

THE RISING TIDE

A bulletin of information and opinion from the
FREEDOM LEADERSHIP FOUNDATION, INC.

LOOK HERE

Tell your friends about FLF. Tell them we are a young organization seeking to develop a responsible approach toward strengthening America's commitment against communism. And tell them we need money . . . NOW!

Volume I, Number 11

October 11, 1971

AMERICA'S LEADERSHIP CRISIS AND HOW TO SOLVE IT

by Hal McKenzie, FLF Research Associate

History has thrust America into a position of world leadership; but the degree of authority that America commands abroad depends upon the degree of authority that America commands at home. America is floundering in her foreign policy because her leadership is so confused that it cannot make the appropriate responses to world challenges, nor command enough respect from the American people to lead them in the correct direction. If we are to reverse this trend, we must uncover the root cause of our leadership crisis, work out the strategic solution, and vigorously carry it out as soon as possible.

According to Arnold Toynbee, civilization arises when a "creative minority," in response to a challenge, inspires and leads the people in a cooperative effort, centered on a common religious ideal. In order to maintain authority, these leaders must provide, generation after generation, capable leadership which continues to manifest the high standards and ideals which command love and respect from the people. To do this effectively, the leadership must cooperate with the people, welcoming the most capable leaders from the lower classes into its ranks.

Society disintegrates when the leadership loses its moral sanction; when it becomes alienated from the people, no longer creatively leading them, but merely holding on to its privileges and way of life at their expense. Then, what Toynbee calls the "rhythm of disintegration" begins: a ruinous pattern of conflict and confusion which culminates, as Marx wrote in the *Communist Manifesto*, "in either a revolutionary reconstitution of society, or in the mutual ruin of the contending classes."

De Tocqueville noted in *L'Ancien Regime*, that the French aristocracy degenerated into a predatory caste, and was therefore destroyed in the bloody French revolution—the pattern for the later, bloodier Russian Revolution. The British aristocracy, on the other hand, reversed this negative trend by

cooperating with the leaders of the lower classes in building democratic institutions. America originally followed this British tradition—therefore we had a relatively bloodless revolution, followed by a dynamic and stable republican system.

The strength of this system was well-known to Marx, who saw such class cooperation as a deadly enemy to his program of violent revolution in the French tradition. In *Das Kapital*, he wrote: "The more a ruling class is able to assimilate the most prominent men of the dominated classes, the more stable and dangerous its rule." Ever since, the primary tactic of Communist movements has been to generate hatred and mistrust between leaders and followers in target countries so that when the "establishment" breaks down, they can establish their own dictatorship "of the proletariat."

The key factor in America's leadership crisis, then, is the breakdown of our civilization's Judeo-Christian moral base, and the rise of conflict-oriented ideologies (such as Social Darwinism and Marxism-Leninism). The Christian humanism and natural philosophy of our founding fathers certainly didn't bring immediate perfection, but it did foster a respect for human dignity, a commitment to serve mankind, and to extend to others the benefits of freedom. The Judeo-Christian concept of the Family of Man under God helped prevent caste attitudes, and allowed immigrants, Jews, and eventually Negroes to rise to positions of authority. Also, the virtues of fair play, humility, support of the down-trodden, and responsible activism made democracy possible. Without such virtues, violence and tyranny flourish.

However, Judeo-Christianity has almost been disintegrated in the massive scientific and industrial revolution which arose in the late nineteenth century. The turmoil of this age inspired mechanistic world-views which denigrated Judeo-Christian values and upheld materialism and "survival of the fittest" as

(Continued on Page 4)

IN DEFENSE OF DEFENSE

The buildup of our defense system has been attacked as immoral by many anti-war factions in the U.S. Members of the FLF research staff recently attended a congressional hearing on the SALT talks, during which nuclear proliferations expert Frank Armbruster argued strongly against such accusations. Parts of his testimony are reprinted here.

In the vital areas of ballistic missile defense and intercontinental ballistic missile guidance, we apparently are following a policy which is not only imprudent but morally questionable . . .

Obviously, the most desirable solution would be to completely abolish all nuclear weapons; and our government has for many years been engaged in a highly commendable effort to find a way to accomplish this . . . Until this effort is successful, however, we must live in a world of nuclear arms; and a posture designed to make a nuclear war more horrible if it should come seems highly questionable.

Yet, I submit that is what our current policy does. The relatively low-priority and deployment schemes of our antiballistic missile program plus our current position at the SALT talks put what I consider to be an essential element of a prudent, moral, defense posture—the heavy defense of our cities against incoming warheads by short-, long-, and very long-range antiballistic missiles—beyond our reach even in the not so near future. At the same time, we have adopted a policy not to develop superior guidance for our intercontinental and submarine-launched ballistic missile systems, which may rob them of their highest capability to dig out hardened enemy missiles aimed at us . . .

CHINA???

Everybody is curious about China. And they should be. But when curiosity becomes so intense as to obscure one's sense of history, it is not only a sign of naivete, it is a sign of danger.

One may argue that a policy which ignored 750 million people is immoral. That is precisely our point. It strikes us as strange that many of those China scholars who know best what life has been like for the Chinese people are the very ones who have opted for a policy which in effect strengthens the institutionalized despotism of Chinese Communism. People who call themselves liberals often cite their moral duty to *speak out* against tyranny wherever they find it; we are hard pressed to find a better example of tyranny than the form of government by forced ideological conformity which now exists in China.

Have we forgotten that China was an aggressor during the Korean War? That the U.N. International Commission of Jurists, upon investigating Communist Chinese policies in Tibet, called them "genocide"? That China continues to foster subversion wherever it can find a base, supporting anyone from kings to dope peddlers who will help them gain influence or increase contradictions in established governments. That 750 million people are forced to do obeisance to Mao Tse-tung every day and to accept the teachings of a plastic book as their personal credo and "inspired truth"? Can we ignore a recent Senate study which presents hard evidence that a *minimum* of 30,000,000 people have died as a result of a combination of Mao's tyranny or his mistakes?

The evidence that Communist China has acted in a criminal, anti-human fashion is overwhelming. The evidence that China's leaders are prepared to cooperate with world society or liberalize internally is entirely lacking.

Chinese Communism is every bit as detestable as Hitlerism ever was. The motivation which led to the selling out of Europe at Munich was "Peace in our time," much as the motivation for President Nixon's accepting with pleasure an invitation to China is a "Generation of Peace."

What about future generations, Mr. Nixon? We think you are making a mistake.

Under current policy, as enemy nuclear delivery systems are placed in less and less vulnerable concrete silos, we may have a primarily soft-target, or "city-busting" intercontinental nuclear force; and at the same time, because of our antiballistic missile policy, our own cities will be largely uncovered. There are those today who applaud this posture on the grounds that this makes nuclear war unthinkable and therefore deters those who would start one. I consider this argument weak on many grounds.

Even with the heaviest antiballistic missile defense systems and best "counterforce" weapons, one is absolutely at a loss to conceive of an issue (except perhaps the very survival of the nation itself) over which a rational decision maker would launch a nuclear first strike. One can make the not completely unpersuasive argument that a somewhat irrational decision maker could be made to feel entirely "safe" (when he really wasn't) by such defensive and counterforce systems, and thus be tempted to initiate a nuclear strike. But when one enters this area of irrationality and accident, one must consider possible irrationality of future potential *enemy* leaders, the probability of accidental launch from some potential nuclear delivery system, etc. . . .

Let us consider the following illustrative and not completely improbable scenario: a confrontation occurs in which the United States is attempting to prevent the fall of some small nation to the aggression of a second-rate nuclear power or its proxy. This nuclear power has no counterforce capability against our nuclear forces and cannot match us in conventional force at the point of contact. For the sake of being specific, let us assume this nation is China. (Diplomatic recognition and commercial trade do not rule this out; the British were dealing fully accredited ambassadors from both the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany in 1939 and had a diplomatic mission en route to Moscow when Russia and Germany announced their partition of Eastern Europe which started WWII). In this scenario San Francisco and Los Angeles are implicitly, if not somewhat explicitly, threatened by a few relatively crude warheads, and the President is faced with a difficult situation, which would very likely have some effect on his "negotiating" position. Without specific point- or large area-defense antiballistic missile systems, he cannot defend these cities; and if the Chinese weapons are buried in thick concrete silos (no great technological feat), he may not be able to dig them all out with anything but a large, first-strike salvo of our less than superaccurate intercontinental ballistic missiles. . . . Perhaps the only way he can look serious in his demand that China or her proxy cease and desist may be to quickly place himself in the morally undesirable position of threatening to incinerate millions of innocent Chinese men, women and children by destroying two or more of *their* large cities. Even if he chose the questionable alternative of a large U.S. nuclear strike by many less than fully accurate missiles on enemy hardened missiles, the moral question still comes up because of the chance of fallout from these many ground bursts killing large numbers of Chinese civilians, as well as the chance that two prelaunched and/or surviving Chinese missiles will hit unprotected Los Angeles and San Francisco anyhow. His third alternative is to back down.

A prudent President must go through such thought processes long before the crisis reaches this stage, and he may well be almost as deterred by the horrendous consequences of his own threatening actions as by the possible loss of life among the population of the United States. He deserves more

What's Happening for Freedom

... WFI on Campus

FLF's national educational and training project, the World Freedom Institute of Washington, D.C., plans several seminars on the George Washington University campus this semester. Subjects of the prospective seminars include a critical evaluation of Marxist Theory, North Korean Communism, Soviet Global Strategy and Life in Communist China. The WFI opened over the Labor Day weekend with a highly successful youth leadership training workshop, which included delegates from 6 major American cities, coast to coast.

... Berkeley course to organize again

A praiseworthy summer course organized by FLF representative Nancy Callahan concluded last month; Miss Callahan plans to reorganize the course for the public this quarter under the auspices of the WFI. Many of the teachers involved in the course have been unable to present their views in public due to severe intimidation by Berkeley radicals, including not only the disrupting of classes, but bomb threats and several actual bombings of a professor's home. So this project could be an important first step in reopening channels for rational dialogue in Berkeley's radical-dominated campus community.

... CPU launches national activist campaign

A promising new youth activist group has made its nationwide debut with a three-day "Fast for Freedom," warning against trends which may lead to the abandonment of free Asia. The Christian Political Union braved radical assaults to launch its campaign, which promises to be one of the most substantive approaches to anti-radicalism yet to come along. You may have read about the CPU's activities in the papers or seen them on TV. Our regular readers will be pleased to learn that many of these courageous young people were trained through the WFI workshop program and made their commitment to fight for freedom through their experience with FLF. . . . *Synthesis* unveiled

FLF announces the publication of a vital new series of articles: *Synthesis*. These papers (12-24 pages in length) have been written by some of the most prominent American and world scholars and are especially valuable in that they cover topics not usually reported in detail by the American press. For instance, in the first three issues of *Synthesis*, professor Chu Saito details the case for Japanese repossession of the "Northern Territories," illegally occupied by Soviet troops for more than 25 years; Cambodian scholar Thach Sarunh examines the Khmer (Cambodian) people's struggle against North Vietnamese Imperialism; and Dr. Robert Scalapino (Univ. of Ca. Berkeley) testifies to the tyranny of North Korean communism under its dictator, Kim Il-sung. *Synthesis* is stimulating and scholarly reading which you won't want to miss. (Price: 50¢. Available soon.)

... Asian tour completed

FLF's Asian delegation has returned from its tour of Nationalist China and Korea. Expressing satisfaction with the tour from an educational, cultural and political standpoint, delegation leader Rick Hunter presented the group's report to the WFI Labor Day conference in Washington, D.C. After completing their course of training through the WFI, delegates have now returned to their home cities, armed with vital first-hand knowledge about Asia as well as the WFI's proven techniques of recruitment and organization. Mr. Hunter heads up activities on the University of Maryland campus; Leslie Elliot is organizing pro-freedom forces at Berkeley's famous University of California; Gary Fleischer and Adrian Dellas are active in Los Angeles area at LACC and UCLA, respectively. Copies of the delegation's report are available from FLF headquarters.

All of the above projects are deserving of your support, especially at this time, when so very few people are doing anything to speak out for freedom and against communism. In order for FLF-sponsored projects to continue (i.e. the World Freedom Institute, Committee for Responsible Dialogue, literature publication and FLF delegations to foreign countries) YOUR support is urgently needed. We are thankful that our work has been able to expand so rapidly, but we cannot continue to grow without financial support. So *please*, give as much as you can, and give TODAY.

Committee for Responsible Dialogue

In keeping with our desire to continually expand our operations, to find new methods and alliances that can mobilize the forces of education against communism, we are very happy to announce the establishment of a new FLF affiliate—the Committee for Responsible Dialogue. The Committee is a result of growing frustration on the part of many responsible spokesmen for our side, who are tired of reading headlines made by rhetoric-prone revolutionaries who have no case to make in a real debate situation. . . . THIS YEAR THEY SHALL BE ANSWERED!

The Committee was formed under the auspices of the FLF by a special meeting of the Board of Directors, Sept. 10; but the real credit for the organization goes to newscaster Fulton Lewis III, who brought together FLF President Neil Salonen, Youth Organizer Charles Stephens, and Mrs. Mary Nemeč Doremus to get the ball rolling. The Committee seeks to turn every situation into a debate, to expose campus youth to a balanced representation of both sides of many questions formerly monopolized by the revolutionaries. Already an impressive list of challengers has been organized: Capitol Hill Congressmen Philip Crane and Guy Van der Jagt, Senator Bill Brock, young black conservative leader Jay Parker, Vietnam veteran Bruce Kessler, plus the above-mentioned Committee officers, to name just a few. Each has agreed to be on call for any debate that comes up.

We want to ask our membership for two things primarily. 1) Help us set up an intelligence network to monitor the campuses and be alerted to any unbalanced speaking situation as it comes up, and 2) offer the Committee financial assistance whenever possible.

C.R.D. speakers are experienced, and have shown their effectiveness in past debates with the radicals. We hope we can count on your support for this long-overdue effort.

- Enclosed is my check for \$4.00 for a trial subscription to THE RISING TIDE (12 issues).
- I would like to support FLF's work. Please send me more information.

Types of affiliation (includes \$4 for 1 year's RISING TIDE subscription):

- Life Sponsor (\$500) General (\$15)
- Senior Sponsor (\$50) Student and GI (\$5)

- Enclosed are names and addresses of other people who would like to receive a complimentary copy of THE RISING TIDE.

Name _____
 Address _____
 City/State/Zip _____
 School (if attending) _____

ALL CONTRIBUTIONS
ARE TAX-DEDUCTIBLE.

AMERICA'S LEADERSHIP CRISIS . . .

(Continued from page 1)

ultimate principles. This led to the justification and institutionalization of ideologies such as Social Darwinism and Marxism-Leninism, which glorify conflict, hatred, brute power, and deceit as morally justifiable means of attaining humanity's goals. Thus arose the twin horrors of Fascism and Communism.

While the former has been mostly subjugated with the defeat of Hitler, the latter has conquered over one-third of the earth's population, and is continuing its massive assault on the ideologies which developed around the world's Great Religions. Communism's intensive propaganda has blinded many people in the Free World to the immensity of its crimes, and has paralyzed many conscientious souls with confusion, self-accusation and moral relativism. America's leadership crisis can be overcome only if our country's youth rediscover the relevance of its moral and spiritual heritage. The recent upsurge of interest in Oriental religions and the "Jesus Movement" are indications of a trend in this direction. However, a spiritual renewal, in order to accomplish anything substantial, must be manifested in socio-economic-political relations. What remains now is for spiritually concerned young people to see the relationship of their beliefs and experiences to world society--particularly to communism's attempts to destroy alternative world views and suppress man's spiritual search for God and self-fulfillment. And having seen this relevance, these young leaders must work diligently to gain prominent positions in

society, and motivate others to reject dialectical and materialistic approaches to solving the world's problems.

Despite cries of gloom on every side, America can look forward to a very hopeful and exciting future, if only the positively oriented groups of individuals can mobilize, and develop the wisdom and experience necessary to carry the constructive revolution through to its goals.

IN DEFENSE OF DEFENSE

(Continued from page 2)

time and flexibility of action within the framework of our moral value system, and our defense posture should not be designed to deny him this time and flexibility. An ABM system that protects our cities would lend more credibility to a firm posture by the President in low-level nuclear crises without his having to go to explicit, extreme threats; and it could defend our cities from the stray, accidentally launched or crude ICBM with a bad or non-existent fail-safe system. If the unwanted war should come, despite all efforts, there would be some defense, at least against small, and eventually presumably even against large, salvos. Furthermore, in the event of war, superaccurate ICBM's and SLBM's could enable us, as a last resort, to apply a smaller number of lower-yield warheads in a "surgical" strike against enemy ICBM's, thus reducing residual radiation and alleviating, to the greatest degree possible, the effects of a nuclear strike. Surely this is the more prudent and moral defense posture in the nuclear environment in which we are forced to live.

THE RISING TIDE
1106 Munsey Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

Nonprofit Org.
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
Permit No. 44294