a peasant-laborer were only passive tools which served either to kill or to destroy, or to produce food or industrial goods. Considering the meager effectiveness (in comparison with modern death tools) of the weaponry of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the destruction of even one cannon during the Napoleonic wars surely was a greater loss than the loss of a hundred soldiers. The human mass was considered to

be litter to cover the battlefields of those days, and the acquisition of reserves by recruiting was not a difficult problem. The fact that as a result of long wars and, following them, hunger and epidemic, European countries were depopulating, necessitated waiting only until the new generation of "cannon fodder" was supplied.

A similar situation, though of course, not so drastically marked by a massive crop of death, reigned during the years of expanding Capitalism. Here, it went through early stages in different periods of time in England and Europe and, in a different way, - in America. A human life to an owner of manufacturing company or a mine has been exactly the same as the life of a soldier to a great strategist of war. There was only one difference though; it served different aims - not to kill or destroy, but to build and produce. The need, *among many other needs*, for rapid reproduction of new generations for war and peace was a source of a severely restricted sexuality of these days; the only purpose of sexual relation was maintaining the human species - production of children under the protection of the institution of marriage. For this reason all kinds of homosexuality were for ages unrecognized by the morality of those days.

The technology of goods production and raw materials exploitation were parallel with the process of improvements in weaponry whose attending demanded greater qualifications of man. How slow the process of production was, is proved by the fact of a seven day week and 16 hour workday - in some capitalistic countries even at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries. The mechanization of production and an impetuous jump from single shot to automatic weapons still had not elevated the value of

human life to a rank which would force engineers of war to economize on human lives. However, the First World War brought something new - a turmoil in public opinion caused by repetitious, senseless offensives which took hundreds of thousands of lives on the battlefields of France.

Only when the conflicts and micro-wars of the technotronic era *had changed, mainly, into the materiel wars*, the losses in military equipment and the losses in human lives acquired reversed proportions. We can see this reversal from the examples of the Vietnam war and the two short wars in the Near East in 1967 and 1973. The losses in manpower, if we took into account the manifold fire power capacity of a contemporary soldier, are unproportionally low in comparison with death harvest of yore. Modern warfare demands not so much the multitudes of men, as highly qualified specialists. That's why a man became incomparably more valuable than equipment. 3/ Technotronic revolution represents something that goes further than just mechanization. Programming and application of computers in production process increasingly eliminates a need for muscle power and unconscious brain power. Hence the postulates of bringing women into different industries, services and the military. Although all of it is based on the quite often absurd egalitarian theories, the genealogy of this equalization is clear on the background of the

3/ In the Air Force is was properly evaluated during the Second World War, when it was found that the loss of one crew member was costlier than a loss of an airplane.

complete social changes created by the post-industrial epoch.

The effects of technotronic revolution will become easier to understand if we looked at them through a magnifier. In other words - if we imagine its subsequent stage - a general replacement of every physical and even nonphysical work by robots. I don't know if it will ever happen, and I have on this subject some doubts considering, - for example, - the present energy crisis of the world. Nonetheless, modern technotronics suggests strongly a micro-model of the future. It is easy to envisage what would happen to a man in the conditions of absolute automatization. The only value left for him would be the safety and comfort of his life. I think we should stop dreaming about it. If it ever should become real, mankind would exclusively change into a great community of consumers without any need for minimal effort. The vision of this kind of future must raise a shudder of fear because it would threaten an absolute deformation of mankind. I hasten to mention it only from the visualization of the direction its evolution is taking, a process which started with the postindustrial epoch and its actual consequences with regard to the role and importance of man. We came a long way to reach this point. From the building of pyramids at the cost of tens of thousands of the human lives, to the days when at their summits, in full glory of almost holy humanity, stood Western man.

Needless to say that in the technotronic epoch I find the genealogy of the new ethico-moral revolution, no less important, perhaps even more important than the one which was connected with the birth of Capitalism, and, which in Western Europe and England had occurred much earlier than in the US. Capitalism demanding hired manpower created a new morality

which gave birth to a contempt of slavery, an institution thousand of years old. 4/

The technotronic revolution is the mother of a new ideology which proclaims the primacy of a man, his rights and privileges - regardless of his religion, color of skin, and nationality. The West - the US in a leading position - created this technology. The Soviets were creating it too, but to a very insignificant degree - among many reasons, because they too late recognized the importance of electronics, and mainly, because their scientific researches are overwhelmed with the administrative-police control. Truly, the prominent Soviet technologists and physicists have the advantage of many materialistic privileges, but that's not enough for the full devotion

4/ This thesis, being in my conviction one of the best conceived observations on anti-idealistic historical schools of nineteenth century, may be supported by an additional argument. How much morality in politics is shaped (though not always) by economic interests may be seen in the politics of Great Britain during the US Civil War of 1861-65. Great Britain - a cradle of Capitalism - had, long before the Civil War started, enacted a law forbidding the employment of slaves in her possessions. Nonetheless, from the beginning of the bloody conflict (which divided America) Great Britain supported Southern Confederacy - that raised its banners to preserve the slavery. The reason was simple: The English textile industry urgently needed cotton whose supplier was the American South. The conflict of interests and morality in Great Britain was of such magnitude that at a certain stage threatened war between England and the US.

to their scientific researches. Recently, in the Soviet scientific circles, there grows not only a need for freedom, but also a need for the right to oppose, and the Soviets cannot allow it; a condition for entering closely guarded scientific institutions and laboratories, is an "identity card" of a complete loyalty and obedience to the Power. The Soviet leadership knowing that in the atmosphere it created, the prominent Soviet scientists cannot be fully productive, was, and is sentenced to buying the most modern technology from the West - mainly from the Americans. As we know, America and the West do, eagerly, sell it. More eagerly since the abrupt increase in the price of oil - a fact which shook the financial balance of many industrial countries.

A nation which couldn't even produce any technotronic improvements - buying it from the others, - would be able to create a situation in which the lives of its inhabitants would become easier and more comfortable. With it, there would spring and develop some ideas closely related to ideas which affected the way of life in the Western nations. The Soviet Union is in this theoretically potential situation - regardless of what part of electronics it itself creates, and of what part it obtains from the West. In other words, the new technology which in the West brought an ethico-moral revolution with all the consequences I have cited, did not improve conditions of the life for the Soviet citizens. 5/

5/ Of course I write not about the post-industrial changes which no one questions, but about the changes that result from the technotronic revolution which began there slightly later than in the West, and coincided more or less with Brezhnev's ascending to power.

Although the situation of people in the USSR, in the spectrum of civil rights, has not changed since Khrushchev, and - if it changed, it was for worse - we cannot say the same about the situation of the USSR as a whole. To the contrary; Owing to their own technology and that obtained in the West - used mainly for increasing their military power - the Soviets turned to be what they are today: "The savior of the oppressed peoples" according to their own definition, and a candidate for the future owner of the world in belief of others. The fact that the Soviet Union made such and no other use of the old and new technology evolves from two causes: 1/ Ambition for subordinating the world to her - as much as possible without bloodshed - to which goal she is, or was pretty close until recent days. 2/ A striving to upkeep the undiminished power of the party within the Soviet empire. Nobody can deny - since it would be a nonsense - that it is easier to govern citizens who are better fed and dressed, than hungry and in rags. We cannot explain an abundance of deficiencies in consumptive goods solely by priority given to the production of armaments. We know for certain that if the Soviet system functioned more efficiently, then, at the present level of development in agri-technology, the Soviet authorities wouldn't be forced to face the alternatives; an abundance of food and housing, or roc'ets - quantitatively and qualitatively higher than American weaponry. Both would be reachable. However, the totalitarian system cannot be radically changed or improved without a change of the power structure, because it would be equal to the political (if not physical) suicide of the Central Committee with all its additions.

Under these circumstances the USSR tried by all possible means, to obtain new technol-

ogy, suppressing a threat of consequences evolving from technotronic revolution. If the USSR wanted to preserve its system, it had no other choice than doing so. It did not intend to buy or to create the technotronics with "insolvency" which resulted in the West. What I want to say is that from the postindustrial revolution the Soviets desired to take only those things which strengthen their internal and world power. The ideas which followed the postindustrial revolution were treated by them as sideline and an entirely undesirable product. *In this manner, the Soviet leaders once more erased all their ties with Marxism, one of whose basics is the thesis that the new possibilities and production relations should be followed by social relations that would enable their full development.*

* * * *

During the combined tenure of Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon and Ford, the US - which in this period have lived in the full bloom of technotronic revolution - readily rendered accessible its conquests of science to the USSR. In any case, the US did not guard them against the "potential adversary," taking the position that selling them the new technology - which would not necessarily be used for the war industry, - belongs to a common commercial practice. But it could not sell technotronics together with the new ideology arising from it. First, nobody could see any connections between these two matters; Second, it did not comply with good business relations. It would appear as some sort of a "linked trade" when a seller forces a buyer also to accept an article which he doesn't desire, even - as in the case of the Soviet buyer - if he were going to receive it for nothing and without the cost of delivery. I

don't know whether the Carter Administration and his advisors have noticed the relations between the technotronic epoch and the raising of human rights to the highest rank - the rights so long trampled in the Soviet Union and many other countries of the Third World. In any case President Carter took a position well known to the world: Taking advantage of American technological and financial resources by friendly, or even unfriendly countries, without the restoration of human rights (foreseen by the UNO Charter and Declaration of Helsinki), can no longer be practiced. I doubt whether the taking of this position arises from the missionary callings of the new president. Rather, I believe that it is the view of a practical and farsighted politician. New president hasn't discovered any revealing truth: - that supplying the Soviets on credit or for cash with whatever they want, without simultaneously creating a dam against their global appetites, is putting ones head under executioner's ax. But on the other hand, President Carter, realizing how inadequate in comparison with the Soviets is the military potential of the US and her allies, and, which is more important, how low is a fighting spirit of his own people, can quite justly consider that the only actual barrier that would protect the Western world against the Soviet expansionism is the restoration of freedoms and rights of the people, who, by the way, do not want any conquests, but just a quiet and relatively comfortable life. It doesn't appear to me though, that Carter and his security advisor - realistically appraising the situation - counted that by some pressures they would be able to persuade the Soviets to offer their citizens the rights foreseen in so many documents and declarations. First, neither the Americans nor the West have at their disposal any means

of pressure against the Soviets. Reciprocally, this process is in the Soviets' hands. Second, even if a means of pressure existed, no one can force the Soviets to accept Carter's postulates because applying them would be equal to self-destruction of their power.

Knowing the atmosphere in Europe and in its own country, the new American Administration must and should count on something different. On the fact that the growing ferment in the Soviet empire, at the more and more visible signs of recovery in America, will act as catalysts. That the slowly increasing resistance of dissidents in the East will inspire the West with a will for resistance too against the Soviets, and vice versa. I suppose this situation is correctly deciphered by the Soviet leaders, which fact may affect their decisions for fear of not missing any favorable historical occasion. In any case the Soviets do not try to diminish their power in the eyes of the world. To the contrary, the last speech of Gromyko in answer to disarmament propositions of Carter, was aimed at showing Western public opinion the military superiority of the USSR in its full glory, thus making it clear that for capitulation, it is too late. 6/

It is not that Carter is a fanatic

6/ The same purpose served, in my opinion, information obtained from "reliable" sources about a new Soviet absolute weapon - a new kind of laser able to neutralize the whole nuclear arsenal of America. This news given to the public by the American periodical *The Aviation Week and Space Technology* - is, in my opinion, prepared by the Soviet Department of Misinformation.

missionary dreaming about unreachable goal of better and happier world. It is that his predecessors were shortsighted blockheads. If Carter has some of the characteristics of a missionary, it doesn't in any case mean that he is a type of fanatic who wants to get everything - and fast, in particular, to "save the world" by using the economic pressures of his limping country. His "in-consequence" he is reproached with by some of the sillier politicians and newsmen - that why doesn't he apply an easy tariff toward China, since he demands freedom in the Soviet Union, proves that Carter dilligently recognized the weaker triumph cards that America still has, and doesn't intend to lose them in order to please some critics of suspicious character or totally stupid conservatists, to whom the fight against the Soviets means a fight against every kind of Communism, and vice versa. A missionary, who undertakes a crusade - blindfolded would be a catastrophe. A missionary realist, if he is able to win public opinion - even against the Congress and unsteady liberal opinion - may become the only true help to the world and with it to Poland.

I don't know how long Carter will hold out in his politics of opposing the Soviet Union. We don't know what kind of new generation "Munich Pact lovers" will block his attempts or try to persuade him, either that it's too late for capitulation, or that it is possible to find a compromise with the Soviet Union - after all, a nation guided by the same logic as we have, and a power governed by ambitious men. We don't know when a new wave of arguments will arrive, that aiding the Soviets is the best road to tame and humanize them. If Carter yielded under these pressures, America will lose not only the leader who was the hope of the world, but also

the last chance of survival before the deluge.

Zbigniew BYRSKI

New York, May 1977

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 4/9

Nov. 1977

by

Charles Joel

BRUKSELCZYK

WHITE, BLACK AND RED

A translation from the Polish magazine "Kultura" NO 7/358-8/359/ - 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.

WHITE, BLACK AND RED

In August 20, 1977, from Cape Canaveral in Florida the lift off of the American cosmic ship "The US Voyager 1" will take place. In March 1978 the ship will pass by the planet Jupiter, in November, 1979 by Saturn and several years later it will depart the solar system. Because of a strong possibility that in the universe beyond the solar system there may live some intelligent creatures, some wise people decided to equip the *Voyager* not only with technical instruments, but with a proclamation from us humans. Like a bottle thrown into the depth of the ocean, the *Voyager* will take a copper plate with an imprinted message of Mr. Waldheim and 14 UNO delegates - the members of the commission for peaceful exploitation of cosmos. With a characteristic of Mr. Waldheim and his institution lack of sense of humor, he sent to the cosmos the news that "We leave the solar system and enter the universe in the name of peace and friendship." Believing that the recipients of the message in the universe do not know the effects of activities conducted by the institution led by him under the same slogans - here on the earth, Mr. Waldheim and the 14 respectable gentlemen think, that somebody in beyond our solar system would believe in human wisdom expressed in such manner.

I'm sorry that I don't have at my dis-

posal a rocket which would stop this action - here on earth or in cosmos. What a pity. Because... because. If beyond our system there actually live some intelligent creatures, it is doubtful they will understand the real sense of Waldheim's sonata; they will know that it is propaganda, a dream never to be realized here - on earth - where everything happens to be in reverse, where for ages we have joyfully murdered one another, in which process, by the way, the UNO - author of the message, by its cynicism, hypocrisy and weakness greatly cooperates. The intelligent creatures beyond our system will surely loose their desire to make any contact with us, and everything will come to nothing. If however, beyond the solar system there live unintelligent creatures, or, in fact, nobody lives there, then it isn't worthwhile to send anything, to spend a lot of money on recording stupid messages.

But, as I said, to stop the expedition beyond the sun, I have no power. So, I decided to take a reversible position. I propose - as long as there is time - to supplement the copper plate. I propose adding to it a word from ambassador Andrew Young, Jr. I base my proposition formally and meritoriously: formally, because Mr. Young is presently and - as he, himself thinks - will be during the subsequent 8 years, the Ambassador of the US at the UNO; meritoriously, because the world message would be incomplete without at least a few political reflections of Andy Young. He is the most often cited American politician of 1977; he just cannot - though he insists saying that he tries - "stay off the front pages of the world press." Consequently, no message that expresses the wisdom of a sunny world should ignore Young.

Who is Andy Young? The son of a wealthy dentist, Andy Young, 45 years old, has 3 daughters, a son, and several colossal qualities.

First, he is a negro. His parents wanted him to become a doctor or dentist and to continue the strengthening of the middle bourgeois negro class - successfully breaking the racial barriers in the US. But he heard spiritual voices and chose the career of a clergyman. Studied theology, practiced as a pastor in several parishes, but soon moved into politics, to active work for equal rights for negroes. Prominently clever, witty, easy going (Today he introduces his guests to his servant, and eats breakfast with his chauffeur), a product of a strange but usually fruitful blood mixture, having Indian ancestors and also a great-grand-father with the name of ... Czarnowski (who said that among Carter's closest advisors only Brzezinski has Polish blood?), Young quickly advanced and became Martin Luther King's closest cooperator.

Second, Young is a friend of President Carter. Their paths crossed many years ago when both were making political careers in the South. At the moment of Carter's start toward the White House, Young, at once took his side, bringing also the black votes which most probably decided Carter's victory.

Third, Young is something like a Carter *catharsis*. Carter reproaches himself that he was too late in entering the action on behalf of the negro equal rights movement. By granting Young an exceptional position, Carter seems to admit that in some ways he is catching up, that he is compensating for his delays. This may be the only way to explain why Young is the first American ambassador that has the full rights of a

cabinet member, has his own offices and his own staff not only in New York but also on the exclusive sixth floor of the State Department, next door to Vance. This may also explain why Carter not only tolerates Young's gaffs and follies - for which any minor clerk in the American embassy in Pernambuco would be thrown out - but takes it all as his own responsibility and after every Young stumble, signs a new check *in blanco* for him.

Feelings and politics

Well, this kind of vouchsafing may become very tedious and nauseous an occupation, because Young surely is the most loquacious American diplomat. He constantly surpasses dubious records of mixing accurate observations with astonishing trash. Not long ago, he offended the USSR, Sweden and England. "Russians" - said Young - "have only Marxism to propose to Africa, while what Africa needs above everything are goods; Russians are just common racists and will never influence Africa." Then he referred to Sweden. A country which harbors thousands deserters from the Vietnam war, among them, many negroes, was described by Young as a racist country where negroes are treated like negroes of the famous New York Queens. England, in his eyes "has never stopped despising colored peoples." In addition, he moved from the states to personalities. Presidents Ford and Nixon are common racists too. Reactions were mixed. Moscow felt offended, the Swedes and English too, but finally laughed it all off. Ford kept silent, but others tried to defend his honor. Nixon was silent too, but in defense of his honor nobody said a word.

A lot of his statements might be pardonable if Mr. Young referred only to racism. Understanding means forgiveness, and I, for

example, understand well the position of Young on racism. All of us have right to have our own views on racism, but none of us is a presidential "catharsis" that can talk loudly and from a high political position about it. The situation worsens, however, when Mr. Young in similar fashion turns toward politics. In this domain and on this level the color of the skin and the experiences connected with it, should not be deciding in politics. Politics should not be mixed up with sentiment. Some of the "special envoys" or "permanent delegates" accuse me that in my writings I'm settling my own private accounts with Poland, Russia and the whole camp of Socialism and Peace. How is it that I, just a newspaperman has accounts with the superpowers; and above all - all of it is a lie. I only deal with facts, with an appraisal of the relationship of powers in the world; an admission of emotions in evaluating realities would mean twisted facts and wishes, would lead to stammering, or to an easily detected lie, to an end of journalism, and transition to propaganda. In diplomacy, this principle is much more ruthless. I have different aspirations. The result of journalistic sentimentality may be a bad article. The result of sentimentality in diplomacy may be a world war.

Mr. Young, although he is the Ambassador of the US at the UNO, spends most of his time in Africa. It's his business, though some people think he is the Ambassador of Africa in the US. Much worse is that Young himself thinks he has a special mission to fulfill. A mission of double character. First, a general one: to force the American people to openly talk about the foreign politics of the US. "There must be a way" - says Young - "to take international politics out of the area exquisitively reserved for the experts working in secrecy. This is a

monopoly which brought up all the tragedies of the last 2 decades." Second: When we finish with this monopoly, we should try to extinguish the paranoic - according to Young - fear of Communism. "It's ludicrous" - cries Young - "that the greatest power on earth panics everytime a thousand Cubans appear in some remote part of the world. I never feared Communism. The Cubans can do nothing which American Might wouldn't be able to cope with." In sum, Young wants to make the American people "to think creatively, as only then we may contribute to the building the new world."

A very great stabilization

In order to make people think creatively and to reshape the world, Young made in May a 17 day voyage to the eight African countries. Although it was difficult to foresee that the travel of black ambassador could make a break through African matters, Young was satisfied. "I'm a modest man" - he said - "and I truly believe that the outlook is excellent."

What is this excellent outlook? What is it that is so rosy that Young discovered in Africa in May, 1977. Let us try to find in his announcements some of the keys to these secrets.

About Angola: "The presence of Cubans is not necessarily a negative phenomenon. The Cubans in Angola are a stabilizing factor. If the domestic war continued, there would be no one to talk with in this country. If Cubans withdrew from Angola, president Neto wouldn't be in power." Ambassador Young was not wrong. Several days after this announcement there was an attempt of a coup d'état and if it had not been for the

Cubans, president Neto indeed wouldn't be in power.

About Abyssinia: "Ethiopians murder one another. I believe that the presence of Cubans there may have a good influence and would stop bloodshed in Abyssinia." So far - they have not had much effect, as about 5,000 students and other educated people were shot. The recovery of their mortal remains by relatives costs \$150 each. "On account of returning the cost of ammunition" - explain the true revolutionaries.

Two meetings belong to the most unforgettable experiences of ambassador Young in Africa. The first, with one of the most popular black leaders in S.Africa, "chief" Gathsa Butelesi. Both gentlemen sang unisono the hymn "Nkosi Sikebela and Afrika" or "God Bless Africa," after which Young went to his second meeting. In Maputo, the capital of the marxist republic of Mozambique, he met Mr. Valdez Vivo, a Cuban politician. They had a "long and friendly talk" and Valdez invited Young to Cuba to meet the chief of the "stabilizing factors" in Africa...

Well, while Young was singing "God Bless Africa," and talking with the "stabilizing factor", this factor, without singing hymns, was preoccupied with the stabilizing. Not long before the journey of ambassador Young, a similar safari was undertaken separately, although not through the same countries, by the leading stabilizers, Podgorny and Castro. It was a completely marvelous merry-go-round; gentlemen trotted on each other's heels; vanished in mysterious circumstances; the whole of Africa was full of echoes of salutatory and stabilizing salvos, and, finally - to the

general applause and with an accompaniment of a joyful music, both gentlemen fell in each others arms in the Kremlin. The balance of these stabilizing activities may be expressed as follows:

Angola: 12,000 Cuban soldiers and 3,000 "civilian" advisors. The Cubans fight on all internal fronts of Angola, guard (for Angola) the oil enclave at Cabinda, train partisans of Namibia and Rhodesia, trained (poorly) the so called gendarmes of Katanga, who attempted to invade one of the richest places in the world - the Katanga province in the south of Zaire. The Cubans control all the higher levels of administration, police and security, and guard the safety of the president.

People's Republic of Congo: Several hundred military advisors teach the natives how to use Soviet weapons. Very clever pupils: they were able to kill president Nguabi, and to punish by death the "assassins."

Guinea: Several hundred Cuban advisors stabilize the situation. President Seku Ture is still alive.

Guinea-Bissau: The Cubans advise on every level of administration. President alive, under security guard of the *barbados*.

Mozambique, Tanzania, etc., etc., idem: In Somalia the Cuban advisors are not needed because for quite a long time the Soviets are advising there. There are a few words about Abyssinia to be added: The first hundred Cuban advisors are already in Addis Ababa. In June the next 500 are expected to arrive. Castro, who granted an interview to Miss. Barbara Walters, the most expensive broadcaster in the world (one million dollars annually), from ABC, assured the American

people and ambassador Young, that this is strictly a matter in which only civilians are involved and that their influence there, will be exquisitely stabilizing. However, during his visit in Addis Ababa Castro said something completely different. "The Abyssinian revolution is very much like the French and the Russian revolutions," shouted the chief stabilizer, "my visit here is not an official visit of the head of state, but the visit of a companion-in-arms who came to express his solidarity with Abyssinian revolution." Fidel forgot to add that several weeks before his visit in Addis Ababa general Arnoldo Ochoa, the chief of the Cuban *Africa Corps*, stayed also there and discussed every element for the absolute stabilization of Abyssinia.

Of course one must keep calm. As ambassador Young teaches, don't get panicked; the list cited here is not a final one; we must wait for a serious inventory; Africa is not a Cuban colony yet. But, at this moment, neither Cuba, nor the final colonizer of Africa, is a subject of our concern. Behind the folkloristic messianic mission stands the whole, or almost the whole power of the USSR. The great game in Africa is not played by Cuba, but by the USSR. In order to realize its "stabilization" program for Africa (and it represents an important part of the world *kriegspiel*), Russia tries, as much as possible, not to act under her own name. Hence, the historic role of the Cubans.

The proposal of entrusting Fidel with running the "stabilization" action in Africa has not been wholly preposterous. In 1965 Che Guevara appeared in the Congo jungle when Moscow had not yet trusted Castro, when Castro already lost his confidence in Guevara,

and when both - Moscow and Castro, had not yet the necessary means for undertaking the action. Now, Moscow has everything.

What does she have? First of all a clear outlook on the world situation, on the disposition of forces in the US, on the weaknesses of the West; she has her own superpower aspirations, a consciousness of an assured status. In other words she has a conviction that she must grab everything that is possible to grab and ... "watch what will happen". Above all, she will grab everything that the Americans abandon in the post-Vietnam shock, in accordance with ambassador's Young principle of nonpanicking.

In all this the Cubans are perfect performers. First, for "objective" reasons they had to stop exporting the revolution to the region of their natural expansion - Latin America. Africa, sunk in chaos and "not subjected to panic" gives Fidel a colossal chance to realize his sick ambitions. Second, which is most essential for the success of every kind of messianic mission, Fidel has fantastic troops, trained by the Soviets and equipped exquisitely with the Soviet weaponry which Russia sends to Africa and which serves the stabilization. Third, the Cubans are not all whites, they are 25% black, not to mention the colored, which fact facilitates penetration on the principle of human and ideological mimicry. A colonial slogan cannot be sold today by a White in Africa. But a Black, especially an armed Black - that's a different story. It isn't coincidental that Castro doesn't stop shouting: "The Cubans are not only Latin-Americans, but Afro-Americans too."

The effect of all this is that the

white colonizer in the Black Africa is, in reality, a red but invisible colonizer. A perfect operation and so very convincing that Fidel who invaded Angola, moving by Soviet ships and planes the whole expeditionary corps from the island 10,000 km. away, can today, even without evoking a smile from ambassador Young, cry: "Every attack on Angola will be treated as an attack on Cuba." In other words, he tells us exactly what Krushchev told us after the massacre in Hungary, and Brezhnev after the "stabilization" of Czechoslovakia. The world looks at it all, and doesn't panic, because Mr. Young defines it not as an invasion but as stabilization. And what would Mr. Young say if it weren't Angola, but, for example, if Luxemburg would occupy blood-covered Uganda, sending there its troops in the French planes - in the name of stabilization, shouting - "every attack on Uganda will be treated as an attack on Luxemburg and prince John and his family." If Luxemburg attacked Uganda, ambassador Young would describe it as an impermissible act of aggression of a white colonizer. Black or lanky Cubans in Angola - and anywhere else - however, is an "act of stabilization" or simply, one more "African peripatetic."

I won't offend the readers of *Kultura* by writing what all this business is about, on what ideology Moscow assures all the colossal logistics needed for the Cuban safari. I still don't know to what degree all this operation will succeed. Russia herself doesn't know if she can, in the historically defined future, ultimately "stabilize" Africa. But at this moment, from the bases located on both shores of Africa, (deep harbors in Luanda, Beira, Nakala, Porto Amelia, airfields in Angola, Somali, Ethiopia and Mozambique, including

the island of Barasato where the East Germans just installed the most modern radar system), Moscow has military control over the route through which flows 70% of all oil to Western Europe, not to mention other raw materials. Without falling into a panic - as ambassador Young advises us - let's add that South Africa, which is the final goal of destabilization followed by stabilization by Cubans and Moscow, supplies the free world with 95% of platinum, 90% of chromium, 75% of vanadium, 70% of gold, 70% of manganese, not to speak of other strategic minerals necessary for life and defense of the yet unstabilized parts of the globe.

What results from it is that the TASS agency was right when it attacked Young. Of course, not because of his belief in the stabilizing mission of Cubans, but for his statement that "the USSR exports only ideology and arms to Africa." Yes indeed, it is harmful to the USSR, because, in the first place, what Moscow exports to Africa are the Cubans.

In politics things may happen too late too...

In connection with all I have said above, I allow myself - with due respect to ambassador Young - to draw his attention to some of the not entirely convincing elements of his reasoning.

When Young states that "not until recently the North was thinking only in white," Young was right. However, he is wrong in telling that a right answer to it may be the situation in reverse, when the "South will be thinking only in black." The world - like TV - is not only in black-white; the world is of many colors. One of the alternatives is

thinking exclusively in red.

When Young declares that "it would do a lot of good to South Africa if it had a short and temporary marxist government," then he is right from the educational point of view. The regime of *apartheid* truly deserves a good lesson. But he is wrong declaring that a marxist government had, at any time in the past, taught anybody Democracy and anti-racism; and that it is possible to have a marxist government "for 15 minutes." Mr. Young shouldn't forget that the only changes in the direction of Democracy occurred in fascist countries, and that not a single communist country had ever been democratized. Mr. Young should not ignore the fact that Greece, Portugal and Spain and not Poland or Czechoslovakia have today the system that is close to Mr. Young's and President Carter's heart. And that racism prevails in the USSR and is not at all present in Spain.

Consequently, when Young insists that the presence of Cubans in Angola and anywhere else may act as a stabilizing factor, then he is right. But, he should remember that this is colonial stabilization - so much disliked by him. In the name of this same stabilization, Hitler invaded Sudetes and Austria, the Russians arranged the blood-bath in Hungary in 1956, and invaded Czechoslovakia in 1968. And what will ambassador Young say when on the day of Tito's death (he just reached the age of 85 years) the Serbs and Croatians will grapple, as in the old days, at each other throats, and the red armies will occupy Yugoslavia, march to the ports of the Mediterranean Sea, threaten Italy and the whole of north Africa, not to mention the Near East - and all in the name of stabilization. And what was so

different in what Syria was doing in Lebanon? Every occupation of any country acts as a stabilizer, at least for a while. Finally, the Ku Klux Klan, the organization well known to Young - especially to his non-Polish ancestors - was, in the South after the US Civil War, also acting in the name of stabilization.

The US ambassadors to the UNO before Young were an Irishman, Moynihan and a Jew, Goldberg. Neither of them used their posts in the interests of Ireland or Israel (though in the case of Israel TASS and PAP have had different opinions).

The editor of *Kultura* replied recently to the question in the American magazine *The National Review*, regarding a hope which the democratic Polish immigration may connect with the fact that a politician of Polish descent seats at the right hand of Carter. *Kultura*, very wisely replied that it has great hope that Professor Brzezinski will have acted according to the interests of not the Polish immigration, but in accordance with the interests of the US, in which, his knowledge of Eastern European matters may be very useful. Let's express our hope that the knowledge of racial problems will let ambassador Young act to the benefit of the United States, and not to the benefit of narrowly conceived interest of class, color or regional groups.

Mr. Young is right when he insists that there is no need for panicking everytime somewhere in the world there appears a thousand Cubans. But the nonpanicking should evolve not from the ignorance but from a reasonable analysis of a situation, not from a naiveness but from a sense of reality. The lack of experience

ought not authorize Young to make political deductions. Mr. Young insists that never in his life has he felt threatened by Communism. It is probably true (though there are many who have felt - and how much! - oppressed), but if Mr. Young ever felt he was being threatened by plague or cholera he would not hesitate to be inoculated if he happened to be a partner in the stabilization of the slums of Calcuta or Old Delhi. A refusal of political inoculation also threatens infection and sickness. And, as in medicine, so in politics, sometimes it may be too late too...

Mr. Young should study a little more. Theology allows a certain perception of the other world. But history teaches about our real world. Truman, for some 5 years believed "Joe" Stalin to be a man of honor, until he had matured and proclaimed his "doctrine" which prevented the stalinization of Greece, Turkey, etc. Kennedy traveled to Vienna to meet Krushchev, full of naive belief in his peace and save-civilization mission and in Nikita's good will. He had matured to the presidential function, but only after threatening world war, in order to throw out of Cuba (for how long?) the Soviet atom rockets.

Of course, if it all related to Andy Young, it would even be entertaining. The political folklore would become enriched, and the world wouldn't suffer because of it. But this is a matter of President Carter and The United States. The presidential "catharsis" and the stings of remorse, his friendliness toward Young, and the feeling of blame because of the delayed antiracial fuse, should not induce him to tolerate and absolve statements that are harmful to America and create anger and

ill-feelings, for example, in Eastern Europe where the discoveries of Mr. Young help - no doubt against his intentions - to fortify everything that is called Brezhnev's doctrine, which is nothing but the occupation of half of Europe by the Soviet armies. Surely, it is true that this is not a matter of Negroes, but of the common white Poles, Czechoslovaks or Germans... there is only some poor 100 million of people, who one day could be helpful to America... And, after all, this is a matter of the true, most sincere friends of America in the whole world.

I read recently a wise and beautiful attempt of defining what is it that we call an experience: "It is the knowledge obtained not through lecture, but through touch, sight, hearing, through successes and failures, through sleeplessness, devotion, love, through all the human endurances and emotions which are on this earth a part of all humanity and every individual human being, and, perhaps, also through loyalty and respect for certain things that are invisible to our naked eye."

This definition belongs to Adlai Stevenson, the most magnificent of all the predecessors of Young in the post of US ambassador to the UNO. I wish Young, in his experience, to have more successes than failures, more respect toward things that he wasn't able, or had not yet occasion, to see with his own eyes.

This I wish him in the interest of the United States, and in his own.

And, in my own too.

BRUKSEL CZYK

Written in June 12, 1977

75¢

Fragments

Vol. 4/10

Dec. 1977

by

Charles Joel

Adam KRUCZEK

IN THE SOVIET PRESS
(excerpts)

A translation from the Polish
magazine "Kultura" NO 7/358-8/359,
9/360, 10/361 - 1977

No part of this work may be repro-
duced in any form without permission
from the editor except for the quo-
tations 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)

On June 2, 1977, the Soviet television audience was able to view the father of the constitution, the leader and manager of the Soviet nation. Leonid Brezhnev appearing at the French week conclusion on Soviet TV, was seen by the West, as French TV transmitted his appearance. The father of the constitution looked like his own monument: Golden medals adorned his jacket from one flap to the other, and in the background there was a small shelf with 5 volumes of the collective works of Leonid Brezhnev.

The Brezhnev constitution preserves all the democratic rights which were conferred upon the Soviet citizens by the Stalin constitution: rights of every kind - from the freedom of speech, meetings and demonstrations to the guaranteed immunity of homes, privacy of correspondence and phone talks. To be sure, a small supplement explains that all these freedoms and rights are guaranteed, but only if they are synchronized with "the

interests of working people" and if they are directed "toward the strengthening of Socialism". This supplement was also included in the Stalin constitution proclaimed in Moscow at the time of the conclusion of the first great trial, and when many other trials were under way. By a strange coincidence, the Brezhnev constitution was proclaimed in Moscow while simultaneously appeared the news about the prosecution - just about to begin - of the Jewish activist Anatol Schcharanski, accused of spying connected with foreign intelligence, etc. The most difficult task for the creators of the Brezhnev constitution was the solution to the nationalisms' problem. We know today, that among the many gigantic plans of Khrushchev - the forefather of the new constitution - was the administrative plan for the reconstruction of the Soviet Union, in which the federal republics would be deprived formally of authority to even govern. We may assume that the 10 year delay in introducing the Brezhnev constitution was connected with a desperate search for a formula to limit the republics' power. As a result, everything remained as before - as in the Stalin days. The republics have been allowed to retain their rights - among them *the right to leave* the union. What they were deprived of was the right of having their own territorial military forces. Doubtless, this right, as well as the other rights, was only theoretical, and existed only on paper. We must add, however, that among Khrushchev's projects there was also a project for greatly reducing the Soviet army, while simultaneously creating territorial units - local military formations of the individual republics.

Fifteen years after Khrushchev concept, the demographic tendencies in the Soviet Union became more visible and the danger of the "yellowing" of the Soviet army - most

real. The late minister of defense of the USSR, Marshall Grechko, in the book "The Armed Forces of The Soviet Union" (Moscow, 1975), sharply attacks the concept of creating territorial formations as hostile to the "multinational Soviet army". Hence, we may suppose that Khrushchev's idea had many proponents since the result of these disputes and disagreements on it was to be included in the new constitution.

The new chapter of the constitution is the foreign policy. The basic lines of the Soviet foreign politics are fixed in the constitution - we may say - for eternity. What calls for our attention to the text is the lack of the word whose sound makes the hearts of Western politicians beat fast - *détente*. The aims of the Soviet foreign politics are delineated clearly and unequivocally: "... the foreign politics of the USSR ought to secure international conditions favourably to the building of Communism in the USSR". To fulfill this mission it ought to "fortify world Socialism, support the nations that fight for their independence and social progress...".

In this way, the matter of helping "fighting nations" became the internal matter of the Soviet State, and any criticism, for example, of Soviet intervention in Angola or Ethiopia, will be treated as an intolerable interference in the internal matters of the Soviet Union. From now on, the Soviet foreign politics will be - according to the new constitution - bound to the widening of the Soviet influence in order to "help the building of Communism in the Soviet Union".

In his first TV appearance - after the birthday of the new constitution - Leonid

Brezhnev looked unusually solemn, self-assured, and in a somewhat threatening voice warned the West - the US in particular - not to interfere in the "internal matters of Moscow, even in those cases in which matters are outside Peace and Socialism".

The new Soviet constitution doesn't differ much from the old one. In sum, its main goal amounts to putting the general secretary on the top of the Soviet power pyramid. He doesn't need anything more now. His own monument in Moscow is well secured. In order to close the matter of changing Stalin uniform for Brezhnev, the decision has been made to introduce a new Soviet national anthem. As we know, for the last 2 decades the Soviet anthem was a song without words, because in its original text there was the statement: "We were taught by Stalin". This statement is entirely justified - considering the overall behavior of the present Soviet leaders, but Brezhnev doesn't like any connection with historical names - except Lenin's. That's why on Sept. 1, 1977, the Soviet citizens will sing the new words, the music - as we say - is exactly the same. So much the better, because the "music" of general Alexandrov, which became the national anthem of the Soviet Union, was the anthem of the Bolshevik Party.

* * *

The Soviet press did not write much about the Congress of Psychiatrists in Honolulu. In the not too numerous articles there were some unclear allusions about CIA intrigues, about "calumniators" who dared to insist that in the Soviet Union "psychiatry is used as a weapon against dissidents".

However, the Western press has devoted considerable attention to the Congress which lasted from August 31st to Sept. 3rd, 1977. The best formulation of the disputed problems was published by a certain French newspaper, in an article titled "Pliushch won by a 2 vote margin". And, indeed, with 90 votes against 88 the Congress passed the resolution of contempt for the systematic abuse of psychiatry by the Soviet Union for political ends.

Two votes is not a great majority, but considering that in the past there has never been a resolution of contempt for the USSR politics on the international forum, and remembering that the world public opinion - including a great number of Western psychiatrists - had changed under the pressure of the overwhelming evidence given by the Soviet dissidents who paid for it - and still pay - by years spent in psychiatric asylums and gulags, we may evaluate this two vote resolution in the Congress, as an enormous victory of the spirit over the merciless brutal force.

Six years ago, the day before the opening of the first psychiatrist Congress which took place in Mexico, Vladimir Bukowski managed to pass a *dossier* to the West, which contained many documents - among them the texts of psychiatric experts' reports which proved psychiatry was used in the war against dissidents. Bukowski titled his collection of documents: "A new psychiatric disease in the USSR". The psychiatrists gathered in Mexico refused to discuss the situation in the Soviet Union; the Soviet delegation threatened to leave the Congress and the Psychiatrist Federation if this matter appeared on the agenda. Victor Tajnberg, who in autumn 1977 was sent to a Soviet psychiatric asylum in punishment for demonstrating in Red Square against the occupation of Czechoslovakia

was telling after he left the Soviet Union, that during the conference in Mexico, there was a definite improvement of conditions in which the patients of the asylums had lived. However, the next day after the Congress in Mexico ended, the patients had been returned to the usual tortures and forced medication - exactly as before - by injections of maddening drugs.

It's difficult to predict, whether the situation of prisoners in the Soviet psychiatric asylums will change for the better after the passing of the resolution in Honolulu. But for the time being it should suffice to know who the members of the Soviet delegation there are. On the 30th anniversary of Hitler's defeat Leszek Kolakowski wrote a wonderful essay envisaging how the world would look had the Germans won in 1945. But even Kolakowski with his enormous imagination, wouldn't even dream about describing the World Congress of Doctors, in which doctor Mengele would talk about the experiments he conducted in Auschwitz, which contributed to progress in medicine. In the Soviet delegation to Honolulu were academicians Sneznevski, and prof. Morozov, the director of the famous Institute of Serbski in Moscow - the main theoreticians of the fight against dissidents by locking them in psychiatric asylums. We can't expect because of some resolutions that any changes in treatment of the sick will result from this kind of people. We may suppose though, that only the rank and file doctors will try to use this resolution to ease the conditions of the sick. But we must remember that in doing so these doctors will be violating the "oath" they take and sign when receiving their medical diplomas. Before the revolution, the Russian doctors were taking the *Hippocrates oath*. Today, in the country of "pro-

gressive Socialism" Hippocrates is long forgotten. "I swear solemnly" - declares the Soviet doctor - "to support and to develop the beautiful tradition of national medicine. To perform all my activities on the principle of Communist morality. To remember always the high authority of the Soviet doctor, and the responsibility toward the people and the Soviet State". There is no word about the sick in this oath.

The condemnation of the Soviet Union by the Congress of the World Federation of Psychiatrists means, above all, a victory for the Soviet dissidents - for those who are free or in prison in the Soviet Union as well as for those who on immigration tell the truth "about the country of developed Socialism".

We may expect that the Soviet authorities will try to seek revenge for this defeat in Honolulu. For the past several months in Moscow preparations have been under way for a trial; its goal - delivering a mortal blow to the movement that exists around the "Helsinki group". The most important elements of this show-case for Soviet judiciary system are ready. Those are: The arrested, the fabricated accusations and the provocation. What's needed now is having proof of repentance of one of the accused. G. Medvedev - who was in Paris on the occasion of the publishing of his book "N. S. Khrushchev - The Years in Power" - said to the reporters of *Le Monde*, that in Moscow hundreds of witnesses are being judicially investigated "in connection with the Ginsburg affair - in order to make the case proceed with a special vigour". The case of Yakir and Krasin took 150 volumes of material - only slightly less than the case of Goering and his colleagues sentenced in Nuremberg. Preparing the case of Orlov, Ginsburg and Shcharanski, the KGB

had, no doubt, collected hundreds of volumes of confessions, but it is possible that there is still not enough evidence necessary to convict them on charges of the betrayal of country.

* * *

While the trial is under preparation, the International Book Fair is already - for the first time! - open in Moscow. For the first time the Muscovites may - after standing hours in line for tickets - look at books published in the West. Under the spell of colossal profits - with which for 60 years the Western capitalists were tempted by a mythical Soviet market - Western publishers agreed to submit to very severe censorship: Heaven forbid! The visitors are not permitted even to glance at the censored books.

The organizers of the fair understood well what kind of risk they are taking: Despite the most severe scrutiny there is always a chance that on some stall there might be hiding an innocent but (you never know about the books!) somehow, a harmful book. But they took the risk because of the "developing of cultural relations with the West". Since the signing of the Declaration at Helsinki, Soviet propaganda puts a lot of stress on the "widening of relations", which - according to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union - should be achieved by the increased export of the Soviet literature to the West. The chairman of the Soviet Agency for Authors' Rights, Boris Pankin stated the day before fair opening that it will be devoted to literature. Pankin stressed that the Soviet Union counts on better an acquaintance of

the West with the Soviet writers, and the balancing of the disproportionate exchange of literature between the East and the West.

A candidate for philological scientist, Alexandr Mularchyk complained in *Izvestya* about the inequality of cultural exchange between the USSR and the US in the area of books publication, the staging of theatrical plays, TV - Radio programs, etc. A member of the Science Academy, N.T. Pedorenko, revolted in *Literaturnaya Gazeta* against the "humiliating disproportion" in publishing the translations of Western writers in the Soviet Union and the Soviet writers in the West. Between 1946 - 1972, in the USSR there were 6,350 works of Western writers published and in the same period the US published 450 translations of the Soviet writers. The Soviet propagandists insist that this is impermissible. They reason: Since the Soviet Union is equal with the US in the area of intercontinental missiles and nuclear warheads, then it is high time to become equal in the area of books, film-art etc. Let's say, for example, that a Soviet publishing house issues a translation of Faulkner; consequently, the US must publish a translation of Markov. Besides, the Soviet leaders demand that they should have the right of not only to choose those Western writers who should be translated, but also the right to indicate to the Western publishers the Soviet authors whose books should appear in the West.

The specificity of the Soviet system causes many books of the prominent Western writers to be published in the USSR. An explanation of this fact is simple. Every really true writer has a critical attitude toward his epoch and society he lives in. As Yevgeny Zamiatin wrote: A true writer is a heretic. Soviet propaganda uses Western literature as material for the "unmask-

ing of Capitalism". However, only a true Soviet writer apotheosizes the Soviet regime. Soviet propaganda wants him for the disseminating of the lies about the country of the "developed Socialism".

But there are also some of the Soviet writers who don't obey the established norms; it refers not only to dissidents whose - as Mularchuk sarcastically remarked - works are preferred by the bourgeois publicists, but also to the more or less loyal writers who in their books try to smuggle some "grain of truth". This is the reason why the control over what literature from the Soviet union should be published in the West is necessary.

On August 20, there was in Moscow the burial of a writer whose works are impetuously recommended for translation in foreign languages, although he wrote in 1924 the only book whose title will remain in literature. In the epitath in *Literaturnaya Gazeta* we read: "Died, a prominent Soviet writer and social activists, delegate to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the hero of Socialist work, the Chairman of the governing board of the Soviet Writers Union". Then followed all the rewards bestowed on him: "The Golden Star of Socialist Worker, Four Orders of Lenin, Order of the October Revolution, two orders of the Red Banner, and many medals". In addition there was a mention of "The Laureate of the State Reward" (some time ago it was known as the Stalin Reward) and the rewards of Bulgaria, East Germany and Mongolian Peoples Republic. It is interesting that in all the epitath in honor of the deceased there are only two of his novels mentioned, and nothing is said about his best book.

Constantine Fiedin - it's he we write about - is a magnificent example of something which Arcady Byelinkov called - "The capitulation and destruction of the Soviet intelligent". Constantine Fiedow who began his career with an excellent novel "Towns and Years," ended it as *apparatchik*, taking an active role in hunting for Boris Pasternak and Solzhenitsyn. V. Kavyerin wrote to his ex-friend Fiedin in 1968: "A writer who puts the noose round the neck of another writer, is a scum of a man who will remain forever in the history of literature, independent of what he wrote, but entirely dependent on what another writer created."

The Secretary of the Soviet Writers' Union, Fedorenko, who is particularly moved by the disproportion between the translations of Western books and the translations of Soviet books, having foremost in mind his own book, had recently published a collection of aphorisms that undoubtedly deserve the right of being translated in every language of the world. Particularly one aphorism - never mentioned in any anthology. Its author - Felix Dzierzynski - until now was unknown as a philosopher. It appears now that it was he who said: "Life is long, and death - short, there is no need to be afraid of dying". As we know, Felix Dzierzynski was a prominent specialist on the problem of dying. But it is possible that he was right in regards to life in the Soviet Union. After such a life there is no reason to fear the death.

* * *

Kultura in July-August number published

its version of the changes in the text of the Soviet Union anthem, which from Sept. 1, will be sung by all progressive humanity. The Soviet press did not hesitate to publish the official text of the anthem. In June 12, all the Soviet papers printed its music and the text on their front page. We must admit that *Kultura* was wrong and deceived its readers. It appears now that there are no changes in the text and the music as well. Also the authors are the same as before. There were 2 key lines in the original text of the anthem: first - "Forever insuperable union of the free republics was made by Great Russia," and the second (second line of the chorus) - "The Party of Lenin, the Party of Stalin leads us from victory to victory".

The next text gives the first line: "Great Russia remains officially the main leading force in the union of the free republics". In the second line there was applied a small cosmetic retouch which proves that nothing has changed. This line today is: "Party of Lenin, power of the people leads us to the victory of Communism!" Instead of "from victory to victory," there is a more accurate definition: "the victory of Communism," and the place of Stalin was taken by Lenin. This kind of cosmetology is very well known to the Soviet people. The publication of the so called Soviet proverbs may serve as good example: "The command of Stalin is the command of father," "March with Stalin - live in happiness," but in their 1961 edition we read: "Lenin's command - is father's command," and, "March with Lenin - live and grow in happiness".

The Soviet people know well that the cosmetic retouch - the change of Stalin's name of Lenin's - serves to stress the

immutable character of the regime. And, it wasn't just a coincidence that on the joyful day of the proclamation of the new constitution, many dissidents - demanding the fulfillment of Helsinki Declaration - were arrested.

* * *

Nobody was able to formulate better the essence of the so-called Soviet Democracy, then Stalin: The unbreakable tie between the realization of the constitutional obligations of power, and terror. Appearing in the 18th Congress of the Party (1939) the father of the Soviet constitution expressed his thoughts clearly and unequivocally: "In 1937, Tuchachevski, Yakir, Uborevich and the other degenerate were sentenced to die by the firing squad. Afterwards, followed elections to the Supreme Soviet in which 98.6% of all the voters accepted the Soviet authority. In the beginning of 1938, Rozenholtz, Rykov, Bucharin and the other degenerates were shot. Then, there were the elections to the Supreme Soyuzes of the Union Republics. In these elections 99.4% of all votes were cast in support of Soviet authority." Perhaps some professor of logic would find some fault in Stalin's syllogism, but the 60 year old Soviet practice - to the present - proves completely that Stalin was right: The more rigorous terror - the higher percentage of votes in favor of the Soviet authority.

In the West we often hear: We cannot compare the present terror in the USSR with the terror of the Stalin's period. But in fact what has changed are only the forms of terror: A quarter of century has passed since the death of the father of all peoples, and we live in the epoch of scientific-technological revolution - as the Soviet press likes to call it. It's clear that repressions

in Stalin's style, the arrests of millions or even only hundreds of thousands people would in a very short time destroy the Soviet economy and all the Soviet State machinery. Along with it all, the knowledge in the collective memory of the people about thousands upon thousands shot to death, and the conviction of the Soviet citizens that the ruling power may at any time - if it were necessary - resume the mass terror, force the Soviet authorities to limit the persecutions to arresting only the chosen leaders of the opposition, or to sending them abroad. Lydia Alekseyeva, an active member of the Moscow "Helsinki group," who immigrated from the USSR in June, says: "The Soviet government-making by every possible means the immigration of Jews and other nationalities impossible - favors the immigration of an active dissident." Lydia Alekseyeva and her family waited only 10 days for a permit to immigrate.

* * *

New opposition in the Soviet Union is rooted in an enormously important phenomenon. It's the first time in 60 years that the West has heard the testimonies of the Soviet dissidents. A little time will be needed until the full meaning of Alexandr Solzhenitsyn's works, above all, of his "Gulag Archipelago," will be recognized. But even today we may state that his writing - opening eyes and ears - has had tremendous impact on world public opinion. In addition, for the first time under the influence of Solzhenitsyn the "revolt against Marx" in France came to life. There appeared a whole pleiad of young philosophers - André Glucksman (La cuisinière et le manger d'home, "Le maître penseur"), Bernard Henry Lévy ("La barbarie à visage humaine"), Jean-Marie Benoist ("Marx

est mort") and others who analyze the roots of totalitarianism. The French critique has received with great enthusiasm the recently published book (in French and Russian) of a prominent mathematician Igor Shafarevich, "Socialism as a Phenomenon of World History". The Moscow mathematician, an honorary member of the American Science Academy, a member of the Committee for Defense of Human Rights, proves - on the basis of enormous research material, that Communism is not the invention of Marx, that rather, it is a permanent characteristic of human nature. The French historian, Emanuel Todd, writes in his critique: "Shafarevich describes the character of the three structures - contemporary Communism, utopian Communism and from the dawn of humanity, elementary - spontaneous Communism. Taken separately, each of them is generally known. The Soviet mathematician builds up a synthesis of astounding force, and discovers that everywhere, independently of geographical conditions and degree of development, there is one and the same system, the same *idée fixe*. He concludes that in us humans there is an unchangeable system of thinking".

As an example of the new approach toward the Soviet dissidents, I would like to mention the meeting organized by the French intellectuals - writers and philosophers (dissidents from all the countries of East Europe were invited too). According to experts for the first time in one room there was never gathered so many French "masters of souls," representing every ideological trend - from Sartre to Ionesco. This meeting was especially important as it took place at the time when on the other bank of the Seine the President of France was receiving Leonid Brezhnev.

The July visit of Brezhnev in France was his first trip abroad in over 2 years. The Soviet press assured their readers, that the French people, grateful to comrad Brezhnev for the honor, did not eat nor drink through the whole week - thinking only of the leader of the progressive humanity. The sojourn of Brezhnev in France, brought 2 results: First - the French people could see a very sick man. Every French newspaper circulated an astounding photograph of Brezhnev at the tomb of the unknown soldier, holding his head, and evidently not understanding where he was. The impression of a very sick man wasn't changed by the fact that Brezhnev was reading a 2 hour long speech of welcome and instruction to Giscard d'Estang. As a consequence the chief editor of *Le Monde* observed that not only cyclists should be forbidden to use narcotics. The second result - the president of France during his talks with Brezhnev appeared as the defender of the Soviet politics of *détente*, and accused president Carter of violating "the code of decent behavior in the circumstances of *détente*". Anti-American appearances are obligatory for all the French politicians, especially before elections. However, we may marvel at the statement of the French president, that "the scientific analysis of the Soviet life during 1967-1977 - be it in reference to the widening of information inflow, or the dissident phenomenon - gives evidence that great changes are developing". We are surprised not only at the fact that there are no changes in the direction of liberalization to be found in the USSR, but also at the fact that the French scientists who study the Soviet Union, did not discover any such changes at all. Out astonishment vanishes however when we recall that the main

advisor to the French president in matters of the Soviet Union is Samuel Pisar, a lawyer employed by several American corporations which trade with the USSR, the ardent defender of *détente*, the author of "The Weapon of Peace".

An interesting commentary about Pisar's views is in "Vodka-Cola", the book of American trade union activist, economist and sociologist, Charles Levinson. As if answering Pisar, the first chapter of this book bears the title: "The Profit of Peace". Charles Levinson cites many different facts and documents which prove that the western multinational corporations want to use their power to support the Communist regimes in East Europe. In the opinion of the author of "Vodka-Cola" the ingenious concept of multinational corporate business consists in reshaping the citizens of the Eastern European countries into low cost - on Western licenses - goods producers, so that these cheaply produced goods would be later sold on Western markets with profits going first to the corporations. Some of the critics reproach Levinson for his exaggeration in defending the interests of the American workers. To that, we may say, that it is exactly position of *Fortune*, a magazine of the American bankers which announced a special *dossier* devoted to the whole system of banks established by the USSR in foreign countries. The American bankers welcome their Soviet colleagues! The *dossier* bears a joyous title: "This Communist international system talks with a capitalistic accent". *Fortune* repeats almost literally everything that was written by Levinson: What is necessary is enabling the Soviet Union to get the largest possible amount of hard currency, because in the last count this currency will be used to obtain Western technology and machinery, which, in turn will be used for the exploita-

tion of raw materials, which, consequently will come to the West. The economic banking ties entice political ties. Between the 9th and 13th of July, not far from Riga, in the holiday resort at Jurmala, a discussion took place between the Soviet specialists on the United States and the ex-closest-cooperators of Kissinger, famous Sonnenfeldt and David Rockefeller.

The busiest of all arts - the movies (I mean the American movies) - have eagerly embraced the idea of united capitalists of all countries independent of their political systems. In the last film of Sydney Lumet, "Network," there appears the richest American capitalist, the owner of all the banks, industries and TV networks, who calls: Bankers of all the nations, unite! And announces that money doesn't recognize any boundaries, and that the ruble is as equally valued by him as the dollar is.

Unconsciously, Sydney Lumet showed on the screen the same capitalist who, as Lenin said, will sell to the Soviets the rope on which he will be hanged. Lenin though, should have made one small correction in his saying: The capitalist *is* selling the rope on credit.

Adam KRUCZEK