

# CACC

## NEWSLETTER

March 15, 1970

[SENATOR FULBRIGHT,  
SOUTHEAST ASIA, AND  
COMMUNISM](#)

[COMMUNIST CHINESE  
MEDICAL SCIENCE](#)

[THE ORANGE COUNTY  
ANTISUBVERSIVE SEMINAR IN  
RETROSPECT](#)

[WHITHER THE NATIONAL  
COUNCIL OF CHURCHES?](#)

### SENATOR FULBRIGHT, SOUTHEAST ASIA, AND COMMUNISM

As chairman of the Committee of Foreign Relations of the United States' Senate, Senator Fulbright is one of the most powerful men in the United States. His opinions on important matters of foreign policy are a legitimate subject for public discussion and concern. An eminent and respected Australian journalist, Denis Warner, stated in one of Australia's leading and most responsible newspapers, the Sydney Morning Herald, of Tuesday, December 30, 1968, that Senator Fulbright had told him 18 months previously, "that he did not care if all countries in Southeast Asia became Communist."

I felt that this was important enough for public discussion. Consequently, in our newsletter of January 15, I wrote:

““Senator Fulbright, who told me eighteen months ago that he did not care if all the countries in South East Asia became Communist. . .’

“These words appear in an article in The Sydney Morning Herald, Australia, Tuesday, December 30, 1969. The article is written by Denis Warner, one of Australia's most prestigious journalists and a leading expert on Vietnam.

“This incredible statement is a symptom of the malaise that afflicts so many educated and otherwise intelligent people. This intellectual affliction is a blindness to the true nature of communism. The victims of this disease find it impossible to believe that the communists are sincere in their devotion to their doctrines and that their activities are designed to achieve the objectives demanded by these doctrines. This makes them unaware of the international significance of every national communist advance.

“To the communists, the conquest of Southeast Asia is a stepping stone to the conquest of the United States. A logical extension of the statement of Senator Fulbright would be ‘he did not care if all States in the U.S.A. became communist.’ I am not accusing Senator Fulbright of being logical and do not suggest that this latter statement expressed his sentiments in any way. I do state that indifference to communist advance anywhere contributes to communist danger everywhere. The communist conquest of Cuba threatens all Latin America, and the communist conquest of Southeast Asia would threaten India, Japan, and Australia.

“This intellectual blindness is primarily an affliction of the highly educated, many of whom are teachers, who pass it on to their students. A generation which sees no evil in the materialism, dictatorship, and classicide of communism is emerging. The transition from

benign neutrality towards communism to positive support for communism is an easy one for the young to make. This transition was made by the leadership of SDS with lightening speed. SDS was formed as an anticommunist organization in 1962. It rapidly evolved to an organization accepting communists and finally to an organization dominated by fanatical self-confessed communists.

“A hard hitting aggressive program to reveal the doctrines, morals, methods, and objectives of communism to high school and college students is imperative. Our New Year resolution is to carry out such a program with energy and skill.

“May I suggest that you consider making a resolution to give regular monthly support to the Crusade if you are not already doing so. A letter from you informing me of your resolve to do this will be a great encouragement for this New Year.”

Senator Fulbright denies categorically that he ever made this statement. He sent the following letter to the Sydney Morning Herald which was published on Tuesday, February 24, 1970, along with a reply by Denis Warner:

“The Sydney Morning-Herald of Sydney, N.S.W. Australia

Tuesday, February 24, 1970

“Fulbright denial

“SIR,—The reason for this letter is that in the ‘Herald’ of December 20, 1969, an article entitled ‘The Australians in Vietnam,’ by Denis Warner, contains a serious misstatement of fact concerning me.

“Mr. Warner states: ‘With the benefit of hindsight, and the barbed comments of Senator Fulbright, who told me 18 months ago that he did not care if all countries in South-East Asia became Communists, it is easy to look back and question many aspects of the policy.’

“I wish to state unequivocally, with no reservations whatever, that this statement is false. I have never at any time to anyone stated that I did not care if all or any countries in South-East Asia became Communist.

“I think it most unfortunate for any country to fall under the sway of any Communist regime, because I believe that Communism is not a system designed to serve the best interests of civilized human beings. I am opposed to authoritarian systems, and especially those which have a doctrine so inconsistent with the best interests of normal human beings, as have the Communists.

“It is inconceivable to me why a reporter should make such a statement, unless he is desperate to draw attention to his otherwise dull and uninteresting article by an outrageous misrepresentation of a public official’s views.

“It would not have been too serious if this falsehood have been confined to your paper, but a notorious exploiter of the gullible and uninformed in this country, Mr. Fred Schwarz, has

picked up this statement and given it very wide distribution in this country as a part of his money-raising campaign which has been going on continuously for years.

“I think it is very unfortunate that a reputable paper such as yours has become the vehicle contributing to the despicable programs sponsored by Mr. Schwarz. For this reason I write you this letter in the hopes that you will correct the statement carried in your newspaper.

“J.W. Fulbright

“Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate.

“Denis Warner’s Reply

“I share Senator Fulbright’s misgivings about the campaigns conducted in the United States about Dr. Fred Schwarz.

“There is, however, no question that Senator Fulbright made the statement that he now denies. His memory seems short, for, in an earlier protest to the Australian Embassy in Washington about the article, the senator not only denied that he had made the statement but that he had ever talked to me.

“I saw him by appointment in his office in the U.S. Senate in March, 1967. The appointment was made by the Washington bureau of the ‘Reporter’ magazine. Though the magazine has since closed down, former members of the staff are still in Washington and could no doubt confirm that the appointment was made.

“Perhaps the senator failed to identify me as an Australian and was unaware that, in addition to my work for the ‘Reporter,’ I also wrote for ‘The Sydney Morning Herald.’

“Certainly, in a long career of reporting international affairs I have never talked to a senior public official in any country who was so ready to denounce his own country’s policies and the views of senior officials to a foreign newspaperman.

“The United States had to get out of Vietnam, he said, because it was inevitably leading to a major war. His country had always been military irresponsible, and he suggested that I should talk to a senior serving military officer, who also came from Arkansas, if I doubted him.

“He was not concerned whether all of South-East Asia became Communist, or countries became Communist, and he cited U.S. relations with Yugoslavia as an example of what the United States might have achieved with North Vietnam if it had pursued more sensible policies.

“In a dispatch sent from Washington after the interview and published in Melbourne on March 21, 1967, I contrasted what Senator Fulbright had to say with the deep sensitivity of Senator Mike Mansfield, who also gave me an interview on the same day. In this article I described Senator Fulbright’s remarks as ‘blunt, direct, and, I can find no other word for it, irresponsible.’ I have not changed my opinion since.—Denis Warner”

Here we have two statements in direct conflict. However, the personalities involved are not the issue. The real issue is, “How can communism be prevented from conquering all

Southeast Asia?” The present situation in Laos, Thailand, the Philippines, and India is alarming, not to mention Vietnam.

The answer to this question cannot be found through personal vilification but requires the application of the intelligence, energy, courage, and assets of all who are devoted to the retention of personal freedom.

### COMMUNIST CHINESE MEDICAL SCIENCE (Pins in the Ear)

When I was doing the medical course, the Professor of Pathology, the late James V. Duhig, who was an ardent fellow traveler, used to define communism as “the application of science for the benefit of mankind.”

The gulf between vision and reality is revealed by an article on medical treatment in Communist China in the Peking Review of February 6, 1970. This article claims dramatic results in human healing from “acupuncture” which is the insertion of needles into the human body. If an opponent of the regime had accused the communists of using and exalting this form of medical treatment, he would have been accused of making slanderous attacks. However, the report is published by the Chinese Communists themselves in their official journal in English under the title, “New Trail in Acupuncture Treatment.” It states:

“How can the workers, peasants and soldiers be served better? On the basis of a suggestion of team leader Wang Chung, the team made a proposal to treat diseases by auricular needling. The treatment, which stems from a precious Chinese medical heritage, consists of inserting needles at different points on the external ear.

“The team began treating patients with auricular needling in a big way from October 1968. First, its members began practicing the new cure on themselves and looked for the acupuncture points on each other’s ears. Then they summed up their experience and continuously raised the efficiency of healing while treating patients. One member accidentally sprained his hand while at work. The pain was so great that hot compresses and sedatives offered no relief. The pain eased three minutes after some points on his ear were needled and the swelling disappeared two days later. A girl student who had rhinitis suffered from headaches, dizziness and failing memory. She had to leave school to get medical treatment, but felt no better after visiting different hospitals for more than a year. After coming to this medical team for auricular acupuncture treatment, her disease was cured in a few days and has not recurred. A patient who came on crutches was able to leave without them. Another patient who had to be brought in lying on a cart was able to push the cart home when he was discharged. The worker, peasant and soldier masses praise the new auricular acupuncture treatment as a method which meets the requirement of the general line of achieving greater, faster, better, and more economical results in building socialism.

“Supported and helped by the leadership and the masses, the team worked even harder. It looked for new ways of treating more diseases by auricular needling, to make it yield good results not only for functional disorders, but also for many organic diseases. Housewife Kao Su-ping had been confined to bed with intestinal tuberculosis for a long period. Her face was swollen and she constantly had sharp abdominal pains. She recovered after the medical team gave her two courses of auricular treatment. Overjoyed, she shouted over and over again ‘Long

live Chairman Mao!’

“Displaying the thoroughgoing revolutionary spirit of the proletariat, the medical team members are enthusiastically searching for more new ways to treat diseases by needling the ear. . . . In less than a year, they have treated tens of thousands of cases, which have shown that auricular needling is now highly effective for more than 150 diseases, particularly of the digestive, respiratory, nervous, urinary and reproductive systems, as well as for diseases of eye, ear, nose, and throat.” *Peking Review*, Feb. 6, 1970, Pages 15 and 16.

## THE ORANGE COUNTY ANTISUBVERSIVE SEMINAR IN RETROSPECT

The Orange County Antisubversive Seminar was held in the Inn of Tomorrow, 1100-1110 W. Katella, Anaheim, California (adjacent to Disneyland), February 20-23, 1970. It was a great occasion. The majority of the student body of 500 were university, college, and high school students. There was also a good representation of teachers, ministers, and peace officers.

Some who came to doubt, remained to pray. This is shown by the following extracts from letters received:

“I’m a college student and I get a lot of Marxist ideas in school, and when I try to hear the other side, I’m exposed to inarticulate axe-grinding by hardly objective ‘conservatives’ who spend most of their time grumbling about specific government actions and little time expressing any knowledge about Marxism. But you’re different, and although I expected another of the many half-disappointments I’ve had in the past, I was pleasantly surprised. You did just what you said you were going to do—teach about communism. I heard little grumbling about what our government is and isn’t doing, just an objective presentation and analysis of the communist system. In other words, I learned a lot, much of which will help me in the campus fight.” Paul Chierichetti, Calif.

“I did come with the attitude that I would have to be shown—and I was shown. The presentation by the different speakers, and your own Christian spirit of honesty and integrity did the trick. I am completely convinced of our need to fight international communism as the conspiracy that it is, and the anti-Christian philosophy it presents. Its arguments do sound rational and logical, and here is its strength—but its weakness is that it is wrong.

“I shall begin this Sunday with a series of messages introducing my people to this communistic ‘religion’ and continue with a weekly study group.” Rev. Milton Allen, Ontario, Calif.

The students came from a variety of backgrounds and professed diverse ideologies. They were encouraged to give 3-minute speeches during which they were free to present any message which seemed important to them. The only condition was that they must be willing to accept criticism after they had spoken. Many were remarkably articulate and firmly committed to some organization or doctrine. Many Christians seized this opportunity to give their personal testimony while others promoted some organization to which they belonged.

The first speaker impressed me. He was a high school student with long hair who introduced himself as a Christian pacifist. With great fluency and earnestness, he stated that no

Christian could kill another human being under any conceivable circumstances.

I experienced a kindred feeling for this young man as I remembered the days of my youth when Christian pacifism was very appealing. Nevertheless, I accepted his challenge and asked him if there could not be circumstances in which a Christian had a duty to kill. I asked him what he or any other Christian should do if he observed an insane man 200 yards away hacking a group of little children to death. If he ran up and tried to stop the man, several more children would have been killed during the time it took to reach him. If he was carrying a gun, as a Christian should he shoot the man?

The student tried to confront this dilemma honestly. He replied that in such a situation, he saw no alternative to killing the man but still thought that if he did so, he would go to hell.

The fruit of the seminar will be harvested when the students return to their respective schools. Many were determined to commence study groups and anticommunist organizations on their campuses.

### **Poor Publicity**

Although the students were enthusiastic, opinionated, and energetic, they were remarkably well-behaved. The hotel personnel classified them as the best-behaved group of young people they had known. This diminished their news value. Violence makes news whereas good conduct is ignored. The school received a mere fraction of the publicity it deserved. A comparable gathering of left-wing agitators would have received massive coverage on radio and television and in the newspapers. This news blackout is part of the price paid for good citizenship and decent conduct.

### **T.V.**

Fortunately, part of the school was televised. The George Washington Birthday Rally was seen in color on Channel 5, KTLA, throughout the Los Angeles viewing area from 2:30 to 4:00 p.m. Messages were delivered by Dr. Walter Judd and Dr. Fred Schwarz. This program had been widely acclaimed and hundreds of letters have been received expressing the hope that it will be repeated in Los Angeles and shown in other cities of the nation.

This program is available both on video tape and film. The objective is to have it shown widely. The problems include the following: 1) Persuading television management to sell time to present the program, and 2) Securing the money to buy the time.

It is difficult to get the money, but in most cities, it's even more difficult to purchase the time. The Los Angeles program cost \$10,000 and it had no commercial sponsorship. Three thousand dollars has been received from those who viewed the program which is an encouraging response.

As a practical step to presenting this program across the country, we suggest that local committees be formed of those who desire to work for this project. This committee can then negotiate with a television station in their area. If the committee can raise half the cost of presenting the program on television, the Crusade will guarantee the remainder so that the

message can be given to the people. Here is one answer to the question many ask: What can I do?

An antsubversive seminar is planned for Washington, D. C., June 12-15. Full details will be published shortly.

## WHITHER THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES?

The idea that all protestant churches should combine into one bureaucratic monster has always been repugnant to me. Organizational unity is not identical with the spiritual unity which Christ prayed that His disciples might enjoy.

Freedom lives through choice. Where choice is denied, freedom is destroyed. At present, the individual Christian may express his freedom by choosing one of many church denominations. If these denominations combine into one church, this choice is denied, and the Christian is robbed of some of his freedom. Christ came to increase, not diminish freedom.

The National Council of Churches is not a super-church. It can be considered, however, as a stepping stone to a super-church. At present it is a bureaucratic organization, disinterested in Christian doctrine, divorced from its constituency, exercising authority without responsibility, and subject to exploitation by nonrepresentative elements.

Criticism of the National Council of Churches has now come from a totally different direction. The Christian Century has been a passionate protagonist of the ecumenical movement. In their issue of February 11, 1970, under the heading "Suffering Ecumenical Cats" their editorial states:

"WOE is the National Council of Churches! The downward spiral of disenchantment which during 1969 marked staff morale, General Board meetings and the Detroit General Assembly has not been reversed in the first days of the new decade. If the Tulsa meeting of the General Board in late January was an authentic exhibition of the true state of the N.C.C., conciliarism in America has plummeted to a condition of painful distress, acute embarrassment and operational impotence.

"There is widespread conviction that:

- 1) the National Council has, until very recently, been insensitive to the issues of minority representation and that rash promises and ill-considered decisions are now being made for the sake of tokenism;
- 2) the general secretaryship of R. H. Edwin Espy, while characterized by personal integrity and held in affectionate trust, had not been notable for either administrative vigor or theological imagination;
- 3) a lack of effective staff cohesion obtains throughout much of the organization;
- 4) the General Board and even the program boards of the N.C.C.'s divisions are virtually powerless bodies which function primarily through staff manipulation;
- 5) a lack of firm executive control over finances is conspicuous;
- 6) Cynthia Wedel, as a recent associate general secretary, may have

considerable difficulty in establishing formidable presidential authority over her former staff colleagues;

7) the N.C.C. has turned increasingly to the drafting of statements, resolutions and position papers, to the neglect of effective implementation and communication;

8) the restructuring of the council in the mid-1960s was ill served by the managerial mythologies invoked, and intramural strangulation has increased, not diminished;

9) the council, like the U.S. Congress, may be essentially incapable of renewing and restructuring itself, and very likely only denominational leaders and outsiders can provide the necessary catalysts to change;

10) the denominations should (stock phrase!) ‘rethink their relationships’ to the N.C.C.” Page 163.

If this is the true position, it is a positive development.