



Christian Anti-Communism Crusade

P. O. BOX 890
124 E. FIRST ST
LONG BEACH, CALIF. 90801
HEmlock 7-0941

April 15, 1979

CREATING POTENTIAL COLLABORATORS WITH MARXIST REVOLUTION

A longtime devoted supporter of Campus Crusade for Christ was deeply disturbed when he read the article "'The System': Creating Hunger Amidst Plenty" published in the March 1979 edition of *WORLDWIDE CHALLENGE*, the monthly magazine of Campus Crusade for Christ, and he asked me for my opinion of it. After reading the article, I share his concern and feel that it presents significant danger to some of the idealistic and sacrificial young people associated with Campus Crusade.

The danger is that they may be recruited as collaborators with violent Marxist revolutionaries as has happened with others, specifically Catholic priests, who have embraced the viewpoint presented in this article. This viewpoint is similar, if not identical, to that expressed in Liberation Theology, and many of the quotations used by the author of the article come from supporters of Liberation Theology.

The author of the article is Dr. Stanley Mooneyham, who is the President of World Vision International, an organization which has an unrivaled record of worldwide service to suffering humanity. This organization has blended caring for orphans, healing the sick, feeding the poor, and enlightening the mind with the presentation of the Christian Gospel in a remarkably effective manner.

The last thing I wish to do is to harm either Campus Crusade for Christ or World Vision, but, since the point of view in the article may do that, and since the article has been published, it should be publicly answered.

Recognizing the danger of distorting the message by taking quotations out of context and ignoring significant passages which qualify selected quotations, I reprint the article in full:

'The System': Creating Hunger Amidst Plenty by Stanley Mooneyham

In this excerpt from his book, What Do You Say to a Hungry World?, Dr. Stanley Mooneyham questions: What have God's people been saying to a hungry world?

IT IS difficult, if not impossible, for the average middle class American to disbelieve that every person in the world could make it like he did if only that person would (a) apply himself, (b) work hard, (c) grab the opportunities, and (d) save his money.

After all, everyone knows it is the application of those virtues that made

America wealthy and great. If they work here, they'll work anywhere.

And we really believe that. We think everybody is playing the survival game in the same league. It just isn't so — you've got the major league teams and the sandlot teams. And most of us in the majors don't even know what the sandlots look like where the other teams

play, much less how the players live.

But if we are serious about becoming agents of change, we must know empathetically the life-styles of those who play in the Third World sandlots. If we would understand the root causes of poverty in the world, we must see how the rules of the games are stacked against the weaker teams.

But let me caution you that the facts are likely to challenge many of our sentimentally held notions.

At the heart of the problems of poverty and hunger, injustice and inequity, are human systems which mistreat and exploit man made in the image of God. If humanity is to be served, if the hungry are to be fed, if the poor are to share in God's bestowed abundance, some systems will require drastic adjustments.

The Case of Juan Díaz

Let it be said in our behalf that most of us probably never stopped to think that the arrangements of world trade and commerce, which are so profitable for us, may be unfair and oppressive for those on the other end. So let us now consider that possibility.

Tomorrow morning while you are enjoying your coffee might be a good time to contemplate the case of Juan Díaz, a coffee worker in the Central American Republic of El Salvador.¹ Juan and three of his five daughters spend long, hard days in the coffee fields of Montenegro. On a good day, Juan picks enough coffee to earn \$1.44; his daughters make a total of \$3.35. With \$1.24 of these wages, Juan and his wife, Paula, are able to feed their family for one day. In bad times, Juan and his daughters make as little as \$.56 a day — less than half the money they need just to eat.

At the end of the six-week coffee season, Juan does odd jobs around the hacienda. He can earn about \$.90 there for an eight-hour day. Paula de Díaz supplements her husband's earnings by working in the market. When people have enough money to purchase the home-grown vegetables she sells, Paula can make about \$.40 a day.

The hacienda provides a simple dwelling for the Díaz family, but no modern facilities. Candles are used for light, water has to be hauled from a well and furnishings consist of little more than a table and some chairs. Aside from a dress and shoes for each of the girls during the coffee season, the family has not been able to buy much else in the last five years. Whatever money doesn't go for food is spent for visits to the health clinic (\$.40 each time), the high interest on bills at the company store, expenses for the children in school, and for the burial of Juan's father, who died last year.

When Juan looks at the plantation where he works, he sees no chains which bind him to it, but he knows he is not free to exercise any significant control over most things that affect his life.

Forming a union to press for higher wages and increased benefits is not a prac-

tical option, for he fears such agitation would result in his being fired.

If Juan could get out of debt to the company store and save a little money, he might leave the plantation and try to find work elsewhere. But this is also impractical, for he never has had a chance to get an education or develop other skills.

When Juan looks at his country, he sees here, too, that the system is stacked against him. Virtually all the wealth and income, land and industry, political and military power rest in the hands of a small ruling minority. One-third of El Salvador's wealth is controlled by five percent of the people. The annual income of a person in this privileged class is 12 times that of the poorer two-thirds. The disparity is even greater — 30 to one — for the poorest 10%.

In addition, those who are better off consume disproportionately more — up to 13 times as much.

The distribution of farmland in El Salvador is weighted in the same way. More than 40% of the arable land is controlled by an elite one percent of the people, while 78% of the poorer agricultural population share only 11% of the land.

Although Juan knows nothing about the international forces which affect him so deeply, these powers extract from his country and the rest of the developing world their natural resources — a part of the system which has been going on for centuries and which made it possible for the western nations to accelerate their industrialization.

It was the plunder mentality of such civilized countries as Spain, Portugal, England, France and Holland in the 16th and 17th centuries that started the rich lands of Latin America down the road to present-day underdevelopment. Gold, silver and other precious resources were removed from these colonies and used to enrich the mother countries.

Even after independence in the 19th century, the more industrially advanced countries wielded enormous power over the newly independent Latin American nations because they dominated the international systems of trade and the international monetary system, and they used their political and military power to preserve the status quo.

These patterns set hundreds of years ago are not terribly different today. But now other countries of Western Europe, Japan and the U.S., have come into the picture. By means of trade and economic assistance, these nations pursue their own ends — with some unfortunate consequences for Latin America.

And what does all this have to do with

your morning cup of coffee?

Well, El Salvador and 12 other Latin American countries emerged from their colonial past with one-crop economies. They depend on the sale of a single commodity for over 40% of their export earnings. Five of these countries, including El Salvador, depend on the sale of coffee alone for a substantial portion of these earnings. Coffee, however, makes up only one percent of the volume of world trade; and, to make matters worse, it is not an item of absolute importance to an industrialized economy.

But for Juan Díaz and 350,000 other coffee workers in El Salvador, the price of coffee on the world market can literally mean the difference between life and death. It has been estimated that a decline of even one cent per pound in price of "green coffee" means an annual loss of about \$65 million for the coffee-producing countries.

As you brew your coffee, ships set sail, goods are being exported and imported, capital is being invested, and Juan and his daughters begin another grueling day in the coffee fields. Broadside denunciations of the system in which Juan is trapped will not lighten his burden.

What is needed is conscious effort, based on truth and compassion, to make fundamental changes in the system. First, we must be open to rethink words and concepts which heretofore may have seemed threatening to us.

Take the word radical, for instance.

To be radical simply means to get at the root of things. The trouble with many so-called radical causes is they are not radical enough. Violence is not radical; it is reactionary. Only forgiving and serving love is radical. Communism as an answer for the world's economic ills is not radical at all — it deals only with superficialities and never touches the deep roots of alienation and selfishness. Neither does capitalism or socialism. No system that ignores the sin problem in man and society and that values machines and production quotas over human beings can pass the test as an adequate answer.

Vanguard or Rearguard?

For that reason I believe the people of God have a unique contribution to make toward the restructuring of the old systems and the creation of new ones. When we should be the vanguard of change, why are we more often the rearguard preservers of the status quo? It seems that we deliberately misunderstand Jesus' words, "You always have the poor with you," as confirming poverty and discrimination as a perpetual God-arranged state for some. Jesus' words, however, are

no invitation to resignation and inactivity, for He continues, "... and whenever you will, you can do good to them.

Should not doing good include working for systemic change as well as delivering a Christmas basket, making a contribution on Worldwide Communion Sunday, or writing a check to the United Way?

Some time ago, 300 Roman Catholic priests in Brazil issued a statement that stabs deeply into the Christian conscience. It said in part:

It is in the framework of paternalism that many people, including church authorities, approach present-day realities and social problems. They attempt to solve them by appealing to the duty of paternal charity. They establish countless charitable organizations, social programs and money campaigns. They unwisely launch philanthropic initiatives that are dear to the middle class, because the latter can thereby work off their feeling of guilt. ... In practice, the Church's life of action makes her an accomplice in the brutal exploitation of the people and in the misguided effort to solve poverty and illness on an individual basis.

Where the church has failed, let it repent and do the works demanded by a just and righteous God: "... seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." The God of morality and right insists that aesthetic worship is no substitute for moral honesty. God loathes a church that revels in an impractical and unapplied piety.

The time is ripe for the church to rediscover its total mandate. The church must do something more than tell government and business what their responsibilities are. True, the church must apply the standard of judgment to secular institutions, but I think most of them are sick of pious frauds passing resolutions for them while completely ignoring their own inconsistent practices.

I think God may be sick of it, too. I know I am.

The church has had so little influence in political and economic matters recently that I still see the story of Wilberforce's efforts to free the slaves in England 150 years ago used as the most contemporary illustration of its involvement.

If God is on the side of the poor and oppressed, where is the church? Asleep?

That's where it seemed to be in Ethiopia while over the centuries an aristocracy built a feudal system to which the recent famine in the country can be heavily traced. Or maybe it was only pretending to be asleep, because actually the

Ethiopian Orthodox Church — by owning 30% of the land in the country — was an active participant in the heartless system.

Consider this: Although over 90% of the population of Ethiopia must earn their living from the land, these peasants share ownership of only about 10% of the land. Apart from what the church holds, the aristocracy owns the remaining 60%. The system requires share tenancy, with the peasant paying his rent in money, produce or crops.

But here is the crusher. The law of the land (1960 Civil Code of Ethiopia, Article 2988) states that rent is presumed to be 50% of the produce of the rented land. And that isn't all — the peasant must pay tenancy fees, a tithe, and a land tax which is a fee for the right to rent! Together these can eat up 90% of what the poor farmer earns.

How can he possibly afford fertilizer or irrigation? He can barely live. Many didn't during the famine — an estimated hundred thousand died.

Ethiopia is not an isolated example of a discriminatory system of land distribution. Latin America provides many more. In Chile, one percent of the plantation owners have 43% of the land. In Bolivia, before the last reform, 6.3% of the population owned 91.9% of all the land.

In the same book from which those figures are taken, Father Rosier says he doesn't believe the answer necessarily is to be found in parceling out the land in small chunks — but he does think that exploiting the land and underpaying the workers should be made a punishable social crime. Also, I would suggest there are some other crimes — those committed by governments against their people — that ought to be punished somehow this side of Judgment Day. Crimes like preserving the national image over the lives of starving people.

The Far Eastern Economic Review (Nov. 15, 1974) reported that "India is trying its utmost to soft-pedal reports of famine in some parts of the country. New Delhi has sent strict instructions to its diplomatic missions abroad that they should blandly deny stories in the international press saying that the problem is reaching serious proportions. ...

The magazine must have been right, because two weeks later the Minister of State for Agriculture and Irrigation, A.P. Shinde, accused the foreign press of "exaggerating" famine conditions and trying to defame India.

That attitude of governments, I insist, ought to be a punishable crime.

Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau of Canada has written: "Never before in his-

tory has the disparity between the rich and the poor, the comfortable and the starving, been so extreme; never before have mass communications so vividly informed the sufferers of the extent of their misery. ... We are faced with an overwhelming challenge.

The challenge is to change the system fundamentally. There is no single human task facing mankind today which has a higher priority. Within nations, agrarian reforms must be tackled resolutely. The poor must be franchised into the economy. Between nations, trade policies must be adopted which benefit all, not just the self-chosen few. The present patterns, rigged so favorably in the interest of the developed minority, cannot continue.

Justice is what the Third World feels it has been denied. No more knowledgeable spokesman for that point of view has emerged than Mubashier Hasan, Pakistan's minister of finance, planning and development. In a 1974 speech to the United Nations he called on the industrialized nations "to make suitable adjustments in the economic order that has brought them the highest standards of affluence ever attained by man in the history of civilization."

Contrasting that with the nonindustrialized world, he says: "Out of every three children born in the developing countries, one succumbs before the age of five. For those who survive it is a life of deprivation, desperation and degradation. Theirs is a subhuman existence. It is an intense, but, mercifully, short struggle, as their life expectancy is no more than 30 years."

How did this disparity happen? By "an unceasing transfer of resources ... from the poor to the rich nations." And by exploiting of cheap labor which takes literally billions of dollars out of the pockets of "nearly two-thirds of mankind, who toil from dawn to dusk, from childhood to old age."

If you have any doubts about Mr. Hasan as an objective source, let me cite some other facts: From 1959 to 1969, the United States invested \$16.23 billion in Europe and \$10.9 billion in Canada. During that 10 year period we repatriated profits from those investments of \$7.3 billion and \$4.7 billion, respectively. Large, but not exorbitant.

During the same 10 year span, we invested \$5.8 billion in the Third World countries of Latin America, Africa and the Middle East. Our repatriated profits from those investments were \$15.1 billion — a whopping 250% return!

In a speech given at the James H. Oliphant Forum in New York near the end of 1974, Senator Mark Hatfield of-

ferred a concise and practical analysis of the action needed:

"What will be required is what has always been most difficult to accomplish without violence: A redistribution of power, and the wealth that brings power; an end to pre-emption of resources by the rich; and a replacement for the kind of economics which divides the world into

potential consumers and expendable workers for the sake of acquiring more money. Developing that sort of political economic meaning will be a tremendous task, for it requires grasping a new reality through experience, understanding, and no small amount of sacrifice. It will take, as Claude Levi-Strauss has said, 'a spiritual revolution as great as that which led

to the advent of Christianity.'"

Perhaps the first step toward this "revolution" is a sober reevaluation of our personal life-styles, to be followed ultimately by a renunciation of our unrestrained pursuit of superaffluence.

The place to start is here.

The time to start is now.

The person to do it?

Me. ☺

Change the "System"

The central theme of the message, as indicated by the title, "'The System': Creating Hunger Amidst Plenty", is that the abject poverty of the developing world is caused by an international "System" and the primary duty of Christians is to change this "System." Apart from the heading, this is stressed numerous times. Typical quotations are:

1. What is needed is conscious effort, based on truth and compassion, to make fundamental changes in the system.
2. I believe the people of God have a unique contribution to make toward the restructuring of the old systems and the creation of new ones.
3. Should not doing good include working for systemic change as well as delivering a Christmas basket, making a contribution on Worldwide Communion Sunday, or writing a check to the United Way?
4. The challenge is to change the system fundamentally. There is no single human task facing mankind today which has a higher priority.

Accomplices in Brutal Exploitation

The writer goes further. He suggests that attempts to perform works of Christian charity without the priority of changing the system is essentially evil conduct. He does this by quoting with approval the following statement by 300 Roman Catholic priests in Brazil:

"It is in the framework of paternalism that many people, including church authorities, approach present-day realities and social problems. They attempt to solve them by appealing to the duty of paternal charity. They establish countless charitable organizations, social programs and money campaigns. They unwisely launch philanthropic initiatives that are dear to the middle class, because the latter can thereby work off their feeling of guilt... In practice, the Church's life of action makes her an accomplice in the brutal exploitation of the people and in the misguided effort to solve poverty and illness on an individual basis."

It may be noted that these priests are spokesmen for attitudes and programs tuned to Liberation Theology.

Surely this is a repudiation and condemnation of the entire ministry of World Vision as it has been carried out during the past 25 years. World Vision has raised money, recruited workers, and carried out social programs directed to the alleviation of poverty, the healing of the sick, and the proclamation of the Gospel, without engaging in political action. This would make World Vision an accomplice in the brutal exploitation of the people and in the misguided effort to solve poverty and illness on an individual basis, if we accept the above statement as true.

What is 'The System?' Imperialism?

What is this system which must be changed? At this point the author becomes a little vague. The system

apparently is the entire complex of economic, social, and political relations which exist nationally and internationally. He does not give it a name, but he makes a few comments concerning it. Discussing the plight of Juan Diaz of El Salvador, he states:

"Although Juan knows nothing about the international forces which affect him so deeply, these powers extract from his country and the rest of the developing world their natural resources--a part of the system which has been going on for centuries and which made it possible for the western nations to accelerate their industrialization."

He also quotes a speech by Mubashier Hasan, Pakistan's minister of finance, in a 1974 speech to the United Nations:

"' Out of every three children born in the developing countries, one succumbs before the age of five. For those who survive it is a life of deprivation, desperation and degradation. Theirs is a subhuman existence. It is an intense, but, mercifully, short struggle, as their life expectancy is no more than 30 years.'

"How did this disparity happen? By 'an increasing transfer of resources... from the poor to the rich nations.' And by exploiting of cheap labor which takes literally billions of dollars out of the pockets of 'nearly two-thirds of mankind, who toil from dawn to dusk, from childhood to old age.' "

Anyone familiar with the terminology will recognize this as a caricature of the system of international capitalism which the communists and others call "imperialism." According to this doctrine, the poverty of the Third World is caused by greedy capitalists in the industrial world robbing the underdeveloped countries of their natural resources, including their mineral and agricultural products.

The doctrine of imperialism is based on distortion and half-truth. The industrialized nations can certainly be indicted for having failed to eliminate poverty from the nations of the underdeveloped world. They cannot be blamed for causing that poverty. Grinding poverty has existed since the dawn of history. Bad as the conditions of Juan Diaz, his wife and his daughters are in El Salvador today, they were certainly worse for his parents and grandparents. Not many years ago there would have been no coffee season as the coffee trees had not been planted, and investigation would probably discover that the coffee trees had been originally provided by "foreign exploiters." There would have been no health clinic to attend. For many centuries life had been, in the words of Hobbes, "dull, brutish, and short."

Positive Achievements of the System

The attack on "the system" usually fails to acknowledge what has been added to the life of the people in underdeveloped countries while it concentrates on what has been subtracted. This is bias, not Christian truth. Consider, for example, the question of health. Infant mortality in underdeveloped countries is appalling. However, it is much better than it used to be. According to an article published in the March 21 edition of the CHRISTIAN CENTURY, which is no friend of "the system":

"In Africa, 170 children out of each thousand die before reaching the age of 5 years; in Asia, 107 die; in Latin America, 70 die; while in the industrial world, 25 die." (Page 312)

These figures can be looked at in various ways. The higher death rate in Africa, Asia, and Latin America can be contrasted with that of the industrial world. The natural reaction is limitless indignation. It can also be compared with the much higher death rates which existed in these countries only a few years ago. From this vantage point the saving of life is a cause for rejoicing and praise.

What is the cause of the lower infant mortality in the underdeveloped countries? Much of the credit

for this must go to the capitalist system of the industrialized countries. Fewer children are dying because infectious diseases are less prevalent and are usually treated successfully when they occur. They are treated by the life-saving drugs which have been discovered during the past 40 years. During this time more than 100 life-saving drugs such as penicillin, the sulfonamides and the antibiotics generally have been discovered. Every one of these drugs has been discovered in the capitalist world; not one has been discovered in the socialist or the underdeveloped worlds. Most of the drugs have been discovered by pharmaceutical companies in their quest for profit.

Facts like these should be taken into consideration before condemning the existing system wholesale. Could not the following attitude be considered? The prevailing system has reduced infant mortality by 50 percent in a generation. Let us cooperate with it while it completes the job.

What System Should Replace the Present One?

Having emphasized that the present system must be fundamentally changed and restructured, the question arises, "What system should replace the present one?" Dr. Mooneyham provides no answer. He condemns equally--communism, capitalism, and socialism. He merely makes some vague generalizations about desirable objectives.

"Within nations, agrarian reforms must be tackled resolutely... The poor must be franchised into the economy. Between nations, trade policies must be adopted which benefit all, not just the self-chosen few. The present patterns, rigged so favorably in the interest of the developed minority, cannot continue."

It is relatively easy to discern desirable results. The difficulty is to discern the specific measures that will bring those results to pass. Millions of minds throughout the world have concentrated on this task, but the results have left a great deal to be desired. Systems can be designed which seem to promise prosperity, justice, and liberty, but they fail because of the sinfulness of human nature. It is impossible to create perfect systems from imperfect raw material.

The Temptation

Young people tend to be idealistic and impatient. Consider the plight of a young idealist who is appalled by the poverty and injustice that surrounds him. He is convinced that the major responsibility for this poverty and injustice is the system that exists and that his primary duty is to change that system. Naturally he looks for allies in this important and vital battle and searches for those who are actively engaged in striving to change the system. His search leads him to the Marxist revolutionaries who are engaged in violent activities. Their courage and devotion to their objectives gains his admiration and respect. The temptation to join them in a united struggle must be strong. He may think he can add a dimension of Christian compassion to the courage and dedication of the Marxists. As a Christian, he picks up a gun and fights alongside the Marxists.

This is the pathway that has been taken by many young priests in Latin America. It would be tragic if one supporter of World Vision or Campus Crusade for Christ should be seduced into such a course.

I pray that World Vision will adhere to its time-tested "paternal" policies of nurturing orphans, feeding the hungry, healing the sick and ministering the Christian Gospel wherever suffering exists, and not accept the new priority of "changing the system." These policies have brought health and happiness to multitudes and have harmed none.

Jesus stressed the value of individual action when He said:

"Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come you blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: For I was an hungred, and you gave me meat: I was thirsty, and you gave me drink; I was a stranger, and you took me in: Naked, and you clothed me: I was sick, and you visited me: I was in prison, and you came unto me.

"Then shall the righteous answer him saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee?

"And the King shall answer and say unto them. Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as you have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, you have done it unto me."
(St. Matthew 25:34-40)

CHINA'S TRIPLE LESSON

The Chinese Communists claimed that their invasion of Vietnam was designed to teach that country a lesson. Questions arise, including: 1) What was that lesson? 2) Did the Chinese teach it successfully?

I believe the Chinese attained all their immediate objectives in Vietnam. They certainly won a military victory despite the fact that the Vietnamese have not been forced to withdraw from Cambodia. The evidence of this is provided by the U.S. Communists who are wholehearted supporters of the Vietnamese, and who sent their own reporter, Terry Cannon, to observe and report events in Vietnam. In a report in the PEOPLES WORLD, March 24, he states:

"Lang Son is an empty, ruined city. It was a beautiful city of tree-shaded streets lined with brick walls--two weeks ago when some 50,000 Vietnamese lived here. The Chinese troops, who entered the city on March 3 after stiff resistance, have devastated it."

Cannon reveals that the Chinese advanced by "Human Wave" tactics. He writes:

"Erik Eriksson, a veteran Swedish journalist who has been here many weeks, said many Vietnamese soldiers have told him of 'human wave' attacks by Chinese troops.

"One Vietnamese machinegun unit holding a hilltop near Lang Son told Eriksson they had gunned down hundreds of Chinese soldiers in wave after wave until they were exhausted with killing. The machinegun crew retreated when they finally ran out of ammunition." (Page 3)

This illustrates the lesson China taught. They can conquer Vietnam at any time they choose by using and sacrificing their enormous population, and, since the Soviet Union is unable or unwilling to give sufficient help to defeat such tactics, the Vietnamese had better consider carefully their alliance with the Soviet Union. The future will reveal the results of this lesson.

The Chinese also taught the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. They taught the Soviet Union the limitations of their nuclear power. They taught the U.S.A. that the Soviet Union will hesitate to become fully involved in conflicts on behalf of its allies. By calling Vietnam the Cuba of Asia, they sought to show the U.S.A. how, in their opinion, Cuba should be treated.

The Chinese Communists also taught the whole world how cheaply they regard human life and how dangerous they can be both as allies and enemies.

DETENTE: SOVIET STRATEGY FOR VICTORY

To the Soviet Communists, Detente means that the military forces of the U.S.A. and its allies must remain immobilized and inactive while the communists gobble up country after country throughout the world.

This is made clear in an article by Vladimir Kudryautsev, Soviet Political Analyst, Deputy of the Supreme Soviet USSR, and Vice-President of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, published in the communist DAILY WORLD, March 13.

Kudryautsev points out that, under the restraints of "Detente", the countries of Vietnam, Laos, Kampuchea, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Mozambique and Angola have been added to the Soviet Empire while the West has lost Iran, and bases have been secured for intensified attack on Rhodesia, Namibia (Southwest Africa) and South Africa. The article states:

The opponents of detente, who oppose its spread to all continents without exception, resort to allegations that this international process stands in the way of the national-liberation struggle and disarms its participants politically and militarily.

The aim of such assertions is not only to stop the development of detente, but also to set the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa against the Soviet Union as the inspirer of this policy.

The facts, however, completely refute this interpretation of detente. When the policy of detente asserted itself in relations between countries, during the 1970's, successes were scored by the national-liberation movement. Victory was the culmination of the Vietnamese people's struggle against U.S. aggression for the reunification of their country.

The path of socialist development was taken by the liberated peoples of Laos and Kampuchea, where the savage Pol Pot regime was overthrown. A people's revolution destroyed the vestiges of feudalism in Afghanistan. In Iran the Shah's dictatorship is overthrown and a republican system established. A national democratic revolution has won in Ethiopia. Lastly the 70's were marked by the collapse of the last colonial empire — the Portuguese. The result of this was the emergence

on the map of progressive independent states of Mozambique and Angola. Under the direct influence of this victory an intensified assault was mounted against the racist citadels in Rhodesia, Namibia and South Africa itself.

All these facts convincingly show that detente, far from holding back the development of the national-liberation movement, has actually provided it with fresh opportunities in the struggle for independence and early abolition of the remnants of the colonial regimes and racist dictatorships.

The successful struggle of the peoples for national liberation strengthens detente by promoting the abolition of seats of the danger of war and is objectively directed towards consolidation of peace and security.

The national liberation struggle of the Arab peoples who demand the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories and also the right of the Arab people of Palestine to set up a sovereign state, in fact means a struggle for the relaxation of tensions in the Middle East.

The same can be said of the victory of national patriotic forces in Iran, which has resulted in the cancellation of new deliveries of American armaments to that country, which of course helped to ease tension in the region.

It is clear that, to these communists, Peace means Communist Conquest while Detente means the application of the formula for conquest: External Encirclement, plus Internal Demoralization, plus Thermonuclear Blackmail, equals Progressive Surrender.

Secure knowledge about communism by reading the Crusade newsletter. Receive it regularly, at no cost by writing to: Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, Box 890, Long Beach, Ca. 90801

Dr. Fred Schwarz, Editor