



# *Christian Anti-Communism Crusade*

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

August 15, 1979

## COMMUNIST VICTORY VIA DETENTE AND PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

As the U. S. Senate debates the vital question of whether to ratify SALT II, it is important to study the record of the past achievements of the Soviet Union as it has followed policies consistent with its interpretation of Peaceful Coexistence and Detente. It is equally, if not more important, to predict accurately what the future programs and policies of the Soviet Union will be.

Fortunately, there is nothing mysterious about the Soviet definitions of Peaceful Coexistence and Detente. Soviet spokesmen repeatedly publicize in words of crystal clarity precisely what they mean by the terms. They also describe, in considerable detail, the programs and policies to which their definitions logically lead.

In Moscow the communists publish, in English translation, a monthly magazine called INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS. They have been publishing it since 1955. They classify it as "A Monthly Journal of Political Analysis" and it contains a frank exposition of communist doctrines and policies and programs. The articles are written by Soviet scholars, but they express the views of the communist leadership. The May and June, 1979, editions contain two remarkable articles entitled respectively, "The Leninist Policy of Peaceful Co-existence and Class Struggle," and "Detente and the Modern World." The authors are: Professor V. Kortunov and A. Sovetov. We ignore the information in these articles at our peril.

### Meat and Poison. Conflicting Views of Detente and Peaceful Coexistence

The Soviet leaders are well aware that the common interpretation of Detente and Peaceful Coexistence in the U.S.A. is different from their own, and they happily exploit the difference. Consider this specific statement from the May article, "The Leninist Policy of Peaceful Coexistence and Class Struggle."

"For the Soviet Union and other socialist states, the policy of detente constitutes a struggle to create favorable conditions for communist construction and for the development of the world revolutionary process; for the capitalist countries, it is an effort to protect the bourgeois set-up in the new historical situation, to hold back social progress and use expanding interstate relations to further their own class interests.

"Bourgeois ideologists and politicians often read detente as a guarantee of the social status quo. They also claim that the future of political detente depends largely on whether the socialist countries make any ideological concessions, rather than on whether it is extended and supplemented by military detente. They invite the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to give up their class goals, to 'deideologise' their domestic and foreign policy in order to secure reciprocal 'concessions' on international detente from the West. Those who urge such a 'give and take' grossly distort the correlation between peaceful coexistence and the class contest between the two socio-economic systems, the very substance of current

international relations. The main content of the present age is mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism." (Pages 85 and 86)

Could anything be clearer? Detente is designed to create favorable conditions for the "World Revolutionary Process." The world revolutionary process embraces the entire complex of military, social, and cultural events which combine to assure the victory of communism throughout the world. It includes everything from the Soviet monopoly of missiles with massive mega-tonnage, such as the SS 18, to the conduct of the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow; it extends from the attempted blackmail of the U.S. Senate to the seductive wiles of Jane Fonda. To the communists, it is the execution of the programs and policies that will fulfill their historic mission of arranging mankind's "transition from Capitalism to Socialism."

### The Laws of the Class Struggle

The articles are a mine of both doctrinal principles and specific programs. A few quotations will illustrate this:

"Detente does not in the slightest abolish, nor can it abolish or alter, the laws of the class struggle." (Page 85, May)

"The complicated dialectics of present-day international affairs, of the process of international detente are primarily determined by the contest between the two systems, capitalism and socialism, each of which maintains its own class stand." (Page 85, May)

"Detente itself implies a struggle against imperialist reactionary forces." (Page 3, June)

Axiomatic to the whole discussion is the assumption of the existence of a class war with certain immutable laws. This class war is both national and international. Consider the following:

"The present contradiction between socialism and capitalism is based on a conflict between two antagonistic classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, whose final historical goals are irreconcilable." (Page 86, May)

"When the contradiction between the two main classes of present-day society became the chief contradiction of international relations, these relations were in effect 'ideologised', for they became a contest arena for two classes with different ideologies, different views and ideas about the world, politics and all major social problems. In other words, with the world's split in two systems, international relations became a center of contest between two opposing class outlooks." (Page 86, May)

### Classism--Malignant Doctrine of Death

The unit of communist thought is always the class. They see the world as divided into two hostile competing classes, the industrial working class or proletariat, and the owners of common stocks and bonds, the bourgeoisie. The former class is progressive while the latter is reactionary. The only right the bourgeoisie possesses is the right to be destroyed.

The hideous doctrines of class and classism have been responsible for untold human suffering. They have led to the torture and death of multiple millions. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee published reports which estimated that communism had killed 21,500,000 in Russia and 62,534,000 in China. Most of these deaths are due to the doctrines of class and classism. These doctrines caused the Cambodian Communists to slaughter millions of their own citizens in a senseless genocide.

and it is presently causing the plight of the Vietnamese "boat people" as they flee from the torments imposed by their "proletarian" masters.

The class struggle is alleged to be governed by certain immutable laws. These include:

### 1. Irreconcilability:

There is no possibility of reconciliation between the conflicting classes. The fight must continue to the bitter end in which one side emerges totally victorious and history has decided that this class will be the proletariat led by its vanguard, the communist party. When communism is victorious, peace will come to pass. Till then, true peace is impossible. Consider these statements:

"The world outlook and the class aims of socialism and capitalism are opposite and irreconcilable." (Page 88, May)

"Communists maintain that the struggle between socialism and capitalism will continue in the political, economic and, of course, ideological spheres." (Page 88, May)

"Peaceful coexistence does not and cannot eliminate the ideological struggle, which does not take place at the will and pleasure of individuals, or social forces, but results from objective factors and reflects the real contradictions of the age." (Page 88, May)

### 2. Inevitable Result:

The result of the Class Conflict is foreordained. The communists must win. This is inevitable. This conviction is repeated ad nauseam. The article states:

"The main content of the present age is mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism, during which the class antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the working masses is to be resolved in favor of the latter." (Page 86, May)

"Detente is based on a fundamental change in the world balance of forces in favor of socialism, and this change is irreversible." (Page 4, June)

"Now, that the balance of class and political forces in the world has changed radically in favor of socialism and that the transformation of international relations in accordance with the new balance of forces has become irreversible, detente has become the leading trend in world relations." (Page 4, June)

### Evidence of Coming Communist Victory

The communists do not depend upon doctrinal conviction alone for their certainty of victory. They also proudly present the evidence of the achievements that have resulted from the policies they have followed. They state:

"Detente has stimulated the crises that have for a long time been eroding the military-political blocs of the imperialist powers." (Page 6, June)

Some of the achievements they list are:

"Against the background of international detente, the peoples of Indochina have scored historic successes in repulsing the aggression of external imperialist forces. There is no doubt at all that in an atmosphere of cold war, such a victory would have been much

harder. Under international detente, the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau destroyed the last vestiges of the Portuguese colonial empire and set up independent sovereign states, choosing the noncapitalist course of development. In the same period, a people's democratic revolution took place in Ethiopia, which put an end to the rotten feudal-despotic regime. We have also witnessed the collapse, as a result of a popular revolution, of another historical anachronism--the corrupt regime of the Shah of Iran, which had made the country dependent on US imperialist circles." (Page 8, June)

In their next article, they will doubtless list Nicaragua as another of the successes of detente.

### Detente Demoralizes the U.S.A.

They also give detente credit for the economic, social, and moral problems that plague the U.S. as well as for troubles with allies:

"The dialectical interplay between detente and the revolutionary transformations in the world has also manifested itself in another important area, serving to intensify the general crisis of capitalism, which has now acquired qualitatively new features. It is no exaggeration to say that since the war the crisis has never been as acute as it is today, plaguing the economy, politics, ideology and inter-state relations of the leading imperialist powers. Under detente, the contradictions within existing aggressive blocs have been sharply aggravated. This is particularly true of NATO, which is now in a state of permanent crisis." (Page 8, June)

### Victories Must be Protected by Force

Gains made by the communist forces must be protected by force. This policy has the imprimatur of Lenin who is quoted as saying: "Coercion is effective against those who want to restore their rule." (Page 87, May) Thus, Cuban troops are dispatched to consolidate gains in Angola, Ethiopia and other countries of Africa, and East German and Soviet personnel are spread from Afghanistan to Cuba. Will communist military forces be sent to Nicaragua?

This policy is given formal structure in the Brezhnev doctrine which states that the military forces of international communism must be used to defend any communist dictatorship which is threatened by overthrow from its own people.

### Dimensions of Detente

Detente means the avoidance of nuclear war and the promotion of local wars in the guise of so-called "Wars of National Liberation." It means the granting of loans and the transfer of technological processes to the Soviet Union while it promotes industrial disputes, strikes, and racial conflicts within the U.S.A. It means massive Soviet military might. It is the implementation of programs derived from their formula of conquest: "External encirclement, plus internal demoralization, plus thermo-nuclear blackmail, leads to progressive surrender."

### Why so Frank?

Why do the communists publish their views so frankly? Are they not afraid that they may alert the U.S. leaders and people to their designs and stimulate effective countermeasures?

The communists are, in measure, prisoners of their own doctrines. They believe that national philosophy and character are products of the prevailing economic environment. They are convinced that

the present economic environment in the U.S.A. is capitalism in its dying phase. Consequently U.S. philosophy and the quality of U.S. morals and character lack survival virtue. They believe that no evidence, however irrefutable, will convince the majority of U.S. leaders of the reality of the communist danger to the degree that they will make necessary sacrifices. Specific statements will be dismissed as politically-motivated rhetoric; communist conquests will be portrayed as haemorrhages draining the economic strength of the Soviets and essentially temporary. Those history has marked for death generate suicidal attitudes.

We reject communist doctrine. It is a compound of selected facts, historical assumptions, half-truths and lethal nonsense. Let us prove them wrong by facing the truth honestly and courageously, devising the strategies, and willingly making the sacrifices necessary to survive.

The U.S.A. should not fear a conflict with the Soviet Union in the economic and humanitarian spheres. The economic system of free enterprise is much more productive than the "planned economy" of the Soviet Union. The freedom granted the citizens of the U.S.A. is a lighthouse to the world. While millions flee from communist countries at every opportunity, millions try to enter the U.S.A. to accept the most menial tasks.

The tragedy is that the leaders of the U.S.A. are not fighting in the economic and ideological war the communists have forced upon them. This is an invitation to defeat.

Before voting on SALT II every Senator should read the Soviet articles: "The Leninist Policy of Peaceful Coexistence and Detente," and "The Modern World." A step towards this objective will be taken if you send a copy of this discussion to your Senator.

### THE MYSTERY OF SOVIET STEEL

Where does all the Soviet steel go? The Chinese Communists consider this question in this article.

The Soviet paper *Izvestia* in a recent article said: "Our steel output today (1978) has reached 151 million tons, making up nearly one fifth of the world's total, and greater than any other country can produce. In terms of total output or per capita output, it is very high, but inexplicably, it still cannot meet demands."

Where have these large quantities of Soviet steel gone to? The Soviet press had this to say: "The disparity between the steel output and manufactured steel is very wide. This year, the Soviet Union plans to turn out 156 million tons of steel and plans to use this huge amount of steel to turn out 108.7 million tons of finished rolled products, 18.2 million tons of steel pipes, and 9 million tons of molten steel for foundry production. The disparity between total steel output and the amount of manufactured steel is more than 20 million tons." (*Pravda*, January 22.)

"The Soviet Union turns out less machines and other products with the same amount of metal than, say, the United States or Japan." "Our country (the Soviet Union) turns out 20 per cent more steel and 32 per cent more iron than the United States but we manufacture about 20 per cent less industrial products than that country. Therefore, the total amount of

metal used in the Soviet industry is correspondingly 50 to 60 per cent higher than the level of the United States." (The Soviet journal *United States*, No. 5, 1978.)

The above shows to a certain extent that the Soviet Union, though surpassing the United States in steel output, falls far behind it in making efficient use of the steel in the national economy. Much steel is wasted.

However, the major reason for the Soviet steel shortage lies in the use of growing amounts of iron and steel to expand armaments for war preparations. Over the past few years, the Kremlin has energetically boosted its armament production under the pretext of developing its heavy industry. The Soviet arms and ammunition industry grows far faster than its steel output. In the ten years from 1965 to 1975, the machine-building industry, devoted in large measure to armament production, grew three times faster than the iron and steel industry.

The arms industry which used up vast quantities of steel contributed to the lopsided development of the Soviet economy, causing Soviet civilian enterprises to operate constantly under capacity.

## WHO MAKES THE "OBJECTIVE LAWS OF HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT?"

Spokesmen for the Soviet Union are forever talking about "Social and political changes going on in the world based on objective laws of historical development."

On examination it is clear these changes are the result of such deliberate actions as: 1) Massive propaganda; 2) Selection and training of subversive leaders; 3) Infiltration of K.G.B. agents; 4) Economic sabotage or seduction; 5) Supply of weapons; 6) Use of Cuban, East German, or Soviet troops; and 7) Thermonuclear blackmail. The communists are obviously making "The Laws of Historical Development."

This theme of alleged objective laws is emphasized in a statement by a Soviet spokesman, Vladimir Kudryavtsev, in an article in MOSCOW NEWS WEEKLY, July 8-15. This periodical is published in Moscow and the English edition is distributed in the U.S.A. Here are some of the comments of Kudryavtsev:

"The opposition to SALT-2 in the U.S. Senate threatens to make amendments to the Treaty as signed in Vienna in order to torpedo it altogether, or to emasculate it, especially in those features which attest to the carefully balanced interests of both sides. Leonid Brezhnev and Jimmy Carter spoke in Vienna against any kind of amendments because they would mean an attempt 'to rock this elaborate structure, which it has been so hard to build, to replace any of its elements, to pull it closer to one's own self' (Leonid Brezhnev). President Carter called the Treaty a carefully balanced whole. The opposition forgets that the USSR also has to ratify the Treaty, and it is guided by the feeling that there can be no deviations from it. Some Senators are now thinking back to the Senate amendments to the USA-Panama treaty. Here we will not go into detail about relations between the United States and Central American countries, at least in the latest example which Nicaragua provides, but we do have to say that these conceited people should realize that similar references are inapplicable to a power like the Soviet Union. We hope that the arrogance of Senators like Henry Jackson will be tempered by the hard realities on all continents.

"I did not end my previous section with the words 'all continents' by accident. Senator Jackson and the other opposition-minded Senators are continuing to spread propaganda about the 'Soviet threat', which they claim exists literally on all continents. On a TV programme, Jackson mentioned Afghanistan, Angola, and Ethiopia. Others broaden the list to include all of Africa, the Middle East and South East Asia. These allegations have also been heard in official American circles. This vividly expresses the reluctance, perhaps the inability of the ruling quarters in the United States to grasp the essence of the social and political changes going on in the world based on objective laws of historical development.

"The question arises: 'Where are these Soviet intrigues in the Middle East?' The objective laws of social development operate there as they do everywhere else, and when they are ignored, they turn on the politicians whose thinking is that of yesterday. The USSR's Middle East policy is consistent and principled, and its well-known proposals to eliminate the aftermath of Israeli aggression are gaining growing world support.

"This kind of policy--i.e., by trying to salvage the racist regimes--only worsens the situation in Southern Africa and along with it, heightens the military threat to both all Africa and the entire world. At the same time, the Soviet Union sides with the progressive forces in Southern Africa struggling to rid Africa of the remnants of colonialism and of the racist regimes which are the source of a continuing military threat, to say nothing of their being anathema to elementary human rights." (Page 7)

The year 1979 has been designated, "The Year of the Child." Many who are most vociferous in their professed devotion to the rights of children have promoted attitudes that have led to their neglect and abuse.

The major right of a child is to be reared in a stable family; to experience the love and care of a mother; the tender discipline and affectionate companionship of a father; and the happy associations of brothers and sisters. Whatever weakens the family, robs and abuses the child.

True parenthood demands unselfish sacrifice. The present cult of self-indulgence, self-fulfillment, self-self, blights children's lives. To express our love for children, we must strengthen the moral and material foundations of the family.

As a schoolboy in Australia, I was stirred emotionally and positively by the following poem. To some of you, it may bring back pleasant memories; to others it may be new since such poems are not popular in schools during recent years:

## WHICH SHALL IT BE?

"Which shall it be? Which shall it be?"  
 I look'd at John--John look'd at me  
 (Dear, patient John, who loves me yet  
 As well as though my locks were jet);  
 And when I found that I must speak,  
 My voice seem'd strangely low and weak:  
 "Tell me again what Robert said."  
 And then I, listening, bent my head.  
 "This is his letter: 'I will give  
 A house and land while you shall live,  
 If, in return, from out your seven,  
 One child to me for aye is given.'"  
 I look'd at John's old garments worn,  
 I thought of all that John had borne  
 Of poverty and work and care,  
 Which I, though willing, could not share;  
 I thought of seven mouths to feed,  
 Of seven little children's need,  
 And then of this. "Come, John," said I,  
 "We'll choose among them as they lie  
 Asleep;" so, walking hand in hand,  
 Dear John and I survey'd our band.  
 First to the cradle lightly stepp'd,  
 Where the new nameless baby slept.  
 "Shall it be Baby?" whispered John.  
 I took his hand, and hurried on  
 To Lily's crib. Her sleeping grasp  
 Held her old doll within its clasp;  
 Her dark curls lay like gold alight,  
 A glory 'gainst the pillow white.  
 Softly her father stoop'd to lay  
 His rough hand down in loving way,  
 When dream or whisper made her stir,  
 Then huskily said John, "Not her, not her!"  
 We stopp'd beside the trundle bed,  
 And one long ray of lamplight shed  
 Athwart the boyish faces there,

In sleep so pitiful and fair;  
 I saw on Jamie's rough, red cheek  
 A tear undried. Ere John could speak,  
 "He's but a baby, too," said I,  
 And kiss'd him as we hurried by.  
 Pale, patient Robbie's angel face  
 Still in his sleep bore suffering's trace.  
 "No, for a thousand crowns, not him!"  
 We whisper'd, while our eyes were dim.  
 Poor Dick! bad Dick! our wayward son,  
 Turbulent, reckless, idle one--  
 Could he be spared? Nay; He who gave  
 Bids us befriend him to his grave;  
 Only a mother's heart can be  
 Patient enough for such as he;  
 "And so," said John, "I would not dare  
 To send him from her bedside prayer."  
 Then stole we softly up above  
 And knelt by Mary, child of love.  
 "Perhaps for her 'twould better be,"  
 I said to John. Quite silently  
 He lifted up a curl astray  
 Across her cheek in wilful way,  
 And shook his head: "Nay, love; not thee,"  
 The while my heart beat audibly.  
 Only one more, our eldest lad,  
 Trusty and truthful, good and glad--  
 So like his father. "No, John, no--  
 I cannot, will not, let him go."  
 And so we wrote, in courteous way,  
 We could not give one child away;  
 And afterward toil lighter seem'd,  
 Thinking of that of which we dream'd,  
 Happy in truth that not one face  
 We miss'd from its accustom'd place;  
 Thankful to work for all the seven,  
 Trusting the rest to One in heaven.

## A BLACK LEADER CONDEMNS THE CARTER-YOUNG POLICY ON RHODESIA

The philosophies and policies of U.N. Ambassador, Andrew Young, and the Carter Administration, which have led the Administration to refuse to recognize the black majority government of Zimbabwe Rhodesia, led by Bishop Muzorewa, and to continue sanctions against it, are not shared by all black leaders in the U.S.A.

Bayard Rustin is national chairman of Social Democrats, U.S.A. He has been a long-time civil rights leader in the U.S.A. and has been active in the fight for the advancement of blacks in Southern Africa for nearly 30 years. He traveled to Rhodesia to observe the recent elections there and has written a report on his observations and conclusions which is published in the July edition of the prestigious magazine, COMMENTARY, of the American Jewish Committee. The article is titled: "The War Against Zimbabwe."

This statement from his article merits serious study by President Carter, Andrew Young, the State Department, the Congress, and all who contribute to the formation of U.S. policy in Africa:

"Into this essentially internal African debate have stepped the Soviet Union and its Cuban and East German proxies, seeking to exploit African conflicts and frustrations to advance Moscow's geopolitical ambitions. And into it also has wandered the United States, newly sensitive, as it would like to think, to the aspirations of Black Africa and determined, as Secretary of State Vance has put it, not to 'mirror Soviet and Cuban activities.' The foremost U.S. objective has been to preserve American 'credibility' in black Africa, the assumption being that this is the measure of our influence on the continent and is also the best and the only way (all military options having been ruled out) to deter the Russians. Anything we might do to undermine that credibility, it is thought, would only invite further Soviet intervention which we would not (and should not, given our Vietnam experience) be prepared to counter.

"With respect to Zimbabwe Rhodesia, the price for maintaining American credibility among the frontline presidents and with Nigeria has been that we support--or at the very least, do nothing to oppose--the Patriotic Front. As a result, we have found ourselves, until now, tacitly aligned with groups armed by Moscow, hostile to America, antagonistic to democracy, and unpopular within Zimbabwe Rhodesia itself. And we have opposed the internal parties which look to us for support, share our professed belief in an open multiracial society, and have genuine popularity within the country. We have defended this policy in terms of our historic commitment as a nation to human rights and, more practically, in terms of protecting our country's vital interest in Africa and of preventing the escalation of civil war. Yet it has been hard for most Americans, or for the United States Congress, to understand how any of these objectives is served by promoting the Patriotic Front.

"The fact is that this has not been the only practical course open to us. The psychology of appeasement is now so deeply rooted among most American officials and political commentators that they have, almost as a matter of course, underestimated our own strengths and the strengths of our friends, as well as the weaknesses of the Soviet position. U.S. officials tremble at the thought of a Nigerian oil embargo, forgetting the fact that Nigeria needs American capital and technology at least as much as America needs Nigerian oil. Most importantly, within Zimbabwe Rhodesia itself, there is now less sympathy for the guerrillas than ever before. The people are simply tired of violence, especially violence which has no purpose, since there is now a black majority government...

"Whether Moscow would be prepared, under these circumstances, to escalate the war is doubtful. At present, the army of Zimbabwe Rhodesia is, in African terms, a strong fighting force and more than a match for the divided Patriotic Front. To defeat it would require a major commitment by Soviet proxy forces at a time when the Cubans are overextended in Angola (where they now maintain a force of 45,000 military and civilian personnel). An intervention of this kind would be deeply resented in most of Africa, and it would strengthen opposition to detente in this country and weaken whatever chance there is for Senate ratification of SALT.

"The Russians will, more likely than not, remain cautious and wait for an opportune moment to strike. The point is that it should not be our policy to create opportunities for them and to encourage the guerrillas to continue fighting, which is what the President's repudiation of the Muzorewa government in his June 7 statement has already done. Beyond the narrow issue of economic sanctions against Zimbabwe Rhodesia, there is the larger question of whether we will do anything to help the new black government to survive and continue to evolve in a democratic direction; or whether, by our inaction and failure of nerve, we will embolden its enemies and thus destroy any hope for democracy in the country. If we take the latter course, we will have done nothing to increase the credibility of the United States either in Africa or elsewhere. On the contrary, we will have raised a signal to all the world that this country no longer has the capacity to defend or even understand its interests, or to help those who, unlike ourselves, continue to believe in freedom." (Pages 31 and 32)