

THE RISING TIDE

Due to financial difficulties, we were able to publish THE RISING TIDE only once last month. We hope and plan to maintain regular bi-weekly publication throughout the year. Your help is urgently needed.

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

Volume II, Number 2

February 13, 1972

China's Power Struggle and the President's Trip

By Gary Jarmin

In his previous article on the struggle for power in Communist China, [see last issue] Mr. Jarmin presented background information and argued that President Nixon's trip to Peking might have been and still could be an important factor in determining the outcome of the struggle itself. Here, Mr. Jarmin discusses not only the importance of the President's visit for the power struggle but also the effect of the visit on prospects for peace with freedom in Asia.

There is little doubt that the Administration was well aware of the struggle for power in Peking. China experts had been pointing it out for some time, and the President undoubtedly had the best intelligence gatherings available on the subject. However, since precise knowledge about the conflict was so deeply hidden, President Nixon cannot be criticized for not knowing all the facts concerning it. But the prematurity of his move to establish relations with Peking, especially when the Chinese leadership was in the midst of a period of obvious instability, must be judged.

At the time Nixon accepted the invitation to visit Peking, the Chou-Mao faction still had a strong and well-entrenched military leadership to overcome before their coalition of "moderates" could claim effective control of the government. Nixon's visit was very likely the added leverage needed by Chou and Mao to help offset the increasing power of Lin Piao and his group of military leaders, who had been strongly opposed to any moves toward the U.S. which might anger Moscow at a time when China's military still needed modernization. It appears that Chou and Mao have gained the upper hand in the conflict; and Nixon's visit to Peking, although not the sole factor in the power struggle, has undoubtedly had its effect on the outcome. The fight for leadership in Peking is not yet resolved, and it is likely that the issue of Nixon's visit will continue to be used as a political lever. Recent reports indicate at least two dozen military leaders have tried to flee the country, which shows that the purges of leaders in opposition to Chou and Mao are still continuing.

To speculate as to what might have happened had Lin and his generals become the domineering faction is, at this point, purely academic. The real question is whether or not President Nixon had considered these matters seriously enough before he announced his trip. In any case, the fact remains that he finally decided in favor of the trip, and in so doing undertook a grave risk. Whether Providence has worked for or against Nixon on this matter will probably not be known for some time. However, if recent developments in China, the U.N. and elsewhere are any indication of what is to come, then the future of freedom in Asia does not look very bright.

Despite the widespread feeling that Peking would tone down her rhetoric once she was admitted to the U.N., her opening U.N. remarks have only re-emphasized her determination to wage more wars of "liberation" against the so-called forces of U.S. imperialism. In addition, a U.N. seat for a loyal U.S. ally, innocent of any charter violations, has been lost in favor of a regime that was branded by the U.N. itself as an aggressor, guilty of genocide. Our New China policy, moreover, cannot be denied as an important factor in driving India (a nation which can hardly be written off an unimportant) farther into the Soviet camp. Surely the possibility of Japanese detente with China against the economic strength of the U.S. must disturb anyone with a concern for the development of a prosperous, non-Communist Asia. Nor can we refuse a major portion of the responsibility for the recent democratization of countries such as Cambodia, Vietnam, Thailand, and Korea whose relative openness depends so heavily on the credibility of America's commitment to defend them against Chinese aggression or Chinese-sponsored Communist insurgency.

The very predictable reaction of the Soviets to exploit the fears of the Vietnamese and Korean Communists and to make a more hostile situation capable of undermining the President's

(Continued on page 2)



Sun Myung Moon
Founder of the I.F.V.C.

Anti-Communist Religious Leaders Touring U.S.



Richard Wurmbrand
14 years of "liberation"

Two of the world's most important anti-Communist religious leaders are currently waging speaking campaigns throughout the United States. They are Rev. Richard Wurmbrand, formerly of Rumania, and Mr. Sun Myung Moon of Korea.

The message of both men is essentially religious, but they also bear eloquent testimony against the horrible crimes which Communism has committed and continues to commit against individuals, groups and whole classes of people in the name of safeguarding the "Socialist State."

Rev. Wurmbrand, who spent a total of 14 years in Rumanian Communist prisons and also suffered at the hands of the Nazis, now resides in the U.S. and is the President of "Jesus to the Communist World, Inc." He urgently warns the American Christian churches *not* to be misled by promises of peaceful coexistence and "Marxist-Christian dialogue."

"Engels himself gives us the answer to the question of coexistence between Communism and Christianity," says Rev. Wurmbrand. "'Communism is the death blow to religion.'" Knowing this, Rev. Wurmbrand feels responsible to point out the hypocrisy of such groups as the American Council of Churches, which jumps at the opportunity to give thousands of dollars to the Angela Davis Defense Fund but hardly considers the oppressed underground Churches in Eastern Europe worth supporting, materially or even spiritually.

Sun Myung Moon's Message is also essentially Christian, but he points up the need for people of all faiths to find a basis for uniting internationally against Communism. It was Mr. Moon who, with this motivation, founded the International Federation for Victory over Communism. His movement to unite various faiths in the anti-Communist struggle is based on a new ideology which uses the scientific method to criticize Marxism and presents a counterproposal based on the

ethical principles of the world's Great Religions. [This ideology is the foundation for the book written by Dr. Sang Hun Lee. (See article this issue.)—Ed.]

Mr. Moon was arrested and severely tortured by the North Korean Communists, spending three years in a labor camp in which most of his fellow prisoners died after three or four months in the sub-human living conditions. He believes his survival and escape were nothing less than miraculous and has dedicated his life to the task of ideological and spiritual victory over Communism. Mr. Moon, who lives in Seoul, is currently touring the U.S. as the featured speaker in the "Day of Hope" spiritual awakening lecture series sponsored by the international Unification Church.

* * * * *

Both of these men are well worth seeing and hearing. Their description of their personal experience with Communism instills the direct emotional impetus which makes one's commitment against Communism more than simply academic. At the same time, their approach is rational, responsible and intellectually sound. Most important, however, they project a universal love and compassion which embraces even the Communists who tortured them nearly to death. These men are revolutionaries. They believe that in order for a harmonious world to come about, a radical change is necessary; but unlike the Communists, they believe it starts with the individual. If you know any young people who are flirting with the New Left, the drug culture, or simply lack an understanding of the threat which Communism poses to individual and collective freedom, may we suggest that you take them to see one of these inspirational men when they speak in your area.

[For more information please write FLF National Headquarters.—Ed.]

CHINA'S POWER STRUGGLE

(Continued from page 1)

visit in Peking is another factor which leads one to wonder about Mr. Nixon's foresight in this matter. The Soviets have supplied the North Vietnamese with new and better equipment which they have been using in their latest offensive in Laos; and Laos' chances for survival appear increasingly slim. The new Communist offensive in Cambodia and South Vietnam also relies heavily on Soviet support and is no doubt at least in part an attempt to stymie Nixon's visit, which the North Vietnamese fear. In addition, the recent warming of relations between Moscow and Pyongyang was probably an important factor in South Korean President Park's decision to declare a state of national emergency—for the Soviets would like nothing better than to see increased border incidents or even more serious trouble between North and South Korea as a means of putting an additional wedge between Peking

(Pyongyang's foremost ally) and the U.S.

In short, the balance of power has been tottering seriously since the announcement of Nixon's trip. It is hard to believe that an expert in power balance strategy like Henry Kissinger could counsel the Peking move at the time it was made. Perhaps, we must consider, the decision was more political than strategic.

The only thing President Nixon has made perfectly clear about his New China Policy is that, at least in the short run and quite possibly in the long, America has been willing to sacrifice the security of its less powerful allies for the sake of big-power detente. We wonder, along with Zigniew Brezinski, [Newsweek Jan. 24] whether the next decade will see the beginning of the Generation—or the Degeneration—of peace. Hopefully these thoughts will be perfectly clear in the mind of President Nixon when he travels to Peking this February 21.

Some Theoretical Considerations

By carefully interweaving objective observations of the universe with the materialistic assumptions of the Marxist dialectic and the appeals of utopian humanism, Marx and his followers have been able to win the hearts and minds of some of the world's most talented and potentially creative people.

Recently, a new critique of Communism was written by Dr. Sang Hun Lee and published by the International Federation for the Victory over Communism. Dr. Lee's approach is extremely valuable in that he not only exposes the fallacies of Communism, but also presents the Marxist arguments objectively, and moreover, offers an ideological counterproposal which is the foundation of an important new youth movement which is spreading rapidly throughout the world.

In this article, Dr. Lee discusses and criticizes the Marxist concepts of contradiction and negation.

The Concept of Contradiction

The contradiction which the dialectic method treats is that two certain opposing elements need each other on one hand and reject each other on the other hand. Such mutual relationship between two elements is contradiction. In this case the relationship of mutual need is union; and that of mutual rejection is struggle. All things have within themselves two elements which contradict and oppose each other, and through this union and struggle things change and develop. Lenin gives the following examples of opposing relationships: plus and minus in mathematics; action and reaction in dynamics; positive and negative charges in physics; combination and dissociation of atoms in chemistry, and the class struggle in social science. The dialectic view is that although there is the unifying mutual relationship of two opposing things, they are at the same time antagonistic and struggling. Change and development, for the dialectic thinker, is always accomplished through union and struggle of two opposing things.

Let us examine the concept of contradiction. We must say that the concept of contradiction according to dialectic method appears in a sense correct when applied to the case of social development, for the history of social development is no doubt a history of struggle. [Dr. Lee examines this concept elsewhere in his book.—ed.] However, we cannot recognize its validity when applied to change and development within nature, for there we find unity, but not antagonism. For instance, it works neither as in the case of negative and positive charges, which unite and are neutralized, nor as in the case of the proton and electrons within the atom, which through their mutual action maintain the relationship of harmony. We cannot say (as Engels did) that the shoot of a plant is the result of mutual opposition or contradiction between the germ and seed coat. On the contrary, the germ grows under the protection of the seed coat for a certain period, and then the seed coat becomes weak to allow the germ to emerge as a shoot. At this time the seed coat becomes thin to help the shoot. Thus, the change and development of the natural world generally does not take place through struggle, but in harmony, correspondence, and cooperation—in unified mutual relationships.

The Concept of Negation

When a thing, because of the opposition of an antagonistic element within itself, is transformed into that antagonistic

element, the opposing action is called negation. Negation, in the dialectic method, is the concept used to explain the development of things. In this negation the original things are not abandoned. On the contrary, the previous state is sublated and its positive part maintained and embraced in the negation. Engels said, "Negation is negation in form only, and content is preserved." Such negation takes place in dialectic union. For instance, the seed in its growth process on the one hand maintains union with the germ, which is the antagonistic element. But on the other hand, negated by the germ, it finally becomes a shoot. At this time, the shoot, which is the negation of the seed, did not abandon the seed completely, but by absorbing the content of the seed became a shoot. Thus, dialectic negation is neither reconciliation nor abandonment. It is developmental negation combined with preservation and sublation.

This is the dialectic concept of negation. One thing we must note is that this negation has something in common with the concept of contradiction (union and struggle of antagonistic things.) Consequently, negation does not permit reconciliation or harmony at all. The above explanation of negation seems at first glance to be correct, but on deeper examination we can discern that it is not true. Let us look once more at the seed. Is the emergence of a shoot from a seed truly the result of negation? There is a seed coat and content within it, but this does not exist to be negated by an antagonistic thing. It exists totally for the growth of the germ, and until the germ grows to some extent and becomes a shoot the function of the seed coat is to foster its growth and protect it. When the germ grows and fills the seed coat, the seed coat need no longer exist, and it becomes thin and dies away. On the other hand, the germ does not exist to negate the seed coat, but to grow and become a shoot with the help of the seed coat. The germ does not become a shoot through the opposition and negation of the seed coat, but with its affirmation, reconciliation, and cooperation.

As far as natural phenomena are concerned, Marx' concept of contradiction and negation was completely erroneous. Though Marx uncritically accepted the philosophical concepts of contradiction and negation from Hegel, he then had to change them into militant ideas and apply them even to natural phenomena in order to rationalize revolution and make his philosophy the guide to revolutionary action. What Marx needed and what he produced was a theory to justify and rationalize proletarian revolution, not a philosophy to clarify truth. To fulfill this purpose, Marx and his successors spuriously applied the terminology of contradiction and negation, and through the magic of subtle words they misled the masses.

Editor-in-Chief	D. Fefferman
Circulation Manager	E. Barros
Layout, Typography	S. Baum, C. Efav, K. Hughes
Graphics	F. Johnson, 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

- 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.

TI2213



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