

CACC

NEWSLETTER

July 1, 1983

THE POWER OF NUCLEAR BLACKMAIL

Do we need to be concerned about nuclear blackmail? The writer of the following letters contends that such concern demonstrates lack of sense:

May 17, 1983

Harry F. Klinefelter, M.D.
Baltimore, MD
21205

in your last issue, dated May 15, 1983, you state at the bottom of page 6, "The Military encirclement of the United States by the Soviet Union, which is an essential element of the plan to conquer the U.S.A. by using nuclear blackmail to extract successive concessions, is proceeding apace."

I am enclosing a copy of a letter I wrote to the editor of the Morning Sun on this subject. Does any sensible person really feel that the Soviet Union can blackmail us or that we can blackmail them by using a weapon that will destroy the world?

I have been in favor of nuclear freeze ever since it began in this country and will continue to work for it. It is the only hope of avoiding nuclear holocaust.

Once a nuclear freeze has started, perhaps then there will be some way to bring about mutual disarmament and eventually peace.

Very Sincerely,

Harry F. Klinefelter, M.D.

Article: What Blackmail?

Editor: There is much talk by the Reagan administration and other conservatives about thermonuclear blackmail. Their reasoning seems to be that if the Soviet Union has more nuclear weapons than we have, we will be blackmailed.

Both the Soviet Union and the United States have many times more nuclear weapons than are needed to obliterate the opposition. If either superpower ever dropped a nuclear bomb on the other, retaliation would negate any conceivable gain achieved by the first. Any "victory" gained by dropping a nuclear bomb would be a hollow victory; a city leveled by a nuclear bomb is of no value.

It is difficult to understand why anyone should be concerned about thermonuclear weapons is another matter. The first step to control thermonuclear weapons is to stop making them, that is, have a nuclear freeze.

Whether the Soviet Union would stop making more if we stop making them doesn't really matter. If we do stop making nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union may follow suit. If we don't stop, the Soviet Union certainly will not. What advantage is there in having enough nuclear weapons to destroy your opponent 100 times instead of 50 times.

Harry F. Klinefelter
Baltimore

1/14/83

I have replied to him as follows:

Dear Doctor Klinefelter,

You ask the question, "Does any sensible person really feel that the Soviet Union can blackmail us or that we can blackmail them by using a weapon that will destroy the world?"

Blackmail does not result from using a weapon but from "threatening" to use it. No sensible person can deny that nuclear blackmail has already been used effectively by both the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. and that there will be attempts to use it in the future.

Webster defines blackmail as, "Anything extorted by means of threats of exposure or danger." According to this definition, President Kennedy used nuclear blackmail effectively to force Nikita Krushchev to remove nuclear missiles from Cuba in 1962. Krushchev did not desire to remove those missiles, but he was compelled to do so by the threat of a U.S. attack, which might be nuclear, upon the missiles he had installed.

At that time, the nuclear forces of the United States were vastly superior to those of the Soviet Union. I have no doubt the Soviets regarded the threat as nuclear blackmail.

This illustrates that nuclear weapons can effectively determine national policies by their mere existence. They don't need to be exploded. The threat that they may be exploded is often sufficient to obtain the objective desired by their possessor.

Already, many United States' policies are being determined by the necessity to avoid situations which may provoke confrontations which could lead to nuclear war.

It is common knowledge that very large loans have been made by western banks and governments to the countries of Eastern Europe which are governed by communists. Poland has been loaned nearly \$30 billion, for example. The banks have been encouraged to make the loans by their governments, which profess to be anti-communist. Why have anti-communist governments encouraged such loans?

The governments hoped that the loans would stabilize conditions in the countries which are Soviet satellites and discourage popular revolt against their communist governments. Popular revolts were undesirable because Soviet troops would intervene, if the revolts appear to be about to succeed, as they did in Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan. This would lead to conflict which might escalate and involve the United States. The grim possibility would arise when nuclear weapons might be used.

In order to avoid the risk of nuclear war, both governments and banks loaned these large sums of money to communist governments. This can be considered a demonstration of successful nuclear blackmail.

How many nuclear weapons are necessary for nuclear blackmail to be effective? In many situations the possession of a single weapon would be enough. Imagine the concessions that would be made to a terrorist group which could dispose of a single nuclear bomb! Dramatic results could be obtained without the necessity to explode the bomb.

Deterrence is an application of nuclear blackmail. The international policies of both the Soviet Union and the United States are presently guided by the doctrine of "Mutual Assured Destruction" -- known as MAD. Since both the Soviet Union and the United States possess the power to destroy the other, each refrains from taking any action that might provoke the other to use that power. Thus, the threat of destruction has created the uneasy peace which presently exists.

It is paradoxical that the existence of nuclear weapons has probably prevented the outbreak of war in Europe on several occasions. If nuclear weapons had not existed, what would have happened during the Berlin Blockade or the invasion of Hungary by the Warsaw Pact forces? To bring the question up-to-date, what would be happening in Afghanistan today?

It is obvious that nuclear weapons can be used in a variety of ways. It can be said of them, as it has been said of fire, that they are dangerous servants and fearful masters. If they are used in nuclear conflict, there is the risk that they will destroy the world. This means that those who use them either offensively or defensively will commit suicide. Their use, therefore, would be madness.

This does not mean that they are useless. Communist strategy for world conquest depends upon the threat of destruction which their existence makes credible. Since rationality demands that nuclear conflict must also be avoided, any confrontation which has the potential of developing into nuclear conflict must also be avoided. This enables the communists to proceed with their program for world conquest by small increments of conquest. Opposition to each increment must remain below the threshold which might provoke war.

Let us consider a hypothetical case. Assume that the Soviet Union builds military bases in Nicaragua which present a real threat to the integrity of every country in Central America. The United States would be tempted to take requisite military action to neutralize those bases. Would such action be restrained by the fear of provoking conflict with the Soviet Union which might result in nuclear war? The probability that this would be so is very great.

Thus, the possession of nuclear weapons allows the Soviet Union to proceed with their program to conquer the U.S.A. in relative security. This program follows the formula, "EXTERNAL ENCIRCLEMENT, PLUS INTERNAL DEMORALIZATION, PLUS THERMONUCLEAR BLACKMAIL, LEAD TO PROGRESSIVE SURRENDER."

You state: "I have been in favor of the nuclear freeze ever since it began in this country and will continue to work for it. It is the only hope of avoiding nuclear holocaust."

This statement puzzles me. I can understand the psychological comfort that the prospect of a nuclear freeze may bring, but I do not understand how it would help eliminate the possibility of a nuclear holocaust. The number of nuclear weapons that currently exists is certainly sufficient for a nuclear holocaust, and a nuclear freeze would not diminish their number by a single unit. To eliminate the danger of a nuclear holocaust, elimination of nuclear weapons is necessary. A reduction in existing nuclear weapons would be the first step towards such an elimination.

You may assume that a nuclear freeze would lead to a reduction in existing nuclear stockpiles. This assumption may not be true. The assurance that no new weapons would be added to the western stockpile could conceivably persuade the Soviet Union to maintain the advantageous position for nuclear blackmail which it presently has. It certainly possesses enough weapons to blackmail effectively. The possibility that new and more efficient weapons might be added to the western stockpile could conceivably convince the Soviet Union to negotiate a reduction in weaponry. This is the rationale that guides the policies of the Reagan Administration.

I am conscious of the limitation of my knowledge about nuclear weapons, and I hesitate to be dogmatic. One thing, however, does seem absolutely clear. If there is a nuclear freeze, the Soviet Union will continue to possess weapons of enormous destructive power; and the fear of these being used will tend to deter any effective action whenever the Soviets add new countries to the communist empire even though the security of the U.S.A is threatened.

The Soviet Union repeatedly affirms policies which, to the casual observer, appear mutually contradictory. These include:

1. Devotion to world peace.
2. Support for wars of national liberation.
3. The duty of military intervention to retain communist governments in power if they are threatened by popular revolt.
4. The inevitability of the establishment of "world socialism".

These apparently contradictory policies are harmonized by the basic communist doctrine. The communists believe the "progress" is inherent in human society and that this has ordained that socialism will prevail universally. They also believe that the Communist Party has a historic mandate to cooperate with social forcers to assure the triumph of socialism locally and throughout the world as soon as possible. They are convinced that the triumph of socialism

throughout the world will bring universal and permanent peace to mankind.

As long as such beliefs direct the policies and programs of the rulers of the Soviet Union and associated countries, there is no prospect of permanent international harmony. This does not mean, however, that nuclear war is inevitable. The Soviet objective is to attain universal socialism without thermonuclear war. The program for attaining this objective without thermonuclear war has been given a name, "peaceful coexistence". The system of international relations in which the anti-communist nations of the west finance the program designed for the establishment of world socialism has been called "dentente."

Ignoring the reality and influence of communist doctrine is as foolish as ignoring the existence and influence of nuclear weapons. Modern history repeatedly demonstrates that ideas have consequences. The ideas of Adolf Hitler were largely ignored until the consequences became dreadful for the Jews and mankind.

The doctrines believed by Pol Pot and the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia led to the death of one-third of the Cambodian people.

Your concern about the possible consequences of the existence and escalation of nuclear weapons should be matched with a concern about the consequences of communist doctrine.

An acknowledgement of the existence of communist doctrine and an understanding of its directives can provide guidelines for effective policies to avoid nuclear destruction and to preserve freedom.

The success of the communist program depends upon the conquest of country after country in the underdeveloped world. Each country conquered by the communists is immediately militarized and thereby adds to the forcers encircling the United States.

The first step in the conquest of any country is to recruit communist leaders from the students in high schools, colleges, and universities. This is done by providing them with well-produced literature which gives a seductive but false picture of life under communism. These communist leaders then exploit the resentment of injustice that prevails in their own country in order to overthrow the government and establish a communist regime.

Programs to prevent the success of this communist strategy are possible. One is to abolish the injustice which the communists exploit. This means abolishing hunger, malnutrition, poverty, fear, ignorance and oppression. The achievement of this presents enormous problems to which mankind has not yet found the answers. The communists have repeatedly proved that they do not have the answer. Nevertheless, it is a long range objective to which all intelligent and compassionate individuals should be devoted.

An alternative or complementary program is to prevent the recruitment of idealistic students into the ranks of the communists by giving them true information concerning the errors of Marxist doctrine, the cruelties and inhumanities that have characterized communist conduct, and the increased human suffering that will result from communist conquest. This will require a substantial investment in literature and radio, but it can be done quickly with most beneficial results.

Knowledge of the truth will prevent any intelligent, idealistic students from being deceived and ensnared by the communists.

I invite you to add your voice to those urging the U.S. authorities to invest a sum equal to one percent of the military budget in a concentrated worldwide truth campaign. If such a campaign is successful, it will deliver us from the dilemma of choosing between nuclear destruction and surrender to communism.

Most sincerely,

Fred Schwarz

VOICES FROM THE GULAG

A group of prisoners in a Soviet Labor camp has addressed an open letter to President Reagan. They report the punishment received for daring to celebrate the Resurrection of Christ at Easter time:

On 18 April 1982, 14 inmates gathered around a humble prison table for prayer and an Easter meal. Prisoners Miraslav Marinovich, Victor Nekipelov and Mikola Rudenkao were taken away directly from this table and thrown into a punishment cell for two weeks for allegedly being the 'organizers of a mob gathering.' It is amazing that the celebration of Christ's Resurrection is considered a 'mob gathering' which must be dispersed. It is difficult for us to imagine that there could be another such prison anywhere in the world where a religious ceremony would be punishable by a harsh penal cell." (The Samizdat Bulletin, No. 120, April 1983)

Punishing the Family

How important the family relationship is! The communists realize this and punish prison inmates by arbitrarily depriving them of visits from members of their families. The prisoners write:

"Just as often and just as easily we are being deprived of that which is most dear to us -- visits with our relatives. And this punishment is extremely difficult to bear because a prisoner is not entitled to a visit on a weekly or a monthly basis, but only once annually. In February-April 1982, for various absurd 'reasons' the following men were deprived of visits: Oles Schevchenko (also for celebrating Easter), Victor Niitsoo and others. The relatives of Genrikh Altunian, Norayir Grigorian and Alexander Ogorodnikov, who had reached the camp after traveling thousands of kilometers, were forced to return home without seeing their dear ones; in the first case allegedly there were no vacant quarters for them; Grigorian had been put in a penal cell the day prior to his relative's arrival; and Ogorodnikov's wife was told that a visit could not be granted because their marriage was registered with the church only." (The Samizdat Bulletin No. 3)

Conditions in U.S. prisons are frequently described as deplorable, and this description is undoubtedly accurate. Nevertheless, compare the prison treatment given Angela Davis with that reported above. She was in prison charged with participation in the murder of a judge and court officials. She was provided with an office, equipped with a typewriter, where she was interviewed by television personnel.

It is understandable that some individuals have voluntarily returned from what is called "freedom" in a communist-ruled country such as Cuba to go to prison in the U.S.A.

The author of the following article, which appeared in the WALL STREET JOURNAL, May 17s, has been familiar with Nicaragua for many years and recently visited there.

FACT IS FICTION IN THE SCHIZOPHRENIA OF TODAY'S NICARAGUA

By Joan Frawley

George Orwell observed that totalitarianism demands "the continuous alteration of the past and in the long run probably demands a disbelief in the very existence of objective truth... A totalitarian society which succeeded in perpetuating itself would probably set up a schizophrenic system of thought, in which the laws of common sense held good in everyday life and in certain exact sciences, but could be disregarded by the politician, the historian and the sociologist."

When Orwell wrote that in 1946, this form of social schizophrenia already dominated Soviet life, and today it continues to be a subject for underground satirists in the Eastern bloc. But the exportation of totalitarianism to other parts of the world, most recently Nicaragua, offers a first hand look at the young roots of a society in which truth has a twin.

Anastasio Somoza Debayle, the late deposed dictator Nicaragua, possessed simple tastes. His interests extended to money and power. The Sandinista revolutionaries who gained control in 1979 are more ambitious. They want acceptance as the apostles of a cultural transformation that will liberate their countrymen from the clutches of tradition.

Public acceptance will come only with the widespread conversion of ordinary citizens to the "revolutionary process," but many remain unconvinced, even, confused, by the social and economic miracles wrought by the Sandinistas.

Their uncertainty begins with the exclusion of their private reality from official discourse - a condition that is felt most strongly among the poor, the assigned beneficiaries of the revolution. Lacking education and financial resources, the campesinos are more dependent on the state and more vulnerable to its encroachment into their daily lives.

Told that the new order liberated them from the oppressive Somoza regime, they now find their actions and leisure time more carefully monitored than ever. Sandinista Defense Committees, neighborhood organizations that distribute ration cards, organize party activities and regulate revolutionary fervor, are stronger in poorer sections of urban and rural areas.

On "black and red Sundays" barrio residents "volunteer" to work for free on government projects. Once a week, a young mother might stay up all night to watch the streets, protecting the neighborhood from "the enemies of the state." On the other evenings, people attend political rallies, or educational workshops where the apparent paradoxes of the new order are resolved.

The poor are also told that the nationalization of selected industries and the sharp cuts in private-sector profits give them a bright financial future free of capitalist exploitation. But, they find that even the necessities of life are inaccessible - except at a high price on the flourishing black market. Observed one businessman: "Really, the middle class has benefited the most from the revolution. Before, everyone could buy sugar, now only we can."

Even visitors who scratch the surface of this society are likely to question the existence of objective truth.

For example, a reporter returns from a visit to a Miskito Indian camp on the Atlantic Coast where he heard refugees commend the government's relocation efforts. Back in Managua, a Catholic priest explains that the camp he visited was little more than a Potemkin village.

Words are also transformed to complement the new landscape. "Do the universities have autonomy under the revolution?" Carlos Tunnerman Bernheim, minister of education, is asked. He nods, then replies "You must understand that our concept of university autonomy is not exactly the same as it was under Somoza."

Seeking to blunt the erosion of their individual reality and the moral and cultural perspective that shape it, the majority of Nicaraguans turn for support to the independent press and the local Catholic Church. But they too are not immune to the debilitating effects of confronting a schizophrenic system of thought.

Pedro Joaquin Chamorro Jr., the co-director of La Prensa, the country's only independent daily newspaper, approaches his job with a strong sense of black humor. Reacting to the imposition of official truth on his publication, Mr. Chamorro created a cartoon character named Rionsiot who wickedly pokes fun at the inconsistencies of life in the new Nicaragua. When the censors banned any mention of Commander Zero, Eden Pastora, the popular revolutionary hero who broke with the Sandinistas and is plotting their overthrow, Rionsito no longer told La Prensa's readers, "Since zero no longer exists, only the numbers from one to nine remain."

In his effort to present an independent voice, the young editor follows the path of his late father, Pedro Joaquin Chamorro Sr., the former head of La Prensa whose assassination in 1978 sparked the final insurrection to overthrow Somoza. Nicaraguans still cherish the memory of this hero who courageously fought for human freedoms.

It is a measure of the schizophrenia which fragments this society, however, that not all members of the Chamorro family maintain their ties to La Prensa. The late newspaperman's brother Xavier established Nuevo Diario, a revolutionary daily, and his other son, Carlos Fernando, directs Barricada, the official party newspaper. His widow, Violeta, remains at La Prensa with another brother, Jaime, each insists that the spirit of Pedro Joaquin Chamorro Sr. resides at his paper.

The social confusion that divides once united families like the Chamorros also afflicts the church. Sandinista supporters contend the official church must confer moral legitimacy on the new government. In the words of one lay

Catholic leaders, "They want the church to link the New Testament with Marxist ideology, the Messiah with vanguardia, and the Kingdom of God with Nicaragua's socialist paradise."

The presence of five priests in government posts and the wide distribution of liberation theology writings, -- which advanced the notion that the kingdom of God was already under construction in Nicaragua have undercut the orthodoxy of Managua's Archbishops Obando y Bravo. Until the arrival of the pope, some Nicaraguans couldn't decide whether the archbishop was a reactionary or a man of courage.

The meeting between the Sandinistas and the pope was a black and white confrontation, dispelling the grey moral haze that generally envelopes papal trips to hostile lands. This time even lukewarm Catholics were forced to consider the next step- a choice between the revolution and the defense of their religious beliefs.

The government appears eager to learn from its poor management of truth during the papal trip. Further, it has promoted a new interpretation of its actions via a vis the pope to protect the credibility of its cultural transformation. The Sandinistas face the now familiar task of convincing their countrymen that what they saw and heard was really something quite different from what transpired.

Miss Frawley is a contributing editor of the National Catholic register and a freelance writer who has recently returned from a trip to Nicaragua.

SURGING SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

A campaign of anti-Semitism has accompanied the advent of Yuri Andropov to power in the USSR. This campaign professes to be anti-Zionist rather than anti-Semitic, but it bears ominous similarities to the campaigns of Adolph Hitler.

The Soviet communist newspaper, PRAVDA, and other newspapers carried on April 1 an "appeal" by eight Soviet citizens, mostly with Jewish names, to join them in the formation of an "Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet Public" which would seek to "more decisively carry out the struggle against the ideology and political practices of Zionism."

The Soviet Military Review, a multi-lingual journal of the Soviet Ministry of Defense, published an article entitled "Zionist Terror" in its March, 1983 issue. The article attacks world Jewry as well as Israel in words almost identical with those used by the Nazis:

"Israel is but a part of the world Zionist system; the ideology, policy and practice of the monopolist Jewish bourgeoisie seeking absolute domination in the capitalist world, destruction of socialism and the suppression of the liberation movement." (Soviet World Outlook, April 15, 1983)

An attempt is made to weave vilification of the Jews into the fabric of orthodox communist doctrine. U.S. imperialism, driven by lust for obscene profits, is presented as the parent of Zionist terrorism:

"Zionist terrorism is part of a wide-scale strategic offensive mounted by world imperialism and aimed at poisoning relations between nations, at aggravating international tensions, and at escalating the arms race which brings fabulous profits to Zionist banks and industrial tycoons."

The conflict between Jews and Palestinians is portrayed as the result of a deliberate Jewish policy based upon Jewish contempt for Palestinians as inferior beings, who would be exterminated like wild beasts or "speaking animals". Consider this passage:

"The advent of Zionism was motivated by a need to secure the interests of the Jewish big bourgeoisie. Zionism is a progeny of imperialism. Ever since the 1940s Jewish bourgeois ideologists have been advancing the idea of setting up a 'racially pure centre of hegemony' on a neutral territory in the form of a 'Jewish state'. The major methods of implementing the Zionist plans were aggression and terrorism.

"Even in the early years of this century as the Zionist center, 'The World Zionist Organization', was just rearing its head in New York; its leader Herzl declared that antagonism is the main element of human life. The Jews, he

continued, would exterminate the aboriginal Palestinians like wild beasts and blow them up with dynamite. He spoke of Palestinians because of the Jewish bankers and industrial big wheels were determined to set up a base of a future Jewish state in Palestine populated by the Arab peoples. At first the Jewish gold bags bought plots of Arab land for Jewish settlements there. Afterwards the Zionists set out to form armed bands of the 'Hagana' army in order to expand the 'living space' of a future 'great Israel' at the expense of the Arabs who were driven from their land by force of arms. One can see that the 'living space' concept was adopted by Zionists many decades before Hitler. The same might be said of the Zionist concept of regarding the Jews as a 'superior nation' and the other people as no more than 'speaking animals'. This is the reason why the UN General Assembly condemned Zionism in 1975 as a form of racism and racial discrimination."

The motivation for the anti-Semitic campaign appears to be threefold:

1. To appeal to the latent anti-Semitism which is prevalent in Eastern European countries, such as Poland, and to provide a scapegoat which can be blamed for the deplorable social and economic conditions which prevail in those countries.
2. to appeal to the Arabs and to present the Soviet Union as their friend and ally in the struggle against the Jews.
3. To divert the resentment of Soviet citizens caused by the continual belt-tightening which is demanded of them from their communist overlords to the Jews.

THE ANTI-COMMUNIST MOVEMENT, UNITA, RULES MUCH OF ANGOLA?

Communist-ruled countries are very active in Southern Africa. This is revealed by the fact that in Angola, the forces of Jonas Savimbi, which are opposing the Marxist government, have captured 64 Czechoslovakians and are holding them as hostages.

Czechoslovakia has expressed its willingness to negotiate directly with Savimbi's guerrilla movement, UNITA (the National Movement for the Complete Independence of Angola), to discuss the release of the hostages.

UNITA has demanded a number of concessions in exchange for the release of the adult male hostages. The women and children will be released unconditionally through the International Committee of the Red Cross..

The demands of UNITA include:

1. The release of seven mercenaries, six Britons and one Irishman, held by the Angolans every since 1976 for "some" of the Czechs.
2. The release of an unspecified number of jailed UNITA supporters.
3. The release of a French doctor, Philippe Angoyard, who was captured on January the 16th while working with rebel tribesmen in Afghanistan and who is now imprisoned in Kabul in exchange for a Czech woman doctor.

The support which the forces of UNITA receive from the Angolan people is illustrated by the hostages UNITA has taken and retained despite all the attempts of the Angolan and Cuban forces to liberate them. UNITA releases them when it chooses to do so. The hostages include Soviet pilots, scores of Portuguese civilians, foreign missionaries, Red Cross workers, and an Angolan Archbishop.

The communists have used and are using the techniques of guerrilla warfare repeatedly and effectively. The forces of UNITA are proving that these same techniques can be used effectively against the communists.

End.