

PE.  
7017.  
S

# Tasks for the Free World Today

Thoughts on Positive  
Anti-Communism

Contributions by:  
M. Lamberty  
S. W. Couwenberg  
N. von Grote  
P. Zacharias Anthonisse  
A. Müntz  
H. von Rautenfeld  
C. C. van den Heuvel

Tasks for the Free World  
Today



by 2



## Contents

Introduction	7
Notes on Terminology	9
"Western Values and Positive Anti-Communism" Prof. Dr. M. Lamberty, Brussels, Belgium	11
"Changing Attitudes Towards Communism" Dr. S. W. Couwenberg, The Hague, The Netherlands	31
"What is Positive Anti-Communism?" Dr. Nicolaus von Grote, Munich, Germany	42
"Confrontation with Anti-Communism" Prof. Dr. P. Zacharias Anthonisse, O. F. M. Cap., Nijmegen, The Netherlands	49
"Thoughts on East-West Conflict" Dr. A. Müntz, Zurich, Switzerland	61
"Intellectual Confrontation with Communism" Harald von Rautenfeld, Loccum, Germany	70
"The Answer of the West to the Challenge of 'Peaceful Coexistence'" C. C. van den Heuvel, The Hague, The Netherlands	81
Appendix A "Theses on the Ideological Problems of the Communism of the Future" (Arnold Buchholz)	85
Appendix B "Reflections on the Fate of Russia and of Europe" (Nicolas Berdyaev)	89
Appendix C Some Ideas of Teilhard de Chardin	92
Interdoc	93
The Contributors	94

## Introduction

*"... For today the winds of change are blowing across the Iron Curtain as well as in the rest of the world..."*

(From a speech by the late President of the United States of America, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, delivered on 27th June 1963 before the students of Berlin in the Assembly Hall of the Free University, Berlin.)

In the context of the confrontation with communism an attempt has been made in the following contributions to develop some basic thoughts on the present-day psychological-political tasks of the Free World.

The contributors belong to various European nations as well as to differing schools of thought and different confessions. Their views reflect, therefore, as well as their individual interpretation, the multiplicity of intellectual currents alive in Europe today. However varied the treatment, the basic idea animating all contributions lies in the need to discover and to define the response of the Free World in its confrontation with the world of communism.

The contributions are not intended to give an analysis of communist ideology. There is no lack of scientific studies dealing with this subject. The task undertaken here goes beyond analytic assertions. Since the end of the Second World War and to an even greater extent during the past few years, there has been widespread discussion over the "values of the Free World". The question constantly arises: What convictions and truths of a dynamic nature has the Free World to confront the communists' assertions and belief in the predestined victory of the Marxist-Leninist ideology? To put this question is symptomatic of the situation in the Free World, particularly in the West. It is obvious that in the Western World, which considers itself as being of an open and pluralistic order, there is a wealth of living intellectual, social and political values, which far surpass dialectical materialism. The Western World, therefore, need have no fear of the outcome of a tough and frank confrontation with Marxist-Leninist ideology.

In spite of this the absolute validity of Western values is often questioned, more especially by young people, because it is felt the present world is in need of constant change but that its basic values are not questionable at all. Many people—fascinated by the assumed coherent but actually disintegrated communist ideology—doubt whether our Western values are strong enough to withstand communist ideas. Because of this attitude

they are inclined to think mainly along defensive lines. But in order to prove the superiority of the values of the West, it is not necessary to assume such an attitude. It is more a question of making the Free World fully conscious of the fact that the diversity of our concepts of human dignity, freedom, justice and other values, constitutes a definite superiority over Marxism-Leninism.

The authors of the following articles venture to hope that these contributions which make no claim to be conclusive, will promote further discussion of the "tasks of the Free World" in its confrontation with the Communist World. Critical voices, which, it is hoped, will not be lacking, will be welcomed as signs of lively interest. In the further development of this same theme, it is planned to bring out a second series with contributions also from other countries.

*The Editors*

## **Notes on Terminology**

In the following articles three somewhat confusing concepts will be used. This is not an effort to make simple things complicated, but to distinguish concepts which are more and more used in connection to attitudes towards communism and anti-communism. Although these concepts will be treated at greater length in the following pages, it may be useful to say something about them now:

*Negative anti-communism* tends to picture things in connection to communism in terms of black and white. It only wants to *criticize* communism, which is often done in a purely negative and emotional manner. It is usually not inclined to see any improvements in relations with the Communist World or inside that orbit.

*Positive anti-communism* wants to study communism as objectively as possible, in order to base its criticism on scientific research. It maintains an open mind regarding the possibility of favourable changes in communism and in East-West relations. Through the confrontation with communism it wants to stress the basic values of the West.

"*Anti-Antikommunismus*" (literally anti-anticommunism) is a concept more used in German than in any other language, and therefore the German term will be used in this publication.

"*Anti-Antikommunismus*" rejects anti-communism on the grounds it is too negative, too emotional, and uninformed in its approach. It is trying to present itself as a modern, unprejudiced philosophy in East-West relations.

## Western Values and Positive Anti-Communism

by Prof. Dr. M. Lamberty, Brussels

### *Positive Anti-Communism*

The term *positive anti-communism* presupposes the existence of a form of anti-communism that is *negative*. Needless to say, they are both forms of *anti-communism*, but the difference between the two phrases, both of which express an attitude, comes down to the essential distinction that one is based upon arguments while the other upon action. *Positive* anti-communism is based on motives, explanations, reasons, and justifications.

It can be argued that not even those attitudes which seem to arise from the darker impulses, sudden emotions and the irrational passions—attributed to the masses by some sociologists—are entirely “blind”, but based more or less on reason and, therefore, subject to logical explanation. In fact, a close analysis of “negative” anti-communism invariably reveals a conscious element, a number of facts which taken together form the key to this attitude. A negative attitude does not necessarily originate from blind impulses, irrational outbursts, and tendencies void of consciousness and reason. Nothing in living beings is really blind. Actually, nothing is more rational than instinct, although by definition it is irrational. Instinct does not reason, but knows exactly what it is after. A man’s elementary inclinations are invariably governed by the distinction between a “good” which he has glimpsed and tried to find, and an “evil” opposed to it which he intends to avoid or fight because it constitutes a threat. At the bottom of an “emotional” attitude there is a number of more or less clear-cut ideas as to what *good* and *evil* are.

Thus, the form of anti-communism here termed *negative* is in several ways just as well-founded, explicable, and justified as that which presents itself as *positive*. The uncompromising, absolute, fanatic anti-communism, too, has perfectly understandable reasons behind it.

### *Need for Clarity*

Anti-communism, whether positive or negative, therefore always has its motives, linked with the more or less clear knowledge of a Good, on the one hand, and an Evil threatening the Good, on the other. In order to

understand and to act, however, an effort should be made to clarify and elucidate matters not generally grasped.

It is an important, essential, fundamental task to facilitate the distinction between the Good and the Evil involved, to define their outline and content, to make accessible to consciousness, reasoning and judgment what in the eyes of millions is obscure and confused.

This task is essential first of all because of the global character of the issue: the *East* and the *West*, the antagonism between huge and powerful political and military bodies. It must be known what separates the two giants and why they are opposed to each other. It must be grasped to what extent the enormous sacrifices that governments demand of their subjects, in order that they may face the consequences and risks of international tension, are justified.

This task is urgent, because successive events that took place in the course of 1963 have upset certain opinions and former attitudes as regards the position of the *East* with respect to the *West*.

The relaxation of the tension between New York and Moscow, the development of a split between Moscow and Peking, the repeated assurances by the Soviet Government of its wish for peaceful coexistence, the aid granted by the western powers to the U. S. S. R. and its satellites, to enable them to overcome the agricultural crisis, have changed the "climate" to which the five parts of the world had become accustomed during about fifteen years of "cold war".

The combination of strict doctrine with an evident opportunistic realism, or, in other words, the combination of theoretical absolutism and practical pluralism, as now occurring in Moscow—and as condemned in Peking—has brought about an appreciable relaxation within the western powers. Quite a few people—though greater in number than in authority—are calling for the policy of the extended hand, for negotiation with a view to coming to a lasting agreement, even at the cost of great sacrifices.

It is, therefore, more than ever an urgent necessity to clarify the fundamental aspects of the problem. This is necessary irrespective of further developments in world policy.

Either New York and Moscow will lead their allies towards a lasting peaceful coexistence, as a preliminary to a new equilibrium in the world, or before long they will return to the "cold war" and the immediate threat of an armed conflict.

In either case we must see clearly, make up our minds, adopt an attitude, and explain ourselves. All wars are the subject of decision, all wars are *declared*.

Decisions and declarations are invariably accompanied by a solemn statement as to the causes and what is at stake in the conflict, for which the governments demand the ultimate sacrifice of their peoples and their armies. Military alliances, which prepare positions at the outbreak of a possible war, are conceived and concluded with a similar perspective and for the same cause, which always amounts to the defence of a certain conception of the common good against the danger threatening it.

### *Philosophy of a Treaty*

This has been very well understood by the governments that have laid the basis of the "North Atlantic Treaty Organization", N. A. T. O., the large military alliance formed in 1949, which unites 15 states with the object of defending the West by force of arms, if necessary. The Preamble to the Treaty gives an outline of what has led to the Alliance and what are its aims. It declares that parties *are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and the civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law.*

By *freedom* of the peoples we must obviously understand national independence, which, of course, differs from the *individual* liberty to which reference will be made later. As regards the *rule of law*, by this must be understood adherence to the law and the concomitant rejection of arbitrary methods. These are among the basic principles of the political regimes of the nations represented by the signatories to the treaty.

The text mentions the *common heritage* which the allied people intend to safeguard. It immediately adds: the *civilization*.

No mention is made of the *culture* or the *values* of the West, words which are currently used. But it is not very difficult to discern in the words *common heritage* and *civilization* what most writers generally refer to as *Western culture* and *Western values*.

### *Divergence of Views*

The justification of the military alliance, its motives, its aims, as defined in the Preamble to the Treaty, apparently do not exhaust the subject. Some have wanted to be more explicit. Others have more or less insisted on emphasizing certain aspects. Others again have added to the ideas expressed in the Preamble value systems that were not expressly mentioned in it.

Thus M. Spaak, on assuming his duties as secretary-general of N. A. T. O., declared in a speech before the Belgian Senate on April 4th 1957:

"I am convinced that the whole of Europe belongs to the same flow of thought, that this flow originated in Greece and has found its final form in the teaching of Christ. I am also convinced that Western civilization has been made for Man, to his measure and that its essential feature—by which it is characterized and distinct from other civilizations—is this notion of respect for man."

This synthesis did not satisfy everybody. Christ's message is not restricted to the West. There are still Christians in the countries governed by communists. On the other hand, to claim that Christ's teaching is the final form of a flow of thought that originated in Greece, is a risky thing to do. Christianity did not arise from ancient paganism, but rejected it. Moreover, if we consider the whole of Europe, we must admit that the part of it that is under communist rule shares the same flow of thought with free Europe.

But let us retain from the Belgian statesman's testimony the idea that Western civilization is essentially Christian. He was not the only one to say so.

In a speech made at Gettysburg two years later Dwight D. Eisenhower, then President of the United States, had stressed what separates the West from the East, ascribing to the East atheist dictatorship, which reduces men and peoples to slavery, whereas the Christian West respects the liberty and the dignity of man and of nations.

Even within the nations whose opinion this speech was supposed to represent, criticism was heard. Among the most representative voices was that of M. Rolin, a lawyer of international repute, member of the International Court of Justice and former President of the Belgian Senate. He regretted the Gettysburg speech. He put forward that the atheism of the autocratic Soviet regime could not be considered an essential feature of the system; if it were, one could infer that an autocratic non-atheist regime, like that on the Iberian peninsula, cannot be judged in the same way as the Soviet regime but on the contrary can even be compared with the political system of the democratic countries.

Dr. K. Adenauer, former Chancellor of the German Federal Republic, in his Christmas message of 1960 also identified Western culture with Christianity. Meanwhile an American, Shepard B. Clough, professor of history in Columbia University, New York, had written a study on the values of Western civilization. His book, entitled *The Basic Values of Western Civilization*, appeared in 1960. The author had obtained

support from N. A. T. O., which had appointed him research fellow and commissioned him to study the problem and to draft conclusions. Moreover, the *State Department* of the United States had granted him a scholarship. It should be added that professor Clough's work was dedicated to P. H. Spaak, then secretary-general of N. A. T. O. Professor Clough presents the results of an investigation made in the two Americas and in Western Europe.

The picture outlined by Clough differs completely from that given by all those who have identified Western culture with Christian religious tradition.

The main trend revealed by Clough in the course of his investigation is not religious but humanistic. He summarizes it with these words: *The end of man on this earth is man*. Western man considers that man himself is the highest value. He strives after human and earthly well-being. He appreciates science and technology because they are sources of power and well-being. He values above all the most complete freedom which should give full scope to all his capabilities. He usually belongs to a Church but allows himself a considerable degree of freedom with respect to what is taught by Churches and philosophers. He sees "fuller life" in a "better society", above all as an earthly and utilitarian reality, and he neglects the metaphysical aspects that used to be so important and influential.

For the rest, the author does not fail to stress repeatedly the decline of religion in the Western world: "*the decline of religion as a value in the West*".

In short, the picture the American professor presents to us cannot but call forth what innumerable authors have been calling *materialism* for over a century. It is beyond argument that the Western man encountered by the American professor is dominated by a philosophy that is at the same time humanistic, eudemonistic and utilitarian, although generally and from mere habit he remains faithful to a Church.

It goes without saying that all reviews by defenders of the Churches refuted the conclusions drawn from professor Clough's investigation. In the course of the controversy that opposed humanists to theists nobody ever thought of pointing out how far both parties have moved away from the ideas expressed in the Preamble to the North Atlantic Treaty. On both sides viewpoints have developed on a different plane thus passing beyond that of the Preamble and ignoring its main features: national independence, common heritage, civilization, democracy, individual liberty, law and order.



Was it an omission on the part of the authors? In fact the principles and aims set out in the Preamble could assume their full significance only in the context of a general philosophy. The discussion ended where it was bound to end. But it revealed right away the deep cleft between Western men: some remained faithful to Christian theism, other became convinced defenders of rationalistic and eudemonistic humanism.

### *Institutions, Congresses and Publications*

Within the European Council and outside it two institutions came into being: *the European Cultural Fund* and *the European Cultural Foundation*. The former emanated from the European Council, while the latter was the outcome of private initiative. The two institutions act by common consent. Their mission is to promote the knowledge of Europe's cultural heritage. However, congresses, study weeks, discussions, encouragements and the annually awarded Erasmus prize have failed to lead to complete definitions of European culture. Still less have they been able to resolve the opposition described before, viz. the presence at the bottom of Western culture, of two irreducible currents: Christian theism on the one hand, eudemonistic humanism on the other.

The congresses that are held at long intervals in order to study problems related to European culture, especially those held in Berlin in 1950 and 1960, have enhanced rather than decreased the difference and the confusion.

Of more importance for the knowledge of European culture were the magnificent encyclopedias published by certain large firms. I particularly have in mind Messrs. Elsevier, Amsterdam.

These encyclopedias, which are essentially devoted to the fine arts, have made it clear that in this, as in many other fields—literature, philosophy, music, science, technology—it is difficult, if not impossible, to separate Western Europe from its Eastern wing and even from Asia Minor. The Berlin Wall separates two different political systems. It does not separate two different cultures.

### *Complementary Views*

Numerous authors have opposed Western *freedom* to the servitude of the communist-governed world. This wide-spread view, which was held also by J. F. Kennedy, the late lamented President of the United States, has

even led to a very picturesque way of characterizing the attitude of all those who have fled from the "socialist" camp to seek refuge in the West: to refuse to live under Soviet rule means to *choose freedom*.

This idea is no doubt worth keeping in mind: in the Western world liberty, freedom of choice, of determination and of initiative, indeed, form the principle, the method and the aim of the coexistence of individuals and groups within the same State.

Other authors, as well informed as those mentioned, rightly designate the Western World as a democracy, while the political regimes imposed and controlled by the communists are called "totalitarian" and "dictatorial". This is undoubtedly true and we might adhere to these definitions if only democracy, totalitarianism and dictatorship were unequivocal terms. But there is ambiguity in these words and it has been cleverly maintained by the communist parties, which continue to regard themselves as democrats, calling such autocratic regimes as those at Pankov, Prague, Budapest, Sofia and Bucarest *popular democracies*.

Far from being a simplified form to characterize the West, the term "democracy" needs too much comment, definition and qualification to avoid all confusion, and for it to become the symbol that will rally the peoples of the West.

Some authors consider that the element most characteristic of European society is to be found in the great development of science and the perfection of technical means. Obviously, most of the marvellous achievements of present technology originated in Europe. But it is scarcely possible to point to some element in these achievements that could serve to distinguish the world on the other side of the Berlin Wall from that which begins on this side and includes America.

### *The Soviet Point of View*

What do communist leaders think of these problems, which are occupying the minds of so many Western authors?

Their point of view is simple and expedient. They are not troubled by questions relating to culture and to the system of intellectual and moral values associated with it.

As they see it, the difference between East and West lies exclusively in the view, which at once brushes aside all problems that the West is the rule of capitalism; the East is the rule of socialism which, later, is to become communism.

All efforts made by communist governments, all material means at their disposal, all the psychological action they are undertaking day after day, have but one aim: to destroy capitalism and to ensure world victory for communism.

These ideas, which they ascribe to Marx and Lenin, have been raised not only to the level of a political way of thinking, but even to that of a science whose primary truths and inferences have, in their eyes, the value of mathematical axioms. We do not intend to point out once again how wrong this picture is. The history of mankind is something quite different from the struggle between classes prompted by economic motives. According to a common saying "all sorts of things are necessary to make a world". Even the most superficial study of society—present or past—brings out clearly the impossibility to reduce the whole of psychological, cultural, social, political and even economic reality to the irreducible antagonism between the starving proletariat and the well-fed bourgeois.

The antagonism that communist leaders are trying to bring about in this way between the East and the West is artificial. The picture of a socialist Paradise as compared with a capitalist Hell differs so much from the real facts that the communists have chosen to build a wall in Berlin to prevent the proletarians of "democratic" and "socialist" East Germany from fleeing from their paradise and seeking refuge in the Western, "capitalist" sector.

In any case, what we understand by culture is absent in this view. There is no question of intellectual, moral, aesthetic, psychological values but only of economic values and the institutional context that is related to them.

#### *And Eastern Culture?*

If we deal with Western culture, i. e. the whole of Western values, it is only natural also to think of an Eastern culture.

Generally, it is not referred to, for two clearly different and equally decisive reasons.

On the one hand, as pointed out before, the communists keep culture out of their capitalist-socialist scheme, ethical values being mere side issues of the economic system. On the other hand, what would be the content of Eastern culture? Obviously it is not Europe from Berlin to the Urals that is concerned, for this part of Europe coincides with "the socialist camp".

When we cross the Urals we are in Asia, the huge continent where age-old religions, and therefore cultures, still prevail. These cultures differ from those prevailing in the West, but this difference is not, and never has been, the root of an antagonism that now opposes the West to the East. Actually, Asia is stirred up by currents other than religious ones. Just as Africa, Asia is shaken by tendencies which we know well: democracy, socialism, communism, nationalism, the rights of man, the rights of peoples to self-determination, etc.

Not one of these arose in Asia. They all originate from Europe, notably from Western Europe. It is impossible to regard these tendencies as typical manifestations of an "Eastern culture". They are not original, they are borrowed.

From these facts it can rightly be inferred that never before has Western culture expanded so far. It no longer meets with any obstacles. Even the old Asiatic religions do not withstand it. It is evidently becoming the universal culture.

Consequently, it is impossible to refer to a culture of the East opposing the culture of the West.

#### *The Crux of the Problem*

We have strayed far from our subject: How to define what distinguishes the *West* from that we reluctantly call the *East*?

On the one hand, the East is strongly influenced by the doctrines imported from Europe. On the other hand, Westerners are strongly divided. Among them there exist striking differences, obvious contradictions, centuries-old confessional contrasts, theist currents side by side with humanistic, agnostic and even atheist concepts.

The values governing the former originate direct from some supernatural reality. The values guiding the latter are as closely related to the worship of Man in his earthly universe. The theocentric concept of the former can hardly be made to harmonize with the anthropocentric one of the latter. And yet, both, the former as well as the latter, intend to defend a "common heritage", as is stated in the Peamble to the North Atlantic Treaty. All are prepared to accept the heaviest sacrifices to face the danger and preserve this common heritage.

We have to admit that despite the variety and contrasts of concepts and value systems that divide the Westerners among each other, there is a sufficiently strong common denominator to reconcile what appears in-

compatible at first sight and to mitigate the contrast and the tensions caused by them.

The differences in philosophy no doubt form an important and typical aspect of Western society, but they are neither the most important, nor the most typical aspect.

The most important and the most characteristic aspect is the coexistence of these differences, which are tolerated, accepted and respected, even the most important and the most characteristic. Contrasts also exist between theists and humanists beyond the Berlin Wall. But what does not exist there is tolerance, laid down as a principle and solemnly proclaimed in constitutions. The existence of this tolerance is an essential, absolutely definitive aspect of Western society. The absence of this tolerance is an equally essential and definitive aspect of the communist society.

Does not this mean that we are setting extreme limits to our ambition to determine what distinguishes the West from the so-called "socialist" world? Does not this mean giving up the idea of describing the *values of the West*, as they are commonly called? Does not this mean that we are depriving the values of the West of any absolute character?

That we are giving up the plan to define them, merely restricting ourselves to the phenomenon of their coexistence?

It certainly does! Nevertheless that is where the crux of the problem lies, and that is where an answer to our questions must be sought. The search for this answer will reveal the full significance and the incalculable implications of what we shall for the moment call Western tolerance.

### *The Prelude*

It is difficult to follow the authors who, writing on the subject of civilizations, have taught and are still teaching that these constitute an organic and independent whole, that they force themselves upon the successive generations and that they develop within the limits of a cycle according to their own laws to which man is subject without being able to change them.

It is more exact to say that the civilizations that have arisen from a human society develop as a function of human experience and thought within that society.

When studying the history of European society we observe at once that the system of values that has guided its evolution has varied considerably from one century to another. We may say that it has undergone many more transformations than simple variations.

Obviously, in 1500, Western civilization was, neither in content nor in scope, what it was to be two centuries later and still less what it is at present.

It was a very fruitful idea of German philosophy since Hegel to have shed light on the rôle of the gradual development of human reality.

In order to fully understand what is Western culture in the twentieth century, its birth and growth in the course of some twenty-five centuries must be studied. What happened in the last four centuries was of particular significance—and influenced its destiny decisively. It initiated an evolution that has not yet come to an end.

### *The Great Crises of the Sixteenth Century*

The system of values which almost exclusively dominated European society during the Middle Ages and to which our ancestors attributed an absolute character, was confronted in the beginning of the Sixteenth Century, with a dramatic event that was to shake all previous cultural relations. We have tried to sketch this event in other publications and no space is available to deal with it in the present article. Therefore only the most salient points will be indicated. Towards the end of the Fifteenth Century streams of thought arose which aimed a direct or indirect blow at the authority and the influence of the principles that had until then been accepted without argument: Among these streams was the *Renaissance*, which was not so much a renewed taste for the literature and the arts of Greek and Roman antiquity, but rather the revival and exaltation of the grandeur of the ancient pagan society to the detriment of Christian theology. Another stream arose from the *Protestant Reformation* which, by a series of chain reactions, soon replaced the Roman religious unity by a plurality of Christian confessions. This was followed by the rapid development of a new *natural science*, deliberately brushing aside any influence by metaphysical factors and repelling theses accepted by theology.

There was the general *confusion* which took hold not only of intellectuals, but also of the masses and which was only aggravated by wars, repressions and interventions of the Inquisition, and above all by the *Counter-Reformation*, which made the gulf that henceforth was to separate Roman Catholic Europe from Protestant Europe even wider.

Another factor arose which was the direct consequence of the conflicts that had been lasting over a hundred years. This factor, which became the

starting point of a major evolution in European intellectual life, was *doubt*.

This factor is at the bottom of the humanist tendency to limit the universe to Man within his earthly reality. It imparts force and vigour to the concepts that lead to scepticism, agnosticism, materialism, and atheism. It gives birth to modern philosophy, which expects to discover its primary truths, axioms and criteria no longer in supernatural revelations but in reason, and particularly in human reason. This philosophy reaches its zenith in the Eighteenth Century, the era of enlightened Reason.

### *The Transition*

The double absolutism that ruled since the constitution of Charlemagne's empire, viz. that of political power and ecclesiastical power, which were associated and lent each other support and assistance, could not be sustained. It was no longer possible to uphold the old system; Protestantism and humanist philosophy, which accepted and indeed proclaims the autonomy and even the supremacy of the individual conscience soon put an end to political and confessional absolutism.

There were soon signs of a revolution which broke out at the end of the Eighteenth Century, first in Protestant America and then in Catholic France. The result is a transition, full of incident, but irresistible, from *autocracy* to *democracy* or, in other words, a transition from *absolutism* to *pluralism*.

Absolutism and autocracy on the one hand, pluralism and democracy on the other.

Let us deal in some more detail with these words, which will help us to simplify and clarify the data of the problem. *Autocratic* power depends on no one else and is answerable to nobody. It finds its origin and its justification in itself. That is why it is absolute, i. e. free from any contingency, condition or restriction whatever. Its advocates are partisans of absolutism.

It is then opposite of *democratic power*, which, by nature, is dependent and answerable to all on whom it is exerted. It has no other justification than their support. It emanates from the plurality of the men whose opinion, choice and will it expresses. It is pluralistic because it is the instrument of this plurality of men and opinions.

The evolution of absolutism to pluralism, or of autocracy to democracy, was inscribed in the history of European thought, or, more accurately,

West European thought, from the moment when powerful philosophic and religious currents set out to confer on man a dignity which had been denied to him in the Middle Ages: the dignity that consists in following his individual conscience, his own judgement in the search for Truth and Good.

To attribute to all men the faculty of judgement, according to the theses of the rationalist philosophy of the eighteenth century, was to admit that all men are equal in dignity and therefore have equal rights.

To bow before the autonomy of man's judgement meant to tolerate and to respect his judgement.

It was therefore necessary to put an end to a regime that kept the peoples under tutelage.

It was impossible to regard a country any longer as the appanage of a crown, and its inhabitants as depending on the country, as had been done by the Old Regime for centuries.

It was necessary to abolish any absolutist regime which, by its nature, could be nothing but a most serious offence to the autonomy of human thought. It was necessary to build up a regime that would make autonomous and supreme human thought the basis of all institutions. In short, it was necessary to substitute democracy for autocracy.

Democracy became the political expression of pluralism. The proclamation of the freedom of conscience in the constitutions of the Nineteenth Century became the manifestation of pluralism in religion and philosophy. It should be remarked that confessional pluralism appeared in Europe before political pluralism. In fact, before the French revolution of 1789, a German monarch, Emperor Joseph II, signed the Edict of Tolerance of 1781. This famous edict made room for five different religions in his empire, which then included nearly the whole Central Europe: the Roman Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox Christian, Jewish and Mohammedan cults.

To situate this surprising reform one should bear in mind that the Westphalian treaties of 1648 had established religious peace by giving the political authority the right to decide sovereignly on the choice of religion for the country and its inhabitants. The French revolution was to take the same course as Joseph II as regards religion. But it went to greater lengths. In one stroke it overthrew the double absolutism as symbolized by Throne and Altar combined. It was not the end of an evolution. It opened the way to one of the most eventful episodes in the history of Europe.

## The Outcome

The *revolutionaries* were at once opposed by the *conservatives*. This opposition persisted in various forms up to the beginning of the Twentieth Century. Neither party wanted to accept defeat. *Left* radicalism found itself confronted with radicalism of the *right*.

There were communist, or even anarchist, theorists who announced the total destruction of the existent society.

In Rome there was a pope who in famous encyclicals declared that freedom of conscience was a fatal freedom.

Everything was called in question. Everything was subject to discussion. Not one branch of society escaped the controversies. They attacked, one by one or simultaneously, political doctrines and regimes, economic systems, social relations, relations between State and Church, philosophical and religious concepts.

There is no country in Europe, not even among the most stable ones (which, curiously enough, happen to border on the North Sea), that could boast having preserved the political, social, economic and cultural status it had at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century.

This century was a training school. Since the Middle Ages, i. e. during three centuries, Europe had become accustomed to the plurality of religious and political doctrines. The Nineteenth Century added much to this: despite the reactionary trends that dominated European policy after the Vienna Congress, governments were progressively forced to guarantee, in solemnly promulgated constitutions, the freedom of religion and of opinion, as well as the representation of the people in legislative bodies.

Although, admittedly, there were fewer wars in Europe in the Nineteenth Century, there were more revolutions, in the course of which the controversies no longer separated rather small groups of intellectuals, as was the case during the old regime, but all classes of society were passionately involved.

It was in a general upheaval—following the clash between majorities and minorities around governments and the contrasts between political parties, united or separated, over issues concerning all sectors of society—that the pluralism characterizing the present-day Western society was born.

This pluralism had become indispensable to a certain measure of equilibrium and stability within the societies and to protection against violence and dislocation. It made appeasement possible and permitted coexistence.

Of course, it was only a *modus vivendi*, a compromise, a simple method allowing men and groups to assert themselves, without restraint, since, in principle, all doctrines and all value systems were considered to be equally respectable and therefore could count on protection by an impartial political power.

The State, no longer being the instrument of an absolute power and an absolute truth, became the safeguard of all political or philosophical doctrines, a Liberal State, which had no truth to proclaim or impose and restricted its activities to the realization of the public weal, conceived and willed by the free citizens having equal rights. There was a wide gulf between the State of the old regime and the Liberal State. This gulf was crossed in Europe in the course of the Nineteenth Century.

The new State set up democracy on the ruins of autocracy. It replaced absolutism by pluralism.

### Pluralism or Liberalism?

One can use the word *liberalism* instead of *pluralism*. The two words are closely related and express similar attitudes. Just as pluralism, liberalism has not generally presented itself as the defender of a well-defined value system, but rather as the champion of a way of life that will fit in with all systems on the basis of freedom. It has permeated political, cultural, economic and social life in European or American countries to such an extent that even the supporters of well-defined ethical and political systems have been profoundly influenced by it; this was also true within confessionals parties, such as there are in Catholic parts of Europe. The same remark can be made with respect to the socialist parties formed in Europe since the middle of the previous century. They were, and still are, essentially advocates not of Marxist theses, but rather of a fundamental liberalism with a socialist trend, which, eventually, was to set mankind free, liberate it, to release it from any tutelage, constraint and servitude.

That we prefer to use the term *pluralism* in this paper, is due to the fact that it is more detached from the concrete political reality that the countries of Western Europe have known since the beginning of the past century. The term pluralism is more general and more significant in scope. It appears to be the most suitable name if we want to oppose it to its antithesis, which is absolutism.

## *The Antithesis*

Let us reconsider the terms so frequently used in the preceding pages: *autocracy, democracy, absolutism, pluralism*, autocracy being essentially absolutistic and democracy being essentially pluralistic.

When trying to decide, with the aid of this terminology, what must be understood by the *West* and the *East* we can see at once how the division is made: the *West* is the rule of democracy, and therefore of pluralism, whereas the *East* is the rule of autocracy, and therefore of absolutism. We do not intend to re-analyse the Soviet doctrine and the Soviet system, which has been considered elsewhere, and which would, in fact, be outside the scope of the present article. We shall confine ourselves to some observations on the nature of the Soviet system and showing in what respect it differs fundamentally from the Western democratic system.

Whereas the Western system is the outcome of an evolution that took over four centuries, the Soviet system came up suddenly in the course of a confused revolution, accompanied by the disorder of a lost war. It bears all the marks of an improvisation, later given a doctrinal support by the leaders of the coup d'état. It was a "punch to a paralytic", as Trotzky said.

By a curious return of the past, the system founded by Lenin halted in Russia the evolution that had been in progress in Western Europe since the Sixteenth Century and returned to the double absolutism that had characterized the old regime: a political absolutism closely linked with a doctrinal absolutism.

There is no doubt that the political system established by Lenin was, and still is, an absolutistic, autocratic system. It has often wrongly been called "dictatorship". It is an *autocratic oligarchy*; autocratic because it is answerable only to itself, an oligarchy because the group which, constitutionally, is the "nucleus controlling the whole of—state-controlled or semi-state-controlled—political, social, economic and cultural structures", (art. 126) is a very small minority in fact, members of the communist party form only a very small minority viz. 4<sup>0/0</sup> of the Russian people, i. e. 7<sup>0/0</sup> of the adults, 1 elector out of 14.

However, it is not the approximately nine million members of the Party who are governing, but the 175 members of the Central Committee, of whom Khrushchev stated quite opportunely in April 1963 that it is "the experienced body leading the Soviet people and comprising men and women of the highest authority in the party and the country".

But the autocratic, and therefore absolutistic, political system is supplemented by another absolutism which does not belong to the purely political field: a doctrinal absolutism.

This double absolutism, political and confessional, which our ancestors in Europe used to know, crops up again here in a more prominent form, with a content that has replaced the Church by the Party and religious faith by a philosophical doctrine.

The absolute character in this field is particularly marked: the philosophical doctrine, "dialectical materialism", has been raised to the level of a science beyond all controversy and dispute. The members of the Party serve it to the best of their ability, but do not consider its merits. In fact, only its firm supporters are eligible for Party membership. As soon as they no longer subscribe to it they cease to be members of the Party. The existence of this double absolutism has turned the Soviet Union into a kind of theocracy without God, an autocratic State serving a doctrine to which an absolute value has been ascribed.

Need we say more to make clear how much the Soviet regime is the antithesis of the regime of the Western nation?

We are dealing with two worlds so different that to choose one is to exclude the other. On either side there is a coherent body of principles and norms. They are related to the pluralist attitude on the one hand, and to the absolutist attitude on the other. The corollaries are: in the *West* the democratic structure of the state and its associated intellectual freedom; in the *East* the autocratic state structure and general tutelage, extending over all sectors of society, cultural as well as economic and political.

On both sides, through these principles and norms arises the picture of the different values they are intended to safeguard. On both sides there is one that is clearly more important than any of the others: in the *East* it is the promise of a society shaped according to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine and guaranteed by the Party; in the *West* it is Man, to whom governments leave the free choice of his values.

## *The Charter of Pluralism*

We shall now leave this subject, which has been dealt with in more detail elsewhere. Besides, the Western concept of society is outlined very clearly in a document of primary importance, which, incidentally, has been brushed aside by the Soviet bloc, viz. the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, adopted on December 10th, 1948, under the aegis of the

United Nations by 48 states, 8 states having refused to declare their adherence. These included 6 countries of the European Soviet bloc, South Africa and Saudi Arabia.

The Declaration can be considered to be a particularly clear expression of the pluralist attitude. It does not state any specific values. It leaves the decision to Man. It is up to Man to choose his values. It is not the political or cultural institutions that decide, proclaim and impose these values, as was the case at the time of political and confessional absolutism, even after the Middle Ages, even after the religious wars, in particular at the conclusion of the Westphalian treaties in 1648.

The 30 articles of the Declaration contain only one value judgement. It refers to Man. In article 1 the Declaration proclaims that all human beings are *equal in dignity*.

By reason of this quality they are entitled to their rights irrespective of race, sex, religion, political opinions, social position. Articles 18, 19 and 27 proclaim the *supremacy of human conscience* with respect to intellectual, moral, religious or cultural values: "Every person has a right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion" (art. 18). "Every individual has a right to freedom of opinion and expression" (art. 19).

Since all human activity is determined by, and oriented towards, intellectual or material values and since every system of ideas, philosophical or religious, comprises a scale of values, the intellectual freedom formulated above has a double implication that is of fundamental importance: every man has the right to recognize and choose for himself, by virtue of his own judgement, the system of values that he prefers to adhere to.

No authority whatsoever has the right to impose upon a man or a group of men a system of ideas and hence of specific values. This is the expression of the innermost and final stimulus of what can be considered to be the heart and soul of Western civilization. Western civilization is not a coherent whole of values. The values adopted by Westerners are extremely varied and even contradictory. They spring from contrasting theist or humanist concepts. Some attach more importance to intellectual or moral values. Others are rather more interested in material, biological or economic values. Everyone is aware of these differences and contrasts. But although they may not agree to the ideas of their fellow-men, disapprove of them and regard them as mistakes, they recognize their existence and leave it to their fellow-men to judge and to choose.

This is the factor that ensures the unity of men and nations, the source of their power of resistance and expansion. Western civilisation is essentially based on the concern for the intellectual and moral integrity of man.

This fundamental concern implies *recognition of the supreme authority of man's judgement, which constitutes the highest form of respect for the human dignity and involves the acceptance of the plurality of opinions and the desire to safeguard their expression*. This is the philosophy of the West in a nutshell. This is the principle underlying its every move, every initiative, every attitude.

These attitudes, particularly in the political sphere, can be easily reduced to a single one which includes them all and which we have named a *pluralist attitude*, the starting point of any peaceful coexistence, of any real peace.

### *Failure and Progress of Western Pluralism*

Undoubtedly, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is not generally and regularly applied even in those countries which have solemnly accepted it. But its principles remain none the less a source of inspiration for the general attitude of the governments that have adopted them. Not one political authority, even in the countries that have refused to accede to the Declaration, would venture openly to disavow or repudiate these principles.

The pluralism to which it leads in actual practice, i. e. the acceptance of the plurality of philosophical and political concepts as the basis of collective life and the rules of tolerance and mutual respect that go with this attitude, is in constant progress.

Is not it an event of the greatest importance in this respect that in the Roman Catholic Church a profound evolution is taking place which started with Pope John XXIII and is continuing under Paul VI?

It should be borne in mind that for almost twenty centuries the Church was the centre and the support of the double—political and religious—absolutism, crowning kings and entrusting these kings with the repression of heresies.

Hardly enough emphasis can be placed on the revolutionary character of such encyclical letters as the one signed by John XXIII a few weeks before his death, which was entitled *Pacem in Terris*. It has put an end to twenty centuries of absolutism. It has proclaimed the supremacy of the individual conscience, because man "has the right freely to seek truth as well as freely to express and propagate his thought". By this encyclical letter the Church, although proposing to the world faithfulness to Christ's message, although confirming a choice millions have made for twenty centuries,

although defending a well-defined value system, implicitly rejects absolutism and turns to pluralism.

The teachings of this letter harmonize so well with the spirit of the Universal Declaration that it could be regarded as the Catholic version of the Declaration.

The encyclical is mainly theistic in outlook. The Declaration is clearly humanistic in outlook. But on both sides there is basically the same attitude with respect to present-day reality. Both sides recommend a pluralist attitude, pluralist methods and solutions.

What the Western countries oppose to the regime imposed by communist governments, what they propose to the world is pluralism; pluralism with all that goes with it, viz. recognition of the supremacy of the individual conscience, acceptance of the plurality of philosophical religious and political concepts, tolerance and respect for all convictions – democracy, which is the political expression of pluralism.

## Changing Attitudes Towards Communism

by Dr. S. W. Couwenberg, The Hague

Within the framework of their policy of peaceful coexistence the communists are striving by all possible means to break down the anti-communist persuasions of the West and thus fundamentally to undermine the psychological resistance potential of the people. They do this skilfully by identifying the anti-communist attitude with things which are already suspect in the West, such as fascism, militarism, revanchism, etc. It cannot be denied that they have scored striking successes in the Free World with propaganda of this kind.

Those who show a disposition to condemn anti-communism as reactionary, usually overlook the fact that there are very different forms of anti-communism and that it is unreasonable, from the point of view of political exactitude to treat all alike.

In order to arrive at a clear opinion on this point, one must make a distinction between negative anti-communism and positive, constructive anti-communism.

### *Negative Anti-Communism*

Negative anti-communism tends to display "black and white" thought patterns, just as communism does, and is no less inclined to intolerance. It is apt to be emotional and is thus unable to take a matter-of-fact view of reality. It is dominated by an anxiety complex, which often leads to dangerous neurotic reactions. It sees, for instance, communist influence at work everywhere, even where it is entirely absent. It has a strongly reactionary character, and therefore it is opposed to everything which is progressive which it frequently identifies with communism.

In the first half of the fifties McCarthyism was the most typical example of extreme anti-communism. Shortly after the election of Kennedy as President of the United States there was a strong revival of this political neurosis<sup>1</sup>. It manifests itself in the formation of many extreme right anti-communist groups.

<sup>1</sup> We have borrowed this term from an article by Arthur Koestler in the "Christmas Book", 1953 of the well-known American weekly "The New Leader", entitled: "A guide to Political Neurosis". By "political neurosis" is meant a situation-neurosis which can occur within the framework of an otherwise normal personality and concerns a neurotic reaction to a particular, in this case political, situation. Pacifism can also be regarded as such a neurosis. Pacifism has in common with extreme anti-communism that it is also dominated by an anxiety complex, so that it has just as distorted a picture of political reality as has extreme anti-communism.



In France the O. A. S. was a clear example of this extreme right attitude, which brings anti-communism more and more into discredit, and only harms the Western cause.

In the "New York Times" of 8th May 1962 attention was drawn to the seriousness of this situation: "The real tragedy is not that Robert Welch – the founder of the 'John Birch Society' – has succeeded in organizing a group of political idiots, but lies in the fact that American liberals, who know the communists best because they have fought them over and over again in the trades unions and in the political arena, have now been silent for more than ten years on the subject of communism.

There has thus arisen a vacuum in the fight against communism, which has been filled by 'Birchers' and other anti-communist crusaders." The need for a constructive liberal form of anti-communism is urged by this newspaper which rightly treats liberalism and opposition to communism as synonymous terms. As the term "liberal" is used here in its specifically American sense, we prefer to speak of anti-communism in a positively orientated, constructive and progressive sense.

#### *Positive Anti-Communism*

Positive anti-communism is based on the Western values, as stated in the Universal Declaration of the Human Rights of Man of 1948. These concepts reject "black and white" thought patterns as unrealistic and dangerous, and they demand judgement of communism on a factual basis. This involves taking a stand which derives its strength not from a sterile negative and defensive attitude, but which wants to show by the presentation of hard facts that Western values provide a better basis for the promotion of real progress for man and human society than communism is able to offer; both in the West and in the under-developed areas of the world. Needless to say, Western values will not necessarily take on the same form in those areas as they do in the West. The differences in tradition and in the level of development will necessarily bring about different forms and accents. For example, in Asia, Africa and South America for the time being there will inevitably be stronger emphasis on collective leadership than prevails in the West.

It is not enough to *formulate* criticism of communism; we must above all *live* our criticism of communism. And we *live* our criticism if we, (while possessed with a clear realization of those inevitable human failings which are inherent in all human endeavour), purposefully strive

after a way of life that is worthy of a human being and realizable for everyone, not only in a national context, but also in an international context. In the Western world, much has already been, and is being done, in this direction.

#### *Positive Tendencies in the Western World*

The bogey of a capitalist society based on wholesale human exploitation, and driven by internal strife, which is still utilized for communist propaganda purposes, belongs to the past, and can be shown to be fiction by the presentation of hard facts. Significant, in this connection, are the development of a mixed economy, which is almost universally accepted; also the adoption of modern conjunctural and structural policies, whereby a more balanced economic expansion can be achieved, and the dangers of a major crisis warded off. The steady spread of prosperity to the great masses (mass consumption has become the pivot upon which Western economic expansion rests); the adoption of ever-improving systems of social security; increasing possibilities for the acquisition of property and goods; reasonable changes of development for everyone; the application of new and more enlightened methods of personnel management, efforts directed to the extension of democracy in the social-economic sphere; the rapid growth of social work and of mental health care which enable social and spiritual needs to be dealt with more thoroughly, are all indicative of modern democratic thinking.

Communist theory and propaganda characterize the present phase of capitalism as state-monopolistic capitalism, i. e. a combination of the powers of the great monopolies and those of the state for a twofold purpose: the maintenance of the capitalist system and the redistribution of the national income in favour of the monopoly capital. In fact, we are witnessing the growth of something quite different, namely, the development of the modern welfare state, which sets out to promote, as far as is possible, the well-being of *all* groups of the population.

Instead of an uncompromising class struggle between capital and labour, we see negotiation and co-operation in varying degree as established components in most Western societies, and we also see, instead of increasing conflicts between capitalist countries, a growing consciousness of common responsibilities.

The trend towards European integration, which, with the gradual liquidation of the national barriers was one of the chief hindrances to freedom

of movement in Europe, represents a strong stimulus to economic growth and human welfare and freedom in Europe. It provides a powerful stimulant to the idea of a strong Atlantic community based on an equal partnership between America and a United Europe.

Provided that such an intercontinental community does not become an aim in itself but is imbued with a clear realization of common responsibility towards the *whole world*, it can make an important contribution to the concept of a political form for the world society in which we, in fact, already live. The realization of this great and inspiring idea, about which the late President Kennedy spoke several times so eloquently and impressively, and which is also strongly supported by the well-known Monnet committee, must ultimately compel communism to give up its striving for world revolution and world domination, and thus create the conditions for a peaceful and lasting settlement of the East-West conflict.

Finally the rapidly increasing response to the call for the provision of adequate assistance to the economically under-developed countries of the world, shows that the West is seriously concerned to spread Western ideas of social justice not only nationally, but also internationally.

As regard the strength and extent of the Western effort, as described above, there are of course, differences of opinion. For example, on the question of assistance to under-developed countries, it is undeniable that the manner in which the West is undertaking this task is far below the required standard. William Clark, the director of the Overseas Development Institute in England, drew attention to the fact, for example, that there is hardly any purposeful strategy in the field of development aid<sup>2</sup>.

It can, however, scarcely be denied that the trends in the Western world, referred to above, take an active form. The main points at issue in political divergencies in the West, are at present, not so much the rightness or otherwise of such policies, but rather the extent to which they must be promoted, and the manner in which they should be put into effect.

These trends provide a clear and positive reply to the communists charge when it continues to define the "capitalistic" West as a decadent society which is doomed to perish.

### *Possibilities of Exerting Influence through the New Middle Class*

Extreme, uncompromising anti-communism aims at the destruction of communism. To attain this end, many anti-communists of this type do not even shrink from the idea of a preventive atomic war. They thus give abundant proof that they have lost all sense of proportion and are fit for psychiatric treatment.

Extreme anti-communism is directed towards a totally unrealistic objective, whereas positive constructive anti-communism sets itself a more realistic aim, namely: the transformation of communism. Certain positive developments in the communist world support this aim. Above all, the development of a new middle class behind the Iron Curtain is a very hopeful sign.

As is known, in the Western world the middle class has been the standard bearer of Western concepts of freedom, democracy, the constitutional state, human equality etc. The fact that these values had little scope for development in the Slavic world, can be attributed largely to the absence of a strong middle class. Communism thus found there its most fertile soil.

In contrast with the West, where the middle class was also the promoter of the industrial revolution, in Russia it was the communist party which took upon itself this historic task<sup>3</sup>, and has thus prepared the soil from which a new middle class is now developing in the Slavic world. This class, from its very nature, is becoming receptive to the Western ideas of freedom, democracy, rational inquiry and so on, and is revealing itself more and more as the sociological standard bearer of revisionism. Revisionism in the communist movement is the most hopeful sign for the West. There would seem to be no effective political alternative to a communist regime in the Soviet Union. The only real perspective for a future in which communism has ceased to be a threat to the Western world lies in the further growth of revisionism.

As revisionism gains in influence, in all probability the development of communism will be analogous to that of socialism in the West during the last half century, and it will, consequently, lose much of its original revolutionary élan and fanaticism, and thereby, its basic intolerance will weaken.

<sup>3</sup> The first signs of this revolution were already present in Czarist Russia, namely in the period 1890-1914.

<sup>2</sup> See his article in "The Times", 2-2-1962, p. 13.

Needless to say, while positive anti-communism will not refuse contact with the communist world, it will avail itself of every opportunity to influence and intensify, as far as is possible, the humanistic forces and tendencies, which will accompany a revision of communism. The best means for achieving this will be found in contact with representatives of the new middle class, and particularly with the young intelligentsia, who, thanks to the demands of the steadily progressing process of industrialization, will acquire ever greater opportunities to influence the course of affairs and to extort concessions.

How apprehensive the East is of this Western influence can clearly be seen from numerous articles which have recently appeared in the communist press.

It is quite possible that Russia, which is now being confronted in its conflict with China with the real Asia, will again become conscious of its ties with Europe and the European tradition<sup>4</sup>.

#### *Positive Significance of Conflict Situations*

The popular attitude of reserve which exists towards anti-communism is not only a reaction from the reactionary and immoderate tone in which anti-communism often manifests itself, but is also symptomatic of the popular aversion at present observable towards anything which has to do with political and social conflict.

As a reaction to a half century of history of conflicts and tension, this scepticism is in itself understandable. Yet those who judge the East-West conflict purely negatively betray a one-sided and unrealistic outlook on the development of human society. For social development and progress, in accordance with the polarity inherent in human beings and society, are determined as much by conflicts and struggle between parties and values as through co-operation and solidarity. Human co-operation and group formation are stimulated and to a considerable extent determined by conflict and strife situations, particularly in the political sphere. In our own times, this has been clearly demonstrated in the development of European and Atlantic co-operation; also among the young independent countries of Asia and Africa, which gain strength and unity by means of the political concepts of anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism. In

<sup>4</sup> In this connection see the latest book by Klaus Mehnert: "Peking und Moskau" (Stuttgart, 1961). From this it appears that Mehnert does not consider it out of the question for there to be a growing community of interest between the Soviet Union and the West as a result of the Russian-Chinese conflict.

order to strengthen their national unity these young nations will doubtless continue to exploit their sentiments for some considerable time. Indonesia's West Irian action was a typical example of this.

Even India, where the government sat for so long on its moral high horse, lecturing the rest of the world, now does not hesitate to exploit the existing anti-Chinese feeling amongst the population, in favour of the national cause.

The harmonious idealized peaceful society with which many people, especially theologians and ethicists, spontaneously identify themselves, is as was justly observed by the well-known German sociologist Ralph Dahrendorf in his study "Gesellschaft und Freiheit" (1961) a totalitarian, static society, in which everyone agrees with everyone else and where there is no longer room for opposition and for differing opinions. A society which is too harmonious inevitably ends up in deadly boredom and inertia.

As opposed to this, Dahrendorf rightly points to one valuable aspect of Marxist philosophy in which it attempts to explain social progress as resulting from group conflicts.

Although Marxist philosophy on this point, as on other points, is not free from bias, it can scarcely be denied that part of the development and progress of society is attributable to antitheses and conflict. It is possible for conflict to fulfil a positive social function, provided it is carried on constructively. This is part of the essence of democratic conviction. A living democracy cannot exist without political conflict and the free clash of opinions.

To come to a sound judgement of the significance of political and social conflict, a clear distinction must be made between two fundamentally different forms of conflict, namely the violent, implacable and destructive form of conflict, which is aimed at the annihilation of the opponent; and a constructive, positive form, which respects the difference in outlook and convictions of the opponent and aims at a reconciliation of divergent interests and points of view in an acceptable compromise. Here too we often see the tendency simply to identify conflict with the most extreme forms in which it is manifested (war, strikes, etc.).

#### *Humanization of Necessary Conflict*

To banish conflict from society is an unrealistic aim, conflicting as it does with the nature of human beings and society but it is necessary to replace the extreme, destructive methods of conflict by constructive,

positive forms; in other words, to humanize the element of struggle, which is, after all, inherent in human existence. Or, as the well-known Austrian historian Friedrich Heer has formulated it once: "Existence on earth always forms a pattern of opposition and co-operation between people, religions and social systems of utterly opposed natures. It is not a question of finding a 'solution' for the necessary conflicts (by means of an artificial peace full of concessions, by means of surrender, by means of nuclear or some other form of liquidation of the opponent), but of transferring them to a sphere of struggle and of the exchange of ideas, which lies beyond war and defeat." The world peace of the future, the real open peace of great coexistence (coexistence between Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Mohammedans, Buddhists, all types of atheists, between communists, socialists, liberals, etc.) cannot be anything but a struggle, a life process, in Friedrich Heer's view.

#### *Evolution of Social Conflict*

In the social sphere the evolution towards more peaceful, constructive forms of conflicts, particularly in Holland, is already to a great extent an accomplished fact. Here we see a definite development from an extreme, destructive and uncompromising social conflict, with the weapon of strikes as the principal instrument, to a constructive social conflict with peaceful resources (means for influencing and activating public opinion, pressure in parliament and on the government, etc.) aiming at a reconciliation of interests by an acceptable compromise.

The great difficulty, however, inherent in this more moderate and civilized form of social conflict lies in the fact that it appeals less to the imagination than the keener, more aggressive form of conflict. Action takes place on an intellectual level, which is too far removed from the common man, who no longer feels himself involved. Moreover, it can lead to the obscuring of the real conflict of interests and to a certain flabbiness of thought.

It is, however, noteworthy that this remarkable amelioration of the social conflicts is wholly in line with post-war social-economic development, which has promoted a considerable interweaving of the interests of employer and employed. Employers and trades unions are, on major economic issues, less often divided by widely conflicting interests. Both benefit by balanced economic development. It is clear that with the development of this state of affairs, the communist theory of class struggle has lost its validity.

#### *The Significance of "Peaceful Coexistence"*

The most important group conflict of the present time is the East-West conflict. This is a phase in a development which might lead to a higher level of a politically integrated industrial world civilization. Here too we are faced with the task of humanizing the inevitable conflict which seems inseparable from this situation, by replacing an extreme, destructive form of conflict, viz. war (which with present-day armaments techniques is no longer an adequate means of resolving international disputes), by constructive measures utilizing peaceful means of resolving problems. This aim will not be realized, however, by evasion of historical reality, as is done by pacifists. The contest, conducted with peaceful resources (diplomatic, juridical, politico-psychological, economic, etc.) will continue to be necessary in order that certain justifiable changes may come about. To reject such a conflict would in fact freeze the status quo permanently and would be totally unrealistic.

The communist concept of peaceful coexistence, of an international struggle conducted with peaceful weapons, therefore deserves serious consideration, though it must be kept in mind that this idea is still characterized by marked duplicity. On the one hand, it tends towards a less harsh and more peaceful form of conflict, so that this communist conception indicates an apparent willingness to compromise and to cooperate. On the other hand, the struggle with peaceful weapons is still conducted with the aim of destroying the "capitalist" opponent. The idea of compromise is not accepted as a matter of principle, as is the case in a democratic society, but is used simply as a tactical manoeuvre.

Moreover, a certain moderation of the conflict on the international plane is intentionally advocated, in order to create more favourable conditions for intensifying the social conflict in the "capitalist" countries and the struggle for 'liberation' in the "colonial and dependent countries". "Peaceful coexistence", according to the latest party programme of the Soviet Communist Party, "offers the working classes in the capitalist countries more favourable opportunities for their struggle and facilitates the struggle for liberty of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries."

The equivocal character of the communist concept of peaceful coexistence also manifests itself in communist propaganda. Expressions of uncompromising hostility go hand in hand with declarations of friendship and readiness to co-operate. The American journalist Al Newman recently tape-recorded the broadcasts of Radio Moscow over a considerable period

and subjected them to an analysis. From this analysis it appeared that the communist broadcasts are dominated by the following two formulae: The first is: "You are wicked imperialists, but let's be friends." The other is: "Let's be friends, but you are wicked imperialists." This form of duplicity culminates in the communist peace offensive, now being carried out with increasing vigour, in which the idea of peace has been transformed into a political weapon to undermine and drive back the "capitalist" opponent.

In spite of the many divisions between East and West there is still a growing community of interest in certain limited fields. For example, both parties have an equal interest in avoiding a nuclear conflict. However, the alternative to such a conflict is not simply a dialogue, i. e. discussion, but, a continuation of the conflict with non-military weapons, viz. propaganda, economic pressure and competition, political conflict, etc. Discussion between the communist and the non-communist world must thus be regarded simply as a continuation of the existing conflict conducted with peaceful weapons. For the communist, as has already been mentioned, talks are *one* of the peaceful means to achieve his goal, i. e.: the breakup of western "capitalist" society and the victory of communism.

#### *Development Towards Non-Military Conflict Also Possible Without Disarmament*

Development towards a contest conducted with peaceful, non-military weapons can perfectly well take place without there being a formal decision to disarm. In the present world constellation, which is still dominated by power politics, armaments have mainly become a political instrument which (as in the use of the strike—weapon in the social field) must be retained as a threat and as a deterrent, but the use of which on a *wide scale* is becoming increasingly unlikely, since all parties are coming more and more to realize the uselessness of this form of conflict.

Under the influence of the revolutionary development of armament technique there has already been an important modification of American military philosophy, in which the well-known American economist Walt Whitman Rostow has played a significant part. Waging war is no longer seen as action in the three classic sectors: *land, sea* and *air*, but as action in the form of *nuclear, conventional* and *guerrilla operations*. This last form, which, from the military aspect, is presented as being of the least

importance, has become the most important from the point of view of practicability. A typical example of this is the war in South Vietnam. For the time being there can be no illusions about total disarmament resulting from formal negotiations. This is not, however, as disquieting as it may appear. The revolutionary development for armament technique is making modern weapons useless and superfluous as instruments for the realization of political aims.

While development towards a conflict with peaceful, non-military means as the principal, weapon supplemented by guerrilla activities as the military supplement, is in line with the historic evolution of mankind, the adoption of such means, with its inherent readiness to seek compromise and co-operation brings in its train a complication similar to that mentioned above in connection with the social conflict, namely, that it has little appeal to the imagination, so that it could lead to a blurring of the issue involved, and a consequent loss of interest and enthusiasm. The scepticism and reserve, which in some communist circles, especially in communist China, has been displayed towards the idea of peaceful coexistence, may probably, to a considerable extent, be attributed to this.

#### *Rigid Communist Images*

The irreconcilable character which the (class) struggle retains, also in the communist concept of peaceful coexistence, may be explained by the retention of a concept of Western "capitalist" society which is hopelessly out-of-date.

The only way in which such rigid communist notions can be broken down is by means of increasing contact between East and West. From such contacts one may venture to hope that it will ultimately become clear to the communists that there are not only "different roads to socialism", but also different roads leading to social progress and happiness; and in this manner, will the communists come to realize the relativity of their own absolute concepts.

That it is no easy task to break down the rigid communist picture of capitalist society is shown by the following example. When a group of Russians on a visit to West Germany saw a large number of cars parked at a factory and asked to whom the cars belonged, they were amazed to be told by the guide: to the workers. Whereupon the Russian group leader immediately "explained" that the workers in West Germany have to buy themselves a car because public transport there is so bad!

## What Is Positive Anti-Communism?

by Dr. Nicolaus von Grote, Munich

"Anti-Antikommunismus" as described in the introduction overlooks two points: firstly that the communist vision of the future is extremely utopian because communist theories and practices never agree and, secondly that positive anti-communism through its emphasis upon preservation of the democratic order is based upon positive purposes and goals. Anti-communists have long been aware of the fact they cannot hold their own in the intellectual confrontation with communists if they do not also bear their share in the constant advancement and re-vitalizing of freedom, ethics, and religious beliefs. While World Communism is now as determined as ever to establish totalitarian, materialistic, and atheistic forms of collective society under the dictatorship of a shrinking minority, positive anti-communism prefers the direct opposite of this and sees in it a realization of freedom.

There is no need for a rigidly outlined programme which would ignore the diversity of views about man's earthly embodiment and his metaphysical ties which exist in the pluralistic Free World. The fact that its publications dealing with its programme and theories still give a valid definition of communist ideology, inspite of their current internal divergencies, does not demand the statement of a counter-ideology. Failure to maintain differentiation, on our side, would be a disastrous mistake. A "closed" ideological system would be generally regarded as being too restrictive. Communism attempts by the use of slogans to reduce opposition to the simplified term "cold war", and does its utmost to sustain opposition to this simplified form of anti-communism. Communist political journalism provides continual comment on this point. Books, pamphlets and articles in leading East Bloc newspapers and periodicals gather together all the imaginable "bad points" to form a catalogue of anti-communist iniquities. Above all there have been attempts to launch certain catch-phrases such as: "The anti-communist myth is extinct", "Anti-communism is going through a crisis", or has reached a "dead-end".

In striking contradiction to this are other communist statements to the effect that anti-communism is both active and dangerous. The official journal of World Communism, the periodical "Problems of Peace and Socialism" has given a detailed report of a conference on anti-communism in Prague in 1962, at which various types of anti-communism were dis-

cussed. For example in the U. S. A. and West Germany it often takes the form of state policy; it may be observed as an attempt by "theorists" of anti-communism to refute communism "scientifically". In this report was also mention of a "popular" form of anti-communism, which the imperialistic bourgeoisie are allegedly fostering among the masses. As well as extreme anti-communists, there are alleged to be many "cautious" anti-communists, who, though expressing solidarity with the aims of the extremists, were more cautious in their choice of means. Those present at the conference were admonished about the need to exploit contradiction in the enemy camp. Victory, it was stated, would not, however, be easy, since modern anti-communism, whilst not completely having abandoned crude and rude methods, was becoming more refined, resilient and more scientific.

Communism clearly fears the positive aspect of anti-communist resistance. It tries to depict anti-communist theorists as slaves of imperialism and colonialism; as embodying a world of exploitation, absence of human rights and disregard of human dignity, a world of obscurantism and of political reaction, of military excesses and of repressive measures against the workers. Those who examine these arguments closely cannot fail to see that they derive from spheres in which communism suffers from a bad conscience. On the other hand, they show that anti-communism can be effective in the struggle for a better world. This is an important element in the conduct of a dialogue with the East. As communist argumentation becomes more up-to-date, the greater the need for adequate answers. The opponents of communism must therefore reconsider carefully their own viewpoints. By toning down the line of demarcation, the argument is obscured. Anti-communists must therefore present their viewpoint actively and clearly as an indication of the superiority of the Free Society in the dialogue with communism. Anti-communism does not exclude criticism of the system of the Free World, and one also means that our Western society is based on solid values.

Such anti-communism does not consciously hinder the bridging of the gap between West and East, as contact operates in both directions. It is essential to understand the changes which are being experienced by people on the other side, but they must not be overrated, and above all, such changes should not be seen as indication of a far-reaching modification of the communist system. Anti-communism should not be limited to a portrayal of the coercive communist system, but must contrast the Western and Eastern systems against each another. Only in that way can it ensure a constant renewal of those values, upon which our culture

is based. In the Eastern Bloc there is an ever-increasing demand for more rigorous ideological training for party leaders so as to immunize them against the best in Western thought. "Pravda" recently reported that the C. P. S. U. had once again emphasized the need "to carry out a resolute campaign against attempts to press upon us the bourgeois idea of peaceful coexistence on the ideological plane". From this defensive attitude it can be seen that anti-communism has not worked in vain. The reactions of communist propaganda prove that our arguments are not ignored. Every refutation of the supposed identity between communist theory and practice is registered in the socialist sphere of influence — counter-statements inevitably make the criticism more generally known.

One should not become confused by the fact that communist arguments against anti-communism are often taken from certain Western circles, changed in tone and thereafter put back into circulation. At the same time theologians often allow themselves to be confused by the results of communist power politics and are inclined to interpret the fact that communism, in the short time since it seized power, has brought a third of the world under its sway, as confirmation of the validity of its programme. This, once more, poses the old question as to whether might comes before right. Stalin said to Djilas: "Everyone establishes his own (social) system to the extent that his army can advance." We in the West have our own system to defend and, since attack is the best defence, the attack must be on the intellectual front.

One might, for example, place on record the positive (in human sense) statements of communism, and then proceed to point out the discrepancy between words and practice in communism, until the boomerang effect of its own propaganda, causes it to adopt both internally and externally, slogans which promote self-determination, real freedom and lasting peace. Social conditions in the East Bloc have already improved largely for this reason, since communists are sensitive to comparison with the West, and fear its power of attraction. Ulbricht's Wall in Berlin is clearly indicative of this.

The communists envisage the development towards full communism as taking place through changes which will initially be quantitative and ultimately qualitative. In their view, the development spiral does not move smoothly, but in sudden "jumps". One must hope that, as a result of more intense spiritual communication between people in the West and East, and more pointed discussion on the part of the West with communism, these sudden "jumps" will proceed in reverse with ultimate benefit to all mankind. Does that imply an assimilation of the two systems and

confrontation of the theory of convergent development of the industrial societies of West and East? The communists believe that their system will replace our social and economic order. That is the real communist interpretation of "assimilation". There are naive people among us who can conceive of the existence of a planned economy without private ownership, personal initiative, and competition, but without dictatorial direction and assume the possibilities of a classless society without communism.

The West should take advantage of the opportunity created by the rival systems to help the people in the East to free themselves from their coercive system. That would not, however, be assimilation.

Liberal institutions are the indispensable prerequisites for a free economic order. Democratic parliaments, the freedom of opinion, and the influencing of decision-making by public opinion are unknown to communism. Dictatorship rules supreme in the East Bloc. The Central Committees of the Communist Parties, in most cases only their Presidium, take all decisions, the government taking second place. The role of parliaments is mainly to approve what has already been decided. Nor is there any control over those at the head of the Party and the State. In the West, economic associations assist in the co-operation and the free interplay of forces; in the East the Council for Mutual Economic Aid is intended in the first place to strengthen the Soviet economy. Market economy is based on private ownership; under the centrally administered economy of communism there is but limited personal property. The means production are nominally the property of the people; and in agriculture, collective ownership. The economy has a political function. The central plan determines production and consumption. Nevertheless, the economy is not a matter of mathematics, but is largely the achievement of the human mind, of individual decisions and individual risks. In the West it is the consumer who determines what and how much will be produced. Supply and demand regulate the prices. In the East prices are manipulated, and price policy and rationing limit free choice in consumption. The needs of the population are subservient to power politics. In the West production is adjusted according to the population's requirements. As a basic element of market economy competition contributes substantially to prosperity. Contractual and corporate rights; establishment and trading rights; and free choice of employment and place of work are determined by free representation of the interest of the social groups. The Trades Unions in the West are the representatives of the interests of employees, and not, as in the East mere transmission belts of the

Party for the purposes of increasing the performance of the workers. An even more fundamental difference between a free economy and a state-controlled economy lies in the fact that a modern free economy is no longer at the stage to satisfy basic needs, but is entering a new phase where it creates new demands and satisfies them. State-controlled economy, on the other hand, is not even capable of covering requirements. In the West, political and social systems are dependent on the people who make use of them, whereas in the communist world, the system dictates to individuals the scope of their freedom of action, while making use of them for its own ends. In the West the economy is effected through a host of individual decisions. In the East the economy is a matter of state orders. In the West the economy governs itself. In the East it is governed. Unsatisfactory performances are punished. It is significant that Eastern propaganda singles out for attack all that is understood in the West by social partnership and a mutually good working atmosphere. In the East there is no social partnership. The state, that is to say, the Party, determines what shall be the relations of the different groups one with another, wage, working hours, etc. True, training is free, but those who have been trained are compelled to undertake work which, according to the plan, is considered to be socially useful. It is not being contended that in all of the instances touched on above, the state of affairs in the West is perfect. There is ample room for improvement, but changes should be brought about in conformity with the wishes of the people.

Not all positive anti-communists can devote themselves to all these questions, since they are mainly concerned with their own specialties. Nevertheless, they all realize they must find their necessary support from sound social and economic conditions. They can help man to become independent of bureaucracy, plans, and machines, and enable him to deal with the problems of technology (including automation) instead of being controlled by them.

A further task for anti-communists is to promote new forms of international co-operation: to uphold the maintenance of peaceful coexistence as an enduring principle, instead of being treated as a transient concept limited in content and extent as the communists wish it to be. If, as it appears, they interpret peaceful coexistence as a stop-gap measure designed to bridge unfavourable circumstances, or if they exclude ideological coexistence and recognize the concept of coexistences as applicable only between states with different social orders, rejecting its validity in both the uncommitted countries and in the Communist bloc, its reality becomes doubtful. The Chairman of the Soviet Trades Union Congress, Grishin,

declared at the 13th Trades Union Congress in Moscow in October 1963: "The struggle for peaceful coexistence with states of different social orders ... provides favourable possibilities for the development of class conflicts and of the national liberation movement and it furthers the acceleration of revolutionary processes all over the world."

One of the fundamental principles of positive anti-communism is freedom of research, as opposed to the communist demand for partiality or party conformity in scholarship and science. There must be continual attempts to appeal to the Soviet scholar and scientist. But can one hope that Soviet philosophy will eventually recognize the boundaries of knowledge, when it is attempting to "overcome" the question of the purpose of life, of the spiritual form of human experience, of death and that which comes after? Positive anti-communism which is familiar with the atheistic propaganda of communism, will have to defend the right of freedom of belief, and not allow itself to be forced into fruitless discussions. For many people, Christianity is the best alternative to the pseudo-religion of communism. For those who profess non-Christian religions the same principle will apply. The anti-communist, by means of his knowledge of communist philosophy and dialectics, should be able to lift the discussion out of the sphere of the controversy between science and faith. It is a mistake on the part of Christian Churches that they allow themselves to be led along this track. The essential personal decision does not lie here, but in the realm of the individual where suffering, guilt, and existence are at stake. A positive anti-communist can only undertake his task when he can rely upon his own knowledge of the matters under discussion. It is, however, no less important, perhaps even more decisive, that he has a definite conviction, whence his attitude and his modern, unprejudiced attitude also towards the East is derived, and his conviction upheld that peoples must not be condemned to live for ever in anguish of conscience under a communist dictatorship. The paradise-on-earth as promised to all peoples by communism will never be realized, but it is clear that the challenge of communism can provide an impetus for this aim. Our object should not be to destroy communism or the communists, but to assist in changing them through their environment, in such a manner that peaceful co-operation between all peoples becomes a possibility in the sense of more liberal intellectual principles. We do not want to convert individual communists, but to influence the people and the conditions which determine their behaviour.

The Soviet Marshal Shaposhnikov, in his work "Brain of the Army", characterizes peace as the continuation of war by other means; the Cold



War could not be better defined. That communism will carry on with war in this way is a fact we must take note of and we must arm ourselves, and be prepared. As communism is false, it is not omnipotent. The realization of the Free Society and of self-determination in the world of our temporal existence will replace it.

## Confrontation with Anti-Communism

*by Prof. Dr. P. Zacharias Anthonisse, O. F. M. Cap. Professor at the Catholic University of Nijmegen*

### *The Second World War as a Turning Point*

The Second World War would seem to have played a part in the development of an antagonism to anti-communism. For four years Soviet Russia was allied with the West against Hitler. This was accompanied by the dissolution of the Comintern (Communist International) and relaxation in Soviet persecution of religious denominations. Agreements were concluded and contacts were established, which had hitherto seemed impossible. The United States of America allocated to their Soviet ally the same liberal material aid as was provided for all the allies, while the Red Army, supported by its whole hinterland, performed in the struggle against the detested National Socialism heroic feats of endurance and self-denial, which won the sincere gratitude and admiration of all who were anti-Hitler. The author of these lines spent those tense years in Rome and still clearly recalls the expectations which prevailed at the time (also indeed to a certain extent in "Vatican circles"), namely that many changes would take place in the character of the Soviet Union as a result of the war and more particularly after the war.

This being so, it is less surprising that the Soviet Union was received into the United Nations Organization so easily and as a matter of course; even the treacherous invasion of Poland, already defeated by Hitler, in September 1939 and their no less treacherous attack on Finland in November of the same year evoked no insuperable impediment.

The most valuable and most positive element in this development, may be considered to be the growing feeling of sympathy with the people of Soviet Russia. Hitherto, the common attitude was one of aversion and mistrust, all Soviet subjects being considered as inhuman barbarians and highly dangerous conspirators, or – perhaps more frequently – a feeling of compassion for the helpless and defenceless victims of revolution, terror and famine. These feelings have undergone a fundamental change. Countless people had experienced the "Russians" at first-hand. Although exaggerated reports and stories about the barbarious behaviour of the victorious Red Army were spread abroad, nevertheless, people very soon began to distinguish between the excesses of the troops, who had been through

four incredibly austere years of war, and the behaviour of an "ordinary" Russian in his normal, everyday life. Many of us have been able to hear hundred of statements and testimonies from compatriots, and from people from other countries who had come to know the "Russians" during and after the war. Surprisingly, by far the majority of these statements are from Germans who had been at the front in Soviet Russia and had been prisoners of war. In common with many reminiscences which have appeared in print, these reports are, almost without exception, full of praise for the "Russian" as a person, for his good nature and his sympathy with everyone whom he believed to be in a worse state than himself.

This discovery of the "Soviet" as a *person* may be considered as being the most precious lasting result of the otherwise appalling period from 1939 to 1945. And yet the question may be asked: Would that degree of sympathy for the Soviet people, at any rate to that extent, have lasted if Stalin had lived longer or if his successors had followed the same course as he had taken? For Soviet policy after 1945 – the blazen disregard of the treaty concluded during the war with Roosevelt and, above all, the treacherous conversion of the Eastern European countries into Soviet Satellites – caused much of the old aversion and former mistrust to revive. Not much remained of the spirit of alliance and all it had brought about, when Stalin died at the beginning of March 1953.

#### *Khrushchev Allows the "Thaw to Set In"*

Almost immediately after Stalin's death there were indications of impending changes in Soviet Russia. The fall and execution of Beria, who under Stalin had been head of the most notorious and hated secret State Police, seemed a significant sign. In foreign policy, a period of eased tensions could be envisaged which was to be characterized by the term "peaceful coexistence", although at that time this designation had not yet come into use.

When visits to the Soviet Union became possible on a scale comparatively greater than previously, there was certainly a good measure of propaganda involved, but at the same time these visits can considerably increase the prospects of renewing and strengthening contacts with the Soviet people which came about through the war and which were thereafter restricted by Stalin.

Nor can it be denied that the steady flow of travel stories and eye-witness accounts – despite their varying degree of reliability – has considerably

increased our knowledge of the Soviet Union and its people, which must be considered as a gain. The "Iron Curtain" does not yet belong to the scarp heap. Despite the unfortunate barrier between East and West, which in Berlin has even taken on a visible form, there is now more contact between people on the two sides than was possible under Stalin, either before or after the Second World War – and above all there is, and will continue to be a greater desire, not only to meet and understand one another, but also to get more frequently and closely in touch with one another. For the time being this desire has found more expression in the West than in the East, but we may be sure, that it is entirely wanting there.

#### *"Anti-Antikommunismus" as a Sign of the Times*

This development is an indication of something that can no longer be adequately explained simply by reference to the Second World War and to Khrushchev's "thaw".

Moreover, in the form in which it manifests itself, it embraces more than the other more positive attitude to the Soviet people to which reference has already been made. If the Second World War contributed to the "discovery" of the Soviet people, this discovery is linked with a process which is much older and which can be described in words written by the author on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the Communist Revolution:

"Forty years of communism have made Soviet Russia an enduring element in the world picture. The shock which came upon the civilized world in 1917 and the years immediately thereafter, has lost much if not all, of its force and has remained unknown to many of us. The horror, the sufferings and the privations of the Second World War have engendered in many people the paralysing mentality of "peace at any price" and made them all too receptive to the cunning propaganda for peace, a condition which the communists do no hesitate to designate as "imperialistic war psychosis", but what is in reality nothing more than the normal reaction to communist aggression all over the world. The crimes of communism are neither denied nor defended, but are explained away by such phrases as: "Such things are inevitable with a revolution; it is an all too easily understandable reaction to all that they experienced before; they will settle down in due course and be influenced by contact with other countries." Every Soviet "success" is seen as a step further

towards "normal" conditions. In short: McArthur's historic utterance after the capitulation of Japan at the end of the Second World War "What we actually have to deal with is a theological problem" has not been understood. People are not sufficiently receptive to the idea that communism is much more than a social-political system, that it is an ideology, in which people believe with religious fervour and which is proclaimed and propagated as the only means of deliverance whereby mankind can find salvation. Mankind, in its longing for peace, tends increasingly to thoughts of unity, mutual understanding, a change for the better, and ecumenical movement. It is therefore not surprising that the attitude of antagonism towards communism, which at first generally prevailed, became much weaker with many people or was even entirely extinguished. If mention is also made here of popular receptiveness to impressive scientific and technical achievements, which is typical of the present age and for which Soviet Russia is assiduously catering, then we have a fairly complete picture of the development, whereby in the last forty years widespread recognition of communism and the Soviet Union has come about.

#### *"Anti-Antikommunismus" Objections' to Anti-Communism*

When one considers that — and this must be explicitly stated at the outset — "Anti-Antikommunismus" should in no circumstances simply be regarded as synonymous with communism, then it may be a matter for surprise with many people that the "Anti-Anticomunist's" principal objection to anti-communism is directed against the "anti" aspect. Anti-communists are apt to give the impression that communism has no good points whatever; they are entirely "anti" and see no shades or degrees and thus wilfully remain blind to the element of good that is to be found in communism.

This reproach becomes particularly piquant when judgement is passed in Catholic quarters and in papal encyclicals and in other documents communism is rejected "en bloc". Pope Pius XI's encyclical "Divini Redemptoris" (1937), which was zealously studied by Catholics immediately after it appeared seems not only to have become forgotten, but is criticized by some Catholics for its negative narrow-mindedness. This papal work, moreover, provides a good opportunity for another objection to anti-communism. Not without irony is it alleged that the encyclical is concerned with "godless communism" (the underlining is the author's). This irony has

two facets. In the first place there is opposition to the idea that all communists must be ungodly and unprincipled rogues, and secondly there is the implication that a different view can and must be taken even of communist atheism to that usually taken by the anti-communists. Some people even come to the almost positive and at any rate remarkable acknowledgement that Marx did not want to free the people from the saints and from the church! However, the majority limit themselves to the explanation that Marxist atheism represents an understandable reaction to the decline in religious faith amongst Christians in the Nineteenth Century.

In the same trend of argument, but more general in tendency, is the contention that anti-communists forget what took place in the previous century, when with the rise of capitalism the workers were abused and exploited and were nowhere—not even in the Church—able to gain recognition of their rights as human beings or find protection, and that Marx was one of the very few people, if not the only one, who had "sympathy with the masses" and called upon them to bring about their ultimate deliverance and the transition to a state of salvation by means of revolt. From this it is but a short step to the conclusion that the churches, or at least Christians, were to blame for the rise of communism.

This leads directly to a further criticism, from "Anti-Antikommunismus": In the Nineteenth Century the capitalists and their "confederates" not only were not restrained by their Christianity from gravely wronging their workers, but they also used their religion to justify their wrongful attitude. They argued: "The divine order of society and of the state should not be disturbed." Communism—according to "Anti-Antikommunismus"—is frequently attacked in the name of Christianity, whilst in reality, it is a question of the preservation of possessions and positions of power based upon these possessions. In other words, the anti-communists are accused of a great deal of insincerity. "Anti-Antikommunismus" will not accept the accusation against communism of materialism, atheism, disregard of the rights of man, the use of force, the suppression of real or supposed opponents, exploitation—the use of information, instruction, amusement and culture in ideological propaganda—imperialism, coupled with militarism and preparations for war, double-dealing and dishonesty in international relations and many other forms of injustice—while the accusers appear to be blind to, and silent about similar misdeeds, which are tolerated in their own anti-communist countries.

A further line of criticism contends that anti-communism isolates the communists or the communist countries on the national or international level. This amounts to a demand that the communists should not be ex-

cluded from the community. One is reminded, for instance, that this attitude had disastrous results for the Netherlands in the case of National Socialism. Similarly a critical view is taken of dissuading people from, or making it difficult for them to participate in, trips to Communist countries or participation in communist-organized or -sponsored congresses, festivals, etc. In certain Catholic quarters the Vatican has been reproached for not yet having recognized Soviet Russia. Mistrust of communist propaganda for peaceful coexistence is dismissed as unfounded since it is urged that the Soviet Union "seriously and honestly wants peace". The anti-communist's right to interpret Soviet Russian policy as aggressive and subversive is disputed, since the opponents of communism and their governments have driven the Soviet Union into a corner by repeated aggression and a systematic policy of isolation.

The sequel to all this special pleading is to be found in the demand for a "dialogue with Moscow", which has recently been frequently heard and has aroused considerable controversy. It not only offers the opportunity to raise once more the arguments enumerated above, but also gives occasion to accuse anti-communists, who doubt the prospects of success of such a discussion, of dogmatic self-assurance and a disinclination to listen to other people's points of view.

Now, there is no reason whatsoever for a convinced Christian to evade such a discussion—with whomsoever it may be—provided the other partner to the discussion is willing and able to take part. The critics of anti-communism make an urgent plea for "discussion with Moscow", assuming, too easily, that such a willingness and ability exist among the communists. They fail to take into consideration the fact that a true communist, by virtue of his teaching and of the system itself, is deprived of any possibility of discussion with people of a different mind, or when conceptions are discussed which have the same content and value for both sides. "Anti-Antikommunisten", however, seem by no means sure of their case, since during their "speeches for the defence" they seem to change course, and limit themselves to recommending meetings and contacts, which are undoubtedly very useful, but cannot be regarded as representing a "discussion" which is the crux of the matter.

### *In How Far is "Anti-Antikommunismus" Superfluous?*

In this connection, it is above all essential to have absolute clarity. But not the "clarity" which the communist seeks to achieve by dividing mankind into supporters and opponents, whereby the one is represented as conservative, reactionary, antisocial or unjust and the other as without exception the promoter of progress, innovation, equality, justice, freedom and peace.

The new programme of the C. P. S. U. contains a statement in which anti-communism is put on a par with fascism and a number of other movements and manifestations which are very emphatically rejected by the majority of anti-communists.

We do not, however, mean to imply by this that the anti-communist world has always borne clear enough witness in its criticism of imperialism, colonialism and capitalism nor translated it into action.

If the critics anti-communism want to correct this, then they will be fulfilling a positive and acceptable function but at the same time they should express their views regarding the misrepresentation of ideas by communism.

### *How Does "Anti-Antikommunismus" Become Dangerous?*

What may be considered to be really dangerous is the confusion which "Anti-Antikommunismus" creates in an entirely different sphere. While communism claims the exclusive right to fight and to work for all that is good and of value, "Anti-Antikommunismus" is apt to see herein proof that communism promotes its ideals, and attains them more effectively than do others. The simple truth is forgotten that it is not necessarily the same thing, when two people or two groups of people appear to be doing similar things. A few examples will make this clear. Freedom, equality, brotherhood, independence, recognition of human rights, and similar ideals, which communism promises, all bear the stamp "made in Russia". These conceptions are interpreted and used exclusively in connection with, and dependent on, communist ideals and their realization, and therefore they are quite different from the Western conceptions of freedom, etc.

As has been already mentioned, the concept of "peace", regarding which the communists make so much propaganda, represents in the communist sense something completely different from what we understand by it.

Another example can be cited. From time to time one hears from "Anti-Antikommunismus" that communism, with its concern for the human being, has better translated the gospel into action than has generally been the case with Christians. This assertion has more than once been made by Khrushchev, not without sarcasm. But that is not the main point. The fact is that the communists do not regard their activity as a translation of the gospel into action, since the gospel has for them no significance whatsoever. Finally, communist "concern for the human being" conflicts in so many ways with the very essence of the gospel, that such an utterance by a Christian spokesman for "Anti-Antikommunismus" is particularly painful.

In representing that the communists are accomplishing what their opponents are accomplishing or should have been accomplishing, only doing it better, "Anti-Antikommunismus" is accepting communist duplicity.

#### *What is Anti-Communism?*

Anti-communism does not mean the rejection, on principle, of everything which is communist or has been connected with communism. One may be an advocate of a thorough study of the life and writings of Marx and of the origin and development of his system, but this should be coupled with a serious and profound examination of the milieu, in the widest sense, in which Marxism had its origin. This does not exonerate Nineteenth Century Christianity from the charges which are made against it in this respect, although these charges should be made in more precise terms instead of being vaguely formulated as is repeatedly being done by the critics of anti-communism.

One may equally recommend the thorough study of all that is at the present time embraced by the term: Sovietology—i. e. the circumstances and the manner in which communism came to power in Russia and was able to establish the first communist state; events from 1917 to the present day, the methods by which successively Lenin, Stalin and Khrushchev sought to put Marxist ideals into practice; the difficulties experienced; the solutions tried; the changes undertaken; the inevitable deviations; the results obtained, and the more or less serious mistakes—and all this should be studied in every aspect: also communist philosophy of life, and attitudes towards religion, culture, education, economy, social affairs, home and foreign policy, etc. The relations and connections between the party, the state and the people, and their repercussion on the factors

mentioned above should have special attention in such a study. Only with the help of, and on the basis of factual material, resulting from a comprehensive and scientific enquiry, can a valid opinion and an authoritative judgement of communism and the Soviet Union be arrived at.

If a study of this kind is to accomplish fully its informative and documentary task, then it must, of course, also concern itself with the Satellite states, China, Yugoslavia and Albania, and World Communism in general.

Anti-communism cannot, of course, be regarded as an armchair study to be carried on solely at the desk and in the library, excluding personal visits to communist countries and personal contact with their peoples. Such meetings, in this connection, are as indispensable as, for instance, travel in the Middle East would be for someone making a thorough study of Islam. Providing such meetings are preceded by good preparatory study, they are of great value. In the case of communism, however, the preparatory study makes greater and quite different demands than in the case of Islam.

While it is really implicit in the preceding remarks, the point needs to be stressed that anti-communism should not lead to the shunning of communists and of the peoples of the communist countries. Where personal relations and individual contacts with communists are possible, they should not be neglected, if we are not to fail in our duty as human beings. Meetings, and above all co-operation, which bear an official character on one or perhaps both sides, carry with them a responsibility which can impose a certain restraint. Things are, however, totally different when it is a question of the subjects of the communist authorities. A form of anti-communism in which every Soviet citizen is regarded as suspect, perfidious and contemptible, would show itself to be either extremely badly informed, or exceptionally prejudiced.

But are we not ourselves prejudiced and will not many people ask with mistrust: They plead for study and contact, but are they not already absolutely certain of the results thereof beforehand? Do they not expect, or perhaps seek, any other conclusion than that communism should be condemned? In reply to this, it may be said that doubts as to the results of this study is only possible amongst people for whom it is completely, or almost completely, unknown ground. Others—and they certainly form the majority—have already formed a more or less positive or negative opinion. This is, of course, known to those who pose the question. What they really mean is something quite different. They mistrust everyone who, in their opinion, is prejudiced against communism. We believe

that a twofold answer must be given. Such mistrust of anti-communism is justified when it appears that a person who is studying communism is completely biased negatively, so that everything is unfavourably interpreted, real results and achievements in Soviet Russia are denied or misconstrued, indiscriminating use is made of sensational and horrific reports, and, at the same time, such a person is blind to the degree of responsibility which the non-communist world bears for the rise and spread of communism. In this connection a negative attitude has clearly developed into a one-sided prejudice.

On the other hand, an approach to communism must be undertaken with vigilance and caution since the majority of its theoretical elements cannot stand the test of scientific analysis; its moral standards offer no guarantee against injustice and force; its political aims constitute a threat to us, and its history does not offer an example worthy of imitation.

Having described in the preceding paragraphs what is not meant by anti-communism, one must now state clearly what anti-communism does in fact signify. It may be summed up as follows: resistance to, and rejection of communism, and recognition of the existence of communism as a real power both in its deeds and in its aims.

All theoretical study, meetings, contacts, discussions, etc. cannot alter the fact that communism has with unmistakable clarity made known its ideals, plans and methods through the new programme of the party, which is at present communism's strongest bastion and its central point, namely the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Stated briefly, the contents of this programme signify that World Communism will be attained in the classic Marxist way, viz. through social upheaval and revolution, which are prepared and assisted by agitation and infiltration and by exploitation of all weak spots which our society contains, and finally by the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, thus in reality the dictatorship of the Communist Party, which will complete the incorporation of all countries concerned into the Communist camp.

Herein lies the answer to the question as to why a greater measure of caution is necessary in many forms of contact. We are well aware that communism in its official, active and dangerous form is, to a considerable extent, nothing more than a facade, behind which are living millions of people, who wish to have nothing to do with it. For this reason it is desirable that steps continue to be taken to ascertain, if possible, by means of personal visits and meetings, what is hidden behind this facade. On the other hand, at the present time—and who knows for how much longer—it is the facade which faces us and opposes us and which cannot be ignored.

### *And the Apostolic Mission?*

The attitude of unequivocal rejection, which is characteristic of anti-communism, has more than once provoked the reproach that such an attitude is unchristian and that it represents a failure in the apostolic mission to seek out one's straying fellow-creatures and enable them to participate in the Christian message of salvation.

It is, of course, only right that we should not simply leave the communist world, in so far as it really is communist, to its fate. In the first place there must be prayer and offerings for their conversion and salvation. This goes almost without saying since we are dealing here with one of the principal duties of Christian charity and responsibility. But should it be left at that? The "Anti-Antikommunismus" has also come to the conclusion that there is little or no chance of success in preaching Christianity directly to the communist peoples. It quotes the apostolic mission as a motive in favour of discussions. This can indeed be a reason for entering into discussion, but especially where the non-communist partner to the discussion combines in his own person the qualities of a real apostle and of an outstanding specialist on communism. There is all the more reason for favouring such a discussion since it presupposes a not inconsiderable concession on the part of the communists. A really convinced communist will not enter into discussion of religious questions. For him religion is an antiquated notion, which has been mismanaged and which only has to be attacked when, contrary to all expectations, it shows signs of life. If other possibilities, of whatever kind they may be, present themselves, of directly or indirectly influencing the communist world, then it is our duty to exploit them to the best of our ability. In fact these chances are by no means neglected. But this is not the place to go into it in more detail. In this connection attention must, once more, be drawn to a positive aspect of "Anti-Antikommunismus" when it maintains that anti-communism is dishonest, and is therefore not entitled to make assertions, if it fails to deploy to the full, within its own camp, the Christian qualities of evangelical love, justice, equality and brotherhood.

Summing up, it may be said that for this reason, the best form of anti-communism consists of

- a thorough knowledge of communism and well-founded information about communism;
- an undaunted and uncompromising fight against communism;
- sincere concern for the good both of the adherents and of the victims of communism;

—energetic action to bring about a really better world and the willingness to make sacrifices for this goal, as well as the courage to get others to make the sacrifice.

This type of anti-communism provides by far the most convincing answer to communism. It gives the most clear proof that the solution is not be found with Marx and his adherents. It becomes the most powerful proclamation of God and of His plans for salvation.

## Thoughts on the East-West Conflict

by Dr. A. Müntz, Zurich

Those who agree with Jules Monnerot<sup>1</sup> in viewing communism as a religious sect of world conquerors, for whom Russia is but the established starting point of the battle, and who have long since moved from the vertical (the class struggle) to the horizontal (the struggle of 'one' world against another), will not allow themselves to have tactics dictated to them by political fortune-tellers and negotiators from the political no-man's-land. Their attitude will depend on the quality of their opponents, whose strategy and tactics seem to have been drawn up 2 500 years ago by the Chinese Sun Tsu, who wrote:

"The highest art is that of breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting. The direct method is to be recommended if you form up for battle. In order to be victorious, you must ensure that everything goes wrong in the opponent's country. Try to associate the foremost figures of the leading circles with criminal enterprises, undermine their position, and exploit the incidents to the full. Ally yourselves with the most dubious and dishonest individuals. Obstruct the work of the government with all means at your disposal. Stir up discord and dissension amongst the citizens. Set the young against the old. Upset army reserves and supplies as much as possible . . . Abolish the old customs. Make use of loose women to complete the work of demoralization. Make grandiose offers and give handsome presents, do not stint expenses. The more you spend, the better you will be repaid. Money spent in such a way brings in rich dividends. Have your spies everywhere.

Only he who has such means at his disposal and makes use of such methods, who can sow discord and dissension amongst the enemy, is fit to rule and to command. He is a costly treasure for his lord and one of the main pillars of the state."

Lenin made the "doctrinaire cohesion" of the system binding on all arms and fighting methods: "We must have our men everywhere . . . at all social levels, in every position which allows us to become acquainted with the resources of the mechanism of state."

With such a point of departure, the boundary between negative and positive anti-communism need not place anyone in a quandary, except

<sup>1</sup> *Soziologie des Kommunismus* [Sociology of Communism], Kiepenheuer & Witsch, Köln; original French version "*Sociologie du Communisme*", Gallimard, 1949.

possibly staff officers in the Communist camp. As Georg Georgalas<sup>2</sup> has put it:

"If communism is to be interpreted as the negation of the whole of the cultural heritage, upon which freedom, democracy and humanism are based, then anti-communism, according to the rules of dialectics, is positive since it is a negation of a negation."

#### *Monotherapy through Social Measures?*

It is widely held that the communist threat to the Free World would be diminished through improvement of the economic position of the working classes. Scientific enquiries which were carried out in Italy would, however, seem to prove the opposite. The influence of the Italian Communist Party amongst the workers with increasingly high wages has by no means decreased. The same tendency is to be seen in the experience with Italian workers who, though they are put on an equal economic footing with their Swiss colleagues, continue to give their vote to the Italian C. P. By which it is not denied that the struggle, the impetus of which is certainly towards the horizontal, will also proceed vertically as long as the division between the proletariat and the remainder of society continues to exist, a division which communism, as Monnerot<sup>3</sup> says, is trying to deepen and to make finally and completely destructive. Because the communist hope of victory is based on the instability of the social order, it will do everything possible to avoid the fusion in the West of the proletariat with society.

Accurately interpreted positive anti-communism has therefore to concern itself with the problem of the identification of, with the integration of the proletariat, or, in other words, with the elimination of alienation. Everything which promotes and makes feasible this integration is to be encouraged, provided that any form of collective illusion and collective myth is excluded on principle. These efforts must be extended to foreign workers if the latter are not to become a disintegrating factor within the national society.

Based on the results of sociological studies and enquiries, all possible mass media are to be used for this purpose. Human relations, seen not as a sales promotion stunt, but as the oil in the machinery of human society, should act as an air-conditioning plant, tempering the "cold walls" and creating communicating containers where the differences in level were not able to adjust themselves.

<sup>2</sup> "Die Angst vor dem Antikommunismus" (The Fear of Anticommunism), Aktion Freier Staatsbürger, Zürich.

<sup>3</sup> loc. cit. p. 12.

#### *Danger of the Concentration of Social Power*

The realization that "totalitarian dynamism" depends upon the phenomenon of psychological economy, clearly shows the danger of the concentration of social power. The managers of such "concentrations" should summon up the courage to acknowledge the principle of plurality, in order to avoid the impoverishment of the individual psyche, which accompanies every concentration of social power.

#### *The Affective Vacuum*

Communism is essentially a vision of the future. After a half century it is still putting its adherents off with prophecies. It is accomplishing the feat of holding up the U. S. A. simultaneously as an arch-enemy and as an example. In both cases it thereby satisfies an affective demand.

Without imitating this, we should consider whether we do not after all neglect this demand too much. We give our youth neither ideals nor objectives. The affective vacuum which gradually develops acts as a dangerous suction force. The first quack who comes along has a good chance of finding an interested audience.

We may not be satisfied with cheap ideals. We agree with Arnold Brecht<sup>4</sup> that "democracy is in need of a constant injection of ethical impulses and . . . that these impulses—within the framework of the typically democratic institutions and attitudes—were supplied in the past, and are still being supplied, chiefly by religious feelings". Whilst it is not certain that other sources are ready to take over this function, sources which have proved themselves to be as universal and potent in character as the religious motive, the risk must be taken into account "that the decay of religious loyalties may go hand in hand with a decadence of those ethical attitudes which are essential for the functioning of democracy". Positively expressed: As the common denominator of those attitudes most essential to a flourishing democracy religion endows these attitudes with the character of "absolutes", i. e. of absolute values<sup>5</sup>. It is therefore in the interest of the democratic state to allow religion ample space, and to counteract all erosive factors or at least not to promote them.

<sup>4</sup> "Political Theory", Arnold Brecht, Princeton University Press, 1959.

<sup>5</sup> cf. Ernest S. Griffith "Cultural Prerequisites to a successfully functioning Democracy", *American Political Science Review*, vol 50, March 1956, pp. 551-552.



## *Circle of Contact*

Before we go into the question of contact with the East and cultural exchanges, we should like to touch on a problem which lies closer at hand. One may well ask what we expect to achieve through contact with the East, when we are not capable of getting into discussion with our foreign workers, or of making our foreign students from the developing countries feel at home. It seems to us absurd to arrange platform discussions on cultural contacts with the communists and their path-finders, whilst the circle of contact in our town is forgotten, where 80-100 fellow students from Central and South America, Africa and Asia learn via the press of our eagerness to make contact. It is equally non-sensical that, when we receive a scholarship-holder from one of the African states, we bury him in an office, where he is kept in quarantine, and we do not think of fulfilling the promises which have been made to him; indeed, where possible we send him home with a bad reference, when our finances have in the meantime become strained—instead of using the unique opportunity of making his sojourn so memorable that he would later be proof against all communist attempts to convert him.

We have met dozens of Chinese on Taiwan who feel themselves permanently linked to Germany through the memories of their student days.

## *Regard for Freedom*

A propos Nationalist China: 23rd January 1964 was the 10th anniversary of the day on which 22 000 Chinese, who had been taken prisoner in the Korean war, opted under U. N. O. supervision for Nationalist China. Would it not be positive anti-communism of the best kind to show—through increased contact, greater exchange of trade and investments—these 22 000 Chinese and the other inhabitants of Taiwan, the "island of freedom", and ultimately their countrymen on the mainland that the West is ready to honour not servitude but freedom. That would indeed be "conscious planning for freedom", as postulated by Professor Weizsäcker.

## *Integration of Foreign Workers*

To return to the problem lying close at hand. Those who were closely connected with the World Youth Festivals in Vienna and Helsinki will not underestimate the contacts which were sought and found by young

people from the West. The effort was certainly rewarded, but is out of all proportion compared to the missed opportunities at home. We do nothing, or but unforgivably little, to convince foreign workers of the merits of our free society by making personal contacts, through human warmth, invitations to our homes, etc. We gamble some 100 000 dollars on a few short discussions with chance acquaintances in Vienna and Helsinki. We are, however, deaf and dumb vis-à-vis our southern neighbours, whom we designate as "guest workers", but—and the word is not too strong—leave to vegetate in a state of apartheid.

We do not mean, on the other hand, that positive anti-communism should limit itself to relations with students from the developing countries and foreign workers. In the first place we must concentrate on those elements of the communist world which can be considered as capable of being "won over". It may be taken as proved that communist totalitarianism fears the free circulation of intellectual matters. We must therefore make use of all types of media, which come up for consideration as conveyors of intellectual matters.

## *Duties of a Host*

Proceeding once more from attention to those nearest at hand, it is to be recommended that no visit by individuals or groups from communist countries should be allowed to pass unexploited. A helpfully drawn up monograph can make our social system comprehensible, a conversation can lead to correspondence; a telephone number and an address, two sentences in a language foreign to the visitor, can be decisive for his fate. Those who have once had experience of it, know the technical difficulties which can stand in the way of defection. To those who reject such assistance as negative anti-communism, we should like to give the reply that all anti-communism is pointless if we leave in the lurch those who have decided to choose freedom.

## *Attractive Conceptions*

In this connection it is perhaps pertinent to point out that the conception of freedom does not automatically have a positive meaning for those who live under communist domination. In talks with participants in the Youth Festivals who came from the communist sphere of influence the conception of justice proved to be "more attractive", since the communist regime long since ceased to accept that freedom was a fundamental

element of Marxism, but still recognize in theory the "constitutional state" and "legal order". These and other conceptions should, therefore, repeatedly be tested for their positive or negative content and our vocabulary adjusted to the altered linguistic usage.

### *Transition to the Offensive*

It has a disastrous effect that we are continually on the defensive and allow ourselves to have the communist slogans imposed upon us. Taking over these catch-phrases (such as that the struggle is between capitalism on the one hand and communism on the other, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat respectively) in which the communists are wont to express the prevailing problems and which are inevitably misleading, since their meaning was determined in a world which has changed very considerably since the days of Marx, is already to subscribe unconsciously to communism<sup>6</sup>.

In order to regain the initiative we should challenge the leaders of the communist realm with a postulate which must fulfil three prerequisites: it must demonstrate the essence of totalitarianism by means of a concrete test; it must be clear and comprehensible in the 3rd world in order to gain us new "solidarity"; it must confront the totalitarian rulers with the choice either of concurring with it or of losing face.

Such a slogan would be: "Liberty to travel out of the country for every inhabitant of every country." We say "travel out of the country", because enough pretexts would be forthcoming to hinder liberty of travel *into* a country (danger of espionage, sabotage, subversion, etc.). This slogan would refresh our own memory and remind us that Hungarian and Polish relaxations on outward travel are for the present but single swallows which do not make a summer. The Africans and Asians in their open-hearted approach to the world would enthusiastically agree with the slogan. The peoples of the Communist East would welcome it as the fanfare of a new future, above all if it resulted in actual invitations, which would soon radiate as far as official quarters. "Tear down the walls" — not meaning in the first place the Berlin case, but as an appeal to all men to open the doors and to make the world once more accessible to everyone.

This also raises the question of contact with the East. We believe that, in principle, the same rule-of-thumb should apply as was considered appro-

<sup>6</sup> Jules Monnerot, loc. cit. pp. 131-132.

prate (or at least in retrospect) vis-à-vis National Socialism<sup>7</sup>. A clear distinction can be made between gains which exist only on paper and actual gains, certain gains in power and prestige by the opponent are to be weighed carefully against possible "discussion bridges" from man to man, espionage and subversion risks against chances of agreement in the realm of sport and culture.

All reservations would evaporate, should there be the possibility of putting the question of contact with the East and cultural exchanges jointly and of stipulating the principle of reciprocity as a prerequisite to apply to all fields: film, theatre, literature, press, radio, etc. With "one-way-traffic" it is only the communists who profit; with our counter-efforts, which have been purged by the communist censors and the passive role which is forced upon us, liberty cannot come into its own.

The objection has been raised that reciprocity cannot be attained because the democratic governments do not possess the means of forcing such an agreement through within their own domains. Yet nobody gives a thought to such pressure when there are considerable possibilities of exerting influence through the state cultural agencies. Why should not the non-state cultural agents (film producers and distributors, booksellers and publishers, etc.), at the risk of being refused, press for reciprocity! People choose to criticize "negative anti-communism" as being unimaginative. It seems to us that the "kinetic therapists", who plunge unconditionally into the race, are far more unimaginative and that *they* are the real "defeatists" and "bankrupts", *they* are the people who have indulged in "spiritual abandonment" and not the realists, on whom they have bestowed such designations. A sally from the hedgehog position achieves nothing if the troops are thrown back behind the lines they had hitherto been occupying. To demonstrate the "principle of critical candour" to the communist discussion partner is a right as it is problematic, for "... if one cannot in the long run succeed in getting the Eastern partners to accept the Western principles of plurality of opinion and critical candour at least as hypotheses for collaboration, without abruptly apostrophizing them from the outset as unscientific and false, then one cannot see what

<sup>7</sup> Walter Hofer, loc. cit. p. 365: "Everywhere where the liberty of science is possible there no longer exists today any doubt but that National Socialism and Bolshevism belong to the same type of totalitarianism. The characteristics, especially when the Stalinist system is brought into the comparison, are widely similar: one-party state with unrestricted personal dictatorship, an ideology claiming exclusiveness, total absorption and control of society by mass organizations, terror and propaganda, insatiable imperialism with a claim to hegemony — to name only a few catchwords." cf. Jules Monnerot, loc. cit. pp. 137, 356, 367, 369.

sense there can be in more intensive relations outside the usual international diplomatic intercourse"<sup>8</sup>.

The hope that we might provide the other side with ideals, which would be qualified "to produce or to promote thought—and evaluation processes, from which we might possibly expect the preparation of an inner change and thereby the gradual opening of a way out of the present bondage"<sup>9</sup>, seems to be problematical so long as we are incapable of providing real ideals for our own youth.

Should we not deplore our spiritual impoverishment, when we see the faith of the Soviet which proceeds from his love of his fatherland: "Great is the god of the Russian soil, great the genius of the Russian people! No one can intimidate us. The future belongs to us!" For the Russian poet, Constantine Paustovsky, the soil of his native land is "the most splendid thing which is given us on our journey through life; we must cultivate it and care for it and defend it with all the power of our being . . ." "There is nothing more detestable than a man's indifference to his country, to his past, present and future, to his language and way of life, to his woods and fields, to his homesteads and his people, be they genius or village cobbler"<sup>10</sup>.

Thus a prerequisite for any fruitful discussion with "the other side" would be that we should again become more conscious of our own possessions. It is all a question of identification and the least suitable people to act as herolds are therefore those who live in a state of estrangement, to whom our world is but a cruel vexation, our society an abomination, nor, most certainly, the people who look towards the East as though in a trance and try to convince us that the whole matter is not so bad fundamentally, but that it is only that clumsy hands have made a mess of it.

All faith healers render themselves suspicious, who deal not in facts but in charms. Just as little as National Socialism obliged the wishful-thinking of the "appeaser", will communism adjust itself to the visions of the naive. More fruitful than all the discussions with National Socialists would have been hard facts—if they had not partially been systematically suppressed.

Is it very different today? A Swiss firm, which had sent its sales engineer to the Soviet Union for 6 months for the winding up of some business

with the East, forbade the man to give the personnel any information about his experiences—purely from fear that the negative aspect of trade with the East might impede further agreements with Moscow. If anything may be termed "negative anti-communism", then it is this behaviour, which destroys itself and assists communism instead of resisting it.

<sup>8</sup> "Contact with the East as a spiritual problem", *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, no. 1408, 8. 4. 1962.

<sup>9</sup> "Anticommunism and cultural relations", *N. Z. Z.*, no. 3716, 29. 9. 1962.

<sup>10</sup> Constantine Paustovsky, "The Windrose", *Diogenes Erzähler Bibliothek*.

## Intellectual Confrontation with Communism

by Harald von Rautenfeld, Loccum

The development of a relevant and effectual intellectual confrontation with communism is frequently hindered by the fact that the problem is seen only in the context of the East-West conflict of power-politics. That is understandable, although it involves the inclusion of political, economic and social matters which tend to obscure or detract from the main point. In this way it relates to the characteristics of communist thought, and not to the essence of communism. Not until the fundamentals of the communist world movement are exposed, i. e. the theory itself with its origins and motive force, and not its materialization, can a genuine intellectual and spiritual dialogue ensue.

The need for this may be made clear by one example. At the end of last year the Italian episcopate published at the instigation of Pope Paul VI a pastoral letter directed against communism. In it is stated: "The doctrine (of communism) is completely irreconcilable with the Christian faith; it contradicts the basic principles from which Christianity proceeds, in the ideas which it propagates, and in the methods which it uses; it does great harm to the soul and to human society."

The very inclusion of a social order, here described as 'human society', makes an intellectual confrontation with communism more difficult. The pastoral letter goes on to say that the dangers of the situation must also be realized by those "who fear the ungodliness of communism and fight against it, but who in practice very often destroy moral stability and render a spiritual revival of the people impossible by their neo-pagan and materialistic way of life, by their theories subscribing to economic and social egoism and by their critical and disruptive scepticism". Do not these words plainly characterize the 'human society' of the West? By the inclusion of a social-political question the clarity of the otherwise emphatically pastoral letter is obscured, since the other side was thus able to make use of a definition of Nicolas Berdyaev:

"The truth of ungodly communism lies in the revolt against the lie of the degenerate Christian world."

But just as attention must be paid to exposing the essence of communist doctrine, so also is it important to define precisely and clearly one's own premises and standpoint. It is not sufficient to talk in a general and abstract way about the 'free world' or the 'freedom and dignity of man'. These

concepts must at least be made concrete in a systematic manner if it is to be possible to undertake a dialogue with communism. An attempt to do this will be made in the following pages.

The Communist Manifesto was first drafted separately by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels and then drawn up by Marx, directly before the Revolution of 1848. In its essence it contains the historical theory of communism. "The manner of presentation is well-nigh dispassionate, since there is the conviction that things must thus come to pass" (Kupisch). And yet the Communist Manifesto breathes the pathos of passionate expectation. The historic hour approaches. The time is ripe for the elimination of the backward Prussian state and a hollow bourgeois society. The workers are called upon to take decisive action. The proletarians have nothing to lose, but everything to gain.

This strange mixture of (apparently) objective scientific perception and almost eschatological alignment has up to the present day remained the driving force emanating from the communist world of ideas. What is here manifested is true expectation of finality, the dimension of a deep and living faith. Consciousness of this dimension is essential in every spiritual dialogue with communism, if it is ever to penetrate below the surface and comprehend the essence of the phenomena. The communists operate from a firmly based belief, they have a complete doctrine and a clear picture of man. Man is seen as homo faber and as a social being. And as godless. According to Karl Marx: "The only person who is free is he who owes his life to himself; man's real fall, therefore, is in recognition of a god, on whom he is dependent." More shortly one could say: The aim of communism and at the same time the bearer of its ideology is a new man, the autonomous, self-powerful lord of nature and of history. This initial idea liberates enormous forces in man. Communism, proceeding from a humane application of Marx, driven by its expectation of finality and relying on its (ostensibly) scientific knowledge, is beginning its triumphal progress in the world. It is the process of the transformation of the Christian's *hope* in the future into human *planning* for the future, which characterizes communist thought and action.

For the sake of completeness of characterization, attention should also be drawn to the fact that communism in the West, in its modification of evolutionary Marxism, has not corresponded to the hopes and expectations of a radical revolutionary movement as the sole means of achieving communist finality. At first the Russians, with their radical and emotionally-charged way of thinking and with their unexpended vitality, favoured by certain historical developments, accomplished the 'jump from

the realm of necessity to the realm of liberty' of which Engels had dreamt.

Helmut Gollwitzer points out, quite rightly, that: "Leninism is an impatient Marxism, which is partly to be explained by the alien elements of Russian revolutionary thought which poured into it, and partly by Lenin's secret fear that the European proletariat might fail in its mission to humanity and that history might thereby not take the course provided for it by Marx."

Against this communist point of view the 'Free West' must take up its own firm standpoint. Its basic attitude is, consciously or unconsciously, determined by the fact that, historically speaking, it has been formed by, and bears the impression of, Christianity. This last point must be referred to if we are to halt communism, let alone defeat it: we must refer to the Christian faith and to a Christian picture of man.

The frequently heard reproach that 'the West' is no longer Christian at all and communism cannot be dealt with from this standpoint, overlooks the real problem. Otherwise one would have to point out that 'the East' is not really communist, but only a minority of idealists. Intellectual discussions are not carried on by the masses and adopted as propaganda, but are determined by an élite.

An intellectual discussion, which is concerned with pointing out erroneous ideas in communist doctrine, would seem to be pointless. The communists believe in the validity of their theses, none of which has ever been proved objectively. The only effective discussion must proceed from a firm standpoint, which can be made credible as reality and then (perhaps) acts as evidence. Reference to the basic Christian attitude is therefore essential.

The truth of Christ, in all its inconceivable fullness, will not be described here. A few conclusions will be drawn from the acknowledgment of Christ, in so far as they concern the conception of man. This attempt must be preceded by a statement which, it is hoped, will immediately be clear enough to show at least in outline the Christian conception of man. The focus must be on the tenet:

God is a reality, entirely independent of whether He is apprehended or even recognized.

The truth of such a statement can only be disputed by someone who has put his receiver out of circuit and who maintains that there is no emission from a transmitter.

That can happen as a result of ignorance or of indifference. That is the attitude of the Atheists. One can also be aware of the activity of a

transmitter, but react to the transmissions with rejection, abhorrence and hatred, and try to drown them. That is the attitude of the Antitheists. Atheism has its origin in the West and has been given its most drastic formulation by Mauthner: "The present is so serenely atheistic that there is no further need to wrangle over God." Antitheism, insolently militant, is active in the East. It reveals, however, a last hidden relationship with God in that it fights against God.

Man is the creature of God. He is a responsive being. He accepts his responsibility when he hears God's call and replies to it. He has freedom of choice to say Yes or No to God's call. Both answers have their consequences. If we say yes, then the first commandment is applicable, that we should have no other gods but the Lord Our God. We are then dependent upon God. Upon a will outside ourselves. We then have (recognizable) limits imposed upon us and at the same time we are given liberties, which culminate in God's charge: Subdue the earth! and which have released and are further releasing the brainpower which makes us lords (limited only by God) of His creation.

If we say no to God's call, we believe that we need recognize no limitations on man; then the godless, self-powerful, autonomous Marxist man stands before us. Then we come into the power of 'other gods'. Today we call them ideologies, human ways of thinking, which are changeable, but which claim us and absorb us, bind us and eventually master us, for 'the Party is always right'.

This contrast between the two conceptions of man can only be indicated to a certain extent. Perhaps one must add: man exists in two dimensions—in the horizontal dimension of his temporal existence, in the social relation of man to man; and at the same time, and independent of whether he appreciates or even recognizes it, in the vertical dimension of the God-man relation. The two dimensions of existence are inseparable and are only to be distinguished intellectually. They make possible, however, the classic definition of communism, which originated from the Catholic Bishop Fulton-Sheen: "The communists attempt the impossible. They want all men to be brothers, without recognizing the fatherhood of God."

The Marxist view of man is in the deepest sense unrealistic and utopian, since it does not take into account the reality of man. "Rigid adhesion to a programme of total emancipation of man and his absolute control of nature means denial of precisely that which can make man a historical being: the unconditional isolation of man in his responsibility to an absolute supra-mundane authority" (Landgrebe).

In the endeavour to understand man as the absolute lord of nature and of

history, "this basic tendency of modern self-assurance reaches its completion. And because we all have something of the modern man in us, for that very reason we must see Marxism as our own twin brother, and for that very reason is it so difficult for us to find the final position from which we can seriously oppose Marxism!" (Landgrebe).

The necessity of having one's own firm and distinct standpoint was outlined by Fedor Stepun in 1934 as follows: "For the future of Russia and of European culture nothing is more important today than that the great antagonist of Bolshevism, which must yet exert its influence on us, does not develop into a double." We have had actual experience of an assumed opponent and have heard how Goebbels triumphantly proclaimed at the beginning of his Russian campaign: "This time, my German people, it is not a question of ideas or of a philosophy of life, but of wheat, coal and minerals!"

Stepun's challenge is still applicable today, since intellectual discussions cannot be carried on without clarity and precision. Graf Baudissin, who has created for the German army the ideal of 'citizen in uniform', has given a warning that: "The danger of taking over the way of thought and the method of combat from the opponent was seldom so great as it is today. The Free World must consciously resist this temptation, if it is not to fail from within."

But perhaps the antithesis of the Marxist and the Christian view of man should be approached from yet another side. It is a well-known fact that history in earlier days, and still today in heathen cultures, was and is described as a natural cycle. Cultures blossom forth, come to fruition, wither and die off. It is the image of eternal repetition taken from nature. There is a "cyclic development from birth to death, without any way out, without meaning, without any other goal than death" (Heimann).

In the Jewish-Christian cultural field, on the other hand, history is understood in the final sense, directed towards a goal. It is the image of the spent arrow. History is leading towards a goal, "where all that is fragmentary will be whole, all that is thwarted will be fulfilled, all that is imperfect will be perfect" (Heimann).

But there is a difference as to whether the history of mankind and of the world is finite or infinite, whether it will be broken off or completed. The former—that is the Christian view—is brought about by God. God cuts history short and beyond our historical time 'the imperfect will be perfect, the thwarted fulfilled, the fragmentary whole': in the second coming of Christ.

The completion of history—that is the communist belief—is in the hands of mankind. Man can reach the goal of history—Marx calls it the classless society—by means of his own powers. Naturally man must first have apprehended the laws of historical termination, so as to be able to tune himself into the course of affairs ("insight into necessity" is freedom to the Marxists), expedite it and remove obstructions; but he can do that by virtue of his reason and Marx and Engels, Lenin and Mao Tse-Tung have understood the laws of history: everything is precisely determined, rational as a railway time table and predictable as an eclipse of the moon. The laws need only be adhered to and the goal is certain to be attained. In Alexei Tolstoy's novel, 'The Life of Suffering', there is a scene in which two members of the Red Army discuss this state of affairs:

"Do you remember—we have talked a great deal about it—what tiresome nonsense the cycle of history, the downfall of great civilizations, seemed to us, ideas which had become pitiable parodies. Lies! The veil has been torn from our eyes. A blinding light has illuminated the half-ruined vaults of all past centuries: everything is harmonious, everything is in accordance with the theoretical principles, the goal has been found, every member of the Red Army is aware of it!" "It is perfectly clear", writes Reinhard Wittram, "what has happened here: the past has lost its dead weight in being unravelled before the eyes of the faithful. The future is everything: 'the soul of time', 'the key to all history', history is nothing but 'prehistory to the final goal'."

The former Minister of Education and Public Worship of the Soviet Zone, Joh. R. Becher, expresses this in a new version of a well-known choral:

"O People sorely wounded,  
The way has now been sounded,  
Which we shall henceforth tread  
And show to all mankind.  
Let us leave the grave behind —  
Germany rise from the dead!"

The final conception of history is based upon the eschatological outlook of Marxism. Marxism is completely materialistic. It sees itself as the consummation of human history. And once more the differences are to be seen between the Christian and the communist expectation of the ultimate, which are derived from different conceptions of man.

The last words of the Holy Scriptures contain a promise and an answer which evinces certainly: "Surely I come quickly", says the Lord Jesus and

the congregation of the faithful answer: "Amen! Even so, come Lord Jesus!" It is the promise of salvation, the coming of Christ pronounced and promised at the end of all things. Since then the congregation of the faithful lives in expectation of salvation, it is 'en route'. It is watchful, prepared, the ranks are closed and where it is most active, it is filled with the same joyous certainty as the farmer in the autumn, who sows his seed, certain that it will come up in the spring. That too is a promise from God, upon which we can all rely, even we have covered it with the mantle of science.

The Christian's expectation of salvation is the atmosphere of patience, of confident composure, which prevails where God is at work, doing something to us and for us. Anticipation is the constructive power for the unity of the church and the last enduring reason for the two thousand years history of the greatness of Christianity. The Christian's expectation of salvation is based on an inner religious experience. It is a reality which is coming nearer to him.

With the communists, on the other hand, it is a question of a conception of the future, of human thought penetrating into the future, of man's welfare in this world in a classless society. It is the atmosphere of the self-powerful, of the covetous, of the impatient, of the schemer, of the promethean, which is dominant here and which is fundamentally different from that of the expectation of salvation. This must be clearly understood, because we here find ourselves in that dimension of communist ideology where judgements are passed. The judgement of communism takes place in the field of expectation. Expressed in a more concrete form: it is a question of whether God is the lord over history—or man.

The communists are aware of that. Thus a young Soviet political officer in the Soviet Zone of Germany, who had been making enquiries as to the state of evangelical theology, when asked by his amazed partners in the discussion why he was interested in the subject, could give the (prudent) answer: "When the Christian church ceases to preach the second coming of Christ, we communists will have won!"

The intellectual confrontation with communism should be concentrated on the conception of man. That is generally recognized today. Thus Harald Ingensand, for example, sees the result when he writes finally in his description of the 'Ideology of Soviet Communism': "A reliable criterion for deciding the question as to which of the two political systems may in the long run qualify as having more power to achieve its purpose, as to which organizational form may qualify as more fruitful for the future, can perhaps be gained from comparing the conceptions of man which,

according to their different natures, determine the social order and its development in a different way in East and West"; and he concludes his study with the words: "The picture of man provided by dialectical materialism does not correspond to the reality of man."

The East is also beginning to realize what the intellectual dialogue with the West must concentrate on. The treatise of the leading theoretician of the Polish C. P., Adam Schaff, who is also director of the philosophical institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences, is wellknown. He points out that Marxist philosophy will lose the battle for the soul of man if it does not grapple with and master the problem of the human individual and his destiny. "It has been an omission that these things have not been discussed and have been ignored or left to the idealistic opposition. As long as there are people dying and frightened of death, as long as people lose their loved ones and physically and mentally suffer therefrom, it is not sufficient for them to know about the stages of development of social changes, but they want also to understand their personal problems and know how they should act." Because there has been this omission Schaff is prepared to be self-critical and he brings forward the demand "to seize from the West the principle of intellectual freedom, for this principle forms the decisive dam against communist".

In Soviet philosophy there are, according to a happy formulation by Arnold Buchholz, any 'empty fields' and border-line problems of dialectical materialism: the question of death, of the meaning of life, the question of free will. "The study of Soviet philosophy has for some years shown a clear tendency gradually to fill the 'empty fields' ... with the intention of giving the philosophical problems which have not yet been resolved a materialistic interpretation. The problem of man is being slowly enveloped."

Communism thereby enters the field of the intellectual confrontation, in which the 'Free West', if it really understands its standpoint, gains the possibility of making its stand, more than that, of attacking and overpowering the communist picture of man.

In the course of the approach to the anticipated reality of tomorrow, of the materialization of the classless society, the problems of the individual present themselves ever more urgently. The limits of man's existence thereby become visible: one begins to distinguish between what is 'capable of being done', and what is 'not capable of being done'.

In reply to the question, as to whether he was aware that his communist experiment had brought much human suffering and misery upon the Russian people, Lenin could calmly reply: "Certainly I am aware of it",

only to add vehemently: "But you must admit that *this* idea is worth any sacrifice!"

This idea in its original humane definition has today been widely desecrated, corrupted, disfigured by the use of power, or has become torpid in a scientific faith long-since refuted—a last spark still survives today under the ashes of the burnt and can be fanned into a blazing fire again by the bellows of a refined and unscrupulous propaganda wherever historical situations or social conditions present themselves.

In the confrontation of the two conceptions of man there are still more lines to be followed, which can provide a criterion for the approach to the dialogue with communism. The formula of the two dimensions of human existence makes it plain that Christ, who sees himself as God's creature, is in the first instance one who receives. One could describe His position in the world in other words by saying that He thankfully receives God's love with open hands (God loved man in the first place) and strives to pass on God's love, received in the vertical dimension, as love for one's fellow men in the horizontal dimension of human relations. A misunderstanding sometimes arises on this point, to the effect that Christians must passively suffer communism. That is only true if we really see communism as the incarnation of the devil. Moreover, a distinction must be made between the individual and the idea of communism. When the Epistle to the Ephesians says "Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil", it is not evil, but the devil which is expressly mentioned. And when the apostle Paul continues: "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places", then he is alluding to the fact that we are dealing with a diabolical power.

But then we must realize that it does not lie within our human power effectively to combat such a force. Therefore the Epistle to the Ephesians speaks only of a defensive armour including above all "the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked". God is Himself at work in this struggle and we are only His servants, who must be on guard against attacks from God's adversary. That means: patience, perseverance and the certainty that communism 'is not God's last word'. That does not absolve us from taking up a political position and holding our own within the scope of the power-political and world-political dialogue in the Lutheran sense. "Not to fight against the Turks in Christ's name, but in the name of the Emperor Charles; that the Christian may do and shall do!" But this spiritual dialogue will be interrupted,

though not finally, since this is a question of spiritual developments of a very profound nature and therefore of long duration.

Buchholz also brings up this point with the well-known quotation from Bacon: "A little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion!"

Finally, attention should be drawn to a fact which we must see objectively and reasonably and at the same time be conscious that here we are confronted with the most severe expression of the antagonism of communism: (communist) training in hatred! He who interprets history as a class struggle and believes that we are engaged in the final decisive class struggle between capitalism and communism, between the middle class and the proletariat, will strive to win the struggle by active proof of their offensive attitude, and by seeking to strengthen the spirit of resolution within his own ranks by all possible means. But the (communist) training in hatred goes further. There are numerous examples of this, not only in the behaviour of those in power, but also in Marxist theory and in communist doctrine right up to poetic assertions. One example, typical of many, may be quoted here:

*Proletarian New Year*  
by Erich Weinert

365 mornings  
Shalt thou nurse thy heart with hatred.  
365 days  
Raise thy voice against despondency.  
365 nights  
Gather thy strength for the last struggle.  
For there is no god of revenge,  
Revenge, Comrade, is in thy hands!

Here the legitimate question: What is to be done? heavily attacks us and must be fought off again and again.

We are seeking a general formula. We can perhaps accept for this purpose a metaphorical picture which helps us a step further. In the 1920's there appeared a book on Soviet communism, which was not of great significance. But it had a good title. The author, Paul Sokolovsky, sees communism as a process of the 'Silting Up of Europe'. He draws a striking picture: milliards of smoothly polished grains of sand lying next to one another and independent of one another in shifting sands—a symbol



of forming part of the mass. The whole sands are moving—one could speak here of an inherent dialectical power which carries the shifting sands along and pushes them forward and leads to the silting up of flourishing cultures, to the silting up of Europe.

This is only one way in which shifting sands can be brought to a standstill: by planting osiers. They take root, even in sterile sand, so quickly that they form a vegetable carpet which binds the sand masses and terminates the silting up process. The decisive determining factor here is the taking root and the stability of individual units. Seen in this light it is, moreover, clear that in the ideological dialogue with communism it is not just a question of East-West problems, or a struggle of power politics between two geographical areas, but of a world-wide process, the extent of which cannot yet be assessed today. In conclusion, therefore, another classification on broader lines will be given which facilitates our survey. Nicolas Berdyaev has done this in his book on "Truth and Falsehood of Communism". He concludes his first chapter with the words:

"The word stands at a cross-road. We do not know which way will be taken; the decision is part of the secret of freedom. We have no reason to be all too optimistic. The accomplishment of immense and difficult tasks awaits Christianity; above all it must create a new kind of godliness which is capable of working and holding its own amidst the enormous tumult of the world. The future belongs to the working masses; that is the world's inescapable destiny and one in which there lies a great measure of justice. Consequently everything depends on the spirit of the masses and in whose name they are going to create a new way of life: in the name of God and of Christ, based on the spiritual principle—or in the name of the deification of matter and of human collectivism, in which the human countenance disappears and the human soul withers away. This is the question which the Russian people have posed to the whole world.

## The Answer of the West to the Challenge of "Peaceful Coexistence"

by C. C. van den Heuvel, *The Hague*

The relations between East and West are determined to a large extent by the Western response to the communist challenge of "peaceful coexistence". A merely negative answer, an unconditional rejection, would have little meaning. If, on the other hand, the West succeeds in the expression of its values, essence and institutions, it then has every chance of exercising a positive influence.

Time is ripe for an answer; in fact, "peaceful coexistence" calls for one. Increasing contacts between East and West, moreover, facilitate the penetration of Western ideas into the communist world. Whatever may be the attitude to this contact, it can no longer be avoided. In both East and West there is an ever-growing thirst for knowledge of each other's world. It has become a trend of our time, and this knowledge should be used to develop the trend in a most favourable direction. That means that, instead of swimming against the current, we should make every possible preparation for this contact.

This confrontation will work in two directions. The East will undergo influence from the West, but also vice versa. Time will tell us which is the stronger wind, the East wind or the West wind. The communists believe that their ideology is superior to that of the West. According to their ideology, they represent the powers of progress and of the future, the West those of disintegration and of the past. History, they contend, favours communism, whereas capitalism is a doomed system.

When Khrushchev launched his new "peaceful coexistence" strategy, he clearly had no doubts that communist ideas would prove to be the stronger in the East-West confrontation. Lately, however, leading communist organs have been issuing warnings against Western ideological infiltration. The repeated urgency of these warnings seems to indicate that communist authorities are seriously concerned about the penetration of Western ideas into communist society. The strong emphasis that is being placed on the *irreconcilability* of communist and capitalist ideology also betrays concern.

In order to be able to derive advantage positively and effectively in increasing East and West contacts, the West will have to comply with certain fundamental conditions. This applies to East-West contacts which are made in the West, as well as those established in the communist world.

*East-West contacts in the West* confront the latter, in the first place, with a task of defence. The peace offensive and cultural offensive of the Soviet Union have not been without success. The image that has been presented by the Soviet Union in the West is fading into another. The harsh picture which was presented by Stalinism has already undergone considerable change, largely through the "peaceful coexistence". People no longer believe so fully in the aggressive aims of world communism; instead they prefer to believe in the necessity for the Soviet Union to avoid war; in the declared desire of the communist world for more contacts with the West; and in the increasing liberalization of the Soviet Union. Uncritical acceptance of this new image can easily lead to a dangerous optimism with regard to the communist aims. The longing to ease tensions has grown so strong that political realism is losing ground more and more. The warning that, in the present situation, "peaceful coexistence" is a most convenient means for the communists to obtain the world communist society, is steadily losing force.

In this situation the need for accurate information is more essential than ever before. Such information, in the first place, should be concerned with world communism, and in particular its present aspect of "peaceful coexistence". Not only will the continued threat have to be exposed, but also the possibilities for the West to influence "peaceful coexistence" positively will need to be clearly indicated. To attain this, it will be necessary to be well informed in regard to the foundations, structure and institutions of our own society. This information should be given the widest possible publicity with the co-operation of the press, radio, television, films, and all other available means. Society rests on its *cadres*; they form, as it were, its cement, exerting influence both upwards and downwards, and it is of the utmost importance that they are getting this sort of information in the very first place.

When groups from the communist countries visit the West, they should be treated with courtesy and consideration by those persons who are in touch with them, who should possess good knowledge of communism both in theory and in practice. It is often assumed that a knowledge of communist doctrine suffices. A certain knowledge of dialectical and historical materialism is not without value but in practice, it is of little use in conversation with representatives of communist countries. It must be supplemented by a knowledge of communist activities, of the actual situation in communist countries, of communist parties and organizations, and of the relationship between communist countries and communist parties. Even this is insufficient without a deep appreciation of the cultur-

al, political and social values and institutions of the West. Representatives of the West should be able to contrast the political, economic, social and other aspects of both societies. Only those so equipped will be able to enter into useful conversation with communist visitors. They should, whenever possible, be conducted to places which are in themselves manifestations of the Western values, such as certain representative bodies, industries, cultural and educational institutions, families, etc.: The darker side of our society should not be ignored, and it must be indicated that free discussion of this aspect of Western life represents an important value.

*Representatives of the West visiting communist countries* carry an even heavier responsibility. They operate in a foreign environment, with all its dangers. They may find themselves confronted by situations with which they are unable to cope. At a meeting, for instance, they may suddenly find themselves exposed to difficult situations. Persons who lack strength and independence, or who are lightly influenced, are unsuitable for these visits. To influence their hosts they will also need to possess a sound knowledge of the theory and practice of communism. They should be well-informed regarding the situation in the country in which they are travelling. The fewer surprises they come across, the better. Mastery of the language of the country is highly desirable and a knowledge of its history extremely valuable. Since conversation almost inevitably leads to the discussions of important political problems, such as the German question, disarmament, etc., a knowledge of these is essential.

They will also need to possess a thorough knowledge of the values of the West in theory and practice. They will have to be capable of contending with false representations of "capitalism". They should be able to bring "democracy" to life by indicating how it is practised in various fields. Their picture should be neither one-sided nor idealized; it must admit the limitations and the shortcomings of our society. They will continually have to emphasize that, in Western society, *human dignity* is the central concept, and that this term signifies, above all, a high esteem for the individuality of man. They should be able to explain that in the Western view, this is the only way for the self-realization of man.

Such equipped representatives of the West, visiting communist countries, need to have no anxieties about the confrontation. On the contrary, contact can be met with all confidence and can provide excellent opportunities to introduce positive Western ideas into the communist world.

Circumstances are developing favourably for the West. In the communist

world changes are taking place. Disagreements between the communist countries are increasing. World communism no longer has one centre, there are several. In various communist countries criticism becomes a growing factor. Intellectuals and youth are becoming steadily more susceptible to contact with the West. The communist authorities are increasingly being pressed to raise the level of prosperity, and forced to allow more criticism and more personal freedom. A clear comprehension by the West of this changing situation will be followed by a corresponding adjustment in its relations with the communist world. The main principle to be kept in mind will be the introduction of Western ideas into the communist world, with the object of affecting the image of the West. If this succeeds, distrust will probably decrease, and with it aggressiveness. Acquaintance with our world could moreover lead to a relaxation of the authoritarian traits in the communist system. Such changes in the essential characteristics of communism would form the best contribution to a truly peaceful coexistence.

## Appendix A

*Theses on the ideological problems of the communism of the future*  
(from: "Studies in Soviet Thought" III, 2nd June 1963)

by Arnold Buchholz

As communism develops in the future, a number of fresh problems for Soviet ideologists will arise, which make it seem probable there may one day be a far-reaching ideological reorientation in the communist realm. As an introduction to the discussion of these problems, the author's reflections are summarized in the following ten short theses:

1. *The decisive ideological connecting link in the communist ideology is its ideal for the future.* The communist world movement has, in spite of the stresses placed upon it by "Polycentrism", "Revisionism" and "Dogmatism", been held together by belief in a common aim for the future. At the same time this means that the present-day communist movement will not alter essentially until its views have changed on the world of the future to which it aspires and its ideological prerequisites.

2. Communist aims for the future, which under Marx and Lenin were but scantily defined and under Stalin disappeared almost entirely from the ideological field of vision, must, according to the 20-year plan for the transition to communism, be increasingly pondered upon and gradually realized. So far, it has been simple enough to insert idealized concepts into the nebulous aims for the future.

*Now a series of fresh problems are entering into the ideological field of vision – problems which up to now it had always been possible to exclude.*

3. *The central problems of the communism of the future are problems concerning human beings.* It is appreciated also in internal communist discussions that the economic and social structure of the communism of the future can only be realized if men behave better than they have done so far. In the meantime many moral demands have already been laid down for Soviet man in anticipation of this future period.

Yet scarcely any thought has been given to the question of what can really be expected from man on the basis of historical experience covering several millennia. Nor has the question whether man is to be transformed or whether he will be able to develop his "true" qualities through

communism yet been sufficiently pondered. In the latter case it would be possible to investigate more closely just what are the true qualities of man. The decisive problems, however, arise in the realm of intellectual freedom. Will man's intellectual development, when he has reached the "realm of freedom" (Engels) to which he aspires, really be identical with the scope of dialectical materialism? There have been many statements on this and other questions, but not yet any comprehensive enquiries.

4. *The most important future task for communist philosophy is working out an anthropology.* The lack of a philosophical anthropology goes back to Marx. Though the young Marx had originally started on an anthropology ('alienation'), his later interests were wholly directed towards man's social relationships and the establishment of historical conformity. The individual is, however, thereby increasingly excluded from the ideology as a subjective and 'disturbing element'. If one picks up a textbook of Marxism-Leninism today, one will find in it extensive discussions of matter, dialectics, the theory of cognition, the class struggle and man's social relations, but no complete anthropology based on a real appreciation of the problem.

5. *When one works out an anthropology based on the suppositions of dialectical materialism, serious omissions are immediately evident.* The decisive components of a Marxist anthropology are comprised in man's destiny as a material and social being. This evaluation can certainly be justified, but it is insufficient to answer the central philosophical questions which man poses. These 'empty fields' in communist ideology are to be found, for instance, on the question of the meaning of life, the problem of death, spiritual experience and the theoretical prerequisites for intellectual freedom. In order to prevent any misunderstanding, it should be pointed out that an anthropology which is concerned only with existentialist or metaphysical questions and which overlooks social interests, is very inadequate; on the other hand, however, one can say that a concept of man which does not provide fundamental answers to these questions is ultimately intellectually inadequate.

6. *The further development of dialectical materialism in the direction of the 'empty fields' is not leading to a completion of the ideology, but to a reduction of the total claim to truth.* Contemporary Soviet philosophy is attempting to fill the empty fields through efforts in the realm of ethics, pedagogics, psychology, etc. In this connection, however, one can with certainty predict the following: the more Soviet philosophers try to give substance to the concept of man which has hitherto been an unconquered

realm, the sooner they will come up against the fundamental frontiers of rational understanding. Thus, for example, proceeding from the dialectical materialistic assessment, the question of the meaning of life will end in complete confusion. On the other hand, this question cannot be kept out of a philosophy which is adapted to man's needs. The recognition of fundamental limits to rational understanding must first lead to deeper insight. The great 'progress' of philosophy in the transition from the Nineteenth to the Twentieth Century can be seen precisely in the fact that the 'knowledge of not knowing' became an ineradicable intellectual problem. At the same time the accompanying reduction of the total claim to truth is the prerequisite for intellectual freedom.

7. *Subjection of intellectual life to ideological postulates (e. g.: Everything is a product of matter) and real intellectual freedom, which again is connected with the problem of truth, are incompatible.* The craving after truth and intellectual freedom is, however, growing among the masses in the Soviet Union, as man on his way to the communism of the future receives through the conquest of need, through training and freedom the prerequisites to apply himself to himself. Almost three thousand years of intellectual history as well as present day experience of intellectual life in the Soviet Union clearly show that man's great philosophical questions cannot be 'over come'. In this connection it is important to realize that these 'empty fields' are not concerned with specialized questions which are not readily comprehensible, but with elementary formulations from "simple" people, questions which are directly connected with their intellectual development. There is no doubt that in these 'empty fields' in the communist concept of man lies the weakest link in the ideology and, in the long run, its breaking point.

8. *Decisive influences upon a structural change in communist ideology proceed from realms which lie beyond politico-ideological reality.* Many things point to the fact that we have arrived at a fundamental historical turning point. We need only be reminded of the release of atomic power, modern weapons of destruction, the way in which the world is 'becoming smaller' and cosmic exploration. For the first time in world history man has within his power the possibility of self-destruction and also for the first time he has the real prerequisites for shaping a peaceful world. Communist ideology is making great efforts to fit these new prerequisites, which have grown up entirely independently of Marxism, into its theoretical structure, but it still cannot arrive at an all-embracing ideology for a peaceful world. The spontaneous, world-wide recognition of their regi-

men expected by the communist leaders will finally miscarry because of the decisive rejection of their biased and materialistic concept of the world and of man. This applies not only to the Western world, but seems to be true of nearly all the developing countries as well.

9. *It is not impossible that there will one day be a structural change in the ideology of the communist realm in its own interests.* The communist leaders see in their claim to supplying the ultimate answers to man's question the prospect of arousing fresh forces in the world for the communist social system. Such considerations have been brought forward at least in Poland in a variety of forms. Though whether a new ideology, arising from a breach in the materialistic dogma, could still be called communism, is open to question. It must here be clearly stated, however, that a radical change in the ideological concept of communism need by no means result in the downfall of the existing social system.

10. Under present conditions a fundamental structural change in communist ideology would rupture the cohesion of the entire Eastern bloc. It cannot, therefore, be expected shortly, but could be quite possible within a period of ten years. It must be recognized that the far-reaching changes taking place in the world call for appropriate intellectual mastery. We have before us 'intellectual raw material', which carries with it both great opportunities and great dangers. There is a great opportunity for the side which can lay adequate spiritual foundations for a world of assured freedom according to the new prerequisites, and a danger for the side which, because of ideological change, is compelled to postulate a 'special case'. *We should therefore certainly not exclude the possibility that also in the spiritual realm we are in a competitive position with the East, if we are not to be surprised one day by a communist 'ideological sputnik'.*

## Appendix B

*"Reflections on the Fate of Russia and of Europe"*

*from "The New Middle Ages", part III - "Reflections on the Russian Revolution" by Nicolas Berdyaev.*

The only effective forces for a counter-revolution, capable of ending the revolution, are those which are post-revolutionary, not those which are pre-revolutionary—only those which have developed from within the revolution. All that is pre-revolutionary is an internal element of the revolution itself. Salvation can *only* derive from the generation of new life.

The *hypothetical counter-action* must be directed towards generating new life by attaining a synthesis of the past and the future. Bolshevism came to Russia because we were as we are, because no real spiritual force flourished among us, no powerful faith capable of removing mountains. We are to blame for Bolshevism—it is our transgression. We are all responsible. Only those who experience the revolution in this way experience it spiritually and positively. Communism is only an outward sign of the spiritual evil dwelling within us. The authority of power is always dependent upon the faith of the people. When that faith begins to waver, the authority of power becomes unsteady and is overthrown.

*The Russian problem today is above all an intellectual problem. Supremacy in politics belongs to the spirit.* That must today be recognized more clearly than ever before. *Without regeneration of the spirit Russia cannot be saved.* In Western Europe an active movement against Bolshevism, and one which is sustained by an idea, can only succeed if the truth about in whose name the struggle must be waged is recognized.

*Bolshevism must above all be overcome ideologically from within, and only then politically. The problem of communism is not an external mechanical one, which can be solved by military force, but above all an internal spiritual problem.* The present time requires faith and purpose. The activities of St. Augustine have given the world a new course.

The positive outcome of the communist revolution will be a deepening of religious life and regeneration of the spirit. A new epoch of Christianity has begun. For Russia and for Europe there is not, nor may there be, any return to life as it was before the war and before the revolution. The ideological experience of the revolution must convert us to a new and

better life. Every human soul must make its own decision. In Russia the taste for authority and power has developed. The most sinister figure in Russia is not the old type of communist, who is dying out, but the new and youthful communist activist, who is striving for power. Communism is a struggle against the spirit, its moral consequences are far more terrible than the political and economic ones.

The anti-revolutionary intelligentsia, which is opposed to the Bolshevik Revolution, is now as much as ever liberal and radical in its psychology. But there is nothing as sterile as this liberalism. We should not believe in salvation through political forms, be they democratic or monarchistic. Life is determined from within, spiritually, not from without, politically. Only the spirit, which itself creates new forms, can bring salvation. New wine needs new bottles. Persecution has never been fatal to Christianity. In times of persecution Christianity has always increased in strength and stature. So also today. Christianity is the religion of truth crucified. Once again Christianity requires unselfishness and sacrifice from its faithful adherents. Christians today have shown that they know how to die. The Russian church of today has many martyrs. Many people today have been enriched by a genuine spiritual experience and their relation to worldly goods has undergone a change. Neither regeneration of the church nor of Russia is possible on the basis of a political attitude to the church. We live in a period of the realization in life of the truth of the gospel. Russia's future depends on the religious faith of the Russian people. Politicians of today must understand that Russia can only be saved from within, through new life from within itself.

The end of bolshevism will be brought about by *an amelioration* of the conditions in Russia, not by a deterioration. The yoke of hunger and of poverty only fortifies the power of the Bolsheviks. Much that is unexpected is at hand, and liberation will not come from the direction expected by man, but whence it is sent by God. We may not expect salvation from Europe. The communist revolution must exhaust and destroy itself. The communist idea has lost its aureole. The process of recovery is a lengthy, but organic one, progress along the way from the realm of phantoms and fantasies. It is now more than ever of the utmost importance to maintain the supremacy of spiritual activity over political activity. We must now preserve the liberty of the human spirit. Once more the Christian nations are faced with the question as to whether they take Christianity seriously and whether they are prepared to put their whole will into bringing about its realization. If the Christian nations do not spiritually exert themselves to their utmost for the realization of the Christian way of

life, if they do not display intense activity, then atheistic communism will carry off the victory over the world. But the free spirit must act independently of whatever powers gain the upper hand and achieve the victory. Christianity will then—as in the time of Constantine—conquer the world anew.

## Appendix C

### *Some Ideas of Teilhard de Chardin*

The following summary from the 'Diaries' of the late French philosopher, Teilhard de Chardin, contains thoughts which are today frequently reflected upon in the Free World. It is not the intension of this appendix to discuss either his work or personality, but merely to call the reader's attention to some of Teilhard de Chardin's thoughts which are relevant to "positive anti-communism".

"A universal struggle is in progress, and the closer one comes to the origin of the conflict, the more one realizes that the cause of the evil lies not in the apparent conflicts, but—seemingly far removed therefrom—in the inner spiritual fact that man is in despair because he no longer believes in God as a person.

"The unifying power of the spirit is far greater than we suppose. But in order that it may manifest itself, the spirit must be pure and uninhibited and not enveloped in formalism and convention. The moment has arrived when humanity will become divided on the question of belief in, or scepticism of genuine spiritual progress. The future will be mastered and controlled by those who unite in a common belief in the spiritual future of man.

"What we need today is not revival but renaissance. We do not need wisdom, but passionate faith. Life's happiness and value is derived from absorption in something greater than man himself. In 2,000 years the earth has never had more urgent need of a new faith, purged of the old forms, than it has today. Now or never must Christianity manifest itself as a living force, with all its powers of regeneration. Christianity shows itself at the present time as the *only spiritual current* which is capable of developing in the soul a consciousness of the absolute and the universal and, in particular, of the personal, genuine consciousness of the mystical. If there were no Christianity, the presence of a loving God would disappear from the surface of the earth. Christ has not only become the focal point for individual and 'supernatural' salvation, but also for collective and earthly salvation. As a result a new concept of love of one's neighbour has been born—all that is united and embodied in the countenance of the universal Christ."

## Interdoc

The contributors to this publication all belong to the Interdoc-circle. In 1957 a meeting of French and German industrialists, academicians, journalists and representatives of the armed forces took place in the South of France to discuss problems of communism and to determine what steps should be taken to deal with them. As an outcome it was decided to hold these meetings regularly, the first and basic requirement being to ensure the availability of full and accurate knowledge. With this end in view each member of the group was expected to do what he could do within his own field of experience and competence.

After 1958, Dutch, British, Italian, Belgian and Swiss groups participated in the meetings. Among those taking part were several individuals who favoured the idea of setting up a permanent centre. In the beginning of 1963 the International Documentation- and Informationcentre (Interdoc) was established. It acts as a clearing house of information on East-West problems, and as such it is in contact with groups and individuals in America, Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, Scandinavia, Holland, Belgium and Switzerland.

## The Contributors

*Max Lamberty,*

a social scientist, lecturer and writer on sociological, political and economic subjects, specializing in the study of Western culture, Brussels, Belgium

*Servoatius Willem Couwenberg,*

a political scientist, editor of a monthly paper on East-West problems ("Oost-West"), The Hague, The Netherlands

*Nicolaus von Grote,*

an expert on Soviet affairs, secretary of the 'Verein zur Erforschung sozial-politischer Verhältnisse im Ausland e. V.', Munich, Germany

*Zacharias Anthonisse, O. F. M. Cap.,*

a professor of theology at the University of Nimeguen, specializing in the study of the Soviet social system, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

*Albert Müntz,*

a publicist, specializing in the study of Soviet affairs, Zurich, Switzerland

*Harald von Rautenfeld,*

a writer on Soviet affairs, Loccum, Germany

*Cornelis Christiaan van den Heuvel,*

director of the Institute of Ecology at The Hague, The Netherlands

