

# CACC

## NEWSLETTER

October 15, 1987

### WHERE ARE THE COMMUNISTS

Anti-communists are often accused of seeing a communist under every bed, and of blaming everything that is wrong in America upon the communists.

Informed and responsible anti-communists are not guilty of these charges. They are aware that the communists see themselves as an elite minority with a superior understanding of the laws of history and economics, and a special responsibility for creating the historically-ordained future for mankind. They know that the slogan of Lenin, the founder of the first communist party, with regard to membership in that party, was "fewer but better".

### Communist Science

The power of communism cannot be measure by the number of communists. Communism professes to be a science. It calls itself, "The Science of Marxism-Leninism", and each communist strives to be a scientist.

One, who is skilled at harnessing and utilizing forces, and thereby increasing his personal power, can rightly be called a scientist. The sailor harnesses the wind and uses it to convey a heavy ship to a desired destination. He could not transport the ship or its cargo by his own unaided strength.

The sailor-scientist can use knowledge and skill to make the wind drive a ship against itself. This is memorialized in the poem:

"One ship drives east and another drives west  
With the self-same wind that blows.  
'Tis the set of the sails and not the gales  
which tells us the way to go." (Ella Wheeler Wilcox)

It should be noted that the sailor does not create the winds, he harnesses and uses them.

### Social Forces

The Greek scientist, Archimedes, said: "Give me a lever long enough, and somewhere to stand, and I will move the world." The communists believe that they have found that lever. It is made up of social forces. A social force is an idea or emotion which is shared by a number of people, and which can motivate them to action.

Social forces are numerous and varied Typical ones, which the communists have used and are using effectively, include:

1. The desire for peace;
2. The desire for national liberation;
3. The desire for racial equality;
4. The desire for increased material well-being;
5. The desire to help the poor and underprivileged;
6. The desire for equal rights for women;
7. The desire for academic freedom;
8. The desire for civil rights;
9. The desire for a pleasant and safe environment.

These desires are not created by the communists, and they are not evil. The communists seek to use good forces to achieve evil ends. They seek to use the desire for peace to advance class war; the desire for freedom to establish dictatorship; the desire for human regeneration to promote class extermination; the desire for abundance to create poverty; and the desire for civil rights to abolish all human rights. Communism often poses the dilemma, "Shall we do good that evil may come?"

Instruments are often needed for the scientific utilization of forces. The sailor needs a sail and a vessel, while the pilot needs an airplane and a source of power. Knowledge is essential, but not sufficient.

### Communist Fronts

Likewise, the communist scientist needs instruments to control and utilize social forces. Organizations forged for this purpose are often known as "communist fronts".

A communist front is an organization which is formed and controlled by the communists, but which is made up of a majority of non-communists and even anti-communists. It recruits individuals who are devoted to the attainment of some cherished objective. The communist front, however, has three objectives, two of which are secret. They are: 1) Long-range, 2) Announced, and 3) Hidden.

The long-range objective is secret, and it is the communist domination of the world. This is known to only a few of the members of the front.

The announced objective is to fulfill the desire that motivates the majority of the members.

The hidden objective is to secure some immediate local advantage, such as expanding the circulation of the communist press or creating possibilities for gaining recruits for the communist party.

Typical communist fronts are: The World Peace Council, which is organized and controlled by the Soviet Communist Party, in association with communists from other countries; the U.S. Peace Council which is organized and controlled by the Communist Party, USA; and a number of ad hoc Peace Committees which are formed in communities, schools and churches wherever the opportunity exists.

The president of the World Peace Council is not a Russian, but an Indian Communist, Romesh Chandra. He is noteworthy for his "peaceful" statement concerning "wars of national liberation": "The armed struggle in these countries is the peace movement." The Soviets financed, controlled, and used the World Peace Council, while they were invading Czechoslovakia and Hungary, and they continue to use it without embarrassment while they wage war against the people of Afghanistan.

The majority of the supporters of the various communist-dominated Peace Councils are sincere, if naïve, devotees of peace who are unaware of the communist definition of peace and of the long-range objectives of the organization for which they work with sincerity and sacrifice.

### Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI)

One of the major objectives of the World Peace Council is to prevent the U.S.A. from securing an effective shield against nuclear weapons since this would prevent Soviet nuclear blackmail from being effective. If the leaders announced this as the objective they would gain few recruits. The campaign to "keep space non-nuclear" has the same result, and successfully recruits millions.

The number of communists in the U.S.A. is unknown since none of the communist parties announce their membership, but it is relatively few. The largest party is the pro-Soviet Communist Party, USA, which is believed to have about 20,000 members. Altogether, there may be about 30,000 party members nationwide, and there are probably, at least, ten times that number of ideological communists or fellow travelers.

The communists will be found working energetically wherever a social force exists. They will not be found striving to teach communist doctrines directly to great numbers of people. Such conduct would tend to isolate the communist

from the masses whom he should lead.

If he leads the masses well in their quest for the fulfillment of their desires, he will create opportunities to present communist doctrines to great numbers of people. Such conduct would tend to isolate the communist from the masses whom he should lead.

Communists do not waste their energies lying under beds.

(The anatomy of a communist front will be described in a coming newsletter.)

## QADDAFI PROMOTES PACIFIC TERRORISM

Philip Wilson is a lifelong personal friend and an informed and articulate anti-communist. He reports how he was given an expense-paid trip to Libya to attend a conference to promote “anti-imperialism”, a synonym for action against the U.S.A. He was editor of an environmental magazine, *SIMPLY LIVING*, so the agents of Qaddafi apparently assumed he would be a possible recruit. (Sunday Telegraph, Sydney Australia, May 24, 1987)

‘Anti-USA’ trip came out of the blue  
by Steve Warnock

The phone call “came out of the blue” on April 12 this year, according to Mr Phil Wilson, editor of Sydney magazine *Simply Living*.

It was from Robert Pash, the head of Libyan Arab Cultural Association, who, Mr Wilson said, had not previously met or spoken to him.

Mr Pash invited Mr Wilson to a two-day “all expenses paid” conference in Libya last month where delegates from world “anti-USA imperialism” groups were to speak on matters pertaining to peace in the Pacific.

Colonel Gaddafi, he was assured, would address this historic gathering.

Accompanied by his boss, Democrat Senate aspirant Richard Jones, Mr Wilson boarded a jet from Sydney “on a Sunday” and traveled to Melbourne then to Malaysia.

Mr Jones and Mr Wilson spent two days in Malaysia before continuing to Karachi where they idled away a day.

Mr Pash apparently was some where on that plane but for whatever reason did not make contact with the *Simply Living* representatives.

At Karachi things really started to move.

An unmarked 707 jet arrived and Mr Wilson and Mr Jones were taken on board for a flight to Libya.

At Tripoli Mr Pash finally surfaced.

“He spoke to me on a bus from Tripoli Airport to Misurata, where the conference was to held,” Mr Wilson told *The Sunday Telegraph* at his office at Manly.

“He told me about Libya and a little about himself.

“He said Colonel Gaddafi had done a great job and everyone had a free house and car in Libya.”

Mr Wilson spent eight days in a hotel at Misurata before the conference ...”very good quarters”, according to Mr Wilson.

The conference started on schedule at Misurata and Mr Wilson took notes as speakers vented their rage against the USA.

Delegates lashed the United States. One even proposed “a hit” on the US base in Thailand.

Another proposed all groups in the Pacific, including Australia, combine to defeat American imperialism.

Mr Wilson, who had not, and still hasn't been given any reasons why he should have been invited to Libya, said the atmosphere at the conference was “pretty relaxed”.

But he added: “There was a certain attitude...people accepting violence against the US and its allies.

“I wouldn't call it frightening but when I eventually got out and into Rome I felt I was back in a real country.”

After the historic Misurata conference, Mr Wilson and Mr Jones were taken on a three-hour bus ride with other writers and journalists to the town of Syrte to hear Gaddafi speak.

Gaddafi's bodyguards made them run into the conference when the Libyan colonel arrived.

Qaddafi's organizer, Mr. Pash, was formerly a member of the Nazi Party in Australia.

#### POLITICAL STAGNATION ACCOMPANIES ECONOMIC CHANGE IN CHINA

The economic reforms that have taken place, and which continue to take place, in Communist China will not be accompanied by any diminution in the power of the political monopoly exercised by the Communist Party of China. This is made lucidly clear by Deng Xiaoping in an article published in the August 24, 1987 edition of BEIJING REVIEW.

At the beginning of his statement, which is taken from an address to Stefan Korosec, member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, Den seemed to justify the hope that economic reform would be accompanied by significant political reform. In the continuation of his message, he dashes these hopes and makes it clear that any political change will be purely cosmetic.

He raises hopes with this statement:

“China is now carrying out a reform, I am all in favour of that. There is no other solution for us. After years of practice it turned out that the old stuff didn't work. In the past we copied foreign models mechanically, which only hampered the development of our productive forces, induced ideological rigidity and kept people and grass-roots units from taking any initiative. We made some mistakes of our own as well, such as the ‘great leap forward’ and the ‘cultural revolution,” which were our own inventions. I would say that since 1957 our major mistakes have been ‘left’ ones. The ‘cultural revolution’ was an ultra-left mistake. In fact, during the two decades from 1958 through 1978, China remained at a standstill. There was little economic growth and not much of a rise in people's standard of living. How could we go on like that without introducing reforms? So in 1978, at the Third Plenary Session of the 11th Central Committee, we formulated a new basic political line to give first priority to the drive for modernization and strive to develop the productive forces. In accordance with that line we drew up a series of new principles and policies, the major ones being reform and the open policy. By reform we mean something comprehensive, including reform and the economic structure and the political structure and corresponding changes in all other areas. By the open policy we mean both opening to all other countries, irrespective of their social systems, and opening at home, which means invigorating the domestic economy. (P. 13 & 14)

Please note that he promises that the political structure will be reformed along with the economic structure. He later clarifies what is meant by “Political reform.”

#### Political Reform

Denge gives the assurance that political reform will be merely cosmetic. Referring to the Special Economic Zones, he

makes it clear that the special economic privileges of the zone will not be accompanied by political privileges.

“In the meantime, the policy of opening China’s doors to the outside world has produced the results we hoped for. We have implemented that policy in various ways, including setting up special economic zones and opening 14 coastal cities...But I said they should be called special economic zones, not special political zones, because we didn’t want anything of that sort.” (Page 4)

### Reform of Political Structure

He then discusses reform of the political structure:

“Now a new question has been raised, reform of the political structure...It’s a complicated issue. Every measure taken in this connection will affect millions of people, mainly cadres, including the veterans.

“Generally speaking, reform of the political structure involves democratization, but what that means is not very clear. The democracy in capitalist societies is bourgeois democracy—in fact, it is the democracy of monopoly capitalists... Can we adopt this system? Ours is the system of the people’s congresses and people’s democracy under the leadership of the Communist Party. The greatest advantage of the socialist system is that when the central leadership makes a decision it is promptly implemented without interference from any other quarters.” (Page 15)

### Purpose of Political Reform

“What is the purpose of political restructuring? Its general purpose is to consolidate the socialist system, the leadership of the Party and the development of the productive forces under that system and that leadership.” (Page 15)

“Our reform cannot depart from socialism, it cannot be accomplished without the leadership of the Communist Party. Socialism and Party leadership are interrelated; they cannot be separated from each other. Without the leadership of the Communist Party, there can be no building of socialism. We shall never again allow the kind of democracy we had during the ‘cultural revolution.’ Actually that was anarchy.” (Page 16)

### Bureaucratism

Deng acknowledges that the party has problems with bureaucracy. He blames this on the aging communist cadres.

The justification for the political monopoly of the Communist Party rests upon the claimed superior intelligence and dedication of its members. This is summed up in Lenin’s famous doctrine that, “The Communist Party is the mind, the morals, and the conscience of our epoch.” Grim reality has demonstrated that communist party members reveal innate selfishness and greed as they continue to exercise power. They become typical bureaucrats. Deng laments:

“China is burdened with bureaucratism. Take our personnel system, for example. I think the socialist countries all have a problem of ageing cadres, so that leaders at all levels tend to be rigid in their thinking. But we think that to reform our political structure we can’t copy the Western system, the capitalist system. We socialist countries have to work out the content of the reform and take specific measures to implement it in the light of our own practice and our own conditions.” (Page 15)

### The Solution

His solution is much less cruel than that practiced by Stalin and Mao. The former gave every city, institution and factory a “liquidation quotient”. This required the arrest and punishment, by imprisonment or death, of a certain percentage of officials each year. It did not matter who they were. Crimes could be invented for their punishment. The purpose was to stimulate all to ceaseless obedience and activity. Mao declared and promoted the cruel madness of the Great Cultural Revolution. Den proposes:

“Revitalize the Party, the administrative organs and the whole state apparatus, so that they are staffed with people whose thinking is not ossified and who can bring fresh ideas to bear on new problems...”

“Here, the biggest problem is the need for younger cadres.” (Page 16)

His solution is to compel communist members to resign from their positions before age renders them intellectually rigid. It is certainly preferable to those of Stalin and Mao, but unlikely to be any more successful.

It must be noted that the decisions of the communist party determine economic and political realities. The communist party rules China. The history of communism reveals that one man, almost invariably, dominates the policies of the party. The livelihood and lives of the people depend upon the ideas and character of that man.

Deng’s life illustrates the changes that are brought about by changes in the communist party leadership. He was a leading bureaucrat of the party when he earned the displeasure of Mao. This resulted in his disgrace, arrest and torture. When Mao died, Deng was elevated to the seat of power. Now he decides what conditions the Chinese people will endure or enjoy.

The party which permits economic liberties can also prohibit them. A change in leadership may cause a change in policy. Who can guarantee that a new Stalin or Mao will not arise?

Until China renounces communism and replaces party and personal dictatorship with balanced, limited, and reversible political power, neither the Chinese people nor the people of the world can feel secure.

P.S. As I was writing this, information arrived which shows how the communist party dominates every aspect of Chinese life. Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., P.O. Box 220, Wheaton, Illinois 60189, have issued the following statement in their publication, THE CHURCH AROUND THE WORLD, with the subtitle, “Watch and Pray”:

“Recent directives from the official 3-Self Patriotic Movement have restricted pastors from preaching on the return of Christ, suffering for Christ, separation from the world, casting out demons, and healing the sick. The resurgence of party conservatism since the beginning of this year is resulting in increased control of both the government-recognized churches and the unofficial house churches.”

## COMMUNISM AND LABOR UNIONS

Marx and Lenin are the two major communist idols. In 1920, Lenin gave direct instructions to the communists of Europe on how they should relate to labor unions. Those instructions are published in the book, “Left-Wing” Communism, an Infantile Disorder, which is now a communist classic.

Lenin present the communist ideal of total control of the labor unions in this statement:

“In its work the Party relies directly on the trade unions, which at present, according to the data of the last congress (April 1920), have over 4,000,000 members, and which are formally non-party. Actually, all the directing bodies of the vast majority of the unions, and primarily, of course, of the all-Russian general trade union center or bureau (that All-Russian Central Trade Union Council) consist of Communists and carry out all the instructions of the Party.” (Page 32)

Where the communists are not in executive positions in the union, they must behave as follows:

“We must be able to withstand all this, to agree to any sacrifice, and even – if need be – to resort to all sorts of stratagems, artifices, illegal methods, to evasions and subterfuges, only so as to get into the trade unions, to remain in them, and to carry on Communism work within them at all costs.” (Page 38)

Lenin’s instructions are being obeyed today by communists all around the world.

## U.S. FRIEND OF MAO ASSESSES THE PRESENT POLICIES OF COMMUNIST CHINA

William Hinton has been a supporter of Chinese Communism for many years; so has the Marxist-Leninist newsweekly, GUARDIAN. Both Hinton and the GUARDIAN are experiencing great difficulty in believing that the present policies of the Chinese Communist regime will lead to “Socialism”, despite the official claim that The

People's Republic of China is presently a "Socialist" state.

The following article was published in the August 26 edition of GUARDIAN:

Hinton sees 'feudalism' result of Deng's reforms

In order to promote "unity and stability" China's leadership denies that there is class struggle in the People's Republic. They admit only that there are different interest groups.

But as the U.S. left's senior China expert William Hinton describes the scene in China today, it is clear that there are classes – workers, peasants, bourgeoisie and a bureaucratic elite. And it is clear there is struggle going on between and within some of these classes. Classes are being formed. For example, the peasantry is polarizing into rich peasants and poor peasants and some are splitting off into the working class.

The economic reforms of recent years have fostered opportunities for entrepreneurs everywhere. But these efforts to promote the formation of a petty bourgeoisie are, in Hinton's view, running up against "the structural feudalism that has dominated China for centuries and still dominates it." Hinton is the author of "Fanshen," a groundbreaking study of the Chinese peasantry. He discussed the ramifications of China's sweeping economic restructuring in a recent talk at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore.

'FEUDAL FLAVOR'

One might expect that the reformers' efforts to develop a kind of "market socialism" would weaken the bureaucracy, and that the bureaucratic elite resist this in the interest of a centrally planned socialism.

But Hinton sees the bureaucrats "as a revival of traditional Chinese bureaucratic centralists, rather than as socialist planners in the Soviet mode. Among them there are some of the latter, but the majority of the people in power today reflect Chinese traditional rule, not some new socialist form."

"Down in the countryside," Hinton continues, "the feudal flavor is very heavy and is illustrated by severe localism, both political and economic. Often those with state power are building little economic empires, cornering the local market and local supplies and setting up bureaus to tax the hell out of the people. With the tax monies they do not generally invest in production but in expanded office building and bureaucratic empire building."

Long a critic of the bloated bureaucracy, Hinton observes that "even in Beijing, where 'market socialism' has seen most prolific expansion, the number of officials, far from decreasing as would seem possible once so many economic functions turned over to the market, has actually increased by 30%" since the reforms began.

"In the countryside, it's even worse," he says. "One thing the peasants are really angry about is taxation. It takes the form of direct taxes – called as such – for example, the 55% profit tax, and the less-direct taxes known as fees that are collected on gross rather than net income, and on gross expenditures as well. The fee takers get you coming and going because they take a percentage of everything that passes through your hands – either way.

"All these taxes seem small individually, since they are figured at 1% or 2%, but when you add them all up, they take a huge bite out of the economy," Hinton notes. "The freight unloading and loading workers in Long Bow, for instance, get to keep only 50% of the wages they earn at the freight station. The other 50% is split eight or 10 ways with railroad officials, local officials, village officials and various management bureaus which do not let you work unless you pay for a license with a percentage of earnings.

\*\*\*\*\*

LIBERALIZATION V. OFFICIALDOM

In Hinton's analysis "it is these tendencies that make bourgeois reform so attractive to the intelligentsia in China. Actually, the thrust of [Vice Premier] Deng's policies aims at this stagnation, this constipation, this local levy-taking. But the one principle (out of the four cardinal principles) that Deng is really serious about is the leadership of the Communist Party. Since the party holds most positions of power, their office-holding reinforces traditional power and

consolidates traditional feudalism.

“There is a fundamental contradiction,” says Hinton, “between economic liberalization (i.e., bourgeois reforms) and the interests of officialdom. As far as I can see, it has nothing to do with socialism.”

Add to this feudal localism the growth of social pressures to spend lavish sums of money on weddings, funerals, celebrations and ostentatious housing. Hinton sees these as a resurgence of feudal cultural patterns.

As a result of these two tendencies “backdoor, influence-peddling, bribery, graft and corruption of all kinds are growing exponentially. This is reminiscent of traditional feudalism,” he says. “Just about every transaction has to be greased with hard cash, not just cigarettes and wine as was the case in the past. Everyone wants their cut and expects to get it, and the slogan at the village level is ‘Shang tai, fa cai, xia tai’ (Take power, get rich and get out – before you create too big a scandal). All this ‘greasing,’ which is primarily due to the absoluteness of traditional power, diverts huge funds from production to consumption and waste.

\*\*\*\*\*

“So the big question in China is how to transform all this? By the socialist road? Or by the capitalist road? Unfortunately, the socialist road is in serious disrepute because it led directly to the recreation or the prolongation of traditional bureaucratic centralism. And all Mao’s efforts to break this up and transform it failed, including a Cultural Revolution that ended in serious disaster.

“Now the only new forms with any prestige are bourgeois reforms,” says Hinton, “but as soon as centralism is broken anywhere officialdom build local feudal kingdoms which seem to be a step backward from China’s traditional, highly centralized feudalism. You put units on their own, and they immediately begin a dog fight with all the units around them for space and superprofits. The Honan Railroad Bureau will not allow Taiyuan Railroad Bureau trains on its tracks except at an exorbitant fee. The railroads, once a monolith, have broken into a dozen or more independent kingdoms, and Beijing is losing control.

#### IS CAPITALISM AN OPTION?

“Can all these smaller feudal empires be broken up? Can a national free market be created? In many ways it seems that capitalist-style reforms have a stronger cutting edge than socialist reforms against traditional ills.

20—GUARDIAN—AUGUST 26, 1987

#### FAMILY TIES BETWEEN COMMUNISM AND NAZISM

Many, if not most, U.S. citizens would classify communism as a left-wing, and Nazism as a right-wing, political movement. This is far from the truth. Communism and Nazism are located close together on any rational political spectrum.

How did this false classification of Nazism as right-wing become so prevalent? Eric V. Kuehnelt-Leddihn, in an article captioned, “Invasion of the German Left”, published in the September 11 edition of NATIONAL REVIEW, attributes it to the influence of the refugees from Hitler Germany who found a home in the U.S.A. before the Second World War. Most of these were “left” in that they were in favor of Marxism, Socialism, or Communism. He writes:

“Gustav Stolper, a classical German liberal, pointed out that the common American misinterpretation of National Socialism as ‘conservative’ – as the last stand of a degenerate capitalism – was largely due to these Marxist immigrants, who had to press their explanations of the Nazi phenomenon into a Marxist corset and thereby falsified the facts and misled American public opinion. International Socialism was the competitor of National Socialism, not its enemy. Nazis and Bolsheviks both flew red flags, and Hitler saw himself as the real executor of Marxism ‘minus its Talmudic frills.’ Liberal democrats (unless they were also Jews) were not bothered by the National Socialists; I do not know of even one who was murdered by them.” (Page 28)

He also points out that:



“The Nazi ideal was never the aristocrat but the Common Man. National Socialism was the organized rebellion of the masses of the ordinary against the extra-ordinary, of majorities against unpopular minorities; against Jews, priests, noblemen, plutocrats, bankers, modern artists, and intellectuals.” (Page 28)

There is considerable confusion about the classification of political movements as right or left. Common usage places such movements as the Nazis, the Ku Klux Klan, and the Chamber of Commerce on the right with the communists, socialists, and anarchists on the left. A more rational scale would grade political organizations in terms of their balance between governmental authority and individual liberty. Such a scale would have communism, nazism, fascism, and socialism on the left with anarchism, libertarianism, and the Chamber of Commerce on the right.

Communism and Nazism belong to the same family of coercive totalitarian movements.

Dear Friend,

Opening and reading the multitude of letters which awaits me each morning provides an exciting beginning to the work of the day.

Many of these letters originate overseas, and reveal authors of high intelligence and compassionate concern for the problems and suffering of mankind. I wish I could share more of them with you.