

latter. They are seen as too self-confident, deprived of any self-criticism, not sociable and with closed personalities. I am far from undersigning such such prejudice. As far as I can say, the Japanese are intensely rich in emotions, truly sociable, at times in the best Polish tradition, and they have a sense of humor. They are in love with classical music and the fact that Chopin is one of their favorites is dear to the heart of every Pole. The Japanese are a people who is argumentative and tolerant of somebody else's views and, my impression is, they are much gentler than other nationals in defending their standpoint.

Having said this, I cannot help revealing my other opinions of the Japanese.

The first thing I would like to emphasize is the fact that, whether Japan Japan wants it or not, she presently has many responsibilities because of her status in the world. Never before has she held a similar position.

True that, in the past, Japan already had a high-ranking status. At one time, she was militarily perhaps the third largest power in the world. Economically, however, and this in spite of her territories which were larger than the present ones, she was not among the first five most powerful countries. On the per capita basis, she was almost a developing country or, in today's classification, a "newly industrialized country" /NIC/. Japan entered the industrialization era with delay. The same concerns her search for colonies in which search she followed the world fashion of the time - using arms instead of wits and toils. However, she expanded in a fashion hardly matched by anybody.

Paradoxically, when Japan lost the last World War and became "expansionist" by the said wits and toils, she grew to a status of might and dignity never known before. She has been firmly placed among the most developed countries and one can hardly visualize what, short of war, could deprive her of it. There are even chances that this present status of Japan may furthermore improve. Being only second to the US in the non-Communist world, and having an economic potential nearly twice as big as that of the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, willy nilly, has become "somebody" in this world. Hardly nothing, in today's world, is thinkable without Japan's voice. And if, today, that voice may be sounding not too strongly, tomorrow, it can be thunderous.

However, one must also say, that that highly renowned postwar status of Japan has been gained in less than one generation. And almost everybody has been caught by surprise because of that, Japan included. The hard-working and well-organized Japanese, wishing to forget the bitter past, turned their efforts to peaceful work. This was their blessing. The American occupation, dictated not by vengeance, but by the ideals of Democracy and Chris-

tian forgiveness, have only released new forces which had been earlier curbed by excessive state control and militarism. Moreover, thanks to particularly advantageous external conditions, at least until the early 1970's, Japan has dwarfed anything registered by the annals of world economic development.

But successes also pose new dilemmas. The undisputed achievements of Japan have created some serious disproportions in the distribution.

Some people in the world, as well as many Japanese, say that Japan has become an economic giant but, at the same time, is a political and even the more so, military 'dwarf'. That particular word is naturally too pejorative and much exaggerated but, nevertheless, widely repeated.

The political status of Japan in the world is not commensurate to her economic status. Although member of the United Nations Organization, Japan has no permanent membership in the Security Council. This, in itself, excludes her from the 'Big Five' who have veto power.

Japan's voice in the world's political affairs is thus not to her size. Being, economically, the third most important nation in the world, she is not among the five ^{politically} most important nations. The same is true of some other political matters, especially those resulting from alliances. Not being member of any politico-military alliance, such as NATO, and having bilateral treaties quite neutral in nature, she is automatically excluded from the 'great powers' game' which takes place in the world. At best, she is only occasionally consulted and this, not by the main powers.

Military matters look even much worse.

As already mentioned above, Japan became dangerously dependent on her external 'life-lines'. Even because of this very fact, she is obliged to pay more attention to securing her existence. Economic strangling of Japan is easier than that of any other developed country.

Although Japan is the third economic power in the world, she is not even among the first ten military powers. Her defense spending, approximately 1 per cent of her GNP, is almost without precedence in the world because of its insignificance. By all standards, it is too low, but there is a strong internal opposition to revise that share upward, although a movement in this direction exists.

In this field, I am far from not understanding the Japanese. The last war has left deep scars in the Nation's attitudes and one must realize this. Moreover, the victorious Americans were only too eager to make sure that Japan will never again be a military power. Even the new Japanese Constitution was tailored accordingly. Besides, the American defense umbrella has not only worked effectively but, at first, brought even some windfall benefits.

Furthermore, any return, by Japan, to her military might, may still not be too well envisioned by the Americans and the Japanese themselves. It would outrage not only the Soviets but also the Chinese, the North Koreans and even the South Koreans, the Phillippinos, the Indonesians and the Thais, the Taiwanese and surely the Vietnamese. The issue is thus not an easy one.

But, at the same time, it is true that even the most necessary and relatively modest improvements in Japanese defense, more than once carefully screened and thoroughly discussed domestically and with the Americans, face serious political and economic constraints. And they are dangerously delayed. This comes at a time when Soviet Far East forces, the SS-20's including, are rapidly expanding and tension in the Korean Peninsula is growing. Moreover, with American attention diverted to Central America and the Middle East, not saying about growing tensions in the already heavily armed European region, the situation is especially disturbing, if viewed in the broader context.

Yet, many Japanese continue to be almost devout in their attachment to a sometimes ill-conceived peace. Any call of an American warship on a Japanese port, almost always invites angry uproar. Any other defense steps, even legal changes in the country's defenses, meet with road blocks. Many young people consider military service as contemptuous. And many lofty leftists ideas on 'peace' matters have indeed taken deep roots.

Although it is true that Japan is much less leftists than than many developed Western European, as well as some developing, countries, it is equally true that 'anti-war' leftism is stronger in Japan than elsewhere. Japanese Socialists are far more 'anti-war' and anti-American than French Socialists, British laborists nad West German Socio-Democrats. The same is true of Japanese Communists whose attitude on the said matters is in no way comparable to the Italian and even French Communists. 'Doves' are even far more numerous among the Japanese conservatists than elsewhere in the world.

What more, Japanese business circles feel very strongly about separating trade from politics. This feeling is stronger than in Western Europe, not saying about the US.

Japanese mass media and the intellectual community are far more timid in criticizing Communism and the USSR, than is the case with their traditionally liberal counterparts in Western Europe and North America.

Why is it so? Are the Japanese less aware of the dangers posed by Communism and the USSR? Are they less experienced here?

I must admit that I sough the answer to this question more than once, since this very issue is very decisive not only for Japan's future, but also for Freedom and Democracy. I avail myself to deal with it for a while.

Being an impartial outsider, I think I understand some of the Japanese rationales behind the said attitudes.

Japan, many of her countrymen believe, although without saying it openly, can make "better business on peace than on war".

That is definitely true. But if only peace or war were to depend on solely Japan! By not arming herself too much and not offending Communism and the USSR, Japan believes that she may be somehow "left outside" in any future conflict. Yet, any future conflict would be most certainly global, nuclear perhaps. With US presence in Japan, the country is automatically exposed to Soviet blows. Without that presence, however, Japan's freedom and democracy would disappear in a matter of days.

Japan's alternatives are thus limited nowadays. She must chose. There simply exists no third way out. And it would be highly dangerous to attempt its search.

But there is another tacit rationale, too.

The Japanese feel embittered that the treatment they received, during the last world war was too humiliating. The atomic bombs are an important factor here. To a large extent this is also my feeling. There was something of a racial element in this war. On both sides, to be precise. The US had treated even its own Japanese citizens in a way which gets satisfaction only now. US Germans did not get the same treatment, although it was Germany who, like Japan declared war on the US and not vice versa.

US behavior, however, was nothing compared to the Soviet one. The latter, without any pretext at all, and without having transmitted to the US, the Japanese peace suggestions, attacked Japan ferociously. Had the USSR been in the possession of atomic bombs, it would have surely dropped them on Japan. The treatment the Soviets gave to the Japanese POW's has no scale of comparison to the treatment given them by the US. Tens of thousands of Japanese POW's perished in Soviet camps. Those who remained spent years in slave labor and many lost their health.

Unfortunately, in Japan, not enough publicity is given to this. If the US was perhaps provocative by giving Japan the ultimatum which led to war and, if later, it dwelled on the unconditional surrender, then it is also true that there were some reasons behind.

There was nothing of this sort on the Soviet side. Besides this being sheer revenge for the war lost in 1904, it was dictated by purely imperialistic designs. Japan lost the possessed territories not to the US but to the USSR. Hopefully, they are not lost forever, but, for the time being they are in Soviet hands.

The US gave no harsh treatment to the Japanese with the exception of Pre-

mier Tojo and others whom it put on trial. On the contrary, Japan was helped both economically and politically. The latter was an effort to bring her democracy. Japanese traditions were honored, the Emperor's throne was preserved although its prerogatives limited. But then, they have never been too great beforehand. I am more than certain that had the Red Army occupied Japan, the country would be still bleeding for all true and invented acts of the past. Economically, Japan would be living in dire poverty and culturally, she would simply cease to be herself.

Yet, somehow, the Japanese seem to be more emotional about the Americans than about the Russians. Not that they treat the former with more hostility than the latter but they have some sort of a 'complex' before the Americans. This has surely nothing to do with inferiority. It has to do with some kind of pretense that of the Americans one should demand more than of the Soviets and that, what they have done, requires a different yardstick.

But if I understand all that, I still cannot understand where such rationale, shaped on the past, may lead. Where and when does it end? Especially that the Americans themselves have objectively examined their past attitudes towards Japan and have found that they have not always been wise. What else should they say or do? Should they pack up and leave Japan? Perhaps before the last American GI would leave Japan, the Red Army would be already pouring in.

However, I also try to understand the Japanese and to see their problems. Former Prime Minister Fukuda had asked the Americans whether they wanted Japan to be a superpower. They did not answer in the affirmative.

To be a superpower without taking into account certain aspects, would take years, even for such an economic and technological giant as Japan. Nuclear weapons, which Japan could most certainly do by herself, could be a problem for her. Where to make the underground and atmospheric tests? How to test the delivery systems? Japan's tests could trigger off more tests elsewhere and could lead to a preemptive blow from somewhere.

Thus, there should be a 'middle road': not too much and not too little, just as much as is presently necessary. This is perhaps quite a frustrating proposition to many Japanese who cannot see the sense of being 'neither fish nor fowl' in their military status. And one cannot deny logic to this attitude.

But, at the same time, they should rather opt for less, when faced by the 'more or less' alternative. Gone are the years when the US could have both butter and guns. It cannot have both. Not easily at least. When seeing others who are not too preoccupied with their own defenses or even taking advantage of the strained US economy, the US may become frustrated. Either it will

start pulling out from certain areas and shortening the defense perimeters, or it will react otherwise. Protectionism is one possibility. In both cases, others have more to lose than to gain.

Japan is basically right when she says that she desires to promote peace throughout the world and, first of all, the ban on nuclear weapons. No other country is more authorized to seek this. That is true. At the same time, however, we all live in a real world, whose image is unfortunately far from ideal. What worse, it becomes ever more frightening. Only that many people pretend not to see this.

Therefore, mere appeals for peace, if not supported by other actions, may fall on deaf ears. One of such supporting actions is deterrence.

Japan is simply too great and too strong economically to be primarily 'dovish' in her policies. She should not, necessarily be 'hawkish', but a one string violin is no instrument for her to play on. She is too sophisticated for that. And her responsibilities are far too great. I know that Japan understands this perfectly, although somehow, at least until very recently, she refrained from saying this openly.

I fully sympathize with all Japanese official pledges that Japan's contribution to the fight against totalitarianism is her contribution to the assistance for the developing countries. That is a very timely and noble action and should be pursued as energetically as possible. The contests between Freedom and Democracy on the one hand and Totalitarianism on the other, is not only confined to military affairs. The contemporary world is far more complicated than that.

But I would be dishonest if I would not say that this alone is not the most effective way of fighting Totalitarianism. The latter has become simply too aggressive. Moreover, it has practically got away with impunity. Whether this concerns its conquests in South-East Asia, Africa, Afghanistan and Central America or an unprecedented Soviet military build-up, the military crack-down in Poland and the unrelented fight against dissidence in the USSR, the signs are clear and ominous. Totalitarianism is on the offensive and accelerates its tempo. For this simple reason, Freedom and Democracy must, unfortunately, make choices between long-run and short-run objectives. It seems that the latter should be preferred. There are certain emergencies nowadays and they should be dealt with countervailing emergencies.

These are painful choices. That's true. But, unfortunately, one does not always do what one pleases but what one must do.

I should still like to say more.

The moral side of the problem is far more important than all the cold calculations based on certain qualitative factors.

The world, despite all its religious and humanitarian attitudes, has never been too strong in its moral posture. There have always been many 'rationales' compromising the truly moral codes. And Mankind has never been free of all sorts of man-made horrors. With the progress of civilization, paradoxically enough, those horrors have become even more frightening. And, for the first time, in Man's history the very existence of Mankind is threatened by Man himself. This very fact calls for a basic revision of all human behaviors. One c a n n o t simply tolerate any 'rationales' which are based only on sheer violence and lies. Any complacency about their existence c a n n o t be tolerated either. If the world is really to survive, then it must reject violence and lies and abide only by tolerance and compromise. Nothing less than that. If, in the past, certain acts could be somehow tolerated, or even explained, they c a n n o t be so any longer.

Mankind has accumulated too much experience and all truly moral principles are so universally known that one cannot claim ignorance as to the meaning of words and acts. Everything is known and everybody knows it. Even in the least developed countries. And what to say about those with old civilizations? What about those who are sophisticated? Can they claim ignorance?

Yet, it is true that Totalitarianism, mostly Communist and mostly Soviet-style, does not only exist but claims to be the 'future of Mankind' and 'scientific'. It is definitely on the march threatening even to use force to further its cause. Like in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Poland or El Salvador. It does not shy away from nuclear blackmail. And all this takes place already after another brand of totalitarianism had already been judged and put on trial at Nuremberg.

I myself broke with Totalitarianism because of my moral revulsion. There simply exists limits of tolerance to violence and lies. These limits are especially demanded of those whose intellectual level and simple human integrity are expected to exist. Such people are o b l i g e d to understand certain words and deeds, if Mankind is to survive. If crime and cheating are to be endlessly tolerated, whether because of sheer cynicism, egoism or even fear, then the days of Mankind are counted. Or, at least before the turn of this century, we may be living in an Orwellian world, not worthy of Man. Our load of knowledge and experience is far too big for this to happen. The contemporary world is not ruled by small children or hopeless ignorants.

However, with such an obvious state of affairs, it is quite disturbing that many people throughout the world, Japan included, continue to belittle the dangers posed by Totalitarianism. They naively believe that, in fact, it is not as bad as that or that it may gradually mature and turn into a

truly humane civilization. Only that it shall devour anything lying on its way.

May I say that I have always wanted to believe precisely in such an evolution, although not through devouring of others. And, finally, my belief was frustrated all the way down. Nobody can say that I was impatient. For 36 years, 3 months and 3 days, i.e. as long as I stayed in the Communist movement, not only did I try to believe in 'positive changes', but I myself tried to make them. All this only to realize, in the end, that these 'positive changes' which had definitely taken place, were one day rolled back. And there is no perspective of returning to the already existing situation.

Communism and the USSR have not changed for better. They have degenerated even more. What could have once been considered as folly, utopia or sheer ignorance, cannot any longer be considered as such.

Communism, a 'scientific' ideology, has had a lot of occasions in the last 66 years to prove, in practice, how good it can make its promises. Instead, it proved, beyond any doubt, that its truths are myths.

Strange is this 'scientificity' of Communism, when its last 'scientist', Lenin, died almost 60 years ago and his 'scientific discoveries' never went beyond sheer terror used for the creation of a totalitarian state ruled by a monoparty system.

That is practically the only truth which remains valid in 'scientific Socialism'. All the rest is composed of myths. Communist society is neither classless nor egalitarian, neither does the proletariat rule, nor are the people rewarded according to their work nor will they soon be rewarded according to their needs. 'Communism does not beat Capitalism with higher productivity' and it is not free of crises, as Poland's example vividly demonstrated.

Moreover, nothing has been left of other 'higher values'. Chauvinism and nationalism continue. So does aggression, recently even against other Communist countries.

Material life in Communist countries remains in no relation to labor inputs and the standard of living is disproportionately low compared to the level of industrialization and natural resources' endowment. The highly advertised spiritual life is even more miserable. People living under Communism do not know their own history or that of others. They read, see and listen what is to be read, seen and listened to. Crime is rampant although it was supposed to disappear. What worse new kinds of crimes have been established, especially those of the Party and State against the individuals.

Massive evidence has been gathered to support the above. Nobody can say that he or she does not know what real Communism is in fact. Not be-

believing revelations concerning it is by no means an excuse. That is even not naiveté, but simply bad will or, crime by association. And those who participate in the Communist movement, especially if the circumstances do not force them to do this, cannot even claim that they do not know what they are doing.

I myself knew what I was doing. Had I lived in free and democratic Poland, I would have probably never joined the Communist movement. But I did and I do not try to belittle my own responsibility for that. Although, in my understanding, at least, I did more good than bad to Poland. And yet, it is true that many people could have thought otherwise.

Thus, each human being with some intellect, or even simple integrity, cannot claim that he or she does not know what Communism is about and this, in spite of all the attractiveness of its slogans and promises. Moreover, Communism, nowadays, is not merely an ideology alone. This would be by far a lesser evil. What Mankind actually witnesses is state Communism, mainly in the form of the USSR. And, because of that, the matter is far more serious. Aggressive and simplistic ideology, combined with traditional Russian imperialism and the USSR's vast and various resources, supplemented by those of the countries under Soviet domination, pose a formidable threat to Freedom and Democracy. And Japan is thus endangered.

As I have said, this is a very serious matter. I know not only Communism but also the Soviets. From my very childhood. I heard about the Soviets even from the accounts of my father who fought them in 1920. In July 1944, I saw Soviet paratroopers, still later, in January 1945, I could observe the Red Army. And ever since, I saw the Soviets almost incessantly. I travelled several times to the USSR and had very close official and personal relations with many Soviets. In the years 1977-1979, I was even in the Soviet "think tank", composed also of East Europeans, with the exception of Rumanians, Cubans and Mongols. During the meetings, the discussions concerned the means of advancing Communist and Soviet interests throughout the world.

Having thus both experiences behind me, I can speak with some authority on the issue of Communism and Soviet imperialism. And I think I will not offend the Japanese, when I will occasionally make some references to them, in this context.

Communism, without its Soviet fortress, would have most probably disintegrated long ago, or would have been preached by some lunatics only and so, dismissed as an innocent human folly.

Unfortunately, the matters did not go this way. The Communist revolution in Russia has devoured tens of millions of lives. It scared the Germans who, being afraid of Communism, fell into the Nazi trap. The Nazis, toge-

ther with the Soviets, pushed the world towards World War II. There is much evidence supporting the view that had Stalin not played the fool with France and England and not signed the pact with Hitler, the latter might have not attacked Poland and conflagrated World War II, something for which Stalin himself had paid in new millions of Soviet lives /though this was probably far from bothering him/. The Second World War alerted the US and hence her ultimatum to Japan and Japan's response in Pearl Harbour. Yet, Stalin's mockery paid off.

The victorious USSR took half of Europe, half of Korea, destroyed, en route, the Japanese armies in Manchuria strengthening thus the Chinese Communists, who later took over China. This was done, to be sure, at the cost of tens of millions of lives.

After entering Europe and conquering new lands, some of them being Japanese, the USSR rose to the status of a superpower. Thanks to that, it has challenged Freedom and Democracy throughout the world. It was the USSR who was behind the Korean war. It provided equipment and other assistance which led to the war's stalemate. In fact, it is also the USSR who was behind the US defeat in Indochina and behind the millions of lives lost in result. The USSR, together with its Cuban satellite, is behind the seizures of power by Communist puppets in Angola, Mozambique and Ethiopia. The Soviets also back SWAPO, Gadhafi and various turbulences in Africa. Further, the crisis in the Middle East and that in Central America are also fomented by the USSR. The blackmail of Western Europe with nuclear and conventional-chemical assault forces comes from the Soviet Union. Because of this, Western Europe is virtually indefensible without strong American nuclear deterrence. The same blackmail is now being applied towards Japan.

And finally, it is the Soviet Union who, in December 1979, swept into Afghanistan. For the first time, it committed an aggression beyond its immediate zone of domination. The Vietnamese were pushed, by the USSR, to attack Cambodia and, perhaps, one day, it will also push them to attack some other countries. And, last but not least, it is the USSR which, by refusing to negotiate responsibly on any arms reduction and control, has pushed Mankind towards the waste of resources. In the whole postwar period, this waste has already attained trillions of dollars which are so necessary elsewhere. In a world where most of Mankind lives below decent human standards such a drain on economy is simply a criminal act.

Thus, one cannot be indifferent to what the Soviets say or do. With one hand, they sign the Helsinki Accords and, with the other, they put behind bars all those who want to monitor these very accords in the USSR. What duplicity!

The Soviets, whose behavior has been that much convincingly unmasked by a multitude of witnesses many of whom are from the USSR itself, like A.Solzhenitsyn, V.Pukovski and others, must be closely watched. They are armed with most lethal weapons and have, by no means, produced any sort of evidence which would prove that they will not use them one day. All 14 arms agreements signed by them until this day, have been summarily violated. How then, can one believe them?

Therefore, all responsible people, throughout the world, have the duty to be vigilant. And this means that they have to be vigilant today, for tomorrow may be too late. One can only regret that this vigilance was hardly existent yesterday and that even today, it is dubious. Some people still try to defy hard facts and naively believe in something which does not exist!

The Japanese living in the world's second biggest and viable democracy in the world have special responsibilities to this end. I do not think that I offend them when I say this frankly. I would never say this if I were not somewhat concerned about the state of affairs in Japan.

Let me return again to Japan's defenses which are such a touchy problem for most of the Japanese. I have earlier said that I understood all the uneasiness of Japan on this issue. Yet, it is true that Japan's contribution to the defense of Freedom and Democracy is somewhat too modest.

I know only too well that Japan's budget is highly deficitary and any increased defense spendings could further upset it. At the same time, I also know that the issue is virtually negligible in money terms. Between what Japan does and what she could do, according to Japanese defense experts, the gap is of only several hundred millions of dollars annually. This means that only a minuscule fraction of the GNP is involved here.

Without offending anybody, I simply cannot understand how it is that Japan's economy cannot carry such a minuscule extra burden. From my own observations, I can tell that those disputed funds are rather easily obtainable. Once I say this, I should be more specific. In this respect, I see at least two sources where only some economics could close the matter.

One concerns the lavish receptions so much frequent in Japan. The hosting business community dwarfs anything I have ever seen elsewhere in the world. As far as I know, the funds spent on such occasions, naturally tax deductible, surpass those spent for defense. These receptions, whose commercial effectiveness seems a bit questionable, to me, and which seem to contrast with overall life styles in Japan, have always made me gasp. Their splendor would suffer no way, if only their costs were cut by 10 per cent. I think that over 1 billion dollars could be saved in this way.

The same is true of subsidies on agriculture. The fact that Japan must have her own agriculture is beyond any doubt. That this agriculture must be subsidized is also true. But, it is also true that surpluses of rice become chronic and cost too much. Moreover, with the present way of subsidizing them, no perspectives of settling the issue seem to be valid. A cut of 10 per cent in subsidies would, in fact, not change the present state of affairs, but would yield a significant amount of money. Added to other cuts in agricultural subsidies, this would mean another 1 billion dollars in savings.

The two above reductions in spendings, could more than settle the most urgent needs of Japan's defense. Especially that the latter seem most reasonable. More interceptors, better equipment and ammunition depots for ground forces as well as effective patrolling of sea-lanes in North-Western Pacific, are not exaggerated defense demands. In fact, they only raise the ''nuclear threshold'', making it possible to beat off the Soviet conventional attack by conventional means and, without recourse, by the US, to nuclear weapons at the initial stage of the conflict. This is also in the best interest of Japan. Not saying that, once Japan has self-defense forces, they should be credible. This makes sense in purely economic terms even.

I am sorry to have gone into some details, but this was only because I felt that I was obliged to be more specific once I had expressed my general views. As far as I know the Japanese, they do not like idle talk and demand that the views presented to them be concrete. In a very limited way, I had to comply to this demand. Otherwise, generalizations could only invite ambiguities. Still, there is another delicate matter on which I rather hesitate to speak openly.

It concerns counterintelligence services in Japan.

In the past, Japan was a superpower both in intelligence and in counterintelligence. When it comes to the latter, the ''Sorge case'' is much to the point here. However, in the postwar period, because of a rather small emphasis on the country's defense and a weakly developed production of combat equipment, Japan played down the importance of her counterintelligence. And then, for years, Japan's science and technology, in general, were rather a repetition of discoveries made elsewhere and thus, did not demand any special protection.

Nowadays, the situation does not resemble the past. Japan became the second largest economic and scientific-technological power in the non-Communist world. And, although it is true that Japan's war industry is rather marginal and that the country does not produce nuclear weapons, it is still true that many genuinely Japanese technologies are leading in the world.

And the border between ''peaceful'' and ''war'' technology is very flexible to say the least.

When it comes to electronics, which are virtually the backbone of modern weaponry, Japan is the world leader in many electronic items and even in whole branches of this field. The US itself is seeking Japan's assistance in this domain.

The same is true of certain new composite materials, optics, biochemistry and many other things known as ''high technologies''. Even in purely traditional products, the Japanese have made many improvements which have clear significance in war materiel.

Because of that, Japan turned into a spot of intense interest for Soviet and Soviet satellite intelligence services. Although I myself was not involved in any operations of this kind in Japan, almost all my Embassy staff members were. And four of my diplomats were professionals in this domain. That amounted to almost half of my staff.

As far as I know, Japan was considered to be a ''heaven'' for intelligence activities. Their main interest lay in Japan's high technologies with electronics on the first position.

Intelligence of all kinds is widely practiced throughout the world and there is nothing special about this profession which seems to be one of the oldest. Yet, the intelligence services of totalitarian countries, especially of Communist ones, with the Soviet and Soviet-controlled intelligence services first of all, are something special in this respect.

Firstly, no democratic country can match those services whether it comes to their numerous strength, resources or ruthlessness in methods of operation. Those services, over which no public control exists, are virtually ''a state inside the state'' and, because of that, they are sinister in nature.

Secondly, they wage a total war on Freedom and Democracy. Their very objective is to weaken and destroy both in all possible ways. All walks of life of free and democratic countries are of interest to those services. And, this in itself, has something extremely evil to it.

When it comes to the USSR, its intelligence services are the world's largest and most effective. A lot of evidence exists to support the above and I do not intend to repeat known facts.

However, what I should like to repeat is the well-known fact that the Soviet and Soviet-controlled intelligence services widely use official foreign service for that purpose, whether it is a diplomatic staff, foreign based correspondents or trade, maritime and airline representatives. All such official services play the role of a cover for intelligence operations.

When it comes to Japan, during my stay there, the Soviet diplomatic staff, in the Tokyo Embassy only, counted 55 people, not saying about the non-diplomatic staff. It was the fourth largest diplomatic staff in Japan, after the US, Korea and China. Very likely, it could have been the largest, had the Japanese authorities not resisted its enlargement. But still, it is very impressive, only slightly behind the Chinese and not far behind the Koreans. Only the American staff was almost twice as big as the Soviet one, but then, US-Japan relations are by far more developed and universal than the Soviet-Japanese ones.

It is well known though, that the Soviet intelligence services, i.e. the KGB and the GRU /military intelligence/, control also the respective services of the satellite countries. And the number of diplomatic staff members in the Soviet satellite embassies in Tokyo, i.e. of Poland, the GDR, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Cuba, Mongolia, South Yemen, Nicaragua, Vietnam, Laos and Ethiopia /even of Afghanistan although officially not listed/, was 106 at the time of my assignment. Together with the Soviet diplomatic staff this was the largest diplomatic entity, tightly-knit and manipulated by one totalitarian superpower, that is, the USSR.

Naturally, not all of these staff members were intelligence officers, but I would say that their majority was. As I have already mentioned, four of my diplomatic staff members, were professional intelligence officers. They were :Mr. Janusz Omietanski, officially Second Secretary, in fact Resident of the MSW /Ministry of Internal Affairs, equivalent of the Soviet KGB/; Mr. Wiesław Matera, officially First Secretary dealing with ''scientific and technological cooperation'' but, in fact, full-time MSW operational; the same was true of Mr. Leszek Kotelski, officially Assistant Commercial Attaché; Mr. Zygfryd Drozd, officially First Secretary, in fact, Military Attaché. Almost all other members of my staff were associated with either of the above intelligence services.

I can guess, relying on the Polish experience, that the same was true in the Soviet and Soviet satellite embassies.

After I had left Japan, the staff members in my former Embassy, have also changed. But these changes could be rather taxed as strange. The new Commercial Counsellor is, at the time of this writing /May 3, 1983/, Mr. Andrzej Fabijański, once a professional at the MSW, later its part time operational who, in my times, was in Tokyo as Commercial Attaché. He now returned to resume his former ''duties''. So did Mr. Piotr Karsz, presently Commercial Attaché, collaborating, in my times, with the MSW as staff member of the Commercial Counsellor.

There is little trade now, between Poland and Japan, still, some people

keep coming to the Polish Embassy as its staff members. Most certainly, they are not there to promote trade.

I cannot say very much on how effective the Japanese couterintelligence measures are but, my limited experience with police organs, just prior to my defection, during it and even later, leads me to the conclusion that they are 'far behind the requirements'. I would prefer to avoid some details, but I can only say that some of my conclusions would be somewhat disturbing to the said organs.

At any rate, the counter-intelligence service needs 20-30 full-time agents to watch effectively only one foreign intelligence officer. Sometimes, it can be less or more, but a foreign country with some secrets to guard, must spend a lot of money and employ very dedicated and highly skilled counter-intelligence officers to combat effectively foreign intelligence operations.

As I already said, these operations are a common thing nowadays. Poland was once a power in this resoect. But, at that time, Poland was a free country and was defending her independence. Many Polish intelligence officers were thus dedicated to the cause. But this is not true any longer. Poland, as other Soviet satellite countries, wages intelligence operations not in her own interest but in that of the Soviet Union. And, since the Soviet interests are imperialistic and anti-democratic, then all the countries in the shpere of Soviet intelligence interests should defend themselves as much as they can. They must remember that, here, the USSR does not act alone.

Knowing the extreme efficiency of Soviet and Soviet-controlled intelligence services, I can only say that Japan m u s t undertake certain energetic actions, if she does not want to be the main 'supplier' of various technological secrets to the USSR. One day, she and other democratic countries, may pay dearly for certain negligencies.

There are no jokes in this resoect.

And, once again, I am sorry for saying this point-blank.

Japan's responsibilities before Mankind are simply too great and, although, she realizes this, in general, she should perhaps recognize this in particular also. But, my observations do not end here.

I have many more of them and I shall not hesitate to share them with my Japanese Readers.

My impression of Japan's world role has always been that, quite simply, that she has been 'too timid and gentle'. This is understandable in the light of certain known historical facts and experiences but, nowadays, the world has become more dichotonic than ever and the nations and their representatives, are almost obliged to take sides and speak out their views very frank-

ly and firmly.

I observed Japan's activities on international forums from very close, mostly in the United Nations. I have always been stricked by the fact that the Japanese delegations were perhaps the strongest in number. But Japan's voice was in no proportion to Japan's world posture and the strength of her delegation.

Naturally, I could understand many rationales behind this. Japan is included into the 'rich club' and, as such, she is Western in her categorization. Automatically, this poses some problems when it comes to the dealings with developing countries, whose importance in Japan's trade is obvious. The same is true concerning the Communist countries. Not risking to antagonize any of them, Japan avoids more heated disputes. Especially, that she is not without problems with her partners of the 'rich club'.

But all that makes Japan hardly heard on the international forum where, all rhetoric apart, the conflict between Freedom and Democracy on the one hand and Totalitarianism on the other, rages in full gear. Unfortunately, the former do not always have the upper hand. In part, this is also Japan's fault. I think Japan could do more in this respect. She has all the prerequisites for that. Her voice is weighty. If only it were bolder.

One must remember that, as of now, Japan is the only truly democratic country with fantastic economic and scientific achievements, that is not of the 'Euro-American stock'. In a world which, itself, is predominantly non-Euro-American, this is particularly important. Japan's experiences, values and even real might, may serve as a solid basis for her various recommendations to others. Japan has no reason to be too modest about her achievements. Many could genuinely learn from her and, and in a world which is so often victim to various false promises and lofty solutions, Japan's authoritative voice can be of a tremendous countervailing force and value. In this connection, I have to make another observation.

As it is known, Japan does not grant political asylum. She has many good reasons for that. Also, many people, mainly from outside of Asia, would perhaps even not seek political asylum in Japan for many reasons. Yet, the very fact that such a big and powerful democracy does not grant political asylum is, in itself, disturbing. Especially, if it is dictated by political considerations. I think the Japanese should think about that, And what, if one day, they themselves should fall to Communism? Would many Japanese not seek political asylum elsewhere, in democratic countries? And what then, should those countries say?

Human misery, especially if caused by political oppression is something not to be taken lightly in the contemporary world. Man's fortunes are not

granted. They change and, sometimes, most irrationally. Nobody is too wise or too stupid here. One is only more or less fortunate. But, when touching Man's fortunes we, the Poles, have great experience in this very field.

I think it is my duty to explain to many Japanese certain basic facts at least, because, otherwise, many of my above views could be considered as biased or even exaggerated, especially when it comes to the views on the USSR and even Russia.

To be honest, I meet many people who think Poles are specially embittered with the USSR and, for that reason, not objective in their criticism of that country. I also met such people in Japan. Some were indifferent because they hardly knew anything on the subject. Or, and this was worse, they knew but wrongly. Although this is still not clearly perceived by many, Communist and Soviet propaganda, sometimes unintentionally aided by many ignorants in the Free World, have done a lot of harm not only to the Poles, but to the Free World itself. This distorted picture of Poland is also one of the reasons for which I am presently living in the United States and not in Poland.

But then, let me say a few words about Russia herself. Since many people think the Poles are obsessed with Russia and that their feelings are strongly anti-Russian. I should like to develop on this,

The truth is that, the Poles being ethnically classified as Slavs, just as are the Russians, they nevertheless have a true difficulty in finding a common language with the latter. Even the similarity between the two languages is of no help, here. The differences are enormous. Russia is basically what one could call The Christianized Tartar Empire, an "Eastern culture", as such. Because of strong authoritarianism, Russia has never had any outstanding intellectual culture.

Russian history is very complex and has no equivalent among other European nations to whom Russia claims to belong.

Russian mentality or the "Russian nature" is perhaps the most complex. Its existence is undeniable and it distinguishes the Russians from practically everybody else in this world. It is the mold of various intersecting civilizations, of the Orthodox Church and the boundless Russian plains.

Some knowledgeable people say that the Russians fell victim to the immensity of their territory. They add that Russian despotism was a direct result of this. The organization of vast territories and their absorption allegedly encouraged despotism.

Whether this is the only explanation is debatable but, the fact is that, the Russian state has always been something sacrosanct and hardly had an equivalent anywhere else. Even some Russian historians of the pre-Bolshevik

era would say that the more the Russian State grew in power, the more sickly the "Russian nature" became. At any rate, the Russians have developed certain characteristics such as dogmatism, ascetism, the ability to endure and make sacrifices which, with time, led even to the emergence of an apocalyptic world vision and to nihilism. Still later, it led to "revolutionism" where Communism or rather Bolshevism took the strongest roots. The Russians believe in their "Marxist mission" as they had once believed in their "Third Rome mission".

Therefore, understanding the Russians, or the Soviet Russians, now, is not an easy task for anybody. Their perceptions and reactions are different. They are highly suspicious of all others, very sensitive when it comes to their "interests" which, for many, are difficult to understand and are, otherwise, quite uncommunicative despite occasional outbursts of frankness and sincerity.

Thus, many do not know the Russians and, on certain occasions, are easily cheated by them. Moreover, the Russians, especially the Soviet Russians, are almost sickly when they try to whiten themselves and blacken everybody else. Unfortunately, they have mastered the ways of cheating the others to such an extent that they should be even admired for this. Just as the others should be blamed for their naiveté.

Returning now to my living in the United States, I must only blame that naiveté on the others. Why? Well, it was simply believed that Poland had to be given to the USSR to serve as its "bulwark". Both the US and the UK capitulated to the pressure of Stalin in Tehran and later Yalta, and they presented Poland and Eastern Europe to the USSR.

President Roosevelt, upon his return from Yalta, when speaking before the joint session of the Congress on March 1, 1945, said: "...Poland was a corridor through which Russia was invaded throughout the centuries". President Roosevelt "bought" Stalin's "historical" justification to devour Poland. But he could not know Poland's or Russia's history, although his advisers should have. Now, that is four decades after this, I often hear the repetition of this "argument". In the United States it is even advanced by historians and political scientists.

President Roosevelt might have had some political interest in saying the above but, why should others? Where is their scientific objectivity and sheer human integrity?

M. Rakowski, Vice-Premier in Jaruzelski's regime, when interviewed last year, in February, by Oriana Falacci, the renowned Italian journalist, also repeated Stalin's argument and she did not react. She simply did not know Polish history!

And since my country and I myself, have dearly paid for this lie of Stalin which still escapes its unmasking, I think I am obliged to warn everybody of similar lies. Because some other countries may be falling victim, as Poland did, to Soviet imperialism.

Moreover, what prompted me to speak of this subject was the lecture of an article in The Washington Post / April 24, 1983/. The article concerned the interview Andropov gave to the West German magazine, Der Spiegel.

Asked about the Soviet presence in Afghanistan, he explained :'' As soon as there are guarantees that outside political interference will not occur again, we will immediately withdraw our troops.'' This is more than shocking. Once, Stalin claimed that Poland had to be his, because she was the ''corridor'' of invasions against Russia. Now, Andropov is raising other demands. Soviet troops jumped on Afghanistan and will not leave this country before guarantees against ''outside political interference'' are not obtained by the USSR! He even did not bother to explain what he meant under the term ''political interference'' and who should give these guarantees! But, it seems that, before he gets them, he has the right to proceed with the carnage of the valiant Afghan people!

He even went further, adding that, since the USSR maintains a ''big mutual frontier'' it is not indifferent to ''what kind of Afghanistan it will be.''

This is still more shocking. For, anybody who has ''mutual frontiers'' with the USSR, must reckon with Soviet interference! And all the frontiers of the Soviet empire added, plus sea and perhaps air space, are the longest in the world! Japan is by no means an exception. After all, the Soviet frontier runs only a couple of miles from the Japanese coast. And the USSR may, one day, be ''not indifferent about what kind of Japan there is.'' But what is the most disturbing is the fact that the whole world does not raise its voice and throw back into Andropov's face such appalling ''arguments''. More than 3 million Afghans were driven out of their own country, tens of thousands were killed, some of whom died of poisonous gas, and all this because the USSR cannot be ''indifferent'' to the kind of neighbour it has!

For this reason, I think I am obliged to present briefly, to the Japanese, the Polish case. In a general sense, it is not only Polish. Poland is not isolated although, as of now, she is the main victim of Soviet imperialism.

Historically speaking, the situation is the following.

In 966 Poland, situated at that time on nearly the same territories as today, adopted Christianity. From that moment the Polish State began its official existence. Russia, as such, did not exist at that time with the exception of the so-called Kievan Rus', with which Poland was occasionally

at wars. It was nevertheless Lithuania, not Poland, who acquired several Kievian lands. In 1386 Polish Queen Jadwiga was married to the Great Duke of Lithuania who adopted Christianity and, becoming King of Poland took the name of Władysław Jagiełło. Gradually, a Polno-Lithuanian Commonwealth was created and it even stretched to the Black Sea. Such a territory had never belonged to the Kievian Rus'.

In 1634 that Commonwealth had some 10 million people. Russia as such, who, in the meantime, had come into existence, had also some 10 million people. The areas were accordingly around 1 million square kilometers and 1,5 million kilometers, although, by the end of the 16th century a Russian expedition showed up at the Pacific coast.

As it was normal in those times, Poland was at war with Russia, just as she was with Turkey, Sweden, the German States, the Teutonic Order and others.

The first Russian complaint that Poland was a "corridor" for invasions of Russia which came from the West concerns the Polish occupation of Moscow in 1610.

The truth is that Russia was, in the years 1609-1619, in the so-called "Time of Troubles" when dynastic disputes were tearing her apart. It happened that, at that time, Poland was trying to regain Smolensk, lost earlier to Russia. When the siege of Smolensk was laid by hetman S. Żółkiewski, Moscow's boyars asked Żółkiewski to rush to Moscow and "put an end to the anarchy." Żółkiewski reluctantly did what they asked. Poland had no plans at all of conquering Russia. At the head of a small contingent, Żółkiewski entered Moscow unopposed on August 27, 1610. He was most cordially welcomed and the Moscovites wanted the Polish king's son, Władysław IV, as their king. But, the Polish king, Zygmunt III Waza, did not approve this idea. Żółkiewski returned from Moscow, leaving, in the Kremlin, only a small garrison. The times changed, the garrison capitulated on October 22, 1612 and nearly half of it was slaughtered.

The second complaint concerns the Swedish king Charles XII who, allegedly, thanks to the "Polish corridor", invaded Russia in 1709. The fact was that Poland, Sweden and Russia contested, for years on end, for the lands of Livonia, which were later known as Estonia nad Latvia. Because of that, it was Poland who was invaded by Charles XII in 1702 /the Northern War 1702-1719/. Bogged down for 7 years in Poland and harassed by the Russians who, at that time were exceptionally siding with the Poles, he decided to turn on them. But, constantly attacked in the rears by the Poles, he was beaten by Peter the Great, the Russian Tsar, at Poltava in 1709. And Russia pushed to the Baltic. Poland continued the war with the Swedes and became so exhausted by it that, from 1717 she began falling under Russian "protection"

which ended with the 3 partitions of Poland and the loss of independence in 1795. This state of things lasted for 123 years.

Whether Russia should complain about the ''Polish corridor'' is more than debatable. She gained a lot on it.

The third complaint goes to Napoleon's march on Moscow in 1812, through the ''Polish corridor''. At that time, Napoleon was at wars with all the kings of Europe. In 1805 he took Vienna. The Russians, who occupied most of Poland at that time / the rest was occupied by the Prussians and the Austrians/ rushed to the help of Austria through occupied Poland. So, the ''corridor'' was used but by the Russians. However, on December 5, 1805, they were all beaten by Napoleon in Austerlitz.

The next year, Napoleon beat Prussia at Yena and took Berlin. His armies moved into occupied Poland. It must be added that, in those years, although Poland was not on the map, Polish legions fought under Napoleon everywhere and he praised their valiance. But, Napoleon did not want to restore Poland's independence. Instead, he proposed a deal to Alexander I, the Russian Tsar, by which, the latter would not only retain the already held territories, but would be given even those held by the Prussians. Because of his loyalty to Prussia, the Tsar declined the offer. Later, Napoleon changed his mind and, in September 1812, together with the Poles, he moved against Russia. By December 1812, the campaign was over. Napoleon lost. Four fifth of the 100 thousand strong Polish army was lost when guarding the rear of Napoleon's retreat.

The campaign took place because of Russia's rejection of Napoleon's offer. Why should the Poles be held for guilty because of that? This will remain a mystery.

The next complaint concerns World War I. As known Poland did not officially exist at that time. Russia, because of the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia declared war on Austria and Germany. And Germany declared war on Russia on August 1, 1914. The German General Staff believed that Russia may launch the war by 1917 and crush Germany. Therefore, the Germans rushed with a preemptive blow, using as pretext Russia's war on Austria. But, in reality, it was Russia who launched the offensives Westward. However, the Germans and the Austrians beat them off consecutively and German armies penetrated deep into Ukraine, which was part of Russia.

Why should the Poles be guilty for that remains a mystery. Russia had more troops, with some 600 thousand Poles taken from the occupied territories /my grandfather was among them/, than Austria and Germany combined. And that, in spite of this, they were beaten is hardly the fault of the Poles.

Another complaint was about Pilsudski's march on Kiev in 1920. I already

mentioned this in the previous Chapter and I would not want to repeat myself.

And then, there is World War II. Actually, it was the USSR who encouraged Hitler to attack Poland. Together with him, it partitioned the country. The USSR took also the Baltic States, part of Pomerania and attacked Finland.

And that later, it had a deaf ear to the warnings from all sides and was surprised by Hitler's attack, is none of Poland's guilt. The Soviets should be simply ashamed of raising such ''complaints''.

But these were exactly the ''arguments'' behind Stalin's demand to do away with the ''Polish corridor''. And, unfortunately, these ''arguments'' were bought. I wonder whether the Western powers really believed that they themselves could ever attack the USSR through this very ''Polish corridor''. I doubt it. Whatever the case, Stalin's cheat is grave in consequences. The Red Army is now on the Elbe River. Western Europe, especially after France had left NATO, lacks operational depth to beat off the Warsaw Pact assault.

Far grimmer than that is the fact that, now, the ''Polish corridor'' and the Polish troops may be actually used against the Free World. The Polish armed forces, integrated with the Red Army, are the third largest in Europe, after the Soviet and West German ones.

They are offensive-oriented. In case of Soviet conventional-chemical assault over the German North Plain, their combat mission will be to conquer Northern Germany, Denmark, the Netherlands and perhaps part of Belgium. The ''Polish corridor'' is to be used by 34 Soviet divisions to march through it from behind the Bug River and so, add to the thrust of the said offensive. They may be bombarded even by nuclear warheads. Both Poland and the Polish divisions may thus perish in a matter of days and all this, for Soviet imperialistic designs.

Such is the result of yielding to Soviet ''historical arguments''.

And, how many more similar cheatings will the Soviets do? How long will they be tolerated? Hasn't the world learned anything from the experiences of Poland and others?

Andropov's ''arguments'' on Afghanistan are most ominous. They cannot be easily bypassed. The Japanese should also think twice on what he said. Poland's and Afghanistan's mementos c a n n o t go into oblivion. Because, soon, new ones may take place, perhaps even more sinister in nature.

The ''mutual frontiers'' of the Soviet Union, as defined by Andropov, are very long indeed and all those who are close to them should hardly sleep peacefully. They may awaken one morning only to see the Red Army pouring in.

As a Pole, I have something else to add. Many Poles perished of Soviet hands, as I have already mentioned in previous Chapters. The Poles do not seek any revenge because of that. Those Soviets who were responsible for

these deaths are themselves dead. But, one cannot take lightly the fact that, not only does the USSR not admit any guilt in this respect, but it even tries to accuse the others of perpetrating certain crimes.

This is a very bad omen. People who do not admit their crimes can repeat them at any moment. Let me return to Katyń where some 4.3 thousand Polish officers were murdered by the Soviets in April-May 1940. Another 7-11 thousand are still to be found.

The Soviets claim the crime had been committed by the Germans in July 1944. That is totally untrue. Even the Soviets themselves dropped this charge during the Nuremberg Trial. The Polish regime does not mention Katyń at all. The two encyclopedias edited in Warsaw omit simply the entry ''Katyń''. The regime knows very well who had committed the crime, but being a Soviet puppet, it cannot say this openly. Neither can it accuse the Germans in order not to outrage the people.

Nevertheless, the Polish regime used to send the Polish Military Attaché stationed in Moscow, to Katyń to lay a wreath before the Soviet-built monument which accuses the Germans of the crime.

And the Soviets didn't even like that. Although the cemetery is in the ''Byelorussian Soviet Republic'', it has been, as an enclave, incorporated in to the ''Russian Republic''. Since even Communist diplomats cannot travel freely throughout the USSR without Soviet permission, the Polish Military Attaché cannot even go to Katyń now. The Russians say that they cannot give permission to go to that particular place in Byelorussia. And the Byelorussians, in Minsk, say that they cannot give permission to go to Katyń because it is Russian territory!

Thus, nobody can go to Katyń anymore!

However, Soviet duplicity goes further than that. To confuse world opinion, the Soviets lead tourists to a village in Byelorussia, whose inhabitants, mostly Poles, by the way, had been murdered by the Germans. The true name of the village is Hatyn, as spelled in Russian. But for the Westerners they changed it for Khatyn. And those Westerners confuse now Katyń with Khatyn and so visit the place. Even President Nixon was led by his Soviet guests to Khatyn and somehow he went without commenting the obvious hoax.

But the most disturbing fact here is that the Soviets seem to believe themselves that by such shallow cheatings they may make people forget the truth about Katyń.

They may be sure that at least over 50 million Poles, in Poland proper and in diaspora, will never forget Katyń!

With the above explanations, I hope nobody can reproach to me any anti-

Sovietism or anti-Russian feelings. I only explain certain events which should be known for the good of the Soviets and the Russians themselves.

When it comes to myself, I cannot say that I did not like many Soviets and Russians, despite the fact that I knew very well how much harm they did to us without any obvious reason. But personal contacts are quite a different thing.

There are some 145 million Russians and this constitutes more than a half of the USSR's population. They are bigger than any other nation in Europe, the third largest in Asia and the fifth in the whole world. But bigness and even undisputed contributions to the "bank of knowledge" lead also to obligations. They lead to responsibility towards one's own nation and the whole of Mankind. In this context, crimes are less excusable, especially if going into oblivion or distorted. Such a nation can be dangerous to others.

Molotov told Adenauer during the latter's visit to Moscow, in 1955, that the whole German nation was guilty of war crimes. And Adenauer did not reply to this accusation. He wanted his prisoners back. But, if Molotov was right, so what about the guilt of the Russian nation? This is the question. After all, "collective responsibility" is a Soviet invention. One should not be blind and not see the most obvious dangers, posed by the Soviets and mostly the Russians, to the whole of Mankind. I do not go as far as to accuse whole nations. Both I and Jaruzelski are Poles. Jaruzelski declared war on his own Nation but I declared war on him and those like him. The majority of Poles did the same. Dr. Sakharov and his like are noble Russians and it is with them that the Poles could live in peace and friendship. Accusing the entire nation would be equally inexcusable as accusing all the Soviets and Russians for the crimes of the USSR.

The USSR, if democratic, could perhaps preserve the present composition of nations and nationalities, if free choice would be left to them. But, if the Russians decide to join the forces of Freedom and Democracy, have to return everything which is not theirs. Naturally, no democratic Russia should legitimately demand the territories of the Kurile Islands.

This is not a question of dismembering the Soviet-Russian empire. It is democratizing it and halting the spread of its imperialistic designs. Whether later, its nations and nationalities decide to stay in some kind of federation or confederation with the Russians, is another matter. But, as of now, the USSR cannot be otherwise treated than as an imperialistic and colonial power, as the Chinese had rightly called it - "Social-imperialist".

The USSR is the last colonial power in the world and it is still expanding. Communism is the vehicle of this expansion and, until now, it has been the

most effective of all. Cynically, it is being used for the ends of traditional Russian imperialism. In this connection, I have to make another observation.

As I have mentioned, I participated, for 3 years, in the work of the Soviet-led 'think tank', called 'Zvezda II' / Star II / and 'Moment II'. What we had discussed were the new conquests by Communism, or rather, more precisely, by the USSR. The main area of interest were developing countries, called 'the biggest reservoir of revolution'. I am not surprised, now, that Central America is in turmoil. Already at that time, it was considered as 'ripe' for that.

I also mentioned that, as long as injustice, insufficiency and insecurity exist, people will be buying cheap and simplistic slogans. In this connection, the USSR and Communism sponsored by it, fish quite simply in troubled waters and, sometimes, they trouble them themselves beforehand.

Exploiting ignorance, poverty and other ills is something equal to the use of poor children for prostitution, theft and other crimes. If adults do that, especially if they are intelligent, then there cannot be any excuse for such exploitation of somebody's ignorance and immaturity. That should be punishable. And this is precisely what the Soviets do. But they escape punishment! Privately, they are cynical or even unhappy about their own deeds. But, at the same time, they obediently follow any orders from the top. Worse even, they feed the top with various insane ideas, because they simply seek promotion and some other rewards. And they are not bothered that this is immoral.

And thus, the circle closes. The self-motion mechanism works in a most sinister way, for it is the mechanism of `d e s t r u c t i o n` and not of creation.

When participating in the said 'think tank', I was amazed at how the Soviets viewed the world's future, especially that of the poor nations. They were well aware that, in reality, they cannot help them to alleviate their poverty and destitution. They would say that they lacked material resources for that. Yet, this was not deterring them from exporting 'revolutionary ideas' as well as arms. Without offending the developing nations, this is like giving matches to children who play in a haystack. Is all this, Revolutionary zeal, imperialism or quite simply insanity? Which one?

These are difficult questions. Mankind has simply `n o m e a n s` and time to tolerate any such phenomenon. It has too many ills before it and no easy solution to them at hand.

But certainly, hatred and violence are `n o t`, nowadays, the means to settle the ills of Mankind. This is even more than obvious in the light of the rich experience Mankind has fortunately gained by experimenting empirically and not only debating theoretically.

It is still not too late, but time is running out. There is really no explanation to Soviet behavior. No rationality is discernible here, if one excludes the methodical poisoning for a final assault. The Soviets must be simply stopped in their insane preparations. They have been caught red-handed more than once and no doubt should persist as to their true intentions. The world has been receiving these Soviet-sponsored lessons for too long now and it is time it should learn something from them. However, it is disturbing that the most obvious facts are not always perceived as such. And Japan is no exception.

Most people, and the Japanese as well, do not want to see certain things, or they see them through their own prism. They believe they can avoid the worst in this way. When, in 'Mein Kampf', Hitler wrote what he would do, nobody believed. What Marx, Lenin, Stalin and others wrote, said or even did, may still not be believed.

Man, contrary to his knowledge and experience, still does not know what is the internal logic of certain events and cannot read the future. Sometimes, he has difficulties in grasping the present and properly concluding on past events. But this does not absolve him from judgements he should have and acts he should refrain from doing. Certain moral standards are too well established. Here again, I have to refer to the Japanese.

The fact that the Japanese are among the oldest nations and civilizations in the world, not saying about their material achievements, make them additionally responsible before Mankind.

The new scientific and technological breakthroughs which take place in Japan, may open new horizons before Mankind. They may also, in fact, contribute to the defeat of Totalitarianism. Here, however, science and technology are not enough. The spiritual side of the challenge is not less important. In fact, it is even more important. It happened more than once, in history, that more advanced civilizations would yield to barbarians, who lacked many material things but were motivated in what they were doing. And the rationality of their motivation was not an issue here. Up to this day, we do not know what was Genghis Khan's or Heluga's motivation, but most certainly, they defeated more advanced civilizations lying in the way of their ferocious conquests.

There is, beyond doubt, some sort of 'enfeeblement' of mature civilizations. The Chinese, by today's standards, were once 'pacifists' and yielded to the Mongols, because they thought that taking up arms was disgusting in itself. Nowadays, 'better Red than dead', the saying so popular in the West, corresponds very closely to the above pattern.

It is a disturbing fact, to say the least, that although France's and FGR's combined GNP, or that of Japan alone, is higher or equal to that of the USSR, they are militarily dwarfs compared to the latter. The democratic West, of

which Japan is a part, is, economically speaking, almost four times stronger than the Warsaw Pact. Its population is almost two times bigger. And still, it is afraid of the USSR and is virtually at its mercy when it comes to war or peace.

The Americans rotated almost 9 million troops in Indochina, spent some 200 billion dollars and, when they had virtually won the war, they withdrew. I remember how one high-ranking North Vietnamese told me later that when the North went on its final assault of South Vietnam they did not believe that they would win. Spiritual breakdown, as depicted in this event, is disturbing.

Only the other day, I saw, on the television, a Swedish journalist who was outraged about his findings in Nicaragua according to which, he had concluded that, perhaps, the USA was helping the rebels. Conclusive evidence lacked however. But, at the same time, no Swedish journalist was to be seen or heard when the Soviet submarine, with nuclear weapons on board, was caught in Swedish territorial waters, or when, later, another one, or even two, were allowed to escape. Their outrage was not heard then!

And the fate of Raul Wallenberg, Swedish citizen, who saved thousands of Hungarian Jews and disappeared arrested by the Soviets when they entered Budapest in 1945? Somehow, it does not arouse the journalists' indignation. And this, in spite of some evidence that Wallenberg may be still alive.

What then is happening to people living in freedom and democracy? To those who are wealthy and educated? Where are their moral standards and what are they, in fact?

I asked myself this question more than once when observing the Japanese and talking to them.

The Japanese who play such a prominent and ever more important role in the world, have always been a puzzle to me. I had the occasion of seeing the three greatest nations of the region, i.e. the Japanese, the Chinese and the Koreans, not only abroad but also in their homelands. Together, they form a very solid part of world civilization and, in the future, their role may even increase, if not become dominant.

The Chinese, those on the mainland, at least, fell rather easily to Totalitarianism. So did half of Korea, not because of its own choice, although later, without the physical presence of the Soviets, the North Koreans launched their attack against the South and almost won. They would have certainly been victorious had they not been stopped and rolled back mostly by the Americans.

And what about the Japanese? Will they not, one day, become Communist or otherwise totalitarian? What will stop them from taking this road? How strong are they in their spirit of resistance to the onslaught in question? Other peoples in the region did not resist, will they? The type of Totalitarianism

which may eventually threaten Japan is rather only the Leftist one. The Right is weak, divided and not appealing. It cannot find any convincing philosophies or slogans which could attract the people, especially the young. Past glories and conquests do not appeal and seem impractical. Certain changes in the world are irreversible.

Religions also seem to be wearing away. Whether Buddhism or Shintoism, one has the impression that they are rather a way of life, that they preserve their importance at certain special occasions like birth, marriage, funeral. In Japan, I did not currently see devout faithfuls, although I saw many religious ceremonies and numerous objects of cult. Perhaps, I was unable to understand the deep internal life of the Japanese. They were always rather evasive in their answers concerning this aspect of their lives. I had the feeling that their approach to life was rather philosophical and rational, as opposed to one based on unquestioned creed. Some went even that far as to say that Christianity was not convincing to the Japanese rational way of thinking. A God who let himself be crucified was perhaps not that Allmighty after all...

Could then the Japanese become Communist one day? I asked myself.

I sought for that answer when talking to the Left, whether Communist or Socialist.

The Communists impressed me very much. This is the second largest Communist Party in the non-Communist world, after the Italian one. It is at odds, both with the Soviet and Chinese Communist Parties. In fact, it is not close to any Communist Party in the world and its degree of independence is great. It is highly disciplined and it is financially the strongest among all political parties in Japan. Its top activists are intelligent people. Whether I talked with Miyamoto, Fuva, Nishizawa or Tachiki, they have always talked very sensibly. I enjoyed very much their position on Poland which was highly suspicious of Soviet intentions.

The Soviets were very uneasy about the Japanese Communists and so was the Polish Communist Party. Not only are there no official relations between them and the Japanese Communist Party, but there were even open hostilities. I mentioned, in the First Chapter, the problems I had with issuing a visa to Hakata's correspondent, Otaka.

But, at the same time, I asked myself what future the Japanese Communists could have in Japan. True that, on the question of the Northern Territories their intransigence goes even further than that of the Japanese Government. And, on many other issues, their position differs radically from that of the Soviets.

But, at the same time, it is true that should the circumstances change,

the disciplined Japanese Communist Party could instantly change course. Especially in conditions of Soviet domination of Japan. I watched the festive mood of the throng gathered at Hakata's picnic near Tokyo. This made a big impression on me. It was not only very Japanese in style, with many attractions and a visible demonstration of affluence, but there was also something more than that. I had the impression that there was a sort of strong 'communal bond' which always gives the sense of security and belonging. Perhaps, I exaggerate, but I sensed that those Japanese who are Communist are less atomized than the rest of the society. It can be both a strength and a weakness of the Japanese Communist Party, but it exists nevertheless. Its tone is not solely anti-Soviet. It is, by far more, anti-American. It was almost symbolical that the said picnic was held on grounds once used by the American forces in Japan.

Will the Communists be pouring in where the Americans will be leaving Japan? Maybe. But, in the end, who knows?

Another force of the Left, numerically stronger than the Communists, is the Japanese Socialist Party.

Similarly to the Communists, it has long traditions and its influence is strong among the Japanese. It is internally more divided than the Communists. However, it is openly pro-Soviet. I have never seen Miyamoto or Fuva talk to the Soviet Ambassador Polanski, but I saw Asukata do it. I was also rather puzzled that when paying a visit to Asukata, he did not ask me a single question about Soviet interference in the democratization process in Poland. And this very problem was so disturbing to Fuva and Miyamoto. Japanese Socialists are not less anti-American than the Communists. It would even seem that they are more anti-American. Some of their factions certainly are, at least.

Thus, the Japanese Left, despite all its divisions, is strong. In times of prosperity, the Left preserved its strength and, in times of socio-economic troubles, that strength may increase. Especially that social benefits and other aspects of life lag somewhat behind the overall upsurge of Japan. And, perhaps, the 'communal instinct' in Japan is stronger than in any other developed country.

Moreover, the Japanese Center, the Liberal Democratic Party, first of all, is not very cohesive. True, that it dominates the country's political scene, but it is visibly internally divided. The numerous factions and personal bickerings, not saying about frequent cabinet reshuffles, were quite strange to me. Perhaps, this is what democracy is about and perhaps my own totalitarian background makes it difficult for me to understand certain issues obvious to the others, but, nevertheless, I found all this disturbing.

I will say frankly that it was bizarre for me that the largest faction within the LDP is that of Kakuei Tanaka who, himself, is not Member of Parlia-

ment and does not sit in LDP's leadership. Will such things not backfire one day? Will Japan remain governable? Will she not follow Italy's example? Or that of France before De Gaulle?

I do not know. Japan remains a mystery for me. The oldest dynasty in the world has, in fact, never had real power and, maybe because of that, has survived fifteen hundred years. Perhaps, the fate of the LDP or any other democratic force will be the same. It could be that Japan's politics are really not the most important issue in the country. What really counts here are the unique qualities of the entrepreneurs and of the 'bureaucrats' who, together with the toiling and disciplined masses, have elevated Japan to her prominence. Politicians, despite all their divisions, have only contributed to the creation of the framework thanks to which the talents of the Japanese may be fully revealed. For the time being, at least.

But, what next? Will this 'political culture' suffice in the ever more dangerous and otherwise challenging future?

Naturally, I do not know the answer to this. But, what I know is that nothing in the world may count on immuability and that nothing is impossible.

Thus, at a given point, Japan, just as many others, will face certain hard questions. Perhaps, she will have more of them than others. If only because of her world status and certain visible disproportions, swinging between extremes, i.e. between 'giagantism' and 'dwarfism'.

Answering those questions, will very much depend on how strongly the Japanese themselves will feel about certain dilemmas, what moral yardsticks they will use and how they will be committed spiritually to their goals. Will they be equally 'tired' as some developed nations are who once had infinite energies and unshaken spirit? Or, will the Japanese find, as they have already done, ways of bypassing the 'fatigue' stage and discovering new dynamism?

Perhaps, the new future will answer those questions. In the last hundred years, Japan passed through many shocks. Once, when she was confronted with a totally different life style and the industrial revolution. Secondly, when she beat Russia. Thirdly, when she took on the United States and others and, finally ended defeated and reduced in size. Forthly, when she had all the odds against her and, in spite of this, produced the 'economic miracle' which surprised everybody, probably herself included.

What will the fifth stage be? Is Herman Kuhn rightly predicting that the 21st century will belong to Japan? Or will she be reduced to non-importance and even to foreign domination because of internal strains and a hostile external environment?

Personally, I am rather optimistic about Japan's future, but I would be dishonest if I would not admit to having some disquieting thoughts. The shocks I have mentioned above do not pass without leaving some scars in the souls and minds of the Japanese. Maybe, they themselves do not realize this. The falling from one extreme to another, as well as shock-treatments, are not without profound effects on human mentality and the behavior of nations. There are many irrational events in this world. We perceive them as such at least.

In free and democratic Spain, traditionally so Catholic, more and more young people shy away from priesthood. In Communist and Soviet-dominated Poland priests have never been as numerous as now and even some 'surpluses' are being 'exported' to Japan.

Such a phenomenon was hardly predictable once. Many more similar events may also be hardly predictable, if only 'logically' approached. As I have already mentioned, I had met Polish priests and monks in Japan. Some of them arrived there more than 50 years ago. When I asked them what they thought about Japan's future, they were embarrassed.

'-Japan is Japan and will remain Japan' was their standard answer.

Thus, I did not learn very much. Or, maybe it was too much. After all, Russia became Communist and remained Russia. So did China.

Japan can be Japan, even if Communist. But, should this be the case, then the others must not take this lightly. Freedom and Democracy without Japan will not survive. I do not say this to flatter the Japanese. I only ascertain a true fact.

The forces of the Free World, resemble a triad: the US, Japan and Western Europe. Anything amputated from that triad will make the edifice of the Free World crumble. No other democracies will be able to fill the gap. India is too shaky. So is Latin America. The rest is even less promising. I do not say that Japan plays a pivotal role in that triad for all three parts are pivotal. However, the Japanese pivot, should be, I think, even more pivotal than it presently is.

And this is the main question I was trying to talk about.

The very fact that Japan is part of the Free World and a very prominent part indeed, is perhaps the greatest victory of the forces of Democracy during the last war. Those forces failed to restore Democracy to the whole of Germany, although they did restore it to its past. They also restored it to the whole of Italy. At the same time, they strengthened, by their naiveté, Soviet Totalitarianism and lost China.

The victories of Democracy were unfortunately offset by its defeats if one takes into account the final balance. It is difficult to say whether Demo-

cracy won. A new battlefield between Democracy and Totalitarianism has been in the making throughout the whole post war period and the prospects of the oncoming 'final contest', not necessarily those of a shooting war, are not yet clear. In part, this is due to the fact that not all Democracies feel equally strongly about the very nature and scope of this contest.

With all my admiration and respect for Japan, I must admit that, it is precisely Japan who has the most dilemmas, objective and subjective, in this field.

In my book, I tried to present many aspects of a broader issue. Some are personal, others general or, on the contrary, particular. Still others, may be divorced from the main topic. Many episodes I presented, I did so quite simply to illustrate the main topic. A big number of them speak for themselves. The Reader will know for himself what conclusions to draw.

I feel somewhat uneasy that, in the last Chapter, I sounded mentor-like. This was not at all my intention. I simply tried to emphasize some of my views and therefore, spoke too frankly maybe. Were I still Ambassador to Japan, especially representing a totalitarian and foreign-dominated country, I would be more diplomatic and perhaps, I would avoid talking at all. I have never liked silly talks and, frankness, for me was impossible at times, particularly in public.

It is almost a paradox that it is only now that I spoke frankly to the Japanese. Now, that I had left their country and that I have no official title to speak to them.

But it is possible that this very fact gives me the right to speak to the Japanese. And then, I simply feel that I must do this.

Had the developments in Poland gone differently, I would have not sought political asylum in the United States, not left my post in Japan, not left the Communist Party and not blamed the USSR for all of Poland's tragedies. I would be trying to work for my country by changing Communism and Polno-Soviet relations. I knew only too well that no abrupt changes in this field were possible. However, as long as there was some faint hope for a change for better, I patiently waited, without passivity, for something to take place.

Once these hopes collapsed, not only could I not wait any longer, but I decided to fight for the change by fighting against the very basis of Poland's and, in fact, Mankind's, tragedies, that is, Communism and its main fortress, the USSR. Both are non-reformable. On the contrary, they are becoming more and more degenerate, repressive and aggressive. It is my duty to try to alert world opinion about this. I think I know both Communism and the USSR only too well.

Finally, I also had a moral problem. It may be that the following digression

will illustrate this.

Once, probably in 1964, while in Washington D.C., I saw the movie entitled 'The Nuremberg Trial'. It was not about the trial of the main Nazis, but about that of some minor judges serving under Hitlerism. Spencer Tracy played the role of the American judge, one of the defendants was played by Burt Lancaster. Maximilian Shell was the Attorney. Many other stars appeared in the film. The judges were accused that, under Hitler, they had passed harsh verdicts. However, they did not admit to their guilt. They believed that their verdicts had been dictated by the laws of that period.

Finally, only Burt Lancaster told the jury that he was aware of the fact that he was doing wrong, but that he tried to be more lenient than he should have been or than others would have been. His colleagues were outraged. After his statement, they totally rejected him. In the final count they all received the same verdict - life imprisonment. The first reaction of Burt Lancaster who had admitted his guilt, was that of puzzlement. But he understood why he was equally treated with the others. For he knew that he was doing wrong but, nevertheless, he went on doing it. That was his primary guilt.

I thought about this movie and its moral more than once. I knew that Communism was bad, but I was its activist, thinking that I would change it or at least make it more human. I knew that the USSR was bad, but I served it by proxy, believing that, in this way, I will change it, or at least, loosen its grip on Poland. And, because of that, I was in a constant stress. The only thing which kept me on the track for the hope for a change. But when all the hopes collapsed on that fatal day of December 13, 1981, I felt that I could no longer live under this stress. I opted perhaps for a still bigger stress on the personal basis, but morally, it is much smaller. At least, I know that I do not serve the wrong cause any longer independently of how I had earlier served it. Some people could think I did this well...

Now, I can myself warn the others n o t to follow my experience. It is better to impardonably fight the wrong cause than to try to change it. The first option has more chances of success, even if, in the long run, one c a n n o t compromise on certain basic principles. This is the lesson of my life.

By defecting I was unfortunately not leaving a sinking ship. It is not yet going to the bottom. In fact, that ship sails towards its goal, although it must brave storms and rough waters. Many think it may sink before reaching its goal. Counting on this occurrence may be an e r r o r . That ship should be fired upon, whether to warn it or to sink it, depending on the case.

My personal opinion is, however, that this ship cannot, as Lenin had once predicted, call on its destination. If this were so, Mankind would not be

worthy of its name. The future of the world cannot be dictated by the ''teachings'' of Lenin.

I think I gave some evidence as to the wrongness of this sip's voyage. I could say even more on that, but one cannot say everything at once.

Many may not believe me. I cannot say that ''seeing is believeing''. If everybody would have seen what I saw, then nobody would have ever written what I wrote. Why? Simply because, in such a case, we would all be living, or rather, existing, under Totalitarianism. In such a case, not much could be said, not the truth at least. This is the unigness of human experience. Those living in Democracies may not or,do not want to, believe those living under Totalitarianism. This state of things should change and the former should believe the despair of the latter.

The course of this sailing ship will depend very much on the Japanese also. If some of them will read my book, then they will not have the right to say that they did not know certain things. And, if they draw propoer conclusions, then this would give sense to the big step I took in Japan on December 23, 1981. Poland was not the only cause behind my decision. For Poland's fate is not isolated from the fate of Mankind. The Polish memento of today could be the Japanese memento tomorrow.

Let us hope it will never come to this. The Japanese may truly contribute to stopping the march of the Soviet Golem and to defeating him.