

CACC

NEWSLETTER

July 1, 1982

"PEACE" OR PEACE

"The armed struggle in these countries is the peace movement."
Romesh Chandra, President, World Peace Council

"Would you say that all the people demonstrating for peace and nuclear disarmament are dupes of the communists?"

This question was asked me by the host of a radio talk show. I answered: "No! But I do say that the desire for peace, which is almost universal, creates a social force which the communists are striving to harness and exploit."

This leads naturally to the question: "How much success are they having?" The answer is:

"Far too much."

Let us place the present unprecedentedly successful movements for a nuclear freeze and nuclear disarmament in perspective.

1. From World War II until the late 1960s, the U.S. A. held a substantial superiority in nuclear weapons. For several years it held a monopoly but did not use this monopoly to conquer other countries.

2. During the 1970s, the U.S.A. ceased to enlarge its military forces while the Soviet Union spent vast sums in a crash program to develop and deploy improved nuclear weaponry along with conventional arms. Since 1970, Russia has outspent the U.S.A. by \$240 billion on its military forces.

The result has been that the Soviet Union now has massive superiority over the U . S . A. in conventional weapons such as artillery, tanks, combat aircraft and trained manpower, and similar superiority in the explosive power of its nuclear weapons, though the number of nuclear warheads possessed by the U.S.A. and the Soviets is approximately equal.

The June 14 U.S News & World Report states that the U.S.A. now possesses 9,000 nuclear warheads and bombs while the Soviet Union has 8,000. However, the nuclear payload of the Soviet warheads is 11.1 million pounds, while that of the U . S . A. is 4 million pounds. This imbalance is due to some Soviet warheads having much greater megatonnage than any the U.S.A. possesses.

Since 1977, the Russians have developed the SS?20 nuclear missile which has a 3,000?mile range and multiple warheads. They have deployed 300 of these and aimed them at Western Europe.

3. In 1981 the Reagan Administration took power in the U.S.A. and announced that the U.S. A. would invest the necessary money to enable the U.S. military to catch up and attain equality with the Russian forces. This involved the creation and deployment of new nuclear weapons such as the M?1 and Cruise missiles. The U . S. Administration also proposed to deploy Cruise and Pershing missiles in Western Europe to balance the SS?20s which the Russians have in place.

4. Massive demonstrations suddenly took place in Western Europe demanding nuclear disarmament. The largest demonstration was in West Germany. The communists played a leading role in organizing and promoting the rallies, although most of the demonstrators were sincere in seeking bilateral nuclear disarmament. This communist role has been acknowledged by the environmentalists, the so?called Greens, in West Germany.

5. President Reagan offered to cancel plans to install the Pershing and Cruise missiles in Western Europe if the Soviet Union would dismantle the missiles, primarily the SS-20s, with which it had targeted Western Europe. President Brezhnev spurned this offer.

6. President Brezhnev offered to refrain from deploying more SS-20 missiles targeting Western Europe if the United States and the NATO powers refrained from installing the Pershing and Cruise missiles. This would leave the Soviet Union with a devastating superiority due to the 300 SS-20s in place. The Soviets claimed that these were counterbalanced by the missiles on U.S. submarines.

A massive movement for "peace and disarmament" emerged in the U.S.A. A wide range of people of every political and religious persuasion is involved. Supporters range from Evangelist Billy Graham to communist leader, Gus Hall. Resolutions are passed in Town Hall Meetings, Church Synods, and State Legislatures demanding a bilateral freeze of nuclear weapons. Demonstrations involving millions of people are organized. The political pressures exerted in the democratic west are enormous, and many politicians have jumped on the "peace" bandwagon. The political effect in the Soviet Union is nil. The demand is for "bilateral disarmament", but the pressure is "unilateral".

Certain questions demand answers:

Why has this worldwide agitation burst forth at this particular moment? Nuclear weapons have existed for many years. Films describing the nuclear destruction of the world such as "On the Beach," "Dr. Strangelove," and "Fail Safe" were produced and shown 20 years ago, and they used the same arguments as are currently being used. Numerous organizations advocating nuclear disarmament have existed for many years. There has been no incident involving nuclear destruction to alarm the populace. Actually, nuclear weapons have deterred war, as it is probable that several crises would have ignited war in Europe during the past 30 years had not the fear of nuclear weapons restrained the disputants. Why the sudden outbreak at this moment?

Could the present movement have been ignited and fanned by the Soviet Union for their own political purposes? They refused a nuclear freeze when President Carter suggested it. At that time, they had not completed the deployment of their SS-20 missiles in European Russia. A freeze in their present situation of superiority would suit them well. Brezhnev called for a nuclear moratorium at the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Boris Ponomarev, head of the Kremlin's International Department and director of their "peace" organizations, told a group of scientists in December that "the interest of preserving peace calls for further development of the anti-war movement."

The role of the communists can be illustrated by a scientific analogy. A cloud of water vapor may be cooled to a temperature below freezing without its freezing into ice. It is then in what is called a super-cooled state. If a few particles of ice are dropped into the cloud, it turns into ice crystals immediately.

Most thoughtful people have been concerned about the danger of nuclear war for many years. This has not turned them into "peace" activists but has created the emotional state where such a transition is relatively easy. They create a super-peace community.

The communists have dropped their ice crystals, or peace organizations, into these communities and the crystalization into "peace activists" has taken place.

Organizations used by the communists have included the Soviet-created World Peace Council and its progeny such as the U.S. Peace Council. These have been mixed with proSoviet and socialist organizations such as Mobilization for Survival; The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; The National Lawyers' Guild; The American Friends Service Committee; The Institute for Policy Studies; and the War Resisters League. A full listing of the organizations would fill several pages. The Marxist-Leninist paper, The Guardian spread the listing of the organizations supporting the June 12 disarmament demonstration through two editions.

What does the Soviet Union stand to gain from these "peace" demonstrations and demands? An understanding of the Soviet strategy for world conquest will help answer this question.

The Soviet Union aims to increase the Soviet empire by adding the countries of the Third World one by one. This is to be achieved primarily by first supporting and then subverting "wars of national liberation" in underdeveloped

countries. If the government that results from a successful revolution is Marxist?Leninist, that is fine; but if it is not, attempts are made to overthrow it from within by a second revolution led by Marxist?Leninists. Once a Marxist?Leninist regime is installed, it is maintained in power by the military might of the Soviet Union and the entire so-called "socialist camp". In this way the "socialist camp" is enlarged with a consequent increase in Soviet power.

This increase in communist power is associated with a campaign to divide and weaken the "capitalist camp". Sophisticated attempts are made to isolate and weaken the U.S.A. This involves weakening the bonds that unite the U.S.A., Western Europe, and Japan.

One effective way to achieve this is to persuade a substantial part of the population in these countries that the U . S . A. is irresponsible and trigger?happy and liable to incinerate the world by starting a nuclear war. The mass demonstrations protesting nuclear weapons are contributing to the creation of this viewpoint. They are focusing major attention upon the U.S.A. although it is the Soviet Union which has increased its nuclear arsenal dramatically during the past decade.

Along with the isolation of the U.S.A., the communists are counting upon its demoralization. They cannot be blamed for creating all the forces that favor U.S. demoralization, but these forces serve the communist cause. They include the decline in educational standards with special reference to literacy, math and science; the increase in crime; the cult of self?indulgence with its harvest of family breakdown, promiscuity, venereal disease and abortion; the diminution of patriotism; the lowering of productivity; and the promotion of industrial, racial, and sexual strife.

As these processes continue, the U.S.A. will be progressively encircled and weakened. The increase in power of the encircling forces will increase their ability to threaten. The point is finally reached where opposition seems suicidal and appropriate concessions are the only path of survival. By unrecognized steps, the process of creeping surrender takes place until the entire world is embraced in the "socialist camp" and Soviet hegemony prevails everywhere.

During this process, many crises develop, and the U . S . A. will be tempted to take military action. Such action is unlikely if the following convictions prevail:

1. Any conflict involving "clients" of the Soviet Union or the U.S.A. might lead to conflict between the two giants, and this conflict might become nuclear.
2. The use of tactical nuclear weapons would inevitably lead to an unrestricted nuclear war.
3. A nuclear war would destroy all mankind and possibly all life on earth.

There is substantial truth in each of these premises, and the net result is the paralysis of the U.S.A. in most crises.

The Soviet Union, on the other hand, is far from paralyzed. It continues its offensive towards world conquest within the limits imposed by these "axioms". This offensive includes these actions:

1. Using proxy military forces to achieve limited goals. This is illustrated by the use of the Polish army to impose martial law in Poland, and the use of the Cuban army in Angola and Ethiopia. Sometimes the Soviet Union is forced to use its own troops as in Afghanistan, Czechoslovakia and Hungary, but the U.S.A. recognizes the danger of nuclear war and limits its reactions to half?hearted economic sanctions and verbal condemnation.

2. A propaganda campaign to incite hatred of the U.S.A. and capitalism throughout the world, particularly in the Third World.

3. Support of subversive forces within the U.S. A. and her allies. This is achieved by the infiltration of Soviet?supporting communists in the institutions of education, labor, religion, and the news media, as well as government agencies where this is possible. This is done by utilizing national communists such as Gus Hall, Angela Davis, Herbert Aptheker, unannounced or cryptic communists, and agents of the K. G. B. They can be assured of loyal support from fellow?travellers also.

4. The maintenance of sufficient military might, both conventional and nuclear, that military conflict remains "unthinkable".

5. Obtaining the financial, industrial, agricultural, and scientific resources of the western world to make up for the

deficiencies caused by communism. This is achieved by fostering Detente.

6. Exerting political pressures within the U.S.A. by the scientific exploitation of "social forces". Typical is the present use of "Peace".

By the programs associated with these policies, the Soviet Union is advancing to world conquest despite the U.S. possession of a great arsenal of nuclear weapons. The best we can hope for from these is that they will inhibit the outbreak of major war and grant the opportunity to win the conflict with communism by other means. These should include:

1. The termination of the U.S. program of feeding, financing, and arming the communist enemy. This would force the Soviet Union to use more of its resources for the care of the Soviet people and leave less for military investment, worldwide propaganda and subversion. It would also bring pressure on the Soviet leaders to make liberating reforms in order to increase the productivity of Soviet agriculture and industry.

2. A worldwide truth campaign This campaign would present the doctrines, history, methods, organizations, and objectives of communism truthfully, but dramatically. The truth, once it was known, would repel all but the sadistic and the psychotic. Concurrently there should also be a presentation of democracy and capitalism with due emphasis upon the many positive features.

3. The recruitment, support, training, and supply of a "truth army" to carry the message into every corner of the world. Religious workers should be used without hesitation for this purpose. It is not enough to inform the elite.

4. The maintenance of military forces adequate to deter any Soviet attack and to assist allies when they are victims of aggression.

5. The restoration of traditional moral values which will lead to the stabilization of the family, and a diminution in crime, promiscuity, venereal disease, illegitimacy, abortion, rape, and homosexuality. It may not be possible to eliminate these evils entirely since human nature is sinful, but they can be diminished.

6. The replacement of the cult of hedonistic self-indulgence with the ideal of sacrificial service to others.

7. A return to basics in education with emphasis upon discipline, reading, calculation, and science.

8. Increasing productivity in industry along with available employment, currency stability, and general prosperity.

9. Harmony between doctrine and deed as we teach and apply the lesson of our Lord: "Love one another."

This is the pathway of peace.

SELLING THE HANGMAN THE ROPE

The communists, who rule over the people of the Soviet Union, are captivated by the vision of securing a stranglehold on the economic life of the leading nations of Western Europe by becoming the source of the natural gas used in industry. Once this is a reality, they can cut off the flow of life-giving energy when they consider the right time has come.

The pipeline for natural gas, which the nations of Western Europe are financing, will bring gas from Siberia to the furnaces of Western Germany, France, Austria, and other Western European countries. Once the industry of these countries is dependent upon Soviet gas, the threat to close the pipeline will create panic. This places great power in Soviet hands. The communists will be able to use blackmail to enforce neutrality or cooperation when a potential conflict with the U.S.A. develops.

The magazine, Soviet life, which is published by the Soviet Union for circulation in the U.S. A. in accordance with an agreement which permits the magazine America to be published and circulated in the Soviet Union, also features this pipeline in its June edition. It publishes the following statements from statesmen and businessmen of Western Europe,

commending the project:

West Europeans Comment on the "Contract of the Century"

West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt: We regard the achievement of an agreement on the delivery of Soviet gas as essential since it accords with our economic interests.

Austrian Chancellor Bruno Kreisky: The countries of Europe have decided to cooperate with the Soviet Union in this field, and, in my opinion, this should be done.

French Foreign Minister Claude Cheysson: Soviet gas deliveries meet our interests.

Reinhard Bulitz, Burgomaster of Duisburg: The implementation of this deal guarantees jobs for tens of thousands of workers in our city.

Wolff von Amerongen, President of the Association of German Chambers of Industry and Commerce; I would have concluded this deal even without the advantageous delivery for us of pipes and other equipment because we have to expand our energy sources.

Heinz Dürr, Board Chairman of the AEG Concern: Both sides are equally interested in this deal. It is genuine cooperation between the Soviet Union and Western Europe. . . It is also an expression of confidence in the positive development of political relations.

Suicidal stupidity is not too strong an appellation for the policy of feeding, financing, and arming the enemy who is determined to enslave the benefactor.

WHO THREATENS FREEDOM?

The following letter merits serious consideration. The author takes issue with my criticism of the message which ex? Senator Birch Bayh gave at the Conference on Public Schools and the First Amendment, which was held in Indianapolis on April 20, and which I discussed in the June 1 newsletter.

In your 1 June issue, Doctor Schwarz, you criticize Birch Bayh because at an Indianapolis conference on 'Public Schools and the First Amendment he did not sufficiently stress, in your view, the Soviet menace and instead addressed himself largely to the evil of intolerance.

You were invited, you said, to discuss "The Communist Threat to the Public Schools" at that conference. I can understand your dissatisfaction with Senator Bayh or anyone who did not single out Communist Party activities as the threat to the First Amendment, in our schools and elsewhere.

It seems entirely appropriate to me, however, for Bayh to have spoken as you say he did. Intolerance of opposing views has been a major threat to the First Amendment, in public schools, for many decades. Those who control those schools, furthermore, have been on the whole rather intolerant people.

The clear and present danger to First Amendment freedoms, I agree with Bayh, comes not from the USSR but from the Moral Majority, the "Christian" Voice, and other fundamentalist and rightwing groups. The existence of such groups and their intensified campaign, since Reagan's election, to censor school libraries and textbooks, must be well known to you.

In general I agree with your anti?communist stand and activities. This time, however, in my view you are wrong. Loss of individual freedoms "by erosion and neglect" (to quote your report of Bayh's remarks) is not far off, and has occurred in many school districts already. It cannot be prevented or rolled back by anti?communist preaching ?? since it is not from the communists but from the anti?communists that the current attack proceeds.

Your principal criticism of Bayh seems to be that he didn't give your speech. Similarly, I don't expect an anti?communist crusade to be anything but anti?communist; you are pro?First Amendment only incidentally to your anti?

communism. You would do well., however, not to attack those who are concerned primarily for our freedoms, and are only incidentally anticommunist.

William F. Hewitt

The author of the letter writes with lucidity and style and with a complete absence of rancor. His letter could serve as a model for those who wish to write critical letters to Senators, Congressmen, and other dignitaries. I was not surprised when I learned that he is a Doctor of Philosophy and an educator.

The central question is: Did I criticize Birch Bayh unjustly? After careful review, I plead "not guilty".

My criticism was because Bayh misrepresented the communist danger, not because he ignored it. He affirmed the existence of both internal and external threats to freedom, identified Soviet Communism as the external threat, and proceeded to present a summary of the communist danger. He drew a word picture of Soviet paratroops descending on the U.S. mainland and then assured the audience that this would not happen because of the military might of the U.S.A. He trivialized the communist danger and gave false reassurance to his audience. Since he had been a U.S. Senator for 18 years and chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee for three years, he should know the nature of the communist threat. It is true that Bayh devoted few words to the communist danger so he could not be expected to give the full picture. Nevertheless, he could have presented the real danger without devoting more time or words than he did. A simple statement along these lines would have been adequate:

"Today I wish to concentrate on the internal threat to our freedoms though I acknowledge there is an external threat due to the expansionist ideology of the communist rulers of the Soviet Union, their worldwide programs of subversion and propaganda, and their massive military strength in both conventional and nuclear weaponry which gives them power to impose their will on other nations and ultimately the U.S.A., by either the blackmailing threat or the reality of the use of nuclear force."

Demoralization

Mr. Hewitt indicts the Moral Majority and the "Christian" Voice for "creating the clear and present danger to First Amendment freedoms." Would it not be more appropriate to indict the Supreme Court which has not merely menaced but which has abolished "the free exercise of religion" in the schools?

The First Amendment states:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

This states that Congress shall make no laws prohibiting the free exercise of religion. Despite this, private religious groups such as Youth for Christ, are prohibited from practicing their religion on school premises. If they wish to hold a prayer meeting or a bible study, they are forced to use a location off the campus. Is this not a flagrant violation of the freedoms granted by the First Amendment?

It certainly appears so to an impartial observer. Consider this extract from a letter from an intelligent young Nigerian Christian who is studying in this country. He affirms that the Nigerian Constitution guarantees "freedom of religion", and then compares the situation in Nigeria with that of the U.S.A.:

"I think it may sound interesting for you to know that there is at least one vulnerable area of the society where Nigeria practices more freedom of religion than the United States' educational institutions. Anyone is free to express his faith or practice his religion from the first grade in the elementary school to the last class in any university in Nigeria. Christian activities like prayer meetings, bible study, and Christian counseling are freely held with the full knowledge and consent of the state and local educational authorities. In some areas, the expenses for religious rallies in schools are born by the government."

How can it be said that there is less religious freedom in Nigeria than in the U.S.A.?

Present Dangers to Basic Human Freedoms

There are clear and present dangers to the freedoms of 'U.S. citizens, particularly the old and the young. The increase in crime has imprisoned many people in their own homes, behind dead-bolt locks and bars, because they dare not walk the streets at night or sometimes even during the day. This is not due to any activity or advocacy of the Moral Majority. The increase in venereal disease, with 20 million now afflicted by incurable venereal herpes, has robbed many of the freedom to enjoy good health, and again the Moral Majority bears no responsibility; the slaughter of millions within the womb has denied them the freedom to speak, to smile, to run and jump, and to practice their religion, assemble and petition; and the epidemic of rape has robbed millions of women of their right to privacy and to be in control of their own bodies, and sometimes of their lives. The Moral Majority is seeking to restore these basic freedoms.

On the campuses, teachers and children no longer have security and freedom because of the breakdown of discipline and the violence that has followed.

A society of institutionalized child abuse is developing within the U.S.A. This is due in large measure to the poverty and loneliness associated with single parent families. Senator Patrick Moynihan states in an article captioned "One Third of a Nation" in the June 9 edition of The National Republic

"One child in three born in 1980 will be on public assistance (AFDC) before the age of 18. That is more than four times the 1940 ratio. Using the same technique, I recently calculated that the ratio for New York City is now 50.15 percent." (Pages 20-21)

The breakdown in the family is exacting a fearful toll in human health, happiness, and freedom. The victims of the so-called victimless crimes such as prostitution, gambling, and pornography are legion. The Moral Majority and similar groups, which strive to reestablish the traditional moral values which guided this country for nearly 200 years, and which sustain the family, are truly the defenders and extenders of freedom.

DR SCHWARZ APPEARS ON T.V. PROGRAM "JACK VAN IMPE PRESENTS"

Two interviews of Dr. Schwarz will be shown on the 150 stations that carry the Jack Van Impe television program. The first interview will be shown during the week, June 28-July 4; and the second during the week July 5-11. Consult the T.V. Log, which was printed in our June 1 newsletter, for the station and time in your area.

In Los Angeles the interviews can be seen on Channel 9 at 9:30 p.m. on Sunday, July 4 and 11; and on Channel 40 on Monday, June 28 and July 5.

Error! In the June 1 newsletter, we stated that the interviews would be shown between June 28 and July 10. This should be June 28 and July 11.

POST OFFICE BOX 890 227 EAST SIXTH STREET LONG BEACH, CA. 90801-0890 Area Code (213) 437-0941

Dear Friend,

July 1, 1982

"How do you know that your message is reaching people and exerting any significant influence?" A day spent in the Crusade office should answer this question for the most skeptical.

The phone rings. It is not unusual to hear a voice say: "This is the White House calling." Mind you, it is never the President personally but one of his staff. Or the introduction may be: "I am calling from the office of Senator . The Senator asked me to call and see if you can help us secure authentic information on ." The subjects vary, but one example would be???"Religious persecution in Russia."

Opening the mail is always exciting. This morning's mail contains copies of the same editorial published in the May

30 edition of the Indianapolis Star and the June 9 edition of the Midland Reporter?Telegram of Midland, Texas. The editorial begins:

"Once upon a time there used to be communists, but they all seem to have been replaced by 'Marxists,' 'socialists,' 'leftists' and 'radicals.' What happened?

"Dr. Fred Schwarz, anti?communist editor and author, notes that there is no 'comparable reluctance to identify a member of the U.S. Nazi Party or the Ku Klux Klan.'

The editorial is based upon the article "The Malignant Marx" in the May 1 newsletter.

The policy of sending the newsletter to the President and his Cabinet, all Senators and Congressmen, and all newspaper editors is bearing fruit.

Frequently the mail will contain a copy of a magazine or newspaper which has republished an article from the Crusade newsletter. Since we follow the policy of granting anyone permission to republish any material in the newsletter, only a small percentage of the articles republished comes to my attention.

There are always a substantial number of letters from overseas. This morning these letters include one from the Philippines, which was accompanied by a copy of a booklet entitled "Cambodia's Children of Sorrow" by Noberto L. Mercado. The English of the writer is not perfect, but he states:

"The literature you have been sending me helps me know more about the activities of the communists around the world, and our country is not spared by them.

"A friend of mine wrote a book about Cambodia, and I have been helping him sell it to Christian friends. He is also interested to have some of your literature addressed to him. He is one of the Christians I know who is very vocal about his faith in Christ and very vocal in opposing communism in his school."

Our cause is your cause; our work is your work; our success is your success; and our danger is your danger. I am tantalized by the vision of how much more we could do if we had the resources, but distressed by the limitations imposed by the inadequacy of our income. We need your gift at this time as our Truth Fund is diminished.

With Christian love,

Fred Schwarz

Two interviews of Dr. Schwarz will be shown on the T.V. program "Jack Van Impe Presents" between June 28 and July 11. Consult the T.V. Log published in the June 1 Crusade newsletter for precise information on the channel, date, and time in your area.