

# THE RISING TIDE

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

SPECIAL NEW YEAR'S ISSUE!

Why not introduce others to the work of the FLF by ordering extra copies of this special eight-page issue? (Available from FLF National Headquarters while they last.) 1106 Munsey Building, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004. Phone 628-3320.

VOLUME II, NUMBER I JANUARY 17, 1972

## By War or Peace?

By James Cowin  
Chief, FLF Research Associates

The December 16th issue of *The Evening Star* quoted Vladimir Vinogradov, the Soviet ambassador to Egypt, as saying that the Soviet Union would support "any move by Egypt to resolve the Middle East crisis, by war or peace." *The Star* added that this was the first time that a Soviet official had publicly given Egypt such unconditional support.

No one can be certain whether Vinogradov was simply "escalating the war of nerves," or whether he was preparing the way psychologically for an actual ultimatum to the United States and Israel. But it is possible to hypothesize as to the possibility of direct Soviet intervention in order to break the Mideast stalemate, by exploring the historical background against which the ambassador made his statement.

The idea of an empire stretching from the western coast of North Africa to India and even to Southeast Asia has fascinated would-be world conquerors for many centuries. This region, having the world's best climate, terrain, and resources, has been the cradle of European and Asian civilizations. In modern times the region has taken on an even greater importance. The rich "rice bowl" areas of Southeast Asia can feed much of a hungry world, while the oil-rich nations of the Persian Gulf (Iran, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia) supply two-thirds of the oil imports of Western Europe and four-fifths of the oil imports of Japan. The economic resources of the area, however, must unfortunately compete with military considerations in this era of conflict between the Communist nations and the Free World. This strip of the globe is one of the world's most strategic areas.

The region's strategic importance is derived from three factors. Its many ports enable a maritime power to dominate Southern Europe, Northern Africa, the Middle East and all of South and Southeast Asia. Also, the power which dominates the Persian Gulf area can also dominate Western Europe and Japan, simply through economic pressure. Finally, the Suez Canal, the artery between Europe and the Orient, makes it possible for a maritime nation to quickly shift its fleet to either the Mediterranean Sea or the Indian Ocean should the need arise.

In the late 1960's both the Russians and the Chinese directed their efforts at this region. After the Six Day War the Russians obtained bases in Egypt and ports of call across North Africa, in Aden and Yemen in the Red Sea, and in the East African nations of Somalia, Kenya, and Tanzania. The Russian Navy can also call at Indian ports. The Chinese, lacking a powerful navy, rely on their friendship with Pakistan, and with Tanzania and Zambia in Africa. In addition the Chinese train and equip local guerrillas in Angola and the Middle East. The complete withdrawal of the British from the Persian Gulf and the reduction of the American presence all over Asia lead both Communist nations to believe that their aim of domination will be achieved.

But which nation will build the empire? The Russians, with their powerful nuclear arsenal and first-rate navy, seem to have the advantage. But the Chinese outshine the Russians in appealing to the Third World nations, and they can outflank the Russian presence in the Arab

countries by their own presence in the central African nations. In addition, the Chinese are quickly developing a nuclear arsenal. The Russians must act before that arsenal is developed if they are to be successful.

The Soviets would have a freer hand with an open Suez Canal. Their influence expanding or contracting with the effectiveness of their navy, the Russians are hobbled because they cannot transfer ships from nearby ports in the Mediterranean and Red Seas to the Indian Ocean. Hence, they cannot maintain a large fleet in the Indian for a long enough time to be effective; and they cannot actively support any pro-Russian factions within various East African and Gulf area governments. The friendships which they forged with the Arabs could cool, as happened after the abortive coup staged by the Sudanese Communist Party in the summer of 1971.

The Russians do not as yet know how to open the Canal. The Israelis refuse to abandon their positions along its edge unless assured that the Egyptians are willing to enter into a permanent treaty of peace. President Sadat, however, has demanded that before peace talks can begin, the Israelis must withdraw deep into Sinai and that Egyptian troops be permitted to cross the Canal. He also demanded total Israeli withdrawal from the Sinai within six months. Otherwise the Egyptians would resume the war. These conditions being totally unacceptable to the Israelis, the troops remained at their positions.

The Soviet-Arab forces could pressure Israel by three methods: guerrilla warfare, diplomatic pressure, or a direct attack on Israeli positions. At first, the guerrillas seemed most effective, and the Russians supplied Yasser Arafat with arms. Although Al Fatah boasted in an interview that they would wear down the Israelis by constant attacks from Jordan and from within the occupied territories, their efforts came to naught. The Israelis easily withstood the guerrilla attacks. The Israeli people, who saw in their nation a triumph over two thousand years of suffering, were united in their determination to survive. Also, the Israeli army found the new borders easier to defend and could easily cope with the Palestinian guerrillas. The occupied territories never erupted against Israel, because of the relative benevolence of the Israeli occupation. The Israelis allowed autonomy for the Arabs, and with Israeli technology the Palestinian standard of living rose. Finally, the guerrillas harassed the Lebanese and Jordanians to the point where the Jordanian Army attacked and eventually decimated them in 1971.

The Soviet-Arab diplomatic offensive fared not much better. The U.S. State Department failed to face up to the real nature of the problem—that the Israelis feared another attack if they withdrew from the Canal without a definite peace settlement—and attempted to secure peace by a series of compromises. The Egyptians, however, aimed not at peace but at an Israeli withdrawal, which would put the Egyptians in a position to stage another attack. Hence they refused to compromise but put forward their strong demands mentioned above. The United

(Continued on page 7)

# Annual Report

## A SUMMATION OF THE YEAR'S ACTIVITIES AND A LOOK AT THE FUTURE

By Neil Salonen  
President of the Board of Trustees

Greetings for the New Year from the FLF Headquarters here in Washington, D. C. Although we try to keep you all informed of our progress through each issue of *The Rising Tide*, it's all too easy to lose perspective on our overall direction. I'd like to share with you some major accomplishments of 1971, and our vision for 1972.

Until January 1971, FLF operated totally as the part-time voluntary effort of a mere handful of serious young people. Most of us were originally motivated by a religious idealism, of which, unfortunately, we could see all too little in our national leadership. It became obvious to us that the anti-Communist groups in America are often composed of those individuals from a generation which had personal experience with the horrors of communism but was somehow unable to communicate this to the young groups. After a number of FLF Staff members visited Asia last Fall, the absolute necessity of America's accepting responsibility for the world became all too clear. And our efforts to kindle a zeal for this, our national mission, required us to step up our momentum.

### 1971—An Overview

**Administration** To accelerate our communications, modest library and research activities, publications, fundraising and all other "hidden" efforts—we opened a 4 door suite of offices in a central downtown building. Through the enthusiastic support of massive volunteer help—for printing, typing, folding, mailing, etc.—our small staff (4) has been able to function at more than three times their own capacity.

**Publications.** To solidify and coordinate our efforts, several publications programs were launched—the most visible of which was a bi-weekly bulletin, *The Rising Tide*. At our current rate of growth, we will more than double our highest circulation thus far, to over 10,000, by the end of 1972.

**Fact-finding Asian Tours.** Three FLF fact-finding tours went to Asia this past year, always made possible through the generous invitation of various host groups. Each of these were successful in strengthening a relationship with our friends abroad, and in increasing our competence in problems of the area. In particular, my own trip to Vietnam enabled us to document the fraudulent character of the so-called "People's Peace Treaty," sponsored by left-wing extremist groups in this country. From the Vietnamese point of view, this enabled the true representative segments of the students to unseat those factions which gave it unauthorized approval.

**2nd Anniversary Meeting Report.** On August 8th, FLF marked the end of its second year with a general meeting of supporters—to review films, hear reports of activities, and to inaugurate a new educational training division—The World Freedom Institute.

**World Freedom Institute.** The first WFI conference was held over Labor Day weekend, with delegates from all over the nation in attendance. Plans for the coming academic year and workshops on problems of strategy and tactics were covered. WFI plans to hold seminars for serious students regularly on campuses in the Washington, D. C. and Berkeley, California area—sponsoring the best-qualified academicians and mobilizing those in attendance to action.

**Committee for Responsible Dialogue.** Primarily through the efforts of Fulton Lewis III (Newscaster), Charles Stephens (President, United Student Alliance), Mrs. Mary Nemeč Doremus, and myself—a panel of "challengers" (including several prominent Congressmen and media personages) was set up to convert any one-sided speaking engagements by radicals into debate situations, based on the belief that reason would always prevail. (Brochures are now available from FLF Headquarters).



GOODBYE, MARGARET PEASE!

December 17 was a day of mixed emotions at FLF National Headquarters. Veteran staff member Margaret Pease, after almost one full year of sacrificial dedication, mostly on a full-time unpaid-volunteer basis, has accepted a position as a lay worker with the Unification Church in St. Louis, Mo.

Margaret served tirelessly as the founding editor of *The Rising Tide* and Director of Public Information at Washington Headquarters. We can't hope to replace her talents easily, but we all feel that the work she will be doing in the future will be even more praiseworthy than her efforts here. Good luck, Margaret!

Perhaps this will give you a sense of how we are seeking to challenge dialectical thinking and train leaders who can renew the purpose of our nation, and with that, the hope of the world.

We cannot be "just another anti-Communist organization" if we expect to reverse the tide of moral retreat in America. Communism is more than just political and economic totalitarianism; its whole social system with positive spiritual values. Our society has grown overripe in its material affluence yet still gropes for a purpose toward which it can channel that wealth. The problems of our society are all too obvious and many people, especially the youth, are being driven to negative radical "reform" movements out of sheer despair. They doubt that the existing system can cope with our social ills.

Yet this system is that very vehicle by which we have achieved the highest level of individual freedom and economic prosperity in the world. In having accomplished so much in the pursuit of our ideals, we have been the greatest inspiration to a world which craves peace and freedom. Having done so much, we would betray our birth if we now turn from our vision and, leaving that, negate the momentum of our march toward physical and spiritual freedom for all men. In this challenge, we must accelerate our pace in making the transition from the present historical age to the next with a new ideology, projecting absolute spiritual values into our national life. We must accept this challenge to forge ahead, rather than attempt to defend the imperfect institutions of an evolving system, however well they have served us in the passing. It is the ideals and end goals that we must cherish in America, not the changing vehicles or structure.

We must recognize that communism is the enemy of all religious consciousness and—as such—a grave threat to our whole way of life. We cannot let our nation be deceived by tactical shifts by Communist opportunists. The purpose of The Freedom Leadership Foundation is to develop young leaders who are fully aware of America's responsibility to the world, and equally aware of the tragic consequences of failing to defend the good against the tyranny of the wrong. The highest sense of value in our lives will be found in a total commitment to this struggle.

"Let us go forth to lead the land. We move with a good conscience our only sure reward, knowing that on earth His work must surely be our own."

John F. Kennedy  
1961

# Power Struggle in China

By Gary Jarmin  
FLF Program Coordinator

Even prior to President Nixon's announcement of his planned trip to Peking, reports from the Mainland indicated that a significant power struggle had been taking place within the Communist Chinese hierarchy. Although the outcome of the power struggle is still not completely clear, it can be safely assumed that Nixon's visit has helped or will help determine the eventual victor(s) in the struggle itself.

The current power struggle is a carry-over from the "Cultural Revolution" when Mao Tse-tung attempted to enhance his slipping position over the "capitalist roaders" in his government, particularly Liu Shao-chi, the once powerful President of the People's Republic. Despite the fact that Mao overcame his opposition, his position has been weakening in the long run. The Chinese Communist Party, in which Mao had been losing power since the failure of the "Great Leap Forward" in 1958, was discredited by the fanatical Red Guards, who had Mao's initial blessing and support. The drastic excesses of the Red Guards' violent criticism, however, made it necessary for the Army to take control of the country, in order to keep it from collapsing from widespread rebellion, factionalism and anarchy.

Defense Minister Lin Piao was both the man Mao had used to create his cult of personality (the People's Liberation Army, under Lin's leadership, printed the over 500 million copies of the Little Red Book in circulation, without direct Party backing) and the leader of the forces which eventually restored order when the Cultural Revolution went wild. Thus it was only natural that Lin was chosen by Mao (some believe Lin forced Mao to appoint him) to be Mao's successor as designated in the Party's Constitution. Lin has been one of the major ideological radicals in the military, and during the Cultural Revolution he enthusiastically supported Mao's nationwide purges of the so-called reactionaries in the Communist Party, government and military.

When the purges were officially ended in 1969, the two major factions—"moderates" and radical Maoists—immediately began jockeying for power. The struggle began to intensify about a year ago when Chen Po-ta, a staunch Maoist and fifth-ranking member of the Politburo, came under increasing attack and was ousted from the hierarchy. The attack against Chen came mainly from the moderate elements in the Army and Party who were strongly opposed to the excesses of Mao's campaign to purge the Communist Chinese bureaucracy during the Cultural Revolution.

The attacks on Lin occurred shortly after the cancellation of the National Day parade and the disappearance of some major military leaders. Lin was last seen on June 3. Army Chief of Staff Huang Yung-sheng, Air Force Commander Wu Fu-shien and Navy Commander Li Tso-peng were last seen on September 10.

Chinese press attacks on Lin mainly denounced his views on the importance of "individual genius." A quote from the *Red Flag*, China's leading theoretical journal, emphasized the attack by stating, "The minds of tens of millions . . . create something infinitely loftier than the greatest genius can foresee." Lin had been the chief innovator and supporter of the cult of Mao.

The attack on Lin not only discredited him, but also seems to indicate that Mao himself may again be losing prestige within the Party. Mao's importance as a figurehead, though somewhat diminished, remains extremely important among the masses, who still must display unflinching loyalty to the "Great Thought of Chairman Mao."

Aside from personality, what are the substantive issues behind the Chinese power struggle? First, the role of the Army vis a vis the Party. Second, the debate over foreign policy. Third, economics: military modernization versus industrial development and agricultural mechanization. Chou En-lai and Mao have been somewhat disturbed by the entrenched power of the Army, especially since the Cultural Revolution,

and were anxious to see the Communist Party regain its former position. Lin had become too powerful, even for Mao, his "close comrade in arms." The other two major disagreements, military modernization and foreign policy, are somewhat related. Lin has favored increasing military spending to prepare for possible war with the USSR. Chou and others have opposed military spending in favor of industrial and agricultural modernization but have continued inflammatory statements against the Soviets, which Lin apparently believes to be extremely dangerous without more military preparation.<sup>1</sup>

Reports indicate that on September 12 a plane with nine Chinese aboard had crashed deep inside Mongolia. Some speculate that Lin and the other military commanders might have been on board on their way to the USSR. One reason given for the possible escape attempt was that Lin and the other leaders were allegedly planning to assassinate Mao and take power in Peking. The plot, however, was supposedly revealed to Mao; and Lin and his group were killed in the plane crash trying to escape.<sup>2</sup>

Whether or not anything as dramatic as this actually took place, it is fairly evident that Chou En-lai has gained the upper hand in the power struggle over Lin's faction. Although it is not certain, it appears that some sort of collective leadership, including moderates of the Party and military, will replace the generation of one-man rule by Mao-Tse-tung. Mao still reigns as the "number one" head of the Party, but his days of exercising absolute power have come to end.

However, Mao's decline should not make anyone breathe any easier. With Chou En-lai in an ever-increasing position of power, the Free World will have plenty to worry about. The Communists have always been masterful in deceiving friend and foe. In fact there has hardly been a Communist revolution yet where the people were not promised the exact opposite of what they got. When President Nixon goes to China next February, he will have to deal with one of the most clever and skillful Communists of all—Chou En-lai. There is little reason to hope that President Nixon will not be deceived by the friendly smiles that will greet him in Peking, as was the West by the Fatherly love of "Uncle Joe" Stalin, or Neville Chamberlain by Adolph Hitler's warm handshake at Munich. But for the sake of humanity, we certainly hope Mr. Nixon stays carefully on his guard.

<sup>1</sup> It was probably for this reason that Lin was also against Nixon's visit to Peking; he feared this would antagonize the Russians at a time when the Chinese military was still inadequately prepared to handle any major confrontation.

<sup>2</sup> However, according to U.S.S.R. sources none of the bodies on the plane were of a man over 50 years of age. Thus Lin and the others might not have been on board.

Editor-in-Chief . . . . .	D. Fefferman
Circulation Manager . . . . .	E. Barros
Layout, Typography . . . . .	S. Baum, I. Lima, C. Efav
Graphics . . . . .	F. Johnson, M. Richardson, D. Carter
Writers . . . . .	FLF Research Staff
Circulation . . . . .	3,000

The Freedom Leadership Foundation, Inc.  
National Headquarters, 1106 Munsey Bldg.  
Washington, D. C. 20004 (202) 638-3320

# Return to Cambodia

by Hal McKenzie  
FLF Research Associate

*Mr. McKenzie lived in Cambodia for two years, from early 1959 to 1961, when his father was an engineer with the Military Assistance Advisory Group (MAAG) in Cambodia. In late August of 1970, he returned to Cambodia for four days as part of the American Youth for a Just Peace tour of Vietnam and Cambodia in August and September of that year.*

My return to my former home under such trying circumstances has given me a special feeling and appreciation for the Cambodian tragedy. When I lived in Cambodia, the main fighting was in Laos, far to the North. My family, including five children and a dog, drove from Saigon to Phnom Penh down strategic Route One without the slightest hint of danger. We camped out in the pine-clad hills of Korriom, later the scene of a bloody battle, and visited the magnificent ruins of Angkor Wat, now inaccessible because of Communist occupation. I remember the country as one of green, flat alluvial plains, laced with meandering rivers, paddy fields, and lines of palm trees; contrasted with gently rising, heavily jungled mountains. Scattered throughout the countryside were the countless sleepy, peaceful villages and the many clean and shady towns.

Being only thirteen years old at the time, I was too young to thoroughly analyze the political situation, but I remember the political atmosphere as being one of gregarious neutrality. It didn't seem strange in this peaceful land that an American-built highway, a Russian-built hospital and a Chinese-built paper mill would be under construction at the same time. I thought of the Cambodians as a friendly, artistic, unassuming people, content with life, and greatly adoring their leader, Prince Norodom Sihanouk.

When I returned to Cambodia last year, many changes had occurred, and my ability to understand the situation had improved. I believe that I got closer to the Cambodian people in those four days than I had in the two years that I lived there previously. I learned that all had not been as rosy as I had thought ten years ago. The economy had begun to stagnate under the mismanagement of Sihanouk, the "Playboy Prince," and intellectuals had begun to rankle under his arbitrary and often dictatorial rule. Worst of all, Sihanouk, while professing neutrality, had allowed the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese to set up sanctuaries along the border areas, and use the port of Sihanoukville to transfer war material to the border. For five years starting around 1965 the Communists had built up a vast supply complex and administered the Cambodians under their control like a conquering army of occupation.

After years of such abuse, the normally pacifistic Cambodians, seeing their national territory whittled away, their precious neutrality eroded, their people enslaved by foreign invaders, finally exploded. In March of 1970 demonstrations against the Vietnamese broke out in several towns along the border. In sympathy, students rioted in Phnom Penh, sacking and burning the North Vietnamese embassy. We talked with the leaders of that demonstration and were assured that, contrary to many insinuations by the American press, the demonstrations were not part of a CIA conspiracy but were a legitimately spontaneous uprising of the people against the treachery of the occupying North Vietnamese.

The Legislature sent many urgent telegrams to Sihanouk, then in France on a health tour, about the crisis in his country; but Sihanouk responded by accusing General Lon Nol, whom he had put in charge while he was gone, of fomenting a "rightist plot" against him. Left with no choice, the National Assembly voted unanimously to oust Sihanouk from office, in accord with constitutional procedure. Then Sihanouk, in an act of unmitigated treachery, went to Moscow and Peking for support to regain his throne. (Initially, he claimed to be going to urge the Soviets and Chinese to put pressure on the North Vietnamese to withdraw from Cambodia.) At the end of March and early April, the North Vietnamese began a full-scale invasion of Cambodia. Sihanouk, in a broadcast from Peking, urged his people to cooperate with the invaders in a war of "national liberation."

Instead, the Cambodians united in heroic resistance against the invaders. The Cambodian army, only 20,000 strong, poorly trained, inexperienced, armed with a hodgepodge of outdated weapons, stood and fought with unbelievable bravery against a heavily armed, hardened force of 60,000 North Vietnamese—but they had to fall back, until

Saang was attacked, only 20 miles from Phnom Penh, and the important city of Kompong Cham encircled.

Then the U.S., together with the South Vietnamese, in what was surely the best strategic move in the history of U.S. involvement in Indochina, attacked the Communist sanctuaries, capturing vast stores of ammunition, much of which they handed over to the Cambodian army. We talked with Gen. In Tam, then in charge of the defenses around Kompong Cham, who said that without the stores of captured ammunition which the Americans handed over to his forces, Kompong Cham would surely have fallen. The much-decried American "expansion of the war" into Cambodia saved that country from being completely overrun by the Communists.

When we arrived in Phnom Penh in early September, the Cambodians were six months into the war, riding high on a wave of fervent nationalism and righteous anger against the traitorous prince and the invading enemy. The army had grown to 140,000 through an influx of volunteers, although they still lacked training and essential material.

Our guides were students from the Beng Trabek High School, most of whom spoke English fairly well. None of them could have been over nineteen, but they all, boys and girls, wore military fatigues. The students had to defend their own campuses, as the Communists made schools and universities a prime target for terrorism. Already, 168 students and teachers had been killed, 1,072 listed as missing. We read heartbreaking stories of teenage boys and girls holed up in their schools enduring heavy rocket, mortar, and automatic weapons fire with nothing but World War II vintage carbines to fight back with. We visited the heavily damaged University of Kompong Cham, in which twelve students had been killed, the campus occupied before the Communists could be driven out by the Cambodian army and U.S. air strikes. The soldiers accompanying us carried a fantastic array of Chinese, American, British, and French armaments (many of them literally antiques), plus a couple of armored cars, pieced together from scraps. One teenage warrior complained to me, "We go 'bang-bang,' Viet Cong go 'br-r-r-r-ap.'"

General In Tam showed us the defenses they were building around Kompong Cham. Lacking barbed wire, they were setting up what looked like bamboo picket fences, which seemed to be designed more to make a warning noise than halt an infiltrating enemy. Months later, we read that Pochentong airport had been heavily damaged in a sapper attack. Lon Nol had mentioned the inadequate airport defenses (namely, no barbed wire) in our interview with him on September 3. The press attributed the successful raid to the "expertise" of Viet Cong sappers; but, we wondered, would they have been so successful if the Cambodians had been given sufficient barbed wire to protect their installations?

The Cambodians are a peace-loving, hospitable people, desiring only to be left in peace. They have been massively invaded by a foreign enemy, culturally and racially far different from themselves, who is motivated by a militaristic ideology and have been "living by the sword" for decades. Many students and intellectuals in this country, in the name of "peace," are urging that America abandon Cambodia to the North Vietnamese!

This hypocrisy must be rated as one of the greatest obscenities of all time! What right do the North Vietnamese have to invade and destroy the Cambodian nation? If peace is to come to Cambodia, the Cambodians must succeed in driving the warlike invaders out of their country. But they need help. They need sufficient automatic weapons, artillery, and mortars to counter the heavily armed Communist forces; they need economic help to restore their economy; they need effective training for their army and political cadres. Above all, they need and greatly deserve the support of world opinion; particularly from America, the long-time champion of small nations fighting against totalitarian aggression.

If the Communists succeed in forcing their militaristic system upon the Cambodian people, the world will be a great deal farther from the goal of world peace, a great deal poorer for the loss of an ancient and beautiful culture, and that much more savage for standing back and allowing the destruction of the freedom and independence of a creative, pure-hearted and peace-loving people.

## State Department Sees No Great Danger in North Korean War Preparation

by Dan Graydon Fefferman  
FLF Secretary General

When South Korean President Park Chung-hee recently declared a state of emergency in his country, the U.S. Department of State chose to officially "disagree" with his assessment of the threat posed by the North Korean Communists.

Park had declared that South Koreans "must be willing to sacrifice some of the freedoms" of democracy in order to guard against the danger of laxity and division in the face of "frantic war preparations" by the Communists. In particular, Park called for curbs on "irresponsible" discussion about unification prospects among intellectuals and political leaders. Later, he was given full emergency power by the Korean National Assembly. His action was interpreted by many American analysts as primarily a move to consolidate power and eliminate criticism of his government.<sup>1</sup>

Such a view is a dangerous, and in my opinion irresponsible, oversimplification. President Park's assessment could be somewhat exaggerated, but the threat from North Korea is a real one. Since the early 1960's, the DPRK (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) has indeed been preparing for war, which they claim will be initiated by the "U.S. imperialists," just as they claim the Korean war was. DPRK war preparations since 1963 have included the creation of a well-trained and easily mobilizable million-man militia; the initiation and intensification of daily military training for nearly all students, both male and female; the building of underground fortifications (including airfields) and food storage facilities; the organizing of elderly people for military training and mobilization; the purging of non-military personnel from key posts in the Korean Workers' Party; the intensification of ideological indoctrination in order to "firmly establish the unitary ideology of our party among the working class and all people"; an economic policy stressing military and other heavy industry at the expense of light industry and agriculture; steadily increasing provocations and infiltration across the 38th Parallel and the establishment of a personality cult *par excellence* around the figure of "the Great and Beloved Leader" Kim Il-sung.<sup>2</sup>

The North Korean theoretical line stresses that "peaceful unification . . . has nothing in common with a compromise with the United States or with the theory of 'peaceful transition of the social system' in the South."<sup>3</sup> Kim Il-sung, moreover, has continuously proclaimed that "we must drive the U.S. imperialists out of the South," "overthrow the Park Chung-hee puppet clique" and "firmly arm all the people of the northern half of the Republic morally and materially in order to pool strength with the South Korean people and . . . meet the great revolutionary event in full readiness."<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, a master of dialectical paradox, Kim is careful to point out that "we have no intention of marching South, we have no intention to solve the Korean unification question by force of arms."<sup>5</sup>

Most Western analysts believe that the North Koreans will not attempt another outright invasion of the South as in the Korean war. The constraints of the international situation, especially the possibility of a Peking detente with the U.S., are seen as too great. One theorist, however, presented evidence that the Soviet Union is gaining influence in Pyongyang through Kim's alleged alienation from Peking over the Nixon visit; the writer speculated that Moscow may try to stir up trouble between North and South in order to make things more difficult for the Chinese and Americans.<sup>6</sup>

The Chinese, meanwhile, recently signed a "Free Military Assistance Agreement" with the DPRK in order to assure Kim of their continued support, even with Nixon coming. Some sources claim this agreement doubled Peking's military aid to Pyongyang, but this cannot be confirmed.

In addition, the Republic of (South) Korea claims that the DPRK has recently intensified infiltration and provocations along the 38th Parallel. Troop and materiel movements toward the DMZ have also been cited.

Finally, there is the enigma of Kim Il-sung's 60th birthday (next April 15), which he is rumored to intend to celebrate in Seoul. A 150-day "innovation movement to greet the 60th birthday of the Respected and Beloved Leader" is currently being waged by pro-Communist Korean residents in Japan; and South Korean sources claim similar, unpublicized preparations are being made in the North. Moreover, Pyongyang's recent rhetoric is suspiciously similar to its line just before the Korean War: talking peace, accusing the R.O.K. of increasing the danger of war, and preparing to attack in the meantime. Thus, the immediacy of the threat of aggression from North Korea cannot be proven absolutely, but a threat certainly does exist. Barring the distinct possibility of an outright attack, the probable North Korean strategy will be (a) to force an American-U.N. withdrawal from the R.O.K. as soon as possible, (b) to continue to strengthen military and ideological preparations for war "initiated by the American imperialists," and (c) to intensify infiltration and subversion in the R.O.K. in order to wage Vietnam-style guerrilla warfare. The ultimate goal is to divide non-Communist political forces in the South and gain control through a North-South coalition government, in which the Communists would present the dominant unified force. The Communists would no doubt use cultural and family exchanges (now being discussed at Panmunjom) to carry out this strategy.

At the present time the R.O.K. stands at a disadvantage. In the first place, Kim Il-sung has established a monolithic party system with all non-loyal elements effectively purged, while the R.O.K. allows a considerably greater degree of disagreement and political competition. Furthermore, the North Korean politico-ideological system has enforced "steel-like unity" (their term, and probably not much of an exaggeration) between its government and people, while the R.O.K. follows the hazardous path of semi-democratic, quasi-open developing societies. Finally, North Korea possesses a more self-reliant economy, particularly in the area of munitions and other heavy industry.

Thus, President Park's "state of emergency" should be seen as something more than merely an egocentric attempt to consolidate power. It is first of all a response to a lessening commitment from America, for which we, not Park, are responsible. We should not forget that the American refusal to include Korea in its defense perimeter in early 1950 was a key factor in Kim Il-sung's decision (with Stalin's approval or urging, no doubt) to invade the South.

South Korea has made remarkable progress toward economic and political stability in recent years. It still needs time, however, to weed out corruption and prepare its people for an opening to family ex-

(Continued on page 8)



FLF members of the AYJP tour group meet with General In Tam and religious leaders near Kampong Cham, then under siege by North Vietnamese and Viet Cong.

# Communism, Religion and Human Liberation

By Julie Evans Lewis  
Research Associate

Today many young people are taking up the cry that the existing social order "no longer works." Bookshelves are crowded with prophetic works by sociologists, psychologists, college professors, astrologers, politicians and Youth. In *The Greening of America*, Charles Reich assures us that the New Consciousness will mystically bring in a world of universal love where electronic music, bellbottoms, and natural peanut butter will prevail. (Moreover, he tells us that all this will be achieved without the bother of political action or theory!) A new breed of young Christians urges us to have faith in God, who will put an end to the evil of this world and establish a heavenly kingdom of peace, brotherhood and righteousness. A variety of Marxist-based groups conclude that a world of goodness will be established only after the existing order is overthrown through a final dialectic clash, in which we are now engaged.

Whether the means be communism, religion, or "consciousness," we seem to be grasping desperately at some kind of Utopia, where all people will enjoy liberation from suffering and oppression. The union of the unalterably atheistic communism with religion on this issue seems strange, but in order to understand the devotion and absolute faith of the committed Communist, we need to make this comparison.

The binding, burning, sacrificial zeal of the dedicated Communist would put most Christians to shame. Where we reject "blind faith" (and sometimes, unfortunately, all faith), the Communist embraces all the trappings of his ideology with what can only be called *pure faith*—a faith that will not allow him to admit the inconsistencies, the corruption, sometimes even the barbarities that are so evident to those outside this circle of commitment.

But, even though the realities are often less than comparable, there are striking parallels between the *ideals* of communism and those of most religions. All religions seek a better world; some of them a perfect world. The Communists' description of the world to be achieved by communism is often indistinguishable from Jesus' description of the Kingdom of Heaven. A selected sample of Lenin's writings (carefully ignoring some of his more lurid sayings) can be inspiring and visionary. A crucial difference, of course, between communism and religion is the conspicuous absence of God in the Communist theory. Central to Christianity is the concept of God as a personal, all-loving Father; and the human need for a universal father has not been escaped even by the most successful Marxist-Leninists. So in the Communist world we find that the Heavenly Father is replaced by a Stalin, a Mao, or a Kim Il-sung. A typical Communist description of any one of these leaders is enough to make an American Christian, unused to such descriptions even of his God, writhe with embarrassment and disgust.

Ideologically, the choice between communism and religion should be an easy one. Certainly from what we have seen of communism in the past 20 years, almost any religion should be more attractive. The ugly realities of Soviet and Oriental communism shouldn't surprise us; we have only to look at the theory to find the cause. All religions emphasize the importance of the human spirit, but communism rejects the very idea. The results of that rejection have become all too clear; the historical record of communism tragically demonstrates the horror that can result from building a world view on false principles and trying to impose that view through violence upon one's fellow man.

We can see today that more and more people are rejecting the tenets of religion, putting themselves into a moral and ethical limbo. The fact is, though, that our human nature is such that we cannot function in such a state for very long without becoming a victim of inertia and despair. It is startling, but true, that there is no escape from choice; we can either choose to live for some cause or other or we can opt out entirely. For the majority who cannot give up, the need for some sort of value system is too strong to be ignored. So when one system begins to fade, another emerges to fill the void. It is significant that the rise of communism comes on the heels of the decline of tradi-

tional Christianity. With the rejection of moral principles in our educational system, in our society and sometimes even in our churches, it seems that something deep in the human spirit has been disturbed. It is no accident that radicalism, even the most violent kind, paradoxically appeals to the search for love and meaning that is so evident in today's youth. The following statement makes this painfully clear:

"I went to the meeting. I can't describe what I found there, but a new world was opened to me. For the first time I felt love. I belonged. I found a family."

A convert to Christianity describing a spiritual experience? No, the words came from a Weatherman.

Why are the positive energies of people concerned with human needs so often channelled through the false ideals of thinly-disguised Marxism? We have to admit that all too often radicalism has lured away from the churches those who most actively desire liberation for all peoples. Why has religion failed to appeal to this kind of idealism? It is not for a lack of ideals; the very reason for the existence of religion is the need for change.

The sad fact is that many churches are reacting to our changing society in a divisive, sometimes destructive way. Even though the idea of human freedom is basic to all religions, there is often a lack of understanding of the inseparable qualities of the spiritual goal and immediate human needs. This confusion of values is resulting in many churches resigning themselves to one of two extreme positions on the issues of communism and social reform: either a tendency to look with suspicion on all efforts at reform or the adopting of Marxist-like philosophies as a means toward social change. Both of these attitudes distort the fundamental religious idea. Reform is undeniably needed, but any efforts in that direction will be self-defeating if the threat of Marxism is ignored.

Concerned people quickly abandon those churches that do not recognize their role of service to their society on a physical as well as spiritual level. And those that have jumped on the Marxist bandwagon in hopes of attracting youth defeat their own purpose in failing to speak to the spiritual as well as socioeconomic needs of man. The unfortunate consequence is that humanistic efforts have become associated with radicalism, while religion is being rejected as either reactionary or irrelevant.

Our country is at a crossroads, and only an ideology that will make the ideal of brotherhood of man a living reality can point to the right direction. The knowledge of this direction is vital to our survival. If there was ever a time for Christianity and all religions to come to their fruition, that time is surely now. For centuries man has developed his ideals and goals—certainly this has not been in vain. The dream of peace on earth and love among men is a universal one, and at the same time the cynics are rejecting the dream as hopeless idealism there is a new hope for its achievement. Again, the two extremes—realism and idealism—must merge. At the same time as we strive to make the dream a reality, we must be intelligently aware of what can stand in our way.

We clearly need a new attitude. The challenge of this age is the need for more, not less, concern, while recognizing and counteracting the spectre of communism. The churches have the means at hand to accomplish this important dual role. Only by realizing that inherent in the ideological war with communism is the concern for true liberation can they fulfill this role. It is the horrifying exploitation of human beings in Communist countries, born of an anti-spiritual philosophy, that prompts our desire to counteract communism. The new anti-communism can and should be an inspiring, moving force, giving much-needed impetus to the positive values that are emerging today.

"... If we accept the challenge with devotion and valor, the bell of history will toll for communism, and we shall make the world safe for democracy and secure for the people of Christ."

MARTIN LUTHER KING  
*Strength to Love*, p. 100.

Thursday, Dec. 23, 1971

THE WASHINGTON POST

# Tito Threatens Use Of Army in Dispute

Reuter

BELGRADE, Dec. 22—President Tito warned today that the army would act against internal enemies to preserve Yugoslavia's unity. His warning came as the prime minister of Croatia resigned today amid a crisis over demands for more autonomy for the country's second biggest republic.

Prime Minister Dragutin Haramija's resignation was followed by those of three other top Croatian parliamentary and government officials.

Tito, speaking at a Yugoslav army day celebration in the town of Rudo, said: "Our army is primarily called upon to defend our country from all foreign enemies but also to defend the achievements of our revolution inside the country if necessary.

"I believe we have strength enough to develop peacefully but if the worst comes to worst . . . the army is there," he added.

Tito, who is also supreme army commander, warned that the class enemy had recently attempted an attack on the Yugoslav army "But it was our luck that we could protect our army from the influence of such elements." He apparently was referring to demands in Croatia to set up a separate Croatian army.

Today's resignations were regarded as an inevitable repercussion of the major political crisis which erupted in Croatia last month and precipitated a series of forced resignations of top Communist leaders.

Hundreds of arrests have been reported in the Croatian capital of Zagreb, mainly of students. Police detained 352 people in Zagreb last night in a raid on a student hostel.

Tito, a Croat himself, accused the former Croatian Communist officials of allowing nationalist and chauvinist tendencies to flourish. He also said civil war and foreign intervention might have occurred if action had not been taken against "the class enemy."

A widespread drive against the "class enemy" is under way in Croatia. The new party leadership seems determined to follow Tito's criticisms to the letter and to purge all those who were linked with the rise of nationalism.

Action against nationalism, considered hostile to socialism, is also believed to be in progress in other parts of Yugoslavia and none of the Yugoslav republics appears to be immune.

The crisis in Croatia came to a head late last month when students at Zagreb University went on strike over their demands to change the country's apportionment of foreign currency earnings. They contend that Croatia's earnings were being siphoned off to other republics and demanded that the republic be allowed to keep all of its revenue.

A number of student leaders were subsequently accused of counter-revolutionary activity and arrested.

When considering force, the Soviets must review the history of past U.S.-Soviet relations. There have been five major confrontations between the United States and Communist countries which could have escalated into a general war. The United States vacillated when under pressure in four out of the five episodes. The Russians, despite their military inferiority, always won some new advantage, as the Americans were all too ready to compromise their position for "peace."

The first chance of a major war came in Korea in November, 1950. The Americans and South Koreans had pushed the North Koreans almost into Manchuria. The Red Chinese massed an army on the Chinese-Korean border and attacked the Americans. President Truman, although he pondered the use of the atomic bomb, refused to use it for fear of a general war. He also refrained from bombing military and industrial targets in Communist China and from allowing an attack against Communist troops across the Yalu River. The Korean War dragged on until 1953 when President Eisenhower declared that he was not bound by his predecessor's limitations, i.e. that he would use tactical atomic weapons.

The second chance of war occurred when the British, French, and Israelis invaded Egypt in 1956. After they had occupied the Sinai Peninsula and positions along the Suez Canal, Premier Khrushchev threatened rocket attacks against the British and French unless they withdrew. American intelligence must have known that the Soviets possessed no such rockets, and, even if they did, would not risk a general war. The Hungarians had driven the Russian tanks out of Budapest a week earlier, and the Poles were demanding a liberalization of the Communist regime. President Eisenhower, instead of defying the Russian threats, pressured the British and French into withdrawing.

Third, the Russians suddenly built a wall around East Berlin in the summer of 1961. This action was a flagrant violation of the Four Power Agreement of 1945, and the United States had the right to take stern measures. Premier Khrushchev had not long before given the Western Allies six months to get out of Berlin, so that United States was expecting tension. Unfortunately, the American ground forces were much inferior to those of the Russians, so President Kennedy accepted the Russian move as a fait accompli. President Kennedy's failure to take stern diplomatic action, even by threatening to reduce the staff of the Russian embassy in the U.S., thereby severely damaging the Russian spy apparatus, damaged America's credibility to the extent that we never recovered. For instance, two of our staunchest allies in the Middle East, Turkey and Iran, improved relations with their long-standing enemy, Russia. They no longer trusted the determination of America to defend them in case of Russian attack.

The United States was prepared for the fourth confrontation, both militarily and psychologically. Stunned by the launching of Sputnik I in 1957, the American people began to appreciate the full extent of the Russian military threat. Aroused by the constant harassment of West Berlin, President Kennedy called up 115,000 Army reservists and strengthened both the Navy and the Air Force. Meanwhile, Premier Khrushchev had neglected modernization of the Soviet armed forces, as he relied mainly on "nuclear blackmail" to obtain American concessions. As a result, the Russians were unprepared for the sudden American defiance during the Cuban Missile Crisis of October, 1962.

Even during this crisis, the American government compromised. Wishing to leave Premier Khrushchev a face-saving alternative, the President allowed Soviet technicians and advisors to remain in Cuba; and he even promised not to invade the island. (Within a few years Cuba became the major training base for Latin American Communist terrorists). After the Cuban Crisis the Russians made no more overt moves against the United States. Americans, relieved at last that the pressure had ended, relaxed their vigilance. As a result we were psychologically unprepared for the fifth and final confrontation, the Vietnam War.

There was no chance of a quick and easy end to the war, but the Americans could have prevented any major Communist offensive if we had attacked and occupied Communist sanctuaries in Laos and Cambodia as soon as possible, in 1966, for instance. The North Vietnamese presence in both nations violated the 1962 armistice agreement, and the Pathet Lao still engaged in offensive operations. Again possessing overwhelming military superiority, President Johnson refrained from such a bold move but instead slowly built up our forces. The result is well-known, except that it is uncertain as to whether or not the United States will recover psychologically from this war. Americans have become less ready to sacrifice themselves for others, even as smaller nations are looking to the United States as their only hope.

While it is not possible to absolutely predict the approach which the Russians will take, we can expect that the Russian hawks cannot help but be encouraged by reading the latest Harris polls, in which a major-

## By War or Peace

(Continued from page 1)

States readily compromised Israel's position with the Rogers Plan of December 1969, and President Nixon attempted to pressure Israel by refusing to supply needed Phantom jet aircraft. The Israelis, however, aroused by the Russian violations of the August 1970 cease fire, refused to compromise. Pressure diplomacy, even backed by strong military force was ineffective against a determined nation.

The Russians therefore must either convince the Egyptians to make a fair settlement with Israel or must resort to force. President Sadat, however, shows no signs of softening his attitude. Nor can the Russians pressure the Egyptians into making peace, as they need Egyptian bases in order to dominate the Mediterranean and the Indian Oceans.

(Continued on page 8)

- 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.

Please make checks payable to THE FREEDOM LEADERSHIP FOUNDATION, INC.

TI 2/2

### State Department Sees No Great Danger in North Korean War Preparation.

(Continued from page 5)

changes with the North. The ideology of the North Korean Communists is a powerful weapon. Without an alternative, or at least an adequate ideological defense, the South Koreans are understandably cautious about people-to-people give and take with the Communists. Ideological preparation for the South will take time, but substantial and hopeful efforts seem to be in progress. [See *The Rising Tide*, Vol. 1, No. 14]

These things considered, and especially because it was American policy which discouraged the R.O.K. from developing independent defense resources, the responsibility of the United States remains to strongly demonstrate its continued willingness to support the R.O.K. in case of aggression from the North. It should be clear from the above discussion, moreover, that a North Korean attack before late spring of 1972 is by no means out of the question.

President Nixon has said before that the new U.S. China policy will not be "at the expense of old friends." His assurances were certainly not much of a consolation to the Nationalist Chinese. If the tendency of our Asian allies has been away from openness in recent months, we should place the blame not on the "dictatorial tendencies" of free Asian leaders but on the unwillingness of America to risk sacrifices in internal economic and political stability for the sake of the freedom and prosperity of the struggling non-Communist nations of Asia and the world.

<sup>1</sup> For example, see The Washington *Evening Star* editorial, December 10, 1971.

<sup>2</sup> Lee Chong-sik, "North Korea Between Dogmatism and Revisionism," *Korean Affairs*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (April, 1971). See also Robert A. Scalapino, Statement Before House Sub-Committee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, June 25, 1971.

<sup>3</sup> Kim Byong-sik, *Modern Korea* (New York, 1970), p. 337.

<sup>4</sup> Kim Il-sung, *Report to the Fifth KWP Congress* (Pyongyang, 1970), pp. 105, 113.

<sup>5</sup> *Korea Today* (Pyongyang), No. 171 (April 1970).

<sup>6</sup> Paul Wohl, *The Christian Science Monitor*, December 16, 1971.

### By War or Peace

(Continued from page 7)

ity of Americans felt that the United States government should not send troops to assist Israel in case of an Arab-Soviet attack.

During past crises the United States possessed enough of a military advantage as to make atomic war suicidal for the Russians. But the Russians are far ahead of us in many fields of weaponry, including ABM systems to defend against enemy missiles. According to the latest estimates, the Russians may well surpass us in strategic weaponry in 1973. After that there is a good chance the Russians will take advantage of our neo-isolationist attitude and our military inferiority, and attack the Israelis.

In the meantime, the best assurance for peace in the Middle East is a strong U.S. commitment to defend Israel in case of joint Soviet-Arab aggression.

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

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

DATED MATERIAL!  
 PLEASE EXPEDITE  
 Return Requested

Labor Donated