

Egoist is like one sitting for long in a well'

Global sociology as it is seen from the heights of the US «high» political analytics: on Z. Brzezinski's book «The Grand Chessboard. American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives». (Russian edition – M. International Relations.1998. Original edition Brzezinski Z. The Grand Chessboard. American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives».Basic Books.)

There is a legend coming from the antiques times of Greek-Persian wars. The numerous armies and fleet of Persia which by that time already conquered many peoples and established its presence on the Mediterranean Sea, were overhanging the Hellenistic Civilization, the latter, at the first sight, being much less powerful and controlled less «human» and material resources than its potential conqueror. The war began and one sage suggested showing to the Greek warriors their future enemies as they really were.

A group of captured Persians appeared *naked* in the field where the battle-ranks were drawn up. It is known, even from antique sculpture, that the Greeks of those times paid special attention to body-building exercises to prepare themselves for military service. When this people who were used to purposeful physical training from their childhood saw the Persians naked they almost fell with laugh as they could not imagine that such feeble men even though grouped in numerous armies would be a dangerous enemy on the battle-field. The ensuing military actions brought decisive victory of Greeks over feeble ones who at that time pretended to establish the unrivalled world primacy of their state and subsequently, to shape the outlook of the whole world.

Now, we suggest dwelling on the main subject of the present note. The author of the book is the former National Security Adviser of the American President in 1977-1981, consultant of the Center for Strategic and International Studies², professor of foreign affairs in Paul H. Nitze School of Contemporary International Studies at Johns Hopkins University, Washington D.C. (as given in the Abstract).The following dedication precedes the book: «*For my students-to help them shape tomorrow's world*».

As one may conclude from the above, Z. Brzezinski has, in essence, formulated his parting wishes to those future successors who are expected to occupy positions in the American state establishment only after a period of time to come.

Russian reader as well is not left without «parting wishes», since there is a foreword by Y.G. Kobaladze, Major-General of the EIS (External Intelligence Service).Yuri Kobaladze was reported («Pravda», 21.12.96) to hold the post (at least during this period) of EIS press-bureau chief. «In one of his interviews he was explicit in saying that he did not believe in any conspiracies, judo-mason centres, or agents of influence». He is claiming that «the Soviet Union had been pulled down not by the CIA. We did it ourselves»³ (ibid.) So, Y.G. Kobaladze's assessment of Z. Brzezinski's book should be taken too in this context.

Y.G. Kobaladze goes along:

«This is a useful book for all who deal with the foreign policy or devote their passion or interest to this subject. Because still no one has told us about America as the «only superpower» using so simple, rigid and frankly words and still no one has disclosed in such a revealing way, how its exceptional position is to be preserved and consolidated.<...>

Perhaps, one may be shocked by how the question is put about US policy with respect to Russia: «What kind of Russia is in America's interest, and what and how much can America do about it»? To answer this question the author devotes a special chapter. He refers to «the black hole».And this is strange,

¹ K.Prutkov. «Fruits of meditation. Thoughts and aphorisms», 25.

² The names of such institutions are significant. In Japan – Institute for Global Problems Studies, in the USA – Center for INTERnational Studies...

³ See how «we did it ourselves» in the analytical note «Four stages of informational security»

strictly speaking, and inconsistent with the foregoing. In fact, «the black hole «in astrophysics means a certain body which absorbs irreversibly the surrounding substance. Russia, in contrast, is losing parts of its «body». Meanwhile Z. Brzezinski, speaking about Russia in his book, formulates the twofold problem of the American policy: how to encourage Russia's democratic transformation and economic recovery while «avoiding the re-emergence of a Eurasian empire that could obstruct the American geostrategic goal of shaping a larger Euro-Atlantic system to which Russia can then be stably and safely related».

At the end of his foreword Y.G. Kosaladze says:

«It's evident, multipolar world concepts are alien to Brzezinski because of his very nature. And it is all the more interesting that the final part of his book is named: «Beyond the Last Global Superpower». Yes, the author admits that the USA are the first and the last global superpower, also that the time will come when «global politics are bound to become increasingly uncongenial to the concentration of hegemonic power in the hands of a single state». And what if this time is coming already?

The end of the «Cold War» has significantly complicated America's status of «free world's» leader.

This book, written by Z. Brzezinski – one of the forgers of American foreign policy – is a search for a new strategy of American world's primacy. Elephant in a store is trying to break as less plates as possible».

Is Russia a «black hole», as its role is defined by Z. Brzezinski, or Y.G. Kosaladze, surprised by such assessment from the overseas, was right? – This question, when elucidated, will allow answering another question tackled by both Z. Brzezinski and Y.G. Kosaladze: «What will be beyond the last global superpower»? Or more precisely: «Will it be the American global policy that will shape the future world's framework «beyond the last global superpower» or it will be the future world's framework that will make impossible for America to further exist in its present shape framed historically?

To answer these questions, no matter whatever irritation the views expressed by Z. Brzezinski in his book may provoke, one should reject, at first, that dependant-hypocritical standpoint which has been selected by the external intelligence Major-General, **demoralized by the Cold War**. His words: «no one has told us about America as the «only superpower» using so simple, rigid and frankly words and still no one has disclosed in such a revealing way, how its exceptional position is to be preserved and consolidated»-is a testimony of either his full professional inconsistency or his open hypocrisy.

Given his professional position, he ought to know about the content of many papers where the attitudes of American rulers and their advisers towards the USSR and Russia were clearly stated. In particular, the USA NSC-20/1 Directive of August 18, 1948 was clearly entitled: «Our goals with respect to Russia». Compared with Z. Brzezinski's book, it sounds even more open because its target was not good-will idealists of student youth kind, those who have never been familiar with real political practice, but ready American state leaders who have been scrupulously screened both in public politics and within the system of inter-nazi mason lodges – this **internal frame** of *democratic – but in Western manner*-state structure, although this fact permanently falls in oblivion.

Extracts from this Directive are quoted below as cited in N.N. Yakovlev's¹ book «The CIA against the USSR» (Moscow, Politizdat, 1985, p.p. 38-40, as selected):

«Our main goals with respect to Russia are essentially twofold:

a) To minimize Moscow's might;

b) To introduce fundamental changes in the theory and practices of the foreign policy pursued by the government in power in Russia

... We are not committed to any time limit to achieve our goals in peaceful time.

... We have grounds decisively not to feel any guilty when striving for ruling out of concepts incompatible with international peace and stability and for their replacement with concepts of tolerance and international cooperation. It is not our concern to think about internal consequences that such concepts, if

¹ This historian should not be mistakenly identified with A.N. Yakovlev, former Politburo member, who has the same name.

adopted, would entail in other country; equally, we should not think that *we bear any responsibility for these events (we use italics when citing: the United States are guilty since they refused to take care and responsibility)*... If the Soviet leaders assume that the increasing significance of more enlightened concepts in international relations is incompatible with the preservation of their power in Russia it will be their concern, not our. Our concern is to work and ensure that internal events occur there...As government we are not responsible for internal conditions in Russia...

...Our purpose in the name of peace is not the overthrow of the Soviet government. Of course, we are aspiring to create such circumstances and situation, which the present Soviet leaders will not tolerate and which will not be to their liking. Perhaps, when facing such a situation, they will not be able to preserve their power in Russia. But it should be stressed with full authority-it is their concern, not our...

...It is a matter of priority to make and keep the Soviet Union weak – politically, militarily and psychologically – vis-à-vis the external forces which are out of its control.

...We should not hope to fully impose our will on the Russian territory, as we have tried to do in Germany and Japan. We must understand that the final resolution should be political.

...If the worst occurs, namely, the Soviet power will be preserved on the whole or almost whole present Soviet territory, we must require:

a) fulfilment of pure military conditions (surrender of weapons, evacuation of key regions etc.) in order to ensure long-term military disability;

b) fulfilment of conditions aiming to ensure significant economic dependence on the external world.

...In other words, we must create automatic guarantees to ensure that even non-communist regime, nominally friendly to us:

a) does not possess of significant military might;

b) remains largely dependant on the external world in economic respect;

c) does not exercise serious control over main national minorities;

d) does not establish anything that would resemble the iron curtain.

In case such a regime will prove to be hostile to communists and friendly to us, we must take care that these terms be imposed in neither insulting nor humiliating way. But we must impose them by any means to protect our interests».

And this is not just an episode, a kind of "extraction" from general statistics of facts characterizing American foreign policy. The NSC-68 Directive of 30.09.1950 (ibid, pp. 64, 65) envisions:

«... to sow the seeds of destruction inside the Soviet system in order to make Kremlin at least to change its policy ... But without superior military might, available and easily mobilized, the policy of "deterrence" which essentially is the policy of calculated and gradual compulsion, is no more than a bluff».

The own policy is tacitly presumed to be irreproachable.

«...We must conduct an open psychological war to provoke mass treachery with respect to Soviets and to ruin other Kremlin plans. To strengthen positive and relevant steps and actions by secret means in the field of economic and psychological war in order to provoke and support riots and rebellions in selected and strategically important satellite-states.

...Besides the affirmation of our values, our policy and our actions must be such as to cause fundamental changes in the very nature of the Soviet system, and the failure of Kremlin's plans is the first important step to achieve these changes. It is absolutely evident that if these changes are resulting from the activities of internal forces of the Soviet society this will cost less while being more efficient...

Victory, for sure, will be secured by the failure of Kremlin's plans as a result of gradual increase of free world ability and its implantation in the Soviet world in such a way as to cause internal changes of the Soviet system».¹

As reported by N.N. Yakovlev (so much unloved by many democratizers-Sakharov followers) the total edition of the book «The CIA against the USSR» and of extracts from it accounted by 1991 to 20 million. For this very reason, the analysts of Soviet and Russian secret services could be unaware of its contents and unable to react adequately only if there was a **persistent will not to be aware**. This persistence may be explained either by direct

¹ The text is our own translation of the text founded in N.N. Yakovlev's book. If someone finds original text he is welcome to send it to us for updating the present note and other works using the information.

treachery¹ or by conviction, – as Y.G. Kobaladze puts it in one of his interviews,-that he did not believe in any conspiracies or «judo-mason» centres, agents of influence etc.

Well, so he does not believe, come what may, and even life realities are nothing for him; therefore he is claiming that «the Soviet Union had been pulled down not by the CIA. We did it ourselves.» As for how «we did it ourselves» **in full conformity with the overseas directives aimed to destroy the USSR in the time of peace** – the analysis of this problem is far from being priority matter for our native state analysts, though all good-will policy-makers and businessmen should know why the cited overseas directives regarding Russia have not turned to become useless as the proverb provides: «Dog is baying, wind is taking».

But in historical context, the above cited US NSC Directives as well as many other papers still unpublished were preceded also by the notorious «Protocols of the Zion Sages» – truly false document by virtue of its origin, insofar as its primary purpose was- by revealing the fact of its forgery – to create prejudice with regard to real programme, formulated there in general, the programme of management of the XX century global civilization. As one may remember, the overthrow of great empires of Eurasia, including the Russian Empire-and this had been done in the course of the First World War of the XX century, was treated as a special subject in the materials of this diversionary operation which was arranged irreproachably, by the way, in psychological terms (given the prevailing social attitudes of those times).

Those who considered the programmes, as formulated in the «Protocols», to be authentic, were said to be «crazy» by others who were not believing in any global conspiracies and agents of influence and thus were inactive, doing nothing to prevent that the doctrine, as formulated in the «Protocols», comes true. Hence, the «Protocols» worked. The result is well known.

Z. Brzezinski's book is not something outstanding even from the position of how goals and means with respect to Russia and some other countries are exposed in it: it is just one of many overseas voluptuary desires and directives where these desires are spelt.

On the other hand, when – as at the times of J.V. Stalin (Koba)² – the leadership of the Russian statehood-civilization is convinced that other states and non-governmental international circles are trying to achieve their goals on the territory of Russia and inside its society- thus entailing conspiracies supported by local agents of influence- the course of events proves to be quite different. In the same US NSC Directive-20/1 of August 18, 1948 we find the following words to specify the period between 1933 and 1948, when this very approach was prevailing in the USSR with respect to internal and foreign policies: «We have withstood too much during the last 15 years...» But if the analysis in the spirit of Koba and the politics based on it are replaced by Kobaladze's approach, then it is our turn to withstand. Therefore the time has come to put an end to such analysis and such ensuing policies in order not to have to withstand furthermore the stupidity and the villainy.

Meanwhile, as long as global-range political and sociological analysis underlying state-policy in Russia is based on tradition : «I believe or not, and thus I don't want to know» – and this is the case of Y.G. Kobaladze and of many others- nothing inside Russia itself can generally prevent that all kinds of directives – originating from the overseas and manifesting the goals of their rulers with regard to Russia, all of us and of our descendants included, – come true, no matter whether these directives are spoken out or not.

¹ Very similar to what has been done by A.N. Yakovlev (former Politburo member) and by KGB General Kalougin.

² Koba (or probably Coba) – one of J.V. Stalin's party pseudonyms in the period before revolution

In case this situation in Russia persists, the country may be protected against such overseas directives only if the directive-makers commit mistakes that would make these directives unviable or bring results opposite to expected.

A question may arise: «How does the legend's plot, by which we begin the present analytical note, correlate with all this and, in particular, with Z. Brzezinski's book»? The fact is that if not all of Russia then its overwhelming majority is used to view Z. Brzezinski as one of the most powerful political analysts of the world whose role in the ending of the Cold War by American victory and by collapse of the USSR as a state was far from being minor.¹ At the same time, however, the majority is not familiar with what constitutes the substance of views advocated by Z. Brzezinski but just admires his authority boosted by mass-media. Meanwhile, the publication of his book in our country has changed the situation in core: the opportunity has emerged for the Russian reader to observe, – *naked as they are*, – the morals of Z. Brzezinski, – essentially, a typical representative of the American political «elite» – and his **corresponding** world outlook and intellectual culture. Thus, the way has been opened to see and touch «the intellectual muscles» of one of the «strategists-winners» in the Cold War. What we have seen could not but evoke in our memory the legend that had reached us from the far antique ages, this legend reciting about the failure of the ancient – Persian claims for world primacy and for the right to shape the future world.

Z. Brzezinski writes:

“The ultimate objective of American policy should be benign and visionary: to shape a truly cooperative global community, in keeping with long-range trends and with the fundamental interests of humankind. But in the meantime, it is imperative that no Eurasian challenger emerges, capable of dominating Eurasia and thus also of challenging America. *The formulation of a comprehensive and integrated Eurasian geostrategy is therefore the purpose of this book*” (italicized by Z. Brzezinski) («The Grand Chessboard», p.12, dated: April 1997).

This last paragraph in the book's «Introduction» provides all necessary grounds to conclude that America is under great menace and that it is unlikely to avoid calamities just by its own if its present and future policy-makers continue to trust so senselessly to such authoritative analysts and *university professors* as Z. Brzezinski, because their works do not contain ideas that, if they come true, would guarantee the security of American development. As said by the Apostle James: «he is a double-minded man, unsteady in all his ways» (The General Epistle, 1:8). The same is applicable to societies and states. In order to make sure that the remark made by the Apostle James is quite fair with respect to the present American political establishment, we need to consider in details what is written by Z. Brzezinski.

We shall start with *analysing the meaning* of the first phrase cited. First, the «ultimate objective» of the policy of any state, in order to be pursued, should be recognized in this state as an **objective of paramount significance** and, in essence, should be truly benign and visionary to keep with the fundamental interests of humankind. Here Z. Brzezinski is absolutely right.

All other objectives in global, foreign and internal policies of state should be subordinated to this «ultimate objective» of the highest priority of significance. As for conformity of the policy to the «long-range trends», it must be said that some trends out of the full spectrum run counter the interests of humankind; others conform them absolutely and in all times, but there are also trends that either conform the long-range interests of humankind or contradict them, depending on prevailing historical circumstances. It follows

¹ After the failure of the SEC – State Emergency Committee – there was even a caricature in a newspaper showing the Kremlin's wall with memorial boards that cover the urns with ashes. One board inscription was: «Z. Brzezinski – founder of the CIS».

that it was Z. Brzezinski's mistake to refer to indefinite «*long-range trends*» in general when speaking about visionary objectives (see the first phrase cited above), because the visionary (ultimate) objectives-mean one thing, while «*long-range trends*» in general and not defined in essence – mean another thing, this last not always being positive for the former.

The case is not better, if we take the second phrase. It tacitly implies that America is irreproachable, – if not as a historical entity, standing firmly by the present time, then at least in the sense of supremacy therein of steady trends in social and personal development insofar as the «fundamental interests of humankind», mentioned in the first phrase, are expressed by these trends. If this is *really* so, then it is meaningful to support the “blameless” line of American global policy as dominating globally, so that the bearers of other trends which contradict the «fundamental interests of humankind», whether in Eurasia, South America, Africa or elsewhere, do not strengthen their positions to be able to hinder the progress of the whole humankind under American leadership.

But if America is not irreproachable, mainly in the sense of supremacy therein of steady trends of social development, then the meaning of the second phrase of the cited paragraph is evidently incompatible with the meaning of the former phrase on the highest priority of «fundamental interests of humankind» in the American policy. If another society, beyond the US government jurisdiction, turns to be free of trends which run counter the «fundamental interests of humankind» but which are inherent to present America, then, as the general and indefinite meaning of the second phrase implies, the interests of the whole humankind are to be suppressed by American primacy – which is far from being irreproachable – over Eurasia and other regions of the planet.

Having said this, we are not slandering Z. Brzezinski insofar as his book in general does not contain answers to interconnected questions such as:

- What the fundamental interests of humankind are?
- How in particular the historical entity as it stands and the trends of social development, inherent to America, prevent the exercise of fundamental interests of the humankind?

The same set of questions is relevant with regard to any society in any state; meanwhile the way they are answered enables to define all capacities for cooperation in the cause of exercise of fundamental interests of humankind in everyday life of societies and in the foreign policy of states; all other sorts of cooperation do not represent any interest to humankind.

Without answering these questions **in essence**, *the formulation of a comprehensive and integrated global political strategy* (and not Eurasian geostrategy, as Z. Brzezinski envisages in the third phrase) *is impossible*.

In addition, as follows from the cited paragraph and the remaining text of the book, Z. Brzezinski does not realize the evident difference between terms and corresponding life phenomena, such as global policy in general and state global policy, state foreign policy, state internal policy. But if, however, he does realize the difference between them – then not only he is one of the USSR grave-diggers but he is condemned to be included in the aftermath in the list of anti-American agents of influence and gravediggers of the USA as a presently standing historical entity.

Meanwhile the difference between all mentioned kinds of policy does exist:

- **global policy – is the activity aimed to implement objectives with respect to the whole humankind and to the planet of Earth.** In its core, this is mostly the management of a spectrum of long-range trends, what in many cases excludes the conformity of current policy to the trends which already exist. When formulating this policy, the Earth, of course, may be regarded as «the Grand Chessboard»

but this «board», then, is to be used to dislocate all countries, including your own; and the player should involve every country¹, moreover – in such a way as to avoid that anyone loses, except those who will have desire to lose. The fact that Z. Brzezinski has stressed the necessity to «keep with long-range trends» while the «chessboard», according to him, is only Eurasia, means that his worldview is not adequate for global policy-making and for being political adviser in this field, though he has committed himself to this cause. The same is true for those who resort to his advises;

- **foreign policy-is the activity aimed to implement objectives of the state ruling class beyond the limits of its territory and its jurisdiction.** Z. Brzezinski has been successful in this kind of advisory for the simple reason that his customers themselves have a slightest idea about global policy making, which, in essence, can not be associated anyway with neither cruises on the board of the aircraft carriers-as may be derived from what has been said, – nor with the introduction of dollar as a circulating currency, nor with wide-scale demonstration of «Basic instinct»² in all parts of the planet;
- **internal policy – is the activity aimed to implement the objectives of the state ruling class on its territory within the limits of its jurisdiction.**

The ruling classes of the majority of state entities in history are not homogeneous and, by virtue of this, their different subgroups may have different interests and distribute differently their efforts within the framework of their global, foreign and internal policies. For this reason the global, foreign and internal policies of the same state may distinguish, more or less, and even suppress each other. How this may happen in practice, high political considerations left aside, one may read in the novel by Polish writer Boleslav Prus – «Pharaoh», which has been published several times in Russia since 1991.

But the World is such that the comprehensive processes define the course of those that exist inside them, and, by virtue of this, the global policy, as it stands objectively, no matter whether adequately it is understood by political analysts or not, defines the results of internal and foreign policy of any state.

Thus, for instance, when the hierarchy of Ancient Egypt started to make global policy vesting all its covets in the *long-range* Biblical project³ which was aimed to build up a global uniform civilization based on racial financial primacy of the «elite» of Judah-money-lenders, *the Egypt of those who were not involved in that project*, collapsed because its foreign and internal policy could not resist that global policy, while its own global policy had not been formulated; after Egypt the process of collapse embraced other cultures where the Biblical project was adopted for implementation. The opposite example is the fast emergence and spreading of Koranic civilization and undisputable successes of its cultural development in the Middle Ages, although its origins were confined to Arabia, primitive country if compared with the Egypt of pharaohs.

Y.G. Kobaladze, much like Z. Brzezinski, does not realize the evident difference between global, foreign and internal policy of states. But Z. Brzezinski, engaged in American foreign policy making, still possesses – as distinguished from Y.G. Kobaladze – of a certain feeling of **global policy strategies** emanating from different regions of the planet. This very difference between the above political analysts is manifested in the fact

¹ As some chess-lovers who use sometimes to play alone both white and black figures- for and against themselves; and as chess problems are solved.

² «Basic instinct» is the name of American film related to «erotic» group.

³ The main provisions of the global Biblical project of the ancient hierarchs of the cult of Amon (Amen, Amune, Omen, Amine – as different accents and transliterations suggest) are envisioned in *Deuteronomy,23:19,20; Deuteronomy,28:12,13 (28:12 as in the text of 70 translators – Septuagint);Isaiah,60:10-16; Matthew,5:17,18.*

that Z. Brzezinski called his book's chapter devoted to Russia – «The Black Hole» while Y.G. Kobaladze was taken surprised by this because the «black hole» is a body which is absorbing irreversibly the surrounding substance. Russia, in contrast, is losing parts of its «body».

This comment by Y.G. Kobaladze is of the sort – “I am singing what I am seeing (right now)” but I do not know and do not remember anything preceding this and therefore I do not assume any responsibility for consequences. Z. Brzezinski, as distinguished from Y.G. Kobaladze, remembers a lot of what preceded the present situation of Russia, and that is why the chapter devoted to it is called «The Black Hole»; Rus, Russia – which is a regional civilization of many peoples within the limits of one state – was absorbing the adjacent territories, and the peoples who inhabited them were making their own contribution to the culture which was shared by all. This process was not monotone but fluctuating, its fluctuation amplitude increasing with every cycle «*compression of the borders of Russia → MEANINGFUL change in the quality of Russian culture → expansion of the borders of Russia (state-civilization) beyond the limits set up by the previous phase of compression of the borders*».

This circumstance, insofar as it may concern any political analysis with respect to Russia, inside or outside it, and in any historical era, necessitates the identification and revision of «ultimate objectives» and of means used to implement them. But these problems are passed over in complete silence by Z. Brzezinski, though everyone should understand that no «Eurasian geostrategy» can be formulated in America unless the objectives and the corresponding means of those, whom in respect to this strategy is formulated, become clear.

Though Z. Brzezinski does not refer directly to historical cycles of Russia's civilization, he does show a certain feeling enabling him to distinct the character of Russia's historical development from other countries; this is because he uses sometimes the term «nation-state» with respect to the countries of the West. This term reflects the principle of mutually synonymous conformity of the «title nation» (people) to its inherent **statehood**, which constitutes, first, *a system of professional management of society, and second, a territory where the title nation lives together with the ethnically alien national minorities*. With respect to Russia he does not apply this term.

Although Z. Brzezinski refers once to Huntington who directly pointed out to the West that Russia is not a state in the western sense but itself represents one of many civilizations of the planet, this subject has not been elucidated in his book, so the Western reader is kept away from the substance of problems faced by American policy in Eurasia.

And besides, although there were «ethnic conflicts» in the course of this process of integration of the adjacent peoples and territories in this civilization-Russia, what in the West is usually identified with Russian expansion or imperialism, no people had been exterminated or led to «bloodless» point in the way it was done by the Anglo-Saxons (in majority), who abused of their technical superiority to decimate the indigenous population on the territory of the present USA and Canada.

The settlement of lands in the central states and in the «wild West» of the present USA was in fact the war for complete extermination of indigenous population of these lands. It had been conducted senselessly and maliciously by several generations of American citizens against men of other culture, who had not managed to create their own statehood and who were treated therefore as imperfect human beings by aggressively consumptive newcomers from another continent. This war was conducted by *renegades inside peoples*, by those who fled the hardship of unsettled life in their native states instead of concentrating their efforts and overcoming difficulties to settle their life just where they were born.

With regard to indigenous population of the «settled» lands, the American citizens were denying the «Truths to be self evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are

endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness», as proclaimed by Thomas Jefferson, one of the founders of the USA, author of the Declaration of Independence. This principle had been permanently violated in the course of American history- with regard to Indians, Negroes brought from Africa, the population of Vietnam and of many other countries.

This means, that despite the existing and widely cultivated opinion, America was not created by strong, freedom-loving personalities, full of virtues and love to those living close and far from them; instead these were weak persons endowed with *aggressive complex of self-affirmation on the territory of the present USA and Canada; and the indigenous population* who pursued another historical way of cultural development, *just failed to repulse this complex efficiently.*

So, unless the USA recognize this historically real fact and then revise their history as well as their *future intentions in the field of internal, foreign and global policy*, – they will continue to be motivated by unconscious psychiatric complexes of imperfectability and self-affirmation but without any chance to attain the **true might of culture** and the harmony with other societies, Earth's biosphere and the Supreme Power.

This American «complexion» is reflected in the book under question as well. Z. Brzezinski has tackled cultural issues but in the meantime he did not pay attention to specific features of America's birth and development which we have just briefly elucidated. Considering what caused collapse of the USSR statehood in the Cold War he mentions, among other factors, the following:

«The final outcome¹ was also significantly influenced by cultural considerations. The American-led coalition, by and large, accepted as positive many attributes of America's political and social culture. America's two most important allies on the western and eastern peripheries of the Eurasian continent, Germany and Japan, both recovered their economic health in the context of almost unbridled admiration for all things American². America was widely perceived as representing the future, as a society worthy of admiration and deserving of emulation³».

To create more ample impression with the reader Z. Brzezinski ought to recall here both racial turmoils in America at the beginning of sixties and the Vietnam War, which raised condemnation of the USA by more or less reasonably-thinking public opinion in all countries of the world. To forget the «Vietnam syndrome» does not mean to get rid of it.

«In contrast, Russia was held in cultural contempt by most of its Central European vassals and even more so by its principal and increasingly assertive eastern ally, China. For the Central Europeans, Russian domination meant isolation from what the Central Europeans considered their philosophical and

¹ We consider this «outcome» to be intermediate, if any.

² He forgot to mention in this context that in the course of the first five years after the war the USSR has proved to be capable without American or other countries help :

- to recover the pre-war level of production in all industries; after this the economy started to function in the regime of annual planned price-decrease matched by such production growth, which had never been previously observed in any country of the world within the history of global civilization;
- to liquidate American monopoly in the field of nuclear arms (also by secret services operations of penetration into American nuclear programmes);
- to lay foundations for subsequent space conquest, earlier than in America, and for the world's highest rates of socio-economic development that did exist in the fifties and that turned to be discouraging for western economists, as follows from the economic analytical papers of those days. This process fade away only because the post-Stalin leadership of the country had decayed – under connivance of the masses of party-members and of the rest of people – and was unable to resist the activities which were carried out on the territory of the USSR in conformity with the above cited NSC Directive 20/1 of August 18, 1948, and with other similar instructions.

³ As after the end of the Second World War the world was not unanimous in its assessment of the USSR and of the USA, the same was remaining true with respect to the USSR till the time when its authority was undermined by Khrushchev-Trotsky followers with their false exposures in the course of the XX party congress and provocative actions against the USA in «Caribbean crisis».

cultural home: Western Europe and its Christian¹ traditions. Worse than that, it meant domination by a people whom the Central Europeans, often unjustly, considered their cultural inferior.

The Chinese, for whom the word «Russia» means «the hungry land»², were even more openly contemptuous³.» («The Grand Chessboard», p.19).

In the follow-up of this comparison Z. Brzezinski describes how the great empires of the past had emerged and disappeared, and defines American position in the present world:

«In brief, *America stands supreme in the four decisive domains of global power*: militarily, it has an unmatched global reach; economically, it remains the main locomotive of global growth, even if challenged in some aspects by Japan and Germany (neither of which enjoys the other attributes of global might); technologically, it retains the overall lead in the cutting-edge areas of innovation; and culturally, despite some crassness⁴, it enjoys an appeal that is unrivalled, especially among the world's youth—all of which gives the United States a political clout that no other state comes close to matching. It is the combination of all four that makes America the only comprehensive global superpower». (Ibid., p.36).

Every society is managed in one way or another, and therefore the global historical process may be perceived as a global process of ruling which, at the first place, comprises many processes of regional ruling (policies of regional states and international policies, forces which are not institutionalised within state: mafias, Jewish diaspora); secondly, it proceeds within life processes of the Earth and Space, standing higher than it in the hierarchy.

The theoretical basis of the Conception of Social Security (COB⁵) is *the Sufficiently Universal Theory of Ruling (DOTU)* (one can generalize forever, but is there a reason for doing it? DOTU is sufficiently universal for describing any process of ruling or self-ruling with its terms). Accordingly to the Sufficiently Universal Theory of Ruling all means of ruling can be divided into general groups which are hierarchically displaced from the most effective to the less one. Such instruments of influence on society, whose reasonable use allows controlling its life and death, are:

1. Information of *worldview* nature, or methodology, which, once adopted, allows men to project – individually and socially – their "standard automations" of identification with regard to particular processes within the completeness and integrity of the World, and to define *in their individual perception* the hierarchic order of these processes in their mutual interconnection. This information lays foundation for the *culture of thinking* and for the completeness of ruling activities including also *intra-social absolute power* both on regional and global levels.

2. Information of *annalistic, chronological* nature, in all do-mains of Culture and all domains of Knowledge. It allows seeing, in which direction the processes are developing, and to correlate particular domains of *Culture as a whole* and of branches of Knowledge. To those, whose *worldview* is based on the sense of proportion and is conformable to the World, this information allows identifying particular processes while sieving the "chaotic" flow of facts and phenomena through the *worldview "sieve" – subjective human measure of*

¹ It would be correct to say : anti-Christian Biblical traditions.

² This name given to a region perfectly explains why the Far East became a part of Russia and not of China which for many centuries failed to settle these regions situated so far from Moscow.

³ According to our information, even during the period of military hostilities on Damansky Island, there was no anti-Russian propaganda in China. The propaganda was conducted in the sense that the Soviet people is good but at present time it is surviving difficulties which are caused by the fact that the power within the party has been seized by renegades and revisionists who turned the USSR from the socialist way of development, such as pursued by China, and this brings about conflicts between both countries.

⁴ Generally speaking, the *crassness* is not equivalent to genial simplicity. And that is why Z. Brzezinski mentioned the *decisive feature of the US culture* that devalues all others, though this is not clear.

⁵ COB – is the transliteration of the Russian abbreviation for the Conception of Social Security. One can read about it in the note "About COB in Brief", which is available at www.mera.com.ru, www.vodaspb.ru and www.globalmatrix.ru

identification. (Within the present context the culture means all information, which is not transferred genetically in the succession of generations).

3. Information of *fact-descriptive* nature: description of particular processes and their interconnections constitutes the substance of information of the third priority, which includes the faith-teachings of religious cults, secular ideologies, technologies and facts of all *domains* of science.

4. Economic processes, as an instrument of influence subordinated to purely informational instruments of influence through finances (money), which embody a totally generalized type of information of economic nature.

5. Genocide practices, affecting not only those who live today but also the generations to come, eliminating the *genetically determined potential* for learning and for development by them of the cultural heredity of ancestors: nuclear blackmail-threat of use; alcohol, tobacco and other kinds of narcotic drugs genocide, food additives, all ecological pollutants, some medicines-real use; "gene engineering" and "biotechnologies" – potential danger.

6. Other instruments of influence mainly by force – *weapons* in traditional sense of this word; killing and crippling human beings; destructing and exterminating material and technical objects of civilization, cultural monuments and bearers of their spirit.

Although there are no evident distinctions between the instruments of influence because many of them, by their capacities, could be related to different priorities, their classification in *hierarchical order*, as presented above, allows nonetheless to identify the dominating factors of influence that may be used as instruments of ruling, and in particular, as instruments of suppression and elimination of those phenomena in the social life that are conceptually inadequate in the sense of ruling.

When used within one social system this set is tantamount to generalized means of ruling this system. But when applied by one social system (social group) to others, which have different internal concepts of ruling, it is tantamount to generalized *weapons*, i.e. *means of warfare*, in most general sense of this word, or – instruments of support for self-ruling within another social system, when there is no conceptual incompatibility of ruling in both systems.

This approach determines the priority order of the above classes of instruments of influence on the society because the changes in society's state under the impact of the instruments of supreme priorities, entail much more significant consequences than those incurred by the instruments of minor priorities, although such changes proceed more slowly, without "noisy effects". In other words, within the *historically long* intervals the level of effectiveness is increasing from the first point to the sixth, while the level of irreversible results of their application, which by and large determine how efficiently problems of the social life are solved in 'now and forever' terms, is falling.

Z. Brzezinski is either ignoring or maliciously disguising this from his students, and so their world outlook (first priority) is programmed – in one way or another – to make them lead the United States to collapse. If this was not so, then he should not start his description of American position after the end of the Cold War with the sixth priority (militarily, global reach) – what's more, he even failed to come to so evident first priority-but after having clearly stressed the first priority (world outlook) he should gradually descend from it to the sixth priority. Then the origins of many problems affecting America itself would be clarified, and so the way would be laid to solve them.

Nonetheless, here is the final outcome of Z. Brzezinski's reflects on culture and about significance of American culture in the world (as given on the page 38):

«Cultural domination has been an underappreciated facet of American global power. Whatever one may think of his aesthetic values¹, America's mass culture exercises a magnetic appeal, especially on the world's youth. Its attraction may be derived from the hedonistic quality of lifestyle it projects², but its global appeal is undeniable. American television programs and films account for three-fourths of the global market. American popular music is equally dominant, while American fads, eating habits, and even clothing are increasingly imitated worldwide. The language of the Internet is English, and an overwhelming proportion of the global computer chatter also originates from America, influencing the content of global conversation. Lastly, America has become a Mecca for those seeking advanced education, with approximately half a million foreign students flocking to the United States, with many of the ablest never returning home. Graduates from American universities are to be found in almost every Cabinet on every continent», and so on and so forth, but he does not tackle the essence of «some crassness» of this very culture.

For sure, the book is addressed to American students who in majority were born and grown up in the USA, and thus the whole American culture and its inherent lifestyle are well familiar to them from their very childhood. But nowhere does Z. Brzezinski provide any assessment concerning the content of culture and the essence of its crassness. But that is what is essential to define perspectives of his «...formulation of a comprehensive and integrated Eurasian geostrategy...»

With regard to films, less new ideas are being developed and implemented in American society than the amount of films that are produced there; and this is the reason why all their films may be divided in two dozens of stories where only decorations and faces of actors are changing while the content of these stories is mostly reduced to main instincts and demonism. This is one aspect of crassness of American culture whose essence Z. Brzezinski did not tackle in details.

Meanwhile, they account for three fourth of the global market, i.e. somebody needs them. But Z. Brzezinski left aside the question of who is enjoying them and what are their social implications. He also kept silent that Hollywood is being purposefully purchased by Japan: in 1989 «Columbia Pictures» was bought, in 1990 it was the turn of «MCA». Although the trade marks of these cinema companies have been left unchanged and the public does not care, who is the owner of the companies, – the one «who pays is the master of the game». Cinema is standing as the third-first priority of generalized instruments of management³ and Japan, perhaps, has already won its cine-Midway⁴, for Americans are fond of movies about oriental martial arts and mystics, mysteries of the Shiaolin Monastery etc.

With Internet the situation is roughly the same. Bill Gates & Co. have designed their computer software in such a way that the access to the English-written files for a user who does not speak English, is much easier than the access by an English-speaking user to the files drawn on other languages. It means that many more persons can introduce information (first-third priorities of generalized instruments of management) into the English-speaking community than vice-versa. It's true that Pidgin English dominates in computer chatter within the Internet. But chatter is one thing while the meaningful broadcasting of a useful word is quite another thing, and as the same Z. Brzezinski's book shows it, the USA may chatter or even make virtual sex in the Internet, but they have nothing substantial to say. The same is true for American education: it is defective in all aspects related to the

¹ If we take Russian society, it is the stone thrown at all followers of the Laodicea Church (Apocalypses, Revelation, 3:14).

² That is why the indigenous population was exterminated and the biocenoses that had emerged on the US territory by the time the European colonizers appeared there, were extinguished.

³ V.I. Lenin told: «The major art for us is cinema»

⁴ The destruction by American Navy of the Japanese aircraft-carrying formation in the area of Midway Islands in 1942 became a turning point in the fights to achieve control over the Pacific in the Second World War of the XX century.

information of world outlook nature (first priority), and for this very reason even the reliable knowledge of minor priorities is dangerous for those who receive education in the USA.

Though everything said about films, Internet and education is significant, the major aspect is not here, insofar as the global policy and American participation there are concerned.

A lot of paper, ink and time have been consumed so far in internal Russian polemic against «the propaganda in favour of American lifestyle»; the point raised is that values and ideals are different things, because the values may be sold and purchased while the ideals may not. However, Z. Brzezinski, although during his whole life he had been struggling against the Russian imperial policy, was either unaware of this polemic or just considered it insignificant when he simply made reference in a single sentence to «whatever one may think of its aesthetic values...» But the question of whether it is the point to identify «ideals» and «values» in practical policy requires much more thorough consideration than what Z. Brzezinski allowed himself. And though it may be inherent to the same person to care and support both «ideals» and «values», the difference between these notions still exists.

It's not our purpose to fall into loquacious preaches; instead we shall simply refer to Natalie Clarkson¹, who is the chief of the Russian service at the radio station «The Voice of America». She was born and grown up in the USA. Her ancestors were both Russian émigrés and Americans, so she is a person for whom both languages are native. Thus, she noted that when she speaks English she has no problem to pronounce the words «money», «business» etc., that by their notion are somehow related to «values»; but as soon as she starts to speak Russian on the same subjects, her soul rejects this vocabulary (one of the reasons, why it is so, is that in different languages there are different systems of words with the same root and of their interlinks, and so the words with the same root in one language are not always the same-root words in other language etc.).

In other words, particular features of culture express the specific character of statistical distributions of men within society according to their mental structure. And whether one does not care, what are «values» and what are «ideals», while the other does care, – this should be taken as an objective historical reality. Therefore, the ignorance of diverse specific features of mentality in practical policy is a hundred per cent reliable way to bring the chosen political strategy to a fatal end; Z. Brzezinski, in essence, ought to tell this to his students openly and clearly, otherwise later they will lead America to collapse, and then the majority of Americans will perceive the position of Russia and that of the CIS after the state collapse of the USSR as the best dream.

As a matter of fact, it is not our intention to assert that imperturbable phlegmatic men, as usually presumed, prevail statistically among Scandinavians, while the passionate choleric persons dominate in the sunny south. Also, S. Freud's doctrines, which are thought in the West to explain many things, relate to this subject just in the sense that they have infected a lot of people in the West – who read much, but without choice, – by «Oedipus'es» and other complexes, either invented by S. Freud in his mind and imagination or groundlessly attributed by him to everybody, though in practice they are inherent only to a limited number of mentally disabled persons.

Man's mentality is a multi-component system. And so, the same components in the mentality of different persons may achieve not only different degree of development but may be also interconnected in different ways, thus forming qualitatively different management structures of informational flows. Depending on its structural frame the mentality will be capable to support one particular way of thinking and the corresponding

¹ As reported on June 26, 1990 by the newspaper «The Soviet Culture».

individual behaviour, and it will not support others, incompatible with it. The above Natalie Clarkson's mentality, as may be judged from what she says, is endowed by two not so much compatible options of its structure, allowing her to switch independently from one option to another. Of course, the Earth's population is about 6 billion, and each individual's mentality is unique, having unmatched originality. Nonetheless, all this diversity is subject to classification, quite definite whatsoever, and this fact is not taken thoughtfully by Western political analysts, as their works may testify.

If to remember the school course of Biology and to look deep inside your own psyche you can discover that the informational and algorithmic "software" of man's behaviour includes 1) basic instincts and unconditioned reflexes (of intracellular and cellular levels, and also of levels of tissues, organs, systems and organism), as well as their cultural veneers; 2) cultural traditions that are above instincts; 3) his or her own limited understanding; 4) «intuition on the whole» — things emerging from the subconscious level of an individual's psyche, coming from collective psyche, external delusions and from being possessed as this term was interpreted by the Holy inquisition; 5) God's guidance on the basis of the previously named things except for *external delusions and possessions that are direct intrusions into another person's psyche against the will of its bearer*.

These are things, which are possibly or actually contained in every individual's psyche. But there is something that puts a mankind away from the other biosphere, though neither biology, nor psychology and sociology don't notice it and one cannot read it in any learn book. The matter of this reticence is:

Every specimen of Homo Sapiens can have one of the next types of psychological structure more or less stable during his or her adult life.

- **Animal type of psychological structure** – when the whole behaviour obey instincts, and becomes a satisfaction of instinctive needs without considering the circumstances;
- **Biorobotic-zombie type of psychological structure** – when culture-defined automatism comes as the basis of behaviour, and the inner conflict between instincts and culture-defined automatism is solved for the last in the majority of cases. But if changing social and historical circumstances demand to reject the traditional norms of behaviour and to work out new ones, "zombie" declines the creation and continue following the already-formed customs;
- Under the **demonic type of psychological structure** one understands that its representatives are able to create and using their will can overpass the dictation of instinct and historically formed culture. They can work out new lines of behaviour and of solving problems appearing before them and the society. Whether it will be a good or evil, as others understand them, depends on "demon's" real morality. Getting any power in the society demonism demands an unconditional service to it, creating the most cruel and subtle forms of depressing the people;
- **Human type of psychological structure** is characterised like this: every its bearer realises the mission of a human – to be the God's "deputy" on the Earth. Consequently he or she makes his relations with the God during his or her life, and consciously, with his or her own will, sincerely contribute to the God's Providence in the way he or she understands it. The feedback (showing one's mistakes) is enclosed from Above in a way that he (or she) finds himself (or herself) in the certain circumstances correlating to the sense of his (or her) prayers and intentions. In other words: the God speaks to people using the language of life's circumstances.

Moreover people gave birth to the fifth type of psychological structure themselves:

- **The dropped into unnaturalness type of psychical structure** – when a subject belonging to the specie “Homo Sapiens” intoxicates himself with different psychotropic things: alcohol, tobacco or more strong drugs of nowadays. It leads to the unnatural distortion of the organism physiology character in the aspect of metabolism and in the aspect of biofield physiology as well. And its effect is: plural different errors of psychical activity in *all its kinds (from sense organs work to the intellect and will)*, which are typical to the types of psychical structure of animal, zombie or demon (since bearers of human type of psychical structure don’t intoxicate themselves). Thus the “man-like” person becomes a bearer of psychic structure that has no natural place in the biosphere. And by the kind of his *behaviour not corresponding to the circumstances* he appears to be **the worst of all animals**. And for this breach of the status in the Earth biosphere predetermined for him (or her) such person inevitably gets the punishment from Above.

In the same time if a person became an addict for any narcotic he gets the stable distortion of his biofield, and consequently according to the parameters of his spirit he doesn’t belong to the specie Homo Sapiens any more. Moreover the most fuddles are genetic poisons, i.e. they break the work of chromosomal system and destroy chromosomal structures of those, who takes these poisons. Then defective chromosomes are inherited by the descendants and it undermines their health and potential for individual development and creative activity. It has even harder effect if the conception is made before recovering the chromosomal structures by systems acting in the organism. However if the genetic poisons come to the organism too often and in the huge portions systems of chromosomal recovering have no chance to repair all damages – in such case the descendants are doomed to degeneracy.

And this fact allows calling this type of psychical structure – created by men themselves and reproduced by the social culture – dropped into unnaturalness.

For the human psychical structure the non-formal, non-dogmatic and non-ritual belief to God¹ during the Life and activity in course of God’s Guidance of his or her own choice are normal.

A type of psychical structure is determined by the upbringing and education. Thus if one doesn’t achieve human’s type of psychical structure by his youth it is because of social culture’s viciousness and also because of unrighteous bringing up by his parents. However being adult and understanding this fact one is able to change his psychical structure from any to a human one. This is a basis for a following individual development.

Depending on the statistics of distribution of people by types of psychical structure the society forms its social organisation, develops its culture; either supporting the conservation of the state achieved and slave-holding system recurrence attempts; or supporting the recognition of the human type of psychical structure as the norm in the society, and its reproducing during the change of generations as a basis for a following individual and social development of nations and the whole mankind.

In other words, the human dignity is expressed not in education, knowledge and know-how, but in a certain structure of mentality. The same is true for societies: human society is characterized not by its cultural achievements in the field of

¹ His Providence has not yet been known because one believes in Him, but nobody believes Him. (An unknown Russian author)

So, don’t mix to believe in God (which is usually understood as the belief in the simple existence of God) and to believe God (to believe God – is to believe what God says to be true).

science, technology, magic, but by a certain structure of individual and collective mentality.

Those are accomplished men whose intellect in their life development is based on instincts and congenital reflexes, who listen to what downs upon them intuitively while distinguishing in *intuition generally* either God's Providence or satanism directives, or the signs of activity initiated by social collective mentality, and who, by their free will, are conceiving their behaviour in conformity with God's Intention, not giving birth in the society to such type of collective mentality that may be compared with a growing avalanche of mistakes.

In all other cases the opportunity is provided to be men, this opportunity being missed. Many individuals in the course of their whole life are being bound to a determined structure of mentality, while many others in the course of life change the structure of their mentality irreversibly and many times. There are many others too, whose structure of mentality may change many times though in reversible manner even in the course of one day, not to mention the whole period of their life.

This plurality in the mental structure of those who are assigned by Heaven to be men – *in the sense of this word pre-designed by God* – is an objective reality at the current stage of historical development and it may be considered even more thoroughly than this is done in the present work.

And it is from the position of recognition of this objective reality that we may say that the social progress is expressed in the forcing out of one types of mental structure, existing in society, by others. Accordingly, the humankind may move:

- in the direction of basic instincts, when the animal structure of mentality statistically prevails and when biorobots, programmed by culture, herd civilized human-like monkeys while both being dominated by demoniacal personalities;
- in the direction of biorobotization, when the basic instincts are suppressed mercilessly while multiple biorobots are, as in the first option, dominated by demoniacal personalities;
- in the direction of humanism, when the basic instincts, biorobotization and demonism are placed in the condition of impossibility to exist.

Hence, the global policy is an activity promoting humankind's movement towards one of these mutually exclusive «ultimate objectives», no matter whether this activity is guided by basic instincts and their cultural covers or by programmed culture or under the pressure of possession of demoniacal personalities by other demons; or by free will of reasonable man who is not deaf of the *Language of Life, in which every event has an objective meaning addressed to man by Heaven*; this objective meaning a man can understand subjectively either within the limits of virtue inherent to him or within the limits of his vicious nature. In other words, a man is capable to identify double meaning and then to define in his own subjective way what meaning is closer to objective Good and what – to objective Evil, and to correspond in his behaviour either to the former or to the latter.

It is useful alike to muse on the question, which of these aspired ultimate objectives of the global policy is being supported by Creator and His Holy Might in the course of the whole history of the present civilization, and what is He rooting out of the social life of every people on the Earth?

Everyone clearly understands that when moving in any of these directions a leader may emerge, whose cultural primacy over other fellows, who selected the same direction of development, is preponderant.

American cultural supremacy has been tackled by Z. Brzezinski many times, but he did not consider in details the quality aspects of the kind of mental structure which statistically prevails in America, and of the one dominating over statistically prevailing mass, just as this is reflected in the American culture.

The same questions that he either did not notice or considered useless to explain to his students, are relevant with regard to another question, namely – who, as bearers of a particular type of mental structure, are «magnetically attracted» by American culture: human-like, biorobots, demoniacal personalities or those who aspire for humanism?

These questions are neither raised nor tackled by Z. Brzezinski; nonetheless he answered them in his book in the following way:

«More generally, cultural change in America may also be uncongenial to the sustained exercise abroad of genuinely imperial power. That exercise requires a high degree of doctrinal motivation, intellectual commitment, and patriotic gratification. Yet the dominant culture of the country has become increasingly fixated on mass entertainment that has been heavily dominated by personally hedonistic¹ and socially escapist themes². The cumulative effect has made it increasingly difficult to mobilize the needed political consensus on behalf of sustained, and also occasionally costly, American leadership abroad. Mass communications have been playing a particularly important role in that regard, generating a strong revulsion against any selective use of force that entails even low levels casualties.

In addition, both America and Western Europe have been finding it difficult to cope with the cultural consequences of social hedonism and the dramatic decline in the centrality of religious-based values of society. (The parallels with the decline of the imperial systems summarized in chapter 1 are striking in that respect³.) The resulting cultural crisis⁴ has been compounded by the spread of drugs⁵ and, especially in America, by its linkage to the racial issue. Lastly, the rate of economic growth is no longer able **to keep up with growing material expectations**⁶, with the latter stimulated by a culture that places a premium on consumption. It is no exaggeration to state that a sense of historical anxiety, perhaps even of pessimism, is becoming palpable in the more articulate sectors of Western society <...>.

That lack of confidence has been intensified by widespread disappointment with consequences of the end of the Cold War. Instead of a «new world order» based on consensus and harmony,⁷ «things which seemed to belong to the past» have all of a sudden become the future. Although ethnic-national conflicts may no longer pose risk of a central war, they do threaten the peace in significant parts of the globe. Thus, war is not likely to become obsolete for some time to come⁸. With the more-endowed nations constrained by their own higher technological capacity for self-destruction as well as by self-interest, war may have become

¹ **Hedonism** (Greek *hedone* means «pleasure») – an ethical doctrine, asserting that delight, pleasure is the chief objective and motivation of the human behaviour (Epicure). In new times it is characteristic for utilitarianism. Utilitarianism is a principle of evaluation of all phenomena from the standpoint of their utility. To keep close to the terminology of contemporary living languages- hedonism is the slavery within voluptuousness which devours everything without reserves, thus being suicidal.

² And, as a result, these problems are not being resolved in advance, thus aggregating as a snowball and giving birth to collective mentality of the type «avalanche of mistakes».

³ We have not cited how Z. Brzezinski describes the mechanism of collapse of empires of the past but just mentioned it.

⁴ By the end of his book the author has probably forgotten what he wrote earlier in it about unrivalled American cultural supremacy. What to do, «he is a double-minded man, unsteady in all ways».

⁵ No use to reproach the Columbian narco-barons and the bosses of the golden triangle in the South East Asia: supply is caused by DEMAND. This is the axiom of the world where the values and ideals are identical. But where they are not identical a proverb may be applied: «a pig will find its mud», and if not, then it will make mud itself. Once the idiots whose choice are narcotics, are deprived of these narcotic drugs – they will implant electrodes in the pleasure centres as if they were guinea-pigs, and continue to press the button to achieve agony and die in voluptuousness, surrounded by virtual reality of computer world. They were simply grown up voluptuous, living as parasites in the society, no matter whether in America or in Russia or elsewhere.

⁶ The words selected reminiscent those of the CPSU Central Committee report to a congress in the Brezhnev's times. In addition, Z. Brzezinski does not mention anywhere that the planet can not stand this keeping up with the *unlimited growth* of expectations, and how these expectations should be limited in order not to cause catastrophe of the present Earth's biosphere, otherwise the humankind will inevitably suffer if not disappear.

⁷ Better would be adding: «the master and the slave».

⁸ Two paragraphs earlier the author, as we remember, deplored that the American public opinion disapprove any use of military force that entails even low levels of casualties.

a luxury that only the poor people of this world can afford. In the foreseeable future, the impoverished¹ two-thirds of humanity may not be motivated by the restraint of the privileged». (“The Grand Chessboard”, pp. 250,251).

So, if all this is true, then the USA should concentrate on internal problems- to develop their own culture and not to encroach on reforming of the rest of the world, first, making of it a province to ensure the exceedingly growing hedonist (to say in Russian-all devouring voluptuous) expectations of the American metropol, and than-something yet unidentified but named already «new world order» which is to be established «beyond the last global superpower».

But what we read further is quite different:

«Unfortunately, to date, efforts to spell out a new central and worldwide objective for the United States, in the wake of the termination of the Cold War, have been one-dimensional. They have failed to link the need to improve the human condition² with the imperative of preserving the centrality of American power in world affairs. <...>

In brief, the US policy goal must be unapologetically twofold: to perpetuate America’s own dominant position for at least a generation and preferably longer still; and to create a geopolitical framework that can absorb the inevitable shocks and strains of social-political change while evolving into the geopolitical core of shared responsibility for peaceful global management» (“The Grand Chessboard”, p.p.253,254).

To be noted that the priority of goals, as outlined in the last paragraph, namely: 1) America’s dominant position, 2) creation of a geopolitical framework for peaceful global management (what implies that there are no grounds for mutual hostility between peoples), – is controversial to what Z. Brzezinski promulgated in the paragraph of «Introduction» that has been cited above and examined in essence, namely: 1) to shape a truly cooperative global community, in keeping with the fundamental interests of humankind, 2) America’s global primacy in transitional period as guarantor of the fundamental interests of humankind.

It has been shown earlier that these goals do not always coincide. But given the problems facing the West and the USA, – in particular, in their development based on their inherent culture, which demonstrates statistical supremacy and dominance within society of certain inhuman types of mental structure, – whose actual existence is admitted by Z. Brzezinski himself,- the hierarchy of the US political objectives, promulgated by the author in the last paragraph cited (see the last page of the book) is tantamount to suppression of the fundamental interests of humankind for the sake of insatiable voluptuousness and ambitions of the «demonized» American elite.

Policy is a type of management. In the meantime, the theory of management suggests that it is objectively impossible to exercise management when the objectives and the hierarchy of their significance are unidentified and the simultaneously determined goals are incompatible. The doctrine outlined by Z. Brzezinski does not meet this criterion. In case the management is exercised tacitly, i.e. when its goals and the means of their achievement «go without saying» – and hence, the above principle is not relevant,-inevitably come unpredictable consequences which depreciate even the results achieved so far (as it was the case of the US NSC Directive 20/1 of August 18, 1948, in the sense that the execution of its main provisions between August 18 and 23, 1991 has generated even more serious problems for the USA) and may even invalidate them completely (in the West this is called sometimes the «effect of monkey’s paw»). It happens because the tacit (when it «goes without saying») and declared (direct definitions) approaches are practically mutually

¹ Not impoverished but robbed in the past by colonialism and in the present by money-lending policies of advanced western countries and the Jewish banking community.

² Human in what sense: with the animal structure of mentality, biorobots, demoniacal personalities or still Human beings?

suppressing by virtue of different objective and subjective factors; besides, in the social life they generate phenomena which are the result of their interaction.

The same is true, if the present Z. Brzezinski's book relates to that information flow, by which the true American bosses are washing brains of those crowd members who are interested in politics and thus require for their self-psychological comfort some quasi-truthful explanation of the current events and of how they correlate with the officially declared ideological doctrine of state and with political strategy promoting this doctrine. As far as the bosses themselves are concerned, they are relying, in particular, on the doctrine, which has been designed for a very limited circle of initiated persons, – and thus better corresponds to the world's reality,- but which is impossible to articulate in the society in its true dimension without provoking meaningless riot against their dominance or-what is even more dangerous for the bosses,-without generating a meaningful freedom-loving action by those whose future choice is humanism.

If the latter is the case, then the concealed political doctrine and the doctrines declared with the purpose to «reason» the crowd in general and its substrata (parts) are inevitably contradicting each other in some of their aspects. But the crowd and its substrata are being self-managed on the basis of collective consciousness and unconsciousness generated by its individual members, and thus in those aspects of social life, where the activity of structures initiated into the real doctrine is inadequate, these structures are losing their competence. Meanwhile, the foundations of society's established structure are undermined by phenomena which are gaining strength, along with the crowd falling out of management exercised by the hierarchy of structures of mutual deception-whether big or small – whose chiefs are persons initiated in *true villainy*.

Such processes of losing of management ability may develop in reticence and then suddenly become obvious in particular circumstances, when the crowd, inspired by its collective consciousness or unconsciousness, demonstrates unexpected behaviour.

Objectively, such was the internal mechanism of state collapse in the USSR, the same mechanism exists as well in the USA, and it is «working» already...

The very problems in the life of society arise from the truthful lie which has been purposefully proliferated in the crowd beforehand under the cover of ideological, economic doctrines and the doctrines of state political activities.

To avoid that anything similar happens in society, the real doctrine of self-management organisation therein should be so formulated that one could directly proclaim it in this society without resorting to any kind of «transformers»; otherwise, it gains well-looking and moral attractiveness while remaining the source of calamities and villainies in practical policy.

In other words, whatever viewpoint you take, the doctrine of American international policy, as formulated by Z. Brzezinski in his book, represent a danger for America itself ; the answer why it is so, is given by the Apostle James who said: « he is a double – minded man, unsteady in all his ways»,- because the same is applicable to societies.

Of course, one may try, as conceived by Z. Brzezinski, to use the coming opportunity of God's connivance with regard to peoples standing backward vis-à-vis the USA (as the US see it), but it would be more secure – for America itself as well as for all other countries – not to do this, otherwise America itself, in its historical kind, will lose its status on the «chessboard», and not of Eurasia but of the whole world: *fortunately, inside it there are quite enough internal causes that may entail far reaching and wide-range consequences.*

We presume, therefore, that Z. Brzezinski has failed to achieve his initial objective – «*the formulation of a comprehensive and integrated Eurasian geostrategy is the purpose*

of this book», – though he himself, his American readers, students and those who «*inspired him for glories*», may have another vision of his works. As long as this type of world-outlook suggested by Z. Brzezinski in his book, continues to prevail in American political establishment, the USA are protected against global policy – pursued in conformity with either Biblical, Scientological, Marxist-Trotskyist or other projects – even to a less degree than Russia under Nicolas II or than the USSR of the Khrushchev-Brezhnev-Gorbachev – times.

September 19-29, 1998