

supplement

ISSN 0201-4297

1984

6

STP

The struggle of ideas in the contemporary world

**Washington's new version of
cold war •**

**Global problems and mankind's
future •**

**How Adam Schaff "cancelled"
real socialism •**

**The world in a distorted mirror
of neo-conservatism •**

The Novosti Press Agency

supplement



STP

1984

**SOCIALISM:
THEORY
AND PRACTICE**

The struggle of ideas in the contemporary world

Published bimonthly in English, French, German and Spanish

CONTENTS

PROBLEMS OF WAR AND PEACE

- V. SHEMYATENKOV
Cold war or detente: dilemmas of
US foreign policy 3

MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY AND ITS CRITICS

- V. GRANOV
Adam Schaff's "civilized alterna-
tive" 12

MODERN CAPITALISM

- T. KONDRATKOV
Neo-conservatism in the service of
militarism 20
Solzhenitsyn's vision of the world 28

GLOBAL PROBLEMS OF OUR TIME

- The future of mankind in the light
of global problems 33

BOOK REVIEWS

- I. BORISOV
Security through armament build-up?
A wise warning by Erhard Eppler 44

●
Abridged articles are marked with
an asterisk (*)

Editing completed September 20,
1984

© The Novosti Press Agency
Publishing House, 1984

READERS' LETTERS



I teach history, Russian included. I tell my students about your great revolution (the October Socialist Revolution—Ed.), and its world significance. Western media are trying to give a distorted picture of the Soviet Union. Your publications have given us an opportunity to learn the truth about your country. It takes a committed Socialist to write the history of a socialist country. Keep up your good work.

I. Luoga,
teacher, Tanzania

I believe socialism in the USSR and some other countries has not been built according to Marx's notions of the future socialist society. It seems to me that the socialist revolutions were premature and, like all premature babies, are developing with difficulty and painfully. A case in point is the Russian revolution which, in contrast to Marx's views, took place in an undeveloped and uncivilized country, and also in Poland. My conclusion is based upon ideas expounded by Polish philosopher Adam Schaff, now current in the West.

Günter Rauff,
Federal Republic of Germany

Herr G. Rauff, we refer you to an article entitled "Adam Schaff's 'Civilized Alternative'" by Vladimir GRANOV, D. Sc. (Philosophy), sector head at the Philosophy Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences (see p. 12 of the present issue).

●
Address:
STP Editorial Office,
APN Publishing House,
7, Bolshaya Pochtovaya
Street, Moscow 107082,
USSR

COLD WAR OR DETENTE: DILEMMAS OF US FOREIGN POLICY

by Vladimir SHEMYATENKOV

Detente or a crusade against socialism, political realism or reactionary utopianism, a course for peaceful, good-neighbourly and mutually beneficial relations with all states or one of aggression and adventurism, of crises and defeats—these are the dilemmas confronting the United States today.

TWO APPROACHES TO DETENTE

The peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems is an objective law in force throughout the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, and expressed in various forms. The most adequate of all forms produced so far by social practice is international detente which reached its peak in the 1970s. It was the result of the interaction of and struggle between socialism and capitalism. The coincidence of some objective interests of socialist and capitalist states paved the way for the subsequent accords, and their implementation. The different class character of the detente partners, primarily the USSR and the USA, and of their policies, made the detente process contradictory and unstable.

Editors' note: This article was written when the US presidential election campaign had just started. It was not the author's task to foretell its outcome, but to examine the deep-rooted problems facing the USA disregarding the party affiliation of its leader. As the election rhetoric is now being translated into the country's concrete political line for the next four years, these problems acquire added topicality.

- V. SHEMYATENKOV, D. Sc. (Economics), specializes in modern capitalism.

For the Soviet Union, the desire for developing and consolidating detente is the strategic line of its foreign policy. It expresses the unanimous will of the Soviet people, embodies their historical experience, world outlook and moral values, their memory of the 20 million of Soviet citizens who perished in World War Two.

The Soviet detente policy is based on a scientific analysis of world processes, a deep realization of the objective, law-governed nature of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. Today, too, the Soviet Union is doing everything possible to reduce international tension, to stop the arms race and promote international cooperation. In the new, more complex conditions it is actually continuing the detente policy while, at the same time taking additional measures to build up the socialist community's security and to rebuff the growing aggressiveness of imperialism.

For the American side, the policy of detente has never been the result of national consensus. In the 70s, it was supported by a majority of the population and opposed by the imperialist reactionary forces which had not laid down their arms. For the US ruling circles the transition to detente policy was a forced step, dictated in the first place, by their major foreign policy setbacks in the 60s. The political realism of the then US leaders was expressed, above all, in their realization of the military-strategic parity between the USSR and the USA, the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO. Unfortunately Washington's ideas for constructive cooperation were not that many.

The main trouble with US foreign policy in the 70s was that it sought to achieve the unachievable: to "soften" and "transform" the social system in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries at the most and, at the least, to force them to make unilateral concessions in politics, economics, and ideology. Only a handful of more far-sighted and realistically-minded politicians saw the illusory nature of these hopes, but their voices were drowned by the chorus of those advocating "peaceful pressure" on the Soviet Union.

The discrepancy of the aims and means explains why the US "soft" political line in the 70s was so shortlived. It facilitated reactionary, militarist circles' advent to power. The inconsistent, half-hearted readiness of official Washington to participate in the detente process gave way to an overtly aggressive course for undermining this process. But

this departure from the detente principles, far from helping to overcome the contradictions of US foreign policy, intensified them to the extreme.

A RECKLESS POLICY

The ultra-right forces which won the 1980 elections rejected the philosophy of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. They proclaimed world socialism an "empire of evil" with which, according to their logic, it was impossible to have talks. The practical policy of the US government was shifted to total diplomatic, propaganda and economic warfare against the USSR and its allies. Washington officials began to openly discuss a crusade against socialism and the possibility of winning a "limited" or "protracted" nuclear war. The US war machine was geared to materially preparing for such wars. Thus, the ultra-right forces set out to undermine the policy of peaceful coexistence.

But the objective laws of social development operate independently of our will and cannot be repealed by anyone. A "victory over socialism" cannot be achieved without an all-out nuclear war. Nor can it be won through such a war. As the American leaders themselves have admitted on more than one occasion, there would be no victor in this war.

That leaves the "interim" option, the resumption of Cold War. But the latter brought imperialism defeat once. This course offers even fewer prospects with the present balance of forces in the world. The policy of brinkmanship, the product of the US long-gone atomic monopoly on which it is based, is today nothing but a bluff. The Soviet Union will not be intimidated by it. Moreover, the danger of brinkmanship, in view of the development of military technology, has risen greatly for imperialism itself.

The consistently peaceful and responsible course of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, the resistance of the forces of peace and democracy and, lastly, the common sense of the public in capitalist countries are all in the way of the adventurist Cold War. The entire political, intellectual and moral experience of detente militates against the Cold War.

Having come to an impasse, the US aggressive forces began to pin their hopes on some kind of "absolute weapon" which could "alter the course of world history". The space anti-missile system is to become such a weapon. Exorbitant liabilities have been assumed under this asset—to

secure the military invulnerability of US imperialism and, consequently, the opportunity to dictate its will to the rest of the world, to bring world socialism to its knees. But even if such a system were created, it would not make the United States invulnerable. In the final count, the arms race does not increase but reduces its security. If implemented, the programme of America's "arms buildup" would make US security even more precarious.

This is vividly demonstrated by the deployment of first strike nuclear weapons in Western Europe. On the face of it, the Reagan Administration has won the day—Pershings and Cruise missiles have been installed close to the socialist countries' frontiers. But what happened then? Having taken effective countermeasures, the USSR and its allies have annulled this imbalance in military-strategic parity. The balance has been restored, but on a higher and more dangerous level of confrontation between the sides. It has made it impossible to continue arms limitation talks. As a result, the security of the United States and of its NATO allies has been impaired.

The stubbornness with which Washington went ahead with this dangerous move has led to the rise of a multi-million-strong anti-war movement. Many social democratic parties have come out against the missiles. With their deployment, the contradictions between the governments of the West European NATO members and the US administration, far from having been ironed out, have grown more acute. And, perhaps, the main outcome of this development is a profound change in the minds of the masses in Western Europe, who have now seen for themselves who is pushing the world towards a thermonuclear catastrophe.

On January 16, 1984, the White House made a sharp turnabout in its official rhetoric. Those directly responsible for undermining detente suddenly began to profess their love of peace and abhorrence of war, their readiness for dialogue and for far-reaching accords with the Soviet Union.

Subsequent development will show whether these declarations were dictated by common sense or were just a hypocritical pre-election stunt. In any case they testify to the bankruptcy of Washington's foreign policy doctrine. The US Administration has only one alternative: either to slide towards a nuclear holocaust or to give up its absurd aim of destroying world socialism and resume the detente policy. Any other "interim" options are mere self-deception.

There is a rather broad basis for the capitalist countries' conducting a policy of detente. After all, besides their specifically imperialist interests, they have legitimate national interests and, together with all of mankind, have a vested interest in safeguarding peace on Earth, in furthering the international division of labour and cultural exchanges and in solving global problems.

Detente is a matter of particular interest to the West European countries. No wonder that the leaders of many of them continue to reiterate their commitment to its principles. Despite Washington's pressure, they keep up their political, economic, scientific, technical and cultural contacts with the socialist countries.

Peaceful competition between socialism and capitalism based on detente rather than confrontation is not only a guarantee against a thermonuclear catastrophe but, in the language of modern mathematics, is a game with a growing sum, i.e. it opens up additional prospects of material and cultural progress before mankind as a whole and each country.

This is why the idea of detente is winning over the minds of hundreds of millions of people in the capitalist world. Social-Democrats and sober-minded bourgeois politicians are making ever louder demands for the normalization of relations with the socialist countries. The Western scientific press is running various scenarios of a new turn to detente, weighing up their pros and cons.

There are people with different views among the bourgeois supporters of detente, including far-sighted politicians who, without sacrificing their class interests, consistently uphold the principles of equitable international cooperation. There are also quite a few of those who, in their views and actions, are limited by capitalism's imperialist ambitions, the pressure of reaction, the economic mechanism of the arms race and the undemocratic socio-political system of bourgeois states.

The socialist countries are painstakingly conducting a constructive dialogue with the bourgeois supporters of detente. Life suggests the most fruitful path for this dialogue—the search for points of contact and common positions, attainment of mutually acceptable accords, including through compromise, the narrowing of the sphere of disagreements on the basis of mutual trust, mutual understanding and respect for each other's legitimate interests.

It is very important to agree on the principles of mutual relations and draw the correct lessons from the past, to see the sources of the setbacks of the past so as to avoid misplaced efforts in laying the foundations for the future development of detente. An analysis of the theoretical writings of the Western press reveals that far from all the lessons of the past are correctly interpreted. Many of detente advocates are still lacking realism in defining long-term foreign policy objectives. In the long run, everything boils down to attempts to somehow gain unilateral advantages, to combine the incompatible—detente and confrontation. These “misjudgements”, unfortunately, have rather serious foundations. They are born of the very life style of modern bourgeois society, of the objective contradiction between the law-governed peaceful coexistence and the specific interests of imperialism.

In the **military-strategic field** this contradiction is manifested in the idea of the “limit of detente”. In his memoirs Henry Kissinger complains that the US stand in international affairs is traditionally based on the belief that relations between states are characterized by a state of either peace or war, without any intermediate state. The former US Secretary of State is being crafty here, for the real problem of US foreign policy is just the opposite. Its makers try hard to sit on two stools: enjoying the benefits of peace they want to draw dividends—by the mere threat of military force or of military actions that would leave them unscathed—which even a full scale war cannot bring. They intend to have a free hand on the world scene and, at the same time, insure themselves against the possible catastrophic consequences of their own folly.

In fact, those who subscribe to this concept would like, in an atmosphere of unlimited military-political confrontation and continuation of the arms race, to reach agreement on the “limit” which the sides should not overstep. They emphasize the technical problems of “hot-line communication” between Washington and Moscow.

Communication lines must, of course, be improved, precautions taken against the accidental outbreak of nuclear war. But it is clear that technology cannot remove the flaws of politics. And the policy of the arms race, power pressuring and unscrupulous interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states is bound to lead to more tension and local conflicts, creates the threat of mankind drifting towards world war.

The concept of the "limit of detente" is an example of imperialism's brazen speculation on the peoples' legitimate desire to prevent a world thermonuclear war. This ideological invention of the military-industrial complex most adequately reflects its interests in this nuclear age. Its political aim is to knock the peoples off their guard, to create favourable conditions for continuing the arms race and the expansionist policy of US imperialism. Such pseudo-detente actually blocks the road to real, profound detente, to disarmament and only creates a semblance of guarantees against a thermonuclear catastrophe, while in reality bringing it closer.

In the **political field**, we are offered the "linkage principle" which its advocates laud as the acme of state wisdom, while in actual fact it is either an example of short-sighted bargaining or a means of undermining detente.

Of course, all spheres of international relations, all countries and regions of the world are ultimately linked and interdependent. Social and technological progress makes this interdependence even stronger and more diversified. The growing integrity of the modern world (combined with the mounting class confrontation of the two different socio-economic systems) is a cornerstone of detente. It is obvious in this context that, in principle, detente is indivisible, but this indivisibility can be interpreted in different ways.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries proceed from the primacy of detente and the need of subordinating the particular to the whole. They are working to remove the existing disagreements on the basis of the accords already reached, to find reasonable compromises so that the sides, without going against their vital interests, would sacrifice the particular for the sake of the whole. In other words, mutual concessions should be made with the principle of parity and equal security of the sides being strictly observed.

The proponents of the "linkage principle" take the opposite stance. They seek unilateral concessions, turning detente as a whole into an instrument of blackmail on particular questions. A classic example of the ill-advised "linkage" are the attempts made throughout the 70s to force the socialist countries to recognize imperialism's "right" to interfere in their internal affairs, threatening to torpedo detente if they did not agree to this. Such attempts are to no avail, of course, but they did damage the development of East-West relations.

In the **economic field**, the "linkage principle" is embodied in various "sanctions" against socialist countries, aimed at gaining military-political concessions or at transforming their social system. However, the advocates of sanctions are blind to the fact that they are not dealing with weaker partners within the world socialist economy, but with a fundamentally different socio-economic system not subject to the free play of forces on the capitalist market.

Strategically, the socialist community countries vigilantly guard their technical and economic independence from imperialism. This explains the political and economic inefficacy of the sanctions method applied against them. No amount of pressure will compel them to make unilateral concessions on either socio-political issues or purely economic matters.

In the **ideological field**, the majority of bourgeois politicians find it necessary and possible to combine detente with psychological warfare. This is as short-sighted and unrealistic as the attempts to combine detente with the arms race, power pressuring and economic discrimination.

Communists take a clear-headed view of the causes and nature of the ideological confrontation in the modern world. They qualify the calls for "halting the ideological struggle" as unrealistic. Communists prize freedom of speech, the right to explain and popularize their ideas, experience and their moral values no less than representatives of other political forces of our time.

The struggle between class-based ideologies will continue as long as classes exist. Moreover, by virtue of the specific historical conditions in the world in the last third of the 20th century the intensification of ideological struggle is an objective law. But ideological struggle has nothing in common with the psychological warfare being waged by the aggressive imperialist circles of the USA and other NATO countries against the socialist states.

The vicious lies and slander, the unremitting subversive propaganda campaigns which imperialism had wide recourse to in the 70s did not produce the desired ideological effect; but they poisoned the international climate, undermined mutual trust, without which political accord is inconceivable. This was a major factor behind the deterioration of the international situation.

While consistently proposing the path of international detente to the capitalist world, the socialist countries do not sacrifice their class interests. Detente is an integral aspect of their foreign policy, because these interests objectively coincide with those of working people, not only of their own countries but also of the overwhelming majority of mankind.

The essence of detente is expressed in the well known ten principles of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Sovereign equality and mutual renunciation of the threat or use of force, inviolability of frontiers and territorial integrity of states, peaceful settlement of disputes and non-intervention in states' internal affairs, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, equal rights and the peoples' right to decide their own destiny, cooperation among states and fulfilment, in good faith, of obligations arising from the generally recognized principles and standards of international law and from agreements achieved—each of these principles is imbued with the most profound meaning and may serve as a true criterion in appraising political actions. It is the implementation of these principles, not the arms race or the "position of strength" policy that guarantees a lasting peace and safeguards against a thermonuclear catastrophe. They are not the Communists' evil invention as the Cold War advocates assert, but universal norms evolved by the practice of international relations over millennia, which, in antagonistic societies, could not yet be fully applied. Today, such a possibility has become a reality for the first time in history.

Detente cannot be achieved through unilateral concessions. The specific features of imperialism's policy, obstructing the progress of detente, cannot be altered by cajoling and persuasion. The main condition for a return to detente is the firm, coordinated and consistent policy of the socialist community, the persistent struggle of the working class and all progressive and realistically-minded forces which realize the disastrous effect of imperialism's aggressive course in world affairs.

*Mirovaya ekonomika i
mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya,*
No. 5, 1984 *

ADAM SCHAFF'S "CIVILIZED ALTERNATIVE"

by Vladimir GRANOV

In his books and articles Polish philosopher Adam Schaff devotes much attention to the theme of socialism, its essence and ways of attaining it. Schaff thus lays claim to be creatively developing the Marxist concept of socialist revolution, conceptualizing the experience of real socialism and outlining a "civilized" perspective for radical social transformations in the West European countries. Yet, far from being creative, Schaff's appraisal of revolutionary socialist transformations is doctrinarian and dogmatic. He opposes Marx's views to Lenin's and depicts Lenin as an apologist of "underdevelopment", "non-civilization" of countries embarking upon the path of revolutionary socialist transformations, reiterating the concoctions of bourgeois ideologists and revisionists which Marxists-Leninists exposed long ago. The Polish philosopher proceeds from some "ideal" scheme for accomplishing a socialist revolution and proclaims Leninism an exclusively Russian tradition, reducing it to the "technique of seizing power" in a "backward country".

In actual fact, Lenin, while developing his plan for socialist transformations and considering the future of the new world, called attention to the fact that the degree of "civilization" is crucial for the revolution to triumph and for a socialist society to be built.

On the other hand, Lenin resolutely rejected the reasoning of E. Bernstein and other opportunist leaders of the Se-

- V. GRANOV, D.Sc. (Philosophy), who heads a sector at the Philosophy Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, is an expert on the ideological struggle.

cond International (1889) who did not believe it possible to build real socialism in a "backward", "uncivilized" country and tried to prove the "untimeliness" of the socialist revolution in Russia saying it would lead to the deformation of socialist ideals. Lenin also criticized those who asserted that a proletarian revolution could take place only in the developed capitalist countries where the material prerequisites had matured and the proletariat constituted the majority of the population.

As a counter-weight to the dogmatic, abstract and doctrinaire schemes, Lenin offered the Marxist dialectical, specific historical approach. Obviously, certain objective and subjective conditions are required for a socialist revolution to take place: a fairly high level of development of productive forces, the social character of production, a revolutionary proletariat organized in an advanced political party, with a developed class awareness.

It would be wrong to overrate the degree of maturity of the prerequisites for a socialist revolution in Russia. There were, indeed, the essential requisites, but backwardness was there too. Thus, advanced industrial capitalism, with its high concentration of production and banking, the alliance of the monopolies and the state coexisted in Russia with a backward agriculture.

However, neither Marx nor Lenin (and Schaff should know this) believed that the development level of the productive forces directly determined socio-political processes: decisive here is the degree of acuteness of the contradictions between productive forces and production relations and the maturity of the subjective factor, i.e., the vehicle of the historical process—the revolutionary working class and all working people, their readiness and ability to struggle. While pointing to the high development level of productive forces as a favourable condition for a more rapid transition to socialism, Marx would add that it is more difficult to start a socialist revolution in the capitalist centres than on their peripheries.

Lenin also spoke on this, noting that a revolution can be more easily started in countries where capitalism is not as strong and the bourgeoisie is not as omnipotent, organized, experienced and versed in politics as in the advanced capitalist countries. In his polemics with the opportunists Lenin showed that they treated Marxism as a ready-made cure for all ills, whatever the place, time and conditions. They were witnessing capitalist development in Western Europe, he wrote, and were not able to imagine that this

could only be regarded as a model by taking into account the specific conditions in a particular country or region. They could not understand that "while the development of world history as a whole follows general laws it is by no means precluded, but, on the contrary, presumed, that certain periods of development may display peculiarities in either the form or the sequence of this development."¹

Marxist dialectics, Lenin stressed, demands that the general provisions and general truths be applied specifically. Lenin analyzed the development of social revolution in Russia and showed that it was unique due to international as well as internal factors, the most important being the circumstance that Russia's participation in the first imperialist war of 1914-1918 had exacerbated the social antagonisms between the exploiter classes and the working people to the utmost. The latter mounted a struggle for the country's withdrawal from the war spelling privation and misfortune, for democratic reforms, the transfer of land to the peasants on a fair basis, etc. Accordingly, Lenin pointed out, the socialist revolution in Russia could and was, indeed, bound to reveal certain distinguishing features; although these, of course, are in keeping with the general line of world development, they distinguish our revolution from all the preceding revolutions in West European countries.²

A. Schaff, who styles himself a committed Marxist, simply echoes the anti-Marxist fabrications of the opportunists of the Second International who unjustly accused Lenin and his supporters of voluntarism. He speaks in unison with the present-day bourgeois ideologists, social-reformists who are far removed from Marxism, and other right-wing and left-wing opportunists who also make unfounded claims that Lenin broke the law, thwarted the doctrine, rejected Marx's model conforming to the objective economic laws, and as a voluntarist plunged himself into a revolution for which Russia had, allegedly, not yet matured.

A. Schaff's abstract dogmatic treatment of the maturity level of the objective prerequisites for a socialist revolution is starkly revealed with regard to Poland. By repeating the trite schemes of bourgeois Marxologists and opportunists, he is out to prove that in Poland in 1944-1945 there were no adequate prerequisites for a socialist revolution "in the Marxian sense": there was no property to be divided; a backward country that it was, Poland had been

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 33, p. 477.

² *Ibid.*

severely destroyed during the war; there was no working class to speak of, 75 per cent of the Polish population were peasants, while the few workers were of peasant stock; lastly, 95 per cent of the Poles were practising Catholics.

The very first thesis about "property to be divided" is a puzzle. This is not a chance phrase. To Marx too, Schaff attributes the phrase that the immediate distribution of property (wealth) is a *sine qua non* for a successful socialist revolution. In their time both Marx and Lenin resolutely criticized the petty-bourgeois utopian notions of socialism which required the immediate egalitarian distribution of commodities and food. Both Marx and Lenin said that socialism does not come about by wishful thinking, but is built by the working people on the appropriate economic foundation. They warned that any attempts at immediate egalitarian distribution may lead to the old orders being restored.

Schaff always refers to Poland's backwardness. In doing so he disregards the essential features of capitalism's development in this country, notably, the fact that during nazi occupation large- and medium-scale industry, the banks, railways and means of communication were in the hands of German capitalist monopolies. After the rout of fascism and the country's liberation from the invaders the basic means of production were nationalized which was sure to facilitate the country's advance towards socialism. While constantly repeating that Poland was reduced to ruins (and this, allegedly, ruled out the "introduction" of socialism) Schaff conveniently forgets that even in 1947 the country's industrial output surpassed the pre-war level. This was achieved through the dedicated work of millions of Poles and the fraternal assistance rendered by the Soviet Union. That the Polish economy was restored very quickly was precisely because socialist principles were reinforced in industry. Accentuating the fact that the peasantry predominated in Poland at that time, Schaff shut his eyes to the existence of the proletariat with a wealth of experience and revolutionary traditions.

Claiming the role of innovator and scoffing at "dogmatists" Schaff, by the way, basely adheres to an abstract historical-philosophical scheme ignoring the specific historical conditions of the development of this or that country, Poland among them. We shall remind Schaff once more that Marx, Engels and, later, Lenin foresaw the possibility of a country moving to socialism in its own way. Thus, Marx and Engels did not exclude that, for instance, the Russian com-

mune could be transformed along communist lines and underlined the fact that following the triumph of the proletariat in Europe backward nations could "considerably shorten their road to socialist society."³

Present-day social practice convincingly confirms the Marxist-Leninist thesis about the possibilities for many countries to achieve socialism quickly and in their own way. This is shown by Mongolia, Cuba and Vietnam where the socio-economic prerequisites for socialism were created under revolutionary democratic governments, where they had to start from an economic level much lower than Russia's in the early 20th century or Poland's in the '40 and '50s.

Schaff links his untenable conclusion about the absence of the requisite conditions for socialist revolutions in what are now countries of real socialism with the activities of Marxist-Leninist parties and Lenin's and Marxists-Leninists' "departure" from Marx's concept. On the strength of this premise he argues that, in these countries, the development of the revolutionary party inevitably assumes a "tragic character". Wherein lies the essence of this tragedy? Schaff claims that, lacking mass support and in view of the weakness of the new government, the party, of necessity, establishes a one-party political system and acquires a monopoly position in society.

The above certainly does not mean that Marxists oppose a multi-party system as such. Marxists or Communists have never said that the one party system is obligatory for building and perfecting socialism, or would be the inevitable consequence of a transition to socialism. They grant in the course of socialist construction different classes and strata of socialist society may have specific interests embodied in their respective programmes and that they may form political parties and organizations. Along with the communist party other parties exist in a number of socialist countries, such as Bulgaria, the GDR, Czechoslovakia and Poland. Only their role is not the one that the enemies of real socialism would like them to play. These parties believe in socialist construction and recognize the leading role of the working class and Communists in the building of socialism. Expressing the specific interests of definite population groups (peasants, intellectuals, believers, etc.) these parties are building and advancing socialism jointly with the Communist Party and under its leadership.

³ K. Marx and F. Engels. *Works*, vol. 22, p. 446 ((in Russian).

Schaff has obviously examined processes developing in the socialist community countries from the angle of the negative aspects of Polish experience. He wrongly elevates the specific difficulties facing Poland in socialist construction to the rank of "general laws" applicable to all countries of real socialism.

Indeed, people's Poland is now going through a highly complicated and painful period in its development. It has to overcome the aftermath of the 1980-1981 crisis which erupted as a result of subversive activities by external and domestic counter-revolution that exploited the mistakes and miscalculations made by the former leadership of the Polish United Workers' Party (PUWP).

However, Poland's current development demonstrates that socialism's enemies have failed to lead the Polish people from their chosen socialist path, and will never be able to do so. Led by the PUWP, the working class, all working people and true patriots are mustering their forces to normalize the country's life and build and improve their socialist society. All this graphically shows that the crisis phenomena in Poland (and in some other countries building socialism) did not stem from the nature and essence of real socialism, but rather from encroachments on its nature, from departures from its laws and principles.

Having discarded the "old", "deformed", "bureaucratic" model of socialist society Schaff is striving to outline a "new" one, which would inspire the working people in the capitalist countries to struggle against the capitalist system and would serve as a theoretical model of a genuinely socialist society without the shortcomings typical of real socialism.

In proposing his "civilized", "democratic" alternative to real socialism Schaff is pinning his hopes on the developed capitalist countries of Western Europe. He holds that in the next 20-30 years they will witness socialist-type socio-political changes. He believes that the automation of production and the services will make the capitalist mode of production impossible. This entitles him, he says, to put forward his thesis about capitalism dying away in the highly advanced capitalist countries.

Even though Schaff mentions the aggravation of the contradiction between productive forces and production relations he relegates this to the background. He turns the technology wrested from the system of productive forces and production relations, and its spontaneous development into the starting point of social transformations.

Marxism proved long ago—and historical experience has corroborated this—that changes in technology, however radical and revolutionary, do not at all automatically entail changes in a society's basis, in property relations, and immediate socialist transformations.

Schaff, among other things, distorts the Marxist views on the level of maturity of the subjective factor, on the role and place of the working class, its party, and Marxist-Leninist ideology in the present-day revolutionary struggle being waged for radical social transformations. Assessing the revolutionary potential of the working class Marx and Lenin always used precise class and political criteria. To them, it was self-evident that, launching its revolution, the proletariat must be sufficiently strong to take power into its hands, assume the responsibility for society's future, convince the non-proletarian strata of the urgent need for social reforms, and suppress the inevitable resistance of the exploiters. The accomplishment of these tasks, as the entire history of revolutionary struggle shows, does not directly depend on the proletariat's numerical strength or proportion in society, but solely on the proletariat's political maturity and ideological commitment, its readiness and ability to wage a revolutionary struggle. This, according to Marx and Lenin, is precisely the criterion determining the success in accomplishing the revolution and in laying the foundations of the new society. Schaff, in fact, discarded the precise class, political and ideological characteristics of the working class in favour of technological, technical and organizational and other categories.

Schaff does not rely on a concrete analysis of the class forces either when proposing the ways and means of struggle for the fundamental social transformation of modern capitalist society. He utopically makes an absolute of the peaceful ways of effecting social transformations and readily admits that the "new", "civilized" model of socialism will be asserted during the organized retreat of the bourgeoisie which will prudently cede one position after another until the last handful of monopolists will "be shown the door". Meanwhile historical experience shows that the bourgeoisie, once its rule is endangered, unscrupulously abolishes all rights and freedoms and uses extreme, openly violent, terroristic methods of struggle against the revolution.

Schaff fiercely attacks proletarian dictatorship when he expostulates the structural principles of his "civilized" model of socialism. Just like bourgeois ideologists, refor-

mists and revisionists he tries to impress that the dictatorship of the proletariat is synonymous with arbitrary rule, violence and hence it cannot be used as a form of leadership in a democratic socialist society. Schaff again refers to Marx and Engels alleging that they did not identify proletarian dictatorship with violence and recognized the former as suitable only for the brief period of transition from capitalism to socialism. He charges that Lenin and especially Marxists-Leninists identified proletarian dictatorship with the undivided rule of the bureaucratic power apparatus which, he says, merely acts on behalf of the proletariat, that they extended it to the whole socialist era.

Contrary to what the old- and new-time falsifiers of Marxism-Leninism assert it was precisely Lenin, who profoundly substantiated the constructive tasks and functions of proletarian dictatorship. Lenin stressed that the latter's major function was to promote the organizational, economic and cultural efforts of working people to reorganize production, overcome the forces and traditions of the old society, abolish society's class divisions and build the new life. As socialism develops into an advanced socialist society the dictatorship of the proletariat, upon fulfilling its mission, becomes a state of the whole people. This change in the role of the socialist state, particularly in the Soviet Union, is recorded in the new Soviet Constitution.

Rejecting proletarian dictatorship Schaff, in fact, incorporates into his "civilized" model of socialist society the political mechanism of formal bourgeois democracy with its political and ideological pluralism which the bourgeoisie created for its own needs.

Schaff's model creates the illusion that socialism could be built using the ways and means of bourgeois pluralistic democracy, that all development problems of the communist movement and all the difficulties in building socialism could be overcome if the "Soviet model" of socialism were renounced, and the strategy and tactics of the communist parties in the capitalist West opposed to the experience gained by the communist parties in the socialist countries in building and advancing socialism.

Whatever A. Schaff's subjective motives, his attempt at a "fresh interpretation" of the history of real socialism and the search for some new model of "genuine" socialism add grist to the mill of the enemies of socialism.

NEO-CONSERVATISM IN THE SERVICE OF MILITARISM

by **Timofei KONDRATKOV**

In intensifying attacks on Marxist-Leninist ideology the defenders of capitalism, reformists and revisionists, employ the most reactionary trends, including neo-conservatism.

Modern bourgeois ideology is in crisis which even its most zealous exponents cannot conceal. West German politologist R. Ebbighausen was forced to admit that the social thought in Western Europe and America had experienced a "spiritual earthquake". Its epicentre lies deep within the capitalist system, in the aggravation of its general crisis, in the unprecedented growth of militarism which, like malignant tumour, has affected all aspects of bourgeois society—economics, politics and ideology.

THE ANTI-COMMUNIST STAND

Seeking to extricate themselves from the ideological impasse a group of theoreticians calling themselves neo-conservatives—I. Kristol, D. Bell, N. Podhoretz, R. Nisbet, S. Huntington, S. Hook, H. Kahn and others—set the aim of surmounting the "spiritual vacuum" by evolving an ideology which would slow down the process of the revolutionary renovation of the world and conserve the bourgeois system giving it a new lease of life.

Unable to work out a new system of views on the world and social reality or advance any new social ideals, the neo-conservative theoreticians are forced to extract reactionary

● T. KONDRATKOV, D.Sc. (Philosophy), specializes in problems of ideological struggle.

ideas and theories from the "archaeological dust". Treading this shaky ground, they try to surmount the "spiritual impoverishment" of the capitalist West and formulate "conservative ideals" suiting the dominant imperialist elite, which is favourably disposed to such efforts of neo-conservative intellectuals and encourages their zeal.

Neo-conservatives present a set of old-fashioned ideas spiced with diverse futurological fancies and scenarios which give a distorted picture of the development of human society as the ideology of the present and the future. Thus, in one of his latest works a well-known American futurologist Herman Kahn declared with much self-conceit that he saw the ideology of the year 2000 as a more or less Western capitalist ideology growing "transideological", i.e., supra-class, supranational, planetary. This is obviously a piece of advertising which has nothing in common with the real state of things.

The theoretical-methodological impotence of neo-conservative intellectuals is conspicuous also in their treatment of the sources and nature of ideology itself which they characterize from clearly idealist positions as an exclusively "spiritual education" divorced from the social life.

The incompetence and short-sightedness of neo-conservative methodology are particularly striking in the appraisal of the role ideology plays in the modern world. Two decades ago neo-conservative theoreticians vociferously proclaimed the concept of "deideologization", prophesying a "decline of ideology", of faith in it, and called for replacing ideology with technology.

The realities have consigned this concept to the scrap-heap. But this did not embarrass the neo-conservative theoreticians who began to propagate a directly opposite concept of absolutization of ideology with even greater zeal. They have inordinately exaggerated the role of ideology, qualified it as a dominant factor of socio-historical development, and declared an ideological war on all that is advanced and progressive.

The core of neo-conservative ideology is vituperative anti-Sovietism and anti-communism. Anti-communism raised by neo-conservatives to the rank of the official policy and ideology of the USA and its allies is growing more and more aggressive and bellicose. It has been made the main weapon of struggle against the Soviet Union, the entire socialist community and all peace-loving forces, an instrument for escalating the arms race and preparing a nuclear war.

In order to reinforce the crusade against communism, right-wing politicians are uniting their forces internationally. In June 1983 representatives of 22 conservative parties from 19 Western countries met in London and formed a bloc of right-wing political forces which they called an "international democratic union". Under the slogans of struggle for "democracy" and "freedom" this organization is conducting anti-Soviet and anti-communist propaganda and attacking left progressive forces.

The propaganda of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism used by imperialism as an instrument for interference in the affairs of the socialist countries goes together with the defence of capitalism, bourgeois democracy and the Western way of life. Hoodwinking the masses, the neo-conservatives embellish capitalism, gloss over its evils and spread quasi-scientific fabrications about it. The USA is cast in the role of the "leader of the free world" capable of establishing by force a "world order" close to the neo-conservatives' hearts.

STAKING ON NATIONALISM AND RACISM

Fearing that their propaganda of anti-communism and advocacy of bourgeois reality are not effective enough, the neo-conservatives frantically cling to nationalism, the tried and tested weapon of imperialist reaction. This ideology served the imperialist bourgeoisie as a tool for preparing two world and numerous local wars. Today it is taken up by neo-conservatives. Nationalism is very widespread in the United States and other NATO countries. That nationalism and jingoism are rife in the USA was revealed in a poll: eight out of every ten Americans approved Reagan's decision to make a piratical attack on Grenada in 1984.

Cultivating nationalism, neo-conservative theoreticians cannot disregard the fact that this ideology disunites the imperialist states, hinders their cohesion within the Atlantic and other blocs, so essential for their struggle against existing socialism. Consequently neo-conservatives have to update the old ideological weapon, adapt it to the present situation and pass it as something new. Thus, in his report at the symposium in West Germany on the historical, philosophical and sociological roots of neo-conservatism N. Podhoretz defined this ideological trend as a "new nationalism" succeeding the old variety which cultivated isolationism. Unlike its predecessor, N. Podhoretz assures us, "new nationalism" serves the interests not only of the United States but of the Atlantic community as a whole. In

other words, attempts are being made to turn the nationalism of individual West European bourgeois nations into its cosmopolitan variety—"Atlantic" nationalism as an ideological foundation cementing the NATO bloc, as a counterweight to the ideology of proletarian, socialist internationalism.

The reactionary ideas of "Atlantism" are exploited by imperialist propaganda, on the one hand, in order to delete national awareness from the minds of the European peoples, to condition them in the spirit of "Atlantic solidarity", a lackey's loyalty to the leader of the bloc, the USA, and, on the other hand, to fan jingoist moods among broad strata of the population, drum into their heads the ideas of "spiritual" superiority over other nations, extol the Western civilization and step up anti-communist and anti-Soviet propaganda.

The nationalist ideology blending with racism permeates the socio-political, ideological and cultural atmosphere in the USA and other NATO countries.

As the new programme of the Communist Party of the USA points out, about 50 million American citizens are subjected to oppression, discrimination, segregation and exploitation on grounds of race or nationality. Political and racial reprisals have reached unprecedented proportions in the United States. In 1982 alone about 300 people died at the hands of the police in the country. About 60 per cent of murders committed there were racially or politically motivated. This is how the ideology of "new nationalism" fostered by the reactionary imperialist forces works in practice. On the rising wave of nationalism and racism in the USA the neo-nazis and revanchists raise their heads in West Germany and Zionists and South-African racists encouraged from across the ocean perpetrate their bloody atrocities.

The ideology of nationalism and racism in its old and new varieties is rebuffed by the progressive forces and working people who know through the experience of imperialism-instigated two world and numerous local wars how ruinous and dangerous it is. In the battle of ideas victory was and is being won by the Marxist-Leninist ideology of internationalism which proclaims and upholds the equality of all nations and nationalities, repudiates all forms of national and social oppression, promotes peace among nations and resolutely combats nationalism in all its forms.

The religious trend is very prominent in neo-conservatism. Its representatives claim that there is a close unity

between religious convictions and conservative political views.

The clerical religious ideology attracts the neo-conservative theoreticians above all by its cosmopolitanism. Taking advantage of the religious clerical platform that passes over national boundaries, the imperialist circles endeavour to achieve the ideological unity of the Atlantic bloc, to lay the "spiritual foundations" on which to rally the peoples of the NATO countries and their armed forces for the defence of "Christian values" from "godless communism".

Another feature of religious clerical ideology which has so much appeal for the neo-conservatives is its irreconcilability towards socialism and communism. Clericals closely linked with imperialist reaction conduct anti-communist propaganda among the population of NATO countries. Attacking communism, they foster among the masses faith in the immutability of capitalism "blessed" by God, cultivate slavish submission to the powers that be, fan hatred of atheism, of all that is progressive.

ADVOCATES OF NUCLEAR WAR

Neo-conservative ideology appears in its true colours when it comes to cardinal foreign policy questions, and, first and foremost, problems of war and peace crucial for mankind's destinies. Neo-conservatives exaggerate the role of force in the historical process and justify the policy of force in relations between peoples and states. They believe that any foreign policy problem can be settled by the threat or direct use of force.

Neo-conservative ideologists obscure the real sources of violence which they examine outside the context of the social and political system. In their view, violence is built into man's biological and psychological nature. In this way neo-conservatives acquit and whitewash imperialism, the true source of the aggressive policy of wars and armed conflicts.

Intoxicated with the successes of nuclear missile technology, the neo-conservatives have become fervent advocates of the policy and strategy of war, especially nuclear war. Thus, Kahn sees nuclear war as a forced but "rational", "controllable" means of policy, as an effective weapon of struggle against world socialism. It is quite likely, he says, that a thermonuclear war would be an unprecedented catastrophe for the defending side. Depending on the course of events on the battlefields, it may, but not necessarily,

become an unprecedented catastrophe also for the attacking side, just as for some neutral states. However, he goes on, "unprecedented catastrophe" does not yet mean "boundless catastrophe". This shows, and this is most important, that the scale of the catastrophe closely depends on the precautions taken in anticipating it, on how this war is launched and how it is waged. In Kahn's view, the United States would survive a nuclear war, since the colossal destruction and sacrifices incurred would not exclude normal life for the survivors and their descendants.

World wars would, in Kahn's view, continue not only in the near future but also in the distant future. He lists eight world wars: two of them have already taken place and the other six lie in store for mankind, he grimly prophesies (luckily for mankind not one of them has yet broken out). Each war would be preceded by a technological revolution. In view of the rapid progress made in the production of war hardware and weaponry people would eventually give up nuclear bombs and missiles in favour of more sophisticated means of waging war—artificial earthquakes, temperature and weather changes on the enemy's territory and so on. This is the sum and substance of Kahn's theory of nuclear war.

Its component is his concept of "controlled escalation" comprising more than forty stages leading from a conflict to minor wars and from them to a world nuclear war. Controlled escalation has become the central concept among the host of US strategic doctrines. It has been adopted also by other participants in the NATO bloc. In the foreword to the German edition of Kahn's book on escalation former FRG Chancellor H. Schmidt admitted that the mode of thinking of this neo-conservative theoretician has become "a school in the application of pure rationality in politics and strategy". This kind of rationality in our age is a form of irrationality spelling a mortal danger for mankind, because nuclear war cannot be controlled, limited or won.

The facts prove that neo-conservative ideologists act as theoretical advocates of nuclear militarism, the arms race and the aggressive foreign policy line of American imperialism.

A RUINOUS MODEL OF PEACE

Another highlight of neo-conservative ideology is the militarization of peace which is reduced to a dangerous power confrontation in political relations. French sociologist Raymond Aron in his book "Peace and War" asserts that in the

nuclear age the formula "War is the continuation of politics by other means" has turned into its opposite: "Politics are a continuation of war by other means." Both these formulas are equivalent, he assures us. In other words, Aron does not see the difference between a policy pursued by military, violent means and a policy pursued by peaceful, non-violent means. Accordingly, he defines peace as "a continuation of war by other means". Kahn writes that war is horrible but "peace too is horrible." This juggling with definitions and conceptions can have but one aim, namely, to blur the dividing line between the two qualitatively different socio-political phenomena—war and peace, to confuse the people fighting for peace, against the nuclear catastrophe.

The core of the neo-conservative views on peace is the slogan: "Only he who arms lives in peace." This is just a slightly refurbished thesis of the Roman slave-owners reduced to absurdity in the nuclear age: "If you want peace, prepare for war." It keynotes the views and actions of the rightist ideologists, political figures and generals. They are convinced that peace without arms is a pacifist utopia, a chimaera. Only peace based on military power, on Himalayas of weapons is recognized as genuine.

In line with this, neo-conservatives try to justify the arms race, both nuclear and conventional, which is said to be a stabilizing factor in international relations, a guarantor of peace. Peace can be safeguarded, they believe, only through nuclear powers' mutual intimidation, by means of a "balance of fear" between them. The state of peace is described as permanent deterrence ensured by the continuous buildup of armaments. And the neo-conservatives want mankind to be guided by this ruinous model of peace for a long time to come.

The neo-conservative model of peace based on military power is an ideological screen for nuclear militarism. What it means in practice can be seen in the US criminal aggression against the people of Grenada, in the counter-revolutionary raids on Nicaragua, the US collaboration with Israel in the armed brigandage in Lebanon, the transformation of Western Europe into a launching site for American nuclear missiles.

HE WHO SOWS THE WIND WILL REAP THE WHIRLWIND

The neo-conservative ideology and policy of maintaining peace through intimidation and the buildup of armaments pursued by the USA and NATO have engendered a power-

ful anti-war, anti-nuclear movement which embraced millions of people in Europe and other continents. This movement for peace is gathering momentum. Its participants holding different ideological and political views have one common noble aim—to defend peace from nuclear maniacs.

The anti-nuclear movement in the United States is supported by many prominent Democrats and even some Republican politicians. Particularly popular among its participants is the idea of freezing the nuclear arsenals of the USA and the USSR. It is directed against the policy of American imperialism and its partners.

Frightened by the unprecedented scope of the peace movement, neo-conservatives and their patrons are doing everything to slander it, to describe it as "Moscow's fifth column" subverting the defences of the "Atlantic alliance" and creating "a threat to peace". They want to undermine the peace movement from within, to fan conflicts in it, weaken it, and create organizations which would support the USA and NATO and oppose the USSR and other socialist countries.

In contrast to the USA bent on a militarist course which endangers peace, the USSR and other socialist countries condemn nuclear war as the greatest crime against humanity.

In the socialist countries, there are no classes, social strata or professional groups interested in war, its preparation, or the arms race. Socialism and peace are inseparable. Socialism needs peace to fully bring out its potential, while the strengthening of international peace is the direct result of the formation and consolidation of socialism. The wars which the Soviet state was compelled to wage were not caused by internal but by external factors—imperialism's aggressiveness.

* * *

Thus, the neo-conservative ideology is eclectic, contradictory and is turned to the past. Imbued with subjectivism, voluntarism and religious mysticism, it is the world outlook of the ruling imperialist bureaucracy and militarist, reactionary circles, which is alien to the working masses and to social progress. Hence it is doomed to defeat in the worldwide struggle of ideas.

SOLZHENITSYN'S VISION OF THE WORLD

In the chorus of anti-Soviet propaganda conducted by the imperialist circles and the US secret services the voice of the "writer" Alexander Solzhenitsyn again is heard loud and shrill. The organizers of the psychological war against the USSR and other socialist countries exploit his scandalous notoriety in order to call public attention to another of their anti-communist sermons. He is their ideological mouthpiece. The Voice of America broadcasting station, the Foreign Affairs journal and other mass media outlets occasionally allot both time and space to his mouthings and writings.

*What is the real creed of this preacher? Why is so much made of his name? What are the forces that steered the events which determined his fate of a political renegade? This is the subject examined by Professor Nikolai Yakovlev, a noted Soviet historian, in his recent book *The CIA Versus the USSR*. The material below is based upon a chapter from his book.*

UNDER THE VENEER OF "MORAL REVOLUTION"

Solzhenitsyn's pet theme which he often returns to in his books, articles and public utterances is "moral revolution". He toys with this idea in a variety of ways, its overtones depending on the audience he is playing to at each particular moment. In November, 1974 he gave a press conference in Zürich (Switzerland), on the future of Russia, where he declared, among other things, the following: "I call the programme which I propose for my country

moral revolution. I've set it out in a document entitled *A Life Without Lies*." Solzhenitsyn saw the initial signs of this revolution in civil disobedience campaigns in which the broad public refuses to take part in meetings, rallies, demonstrations, etc.

Later an anti-Soviet literary collection *From Under Boulders* appeared in the West; Solzhenitsyn wrote a third of it. In particular he asserted that it was only through the repentance of a great many people that the Russian air and soil could be "cleansed". He

viewed his moral revolution as a precursor of a political revolution in which Bolshevism would be utterly defeated.

In their essence and even in the manner of presentation the author's ideas are very close to the slogans and theses set forth in the documents issued by the Popular-Labour Union of Russian "solidarists"—the PLU¹. And this is no mere coincidence. Over the years Solzhenitsyn has been expounding his views under the immediate impact of the PLU, virtually acting as its literary contractor.

What then is moral for the "great moralist"? What kind of ideology does he propose in place of communism?

"TO HIM COMMUNISM IS THE EMBODIMENT OF EVIL"

This is how the Washington Post, dated July 3, 1975, summed up Solzhenitsyn's political credo. By then he had expressed his persuasions with sufficient clarity in his literary works and in numerous public appearances in the West. The newspaper said further about his position that "from his point of view, any contacts between the Western and the communist worlds are evil..."

This pen-pusher was in a hurry to produce books urging the West to come into direct confrontation with the Soviet Union.

In his novel August XIV he deplores the fact that the "clever nation" (German) failed to subjugate the "fairly stupid" nation. In the third volume of *The Gulag Archipelago* which appeared in 1975 he also reproves Nazi Germany. "Had the comers not been so hopelessly obtuse and self-conceited", Solzhenitsyn lamented referring to the nazis who invaded Soviet territory in 1941, "we would hardly have had occasion to celebrate the 25th anniversary of Russian communism." (In other words, Nazi Germany would have defeated the USSR by 1942). Heaping mountains of lies upon his home country, he deliberately passes over in silence the heroism of the Soviet people and the Red Army thanks to which the Nazi offensive was stopped. Incidentally, but for their heroism, Solzhenitsyn himself would hardly have survived, and, indeed, his libellous writings would never have seen the light of day. The Nazi "new order" spelled death for all people with the exception of the "master race" and their unmurmuring and submissive slaves.

Solzhenitsyn alleged that the Soviet people were looking forward to their liberation from Bolshevism which, in his view, could be secured by an invading foreign army. He accused the

¹ In close contact with many foreign intelligence services including the CIA this organization has vigorously pursued subversive activities against the USSR for more than 50 years. A document elaborated by the strategic commission of the PLU Council, *The Strategic Problems of the Liberation Struggle (1971-1972)*, says, among other things, that Russia needs not only political but also moral restructuring.

Western countries of inaction, of short-sighted policies which, he claims, was expressed in their wartime cooperation with the USSR. He even "invoked" the spirits of F. Roosevelt and W. Churchill, the then leaders of the USA and Great Britain, in order to castigate them for their policy of cooperation with the USSR which, as is known, was dictated by the national interests of their own countries.

Obsessed by the fixed idea that the Soviet Union must be destroyed he also bitterly hates and anathematizes detente. He claims that ever since October, 1917 the West and the USA above all have been making endless mistakes by tolerating the existence of the Soviet Union instead of destroying communism by the force of arms. In his speech in the Hilton Hotel, in Washington, on June 30, 1975, Solzhenitsyn branded as "immoral deals with communism" the West's refusal to support the tsar, its recognition of the USSR in 1933 and its cooperation with the latter in the war against Germany.

This renegade's hatred for his own people hits the climax when he writes in the second volume of *The Gulag Archipelago*: "No nation in the world is more contemptible, more abandoned, alien and worthless than the Russians." And this about the nation, which was the first to carry out the victorious socialist revolution in 1917, and which made a decisive contribution to the victory over fascism in 1945.

A BEACON OF LIBERALISM OR AN ADVOCATE OF AUTHORITARIANISM!

Anti-communists exploit people of the Solzhenitsyn mould, given to political bigotry and demagoguery, in their psychological warfare against the USSR, only as long as such people live in their native countries. Once in the West they completely show themselves for what they are. When at home, thanks to the efforts of capitalist propaganda, they could be depicted as "martyrs" and "persecuted and victimized civil rights champions", and the Western public believed this was so; but on closer examination both they and their ideas were found to be far removed from the ideal image of a "libertarian and democrat". After Solzhenitsyn was expelled from the Soviet Union in February 1974, the Western secret services which had staked upon his subversive activities in our country had to change their tactics. It soon became clear that it was by far from always that he justified the hopes placed in him in his new capacity.

What, then, are the true views and convictions of this "human rights champion"?

Suffice it to say that this much-vaunted apostle of social "liberalization" and spiritual revolution is in fact a zealous advocate of authoritarianism whose principles "can have little in common with modern democracy". He considers the ideas of authoritarianism to be universally applicable to all of mankind

and this exposes his ideological affinity with the ideologists of fascism. According to the Newsweek magazine (US) many people were bitterly disappointed when meeting the author of *The Gulag Archipelago* in the flesh. This evidence is sufficiently eloquent: "Alexander Solzhenitsyn has come West to embarrass some of its intellectuals once again... For most Westerners, the message was clear enough. Alexander Solzhenitsyn was ideologically and temperamentally one of them, a libertarian and democrat whose exile to the West... was really a sort of final reward and homecoming. This conceit didn't last long... What emerged from this torrential flow was a far less tidy and containable vision than anyone had previously had of Solzhenitsyn... highly authoritarian, a disbeliever in democracy."²

Why did the West undertake to patronize a man espousing ideas which are alien even to a large segment of the ruling classes, say, in the USA? The answer is given by the Bulgarian political writer N. Pavlov who explored the nature and causes of this phenomenon. "Imperialist propaganda", he writes, "originally created the stereotype of Solzhenitsyn as a 'libertarian' shouting slogans widely current in bourgeois democracies. The ideological message of his August XIV totally demolishes this pious stereotype. His repudiation of political activity, of

parliamentarism, and, consequently, the atomization of society, his 'promising' speeches about the technocracy being capable of government are all the stock-in-trade and theoretical fundamentals of the philosophy espoused by totalitarian fascist regimes... This extraordinary 'beacon of liberalism' boosted by bourgeois propaganda on closer examination turns out to be an ordinary unoriginal exponent of authoritarian ideas. Once power is given to the sort of people portrayed and feted by Solzhenitsyn, rivers of blood will flow. The author is far to the right of bourgeois democracy... He is steadily supported and sustained for obvious reasons. After all, why can't the international bourgeoisie, using dictatorial regimes in its struggle against the world revolutionary process, put to work an ideologist, even if he espouses totalitarianism?"³

Why not, indeed. The latter-day anti-communist crusaders believe that their aims justify any means.

HIS CREDENTIALS— ANTI-COMMUNISM AND HATRED OF THE USSR

Solzhenitsyn's extremely reactionary revelations bewildered leading politicians in the West. Newsweek reports that in discussing Solzhenitsyn's political views with Nixon, the then US President, Secretary of State Kissinger, historian by profess-

² *Newsweek*, March 18, 1974, p. 48.

³ *Otechestven front*, June 11, 1974.

ion, noted that Solzhenitsyn stood to "the right of the tsars". And he had ample reason to say so.

The world in the opinion of the "prophet" and "great moralist" must be purged from the curse of communism. And the capitalist West should undertake this liberatory mission. Solzhenitsyn treated British viewers to this stuff in 1976. A series of his televised appearances was also arranged then in France and Spain. *Blanco y negro*, a popular Spanish periodical, described the reaction to these discourses as follows: "His speeches exasperated the extreme left and exulted the right".⁴ Among other things, Solzhenitsyn extolled Francoism which, allegedly, "brought absolute freedom to the Spanish people". The public's closer acquaintance with this "preacher" and "thinker" failed to produce the effect the sponsors of his European tour expected. Most people were clearly disappointed.

The CIA transferred him to the reserve for a time. The "writer" settled in the state of Vermont and led a solitary life

awhile. But in the early 1980s, when another anti-Soviet campaign was mounted, Solzhenitsyn was given his customary and fitting role.

His credentials—anti-Sovietism, hatred of the USSR, a desire to see the socialist system undermined internally and internationally—have lost none of their validity for the imperialist forces. In an article published in the US Foreign Affairs journal he again urges the West to scrap detente, join forces with the enemies of socialism within the socialist community and try and end socialism by any means including military, as "it is impossible to coexist with communism on the same planet."

However, today, fewer and fewer people in the West heed the calls of this man whose vision of the world's present and future is distorted and who has discredited himself by his unbalanced character and extremely reactionary views.

From N. Yakovlev's book *The CIA Versus the USSR*, Moscow, 1983
(in Russian)

⁴ *Blanco y negro*, March 27, 1976.

THE FUTURE OF MANKIND IN THE LIGHT OF GLOBAL PROBLEMS

The world is on the threshold of the third millennium A.D. What will this age be like? This question is increasingly stirring man's imagination.

TWO APPROACHES

Marxist-Leninist teachings on communist society originated as the embodiment of mankind's dreams about a radiant future. Yet these teachings are in no way utopian. Communists are not given to inventing myths with a view to saving or solacing mankind; much less are they inclined to make up threatening or apocalyptic ones. They scientifically discover the objective laws and motive forces of the historical process and indicate its perspective—communism as a future historically inevitable and desirable for all peoples. And the main thing is that Communists, relying upon the real-life conditions of our day and drawing upon mankind's development experience which they view as a law-governed natural historical process, theoretically explore the paths leading to the future and translate them into the practice of existing socialism eventually growing into communism.

On the other hand, today there is no dearth of diverse futurological schemes within the framework of bourgeois-reformist thought. In many capitalist countries, primarily in the USA, countless scientific centres have been set up with the sole purpose of making forecasts for the foreseeable future.

The future has thus become an object of special attention by both scholars and practical workers. One might

say that it is now a central problem around which the contemporary world-wide battle of ideas is being fought, and socialism and capitalism compete in the field of social theory.

One must admit that, in their theories about the future, bourgeois scholars have put forward quite a few interesting ideas and specific proposals. This, in particular, applies to the Club of Rome, an international association for the study of global problems, established in 1968. However, the works of bourgeois scholars contain no acceptable concepts of a general nature, no logical, intrinsically non-contradictory concepts about the prospects of social development. The reasons for this are generally objective—not subjective. Although quite a few talented people knowledgeable in many fields are to be found among the bourgeois authors, their ideological and methodological guidelines prevent them from elaborating scientifically valid concepts about mankind's future.

The authors of futurological schemes assume that capitalist society, providing their living and working conditions, should continue indefinitely. Consequently, for them, the framework of the future is artificially restricted, and its social parameters are identified, in some form or other, with the capitalist ones.

True, tangible changes have taken place in this sphere in the past few decades. Today, a growing number of opponents of the idea of preserving capitalism unchanged have been emerging among Western futurologists. They believe that in order to save capitalism, certain radical reforms must be carried out, without, naturally, undermining its foundations.

Today in the West there are also proponents of a social compromise, of a middle course between capitalism and socialism. These ideas have not been given any serious theoretical substantiation, much less practical confirmation. Nevertheless, such convergence-type projects abound and the sphere of their application has somewhat increased, for instance, in examining global problems and in seeking solutions to them.

Incidentally, the ideas of a compromise between the two systems are also current within the labour movement. Thus, since its inception, Right-Wing Social Democracy has visualized the historical perspective as a fusion of capitalism and socialism. Such ideas crop up in some communist parties, too.

How can one dovetail the socialist perspective (that is, if genuine socialism is meant, a society without exploitation and oppression, a system of social equality and freedom, and of true democracy, and not plutocracy) with the preservation of private ownership of the basic means of production, of the political forces of reaction and their organizational structure? For this is precisely how sundry ideologists of a "third way" see the socialist perspective.

The communist, i.e., the proletarian class approach to the problems of our future, has nothing in common with attempts to reconcile socialism with capitalism. The victory of socialism is not the perpetuation of any social or economic relations existing today, but the removal of all social barriers in the path of mankind's progress. The working class itself, emerging victorious in the struggle against capitalism, does not strive to perpetuate its own dominance. On the contrary, it believes its historical mission is to build a classless society in which the very notion of dominance will only be found in history books.

In other words, the communist concept of the future is dynamic, placing no limits on the development of society, save those arising through necessity and understood as an objective law. The authors of the concepts of the future put forth in the capitalist world seek, consciously or unconsciously, to prevent the downfall of the capitalist system based on private property to preserve the past, mankind's yesteryear.

The fundamental difference of these two socially-determined approaches is clearly manifest in the respective positions with regard to scientific and technological progress, its consequences.

FUTUROLOGISTS' ILLUSIONS AND MISCALCULATIONS

Science and technology today have a substantial influence upon man's life, consciousness and emotions. They have transformed our notions about the world and ourselves. However, science and technology have not only opened up new horizons and directions for man's activity, but have also given rise to a host of complex social problems and sharply posed the issue of man's future. These problems are truly global and, so, they require to be resolved on a global scale (e.g. the threat of a world thermonuclear war, environmental pollution, the problem of energy, raw materials and food supplies against a background of the population explosion, the mounting threat

of negative genetic and psychic changes, human health in general, etc.).

Thus, there has emerged a new social and cultural environment in which the problems affecting the future of mankind are posed and resolved. Not only the improvement of the conditions of man's existence is often at issue; man's very survival in the coming decades is in doubt. Are we justified in posing the question thus? Or is this a dramatization?

Marxists have provided scientific answers to all these questions taking into account the new situation and the importance of resolving all global problems within the context of overall social transformations in the direction of socialism and communism. On the other hand, they further emphasize the need for these transformations which are consonant with the fundamental principles of scientific communism and the Marxist concept of the future.

These principles lie at the basis of the real movement of a significant section of mankind living in socialist countries for a communist future and they allow projects which do not correspond to such a concept of the future to be critically assessed.

Bourgeois-reformist futurological concepts envision scientific and technological progress in a different way. Thus, it is often pictured as a panacea against all ills, a magical remedy allegedly giving capitalism "a new lease of life" and fresh hopes for the future. Or else it is depicted as a "demon" threatening mankind with destruction and inflicting all sorts of woes and troubles on it.

For all their seeming differences these futurological projects pursue the same social and ideological goal. There is a certain logic in a particular project being advanced at a given moment, in it being offered an alternative which, in fact, is only designed to supplement it. This logic makes it plain, in particular, why the concepts of "technocratic" optimism, turning scientific and technical progress into the sole source of general progress, so easily coexist in the West with "disenchantment with progress", "technological pessimism" and abstract ideas of "humanizing science".

They all have the same aim of proving that scientific and technological progress confronts mankind, irrespective of the existing social systems, with the problem of survival, which obliterates the fundamental distinctions between capitalism and socialism.

In their projects of future world development, the Club

of Rome members assume stands which have much in common but are not identical.

The Marxist consensus is that the most serious shortcoming of these projects is their non-class approach to global problems, divorcing them from the socio-economic, political and ideological aspects. Consequently, the search for solutions to these problems is largely utopian. True, in some of the latest papers delivered at the Club of Rome sessions the problems of the future are viewed more realistically. However, they too equate the capitalist and socialist countries, thereby distorting social reality. In a special project entitled "Food for a Doubling World Population", project leader A. Linnemann of the Netherlands divided the world into three groups of countries, namely: those with free-market economies (capitalist), those with centrally-planned economies (socialist) and developing countries, plus ten regions roughly coinciding with the classification proposed by M. Mesarovic and E. Pestel in their earlier models.

Similar ideas are voiced in the UN-commissioned study, "The Future of the World Economy" (1976), carried out by W. Leontief (USA), a Nobel Prize winner, and his co-authors. The concept at the basis of the project is more realistic. The proposed global world economy model comprises 15 world regions (three of them encompassing the socialist countries). The authors admit that socialism has so far ensured economic development at rates exceeding capitalism's economic development and stress that the new social system will retain its lead in the years ahead. Socialism's share in world production will continue to increase, the authors note. Nevertheless, the economic and organizational measures proposed for either bridging or substantially closing the gap between the developed and developing countries are set forth outside the socio-political context. It is not clear which class forces would implement the authors' plans for coping with world development problems.

The same is true of the project proposed by the D. Gabor group (co-authors U. Colombo, A. King and R. Galli) under the auspices of the Club of Rome, and which was published in the book "Beyond the Age of Waste" (1976). The authors see the possibility of overcoming the inefficient and irrational utilization of the planet's natural resources in adopting an economical and judicious system of their management. In their view, science and technology today can provide mankind with energy, raw materials

and food in quantities sufficient for its vital activity (considering the projected population growth). D. Gabor and his co-authors come closer to the heart of the matter than many other Western scholars. They note that the difficulties here do not derive from science and technology. What is needed is for certain national states and mankind as a whole to produce the appropriate political and social goals, institutions and mechanisms which would assure the utilization of scientific and technical achievements for harmonious social development. It is precisely the failings of the social institutions and socio-economic mechanisms that, in the authors' opinion, lead to an unacceptable squandering of the planet's natural, material and human resources.

What is meant here by the failings of the social institutions? One of the causes of the squandering is, according to the project, overemphasis upon economic incentives, resulting in the unlimited consumption growth but doing little to promote social progress and the harmonious development of society and the individual. Rejection of the course for wastefulness and the switchover to more balanced socio-economic development presuppose a radical restructuring of both national and international institutions, improvements in the systems of decision-making and management of material and human resources, and also drastic changes in lifestyles, and a revision of socio-political goals and priorities. The very system of social values should be changed eventually.

Obviously, the authors note, although in passing, the role of socio-economic factors in dealing with the global problems of the present and the future. The main stress, however, is laid upon the need to change "human quality", i.e., the derivative goals which cannot be attained without fundamental socio-economic transformations.

IDEALISTIC RECIPES

This came through clearly in the fifth report to the Club of Rome, entitled "Goals for Mankind", submitted by an international research team under the guidance of E. Laszlo (USA) in 1977.

This study is based on the results of sociological surveys involving different population strata in a number of countries; it also included an examination of government documents and an analysis of ideological, political and economic platforms of the main contemporary social

movements, etc. Basic to the study are the authors' ideas of the "inner limits of global development", "a world solidarity revolution" the accomplishment of which is said to be "a great imperative of our time".

History shows, it is further stated in the report, that revolutions in the ideological sphere served as powerful catalysts for human activity. The process of "revolution in contemporary consciousness" stimulated by the development of communications and technology is regarded as a point of departure for solving global problems. The authors believe that the development of new forms of consciousness, such as the realization of the need to control population growth, sparing use of non-renewable natural resources, etc., might provide the basis for the development of a new, integral, truly universal human consciousness.

A "new world order" corresponding to this programme should arise with the emergence of new humanistic standards which will become the norm in all major spheres of state activity. This conclusion is based on an analysis of the "great religions" (Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, the Chinese religious tradition—Confucianism and Taoism, Judaism and some African tribal religions), and, also, of the leading contemporary philosophical and ideological systems, namely: liberal democracy, Marxist communism and "alternative cultures", which are described in the report as a reaction to both "underdevelopment" and "overdevelopment", to the dehumanizing consequences of scientific and technical progress, alienation and the like. In other words, we have a clear case of the idealistic approach which divorces the ideological, political, moral, and other superstructures of society from its socio-economic base and ignores the necessity of fundamentally changing the entire system of social relations to achieve real social progress.

Some considerations set out by Aurelio Peccei, President of the Club of Rome, in his book "The Human Quality" (1977) merit attention.

Peccei believes that "the real problem of the human race" at this stage of its evolution is that its cultural development is out of step with the times; consequently, the human race cannot fully adjust to the realities it itself created. In the author's words the whole matter boils down to the "human quality" and to the possible ways of improving it. It is only through the proper development of the "human quality" and of man's abilities

world-wide, that our material civilized world can be changed and its immense potential used for the good of man. He adds that what he means is not the cultivation of some elitist stratum but of mankind as a whole.

"New humanism" is proclaimed to be an instrument for inculcating this "human quality"; it is called upon to restore harmony between man and nature, bring about a "human revolution" and engender new values—cultural, philosophical, ethical, social, etc.

The humanistic flavour of the ideas expounded by A. Pececi and by other Western scholars, is beyond question. But how can they benefit mankind? The fact that these proposals are not rooted in socio-economic realities detracts from their practical value. For instance, who will regulate the utilization of natural resources and how (Pececi's First Task)? Should the monopolies tackle it, there can be no question of any harmonious development. Similar questions can be posed in respect of other "tasks" formulated by Pececi. He, for his part, does not raise such points.

Unfortunately, in the latest reports to the Club of Rome this kind of unrealistic approach, ignoring the fundamental distinctions between socialism and capitalism, has been much too evident. In some instances it is patently anti-communist. Under the pressure of the international situation, aggravated by the activities of imperialism, primarily US imperialism, the Club of Rome leaders have adopted, on a number of issues, positions which not only betray their social narrow-mindedness but also represent direct attacks on socialism, the Soviet system, etc.

One example of this is the report to the Club of Rome, submitted by bourgeois economist Gavrilishin, (1980).

In the preface the author substantiates the need to tackle the questions of society's effective functioning, with effectiveness being described as a result of the interaction of the following three factors: the system of values of a particular society; the forms of its political government, and its economic system.

In dealing with the systems of values basic to different social systems, Gavrilishin singles out three principal groups: individualistic competition, cooperation and equality. Speaking of the other factors, the author further singles out three main groups of forms of government and economic systems. Significantly, Gavrilishin does not attach decisive importance to any one factor; he stres-

ses that "only their interaction determines the effectiveness of any particular social system".

This thesis is elaborated on in subsequent chapters, especially where the author enunciates the concept emphasizing the need to evolve a certain universal "world order" under which, the author believes, mankind will be able to cope with the existing problems and with those which are sure to arise in the future.

In Gavrilishin's view, particular states' renunciation of their worship of sovereignty in favour of a convergence of societies should be basic to the projected "world order". In connection with this he expresses some sober and well-founded views (e.g. urges the need to halt the arms race, establish normal cooperation between different social systems, etc.). But most often he puts forward considerations which are nothing other than meddling in the internal affairs of states, including attempts to change their existing systems. Specifically, where the USSR is concerned, the author calls for "modifying" the Soviet political and economic system. The author also deems it necessary to "restructure" the social systems of some other countries in order to establish his brand of "world order".

Obviously, there is no need to prove that such an approach is unacceptable, and that any attempts to thrust it upon mankind can only do harm.

Typically, the attempts to make an absolute of the human nature factor, accompanied by utopian schemes in the social sphere coexist, in the activities of the Club of Rome, with technocratic concepts, although sometimes crucially important processes of the development of contemporary civilization are singled out within the framework of this false world view.

One example of this is a recent report to the Club of Rome entitled "Microelectronics and Society: For Better or for Worse". The report aims to elucidate the prospects and problems and to enlighten the public at large on what the development of microelectronics can mean to it. Thereby an informed public discussion is stimulated of the kind of strategy needed to ensure that new technologies are put to the good of mankind, and not to its detriment.

As for the prospects of the wide-scale adoption of microelectronics, the authors claim that, assuming that the world's future can be envisioned against the background of the influence of technology and microelectronics on the development of its different regions, together with

other important trends, it is safe to say that we are embarking upon a period of profound transitional processes. This period will possibly last 30-50 years before culminating in a totally different type of world society, much more populous, with new values, new political and administrative structures, new forms of institutional behaviour, with a technical base substantially different from today's, a base which will decisively influence the lifestyle and culture of countries. The authors indicate three principal factors among the causes of such a transition: population growth; the need for a more or less complete renewal of the planet's system of energy production; the impact of new technologies, especially those based on microelectronics.

The authors are justified in their belief that the cardinal social changes resulting from the wide-scale adoption of microelectronics will call for radical measures for controlling and regulating these processes. Having arrived at this conclusion, they do not, however, specifically differentiate the existing social systems, nor do they identify the ability (or inability) of these systems to develop the positive and neutralize the negative social consequences of the development of microelectronics. But some of the authors' conclusions and observations are interesting, thought-provoking and require philosophical generalizations.

The authors note that in our civilization, based as it is upon technology, there are those who understand its nature and how it functions and those who simply use it "pushing buttons". Following the large-scale introduction of electronics conflicts may arise between the knowledgeable minority and the ignorant majority. This may lead to the emergence of a new technocratic elite. The authors believe that such an extremely undesirable thing can be avoided. Therefore, such an eventuality must be foreseen and precluded.

Here, we again encounter a biased socio-political position equating socialism with capitalism. The wrongness of this is patently obvious, especially when the authors touch upon the question of employment in connection with the expected development of microelectronics. Allowing for the authors' biased views, one should also consider many of their interesting observations concerning the development of education, the meaning of human life in a robotized society, etc.

FOR THE SAKE OF MAN AND HIS FUTURE

The debates between Marxists and bourgeois ideologists as to the shape of things to come are not anything new. They raged back in the last century and in early this one. But then the Marxist views were theory, largely unconfirmed because socialism did not yet exist. In our day, Marxist-Leninist teachings about socialism and communism as the future of mankind are borne out by the social practice of the new world. Today, although socialism has far from fully realized its potential, it implements, both on the scale of individual countries and within the framework of interstate cooperation, a growing range of measures designed to overcome the problems facing mankind. One example of its approach to solving cardinal global problems is the cooperation between socialist countries in satisfying their energy requirements.

Each of the socialist countries takes great pains to protect and rationally utilize its land and mineral wealth, water, plant and animal resources, to keep its waters and air pollution-free, to ensure the reproduction of its natural wealth and ameliorate the natural environment.

Marxists-Leninists are convinced that now, despite all kinds of difficulties, there are real possibilities for making steady progress in solving global problems, through the medium of international cooperation. Positive results have indeed been achieved here, especially in the 70s.

The West's tendency to hold back this progressive process has become particularly evident of late. Scientific and technical contacts between the Soviet Union and other socialist countries on the one hand, and the USA and other capitalist countries on the other, are being broken off under various pretexts and a virulent anti-Soviet and anti-communist political and propaganda campaign is being waged. Obviously, this does not promote the cause of peace and progress, let alone the settlement of global problems. For it is not only the socialist countries that have a vested interest in scientific and technical cooperation. Acknowledgement of the need for international cooperation reflects the realism of the Communists' general position and concrete policies, their humanism, which is totally divorced from utopianism and geared to practical action to solve the pressing problems of our day and age for the good of man and his future.

From the book *Problems of Peace and Social Progress in Contemporary Philosophy*,
Moscow Politizdat, 1983 (in Russian) *

SECURITY THROUGH ARMAMENT BUILD-UP?

A Wise Warning by Erhard Eppler

Erhard Eppler is a noted political figure in the FRG, member of the Presidium of the SPD Board, a deputy of the Bundestag for several years. He wrote a number of books on problems of foreign policy and international relations. Since the adoption of the NATO's double-track decision Eppler has opposed the deployment of the new US nuclear missiles in the FRG. His new book¹ put on the FRG book market at the height of the debate around the attitude of West German Social Democracy towards the siting of the new US missiles in Europe has had considerable repercussions in the political and public circles of the FRG. It deals with the urgent problems pertaining to the struggle for peace and contains a wealth of facts on the missile issue. The author analyzes the changes in US strategy in the late 1970s and the early 1980s and lays much stress upon the Euromissile issue which occupies a special place in this strategy. Giving numerous quotes and excerpts from official sources Eppler incontrovertibly proves that the striving of the present US leadership for military superiority poses a grave threat to peace and pushes mankind towards the brink of danger.

With the emergence of the latest means of warfare, Eppler writes, the states' conception of their security and the means of safeguarding it has undergone a fundamental change. In the first half of the twentieth century the country felt secure in the knowledge that if it were at-

¹ E. Eppler, *Die tödliche Utopie der Sicherheit*. Rowohlt Verlag GmbH, Reinbek bei Hamburg, 1983.

tacked its armed forces could repel the aggressor, i.e. that the task of safeguarding its security lay primarily in defending its borders. But during the years of World War II this customary concept of security was no longer valid because airforce strikes and bombing of targets behind the lines destroyed what the front was called upon to defend (page 24). The development of nuclear missile weapons, stresses Eppler, put an end to the process which was just beginning to emerge; defence in the classical meaning of the word is out of date, at least in Europe. The concept of deterrence has replaced the concept of defence. (Ibid.).

This means, the author continues, that every side seeks its own security by creating and building up a threat for the opposing side. This being so, each side feels that the greater the threat it is capable of creating for the potential enemy the greater its own security. Paradoxically, in the nuclear epoch offensive weapons furnish the basis of the country's defences while purely defensive capabilities are very limited, and the main principle of deterrence is one of intimidating retaliation, meaning the capability of every side to deliver a devastating retaliatory strike.

Concluding, in the early 1970s, the SALT-I Treaty and the Treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems, the author notes, the USSR and the USA thereby acknowledged the military-strategic parity between them and between the Warsaw Treaty Organization (WTO) and NATO that had evolved by then. This parity fettered, to a certain extent, the freedom of action of the US ruling circles in the international arena. It was precisely this fact, Eppler points out, that did not suit the influential ultra-conservative quarters in the USA which did not wish to tolerate a state of affairs when America could not act as it saw fit in crisis situations. These quarters not only succeeded in preventing the SALT-2 Treaty from ratification but, moreover, installed in the Presidential office their man who openly proclaimed the goal of restoring America's lost military superiority.

Eppler convincingly proves that Washington intends pursuing a "positive foreign policy" which is interpreted to mean military superiority that may be freely used to exert, at least, political pressure upon other countries (page 39). To this end, the White House strives at all costs to preserve the threat of nuclear war as part of its foreign policy arsenal. People in Washington believe, the author writes, that nuclear weapons even if available in

quantities sufficient for an "overkill" of mankind are useless politically if you cannot wage a war with them. But then a war which is impossible to wage is no good as a threat to other countries. Hence the conclusion that it is necessary to search for ways that would enable the USA to use nuclear weapons as an instrument of pressure and, simultaneously, reduce to nought the threat of a nuclear attack upon the USA.

Eppler does not confine himself to the criticism of the Reagan Administration. He points out that Reagan could not have put forward his present-day super-armament programme if his predecessors had not conducted vigorous military preparations destabilizing the international situation. The arms build-up by the USA is inseparably linked, as noted in the Prague Political Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty Member States, with an escalation of the strategic concepts and doctrines, such as the "first incapacitating nuclear strike", a "limited nuclear war", a "protracted nuclear conflict", and the like. The greater accuracy and the sharp increase in the total number of warheads carried by strategic delivery vehicles, Eppler emphasizes, are indicative of Washington's desire to secure the incapacitating first strike capability. Since the first half of the seventies, he writes, US strategists have also been elaborating the doctrine of a "limited nuclear war" and the appropriate hardware has been developed for the implementation of this doctrine.

After the installation of Reagan's crew, the author writes, the military superiority line in the United States was spelled out in every detail. The US military and political leadership have now begun to interpret their deterrence theory as the necessity to demonstrate to the world a US capability to wage a nuclear war and win it.

Blinded by a utopian idea of "absolute security", Eppler writes further, Washington violates existing treaties and agreements and spreads the arms race to new fields and spheres. This is a mortally dangerous utopia, the author stresses, and above all it threatens those who have blind faith in it. No method of destroying oneself and others is more effective than by trying to achieve perfect security through the arms build-up. This is the key note of Eppler's book.

The author notes that in its plans for achieving strategic superiority over the USSR, Washington assigns a foremost role to the new missiles to be installed in a number of European countries. (Their deployment has

already begun—Ed.). The US encourages NATO's rearmament not to enhance European security but secure its own freedom of action in the region. These missiles deployed in close proximity to the Soviet Union with its strategic targets in their sights, reveal the true meaning of the new US strategy with the utmost clarity: to develop the capability for winning a nuclear war so as to attain US objectives by threatening to unleash such a war without actually doing so (page 79).

In Eppler's opinion, the thesis whereby the deployment of the Pershing-2 and Cruise missiles in Western Europe is an answer to the threat allegedly posed by the Soviet SS-20 missiles is absolutely false. That medium-range missiles were being deployed in the Western part of the Soviet Union in the late 1950s and in the early 1960s was well-known in the FRG at the time. This fact did not however worry the Americans or the West Germans. At any rate, Eppler who was a Cabinet member in 1968-1974 does not remember a single government session discussing this threat. Not a single Chancellor, Kiesinger, Brandt or Schmidt, ever thought it necessary to bring up this subject before the Cabinet. Even the opposition represented by the CDU/CSU coalition which at the time of the 1972 pre-election struggles brandished the "Soviet threat" bogey in attempts to prevent the ratification of the Eastern accords, did not then say a word about these missiles (page 76).

Eppler is certain and proves that the appearance of the SS-20 missiles did not pose any additional threat for Western Europe. The author disputes the thesis that the Pershing-2 and cruise missiles are equivalent to the Soviet SS-20 missiles. Drawing upon vast material he highlights the idea that the US Euromissiles are strategic weapons, an instrument of blackmail against the USSR.

Eppler recalls that H. Schmidt, the former FRG Chancellor, once advocated a naval variant of rearmament as a reply to the Soviet SS-20 missiles. This variant envisaged the installation of cruise missiles aboard warships in coastal waters of the Atlantic and not in the densely-populated West European states. Calling attention in this connection to the US plans to deploy over 2,500 sea-based cruise missiles towards the outset of the 1990s, Eppler stresses the fact that the Europeans will receive the Pershing-2 and Tomahawk missiles not as an alternative to the sea-based missiles, as was planned earlier, but in addition to them. This "addition" of several hundred mis-

siles is meant, according to Washington's scheme not so much to protect the West European countries as to further tie them down to the USA politically (page 84), Eppler notes.

Eppler writes that by adopting the "double-track decision" in 1979 the West Europeans fatally miscalculated. They believed that it would force the Soviet Union to engage in negotiations and they regarded the deployment of US systems first of all as a means of putting pressure upon the Soviet Union which, they hoped, would force it to reduce the number of its Euromissiles. However, the Europeans lost sight of the fact, Eppler writes, that for the USA NATO's decision on rearmament was not a "double-track" one. For them the deployment of missiles was a foregone conclusion right from the start. But while the development of the new systems was being completed the Americans agreed, to quote Eppler, "to spend some time at the negotiating table in Geneva" (page 31).

All this time, the author continues, the negotiations served the USA as a screen behind which it unswervingly laid the grounds for deploying its new nuclear systems in Europe. Proposing the zero option and then the interim variant in Geneva, the USA knew the USSR could not accept either and, thus, was deliberately playing for time.

It should be noted that some of the forecasts made by Eppler, e.g. that Washington's policy of blackmail designed to wreck the negotiations in Geneva had no future, have come true. But so have Eppler's worst fears: the governments of Great Britain, the FRG and Italy have pushed through their parliaments the decision which makes Western Europe the Pentagon's nuclear missile launching site. Eppler writes that the FRG would be wiped off the face of the world in the event of a limited nuclear war (page 92). Now that the deployment of the US nuclear missiles has started these words are acquiring a special meaning for the author's compatriots.

Ivan BORISOV

New Books on Social Sciences Published Abroad,
Moscow, Progress Publishers, No. 2, 1984 *

ПРИЛОЖЕНИЕ № 6 К ЖУРНАЛУ
«СОЦИАЛИЗМ: ТЕОРИЯ И ПРАКТИКА»
№ 11, 1984 г.

на английском языке
0-35



**The Soviet monthly digest SOCIALISM:
THEORY AND PRACTICE and
supplements to this journal are digests of
the political and theoretical press
featuring the vital problems of Marxist-
Leninist theory, the practice of socialist
and communist construction, the
peoples' struggle for peace, democracy
and socialism, and worldwide ideological
struggle.**

All inquiries should be addressed to
SOCIALISM: THEORY AND PRACTICE
7 Bolshaya Pochtovaya Street,
107082, Moscow, USSR
or to the Information Department of the
Soviet Embassy

