

must be accompanied by a revolution in basic attitudes. Future battles in that revolution—in China and elsewhere—will have to be fought in a theatre in which even the smallest skirmishes are difficult to win: the human mind.

Thomas Land is an author and correspondent who writes on world affairs from Europe.

EXCURSUS 3

Stephen D. Hayes on SOVIET INTENTIONS AND THE GHOST OF HEGEL

The rumbling of Soviet tanks into Afghanistan has sent the foreign affairs experts scurrying to their files in an effort to ferret out the Russian intentions behind the move. Many claimed surprise. Others, like Adam Ulam of Harvard, said it was a rather straightforward extension of recent Soviet behavior.

Is it a short-term move to provide temporary support to a pro-Soviet leader? Or a calculated move to take greater advantage of turmoil in the Middle East and what is perceived as American vacillation in the international arena? Or something else entirely? Apparently, no one is really sure what the Russians are up to. Could it be that the Russian leadership itself is unclear about its own long-range goals? If this is the case (and it's my guess it is), then another factor—the Soviet sense of history—takes on added importance in determining the eventual outcome of the affair.

For Hegel, the philosophic forerunner of Marx and Engels, there was an inevitability to the direction of history, a predetermination by "*geist*," ultimate Reason or the Spirit of the State in the world. For the traditional Marxist the course of history is set, rather, by "objective" economic factors. Marx and Engels tossed out large portions of Hegel's philosophy. But the intellectual tradition undergirding Communist doctrine is laden, very heavily laden, with the Hegelian theme that the direction of history is *set*. Its march is inexorable. It is the unfolding of an ordered plan.

With regard to Afghanistan in the winter of 1980, the particular tactical considerations weighed by Brezhnev or Gromyko may ultimately matter less than the general philosophical milieu in which both men operate. Brezhnev doesn't reread Hegel and Marx in the middle of a crisis any more than Carter and the National Security Council consult the Federalist Papers. But none of them have to in order to be influenced, likely in an unconscious way, by these philosophies. Perhaps it was a subconscious acknowledgement of the Communist philosophy of history that prompted a Soviet diplomat to comment the other day, "The armies of Socialism march in only one direction."

Where will the Afghanistan incursion lead? Might the Soviets be saying to themselves, "We will take care of the troops and tanks and let history take care of the outcome"? (After all, Hegel believed that "individuals and nations are the *unconscious* tools and organs of the world mind at work within them.") If such thoughts are creeping even surreptitiously into Soviet thinking, it is ominous indeed. It is ominous because it reinforces the old belief

(once disregarded?) in the inevitability of Soviet hegemony. It is ominous also because it will run the Soviets smack up against America's own view of future history. When John O'Sullivan first wrote of Manifest Destiny in the *New York Morning News* in 1845, he was speaking of America's justification for civilizing and democratizing our Western frontiers. By the latter part of that century the concept had become one of global scope; it was America's providential calling *in history* to serve as the vanguard of freedom in the world. Despite the ebb and flow of cold war and détente, the spirit of Manifest Destiny still simmers beneath the surface of American foreign policy, still courses through the veins of the American people. The stage is set, once again, for the clash of future histories.

In his monumental *Philosophy of Right*, Hegel argued that history moves from East to West. He went on to say that a nation is, in effect, "selected" to carry out the predetermined work of history and that such a nation is "dominant in world history during this one epoch and it is only once that it can make its hour strike....The minds of other nations are without rights and they, along with those whose hour has struck already, count no longer in world history." The Soviet Union just might suspect that this is its hour. It might be trying to demonstrate at the same time that history also moves from North to South.

In the final analysis the aching worry over the Afghanistan move is not who controls Kabul or even whether it is, as President Carter said, "a stepping stone to possible control over much of the world's oil supplies." The essential question is whether the ghost of Hegel still stalks the halls of the Kremlin.

Stephen D. Hayes is a foreign affairs officer at the U.S. Treasury Department. © 1980 Stephen D. Hayes.

EXCURSUS 4

M. Archer on A CRY FOR HELP

It happened in Beirut, Lebanon, in 1948, when riots burst forth in response to Israel's War of Independence. The Muslim's were running down the street yelling, "First the Jews, then the Christians."

From 1864 until after World War I, Lebanon was a part of the Ottoman Empire, under Turkish rule but governed by a Christian military governor (a *mushir*) and twelve elected representatives of the three religious groups, Christian, Muslim, Druse. After World War I the country became a French mandate under the League of Nations.

In 1920 the French established the independent state of Lebanon, separating it from Syria to increase Christian influence in the area. France made Lebanon the seat of the French high commissioner. Lebanon remained independent under the French mandate until 1941, when it became a republic.

The president of the country is elected to a six-year term by a two-thirds majority of the Chamber of Deputies. He chooses the cabinet and nominates one of its members as prime minister. It was understood that the president would be a Christian, the prime minister a Muslim. Until the arrival of the Palestinians, Christians were a majority, with the Maronites the predominant sect.