As a Romanian mathematician and futurist, I have had the privilege to see 'from within' how intellectuals and the communist state can coexist in Eastern Europe. In my experience, East European intellectuals do not represent a threat to existing communist rule, although they can challenge it. [Few people - if any at all - could have foreseen the amplitude of the anti-communist upheaval in Romania in December 1989. At the same time, some of the predictions made in this paper retain their validity even after the breakdown of the Ceausescu regime. The new ruling body - the National Salvation Front - is overwhelmingly made up of former communists. Their strategy is to preserve some institutions of the old order by changing their names but not their functions. In the meantime, opposition parties have emerged in Romania and the transition to post-communism has proceeded faster than expected. (Eds)]

If 'intellectuals' means, in the broad sense, 'better-educated people who earn their living from mental rather than manual labor' (and therefore including routine white-collar employees as well as the creative and critical intelligentsia), then what could 'East European intellectuals' mean? Are intellectuals living in Eastern Europe a new species of intellectual?

Further, if a State is, in Max Weber's definition, 'an organization which can successfully claim the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory', and therefore a communist state is a state in which 'physical force' is in the hands of the sole ruling Marxist party, then what could a 'National-Communist State' mean? Is such an organization a new one?

My conviction is that both these categories are now realities, and that Romanian intellectuals, as well as the Romanian communist state, fully illustrate them. For me, as a futurist, the present is not only the result and final stage of the past; it is also the starting point for the future. I will not, therefore, describe the past wars, with their victories and
defeats, between intellectuals and communist power; I will only try to discover, in the present situations, the seeds of possible future developments.

EAST-EUROPEAN INTELLECTUALS: ARE THEY REALLY A NEW SPECIES OF INTELLECTUAL?

Intellectuals belong to ‘civil society’. Usually analyses of the relationships between Soviet-type regimes and ‘civil society’ are at two extremes.

At one extreme we find those analyses which assume a total divorce between the society and the communist power: essentially hostile to human nature, they claim, the totalitarian system was introduced by force (first in the USSR, to be further exported, by force also, to other communist countries), and the repressed society has no other wish but to get rid of it and to resume the course of its natural (that is democratic) development. Representations of this sort are frequent in writings of dissenting authors like Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn or Paul Goma.

At the other extreme we find analyses which argue that societies in communist countries have been totally pervaded by the Soviet-type system. A symbiosis has occurred, leading to genuine communization. Ironically, here Zinoviev’s sarcasm converges with the eulogies of official communist authors. The endurance of the Soviet-type system no longer appears to be based on fear but on the total assimilation and natural integration of the new structure – in the USSR and other communist countries alike. In short, communism is perceived as a genetic mutation.

My personal view is in between. It would be hard to believe that decades of communist rule and imposed-by-force behavior have passed without any consequence; but adaptation for survival is a sign of health and vigor. Thus some tenets of communism, and some patterns of behavior under dictatorship, have probably been internalized. But this does not mean that once freed from dictatorship the citizen produced by and for totalitarian society will perform like a Westerner produced by and for democracy. Therefore, it is difficult to say what ‘health’ means, if once cured the