


QUO VADIS HOMINE
WHERE DO YOU GO?

Dr. J. Shumelda, M.A., M.L.S., Ph.D., and DR. JUR.

* * *

ALCHEMY BOOKS, San Francisco, Cal.



QUO VADIS HOMINE
WHERE DO YOU GO?

Dr. J. Shumelda, M.A., M.L.S., Ph.D., and DR. JUR.

*** * ***

**THIS BOOK IS DEDICATED
TO
THE CAREFUL READERS**

*** * * * ***

**L.C. No. 507-277
© Shumelda, J., 1980**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. WHERE DID WE COME FROM?

Introduction

1. Where did we come from?
2. Man's experience with fair rules and self-government
3. The arena of the United States of America

II. WHERE DO WE STAND?

1. Our fair and unfair epoch
2. 19th century's doctrines which affect us
3. Our decades beset with rapid changes, contradictions and instabilities
4. The contemporary Soviet political doctrine and instabilities in the Soviet sphere of influence
5. The trends for consolidation and cooperation

III. WHERE ARE WE HEADING TO?

1. The scenarios of the past and future trends
2. The main impediments to human social and political progress

Postscript

*APPENDIX: FINAL ACT of the Helsinki Conference
[in excerpts and digest]*

* * *

Dr. J. Shumelda, Author of:

**The Revolution Breaks the Chains
From Marx to Malenkov
Post-Stalin Changes in the Soviet Union
and Other Works**

I.

WHERE DID WE COME FROM?

INTRODUCTION — Behind every deep-seated, protracted individual instability stands a confusion and lack of decision in: **WHAT TO DO OR IN WHICH DIRECTION TO GO?** Without such decision and determination no meaningful life can exist and no useful work might be ever performed. Confusion has tendency to breed more of confusions, more crossroads, blind, hopeless, alleys, and mental instabilities, which lead to emotional breakdown.

Every auto-driver knows how frustrating and exhausting it is to come in a dark night to crossroads, lose the course of travel, and be not able to read any signs or follow any signals. The same is true of flying in the air and ocean-navigation. Is it not possibly to loose human life in such a travel? How many men and women lost already their lives after loosing their course of travel?

Our life is like travel in a big ocean. Our times are decades of unique inventions in sciences and technologies, of rapid changes in social and political life. Sometimes it looks as if all social and political signs have fallen down, and there is nobody to lead and guide. Terror and violence, acts of madness and lack of elementary reason surround us.

What shall we do in such conditions? Move in the alleys and crossroads of confusions? Stay busy-bodies without ability and time to think? Sit in despair and succumb to commands of neurosis? Follow the guidance of confused madmen? Resort to drinking and mix whiskeys with narcotics? Dream of social paradises abroad?

When we get confused and lost in driving our auto, we stop our driving, start thinking and reasoning: where did I come from? where do I truly stand? and where I am heading to? where is North, South, East and West? which is my objective of driving?

Reasoning is what we need in every confused situation. It is the only alternative to more confusions, more of blind alleys, more of crossroads, more of psychological torments and mental exhaustion.

It acts like a balm on our brain, our nervous system and our body and our spirit. In the conditions of mental stability we can make reasonable decisions and do anything very well. Without emotional balance and rational reasoning we are just a mad, confused, helpless thing.

We do in this work what we do when we get confused in driving our auto. We stop and ask: QUO VADIS? It means in Latin: WHERE DO YOU GO? Many Romans asked themselves this question when confused in anything. The closest followers of Jesus asked him "QUO VADIS DOMINE?" [LORD, WHERE YOU GO?] when He was vaning after His resurrection. This question is also at the very foundation of modern, scientific psychotherapy.

Then we ask, as all reasonable drivers do in many dark, blind alleys and on the crossroads with no visible road-signs, more detailed questions: WHERE DID WE COME FROM? WHERE DO WE STAND? WHERE ARE WE HEADING TO? On this simple frame of questions OUR TRAVEL in explorations and thinking in this treatise is based. A careful reading is a travel in explorations, reasoning and self-organization, too. Our journey together shall be safe, pleasant, and informative.

* * *

1. WHERE DID WE COME FROM?

* * *

In the tradition of man's historical thinking about his first period of life on the earth is embedded a deep belief that his individual and social life was very happy, balanced, free of any social and emotional tensions. Such belief thrives in religious and athiestic thought, or, stating in other words, in all teachings that God created the man and in evolutionary theories.

The Christian Bible portrays man's first individual and social life on this earth in very ideal conditions. The first man was ideal, too. His fairness, his commitment to truth and justice was beyond any questioning. In the course of time, the Bible teaches, man's body, his spiritual and social quality deteriorated. No matter how much and how often God attempts to correct the deteriorated man and nations, the process of deterioration continues. THE REVELATION TO JOHN, which is the last book in the New Testament of the Bible, speaks about "lightning," "smoke and sulphur," "thunders," "loud noises," "hail and fire, mixed with blood, which fell on the earth," "a third of mankind was killed," "a third of the trees were burnt up," "and all green grass was burnt up." /REVELATION, 8-10/.

Publius Ovidius Naso, known in literature under the name of OVID, tried to describe in his poem "Metamorphoses" how the man and his social life changed since its very beginning to the time of contemporary statesman, warrior and writer, Gaius Julius Caesar. He studied all legends, mythologies, what people's memories carried on this subject, and whatever in this field was already written by that time. Naso admired the first period of man's life on the earth, which was to him a GOLDEN AGE. At that time, OVID wrote, man was FAIR and JUST; he "cultivated by his own free will JUSTICE and FIDELITY." Fairness and justice ruled his individual and social life. No injustice, confusions, and other social ills existed at that time. But then came a deteriorating social process; man and society became like copper, silver and rude iron compared to gold. Misery and social conflicts started to patronize man's life.

Many modern writers and political thinkers made references in their theories to that little known period in man's social life and his behavior. It was like a marvel-period to the writers of 17th and

18th centuries, when fairness and justice were stirring again the best minds in the world and masses of peoples in Europe and America started to go on barricades and fought for their materilization.

Man's recorded periods of history, which in Western and Eastern European civilizations are known as Ancient, Mediaeval and Modern Times, were not ruled by fairness and justice. Despotism and violence held their hands on man's destinies. To many men and women it was their way of life, their behavior, their attitudes, their relations to other men and peoples, and their licence to do whatever they wanted. They were fair and just to their brute psychology, which became their nature and their physiology. But man's quest for fairness and justice never died; it was growing and expanding since the end of Ancient Times. The forces for fairness and justice, as the following chapters will show in great details, supported by other social forces and trends of history, came to organized break-through in France, United States of America and some other European countries in the last quarter of 18th century. But the break-through did not mean any end of the struggle between the forces of despotism and fairness, violence and justice. Both forces are deeply entrenched in all societies and the world. Our decades demonstrate to us how bitter is this struggle in every place and every corner of the earth.

Why fairness and justice, their implementation, are of such great importance in man's individual life, his living in social groups, his political and economic life?

Five cases in sport stadiums can be used to illustrate their importance. *In case no. I:* the game is played very well. The stadium is very quiet and the public attentative. All players play hard and display great vigor but observe all rules of fairness and the game proper. The umpire is as fair, skilled and just as the best judge and outstanding player can be. The public is pleased watching the vigor and high performance of every player of both teams and the role of objective umpire in the good game. Many spectators whisper, "Well-spent money."

In case no. II: the umpire for no reason started to favor one team and discriminate against another. "He is unfair; he is crooked; get him out. . .", the disappointed public started to shout. "If he is not very soon out, we'll be out," the noise continued. "Let us play," a

group of the fans of the down-trodden team cried while entering the playground starting violence. The unfairness of the umpire produced turmoil and fighting; the game ended in bloody violence and police taking over the play.

In case no. III: the umpire was fair, just, and unbiased. A tall player no. 8 of the green team started to kick on the ankles of players of the gray team. The umpire whistled very often and the public shouted, "Get him out as soon as you can . . ." The umpire disqualified the unfair player; a substitute player took his place. The order has been restored; fairness, rules, and stability came to rule the game again. The public was once more calm, attentive, pleased, and well-behaved.

In case no. IV: many of those who came to watch the game were intoxicated, drugged, and ill. Instead of taking seats, some have been walking on the playground while others wanted the umpire and players to drink with them. The game could not come to any start. The manager of the stadium had to resort to law enforcement units; police and ambulances cleared the stadium.

In case no. V: when a good, fair, and vigorous game was in progress, the skies turned suddenly dark and torrential rain hit the stadium. The game was washed away . . . The forces of nature took the upper hand.

These five cases show it takes many factors to have a good, exciting, vigorous, well-balanced, and stable game. Important of them are: vigorous, well-trained, intelligent, experienced in games, healthy, unbiased, honest umpire; the players must know how to work well in teams, because no one player, no matter how outstanding, can win any game; the stadium must be built to comply with the design of the game and have good accommodations for the teams and the public. The fields must be well marked and each player must know where he stands. Nobody can molest the public while playing; sanitary conditions of the whole stadium, good safety devices, and safety for the public are a must for the professional game; reasonable good weather is important factor in any game. But the most important, the most essential, and underlying everything is fairness in all its aspects and dimensions. A game can be played when the stadium is poor, when the weather is not the best, when the players are not as vigorous as they can be and the umpire not the most intelligent, but no unfair game can

develop well and no reasonable game can be based on unfairness.

Not every team can win a game, but those that play good, fair, and healthy games are never losers. The health, vigor, and the feeling of work well done, are theirs. The public in the stadium and millions of those who listen to radios and watch TV have as much respect for the losing team and its good players as they have for the winners, provided the game was good and fair. Those players, who did some kicking in the ankles, or were unfair otherwise, are called STINKERS, no matter to which team they belong.

Those who play and watch the game are often not aware of the fact that all our professional games, including baseball and soccer, were not always in existence. They developed slowly out of primitive games, which often were as rude and brute as the social life was at that time. The sports and professional games played a major part in man's maturing in the arena of history. Designers of some sports and fair plays were often inspired by a vision of more fair man, more fair society, and a new fair world.

* * *

2. MAN'S EXPERIENCE WITH FAIR RULES AND SELF-GOVERNMENT

* * *

Whatever makes a good baseball team or any other sport team forms a good social unit, and what fashions a good baseball league makes a good society and government. The same underlying principles of good health and productivity, of knowledge, and application of rules, of fairness and vigor, of emotional balance and stability, of self-discipline and self-government are common today to all good units on the face of the earth. Whichever does not have these attributes is not good social unit.

The differences between sport-units and other social units are not of quality but quantity. No matter how large a baseball league is, it is always only a tiny part of the entire society. Differences are in great variety of the types of social units, their aims and awards; every social unit, including sport-teams, strive for success or victory; in case of victory of a professional sport-team, the prize might be a small sum of money or a trophy, but successful political campaign might bring to the winning party all spoils of a given office, its power and related wealth, which often spoils, corrupts and intoxicates the party and its candidates. James Barnes made a good statement when he said: "Power intoxicates man. When man is intoxicated by alcohol, he can recover, but when intoxicated by power, he seldom recovers." Boris Pasternak, author of *Shivago* and keen observer of the Soviet system, and its infallibility, described well in one sentence how the intoxication with power works: "As for men in power, they are so anxious to establish the myth of infallibility that they do their utmost to ignore the truth." They often ignore even their own campaign promises and the political platform on which they rose to power. Often during the election campaign they see everything in dark colors and are very critical of many things, but once elected and in the office everything turns rosy. Their successful coming to a given position exerted magic effect on everything.

The differences exist also in the viewing the performance of sport players and those elected or appointed to public offices. Each professional sport-game moves in the front of sophisticated public, which includes many outstanding players of other teams than those which play on the stadium, umpires, managers, and trainers of the teams. The openness in case of each play is perfect.

Openness is a **MUST** in government based on people's sovereignty, which is not required in a despotic or totalitarian form of government. But it is still not practiced in many republican and democratic governmental units; controls and audits are still far away from where they ought to be, and the tendency is for more governmental units to enjoy the status of "top secret." Many governmental officials, who are only public servants on public (taxpayers) payrolls, can view the public any time and any way they want, but nobody can see them even when their activities betray many shortcomings.

When viewed by the standards of modern sport-games and modern constitutional designs, which are based on the same principles, many governmental units do not look like applying their own rules and manuals. Their decisions, activities and behavior are whimsical, and arbitrary. Why is it so?

The answer is obvious: the new social designs are very strange to them, they do not know their rules and do not apply them. The history of governments in the course of six thousands of years of man's recorded history is the record of plays of tyrants, pharaohs, and emperors like Nero, who played flute when Rome burned and Christians were crucified on crosses along the imperial roads and highways. Power-drunk emperors, tyrants, dictators, and those who have been imitating them, shouted like rude Prince Bernard von Buelow in the nineteenth century: "To the meaningless French idealism, liberty and fraternity, we oppose the German realities, infantry, cavalry, and artillery." Gentle American poet, Robert Frost, who studied man's cultures and civilizations in great depth, said: "I often say of George Washington that he was one of the few in the whole history of the world who was not carried away by power."

Some governmental officials are ignorant of new social and political designs, which aim at law and order, mature individuals, who do not **NEED** any sticks and carrots, responsible and well-functioning government, and all of them at their best. They do not understand what French idealism, liberty and fraternity mean. They never read **DECREE ON MARTIAL LAW** of the French National Assembly of 21st October, 1789, which set outstanding patterns for handling in an orderly way any act of violence. They are not familiar with the **DECREE OF THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT**, dated October 1, 1789,

which set a model for the modern republican and democratic government, and never looked at DECLARATION OF THE RIGHTS OF MAN AND CITIZEN of the French National Assembly of August 27, 1789, which states at its very beginning some principles of orderly society and government. It says:

"The representatives of the French people, organized in the National Assembly, considering that ignorance, forgetfulness, or contempt of the right of man are the sole causes of public misfortunes and corruption of government, have resolved to set forth in a solemn declaration the natural, inalienable, and sacred rights of man, in order that such declaration, continually before all members of the social body, may be a perpetual reminder of their rights and duties; in order that the acts of the legislative power and those of the executive power may constantly be compared with the aim of every political institution "

The history of the public, carrier of the sovereignty in most of the countries at the present time, including China, India, U.S. and the U.S.S.R., is neither a long record of well-enlightened groups, which can rule and behave in very sophisticated manner. In the Roman times it was "plebs," which wanted "bread and circuses" in exchange for violent support to those governmental officials, who were able and willing to buy them. In Mediaeval times, the contemporary public was predominantly in the form of ignorant and illeterate slaves and serfs. The public as we know it today, including modern professions, blue and white collar workers, and literate farmers are the products of 19th and 20th centuries. Some thinkers, like Albert Einstein, were very skeptical about the modern man. To Einstein belongs the phrase that "it is easier to denature plutonium than to denature the evil spirit of human nature."

Man's conditioning for fairness and new political arrangements is still not long enough, what they can and ought to be for a happy and stable modern society. The past conditioning by bloody tyrants and rulers like Nero still hangs like a dark cloud over the man and nests in his inner.

The conditioning, on which our social and political institutions rest, developed in the course of history in family units, professional organizations, monasteries and schools, units of local government and cities. One of man's longest experiences in fairness and self-

government was of FREE MEN IN FREE CITIES. This experience, which started in continental Europe and Great Britain in the early medieval period, led slowly to the abolishment of serfdom and slavery in every country of the world. The right to be FREE, which once was a theoretical principle of Christ's teaching, a privilege of kings and aristocracy, came first on a large scale to FREE CITIES, then to some countries, continents, and slowly the entire earth.

"The air of free city will make you free," was the motto of serfs and slaves running away out of landlords' estates to freedom. It was not unlike running away to the steppes of southern Ukraine to be a Cossack there, or sailing to Americas, leaving behind tyrants and oppressors. But to be FREE did not mean banditry, comforts or rest; men and women from everywhere were determined to succeed in new forms of social and political life and they had to protect themselves against groups of thieves, bandits and gangs of warriors. They were busy developing crafts, trade, education, new ways of working together and fostered self-government, which was based on free election of their best men to the leading positions in their community and organizations. In these social arrangements is not difficult to see the new socio-political design in a miniature form, which came to application in some countries on the national and top-level in the last quarter of 18th century, sponsored in 17th and 18th centuries by noted political thinkers like John Locke and many others.

The rapid growth of population, which once disrupted quiet, pastoral type of man's life in the first period of his social existence, began to produce many problems, which will be considered in another part of this treatise. Direct elections to public offices of the men known well to all members of the city became impossible. Cities came to be a place of many political and social vices.

In the last quarter of 18th century, when some countries shifted from the old to the new political design, the social grouping within these countries was extremely uneven and the political map of the earth was in the form of several huge empires, which means that many countries and peoples were not free to rule their own destinies. A part of the masses of peoples of Europe and other countries still lingered in slavery and serfdom, while literacy was a privilege of landed aristocracy, commercial groups and of limited number of professional folk. The final acts of emancipation of

serfs came in 1848 for the countries of Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, of slaves and serfs in Tsarist-Russian Empire in 1863 and in 1865 for the United States of America. In this respect the social and international picture of the world in the eighteenth century was not unlike that in the Roman Empire in the zenith of its power. The only difference was that the Roman Empire was relatively small compared to huge intercontinental empires at the end of 18th century, and Rome faced remnants of weak empires, like Persia, while modern European empires were *on par* in many respects and able to contest each other's influence and power in any place of the earth and any corner of their empires.

The national and social liberation movements on a large scale were still to come. A slow process of rise of people-nations, each based on former tribes, began to develop at the end of early medieval period. They developed one common language, geography and one stream of political tradition. France was in 18th century the first mature, modern nation of Europe, and was followed by a dozen of less mature countries. Some countries, like Poland, or the Ukraine, were divided among the neighboring empires, which fought on their territories for power and political influence.

Poland might be a good case of study in the rise and failure on her territory of new political institutions. Starting in the late Mediaeval period, Poland experimented in great depth with FREE CITIES arrangements, which brought to many cities lucrative trade and crafts, schools and colleges. The Polish landlords competed hard with Polish kings for power and economic wealth. This struggle produced the Polish *Sejm* (parliament), one camera representation of the upper strata of Polish society in 1467. At the beginning of 18th century, *Sejm* established itself into bicameral representation, and in the course of the same century attempts have been made to write a popular constitution and a plank of civil liberties. But Polish experiment with her new political design was not acceptable to the neighboring empires of Austria, Russia, and Prussia. Imperial environment, internal strife in the period of rapid political change, corruption of Polish aristocracy, selling itself to imperial masterminds, brought this once powerful country to a downfall in the last quarter of 18th century.

Developments in France were similar to those in Poland, but she

was in many respects in a much better position than Poland. Being the first mature nation in Europe, she did not have any ethnic dissensions at home; her economy, education, culture, and civilization were second to none in continental Europe; serfdom in France was a part of her far past and it took the form of token payments of peasants to landlords. But France was a carrier of a huge empire, embedded in the system of other empires, and French aristocracy felt closer to conservative forces of Prussia and Russia than to the people of France. The French experience in new design and self-government based on people's sovereignty came to revolutionary explosion, bloody European wars, and foreign armies battling France proper. In place of expected fairness, good justice, law and order, new broad social and political domestic balances and stability, came gloomy destruction and human misery in France and across the European continent. The imperial forces of Europe wrote their verdict in the form of Treaty of Vienna in 1815, which pushed France and Europe to the pre-revolutionary conditions and condemned anything short of absolutism.

After the verdict of Vienna, French people tried again many times to set up a new political stadium for people's sovereignty and government by law. The setup of 1848-1852 came in the midst of European Spring of Nations, but it was as short-lived as was the Spring of Nations. Once more the forces for change fell victim to reactionary, imperial forces. Another attempt, of 1871, left France in the form of a republic, which carried a big empire until the 1950s when the last dependencies decided to have their own national stadiums, and their own Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. This left France *free* of the burden of colonies but short on some industrial resources, which are needed for her many factories.

French revolution looked to the rulers and inhabitants of Great Britain too radical, too fast, too unstable, and upsetting many balances in Europe and the world. Her practice was to start early and move slowly step-by-step in any field, including development of representative type of government. A good beginning was made in 1215, when on June 15 of that year, in the meadow called Runnymede, King JOHN signed the constitution, which granted FREEDOM OF THE CHURCH, LIBERTIES AND FREE CUSTOMS to towns and ports, AMERCEMENTS to freemen, DUE PROCESS OF LAW, and other rights and liberties to barons and the people of England. In 1265, the Simon's

Parliament started its work, and step-wise evolved into the modern two-chamber system of popular representation, two party system, well-functioning courts, and executive branch of government in the hands of the most popular political party. The power of the royal dynasty was reduced slowly to the position of symbol of unity of the British Commonwealth of Nations and *quasi* hereditary presidents in the system of constitutional monarchy.

While facing two traditional alternatives, of staying in splendid isolation or masterminding a coalition against her bitter enemy, she decided to punish France for her meddling and fiddling with British colonies in North America, which Frenchmen helped to set free. Her decision was a primary factor in putting revolutionary France on her knees and in bringing Napoleon Bonaparte, Consul and then Emperor of France, to his banishment in Saint Helena.

* * *

3. THE ARENA OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

* * *

Our rules for the soccer game were set by the London Football Association in 1861; they serve at the present time every professional and amateur soccer game all over the world. The same fairness and rules are needed for the same type of game everywhere. Rules are an iron law of the game, and they do not permit any unfair, violent, plays.

World War II and its aftermath brought to North Africa, near and Far East, Europe and Asia the American baseball game. It moved to these areas on the heels of the United States Armed Forces, and U.S. economic and political power. The design of the fields of the baseball game and rules is credited to the cadet of the Westpoint Abner Doubleday and the Knickerbocker Baseball Club of New York, active in the 1850's. Some elements of the baseball game can be traced to English cricket and rounders, played in 17th century in England and carried by British settlers with British custom and folklore, Kings JOHN CONSTITUTION, BIBLE, and civilization second to none, to the settlements across the Pacific Ocean in North America.

The origin of the United States of America as a people goes back to the beginning of 17th century, when settlers out of Great Britain began to settle in large numbers in lands along the eastern and southeastern coasts of North America. The original settlers were Englishmen, Scots, Irishmen and Welshmen, reared in the same tradition of fairness, constitution, law and order. Their commitment to the cause of free social and political institution was stronger than of their countrymen they left behind. Many settlers were ardent men and women, boys and girls; they were persecuted at home for religious and other social reasons. They were seeking not only bread and wine but freedom as well. The last played often more important role than search for new economic opportunities.

From the standpoint of European history, they were the Western tier and frontier of development of new ways of social and political life, vanguards of peoples sovereignty and people's self-government. The Eastern tier of the same movement was in the steppes of the Ukraine, which was expanding South and East. Those immigrants and settlers established powerful Cossack movements, which, in the 1640's, embraced the entire Ukraine and

led to establishment of the Cossak-State of Ukraine.

In the last quarter of the 18th century, the Western tier's settlers in North America grew bitterly disappointed by the arbitrary colonial policies of the British government, titular ruler of the North-American colonies. In 1775, colonies revolted against the British Crown. The fight and war between the settlers and British imperial forces started. In the same year the remnants of Ukrainian Cossacks fought to the end an uneven war against the forces of rapidly rising Imperial Russia, heir to the Eastern Roman Empire and self-appointed protector of Orthodox Christians. The verdict of Empress Catherine II, the Great, was to destroy the last fortress of freedom, people's sovereignty and people's self-government, which was on the small island of the southern Dnieper.

The Western frontier of freedom was more lucky. It had friends in France and other Western European countries, who helped to fight the war and recognize the independence of the new country, which was proclaimed on the 4th of July, 1776.

When we look today at 152 nations at the United Nations, disappearance of Western and Central European empires, the high tides of people's sovereignty, of people's quest for self-government on every continent of the earth, we must say that the rise of the United States as a free country of new design was an epoch-making event and the beginning of a new period in man's history. The U.S. tier was the only one, which did not succumb to the old forces of history. France, Poland and Ukrainian Cossaks could not hold the onslaught of massive imperial forces.

Not all settlers in the U.S. tier were aware of the significance of the 4th of July, 1776, and the outcome of their determination and sacrifices. But those who fought in the Revolutionary War and wrote Declaration of Independence and other historical documents did not have any doubt about the importance of those events. George Washington, for example, wrote in his GENERAL ORDERS on July 2, 1776, two days before the independence was declared, as follows:

"Let us therefore animate and encourage each other, and show the whole Earth that a Freeman, contending for liberty on his own ground, is superior to any mercenary on the earth."

Samuel Adams, leading man of Revolution, said a few weeks after July 4th the following:

"Driven from every other corner of the earth, freedom of thought and the right of private judgement in matters of conscience directs their course to this happy country as their last asylum."

Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men were created equal; that they are endowed by the Creator with certain, inalienable rights; that among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The above words mean nothing else but people's sovereignty, society by law, strict rules of fairness, justice and freedom.

Thomas Jefferson ended the Declaration with the following words:

"And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

The Constitution of the United States of America of 1785, ratified by States in 1787, was built on the same principles as was the Declaration of Independence. The same principles were embodied in the design of the individual States of the Union. The PREAMBLE to the CONSTITUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS of 1780 reads:

"The end of the institution, maintenance and administration of government, is to secure the existence of the body politic, to protect it, and to furnish individuals who compose it, with power of enjoying in safety and tranquillity their natural rights, and blessings of life; and whenever these great objects are not obtained, the people have a right to alter the government, and take measures necessary for their safety, prosperity and happiness.

"The body politic is formed by a voluntary association of individuals: it is a social compact, by which the people covenant

with each citizen, and each citizen with the whole people, that all shall be governed by certain laws for the common good. It is the duty of the people, therefore, in framing constitution of government, to provide for an equitable mode of making laws, as well as for an impartial interpretation, and faithful execution of them; that every man may, at all times, find his security in them.

"We, therefore, the people of Massachussetts, acknowledging, with grateful hearts, the goodness of the great Legislator of the Universe, in affording us, in the course of His providence, an opportunity, deliberately and peaceably, without fraud, violence, or surprise, of entering into an original. explicit, and solemn compact with each other; and in forming a new constitution of civil government"

The Constitution of the United States of America of 1785 declared:

"We the people of the United States of America, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote general welfare, and to assure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish the Constitution of the United States of America."

In contrast to all despotic and autocratic systems, the constitution defined clearly the role of government, which amounted to public services to the people of the United States of America. Henry Clay, who was born and reared in the first decades of existence of the new country, commented on this role as follows:

"Government is a trust, and the officers of the government are trustees, and both the trust, and the trustees are created for the benefit of the people." (Speech in Ashland, Kentucky, March 1829.)

The constitutional design was very carefully planned. It provided for division of power in government (legislative, judiciary and executive) in order to make despotism or autocracy impossible. The check and balances were built in the design to make corruption and abuse of power beyond any possibility. The jurisdictions (spheres of activities and functions) of the federal, state and local government were delineated clearly. The makers of

the constitution knew well that three women cannot cook simultaneously their dishes on the same oven, and that good work and management rest on clear defining **WHO DOES WHAT AND WHY.**

The fields of plays were painted clearly. Some were marked **"FOR THE PEOPLE ONLY"** and they should have been never entered by any governmental officials. The designers of the fundamental law of the land knew well that a gradual encroachment of government on some fields of the people and individual citizens will interfere with their life, create chaotic conditions, and might lead to a hidden despotism or encroachment of foreign imperialism on the entire country. James Madison, one of the architects of the new political system stated:

"I believe there are more instances of the abridgement of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachment of those in power than by violent usurpation."

The Constitution provided for methods by which it could be improved or changed when the country will grow more complex, larger, and digging deeper into its social issues, social and economic justice. The improvement and changes were to take primarily the form of amendments to be added in separate enactments to the main body of the Constitution. Four years after the Constitution was already in use, came the first ten Amendments, which were not unlike the **BILL OF RIGHTS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE** of 1784, stated:

"Article 1st. (EQUALITY OF MEN, ORIGIN AND OBJECT OF GOVERNMENT). All men are born equally free and independent; therefore, all governments, of right, originate from the people, are founded in consent, and instituted for the general good.

"Article 2nd. (NATURAL RIGHTS) All men have certain natural, essential and inherent rights — among which are, the enjoying and defending life and liberty; acquiring, possessing, and protecting property; and, in a word, of seeking and obtaining happiness.

"Article 3rd. (SOCIETY, ITS ORGANIZATION AND PURPOSES) When men enter into a state of society, they

surrender up some parts of their natural rights to that society, in order to ensure the protection of others; and without such an equivalent, the surrender is void.

"Article 4th. (RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE UNALIENABLE) Among the natural rights, some are, in their very nature unalienable, because no equivalent can be given or received for them. Of this kind are the Rights of Conscience.

"Article 5th. (RELIGIOUS FREEDOM RECOGNIZED) Every individual has a natural and unalienable right to worship GOD according to his dictates of his own conscience, and reason; and no subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained, in his person, liberty, or estate, for worshipping GOD in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience; or for his religious profession, sentiments, or persuasion; provided he doth not disturb the public peace or disturb others in their religious worship.

"Article 6th. (MORALITY AND PIETY) [Lays emphasis on the importance of high moral standards in social life and permits denominational schools.]

"Article 7th. (STATE SOVEREIGNTY) [Sovereignty of the State of Hampshire rests in the people of the State. Some rights might be 'expressly delegated to the United States in congress assembled'.]

"Article 8th. (ACCOUNTABILITY OF MAGISTRATES AND OFFICERS) [All accountable to the people, because their powers and authority have been given to them by the people.]

"Article 9th. (NO HEREDITARY OFFICE OR PLACE) [Explains what the title states.]

"Article 10th. (RIGHT OF REVOLUTION) [Explains that the government is instituted for the common benefit, protection and security of the entire people, not for the interest of any single individual, family or group. Therefore, the people have the right to reform a malfunctioning government or establish a new government.]"

Not unlike the Constitution of NEW HAMPSHIRE, the

Constitution of the United States received, in 1791, ten articles (amendments), which together constitute the BILL OF RIGHTS.

The FIRST — provides for FREEDOM OF RELIGION, SPEECH, PRESS, ASSEMBLY and PETITION.

The SECOND — gives the citizens the right to keep and bear the arms;

The THIRD — “. . . No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in manner provided by law;”

The FOURTH — provides safety against arbitrary SEARCHES AND SEIZURES;

The FIFTH — provides for DUE PROCESS OF LAW in any criminal or related cases;

The SIXTH — provides rules for criminal prosecutions;

The SEVENTH — provides for right for trial by jury in CIVIL TRIALS “where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars;”

The EIGHTH — “Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted;”

The NINTH — “The enumeration in the constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people;”

The TENTH — “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

* * *

The country built on new, good design began to develop by leaps and bounds from its very beginning. There never was, and probably never will be again a country which could show such a rapid growth, territorial expansion, industrialization and other

economic improvements. But one must keep in mind that in rapid growth of anything, natural or social, are hidden dangers and pitfalls. A rapid growth is not unlike inflation, which is marked by strains and heat of producing factors. The overall social growth of a country or nation might be imbalanced as far individual fields of national life are concerned, lay too much strain on human resources, or both.

The scoreboards of the United States' national arena reported continually very high quantitative scores. So-called Northwest Territories and Mid-West were rapidly settled. The movement to the West, to the Pacific Ocean was an unique saga. The railroads from the East to the Pacific Ocean and from the prairies of Canada to the Gulf of Mexico well built. In the second half of 19th century modern industries were established without too much of European capital investment.

Thousands of towns and cities rose in once no man's land and a new, lively type of urban civilization came soon to a blossom; New York, Chicago, and other U.S. cities became famous internationally. With the rise of modern towns, cities and modern education, attempt was made to wipe out illiteracy and establish colleges and universities. Some small denominational colleges opened their doors already in 17th century, among them Harvard College, which in 20th century became famous Harvard University with many outstanding colleges and schools. But a large number of state colleges and universities were established only in the second half of 19th century and they grew to prominence only in the twentieth century. Till the outbreak of World War I, many U.S. students were crowding colleges and universities in Great Britain and continental Europe, primarily Germany and France.

One of the most amazing sagas was a large number of immigrants coming to work and settle in the United States of America. In the nineteenth century, 50 millions of them came, which means the size of population of France, Ukraine and more than of Italy today. The immigrants left the seaports of every port in Great Britain, France, Germany, Ukraine, Russia, and the entire of Europe. In the twentieth century, when the flood of immigrants out of European countries began to thin out, came those out of other countries, including Mexico and latin American countries. Which country on the face of the earth could absorb so many immigrants and open to them opportunities for

employment, housing and even their own autos? Which could make them live and work together?

The system of fairness, equality of all in the front of law and reasonable justice can do amazing things, which no despot and no ingenious dictator can do. In such a system every man and woman, boy and girl, and even children try to do their best. When individual cells and parts of the body work well, the whole body functions well. The same is true of society and nation.

On the arena of the United States of America have been some setbacks as well. Nothing flows smoothly all time in individual, social life and nature. Setbacks are in our lives to show us how to cope with them, how to move more effectively ahead of others, and how to develop more determination in moving to our objectives. They are something to think about and learn by them. Hiding them and worrying about them does not lead anywhere.

The Civil War in 1860's and economic depression of late 1920's and 1930's were, no doubt, major setbacks for the United States of America. A war about slaves and serfs at the time when slavery was not profitable from the economic point of view and backward countries, like Imperial Russia, were setting their serfs free by imperial decrees, was definitely not a very progressive thing. But a war starts often in a very funny way: tensions start mounting about something not very important; then come passions and prejudices into play; and the heat leads to fighting.

Depression of late 1920's and 1930's hit the United States of America in the belly more than any other country in the world. The simple fact is that the country of this type cannot afford any large scale unemployment; fairness, justice, and employment are the main centrifugal forces of the United States of America. Unfairness, whimsical handling of justice and large scale unemployment breed dissent and feed social instability. They affect young, immigrant countries more than the older which are cemented together by many common bonds.

Why did depression come in the United States of America and all over the world? Did the world hit a phase of unlucky business cycles?

The answer is very simple: neither economists nor governments

knew at that time how to steer well national economies and international economic relations. They learned in the course of depression. In the midst of depression new economic theories and designs rose, which discarded some old notions about economic life and advanced more effective approaches to economic policies.

The Great Depression (under this name the depression of late 1920's and early 1930's came to be known in economic and general history) provided many insights in economic life in general and the function of national economies in specific. The lesson of the new insights was: 1. planning in economic and social life is as important as incentives to work and be productive, and 2. national economy without economic fairness and justice cannot work well. The economic reasoning is simple: consumers give direct and indirect orders for goods and services to producers and distributors of goods and services. Consumers are important in a stable economy. When consumers will be unemployed in large numbers or underpaid for their work, there will not be enough orders to run the wheels of machines and factories and make busy the channels of distribution of goods and services. The investments in producers' goods, often called capital, will start idling, and entrepreneurs commit suicides and go bankrupt. To be unfair, unjust and selfish does not bring fruit even in economic life.

The Civil War brought many lessons and insights, too. No stable country can stay in good condition half free and another half in slavery. This applies to territorial dimensions of any country, its individual fields of life and the world in general. Either freedom or masters will rule the slaves and run an unfree society.

The bloody Civil War demonstrated how tenurial the forces of slavery and despotism can be, especially when combined with material wealth. It takes efforts and time to have genuine people's sovereignty, a just and orderly society. No revolution, no new design can be materialized overnight. How could a people's sovereignty exist when such a large part of people were in the form of slavery and serfdom? How much justice and political or economic fairness a slave receives and enjoys?

New political design, which aims to change the course of man's history, and is the product of a new long-run historical trend, can be materialized only in the long period of time. It is important to move continually in the right direction by having in mind THE

DESIGN and the long-run OBJECTIVES. The handling of the Civil War and the Great Depression was the right move in the right direction.

* * *

The United States of America stepped out of political isolation and games in American area to the world arena in World War II. It was a mad world. On the small Italian peninsula, Benito Mussoline wanted *facism*, which stands both for monoparty totalitarian system and a plan to build a huge empire, not unlike the Roman Empire based on Southern Europe and Africa. In Germany, defeated in World War I and cut to her own size, the National-Socialists (National Socialist Workers Party — NSDAP), called *Nazis*, after coming to power, wanted to rebuild the German Empire based on Europe and the entire world. In Asia, the officers and the government of Emperor Hirohito launched in the 1930's, a war to conquer parts of China and Southeast Asia. In December of 1941 they came to attack Pearl Harbor in Hawaii; this attack dragged the United States of America into the arena of open war with Imperial Japan.

World War II started in a mad way, too. When Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini exercised political pressure for territorial changes in Europe, France and U.K. tried to talk to them while building a powerful ring of countries around them. They wanted to see in the powerful alliance the Soviet Union and conducted negotiations with the Soviet Government. But unexpectedly, the Soviet Government, on August 23, 1939, concluded the treaty with the Hitler's *Reich*, which provided for the partitioning of Poland, invasion of Poland by German and Soviet armed forces, Soviet occupation of the Baltic States and parts of Rumania. The SECRET ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL to the TREATY OF NON-AGRESSION BETWEEN GERMANY AND THE SOVIET UNION, concluded in Moscow on August 23, 1939, reads:

". . . Article I. In the event of territorial and political rearrangement in the areas belonging to the Baltic States (Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania), the Northern boundary of Lithuania shall represent the boundary of the sphere of influence of Germany and the U.S.S.R. In this connection the interest of Lithuania in the Vilna area is recognized by each party.

". . . Article 2. In the event of territorial and political rearrangement of the areas belonging to the Polish State, the sphere of influence of Germany and the U.S.S.R., shall be bounded approximately by the line of rivers Narew, Vistula and San . . .

". . . Article 3. With regard to Southeastern Europe, attention is called by the Soviet side to its interest in Bessarabia. The German side declares its complete political disinterestedness in these areas.

". . . Article 4. This protocol shall be treated by both parties as strictly secret.

Moscow, August 23, 1939

For the Government of the German Reich — v. Ribbentrop
Plenipotentiary of the Government of the U.S.S.R.
— V. Molotov."

Many of us wonder how such a treaty was possible between the *Nazis* (fascists) and the Socialist Soviet Union. The following chapters will dig deeply into this question. It is safe to say here that the Soviet Socialism is both Nazism and fascism. It is *Nazi* because it is a specific type of Socialism which developed on the political heritage of Tsarist Russian Empire and the imperial Russian interpretation of Marxism-Leninism. It is *facist* because it is a monoparty type of system which wants to develop a huge empire of Mussolini's type.

Before the outbreak of World War II, the Soviet Union was still an industrially underdeveloped region. Compared to Germany it was only at the beginning of industrialization, whereas the *Reich* was in chemical and engineering industries second to none.

The whole Soviet region of one-sixth of the surface of the earth was cut off from outside world by mined, empty strips of lands and barbed wires. The developments inside of the Soviet Union were woven in great secrets. The systematic academic studies of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics started only on a very limited scale in the 1930's in Western Europe, mainly at German Universities.

The Soviet military strategy was based and keyed to social unrest and revolutions. The works of Leon Trotsky, the father of

the Soviet Armed Forces, were very popular abroad and translated into many languages. The author himself, who came to disagree with Joe Stalin on vital problems of social strategy in the Soviet Union and abroad, was expelled out of the U.S.S.R., and killed by Stalin's man in Mexico City. In 1936, able military leader and world-famous military strategist, Marshall Tuhachevsky, was executed with other high ranking officers of the Soviet top military brass.

There was hardly any ethnic group or union republic willing to fight a war for the existing political system. The farmers were pushed by force into collectives and huge state farms, which they resented and fought by passive resistance. The workers had to work hard and long hours for very low wages. Food and consumer goods were scarce. The Soviet intellectuals were pushed around and by thousands sent to prisons and concentration camps; they had difficulties adjusting themselves to Stalin's interpretation of party dogmas. The religious groups were persecuted in the name of atheism.

The first three five-year plans of industrialization of the U.S.S.R., which started in October 1927, concentrated on heavy industries and armaments, increased the output of coal, steel, cement, some chemical products, and production of arms in the traditional industrial sites in the Ukraine and Ural area, but the quality of Soviet Arms was far behind any European standards. When in September, 1939, the Soviet armies came to occupy, according to the above quoted Molov-Ribethrop Treaty, the Western Ukraine, and some other territories of Poland, they carried their outdated rifles on ropes because leather was a short product.

The memoirs of Marshall Georgi Zhukov and documents related to the outbreak of German-Soviet war on June 22, 1941, show that the Soviet Government and military leadership knew well of the German preparation for the invasion of the Soviet Union, which started in Summer, 1940. As Marshall Zhukov describes in his memoirs, large scale Soviet preparation for the pending war started in the first months of 1941.

Marshall Zhukov's memoirs describe in great detail the outbreak of the war and defense strategy. He does not write (and

could not) about army after army surrendering to the invading German Armed Forces, but such surrenders took place in the first five months of the war. Among dozens of surrendered generals was Vassilly Stalin, son of Joseph Stalin, whose airplane landed on the German territory in 1941.

World-famous Zhukov concedes major setbacks, and that Moscow was in danger to be encircled as was Leningrad. The front came to Mozaisk and other communities within ten miles from Moscow. This should serve as a lesson to all governments and all military planners not to play unfair games to the people. No weapons, no matter how excellent, can win a war against the people or without the people.

There is another bitter lesson to be learned in that period, which Marshall Zhukov and historians of the Soviet-German war do not like to speak. The unusually early and severe Winter of 1941/42 struck the Hitler's panzer divisions, airplanes and armies, when they, sure of victory, started to butcher innocent men and women, boys and girls, and even children because they have been of Jewish or other ethnic origin. They practiced crimes against the mankind on Ukrainian writers and poets like OLENA TELIHA, Irlavskyy and others. Such crimes are punished by the nature and God, and it does not make any difference if the criminals are of Western, Eastern or any other civilization.

As reliable eye-witnesses and documents show, the severe Winter of 1941/42 broke the backbones and destroyed some elite troops of the Hitler's Armed Forces and from this blow they never recovered. This blow meant a turning point in the Soviet-German war, which turned it into position war and then retreat of German armies. There is, of course, no doubt that in the years 1942-45 the morale and quality of the Soviet Armed Forces were rebuilt. The atrocities of Gestapo and of special extermination troops helped to do so. The alliance offered to the Soviet Government by U.K., France's Government abroad, and United States of America after Hitler's invasion of the U.S.S.R., played also an important role in the rebuilding of morale and instilling the Soviet soldier with a new spirit. Not less important was the U.S. help in food and arms. The extent of this help can be illustrated by the letter of Franklin D. Roosevelt to Joseph V. Stalin of October 16, 1942. F. Roosevelt wrote:

"I am glad to inform you, in response to your request, that the items involved can be made available as follows:

WHEAT: two million short tons during the remainder of the protocol year at approximately equal monthly rates.

TRUCKS: 8,000 to 10,000 per month.

EXPLOSIVES: 4,000 short tons in November and 5,000 tons per month thereafter.

MEAT: 15,000 tons per month.

CANNED MEAT: 10,000 tons per month.

LARD: 12,000 tons per month.

SOAP STOCK: 5,000 tons per month.

VEGETABLE OIL: 10,000 tons per month.

"I will advise you at an early date of the aluminum shipment which I am still exploring.

"I have given orders that no effort be spared to keep our routes fully supplied with ships and cargo in conformity with your desires as to priorities on our commitments to you."

The long correspondence between F. D. Roosevelt and J. V. Stalin in the years 1941-44 reveals that he was willing to give to Joe almost anything he wanted. he was careful not to mention his own principle of FOUR FREEDOMS ("freedom of speech and expression — everywhere on the earth; . . . freedom of every person to worship God in his own way; . . . freedom from want; . . . and the freedom from fear . . . that no nation will be in the position to commit an act of aggression against any neighbor . . .") but made several references to common fight of *facism* and *nazism*. He used at times the term RUSSIA for the U.S.S.R., which implies that the Soviet Union is a homogeneous Russian nationality and not the Union of 16 republics, of which Russia is only one. He might have been viewing nationality problem in the light of "immigrants' country" like the United States of America, Brazil or Argentina, but it was an ad hoc viewing, not in correspondence with the history

of Eastern Europe, Constitution of the U.S.S.R., and long-run interest of the United States and the world, which will be better off when Eastern Europe will be in the form of free nations and not in the form of any huge state or empire. In this respect the position of (Thomas) Woodrow Wilson, United States President during World War I, who on January 8th 1918, proclaimed his 14 principles for post-war settlements, which included the right of every people to self-determination, was more deep and far-sighted. It provided for active approach to international relations, a key to political world in the process of change, good understanding of long-run trend of man's history, which the rise of the United States of America started, and was not an opportunistic device aiming to appease *facism* and *nazism* dressed in different suit and colors. Behind F. D. Roosevelt's correspondence with Joe lurked the old-fashioned concept of two great powers mastering and controlling man's and world's destiny.

The YALTA CONFERENCE (February, 1945), in which Winston S. Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Generalissimo J. V. Stalin participated, was written to a great extent on "good Joe's" terms. Military arrangements of the Yalta Conference provided for the entry of the Soviet Armed Forces into Central and Southern Europe, which began to be treated like the Joe's sphere of influence. This was at the time when German's high ranking military were seeking any opportunity to surrender Germany to the Western Allies.

On Joe's terms was made also the POTSDAM CONFERENCE, which took place from July 17 to August 2, 1945, when Franklin D. Roosevelt was already dead. The same spirit of appeasement and containing "Communism" continued. The Soviet Government, which together with Adolf Hitler started World War II, was given the right to huge reparations, parts of East German territories and effective control of Southern and Central Europe, once dream of Russian Emperors. This was at the time, when in the Ukraine, Poland, Czechoslovakia and some other Central and Eastern European countries stood a might of about 1,000,000 men and women in the insurgent armies and guerrilla units.

The Armed Forces of the United States of America of about TEN millions fought the enemies of freedom and justice in Africa, Europe and the Far East. It was an unique assembly of men and women; nothing could stop them and they could take over, by their bare hands, the earth. The word AMERICAN was beloved and respected everywhere.

In spite of political blunders committed in dealing with "good-hearted Joe," who often laughed at the political ignorance of his partners, the end of World War II found the United States of America second to none in respect to military, economic, and political power in the international arena. But as soon as the activities of World War II came to the end in Europe and the Far East, a new struggle in the international arena has opened. The attacker was "goodhearted Joe" and the Soviet Government; the United States of America was to take blows in the course of three decades. From the position of unquestionable champion in anything, it was moved to a defensive position, and called by successor to Joe, Nikita Khrushchev, "paper tiger," and then, "leader of rascists, imperialists, fascists and war-mongers' camp," (see: Slogans on the occasion of 62nd anniversary of October Revolution in 1979).

Besides the Korean and South Vietnam wars, in which about 100,000 U.S. men and women perished, and about 1,000,000 were wounded and crippled, behind which the monster spirit of "good Joe and Nikita" stood, there have been many-sided attempts to infiltrate and cripple the people in the United States proper.

The following parts of this treatise will deal with the world-wide issues, problems and events of post-war decades; deal with them in retrospective and prospective, which will help to understand the new U. S. position in the international and domestic arenas.

At the end of this part of our thinking and research, we might quote the Ukrainian proverb, which says: "Wolf has always tendency to go to the forest," no matter how much domesticated. The call to forest is in his blood and has cumulated in his psychology and physiology. The same happened with "good hearted Joe" and others. As soon as they rose from the conference tables they had a tendency to go back to their own type of *facism*, *nazism*, *imperialism* and *Communism*". The Soviet leadership has, like pagan god "WORLD-VIEWER" — once very popular in the

pagan world of Eastern Europe, four faces. Each face is for a given occasion and for the group of people they like it.

In old writings, including the Old Testament of the Bible, there are many references to the importance of PRIMOGENUTURE (which means first born) and which consequences it has to give it up. The United States of America was the first-born modern nation and the first national and social liberation movement on the face of the earth. It should have kept its title, privileges and rights, and do related duties not sitting with "goodhearted" usurpators of all possible claims. It should have been all the time in political and social offensive and not defensive. Whoever is in defensive position and takes heavy blows might go down on the floor as well and never rise again. That's where the strategy of adversary is.

Joe Stalin used quite often the *dictum*; "Do not get dizzy by your own success." He got dizzy himself when at the end of World War II the Soviet Armed Forces captured most of Southern and Central Europe, German rocket stations, German A-bomb research institutes, the industrial might of Silesia, to which in the course of World War II many West German factories were transferred.

* * *

II.

WHERE DO WE STAND?

I. OUR FAIR AND UNFAIR EPOCH. Any pleasant, safe, convenient and dependable driving of a car and travel take, like a good soccer or baseball game, many things and proper conditions. The driver must be in good health, not drowsy or intoxicated. He must be fair in relation to other drivers on the road next to him. He must know the rules of driving, apply them, and obey the red, green and other signals of the traffic. The rules must have been written by someone else and all drivers must follow them. Someone else made also his car, the oil and gasoline he uses. Roads and highways, on which he drives must be in reasonably good condition; they are not his and he did not build them. A good drive takes good weather conditions, which he does not control. He travels on the earth, which was not created or made by him. There are dozens of other things on which he depends, all not of his making.

A pleasant and safe drive illustrates how complex and interdependent man's present life is, which was not in the first period of his existence. As time goes on and man's history unfolds, it has a tendency to grow more complex and more interdependent.

Once on this road of thinking we could go back as far as the "Big Bang," when out of "clouds and darkness" our earth, life in general, and human life emerged. We might argue about theories of creation or long evolutionary process, but both of them believe it was "cloud and darkness" at the very beginning, and what man called "day" could have been a period of time.

We are not interested in the hair-splitting, because it's a waste of time. It might be good for ignorant fools who do not understand any process, any cause and effect, and any development of anything. As far as our new things are concerned, including autos we drive, they are products of our 20th century. Their origins are at times as long as men's history, especially our modern history. Many of our technological and social inventions started in the 1st quarter of 18th and in the 19th century.

Our decades witness a long series of spectacles in the field of exact sciences and technological inventions, such as rise of nuclear

power stations, production of great assortment of computers, explorations of outer space by use of communication satellites and new powerful telescopes, unprecedented progress in all fields of medicine, biochemistry, genetics, chemistry, and many other fields.

In the 1970's on the horizons of the highly industrialized countries huge domes appeared in many areas; they house nuclear power generators, which symbolize a new epoch of man's intellectual ingenuity and means by which man can open new vistas in the production of goods and services or destroy himself and his entire civilization. The Bible speaks of man's social troubles and pending disasters in the peak of progress of sciences and inventions. They, when handled by immature individuals, can turn the earth into deserted ruins and places where not even a wild sheep will be able to graze, a turtle to move on the ground. David Russell warned us: "We live in a Newtonian world of Einstein physics ruled by Frankenstein logic." Erich Fromm, world-famous psychiatrist and man of great insight into modern man and his inner making, issued his warning as follows:

"The history of man is a graveyard of great cultures that came to catastrophic end because of their inability for planned, rational, voluntary reaction to challenge."

In such conditions the "fumes," "fires," and partial destruction of the earth of which the Bible speaks might turn real.

One of the most paradoxical things in man's history is his inability to cope often with his own inventions in sciences and technologies, which have tendency to grow faster than his social culture, his inner maturity and his ability to use them in a rational way for his own benefit. Great technological inventions played already their games with man's social life in the past and they gave to man violent theories, which hang over us like dark clouds. In the first period of great technological inventions at the end of 18th and first half of 19th, when new industrial towns turned into slums of human misery, rioting workers smashing new machines, and impotent governmental officials, who stood helpless and did not know what to do. The only solution they had for a long period of time was to club by police rioting workers. Industrial sites in many cities of industrialized countries still have the smell of the past slums and unsanitary conditions.

Recent inventions in the field of medicine, such as anti-pregnancy pills, in communication systems based on modern cybernetics, new types of narcotics, and new applications of television and radar stations, have turned some superficial men and women into berserk crackpots, who lost the most elementary standards of human decency and rational behavior. From the standpoint of fairness, people's sovereignty, and modern fair games and travel, it looks as if new drugs, narcotics, pills, and technological gadgets ride on and play their games with human beings, their lack of any personal culture, their social and political illiteracy, and their own health and well being.

It looks very strange because hand in hand with exact sciences, many other fields of man's knowledge have been developing very rapidly, which deals with man's physical and mental well-being, his effective and happy life in social groups. Humanities in general, all fields of medicine, especially psychiatry and psychology, social and behavioral sciences have made as big leaps ahead as exact sciences and technologies.

Man's quest to know himself and grow more mature is not a new one. In the course of his modern history he tried first to polish his feelings, character, and interactions with other fellow men in the Renaissance period. Then he turned to his mind and tried to discipline his reasoning and use it with great intensity. At the beginning of his play with his own mind and reasoning he was involved in abstract thinking. The great thinkers and philosophers of this bent were called rationalists, which comes from the word REASON. Most of them were not atheists (non-believers), as it is fashionable to believe at the present time; a true thinker or scientist comes always to the point where science and religion meet and stand on the common ground as far as basic principles of social life are concerned.

Social life and social processes, which often look very whimsical, are subject to the same forces which rule the life in the universe.

The reasoning of a true religious man and insightful social and behavioral scientists is very similar, although they use different semantics. What SIN is to a genuine believer, UNFAIRNESS of man against himself, other men and society is to the social scientist. The great religions say: "Your body is the sanctuary of the Spirit of God; you must keep it clean and healthy." The

insightful social scientist recommends: "keep individual and public health in good condition, because without them you cannot do anything well."

On the heels of rationalism came EMPIRICISM, which relied very heavily on observations and experiments. While rationalism gave us Jefferson, Rousseau, and Montesquieu in the field of new political and social designs, empiricism carried John Locke, who designed the people's sovereignty in theory and other principles of new society, on which the Constitutions of new Hampshire, Massachussetts, United States of America, and the new design of our epoch were based.

To both, rationalists and empiricists, the old autocratic order at home and abroad looked like icebergs flouting on their peaks. It was not stable, not fair, not productive, and not meeting the challenge of new time and conditions.

Empiricists gave us the start, impetus, methods and tools to rapid development of exact sciences, inventions and technologies, which in turn opened the industrialization and modern national economies. They began to show some spectacles in the last quarter of 18th century, which means at the same time when the new political and social design started to undermine the old autocratic social and political arrangements.

Nobody tried to put Vincent de Gourney, Francois Quesmay, Adam Smith and David Ricardo into any category of thinkers, but they were those who tried hard to decentralize highly centralized governmental and royal economies and bring to the fore individual entrepreneurs, energetic individuals, and individual incentive. People's sovereignty cannot rest only on political phrases and theories, but must rest safely on economic and other factors. Individuals and people must be in the position to stand each time for their rights and sovereignty and not be just a fifth wheel of the governmental power and might.

Vincent de Gourney coined the phrase "laissez faire, laissez passer," which means let the things run their own way and they will work well. Probably he was too much against any social and governmental planning, but the old values are fought often by putting new in sheer contrast and contradiction. Time brings with it a reconciliation of contradictory views and brings a synthesis on

a higher level.

Adam Smith, whose manuscript on "An Inquiry into the NATURE and CAUSES of the WEALTH of NATIONS," known world-wide as "Wealth of Nations," was completed in 1775 and published in 1776, laid the emphasis on the importance of production factors, especially labor. He gave a first deep insight into functioning of national economies and explained why countries amassing gold are poor while others are wealthy without worrying too much about gold.

David Ricardo placed even more emphasis on the importance of labor and he gave more elaborate view of the production factors.

The slowly decentralized economies began to show spectacles and work hand in hand with advances in sciences and technologies. The progress in economic life can be seen by looking at the figures of growth of population and gross world's production of goods and services. As Herman Kahn and John B. Phelps show in "The Economic Present and Future," *Futurist*, vol. xiii, no. 3, June 1979, the earth housed in the year 1775, 750 million people and produced 150 billion GWP, 200 dollars per capita income in terms of today's value of dollar. In 1975, i.e., during the 200 years of our empirical epoch, the world's population rose to 4 billions, GWP to 8 trillions, the world's average per capita income of 2,000 dollars. The projected figures for this year 2175 are 10 billion people, 200 trillion GWP, and 20,000 average per capita income. The affluence of every human being on the earth looks like a sheer reality to come provided man does not destroy himself by his own hands and does not bring disaster to the earth.

During the first 100 years of industrialization of Western Europe, England, Japan and North America, H. Kahn and J. B. Phelps prove, the average personal income in these countries rose 20 times. At the end of that period the industrialization began to widen slowly to other countries and by 1975 was already worldwide. The 1970 decade began to show the tendency toward declining rates in growth of population in the highly industrialized countries of Europe, England, north America and Eastern Europe. At the same time the above countries and regions began to slow down their industrialization rates and shift more to service industries, which will mark all super- and post-industrial economies and societies. The high tides of the first stage of

industrialization moved already to Brazil, Mexico Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey, Spain, Portugal, Hong Kong, South Korea, Taiwan, Saudi Arabia and some other countries. Countries which are considered poor in terms of per capita income, such as continental China and India, make already all possible efforts to cut down on the growth of population and begin industrialization. India has already nuclear power energy and fine machine industries.

The economic base can provide for healthy people's sovereignty and self-government in any country on the face of the earth. In the highly industrialized countries the average man has already what once was a privilege of wealthy men. In the United States of America licensed are about 100 million private autos, which means an average of one auto for two and a quarter of men. The roads and highways on which to drive are excellent. Any gadget for the car and driver is available anywhere along the roads. Food stores are loaded with a great variety of foods. Department stores carry a abundant supply of consumer goods and durables.

Is this epoch unfair as some think? Is it not very generous in terms of anything? Is there any ground for pessimism and despair?

In some countries man has much more than he enjoyed during his first period of existence in the so-called natural stage of his life. The schools, which are vehicles for social advancement and development of meaningful self-realization are free on high school and junior college level. Scholarships are available for studies in senior colleges and universities.

It looks that the problem is that some men and women grow too fat, have too many gadgets and too much concern for material things, which makes their life miserable and limited in its outlook. Another group abuses modern inventions, is unfair to itself and others. There are not many values, which have absolute worth in themselves. Most of them are just tools for some ends. The ends can be *fair* and *unfair*; and the tools can be used for healthy progress or destruction of fellow man and mankind. It is possible to drive an auto safely and for reasonable purpose; but the same auto can be driven on someone's body and house and be waste of energy.

* * *

2. 19TH CENTURY'S DOCTRINES, WHICH AFFECT US

* * *

The roots of many concepts and notions by which we live at the present time have been dreams of man and the best of mankind for many centuries. As we have seen already, some of them came to an intellectual breakthrough and incipient realization in the last quarter of 18th century. If the designs of the new societies and international rebuilding were followed without any impediments, in all aspects to full realization of the projected ends, including fostering by all means man's fairness and social maturity, we would live today in peaceful, stable world.

Most of the countries on the face of the earth today have designs (constitutions or fundamental laws) along the lines of constitutions of Massachussetts, New Hampshire, United States of America, and revolutionary France of the end of 18th century. This does not mean that there was just copying of those (primogeniture) original constitutions. All men on the face of the earth have the same dreams they are dreaming about. The same is true of peoples. The recent constitutions of new countries are more refined and bring into social play economic factors. For example the Constitution of the State of BAHRAIN, a tiny Arab Nation of 200,000 people, of May 26, 1973, has not only such concepts as FREEDOM, EQUALITY, JUSTICE, but BONDS OF BROTHERHOOD, SOCIAL SOLIDARITY, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT WITHIN A WELL-CONCEIVED PLAN, COOPERATION, WORK SHALL BE THE DUTY OF EVERY DITIZEN, and other concepts which in the meantime crystalized in the minds and hearts of the best men and women. The man, peoples and manking never stand still and idle. They think and work; they move ahead; and the best lead, giving at times their lives for a worthy cause.

A smooth development along the lines of the new design would not have seen two world wars and big political mess. Adolf Hitler would have not come to power in Germany and would not have to commit suicide in the fumes of rags and gasoline on April 30, 1945. The body of Benito Mussolini would not have been hanged upside-down by partisans. Joseph V. Stalin would not have been thrown out of his grave in the Kremlin Walls.

Why all this mess?

The 19th century's economic developments and some ideas played with them some of their funny games. We have a heritage of impressive ideas and social remedies, which originated in that century.

The nineteenth century added to the list of world famous thinkers and social reformers a list of its own. The most prolific and revolutionary was the group of HISTORICAL and DIALECTICAL MATERIALISTS, headed by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

Materialists were impressed deeply by the transforming power of new inventions and technologies and disturbed by existence of human misery in the midst of the cumulating wealth in the hands of a few.

Karl Marx, the ardent student of philosophy, and Friedrich Engels, small industrialist-entrepreneur, studied carefully the misery of the new working class in Western Europe and England during the first period of industrial revolution. They wrote together the Communist Manifesto, which was based on the tenets of historical and dialectical materialism.

One can trace without any difficulty the elements of thought and environment on which this new socio-political platform rose. Marx was a serious student of ancient Greek materialism, especially *Epicureanism*, which views the world as a conglomerate of bodies and space, struggle for existence being one of the motifs of human life. Both Marx and Engels were careful students of new inventions, new factory sites, new industries, new towns and their dwellers who lived in slums and primitive houses without any elementary canalization and sanitation system on starving diets. Both witnessed a profound impact of new inventions and new ways of production on English, French and German societies. In order to understand this impact on Marx and his way of thinking, one has to visualize only thousands upon thousands of peasants and farm hands leaving every year the farms and moving with their large families to work in the new factories. Neither were they experienced to work in new conditions, nor new factory-towns had any decent quarters and accommodations for them. The wages in new factories were as low as they once had been in governmental and royal manufacturing establishments, which worked without any machines. It was not uncommon to see the children in the age

of 7-13 working with their parents in the new textile industries.

The men of the end of the eighteenth century and a large part of nineteenth, when the movement out of countryside to towns and new cities mushroomed, did not yet have any experience with the planning of modern cities; the capital in the meaning of well-established factories and financial resources were limited and only in the process of initial formation.

Impressed deeply, as many have been at that time, by rapid growth of industries and wealth on one side, complex new social problems and human misery on the other, Marx wrote that windmill makes a feudal society while the steam engine the capitalist society.

The dialectical part of the new theory was very popular in Germany during Marx's maturing period of life; it was Hegel's interpretation of man's history as a movement which resembles a thinking, which often starts with taking a positive view of a thing or problem, then moves into negative view or position, and at the end comes to a synthesis, which reconciles both views.

The class of capitalist-entrepreneurs and proletariat (poor workers) came to be in Marx-Engels' design two opposing groups and forces of history. There was conflict of interests and struggle between poor and wealthy in the course of entire history. In this struggle, the proletariat will be victorious; it will seize the governmental power, establish dictatorship of proletariat, which will lead to a classless society.

Where Marx got the concept of **DICTIONARSHIP OF PROLETARIAT** is difficult to explain. Some authors explain that he was reared in the system of German autocracy and never was exposed to the concepts of people's sovereignty, and in depth thinking of evolutionary social processes, the key to which is not in the means of economic production but of maturing of man. Other writers think that he has noticed the illiteracy and lack of training in political problems of masses of workers and thought that a few must lead in the name of these masses of laborers. One guess in this respect is as good as another and many others.

Marx, no doubt, planned carefully a forceful, radical, revolutionary and **FORCEFUL** party, which he keyed to the

element of CONFLICT OF INTERESTS and THE STRUGGLE as the mainspring in human life and primary promoter of changes in social and political arenas. A good member in such party is dedicated to the party; he knows how to exploit the existing social conflicts and follow blindly the party leadership. To him, the party's end is beyond any doubt; it moves to its realization as a course of history, but a good member must be always willing to die for this end, which tenets he might not understand well.

What to an average man is a great and exciting idea or philosophy, to a philosopher of Marx type, everything is premeditated and carefully planned. He has in his mind objectives, which might be good or bad, conceived as human progress or his revenge for something. He knows that he has mind and insight into social forces superior to any average man and can control human minds. But he cannot jump over his own head, the environment which reared him and social spectacles which impressed or blinded him.

* * *

Nicolai I. Lenin, leading man of the Russian Social-Democratic Party, was not less gifted intellectually than was Karl Marx. He observed his contemporary political scene out of his father's office, who was high ranking official in the Russian Empire, out of Russian University where he studied law and was busy with politics, out of exile in Siberia, when he was sent by Tsar's police for his political activities and out of Switzerland in the heart of Western Europe. To him the existing autocratic and backward Russian Empire was something which could not stand for long on its feet. It had to be rebuilt and changed.

In early years of his life, Lenin fell in the tenets of historical and dialectical materialism, but imperial Russia was a backward country. A class conflict, in the meaning of poor proletariat versus capitalist-entrepreneurs, did not exist; hence there was no vehicle of Western European type on which to ride. The conflict was still in the stage of aristocracy versus masses of peasants. His mind was concentrated on how to seize the power and by use of power to transform a backward country into something of which he could be proud. He found the answer in the theory of *imperialism*, which said that imperial Russia was the weakest link in the existing international block of countries, which is based on imperial powers. While the weak link will break down, revolution in Russia

and seizure of power will be possible. The well disciplined party had to play even more important role than in Marx' design.

The parties on Marx's, and even more on Lenin's design, are totalitarian parties not unlike National Socialist Worker Party (Hitler's NSDAP) or Italian fascist party. They are intolerant mono-parties, which are highly dogmatic and after seizure of power exclude from political life any other party or movement. They consider themselves a final word in everything. Such parties are fine tools by which to organize a vigorous revolutionary group and seize the power, but they have troubles in fulfilling their programs after seizing the power. Short-run expediences are bought at the price of long-run insurmountable difficulties, which are in direct proportion to how far away is the party's program from the existing conditions. Each progress is based on a process; short-run trends, on which a given political end is based, must not always be a long historical trend. Some social and political problems like temporary misery of workers might be temporary and not apply to all countries. Total nationalization of means of production and total control of the entire life by one party might create an Egyptian Pharaohs' type of social and economic conditions and push man and mankind back to the time of political, social and economic autocracy.

The economic, military, political and cultural history of the Soviet Union offers many good examples on how 19th century's doctrines and short-run expediences in seizing political power produce later a big mess. In order to bring the country closer to the conditions in which Marx lived and his tenets, the leadership of the U.S.S.R. was forced to embark on forceful industrialization, nationalization of the entire economy, total collectivization of agriculture, and one-party system. What all these moves meant for well-being and internal strength of the U.S.S.R. we have seen already.

* * *

Hitler's blunders and atrocities in the 1930's and 1940's can also be related directly to some doctrines of 19th century. His *racism* can be traced to some tenets of the 19th century's anthropology. Some men at that time, such as British Houston Stewart Chamberlain, began to classify all human beings by their external features such as color of the skin, the form of the skull, and others.

This research, of course, indicated man external differences among men, ethnic groups, and peoples. Neither Chamberlain nor any of his colleagues implied to external differences any differences in abilities to be creative and able to organize effective societies, law and order. Hitler and his friends in the universities began to do it on a large scale. They considered some races inferior and not fit to maintain any organized type of society. The historical mission of the German *Herren-Volk*, better race, was to give them the leadership in political life and to organize a huge *German Empire*.

The idea of empire was also very *hot* and alive in the course of 19th century. It was the time when any respected government had to have its empire. The madness for empire tried to enter even in the thinking of some leading men of the United States of America. This we know well from our books in American history.

Behind the scramble for colonies and colonial empires and use of force, stood among other factors, the Darwin's theory of the survival of the fittest. It was interpreted *verbatim* as a straight, brute, use of force and violence for conquest and political reason.

* * *

Trade and labor movement and unions started in 19th century, too. Today they represent the most formidable power in every industrialized country in any type of political system. No government can prohibit their activities, because they represent the interest of millions of working men and women, production factor, which is called labor, participate in setting up the level of wages and other benefits for working men by means of labor-management bargaining. In the mono-party systems, labor unions are the only force which can say NO or come up with demands to the party and government. They can use the method of massive strikes to support their demands. In the Revolution of Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia of 1968, labor unions played the leading role and on the barricades demonstrated their commitment to people's sovereignty and popular self-government. They are for fair play and fair deals in everything.

The trade and labor unions had their roots in gatherings of men and women doing the same type of work or working in the same factory or store. Their purpose was to stand for their common

interests in safety conditions in their places of work and in decent wages. They provided often the training to new and young workers. Elite craft unions had in their backgrounds the Mediaeval craft organizations, which exerted major impact on the political and social life in every *free* city.

At the time when Imperial Germany's iron *Kanzler* (prime minister), Otto von Bismark, wanted to put "Germany in the saddle" and said, "it knows already how to ride," new workers, once farm hands, serfs, and poor peasants, settled well in the cities, began to dig out of misery and slums, and to develop their self organizations. The design of new workers was as simple as it can be: They must work together in their own organizations as they work together in factories and other working places; they must respect one another no matter where they come from; they have already their saddles on which they sit in the factories and at home; they have their uniforms, and when well organized, they will get the social power commensurate with their work and their contribution to the society's progress and well-being; day by day they are on battlegrounds in factories and production sites where some of them get killed or crippled.

Working men and women produced unique *sagas* in developing their own organizations and providing the underpinning for the stability of their own countries. They have been shielding workers against pseudorevolutionary intellectuals of the Marx type, who dressed in bluejeans wanted to send them on the barricades of revolutions they have been planning in British Museums or comfortable university chairs.

The powerful trade, labor and professional organizations of the United States of America, among which AFL-CIO towers with about 15 million organized men and women, offers a good example in this respect. They rose on millions of immigrants and native workers, once immigrants as well. Once they had been illiterate and some, paupers.

The unions of the United States of America are committed to industrial and social democracy, which means fairness in factories and production sites, and justice in the distribution of national income they produce. They are committed to serve the interests of their members, but whatever they do, they have in mind the interest of the entire country. At times a crippling strike might look

like big trouble to a city or the entire country, but what would happen when some pseudorevolutionaries would seize power in the country and start to implement their total command economies and mono-party system?

The trade, labor and professional organizations are the thorn in the eyes of totalitarian forces, which they try to put under mono-party control. They see correctly how deeply all these former slaves are committed to the great cause of man's freedom, fairness and justice. Marx tried to hook them up to his seizure of power. French anarchist, Pierre Joseph Proudhon, tried to send them to destroy the existing society, but the workers know that one generation of society rises on the shoulder of another; what one generation cannot do another will. This has been the philosophy of plain working men since time immemorial.

French philosopher, George Sorrel, tried to turn the unions into *revolutionary syndicalism*, but they were for evolutionary means. In our century, Italian dictator, Mussolini, wanted to circumvent political groups by basing political machinery on union-syndicalism, but unions were not interested in the totalitarian system and the new Roman empire. Joseph V. Stalin terrorized labor unions, but he could not send them all to prisons and concentration camps in Siberia; they were the main driving force behind destalinization of the Soviet Union and the Soviet sphere of influence in general.

* * *

3. OUR DECADES, BESET WITH RAPID CHANGES, CONTRADICTIONS AND INSTABILITIES

* * *

Visitors to the Libyan Arab Republic, North Africa, in the second half of the 1970's were impressed by beaches and seaports of Libya crowded by thousands of crates, which have been unopened for weeks or even months. The crates kept coming from the United States of America, France, England, East and West Germany, Italy, the Soviet Union, Japan, and other countries, for payments of oil, which Libya exports. It was discovered in Libya only in the late 1950's and came to be exploited on a large scale by the U. S., English and other companies in the late 1960's. The young country does not have adequate skilled labor force and enough engineers to open the crates and build the factories.

Libya, former colony of Italy, which was set up free by the Allied Armed Forces in 1943, is busy to develop rapidly everything: roads, agriculture, industries, food-processing factories, agriculture, industries, administration, education, armed forces and security units. Political and social system is of main concern to the new country and its leadership; it should be set up on the right foot and the right design; the past and whatever was good there should blend with what is the most recent and the best on the face of the earth. A new country can do many things which an old would do by revolutions and upheavals.

The Libyan political and social system is a mixture of people's sovereignty, popular self-government with military leadership, and other notions. The social system rests on Muslim tradition, national solidarity, and planning. Free enterprise principles blend with the Muslim socialism.

The government of Libya rests in the hands of the Revolutionary Command Council, which on December 11, 1969, issued the following proclamation, still in force:

"PREAMBLE. THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMAND COUNCIL

"In the name of the Arab people in Libya, who pledged to restore their freedom, enjoy the wealth of their land, live in society in which every loyal citizen has the right to prosperity and well-being.

"Who are determined to break the shackles which impeded their growth and their development, who will stand with their brothers from all parts of the Arab nation in the struggle for restoration of every inch of Arab land desecrated by imperialism and for the elimination of all obstacles which prevent the Arab unity from the Gulf to the Ocean,

"In the name of the Libyan people, who believe that peace cannot be achieved without justice, who are conscious of the importance of strengthening ties which unite them with all peoples of the world who are struggling against imperialism,

"Who understand that the alliance of reaction and imperialism is responsible for their underdevelopment in spite of abundance of natural resources and for the corruption which beset the government,

"Who are conscious of their responsibility in the establishment of a national, democratic, progressive united government,

"In the name of the popular will, expressed on September 1st by the Armed Forces overthrowing the monarchical regime and proclaiming the Libyan Arab Republic in order to protect and reinforce the Revolution till it attains its objectives of freedom, socialism, and national unity. . .

CHAPTER I. THE STATE

"Article 1: Libya is the Arab land, democratic and free republic, in which sovereignty is vested in the people. The Libyan people are part of the Arab nation. Their goal is a total Arab unity. The Libyan territory is part of Africa. The name of the country is the Libyan Arab Republic.

"Article 2. Islam is the religion of the State and Arabic is its official language. The State protects religious freedom according with established customs.

"Article 3. Social solidarity constitutes the foundation of national unity. Family, based on religion, morality and patriotism is the foundation of the society.

"Article 4. Work in the Libyan Republic is a right, duty and honor of every able-bodied citizen. Public functions are the duty of

those who are put in charge of them. The goal of the State employees is in discharging their duties to serve the people.

"Article 5. All citizens are equal in the front of law.

"Article 6. The aim of the State is the realization of socialism through the application of social justice which forbids any form of exploitation.

"Article 7. The State will make all possible efforts to free the national economy from dependence on foreign investments. . ."

[Articles 8-17 deal with individual aspects of the social and economic system.]

CHAPTER II. SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT

"Article 18. The Revolutionary Command Council is the supreme authority in the Libyan Arab Republic. . ."

[Articles 19-32 define the functions of RCC, temporary government. Chapter II, 33-37 explains routines in issuing decrees]

The Libyan Arab Republic is as busy as any of the ONE HUNDRED NATIONS, which gained their national independence in the course of World War II and in the decades thereafter. It wants to do what was not possible to do under foreign rule, and do it as fast as the time and conditions permit. While doing too many things it looks like a "busybody" and factories are not as well set up as they could be; the governmental machinery is not the best; and many other fields of life are laid on the second-rate gear. The country might be better off by slowing down its many-sided efforts, think, and concentrate on the most important aims.

What is true of the new countries applies to the older, industrialized countries as well. While the new try to set up factories to produce as much as possible of gadgets, the older go on producing such gadgets. In the U.S.S.R., the labor force exceeds already 120 million people, while in the United States of America comes close to 100 million. Most of the labor force is producing, distributing, repairing or playing with one or another type of

gadgets. Televisions, radios, and other media of communication lay heavy emphasis on advertising gadgets. Mothers leave their tots behind them and seek gainful employment in order to earn money and buy some gadgets. Some men work on two or even three shifts to get some newer gadget. Where is the time to think, be concerned with more fundamental values than gadgets? Where is time for the life in its full dimensions and depth? How can they grow up well-developed on gadgets and watching gadgets only?

Besides growing "busybodies" we become victims of rapid changes which are products of new inventions and technologies. Our use of these inventions and technologies has tendency to be irrational and hazardous. Let just think what we see while driving our cars from the State of Maine to North Carolina along the East Coast, or along the West Coast from San Jose to San Diego, They look like a crowded beehive. Would we not feel better in smaller cities? Would we not have more conducive physical environment for healthy life and human values?

What a change means?

To quite many of us, sorry to say this, a change means like a pig picking up everything along the road. Whatever is along the road is good, no matter who threw it away. It might be a spoiled apple or a good piece of bread. . .

Exact sciences, inventors, and even producers have every day many new things. Does it mean everything is good for daily use? Is change — use of anything which is available? Should it be not rational use and application of goods and services which sustain healthy life and society? Should we select what we want or a strange individual or a new gadget select us? Is man endowed with reason and free will or not? Are not ability to reason and application of our will the qualities which set us apart from piggies?

While being very busy with no time to think and caught by rapid changes which victimize us, we get caught in the windmill of contradictions in our individual and social life. Often we do not know what still holds true or what is already outdated. Is a good health still a value or not? Is fairness a value or not? Do we need any rules for our individual life or not? Is our country a country or not?

Our life in the period when millennium of absolutism and autocracy end and new millennium begin has tendency to have the contradictions which are not of our making. In this period some traditional theories collide with one another or new trends in social and political life. Lets take for a case of study of the contradictions, which are often beyond us, Italy, former metropolis of Libya and a country of OVID quoted at the very beginning of our travel.

Italy makes a good case of study and a history in which to travel. At the very beginning it was a city of Rome and is good for learning about social life in an ancient city. As the city grew and expanded to the adjacent areas it became Roman Republic, one of very few islands in the ocean of slavery and absolutism. When the Roman Republic started to get busy with external conquests, it turned into huge Roman Empire, which housed many peoples and ethnic groups. The Roman Empire beset with corruption and internal instabilities, fell victim to the onslaught of barbarian tribes ascending on the arena of history. They were stronger in any respect to decaying Romans; the weak cannot stay too long in the historical arena.

In the Mediaeval period Italy emerged in the form of City-States, like Venice, Genoa and others. In the mid 1850's it was in the form of KINGDOM OF TWO SICILIES, PAPAL STATES in the Central Italy and Austrian part of Northern Italy. As some divided nations at the present time (South and North Vietnam in the early 1970's, North and South Korea at the present time), it had difficulties in her unification, which came under *aegis* (patronage) of constitutional monarchy of Italian kings in the 1870's.

The Italian monarchy was caught by the 19th century's quest for colonial empire based on Libya and Somalia. Busy with colonial schemes she did not pay enough attention to development of a well-knitted nation at home. The price for this negligence was the rise of fascism in 1922 and defeat in World War II. In 1947, Italy emerged as a *republic* of the French/ U.S. type. According to her 1947 Constitution "Italy is a democratic Republic founded on labour;" "sovereignty belongs to the people who exercise it in the manner and within the limits laid down by the Constitution." As any modern Constitution it provides guarantees of all civil rights to the citizens and its structure of government is based on distribution of powers into legislative, judiciary and executive.

Unlike Libya or Saudi Arabia, Italy is not endowed with wealthy natural resources and cannot finance development of her industries by exporting oil. But her endowment with many social and political problems, including extreme poverty of rural population in some provinces is great.

As manifold as are the economic and social problems of this beautiful country, which has excellent education, treasures of man's cultural achievements, and oldest universities in the world, many are the segments of political thinking, theories and concepts how to solve these problems by political methods, smoke of guns, methods of mafias or attacks of terrorist groups. In political thinking and political life there is a lack of creative unity, cooperation and consolidation.

Italy has at the present time eight major political parties and a score of small ones, each group and party considering itself a carrier of some important theory, past political achievements, interests of domestic and foreign groups or countries. There is a lack of feeling of national solidarity, which exists in Arab and some other countries.

Partito Democrazia Christiana (Christian Democratic Party) emerged the strongest party in the 1950's and began to show some decline in the 1970's, which made some strange coalitions, including PCI, necessary. The party, as the name shows, is based on social Christian thinking and is unlike some Latin American political parties which have also French/U.S. constitutional design.

Partito Comunista Italiano (PCI — Communist Party of Italy) was for a period of time Italian by name and of the Soviet Union by its design and expectations. It's Marx/Lenin type of party, which was considered already. It's leaders have been travelling to and from Moscow every year to get instructions what to do next and receive funds. The Soviet Government spends about TEN BILLIONS of rubles (close equivalent to U. S. dollars) for financing such parties, groups and other subversive activities abroad.

In recent years, scared to death by the prospect of the Soviet hegemony in Europe, Soviet-dominated world, and Italy being a Soviet satellite, the PCI began to shift away from its Marx/Lenin's

design, lay more emphasis on the people's sovereignty, human rights, cooperation with other Italian parties, denouncing vehemently the concept of *dictatorship of proletariat* and one party system.

The *Italian Unified Socialist Party* emerged only in 1966 as a consolidated party. Italian Socialist Party and Italian Social-Democratic party merged in that year. The new consolidated party is member of the *Socialist International*. Its party platform and policies resemble closely socialist and social-democratic parties of Austria, Germany, Portugal, Spain, France, Belgium, Norway, Sweden, and other European countries. On some issues they are the most bitter enemies of the Soviet Government; on problems of armament of Western Europe their position is shaky and changing.

The *Liberal Party of Italy* is the oldest modern party of Italy. It has on its account credits for the unification of Italy in the second half of 19th century and turning Italian monarchy into constitutional. The ideology of the party still carries in a classical form many 18th and 19th century's liberal concepts, including *laissez faire*.

The *Italian Social Movement* is the heir to Mussolini's *fascism*. It thrives on instabilities in Italy's political and economic life.

The *Italian Proletarian Socialist Party* makes efforts to organize poor elements in the countryside and promises to improve the lot of the poor. Once it was a wing of the Italian Socialist Party, which broke away in 1964 in order to have a party of its own.

The *Italian Democratic Party of Monarchical Unity* was founded anew in 1959. It unites together all pro-monarchy parties and splinter groups of Italy. It wants to see monarchy reestablished, which would provide more political stability to the country. Its platform is not old despotism or autocracy but *constitutional monarchy* as it exists in Sweden, Norway, Netherlands, Belgium, Spain, U. K., Lichtenstein, and some other countries.

The *Republican Party of Italy* stands on the opposite side of the political spectrum and is the most bitter enemy of the IDPMU. It stands for the republican form of government and people's

sovereignty in the most radical form. It's party which has long history and fought once for Italian independence and sovereignty of Italian people on Italian territories.

Small groups have their own platforms, some of anarchism and violence. There is ground to think that a few of them are fed by intelligence groups abroad, which are interested to turn Italy into modern Macedonia, which was known for violence and disorders in the course of 19th century. Modern technologies, electronic gear, long-distance radar stations, cybernetics and "mnemonic language" have been applied widely by the Soviet Government to subversive activities abroad. They make it possible to sit in an office in any place of the U.S.S.R., and direct a group activity in Italy and any country on the face of the earth. The only defense against such activity is well-informed, enlightened and patriotic citizenry and a system based on fairness and law at home.

Italian political and social scene is filled by all possible contradictory views and theories, which lead to conflicts in daily life, in governmental policies and strategies; law enforcement agencies often do not know where they stand and what they do. Individual freedom and human rights, which aim to lay healthy foundations, develop a mature citizenry and are part of the new Italian Constitution, are often a farce. Some think that abuse of freedom and "too much freedom" causes all troubles and violence; they want to curtail the freedom by use of electronic gear and other means of police control, which fall often in the hands of those who are interested to abuse them and produce more disorder and confusion. Often it's not abuse of freedom, but gear from abroad or domestic gear in subversive hands causing *havoc*.

"All cruelty springs from weakness," said Seneca, noted Roman statesman and philosopher. "Order is the first requisite of liberty," stated the father of modern dialectics, which Marx and Lenin turned into subversion and wedges driven into national bodies. Cicero, the great statesman of the Roman Republic, called for honesty and clean hands in political life, because corruption and dishonesty undermine the republic.

Many Italians in the troubled political arena are caught on the treadmill of dilemmas: commitment to Marx-Lenin type of design, which some call "internationalism," royal dynasty, emperor,

dictator, or people's sovereignty. Some consider patriotism — commitment to develop a healthy Italian nation — a symptom of provincialism, backwardness, injustices, and a source of international tensions and wars., But which is today a first channel by which to get rid of all these ugly things? Can one do it by helping to foster a huge empire of Soviet type?

Such dilemmas do not exist for well-balanced individuals and leaders. To Mahatma Gandhi, father of modern India, "patriotism is the same as love to humanity." British Queen Elizabeth II calls herself "the patriot of her country."

All true patriots are for fairness and justice at home and fair deals abroad. Marcus Tullius Cicero, great Roman patriot, exclaimed: "How invisible is justice if it is well spoken and practiced." Alexander Hamilton, ardent patriot of the United States of America, called it "the first duty of society;" and Anatole France warned all of us that "as long as society is founded on injustice, the function of the law will be to defend injustice."

To a person of common sense funny are some other contradiction in high echelons of political life such as *laissez faire versus planning*. We have seen already how this tool came to be used in economic life and which role it had to fulfil in the absolute and autocratic type of societies. Healthy planning is not its contradiction; planning includes "If" and "If" planning; each of them is a principle and tool of life in its many forms and activities. No worker, household woman, good entrepreneur or great statesman ever encountered such contradictions. Henry Ford, the founder of the American auto industry, said: "Thinking always ahead of trying to do more, brings a state of mind in which nothing is impossible." The secret of the Soviet leadership which rides on the very shaky and very shabby design is its great versatility and experience in planning. It plans carefully almost anything, including holdups on foreign countries, for which it maintains many-sided research institutes and "Coca Cola Cities," as it is the case for the United States of America. Such city gathers all possible information on a given country, its social groups, habits of life, weak under-bellies, and any other aspect of social life, plans how to weaken a given country, finds needed stooges and sets the whole subversive design for "automatic materialization."

Italian political parties and groups bicker about the type of

economy they ought to have. This is again a problem of reason and economic model, which our time suggests and the entire social system requires. A decision to have one or another type depends on the people exercising their sovereignty. When the majority of people of England wanted nationalization of coal and steel industries, the parliament voted for such nationalization, and the King signed the bill. Well-trained and sophisticated economists know how each type of economic model works, how well it produces expected goods and services, and which problems exist in its use and transition to such model. They should be consulted and not treated by "payloads" from invisible governmental towers and never disturbed in their work. They might be the most precious asset a country has while coming to many contradictions and crossroads.

* * *

4. THE CONTEMPORARY SOVIET POLITICAL DOCTRINE AND INSTABILITIES IN THE SOVIET SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

* * *

Pravda (In English — Truth) carried on Sunday, December 16, 1979, decree of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to observe the 110th anniversary from the day of birth of Vladymir Ilyich Lenin in 1980. Lenin is called in this decree "giant of scientific thought, people's leader, ardent revolutionary, founder of the Community Party and of the first socialist state on the face of the earth." He established the ideology of the CP of U.S.S.R., which means a system of outlook and world view, political strategy, political tactics, long-run objectives and showed how to exercise leadership. The activities of the Central Committee under leadership of Leonid Ilyich BREZNEV (1906 —) and the decisions of the 23rd, 24th and 25th CP Congresses are related to Lenin's ideology.

The decree does not mention the names of Josif Vissarionovich Stalin (1879-1953), who led the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the course of a very long period which started in 1924 when V. I. Lenin passed away to the Spring of 1953. It looked as if he were doomed to a total obscurity. But on December 21st of 1979, *Pravda*, which mirrors the views and decisions of the Central Committee, published a short essay "About 100th anniversary from the day of J. V. Stalin." He was portrayed as a noted man of the Communist Party, Soviet government, and international Communist movement. Credit was given for his uncompromising position on many political issues, the vigor of some of his activities, and his leadership of the "Fatherland War" in the years of 1941-45. But the tendency of the entire essay was to show that he was a "complex, full of contradictions historical person." His contribution to the party ideology was none; his decisions about what is right for economics, linguistics, and other fields of sciences and social life, which he issued in the years 1948-51, were not even mentioned. The decision of the Central Committee, dated June 30, 1956, about "Conquering the cult of one individual and its consequences," which is known in the West as *destalinization of the Soviet Union* conducted by the third leader of the U.S.S.R., Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev (1894-1971), leader of the Central Committee and the CP in the years 1953-064, was according to this essay correct. The name of N. S. Khrushchev was not mentioned.

Nikita Khrushchev found himself at the end of his life in the mental asylum and unlike J. V. Stalin moved from there to a common grave as Stalin was. He was buried in 1971 in a common grave in a former monastery's cemetery.

NIKITA, not unlike "Joe," who was educated in the Orthodox Seminary and turned to practice his orthodoxy with the Marx-Lenin's design, was a true self-made man. Born into poor peasant family, he worked already in his boyhood in mines. At very early age he became involved in the revolutionary activities of Lenin's group, called often BOLSHEVIKS, which means the wing party as split Lenin's group gained majority of followers, which in Russian means "Bolshevik."

From obscure, party operator, Nikita rose slowly to the top echelons of leadership. In his thirties he studied engineering and obtained an engineering degree. During World War II, he rose to the rank of General of Security Units.

In 1953, when J. V. Stalin passed away and G. Malenkov, whom Stalin appointed to be his successor, took over, Nikita deposed him with a system of tricks and *destalinization*, which became very popular in a country tired of whimsical behavior and brutalities of one-man dictator. He denounced Malenkov for being Stalin's man, who brought the Soviet Union close to disaster in World War II and practiced terror on prominent party members and the people of the Soviet Union prior to the outbreak of the Soviet-German War.

Nikita S. Khrushchev embarked on extensive reforms as soon as he became the First Secretary of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R.; reforms and changes, needed everywhere, were horses to success on which he rode. He concentrated on the field of security and justice, where Stalinism was deeply embedded. The leader of the existing security system, Lavrenti Pavlovich BERIA (1899-1953) was shot to death by Marshall Zhukov, Nikita's friend and collaborator at that time. The high echelon of KGB, the center of lawlessness and arbitrary rule, was dislodged; some were killed, while others left the U.S.S.R.

Khrushchev tried to streamline the overall administration of the country, which was a syndrome of parasites and impotent bureaucrats, and bring the management of industries closer to

individual enterprises, transportation, and communication. In his reforms of administration and management he relied on Lenin's principles of *democratic centralism* and *collective leadership*, which L. I. Breznev wants to practice so hard. He tried to decentralize the political and economic administration of the U.S.S.R., and pushed some ministries out of *union* (federal level) to individual republics of the Soviet Union or a combination of two levels, union-republic ministries.

His reforms in the field of security and justice provided a semblance of law and order, but all his public administration reforms pushed the whole structure only back to the point where it had been in the last years of Stalin's life; he reversed only G. Malenkov's brief reforms in the direction of high centralization. It is not easy to provide effective administration in a total command's economy and society.

Khrushchev's reforms of public administration were not as effective as they could have been because he made them on the same principles, on which the system rested. He did not notice that the entire economic and political system is more centralized and "nationalized" than it was in the Tsars' Empire. It was like irony that a man, who wanted a deep decentralization, sponsored for the agriculture huge *agrocities* (rural cities), which deprived the poor peasants, not unlike his father once was, of small plots of land, which they bought after serfdom was abolished in Imperial Russia in 1863, which left them free politically but without their own land.

Nikita grew very soon obsessed with power at home and abroad. In 1958 he deposed Nikolai Aleksandrovich Bulganin (1896-), noted military Marshall of the U.S.S.R., and took over his position of the prime minister. The top powers were concentrated again in one man's hands, who not long time ago fought bitterly "the cult of one man."

His interest in arbitrary exercise of security revived again, especially in the security and its weak links abroad. We do not know which information his intelligence received from abroad, but he began to call the United States of America "a paper tiger" and thought he can "burry" all Western countries. He organized a new Soviet thrust into Africa, Asia, and the Americas. For the United States, Central and Southern America, he ordered a big assortment of ballistic missiles, which he tried to plant on Cuban soil.

His policies led to the Cuban Ballistic Missile Crisis in 1963, which brought the world close to the outbreak of World War III. There are many hints, direct and indirect, that he must have had his hands in the assassination of John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America and his main opponent in planting missiles on Cuba. In October 1964, about a year after Kennedy was killed in Dallas in November 1963, Khrushchev was deposed by the Central Committee of the CP as party chief and prime minister of the Soviet Union. Mental institution was his place of destiny.

Leonid I. Breznev led the group which deposed Nikita; he got all spoils. He took the job of the First Secretary of CP while the position of prime-minister was secured to Aleksei Nikolaevich Kosygin in order to maintain collective leadership on the summit of power. Only in the second half of 1970's he took over the office of the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet, which is the equivalent of the title of President in Western types of government. This last move enabled him to travel abroad as a President of the country and not only Party Secretary.

Breznev is ardent follower of Marx/ Lenin design, especially its last part — Leninism. He learned this doctrine as a young boy in the schools and then young man in the party organization, which he joined as young Communist (Comsomol) and then full member at the age of 26, average entry age for full members of CPSU. During the World War II he was busy with political training of military units and security in military units, where he rose to the rank of General Major of the 18th army group.

Lenin was very prolific writer and speaker and he dealt with any possible question in domestic and foreign policies., Multi-volumes of his works lend themselves for a Marx/ Lenin's "bible" and is used by Breznev in this role. He is not original political thinker. By his training he is metallurgical engineer and looks on the life more through quantitative data and efficiency in work than through ideas and deep experience in social psychology, which he has on an average level of experienced leader.

Breznev's foreign and domestic policies, his methods of handling problems are keyed to his three way experience and training: 1. of ardent student and follower of Lenin's teaching, 2. of well-trained engineer; and 3. of his experience in security work in the military units. Typical to him are Lenin's recipes such as "make

one step backwards in order to come two steps forward," "better is a sparrow in the hands than a singing bird on the roof," and others. As a metallurgical engineer he might feel at times drawn to the best what is in technologies of Western countries, which, no doubt, he would like to transplant to the Soviet Union. His "coexistence" is of Lenin's type, which aims to secure good relations with another country or group of countries, probe their domestic stability and strength, and move into every possible vacuum as soon as conditions warrant.

Typical in this respect have been Breznev's foreign policies in Europe. He wanted to see East Germany separated from the entire Germany, in the form of Marx/ Lenin type of republic, the Soviet acquisition of Koenigsberg area secured, new Polish Western borders made permanent, and the post-war borders guaranteed. The deepening conflict with the continental China, he thought, calls for a safe back yard in Europe, which can be played with as the time moves on.

When the government of the United States of America was busy with the way in Vietnam and was interested in the Soviet good will and help in ending the war, Breznev got the treaties he needed: 1. Treaty between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany on December 21, 1972, 2. Treaty between the Federal Republic of Germany and Poland on December 7, 1970, and Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in 1973-75, which was concluded with the FINAL ACT in Helsinki on August 1, 1975. These three treaties betray the Soviet experts who worked on drafting them and their lion share in wording the final texts of treaties. The principles of new Soviet Constitution look through them.

The basic tune of Breznev's policies in relation to France, U. K. and United States of America was conciliatory, which reflects no doubt a deep conflict with continental China and unrest at home. But something has happened again in the last quarter of 1979. In September of that year, *Pravda* and other party and governmental papers opened a reckless campaign against the United States of America and to a lesser degree against France and the U.K. Essays like "From the Wild West to Vietnam — the cult of force in U.S.," "The Night of American Spirit," and others were printed; cartoons depicted U. S. Gestapo with dollar marks on the arms torturing human beings, madman with A-bomb in his hands, and similar

pictures. The U. S., leadership and the camp under U. S. leadership began to be denounced as "racist," "fascist," "imperialistic" and "war-mongering." They read as if the Soviet Government was getting ready for a preventive war or imminent military attack on the United States of America. But instead of the United States it came on a backward country in the South of the U.S.S.R., Afghanistan on December 27, 1979. The world came again close to a brink of big war, although it looks that no country is ready and willing to fight such a war.

Afghans' country was in the field of view of imperial planners for more than two centuries. When they have been looking for grandiose territorial acquisitions in 19th century, they could not move North beyond the acquisitions of small Baltic countries (Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia) and getting under political control Finland; in the direction of Central Europe they could not push far beyond Vistula; in the Southern Europe, which could have opened to them a wide access to the Mediterranean Sea, they could patronize only the Orthodox Church in Bulgaria and Serbia; after acquiring Ukraine in the last quarter of 18th century they came to the shores of the Black Sea and pushed into Caucasus area and made significant progress there; to the left of acquired parts of Caucasus, extending further South, was Afghanistan, which looked like a road to the Arabic Sea and the first key to the mysterious and wealthy Arabic world. That area housed strategic keys to Africa, Europe, and to a lesser degree, to Asia. It was the cradle of man's ancient civilizations and empires.

Whoever controls the land of Afghanistan can have direct influence on what is today Pakistan, India and Bangladesh. He can flank the continental China in the East.

The 19th century has seen some of the most bloody scenes and encounters in Afghanistan. The Tsarist planners tried to push into Afghanistan as hard as they could. Great Britain was blocking the Russian entry into that area while standing with firm feet in India and some countries of the Arabic world. Afghans, fierce in fighting and proud of their mountainous country, wanted to have their own way of life and stay independent politically. They have been developing slowly their own constitutional monarchy and stood independent.

The imperial planners came once again in the course of World War II and decades thereafter. They were more sophisticated planners, trained in revolutions, seizures of countries by

subverting their defenses and security forces, in driving wedges into "decadent capitalist societies" and backward feudal countries. In the North they secured again the Baltic States, neutralized Finland, and began to push into Sweden, Norway and Iceland; in the Central Europe they acquired Poland, and most of the lands of former Austro-Hungarian Monarchy; they took over some parts of Germany proper under their control; in the Southern Europe they set their controls on Bulgaria; in Asia they added to the former Chinese lands the outer Mongolia already before the World War II; and in the Caucasus area they held everything which once was part of the Russian Empire. Moreover, in 1970's they came to control politically and economically such far-away countries as Vietnam, parts of Indochina, Angola, Abyssinia, and South Yemen, including the world famous strategic city and port of Aden. Cuba, ninety miles in the South of the United States of America came under their domination already in the 1950's.

They could be proud not only of new great acquisitions and expansion of the sphere of political influence but of gaining the initiative in global military and political moves on the chess-board of the world's problems. Their foreign policies came to be based on what should have been a platform for policies of the United States of America. Their platform calls for people everywhere to fight for their national liberation and independence; it's call to stand for social progress; it's fight against fascism, rascism and imperialism. This platform was revealed in full in many recent writings in the Soviet Union. Doctor D. F. Ustinov, the noted and leading man of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, spoke on November 8th 1979, in the course of public observance of OCTOBER REVOLUTION and its 62nd anniversary as follows:

"Revolutionary processes continue to develop with great impetus in all parts of the world. The Soviet leaders welcome the successes of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America in the struggle for their freedom and independence, against imperialism, colonialism and rascism. . ."

The focus of attention of the Soviet planners and their intelligence research laboratories and intelligence towns turned on Afghans' land, its people and life, in mid 1970's when Europe looked secured for a slow process of grinding. A sour domestic situation needed some spectacles by which to turn away the eyes of people of the U.S.S.R. from domestic scene to successes abroad

and to weaknesses of foreign countries. The setbacks of foreign policies in the Arab world and failure of inroads, which tried to penetrate the Arab nations from the North, successes in Abyssinia (Ethiopia) and the Gulf of Aden, called for looking for a new road of entry into the world of oil, fabulously wealthy kings, world's crossroads, and social contradictions which can be exploited. According to Lenin's writings and teachings this is "uncommitted world" which can be penetrated without great difficulties. The focus showed the roads through Afghanistan and straight continental access to that area. Iran (former Persian empire) was showing deep-seated political and religious problems, which could be intensified and exploited. The boiling revolution there could be moved against the United States of America.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government maintain close ties to every Communist Party on the earth, discuss with them their domestic issues and teach them what to do in their own countries. *Pravda* carries brief reports on such meetings and conferences in order to boost the morale of the members of C.P.S.U. and show to the peoples of the U.S.S.R. the power of the Soviet government. On December 18, 1979, a wide publicity was given to the meeting of delegates of CPSU under leadership of L. i. Breznev and Japanese delegation of the Communist Party of Japan, led by the Chairman of the Presidium of the Central Committee, K. Miamoto. The report included a good photograph of the meeting in the Kremlin. . . CPSU and the Government of the U.S.S.R. maintained for long good ties to the Communist Party of Afghanistan; it could be exploited, too.

The decision was to set up a Marx/Lenin's type of revolution, which transforms slowly a given country into Soviet satellite. The Lenin's device of "seizing the command positions" had to come into play. "Command positions" means key defense and security units must be captured as was practiced in Poland, East Germany Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and attempted in Portugal.

The Revollution of Marx/Lenin type came on April 30, 1978. The "command positions" were seized; Afghanistan was proclaimed "Democratic Republic;" and Noor Mohammed TARAKI, the "great national and revolutionary man of Afghanistan," chosen for the position of Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the post of Prime Minister. The country was to be ruled by decrees of the "Revolutionary Council and Government

of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.”

But the people of Afghanistan did not want this type of government and the countryside began to boil and go revolutionary against the imposed “revolution.” In the leading group of the “Revolutionary Council” tensions and splinter groups began to develop. In September 1979, when Taraki was abroad, Amin’s group seized the power without consulting CPSU and Soviet Government. Amin was closer to the people than was Taraki, but Afghan Revolutionaries kept on seizing the cities and the countryside. By the mid of December 1979, not much of Afghan’s soil was left under Amin’s control. The planners must have felt deceived and Soviet interests threatened in that area. At that time it looked as if Iran is going to pieces and when encircled could be seized. The hands of the government of the United States were tied to problem of freeing 50 hostages, held captive by the Iranian Revolutionaries in the U. S. Embassy in Teheran. The U. S. prestige in the Muslim world was at the very low ebb. The decision was to have a frontal attack on the problem and a full-scale invasion of Afghanistan by Soviet Armed Forces.

* * *

L. I. Breznev, although heavy-set, must walk cautiously like a cat on a thin, hot roof. The facade of total command U.S.S.R., and the total command “national” economy looks very impressive, united, stable, and with no contradictions of any type. But in the ruling doctrines in CP and government and in the Union of 16 republics’ there more contradictions than any “state” has it. The contradiction is even in the name STATE, which is used for 15 nations — republics of the U.S.S.R.

Lenin’s writings and teachings show at times two or three different views on the same problem. He spoke on different occasions to different groups and at different periods of his life. The same is true of his writings, which have been not written in the British Museum like Karl Marx’s *Kapital*. For example, at times he blasted the Russian chauvinism and their subjugation of other peoples, but the idea of mixing, even by force, the “subjugated peoples” and imposing on them one Russian language can be found in the collective edition of his writings and speeches. Which page is then correct?

Any well trained engineer is very sensitive to efficiency in work and returns to capital investments. L. I. Breznev is the man who tried to look with his own eyes into many factories, state farms, and agricultural collectives. Does he not see the contradictions and shortcomings there?

Even the problem of religion is not as simple as it looks. To many, like Muslims in the Soviet Turkmenistan, it is very dear to hearts of many. The same is true of some Christian faiths in European part of the U.S.S.R., and Soviet sphere of influence. The atheist groups produce all sorts of vandals, hooligans, young and old criminals, and do not know how to live with each other. They produce in the Soviet Union high tides of lawless behavior, which undermines the work and life in cities and countryside.

L. I. Breznev cannot conduct openly religious policies because the party dogmas call for something else. But he is against the tides of lawlessness and tries to stop them by laying emphasis on the new Soviet Constitution, law and order. How else could he preserve the Union and the "state?"

At the beginning of September, 1979, the Central Committee of CPSU studied the problems of violence which was riding high tides. L. I. Breznev, of course, presided. On September 11th, *Pravda* and other dailies published its decision in the form of essay under the title "The improvement of measures to protect law and order and reinforce the struggle against violations of law and order."

The violations of law and order according to the above essay comprise the following categories: "disturbing public order in cities and rural communities," "intoxications and alcoholism," "pilferages" of all sorts, "thievery in agriculture," "speculation," "low productivity," "lack of interest to work," "mischievous hooliganism," "violations of work-rules," "anti-social behavior," "violations of social order," "violations of state discipline," "deceiving the state," "anti-bolshevik attitudes," "conflicts in the families and every day life," and others. These categories embrace almost any aspect of social, economic and political life and not just disturbances of law and order by casual outbreak of violence. All of them, according to Marx/Lenin's writings belong to "decadent capitalist societies" and accordingly should have disappeared in the U.S.S.R. as soon as socialism was established. In accordance

with the new periodization of social and political history of the Soviet Union, socialism was established in 1936, when the 1936 constitution was proclaimed. How does it come that all sorts of crimes, violations of socialist rules, and problems of law and order still exist there? Who is correct, the principles of party doctrines or available evidence and facts?

Behind the above contradiction stands even more deeper contradiction. *How* and *why* could J. V. Stalin begin to exempt some categories of researchers from the party tenets, in order to make their research possible, when they are highly scientific? How can these tenets and doctrines be scientific when they have been based on the sciences of 19th century and they changed dramatically in our century?

The Party takes the position that at the present time the U.S.S.R. is already in the stage of *advanced socialism* and prepares "the material conditions" for communism. But in the stores is difficult to find a needle and many other items of daily use. Complaints of consumers are sometimes published in the Soviet press. A pair of shoes or men's suit, when available, carry the tag "one hundred rubles," or more, equivalent to the monthly wage of relatively well paid workers.

In the conditions of poverty and lack of adequate consumer goods or income there will always be a tendency to steal whatever and whenever is available, disturb the existing social order and state discipline.

L. I. Breznev belongs to this category of men and women in our times who fight for law and order and wants to tame violence. As the first Secretary of CP, as man who is in charge of the Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. he studies carefully these painful problems and tries to review every single link which affects directly respect for law and order. In the capacity of the Chairman of the Presidium he signed on November 30, 1979, *four major enactments*, which aimed to improve the work of Attorney General, arbitration system in the U.S.S.R. legal profession, and court system.

The existing system, which rests on Marx/Lenin doctrines he cannot change. They feed a lion share of contradictions and problems of the U.S.S.R. He did his best to reconcile them in the

law of the land, 1978 Constitution of the U.S.S.R., which is based what we called a *new design* but has heavy dose of Marx/Lenin's principles in it.

L. I. Breznev, his constitution-designers and planners, gave serious attention to the revision of the 1936 Constitution, which they considered outdated and a good model for vasa (satellite) states like East Germany and others but not for the leading Soviet Union. A leader must be always ahead in anything, including constitutional design — a blueprint of the society in the process of making.

Their work on the draft of the new Constitutions, which was to be Breznev's Constitution, his contribution to Marx/Lenin's edifice, and, no doubt, his system of law and order at home, started in 1975, as soon as they got the European ACCORD. In the center of political world, they thought, must stand a model legal design like Rome had once for the ancient world. It's strange that this work started at the same time when other planners began to view the Afghans' land and the Muslim world from the position of developments and moves there. One could explain it by an attempt to secure very well the Soviet South in Asia, which is Muslim, against potential Muslim inroads from the South and a step in the direction of getting access to the warm seas in the South, a dream of dreams of some old imperial planners. One must have in mind that governments and systems of countries and empires change but geography remains the same. A country without access to warm waters and sea ports, which never freezes and cannot be blocked effectively by any naval power, is not yet a world power; it takes the power in the air, on the ground and in the seas and oceans to be a genuine, first-class world power.

After debates on the draft of proposed constitution in the years 1976-78 by the Supreme Soviet (like U. S. Congress) in 1978 it became a new fundamental law of the U.S.S.R.

Like any and all constitutions of all countries in the world it begins with a PREAMBLE. It's quite lengthy piece of writing, which resembles some Stalin/Khrushchev/Breznev speeches. It reads:

"The Great October Socialist Revolution, made by the workers and peasants of Russia under the leadership of the Communist

Party headed by Lenin, overthrew capitalist and landowners rule, destroyed the fetters of oppression, established dictatorship of proletariat, and created a Soviet State, a new type of State, a basic instrument for defending the accomplishments of the revolution and for building socialism and communism. Mankind thereby began the epoch-making turn from capitalism to socialism.

"After gaining victory in the Civil War and repulsing the imperialist intervention, the Soviet government implemented far-reaching social and economic transformations, and put the end, once for all times, to exploitation of man by man, antagonisms among classes, and strife among nationalities. The unification of the Soviet republics into Union of Soviet Socialist Republics increased the forces and opportunities of the peoples of the country to build socialism. Social ownership of the means of production and true democracy for the working masses were established. For the first time in the history of mankind a socialist society was created.

"The strength of socialism was demonstrated vividly by the immortal feat of the Soviet people and their Armed Forces in achieving their historic victory in the Great Patriotic War. [1941-45, discussed already in another chapter, including Stalin/Hitler treaty.] This victory consolidated the influence and internal position of the Soviet Union and opened new opportunities for the growth of forces of socialism, national liberation movements, democracy and peace in the world.

"By continuing their creative endeavours, the working people of the Soviet Union ensured rapid, well-rounded development of the country and continuing improvement of the Socialist State. They have consolidated the alliance of the working class, collective-farms peasantry, and people's intelligentsia, friendship of the nations and nationalities of the U.S.S.R. Socio-political and ideological unity of the Soviet society, in which the working class is a leading force, has been achieved. The aims of the dictatorship of proletariat have been accomplished. The Soviet State became the State of the entire people. The leading role of the Communist Party, the vanguard of the entire people, has grown.

"In the U.S.S.R., a developed socialist state has been built. At this stage, when socialism is developing on its own foundations, creative forces of the new system and advantages of the socialist

way of life are becoming more evident, and the people are more and more enjoying the fruits of the great revolutionary gains.

"It is society where powerful forces, progressive science and culture have been created, in which the well-being of the people is continually rising and more favorable conditions for a well-rounded development of individuals are secured.

"It is society of mature social relations, in which on the basis of solidarity of all classes and strata, on the legal and factual equality of all its nations and nationalities, fraternal cooperation, a new community of people has risen — the SOVIET PEOPLE.

"It is society of high organizational capacity, ideological commitment, of new consciousness of the working people, who are both PATRIOTS AND INTERNATIONALISTS.

"It is a society, where the law of life is concern of all for the good of each and concern of each for the good of all.

"It is a society of true democracy where the political system ensures effective management of public affairs, more effective management of public affairs, more effective participation of the working people in the public life, and where citizens' rights and freedoms combine with their responsibilities and duties to the society.

"Developed socialist society is a natural, logical stage on the road to communism.

"The supreme goal of the Soviet State is to build a classless communist society, in which there will be a public, communist self-government. The main objectives of the people of the socialist state are: to lay the material and technical foundations for communism, to make perfect socialist social relations and transform them into communist relations, to mold the citizen of the communist society, to raise the people's living and cultural standards, to safeguard the country's security, and to expand peace and international cooperation.

"The Soviet people, guided by the idea of scientific communism, committed to their revolutionary tradition, relying on the great social, economic and political accomplishments of socialism,

striving for further development of socialist democracy, taking into account the international position of the U.S.S.R. as a part of the world system of socialism, and conscious of their international responsibilities, preserving the continuity of ideas and principles of the first Soviet Constitution of 1918, the 1924 Constitution of the U.S.S.R. and the 1936 Constitution of the U.S.S.R.,

"HEREBY AFFIRM the principles of the social structure and policies of the U.S.S.R., and define the rights, freedoms and obligations of citizens, and the principles of the organization of the Socialist State of the entire people, and its aims, and proclaims them in THIS CONSTITUTION."

The Constitution proper has 9 parts, 21 chapters and 174 articles. It is one of the lengthiest and very elaborate constitutions in the world. Its arrangement by parts is as follows:

- I. PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND POLICY OF THE U.S.S.R.** It is arranged into six chapters, which have 31 articles;
- II. THE STATE AND INDIVIDUAL**, which has 6-7 chapters and 32-67 articles;
- III. NATIONAL-STATE STRUCTURE OF THE U.S.S.R.**, 8-11 chapters and 68-88 articles;
- IV. SOVIETS OF PEOPLE'S DEPUTIES AND ELECTORAL PROCEDURES**, which carry the chapters to 14, including this number and the last article in this part is numbered 107;
- V. HIGHER BODIES OF STATE AUTHORITY AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE U.S.S.R.**, chapters 15-16 and articles 108-136;
- VI. BASIC PRINCIPLES OF THE STRUCTURE OF THE BODIES OF STATE AUTHORITY AND ADMINISTRATION IN UNION REPUBLICS**, chapter 17-19 and articles 137-150;
- VII. JUSTICE, ARBITRATION, AND PROCURATOR'S SUPERVISORS**, chapters 19-21 and articles 151-168;

VIII. THE EMBLEM, FLAG, ANTHEM, AND CAPITAL OF THE U.S.S.R., articles 169-172

IX. THE LEGAL FORCE OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE U.S.S.R. AND PROCEDURES FOR AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION, articles 173-174.

From the standpoint of principles, the Constitution has many elements of new design. It recognizes people's sovereignty, has a very broad plank of civil and human rights, some almost *verbatim* from the U. N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights and its other enactments, which we will get to know in our next chapter; it is based on division of powers in every level of government and has built-in the principles of one branch of government checking another branch; legislative, judiciary and executive functions of government are well defined and delineated; and provides that the Constitution of the U.S.S.R., like many other constitutions in the contemporary world, "may be amended by a decision of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R." . . . "by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the total number of Deputies [Representatives] of each of its chambers." It is not any more a class-struggle, but "equality of all and each citizen in the front of law."

Unlike some Western constitutions, the 1978 Constitution deals in great depth with the structure of administration of the Soviet Union on all levels. It aims, no doubt, to tell every citizen, who does what and how it is being done in the field of authority and government. Article 28 of II gives the right to authorities to support "the struggle of peoples for national liberation and social progress" in any country abroad, which means the extension of the Soviet sovereignty to the entire world. What is not in the "interest" of the "national liberation" or "social progress," can be "aimed at ensuring international conditions favourable for building communism in the U.S.S.R., safeguarding the state interests of the Soviet Union, consolidating the positions of socialism" . . . and other programs of the Soviet foreign policies, which are built into the constitution. Any meddling with and into internal life of any country can thus be excused.

The power of the "Soviet State" is not only world-broad but very integrated, total and monopolistic. "The Soviet State," states article 3, "is organized and functions on the principle of democratic centralism," which means among other things "the

obligation of lower bodies to observe the decision of higher ones," reads the same article. "The territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a single entity and comprises the territories of the Union," declares the 75. "Citizens of the U.S.S.R. are committed to safeguard the interests of the Soviet State, and enhance its power and prestige. Defense of the Socialist Motherland is the sacred duty of every citizen of the U.S.S.R. Betrayal of the Motherland is the gravest of crimes against the people," warns the 62nd article.

The economy of the U.S.S.R. is totally nationalized, planned and of total command type. Article 16 defines this kind of economy as follows:

"The economy of the U.S.S.R. is an integral economic complex, comprising all the elements of social production, distribution and exchange on its territory.

"The economy is managed on the basis of state plans for economic and social development, with due account for the sectoral and territorial principles, and by combining centralized direction with the managerial independence and initiative of individual and amalgamated enterprises and other organization, for which active use is made of management, accounting, profit, cost, and other economic levers and incentives."

The Constitution does not speak openly about a monopolistic, fascist type of party but in a more mild tone. In part I, article 6 states: "the leading and guiding force of Soviet society and the nucleus of its political system, of all state organizations and public organizations, is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The CPSU exists for the people and serves the people.

The Communist Party, armed with Marxism-Leninism, determines the general perspectives of the development of society and the course of domestic and foreign policies of the U.S.S.R., directs the great constructive work of the Soviet people, and imparts a planned, systematic and theoretically well founded course in their struggle for the victory of communism. . ."

When one adds that V. I. Lenin stated openly "where a State exists there is no freedom, and where freedom exists there is no state," one can see what kind of mixture of world-known

constitutional principles which are almost in any constitution of any country on the earth, party policies, party slogans and propaganda, the 1978 Soviet Constitution is. Traditional liberal constitutional principles, Leviathan State, are often one next to another, playing strange dialectics and colliding with one another. The 29 article, for example, which stands next to 28th, which expands the sovereignty of the Soviet State to any other country, reads:

The USSR's relations with other states are based on the following principles: sovereign equality; mutual renunciation of the use or threat or force; inviolability of frontiers; territorial integrity of states; inviolability of frontiers; territorial integrity of states; peaceful settlement of disputes; non-intervention in internal affairs; respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; equal rights of peoples and their right to decide their own destiny; cooperation among states; and fulfilment in good faith of obligations arising from the generally recognized principles and rules of international law, and from international treaties signed by the USSR". These are the principles, which L.I. Breznev or a Soviet plenipotentiary on his behalf wrote into Helsinki's ACCORD and some 1970-73 treaties mentioned in another part of this chapter. They came *verbatim* to the text of the 1978 Constitution.

Another contradiction, which can be used as an example for many others, is between the 75th and 76th articles. When the first speaks of "a single entity", the second states:

"A union Republic is a sovereign Soviet State which has united with other Soviet Republics into Union of Soviet Socialist Republics".

Article 71 lists prominently 15 Republics, which are:

Russian Soviet Federative Republic,
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic,
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic,
Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic,
Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic,
Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic,
Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic,
Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic,

Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic,
Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic,
Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic,
Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic,
Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic
Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic
Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Half-and-half is also treatment given to religion, which plays a major role in retaining some moral standards and values in the USSR, which were undercut by debased and demoralized vandals and holligans. Article 52 pronounces:

"Citizens of the USSR are guaranteed freedom of conscience, which is the right to profess any religion, and to conduct religious worship or atheistic propaganda. Incitement of hostility or hatred on religious grounds is prohibited.

In the USSR, the church is separated from the State, and the school from the church."

Unlike the constitution of many countries it does not give the citizenry the right to sustain any denominational schools.

As mentioned above, the 1978 Constitution has a strong plank on civil and human rights, which resemble the Bills of Rights in some constitutions. Article 34, for example states:

"Citizens of the USSR are equal before the law, without distinction of origin, social or property status, race or nationality, sex, education, language, attitude to religion and nature of occupation, domicile, or other status.

The equal rights of citizens of the USSR are guaranteed in all fields of economic, political, social and cultural life."

Other articles in this group assure a "due process of law," which we found in the *Magna Charta*. But what can a citizen do in the front of massive, "integral" and monopolistic power of the State, which is equipped with modern electronic gears, inventions of modern chemistry, and is ill on a complex of infallibility and megalomania? How the existing economic, social and political arrangements can lead to any communism, which was implied to

the first period of man's life when he was fair and just?

A careful student of social and economic history of human civilizations on the earth and those who know something about social life and human behavior, must have serious doubts about such possibility. The 1978 Constitution and the movement of the U.S.S.R., as well as internal developments, point out to their movement to the social and political arrangements of 17th century, early Mediaeval times and Egyptian Ancient Times. At that time technologies were adored and patronized, too. It might take at least 6,000 years to come back to the times when man *sponte sua fidem rectumque collebat*". Foreign and domestic policies of the Soviet Government at the present time fall rather in the tenets of 17th century's mercantilism and imperialism than basic notions of socialism and communism.

* * *

5. THE TRENDS FOR CONSOLIDATION AND COOPERATION

* * *

The old social and political system, law and order, fairness and justice within the empire, depended on quality of rulers in individual countries and empires and in all of them as a group of rulers. Many ruling houses (dynasties) were very meticulous in the upbringing of royal families and future emperors, kings and queens. Alexander the Great, who set up the empire based on Hellenic civilization was trained in very young age by the best Greek thinkers and philosophers, experts in physical education and military strategies. He knew and absorbed whatever was the best at his times, including Greek notions of fairness and justice in any work or endeavour. In our days, the upbringing of Charles by the Queen Elizabeth II might be a good example of such training for a future King. It takes hard work and long tedious years to develop a good physical fitness and character, knowledge and experience in many fields, including defense and security of the country, to be a good ruler and leader. A good leader is always a head taller in anything than his followers.

In the course of man's history, many rulers have been men and women of outstanding physical and mental vigor, fair and just, well prepared to lead the country in peace and war, excelling in character, integrity, fine manners, education, versatile experience, and commitment to their peoples, countries or empires. Wealth did not matter too much to them because it was like given to them in the form of royal possessions, in the form of revenues out of taxation, and other sources of income. Some were taught by their outstanding teachers not to pay too much attention to material values because some values are far more interesting than any other form of material wealth.

Kings and queens were like army commanders in giving commands, which were following from the top to the bottom of their countries or empires. With these orders was going their way of life, their manners, their fairness or unfairness, their justice or whimsical orders and brutalities. The first were cementing their countries or empires; the second undermining and destroying them instantly or slowly like a mouse cuts in the roots of a plant.

The emperors, queens, kings and other types of absolute rulers,

whose claims to rule were based on royal heritage or divine origin, like emperors of Roman Empire, cultivated their relations to other dynasties by visiting them, inviting them to their courts or palaces, discussing the issues of common concern, settling them or making decisions to fight one another. This was what we call today international relations.

The sons and daughters of the ruling houses at times were entering into deeper relations; they intermarried. It is known, for example, that Queen Elizabeth II is a descendant not only of Norman dynasties but of Ukranian ruling houses as well. The motto of Austrian emperors was for a long period of time "bellum agerant alii — felix Austria nube" (other ruling houses conduct the wars — you, fortunate Austria, marry). As long as she relied on marriage in her empire, the sun was never going down. But as soon as she started to get involved in many bloody wars, she went to pieces.

As often as there have been intermarriages among royal dynasties there have been rivalries and tensions. Selfishness or ill ambition of one ruler, could start at any times a war. Emperors like Roman Nero, imbalanced emotionally, idiotic, suffering on illusions and hallucinations, beset by megalomaniacs, were not a seldom occurrence; they have been turning their own cities into ruins and plunging the earth into bloody wars and chaotic contions.

We do not have any absolute rulers of the old type; some dynasties still left are heading countries based on constitutions. Our absolute rulers, when they appear anywhere, they are self-made dictators of J. V. Stalin, Adolf Hitler or Mussolini type. Even the Empoeror Hirohito of Japan is a constitutional head of the Japanese country and government. Ours is already a new political world.

In the system of independent states and nations, which number already more than 150, most of them based on people's sovereignty, all liberties granted to all citizens of a given state or nation, peoples choosing their own governments, central commands of rulers disappeared. Progress and stability within each state or nation depends on the quality of citizenry and quality of government they choose. The international balance and stability are a sum total of balances and stability within the

individual states and nations. Effective system of international organizations , which draws them together and settles conflicts among them, plays, no doubt, a role in the international stability, too, but is rather of a second importance.

Taking ideally, citizens of each country — carriers of collective sovereignty — should have been developing the mental and physical vigor, character, integrity, fairness and habits of good rulers. The government of each country should be an emanation of whatever the best a nation has. Those coming to the positions of public offices, especially to its top levels, would have to be the best in terms of their health, upbringing, qualities of character, integrity, commitment to serve their people, in exercising prudent leadership and honesty.

Once a relatively simple web of elementary safety and security, balance, stability, and smooth development, became highly complex, interdependent, and millions of links depending on one another. The new system is weak nationally and internationally — where are the weakest groups of citizenry and weak governmental leaders.

International relations among the states and nations cannot rest with comfort on meetings of a few rulers, but must be set for effective cooperation among many states and nations, and their peoples. Each country in order to be a fair player in the international life has to be set up like a good national stadium, good teams of players, umpires, sophisticated public, managers of the teams, safety devices and sanitary conditions. International life and competition are today unlike a Great Olympic Stadium with many sub-stadiums, sports-places and smaller arenas where a vigorous competition goes on in every field of sports in life.

It took about 150 years to move from the country based on a new design to the first, broad international organization of the new type. The League of Nations was founded in 1920, when those who came with blood on their hands, decided that international cooperation and eventually consolidation in man's thinking is a *must*. Its sit was established in Switzerland, beautiful country where each human being is *free*, and proud of his country. It stands on the crossroads between North and South, East and West, and wants to draw all of them together. But, as we have seen, 1920's and especially 1930's witnessed a mad political world, which tried

to make social progress while moving back to the ancient times, abandon old imperialism while reviving new, more brute, totalitarian, vulgar and primitive. In such environment the League of Nations could not function well; it moved down the hill in a charming country when World War II was in the process of getting ready to have another bloody encounter.

While World War II was still going on, turning many European and English cities into ruins, bringing untold human misery and starvations, the idea of a new effort in direction of international cooperation was on everybody's mind and lips. Once Herbert Spencer said: "Civilization is a progress from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity toward a definite, coherent heterogeneity." Ours was already a heterogeneity, which calls for efforts in many different directions.

A war is a temporary use of force and cannot be a way of social and political life. Jose Ortega y Gasset stated that "civilization is nothing else but the attempt to reduce force to being the last resort." It is even better to prevent the use of that resort.

Two weeks before Adolf Hitler committed with his girl friend of many years, Eva Brown, suicide in the smoke of rags and gasoline in his governmental bunkers in Berlin, the representatives of 51 states and nations met in the hilly City of San Francisco on April 15, 1945, and established a new international organization for peace, cooperation, upbringing of new human beings and nations, UNITED NATIONS.

In the PREAMBLE to the CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS we read:

"We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and

"to affirm faith in fundamental human right, in the dignity of man, and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of man, and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women, and nations large and small, and

"to promote social progress and better understanding of life in larger freedom, and for these ends,

"to produce tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, and

"to unite the strength to maintain peace and security, and to ensure, by acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed forces shall not be used, save for common interest, and

"to employ the international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples —

"HAVE RESOLVED TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS TO ACCOMPLISH THESE AIMS.

The Charter (constitution) of the United Nations, which has 111 articles, came into force on October 24, 1945, when the majority of the founding countries ratified (approved) the Charter. Among the founding countries was the Ukrainian SSR and Byelorussian SSR, whose presence was questioned at that time and ever since. We are already familiar with the reasons which cause and caused such questioning. They are as follows: when the U.S.S.R. is an unitary state, then this state is entitled to one vote and one ambassador only; if 15 Union-Republics are sovereign, then 15 should have been entitled to participate in founding and activities of the United Nations. **THREE VOTES** came out of a secret deal, which the Western leaders made with J. V. Stalin.

The headquarters of the U. N. were established in New York, United States of America, the first country which made a breakthrough to new design and natural leader of the Organization of American States (OAS) founded at the end of 19th century after all countries of Americas overthrew the yokes of European colonial powers. Adlai Ewing Stevenson, noted for his ability to deliver unique speeches and write charters, was the man who worded many basic statutes of U. N. He was the first U. S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

The United Nations developed and keeps formidable standing organizations, which deal with big problems such as open hostilities between two or more countries, and small problems such as care of children. At the center of organizational structure is the General Assembly and the Secretariat. Its judiciary arm is the International Court, and military has the form of Security Council and Military Staff Committee. The arm for overall social and

economic problems has the name of Economic and Social Security Council. Disarmament issues are handled by Disarmament Commission. Work, less conspicuous, but of no less importance, is conducted by specialized agencies such as: International Atomic Energy Agency; World Health Organization; Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; Food and Agricultural Organization; International Labor Organization; International Civil Aviation Organization; International Maritime Consultative Organization; International Bank; International Monetary Fund; International Finance Organization; International Development Organization; World Meteorological Organization; Universal Postal Union; and International Telecommunication Union.

United nations machinery against the war and for maintenance of permanent peace helped to settle the conflicts in Korea, Middle, East, Yemen, Jammu and Kashmir, Tibet, Vietnam, Southern Africa, Congo and in other areas. All conflicts threatened to develop into regional or global war.

In the field of main concern of the United Nations, from the very beginning of this organization, was MAN, HUMAN BEING, a basic key to the success of every social unit, including state, nations, and international organizations. It makes all possible efforts to foster healthy, respected, dignified, intelligent, honest and mature men and women. Without them, a fair, just, well-developed, well-balanced, mature and productive country cannot exist. The first thrust of U. N. in this direction was the UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS, which is like a plank of all BILL OF RIGHTS in the world. It was accepted unanimously by all U. N. members in December 1948. The PREAMBLE of the UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS states:

"Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

"Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people,

"Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as the last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law,

"Whereas it is essential to promote development of friendly relations between nations,

"Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human being and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

"Whereas Member States have pledged themselves, to achieve, in cooperation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms,

"Whereas a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge,

"NOW, THEREFORE,

"THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

"PROCLAIMS this Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measure, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member states themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction."

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights has 30 articles which incorporate the principles of Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen of the French National Assembly, of Bill of Rights on the Constitution of the United States of America and civil rights planks of other *new design-constitutions*. But the wordage of some articles are much broader and more up-to-date.

Article 12, which deals with privacy and honour, reads:

"No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks."

Some articles deal with new social issues, which have been not considered in the older types of bill of rights and constitutions. Article 14, for example, gives the right to asylum in other countries to those who are persecuted for illegal reasons. Article 22, that deals with self-realization states:

"Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international cooperation and in accordance with the organization of resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and free development of his personality."

The Universal Declaration speaks not only of many rights and freedoms which every man has anywhere on the face of the earth, but of duties as well. The Article 29 states:

"1. Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.

"2. In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.

"3. These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations."

This unique document of man's rights and duties ends with the 30th Article, which reads:

"Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and

freedoms set forth herein.”

On December 19, 1966, the General Assembly accepted the INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS, the INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON CIVIL RIGHTS and the OPTIONAL PROTOCOL TO THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS. They elaborate in great depth the civil, political, social and economic rights of citizens in every country, member of U.N. Many countries ratified (approved them by their treaty-approving machinery) very rapidly. Among the rapidly approving was the U.S.S.R. The Government of the United States of America was among those which delayed such ratification for a long period of time.

The U. N. SECRETARIAT favours regional cooperation of countries. It stood behind the Helsinki's ACCORD already discussed. EUROPEAN COMMUNITY, AFRICAN COMMUNITY and other regional or continental organizations get full support by the United Nations and many of its specialized agencies. They are, besides U. N. and OAS, a symbol of great consolidation and cooperation mood and movement among all countries on the earth. The new design does not have to splinter the political world; it can organized it in greater depth, on larger basis, and on much healthier principles than the absolute system did. It can save manking of bloody wars as well.

Lets look briefly at the action of U. N. in case of invasion of Afghan land by the Soviet Armed Forces, which was a breach of many sound articles of the Constitution of the U.S.S.R., but licensed by others, which we know already. From the standpoint of Charter of the United Nations it was a breach of foundations on which the United Nations were established.

The U. N. machinery began to deal with this issue at the end of December, 1979, i.e., right when the Soviet troops started to pour into Afghanistan. A normal procedure was to bring the issue to the Security Council, but there the U.S.S.R. has power of *veto*, which is the privilege of great powers. It came to the General Assembly where no state or nation has any power of veto and all decisions are made by plain majority of voting members. On January 14, 1980, the issue came to final voting. The resolution was condemning any invasion of any country by foreign troops and called for

withdrawal of such troops. The representatives of 104 countries voted "yes," 18 casted vote "no" and another 18 were either absent or did not vote. In effect, only the U.S.S.R. and the countries of the Soviet sphere of influence voted in favour of Soviet invasion, being forced to cast such votes by military, economic and political considerations.

The U. N. did not send any troops to stop the invasion because it does not handle any issue in such way. It grinds them slowly while exercising political pressure on the aggressor and let member states and nations take appropriate courses of action short of any violence. Many governments, not long time ago friendly to the Government of the U.S.S.R. and its policies abroad, turned rapidly their backs on the Soviet representatives. Afghan people received all possible moral, political support for their struggle against the agressor. Political support has normally military. We will see the outcome of this encounter in the months and years to come.

What would have happen in the old, absolute system of powers? Would not another emperor invade the country of the invading emperor? Would such invasion not mean a bloody regional or world war?

We can continue our questions in the light of knowledge we already gained by traveling together in this research, writing and reading. Would the invasion have taken place with a true people's sovereignty prevailing in the U.S.S.R? What kind of political constellation would exist around Afghan land with 15 republics of the U.S.S.R. enjoying people's sovereignty and self-government?

Old wine and cheese are often very good. But the old way of looking on new conditions, including old view on consolidation and diplomacy, and looking on them with the eyes of two thousands years ago is no good. Man's history moves ahead and should be as a trend toward something new and better but not to old trash and junk.

* * *

III.

WHERE ARE WE HEADING TO?

1. THE SCENARIOS OF THE PAST AND FUTURE TRENDS

* * *

Quo vadis homine? Where are you heading to, human being? To a disaster? Natural or social, or both?

A natural disaster is always a possibility. The universe in which we live is a big mystery, no matter how much we know already about it. It is a web of millions of planets and galaxies tied together by the elements of space, time, motion and gravity. Everything stands and runs like a huge machinery, everything in its own place, everything and each part performing its function, taken together big and complex and interdependent beyond man's imagination. Something might happen to the big universal machinery, although we are assured by many scientists of many fields of man's knowledge that it will run smoothly for millions of years to come. But some things take place unexpectedly. Some best autos, when driven in high speed, come to one or another type of disaster. Behavioral scientists think that human factor is often less dependable than mechanical.

We take all blessings of the earth on and of which we live for granted. At night we rest when our side of the earth turns back against the sun. At daytime we get daylight, sunshine and many other conveniences. But this earth, as the *geneses* says was once "without form and void," and "darkness was upon the face of the deep." The modern sciences state the same thing. Inside of the earth there still boiling volcanoes and heat which nobody can measure. On its surface some rifts are developing and faults underneath, which produce earthquakes rattling often the entire earth. What will happen when the earth will go the same way to us we do to the earth?

We read already some verses of the *Revelation* in the *New Testament* of the *Bible*. They spoke of disasters caused mainly by the faults of man and his civilization. In the past, some natural disasters went hand-in-hand with social calamities and high

civilizations going once to pieces. Where is the once proud city of Babylon? How deep in mud and clay are some once famous cities of the ancient world? Where is proverbial but once real, super-wealthy and super-civilized Sodom and Gomorrah? What happened to the Western and Eastern Roman empires?

It is strange that high civilizations with their high social and technological inventions have tendency to feed the sources and forces of their own destruction. In the state of nature man lives a life within the natural environment and follows natural way of life and pursuits. He has tendency to stay healthy mentally and physically. Whatever is not healthy the cycles of nature and its laws will weed out. High civilizations come to depend heavily on man, and the man fails. In this light we understand better why the leading men of mankind have been paying so much attention to human qualities, to rearing of men and women who know where they stand, what they do, why they do, what man's history is about and human quality is so important.

Threats to our existence on this earth come from many sources and vices. Exhausts of the cars we drive and factories in which we work and produce our gadgets pollute the air we breath, water we drink and use for many purposes, destroy our natural environment, and make our life in many ways unpleasant. Many new pills invite us to seek pleasures in illusions and hallucinations and not pursue a healthy way of life and use healthy diet. A maniac somewhere at a ballistic missile site or a mad imperialist somewhere in a key governmental security unit might decide to conquer the earth, establish, or extend his illusionary empire based on recent inventions and technologies. When we sleep somebody might practice on us his skills in using modern, invisible, bloodless bullets, and hurt millions of men and women, boys and girls, born and not yet born babies.

On the above examples we can see vividly how important are all these human rights, genuine people's sovereignty, checks and balances in the governmental system, observance of green and red lights in new designs and many other social and political inventions we have already seen. They are not for decoration of anything or anybody but for use and serious practice by all men on the earth and governmental units.

We assume in our travel that no great disaster will hit the earth

and mankind in the decades to come, which would wipe out one-third, one-half, or three-quarters of mankind. Our decision is to continue our travel while doing our best in every step and every minute of our life. No matter what might happen we can always say: "we have done whatever we could, we have done our best, and we used all possible means in each dangerous situation."

Lets look now at what is ahead of us in terms of normal roads, air and ocean travel. In national and international life and developments not everything is exactly as it is on the roads, in air and sea travel. Some of the roads and highways, for example, change abruptly; a good road comes to sudden end, and the sign might read "end of the road," "end of the highway" or something else very much disappointing. In social life there is more of continuity than on some of the roads. The social road of the past and present is indicative of what will come. The same is true of human beings, nations and international developments. Nothing here changes in a minute, not overnight, and not much even in one year. Even violent revolutions, no matter how dynamic and explosive, come back to the normal flow of social life and are absorbed by intermediate and long-run forces of history of a given society or mankind.

When intelligent persons know well a given man or woman, he can predict their behavior and potential activities. The same is true of social groups and organizations. When we come to national or international scene, the past trends and present conditions show clearly the trends for future developments. The history of man and mankind is a process, which has its beginning, forces which feed it, ascending lines and, no doubt, all sorts of encounters. The appearance of an unique man on the historical scene can speed up or retard a given process but cannot stop it. Neither Napoleon Bonaparte, Tsar Alexander II, J. V. Stalin, nor Adolf Hitler could stop the trends of history. They tried to ride on the crest of history, but history rode on them.

Social and behavioral scientists began to chart recently *scenarios*, which means continuous pictures, not unlike motion pictures, of long run trends of social, economic and political developments embracing long past, present time and extending into future. The underlying thinking for such *scenarios* and prediction of future development is based on healthy, common sense reasoning. A trend, which was evident already, let say, for

200 years cannot come to an abrupt stop tomorrow but will continue to come to a natural end. It is like an inception, birth and growth of human being . . .

Lets see now the *scenarios* for political, economic and social developments on the earth for the past 200 years and decades to come.

SCENARIO I, 1775-1815, from the beginning of the U. S. Revolution to the triumph of imperial forces in Vienna.

Political systems based on *new design* (people's sovereignty, freedom of individual, elected government, checks and balances in government, and others) were established in the United States of America and Revolutionary France. But France was pushed back into colonial and imperial system. The United States of America was the only country left free to represent the new political trend.

In Central Europe, Poland was partitioned and the last fortress of freedom in the Ukraine destroyed. The Tsar's Russian Empire came to the crest of its absolutism and continued to push in all directions.

Constitutional monarchies began to develop in the North and West of Europe, which were mixing the rule of dynasties with the new constitutional designs.

The first period of industrial revolution and modern technological inventions started in England and Northwestern Europe.

The world was dominated by several huge empires and so was the international balance and stability, which were quite often interrupted by bloody wars.

SCENARIO II, 1816-1920, from the Congress of Vienna to the post-World War I treaties and founding of the League of Nations.

The earth was filled with national and social unrest and revolutions but kept under the lock if imperial forces in the individual empires and internationally. Wars among the empires were frequent occurrences.

Latin America (Central and Southern America) became a zone of free republics. The Organization of American States (OAS), in which the U. S. was a natural leader, became reality.

France, still carrying a huge empire, joined the column of republics in 1870's. Constitutional systems in all constitutional monarchies, except a few, deepened. Monarchs were moving slowly in the position, which presidents take in the republican form of government.

Imperial Russia, very slow in evolution to the new design, was torn down by Lenin's revolution in Russia proper and national revolutions in the countries seized by Russian emperors. The face of Eastern and Central Europe came to be dotted with *republics*. They rose on the territories of former Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, which collapsed as well.

The industrial revolution extended to North America, Japan and many countries of Europe.

While some empires disappeared from the face of the earth (Ottoman empire, German Empire, Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and Russian Empire) and remaining were slowly weakening, League of Nations was established to watch and sustain a new balance in international life in the process of making.

SCENARIO III, 1921-1945, from the post-war settlements of World War I to the end of World War II.

The old, weak system of imperial arrangements and republics, most of them small and weak, was challenged by imperial movements in Germany, Italy and Japan. The government of the U.S.S.R and C.P.S.U. embarked on bringing under control all countries of former Russian Empire, including Poland. The world witnessed the rise of a mad world, which is still to some extent with us. 19th century doctrines came to a mad contests.

The Westminster Imperial Conference in 1931 opened the road for many countries of the British empire to go free and stay in a loosely knitted system of the British Commonwealth Nations.

The Molotov-Ribentrop treaty of August, 1939, which provided for a new partitioning of Poland and divided Europe in

spheres of political influence of German *Reich* and the U.S.S.R., meant the beginning of the World War II.

In the course of World War II, many countries of Africa and Asia were cut off from their metropolises and embarked on the roads to their political independence. The similar thing happened in Eastern Europe when the Soviet government and armed forces left behind them about 500,000 square miles of territories and were about ready to abandon the European part of the U.S.S.R.

The United States of America was the only victor in World War II, who did not have to fight war on his own territory. At the end of World War II, the United States was economic, political and military power second to none.

The U.S.S.R. came out of the war with about 20 millions dead, parts of some cities in ruins and factories damaged but controlling almost the entire Southern and Central Europe, including some important sites of German industries, ballistic missiles and A-bomb research stations.

SCENARIO IV, 1946-1975, from the end of World War II to the end of the Vietnam War and unification of Vietnam.

The postwar international stability, as planned, was to rest on great powers (the United States of America, the U.S.S.R., U. K., China, and France) and cooperation of all countries in the United Nations. But as soon as World War II ended — a global contest between the U.S.S.R. and United States began to develop. From the initial contest over Central and Southern Europe, it widened to Asia and then in 1950's and 1960's to Africa and Americas. This contest by all possible means was the central theme of this 30 year period.

Another central motif of the three decades (1946-75) was coming to the arena of history of about 95 new nations. Africa, once divided by colonial empires, came to be dotted with *republics* and new nations on self-governing principles and people's sovereignty.

A new revolution came in sciences, technologies and industrialization which became world-wide. New centers of industrial power began to emerge (Brazil, Mexico, India, South

Korea, Philippines and others).

The United Nations came to play important role in the world caught by contest of two powerful giants, birth of many new nations (at times in local wars and revolutions) and others trying to improve their posture in social life. The end of this period (1973-75) has seen attempt at renewed U. S. — Soviet cooperation (detente), Soviet-Sino "patching" of territorial and ideological conflicts (China wants not only a small island in the Amur river, but outer Mongolia, parts of Turkmenistan and area around the Amur river) and U. S. — China amity marred since 1949 when Marx/Lenin's pro-Soviet group siezed the power in continental China.

SCENARIO V, 1976-2025, from the withdrawal of U. S. out of Indochina to the year 2025.

The trend, which is a long run trend, for national liberation of still enslaved peoples will continue and by the end of 2025 there might be about 200 states and nations on the earth. By sheer large number, the new states and nations, freed in 1946-75 and thereafter, will hold a key to international stability. In 45 years many new countries will have their education, public administration and economies well established.

Brazil, Mexico, India, China, Philippines, Indonesia, and possible United Arab Nation will join the rank of politically and economically strong countries. But if the long-run trend is correct and events of 1970's are any indicators, the present so-called super-powers must move politically downwards. How far down?

Our look at the Societ scene has shown the range of possibilities. It is almost impossible to give a correct evaluation of dynamics of the vast, manifold and complex U.S.A. What looks as a temporary setback might ber long-run impediments. In this respect leadership on all levels of government will play an important role.

In the balances on the international scene and its tendency toward stability in the midst of some small wars and disruptions new regional and sub-continental organizations will begin to play a notable role. The voice of *European Unity*, *African Unity* and slowly emerging *Arab (Pan-Arab) Nation* will sound more vigorous and important. Many constitutions of the Arab countries

have calls for Pan-Arabic nation. The contest of two superpowers over this area will help to make this a reality, although with great tensions and difficulties.

The possibility of a big war of World Wars I and II remains a very slight possibility. There is simply no country or government to conduct such a war by conventional weapons. To have a World War by modern strategic weapons is too risky. To recent strategic weapons might happen what in 1930's happened to heavy stocks with war-chemicals. They were available to some countries but nobody used them.

As far as conventional armed forces are concerned, the Soviet Government still holds an edge of large margin over U.S. But next to the U.S.S.R. is the country which has one billion of population and given short time can develop a conventional army 3-4 times as numerous as the Soviets have. Along the Sino-Soviet borders, to the East of them, in Indo-China, where the Soviet Government makes all efforts to put its foot, are the regions loaded with conflicts of high tensity and great exploding force. There are no other areas of this type anywhere else. What can happen in Americas of 16 republics? What can happen in Africa dotted with numerous countries or in Europe of 33 small, medium and large countries? A small upheaval? A social unrest? A dictator taking over the reigns of republic and then being chased?

Sciences and technologies will, no doubt, continue to show their triumphal march. The U. S., Western Europe, Japan, and RFSSR, are the countries endowed with technologies and means by which to promote scientific and technological feats. For a crowded earth is logical move to expand into outer space and universe. When at late mediaeval period Europe was crowded, Americas were discovered which provided outlets for millions of emigrants. At the present time some areas of Americas are already crowded. India and China are over-crowded and the Soviet part of Asia does not have as much of lands for settlements as it is commonly thought. It is time to plan and move with great efforts into outer space, into wide and limitless universe. There is man's new destiny.

* * *

2. THE MAIN IMPEDIMENTS TO HUMAN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PROGRESS

* * *

Man's present, past and future history cannot be treated as a product of windmills, steam engines and other technological forces. If this notion were correct and not extremely one-sided, V. I. Lenin could not have established "the first socialist state" as we read it in the decree of the Central Committee of the CPSU about 110th anniversary of his birth and his great importance to the Russian history and human progress. In 1917, when he made with a small cohort of his followers the October Revolution in Russia proper, she was still a backward country from the standpoint of technologies and economics; the laws of historical and dialectical materialism, if they worked anywhere with the force as stated by marx and Engels, could not work at all in Lenin's Russia. What he did, no matter how much overestimated or underestimated, proves what a brilliant mind coupled with unique will and determination can do.

Windmills, steam engines, nuclear energy and other inventions of man, are products of his hands and brain. The first *do* the things, while the last searches for the principles and laws on which our earth, life and universe rest. The hands and brains belong to human beings; they in turn to the earth and the universe with whatever is visible and sisible, known or not yet knowen. Neither man nor the universe are physical things only. Man has will and determination, but they are not physical. Man has feelings and not all can be reduced to physical drive for self-reproduction. Man's body immediately after death, when nothing has yet physically changed is, looses slightly its weight; some atheistic psychologists say it might be the SOUL.

Man's history, no matter which part or aspect of it, is a part of the earth and the universe, which holds a key to its better understanding. It is strange that human brain, millions of its neurons, have something as complex as the universe has and is so difficult to explore in all its complexity as the universe is. It has been studied for such a long time and yet there still so many puzzles and unknown links. What is well known and beyond any doubt is that when well kept and developed works better than the best computer made by man. It not only stores millions of bits of information but it THINKS, which NO COMPUTER DOES OR

CAN DO in any original or inventive way.

The key to the understanding of man's history is in man as well. Man is much more than so many pounds of bones, flesh and other material things. The man's body as well as his brain are not much worth after the "Spark" of Life expires in them. Brain after death of a given body, in which head it was, becomes a cluster of worthless tissues.

This author was interested to some sort of message to man, which he carried from the very beginning of his conscious existence, or a key to his individual and social potential development. He made a wide search through old documents, old writings and expressions, especially those which plain people carried from mouth to mouth for many centuries, popular *dictums* (sayings) and other sources. When one looks on man's inventions in all possible fields, including social, the products of his cultures and civilization and when one studies what man's genius and ingenuity can do, then the Biblical statement "GOD CREATED MAN IN HIS OWN IMAGE" is the sentence which expresses his individual and social potentialities. Thomas Aquinas, the most learned man of Mediaeval time, who knew well the ancient writings and understood the life in its complexity, wrote:

"The highest manifestation of life consistent in this; that a being governs his own actions. A thing which is always subject to directions of another is somewhat a dead thing."

The old Testament of the Bible, which carries many of man's old and long memories, makes many references to darkness and chaos giving way to something which is well organized and on higher level than it was. Isaiah, the great prophet in ancient times wrote:

"For thus say the Lord
Who created the heavens
(He is God)

Who formed the earth and made it
(He established it;
He did not create it in chaos,
He formed it to be inhabited)
". . . I did not speak in secret

In a land of darkness;"
"I did not say to the offsprings of Jacob
'Seek me in chaos'
I the Lord speak the truth,
I declare what is right."

(Isaiah 45:18-19)

Were the slaves, serfs, injustices and whimsical rulers the highest manifestation of life? Were they not dead things? Were millenniums behind us not a social chaos and darkness with small islands of bright light and commitment to "what is right?"

Are not all these developments in the course of last 200 years, great **NEW DESIGN, SELF-GOVERNMENT, PEOPLE'S SOVEREIGNTY**, attempts to have a new, dignified and fine man, man's quest for fairness and justice, a thrust in the right direction?

Could the enslaved peoples govern their actions? Were they not a dead thing? Was not the old system often a chaos without any truth and right? Could it stay where it was, or was it not bound to give way to something new and different?

The answer of man's history was: they could not; they had to go *free* and have their own stadiums and their own self-governments.

The movement from the old system, where masses of peoples were far away from "the highest manifestation of life" to the new, where they could govern their own actions, was and could be not like a sunrise and darkness of night giving place to daytime. Social and political changes are not unlike organic processes; and almost anything has to change.

The old system of "homogeneity," established in the course of milleniums when man's main problem was bare physical existence, was on very low social level. The level had to be lifted up; and it is like large groups of peoples and masses of social units climbing high summits when and where so many things are important. Taking all other factors given, the leaders of the groups, large and small, had to move ahead and show that the road, methods and style of climbing. We have seen already some of the old leaders, good and bad ones, and some "new," who committed suicides or

have been posthumously thrown out of their graves. Such leaders in quotation marks are the first main impediment to successful upward movement.

The plain thing is that a good leader must know more, must be more experienced, must have better hand and brain muscles and be better in any respect from his followers. Leadership is not just a problem of holding an office, a formal authorization to exercise leadership or a sack of money on the back by which to buy every man and woman. It has to be something more important and socially tangible behind it.

The problem of deficiencies in leadership was subject to serious studies in the course of last decades of our times. As anything else it can be studied, but a study only is not sufficient. It has to be practiced in real life and not in any ivory towers. It has to be learned often in a hard and painful way. A muscle for leadership has to develop and the followers must feel the magnet of the leader and organizer. Some men and women develop this magnet without any formal training, but in a complex world of ours they feel often handicapped; formal education and training brings to the leader experience of very condensed type in a short period of time which no man could learn by himself even if he could live 10,000 years.

Funny leaders have been subject to many writings in the form of fictions. Ivan Krylov (1769-1844), who lived at the beginning of our epoch, has written many fables on funny leadership and those who imitate leaders but can never be good leaders. In the fable on Swan, Pike, and Crab he wrote:

"One day, the pike, the crab, the swan
set out to drag a truck along the road,
All three together harnessed to the load.

"It was not that their load was difficult to move;
But upward strained the swan, toward the skies above,
The crab kept stepping back, the pike was for the pond.

"And which was right or wrong, I neither know nor care;
I only know the truck's still there."

In his world-famous *Quartet*, Krylov gave us the following

scene:

"The tricksome little monkey,
The goat with tangled hair,
The donkey,
And the clumsy-fingered bear
A great quartet had planned to start;
They got the notes, viola, fiddles, bass,
And set beneath a lime tree on the grass,
to charm creation with their art."

"It can't go right like that;
you don't know how to sit.
We'll play to quite another tune
And make the hills and forest dance for glee.
I am sure we'll make it go
By sitting in the row."

"We've notes, we've instruments to tell us
How to sit;
The nightingale replies; to sit is not enough.
Then change you sits and fiddles too;
For chamber music's not for you."

When our political leaders feud and bicker about very little problems of no importance to the nation, these fables come to our minds. Italians might have these fables in their minds too.

It is not easy to lead when the world is stepping into something new and the notions and arrangements of many millenniums overshadow the new. Each birth is very painful and a change produces its own many problems, crossroads and frustrations. But that's what leadership is about and where its function is: lead at times through wildernesses, floods and many odds.

The contemporary leadership's philosophy is caught by many contradictions and has its own crossroads. On one side of the extreme *spectrum* is the new authoritarian and totalitarian leader. He wants to have emperors' shoes and insignia at times hiding them. His rule is by decrees of his own making. A doctrine, which is on his mind, beyond which he cannot see anything, is his source of inspiration and his design. He wants to force the life into a doctrine, which blinds him, and puts on the society his own

dictates. The processes of social life and historical trends do not mean anything to him; he has made his mind on everything long time ago.

Authoritarian leaders cannot rest and often even sleep until they conquer all countries around them and plunge the world into trouble. Then some run away from justice by a suicide or play the role of victims of circumstance. J. V. Stalin, Adolf Hitler, Benito Mussolini and N. S. Khrushchev are the models for this type of leadership.

On the other extreme of the *spectrum*, is a *laissez faire* type of political leader. He wants to climb as high as he can and collect as much of money as he can by doing very little. He is too lazy to study anything, including trends of history, designs, doctrines and his own human environment, the unit in which he sits and works. Everything around him begins to disintegrate and there is no unifying magnet and direction at all.

A reasonable leadership is somewhere in between these two extremes. Nobody has a final formula for such leadership and nobody could describe exactly its methods. It is not unlike auto driving in some respects: at times more gasoline must be pumped into the engine system, which means more energy and a higher speed. Then the conditions might warrant a slow down; no system, including human, can work for too long with high intensity. The rules of traffic and fairness must be applied at all times. Woe to the leader (and the beginning of an end) when he will be caught practicing unfairness. Unfairness has tendency to disintegrate any social unit and breed more of unfairnesses and problems, which can not be controlled. The same woe to the leader, who is caught on fraudulent activities because at the moment he was caught he lost all his followers and the right on which the leadership and authority rest.

A good leader is always better than his followers as far as character and integrity are concerned; there is the magnet and the electricity, flowing from him to them. There must be also a flow of magnet of knowledge and dedication to a given cause. A sack of money will not lead many to do something which is connected with a very high risk of death but a dedication to a cause and a good leader will do the job. How else some leaders without money carried behind them masses of peoples and destroyed mighty

emperors and empires?

He is permissive and lets his followers to grow as tall in any respect as they can and show as much of initiative in serving a given cause as they can. But he demands a strict observance of some rules of fairness to themselves, to others and to him as leader. By his experience he is a social psychologist and can notice any inappropriate move around him. He pierces the innermost of any of his followers and those around him.

A good leader attracts like a magnet every individual who has some sort of "metal" in him or her. He influences them and they him. He becomes a focus of this two-way social process.

In many languages there is *dictum* (saying) "only the work will change our lot." The leader is never a lazy man or woman. They cannot be; there is always so much to learn and so much to do. It is his or her systematic work, self-discipline, and self-organization which are one of the main tools and assets of leadership.

The work of a good leader does not end with election or appointment day. It only begins. Before seeking a given position he considers very carefully: "can or can I not do this job well? If not, why seek a given office?" Every office in the new design system, elective or by appointment" is a public trust position where fitness to do the job well and proper backgrounds are so important.

* * *

Another main impediment in the movement to the social and political summits is the way the highly industrialized countries and regions move upwards. The movement from a backward stage to industrialized level, although considered difficult because of lack of high technological know-how to do things and shortage of capital, was made by many countries without major difficulties. Know-how and capital came to the hands of healthy and vigorous men and women, who in the case of the United States of America came from any country in Europe and then from any country on the earth.

The high industrialized stage shows many men and women tired of everything. In some areas they even have a tendency to grow

shorter and look fragile. The English sites of traditional mining have been studied in this respect and prove this point of view. But what is true of some sites in England is to some extent true of all highly industrialized regions in the world. In the U.S.S.R., for example, the highly industrialized cities of Western and Northern regions show many problems in public health and large scale of male impotencies. In the Asiatic part of the U.S.S.R., especially in rural areas and small towns, these problems do not exist; male and female fertility, which measures the health and physical vigour, is there as high as it ever has been.

The United States of America, which is the most urbanized country in the world and developed the biggest industrial might on the face of the earth, shows symptoms similar to the English and the European U.S.S.R. The public health came to be a serious issue. The President's commission on Public health in the United States of America published in September 1977 its preliminary report; it stated that between 15 to 25 percent of the population have diagnosable mental disturbances while additional 25 percent suffer severe emotional stresses. The final report of Spring 1978, which was no doubt more accurate, brought the first category to 15 percent, 5 percent higher than it was in 1950's; the second category, which never can be measured exactly, was explained in terms of many underlying causes and disturbances (see: "Task Panel Reports Submitted to the President's Commission on Mental Health," vol. I-III, 1978).

The causes of problems in mental health are related in the reports to "drug use problems," "alcohol-related disorders," "childhood disorders," "mental disorders of the elderly" and other causes. The Commission tried to locate the causes and wrote:

"Serious mental and behavioral disorders may arise from a broad range of biological, psychological and socio-cultural factors. By now, it is clear that the causes of mental disorders are often multiple and a resulting illness can represent complex interactions among these factors.

"In the broadest sense, the general health and mental health of the Nation reflects the quality of life, the soundness of childhood socialization and the effectiveness of the social integration of all subgroups in our population. From this perspective, mental health is a reflection of our society and its values."

The reports do not go into such depth of these "complex interactions" and "integration of all subgroups" as we did in our "travel." We went far beyond this nation and beyond the present time. We have seen, for example, the contemporary doctrines and contradictions in the U.S.S.R., and the Soviet sphere of influence. This is the way how "interactions" and "integration of all subgroups" worked themselves out in the long-run trend. This is what the authoritarian and totalitarian doctrines and systems work themselves out and the social products they make.

The Soviet scene is needed for the understanding of the U. S. scene. The *popular* dictum in some languages says: "with whom do you sit, you turn the same way." What is true of sitting, which in this case was short and not continuous, is also correct of fighting in the course very long period of time and inroads which the "competing" partner tried to make by all possible means into U. S. territory. Some day a history of the United States of America must be written in the light of documents which are open or still hidden abroad. It will show how many native Americans found themselves on many crossroads in the blind alleys during dark nights, and show what we often call our own domestic trends, processes and events, have been not of our own making. It is not secret any more that, as F. B. I. report for 1970 states, there have been by that time about 5,000 enemy guerrillas on the territory of the United States of America.

One must be very careful in attributing causes to the events and effects. deficiencies in domestic security and wicked activities of foreign spies and their stooges can produce a gamut of complicated problems, in public health, social and political life, and they can have their origins not in the fumes of the factories, heavy drinking at home and even use of drugs, but in the intelligence laboratories and its psychiatric institutes abroad.

From the standpoint of urbanization and physical environment, the United States of America has some regions where one house stands almost on another and hundreds of factories next to one another or even worse — located in the residential districts. There is no air which to breathe, no grass on which to sit and play baseball or soccer, no parks in which young children could play and develop their physical and brain muscles, be with and in the nature, and see the brimstone of the Universe. When megapolises are overcrowded, the Federal Government holds "in perpetuity"

large tracts of lands, which aiming to disperse the population and block the deadly ecological and environmental trend, which could be used to develop new cities and towns.

* * *

The third main impediment to movement to the social and political summits takes the form of persecutions and crucifications of fairness and justice, on which their new design rests. It is a strange phenomenon of the last four decades. Older men and women might remember 1920's and a part of 1930's when the terms "fair plays" and "English gentleman" have been highly popular all over the world. Every person kept saying and imitating them. Mankind, of course, since immemorial time had high respect for these social notions and cultivated them with great intensity when new type of sports and social designs began to emerge in 18th and 19th centuries. Then in 1930's came Adolf Hitler to power with his tall booths he could put on anybody's head and crash it. In the U.S.S.R., J. V. Stalin tried to eradicate any religious feelings and showed what brute power can do. He could order killing of any of his friends when told that he might compete for power or is smarter than he is. Not only Marshall Tukhachevsky but noted economist and the head of the Soviet State Planning Commission, N. V. was killed in such way. With the outbreak of World War II the persecutions of fairness and justice began to spread to the entire world. After the war came to the end it was fashionable to play a "strong" man and disregard all and any rules of fairness. In the United States of America, the country for long not in direct contract with Hitler-Stalin unfair madness, even 1950's were still different in this respect than 1960's and 1970's which dragged this country into bloody encounters in Indochina, which stood for decades under the banners of brute force and unfairness.

Why is the cultivation of fairness and justice so important?

In order to understand it well it is enough to look at any encyclopedia or dictionary. Dictionaries define unfairness as use of tricks and artificial devices, dishonest, unjust methods, not observing any vows or commitments, not equitable in life and dealings with other human beings.

One of good methods to establish how some habits and notions work is to maximize their power and sphere of expansion. Let's say every man and woman in the society begins to be unfair to

themselves and everybody else. Could any society exist in such conditions? Would any profession be possible? Any healthy human relationship or even communication by means of language? How do you know what any and all words would mean?

If medicine could invent pills for fairness and vaccinate unfair men and women for fairness as it vaccinates man against many other illnesses (unfairness is a pestilence), the life on the earth would begin to look renewed, rebuilt, smooth, soft and more meaningful. Some men and women would look like a tramp, leaving a shower room and putting on new, clean cloth, after the old rags were left on the other side of the shower room. Man, societies, countries, and man's international life would turn new and start to be of truly new design. This would mean a world free of deceptions, crooks, lies, open or hidden banditry and many existing problems.

One day such invention will be real. But the pitfall of such invention will be that it will not work well. Every habit of man must be cultivated and practiced by each man and woman not unlike we develop the muscles of our bodies and brains. It must be done what master players and champions do: work hard and many years. Then it becomes an inseparable part of man's brain and blood.

Fairness is what makes man different from animal. A pig will do anything provided it can and does not meet any hard-core fence. The human being should not do what is unfair to others, including animal world. It is not only for governmental officials, who need it most in order to do any real progress in anything, but for every human being. No one knows what is more unfair; when a mother runs after pleasures or gadgets and forgets to socialize her child well, which means a future handicapped adult, or an official drinking in a bar when he should be working.

* * *

POSTSCRIPT

* * *

The *Book of Ecclesiastes* (9:11) reads:

"The race is not for swift, nor the battle for the strong. . . but time and chance happened to them all."

The time set free millions of those who have been once slaves, serfs or in many types of servitudes. It gave them chance to practice any type of self-government, exercise collective sovereignty and placed them in many ways where once the wealthiest and mightiest rulers stood.

The time gave to man unique inventions, technologies, new medicine, new sciences, knowledge of his environment, his social life and himself. New social, political, economic designs have been produced for his convenience and use. The laws, national and international, assure to him dignity, respect and opportunities he once was dreaming about.

But the clouds of the dark past still hang over man and mankind. Not all bounds have been yet casted off. Some new bonds are rising on horizons. Crossroads and blind alleys develop. They might turn man's history on a rear gear, back to the ancient, despotic times.

The time put everything and everybody in his and her place. Every person, every hamlet, every town, every city, every state, every nation, every organization and association, no matter where and on which level, must do their jobs. In times of great interdependence and complexity every single chain and link count and are very important. In a place of weak link everything might collapse. One madman can cause disaster to a large segment of the earth . . .

What we have today was produced not by time only but by millions upon millions of hard working men and women. Whatever we have is crystalized energy of their brains and bodies. The auto you drive, the road you are on, a traffic rule you read and apply in order not to get killed on the road, are forms of human energy. So is the country, the nation which you call yours.

Whatever we have is a great trust given to us and we cannot

behave like the proverbial Prodigal Son did it. We must add to great store of crystalized energy whatever is the best in us. To be creative and make our contribution to this store means to find a life-long calling, a life full of meaning.

When we come to the crossroads or difficulties in anything there is no reason for despair. Crossroads, blind alleys and signs which are difficult to read mean that we must slow down and whenever needed stop and think: Where did I come from? Where do I stand? Where I am heading to?

But no matter *when* and *where* we drive, *what* we do, we must be fair to ourselves and others. Without fairness there is no driving and no work of any meaning. The rules of driving must be not only in our heads but in our veins. The same is true with great social and political designs of our epoch and our times. How can we do anything without knowing them? How can we do any useful social or political work, without knowing where our time stands?

To know anything takes efforts; it takes man's work and determination to have knowledge as it takes to do anything else. In times of crossroads and many changes knowledge is the safest guide and the most precious value. It might save our health and our life. It pays to have it and is the best and the most safe investment in human life. No fire can burn it without you; no thief can steal it; and no bandit can take it away from you.

Thanks for a pleasant travel together in writing and reading this treatise. We might have more of such travels.

* * *

FINAL ACT of the Helsinki Conference (8/1/75)

DECLARATION ON THE PRINCIPLES GUIDING RELATIONS BETWEEN STATES

THE PARTICIPATING STATES,

REAFFIRMING their commitment to peace, security and justice and the continuing development of friendly relations and cooperation;

RECOGNIZING that this commitment, which reflects the interest and aspiration of peoples, constitutes for each participating State a present and future responsibility, heightened by the experience of the past;

REAFFIRMING, in conformity with their membership in the United Nations, their full and active support for the United Nations and for the enhancement of the role and effectiveness of international peace, security, and justice, and in promoting the solution of international problems, as well as development of friendly relations and cooperation among the states;

EXPRESSING their common adherence to the principles, which are set below and are in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, as well as their common will to act in the application of these principles, in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations

DECLARE THEIR DETERMINATION to respect and put into practice, each of them in its relations with all other participating States, irrespective of their political, economic or social systems as well as of their size, geographical location or level of economic development, the following principles, which all are of primary significance, guiding their mutual relations:

I. SOVEREIGN EQUALITY, RESPECT FOR THE RIGHTS INHERENT IN SOVEREIGNTY

Within the framework of International law, all the participating States have equal rights and duties. They will respect each other's right to define and conduct, as it wishes, its relations with other States in accordance with international law and the spirit of the

present Declaration. They consider that their frontiers can be changed, in accordance with the International law, by peaceful means and by agreement. They also have the right to belong or not to belong to international organizations, to be or not to be a party to bilateral and multilateral treaties, including the right to be or not to be a party to treaties of alliance; they have also the right to neutrality.

II. REFRAINING FROM THE THREAT OR USE OF FORCE

. . . the participating States will refrain from any acts constituting a threat of force, direct or indirect use of force against another participating State . . .

III. INVIOABILITY OF FRONTIERS

The participating States regard as inviolable all one another's frontiers as well as the frontiers of all States in Europe . . .

IV. TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY OF STATES

The participating States will respect the territorial integrity of each of the participating States . . .

V. PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

The participating States will settle disputes among them by peaceful means in such a manner as not to endanger international peace and security, and justice.

They will endeavour in good faith and spirit of co-operation to reach a rapid and equitable solution on the basis of international law . . .

VI. NONINTERVENTION IN INTERNAL AFFAIRS

The participating States will refrain from any intervention, direct or indirect, individual or collective, in the internal or external affairs falling within the domestic jurisdiction of another participating State, regardless of their mutual relations . . .

VII. RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS, INCLUDING THE FREEDOM OF THOUGHT, CONSCIENCE, RELIGION OR BELIEF

The participating States will respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

They will promote and encourage the effective exercise of civil, political, economic, social, cultural and other rights and freedoms, all of which derive from the inherent dignity of the human person and are essential for his free and full development.

. . . The participating States on whose territory minorities exist will respect the right of persons belonging to such minorities to equality before the law, will afford them the full opportunity for the actual enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and will, in this manner, protect their legitimate interest in this field.

The participating States recognize the universal significance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for which is an essential factor for the peace, justice and well-being necessary to ensure the development of friendly relations and co-operation among themselves as among all States.

They will constantly respect these rights and freedoms in their mutual relations and will endeavour jointly and separately, including in co-operation with the United Nations, to promote universal and effective respect for them.

They confirm the right of the individual to know and act upon his rights and duties in this field.

In the field of human rights and fundamental freedoms, the participating States will act in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. They will also fulfill their obligations and agreements in this field, including inter alia the International Covenants on Human Rights, by which they might be bound.

VIII. EQUAL RIGHTS AND SELF-DETERMINATION OF PEOPLES

The participating nations will respect the equal rights of peoples and their right to self-determination, acting at all times in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and with the relevant norms of international law, including those relating to territorial integrity of States.

By virtue of the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, all peoples always have the right, in full freedom, to determine, when they wish, their internal and external political status, without external interference, and to pursue as they wish their political, economic, social and cultural development.

The participating States reaffirm the universal significance of respect for and effective exercise of equal rights and self-determination of peoples for the development of friendly relations among themselves as among all nations; they also recall the importance of the elimination of any form of violation of this principle.

IX. CO-OPERATION AMONG NATION-STATES

The participating States will develop their cooperation with one another and with all States in all fields [of human life] in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. In developing their cooperation the participating nations will place special emphasis on the fields as set forth within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, with each of them making its contribution in conditions of full equality . . .

X. FULFILLMENT IN GOOD FAITH OF OBLIGATIONS UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW


The participating countries will fulfill in good faith their obligations under international law, both, those obligations arising from the generally recognized principles and rules of international law, and those obligations arising from treaties or other agreements, in conformity with international law, to which they are parties . . .

[Articles 2 (I-II) and the following sections (II, 1-6), deal with the social, economic, scientific and other aspects of cooperation among the participating nations. Cooperation in humanitarian and related fields is dealt with under the title "Co-operation in humanitarian and other fields."

The "FOLLOW-UP TO THE CONFERENCE" section provides for periodic meetings of representatives of each participating country. The first was scheduled for 1977 in Belgrade. The Belgrade Conference scheduled the next for 1980 in Madrid.]

[The Final Act was signed by representatives of 33 European nations, Canada and United States of America, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Prime Minister, signed for Canada, and Gerald Ford, President, for the United States of America.]

* * *



Dr. J. Shumelda
400 Rivera Street
San Francisco, CA 94116



RICHARD A. GILSON LIBRARY
Gifts and Exchange
UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94137

*Thank you for your thoughtful remembrance during
this holiday season. We are grateful for your friendship
and send our best wishes for the coming year.*

Rosalynn Carter

Jimmy Carter

Newark Public Library
P.O. Box 530, Newark, N. J. 07101

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138

Columbia

THE LIBRARIES

New York, N.Y. 10027

Minneapolis, Minnesota 554

December 31, 1980

January 7, 1981

Dr. J. Shumelda
400 Rivera St.
San Francisco, CA 94116



LIBRARY

San Francisco State University

Dear Dr. Shumelda:

Dear Dr. Shumelda:

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON LIBRARIES FM-25
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98195

On behalf of the University of Washington Libraries,
I am pleased to express our appreciation for your recent
gift of materials. It is the intent of the Libraries to
acquire and to maintain a comprehensive collection for the
many scholarly programs in which faculty and students
participate. Your contribution will be considered for
addition to the collection.

Thank you again for your generous thought of the
University Libraries.



Sincerely,

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Dear Dr. Shumelda:

Thank you so much for providing me with copies
of your book Quo Vadis Homine Where Do You Go?.
Now that the elections are behind us, I now have
the opportunity to catch up on my reading.

I am also taking the liberty of sharing it with
the Political Affairs Division and I am sure they
will find it very informative.

Very truly yours,

Bill Brock

BILL BROCK

The University of Chicago
1100 East 57th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
ITHACA, N. Y. 14853
U.S.A.



Republican
National
Committee.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY
2000 JACKSON STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94109

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
University of Kansas Libraries
Lawrence, Kansas 68015

UKRAINIAN RESEARCH INSTITUTE
188-183 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
Eugene, Oregon 97403 U.S.A.

The Boston Public Library
BOSTON · MASSACHUSETTS

Columbia University
New York, N.Y. 10027

RUTGERS

THE LIBRARIES
NEW BRUNSWICK · NEW JERSEY 08903

Yale University Library
Box 1007A Yale Station
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

