

An Introductory Course
on the
Real Communist Conspiracy

An essential course in the defence of family and
nation, and the preservation of freedom.

Prepared by Eric D. Butler, National Director of
the Australian League of Rights, President of The
Crown Commonwealth League of Rights.

"Communism is, indeed, our paramount adversary, and it leans on its credo of invincibility to accomplish its ends. The way to fight it is to study it, understand it, and understand what can be done about it. This cannot be achieved by dawdling at the spring of knowledge; it can only be accomplished by dipping into thoughtful, reliable and authoritative sources of information."

—J. Edgar Hoover,
Late Director of the American F.B.I.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR: Mr. Eric D. Butler has been a lifetime student of international affairs and a widely recognised authority on the Marxist and associated movements. He has travelled extensively, lecturing and researching in many parts of the world. As a journalist he has written for a number of papers and magazines. He was the first victim of the Socialist takeover of the former Melbourne morning daily, *The Argus*, in which he wrote on national and international affairs. His articles were stopped immediately the change of ownership took place.

Mr. Butler has also authored many books, including *The Enemy Within the Empire*, *The Red Pattern of World Conquest*, *Dialectics*, *The Fabian Socialist Contribution to the Communist Advance*, *Social Credit and the Christian Philosophy*, and *The Essential Christian Heritage*.

NOTE: This document is not recommended as introductory reading for those interested in today's raging conflict. Rather, it should be studied *after* carefully reading of such works as those listed at the back. It has been produced primarily for those attending League of Rights seminars and taking the League's basic anti-communist course.

First printing, January, 1969.

Second, updated printing, April, 1982.

Introduction

Thousands — perhaps millions — of articles have been published about different aspects of Communism. There is no reader today who has not read some of these articles. Yet, few people could give a coherent account of the teachings, policy, strategy and tactics of International Communism. Many know that Marxism constitutes a deadly threat to free men, but few are capable of lucidly explaining the threat, let alone outlining an effective counter-action and alternative policy based on spiritual precepts and moral values.

This basic anti-Communist course — or, more correctly perhaps, *pro-freedom* study — while really only an introduction to the subject, attempts to briefly outline the real nature of today's world conflict; the essential features of Communist strategy; and the minimum requirements of a policy to defeat Communism and preserve and extend the free and responsible society.

I recommend this Course as one of the most vital contributions to the cause of freedom. I can testify that the large number of Canadians and Americans who have taken this Course have expressed their appreciation of its tremendous value in helping to equip those who wish to fight effectively on the side of freedom against the growing threat of totalitarianism.

RON GOSTICK
National Director,
The Canadian League of Rights.

An Outline of the Course

This course is comprised of three lectures. In conducting schools, each lecture is followed by a brief question period. The class then breaks up into groups to discuss the questions at the end of the lecture. Group leaders then report conclusions to reassembled class, and the lecturer sums up before proceeding with the next lecture. A summary of some of the questions examined in the three lectures, follows:

LECTURE 1: How Serious Is the Communist Threat? A new type of warfare, including propaganda, economics, espionage, subversion and psychological pressures. Many are unconscious carriers of the Red disease. Historical growth of Marxism. The role of Lenin, the organisational genius — how his strategy is being advanced throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America, with Western Europe and North America being encircled. The fifth column within non-Communist nations. Treason in high places. Front organisations. Overall Red strategy still advancing towards ultimate objective: complete world conquest.

LECTURE 2: Recruiting, Moulding, and "Dialectics." The two major misconceptions: that Communism is a "mass movement," and is recruited primarily from poorer segments of society. Communism in reality a movement of the dedicated and highly disciplined few. Why the wealthy and the intellectuals are attracted. The philosophy of "dialectical materialism" as developed by Marx and Engels. Fabian and other "moderate" Socialists no real barrier to Red advance. Moulding the Communist Cadre — Lenin's "organisation of professional revolutionaries." The application of the "dialectic," one of Communism's most deadly weapons.

LECTURE 3: Strategic and Tactical Measures to Defeat Communism. Anti-Communism not sufficient. Positive philosophy of life essential. Western Civilisation based on philosophy of freedom. Freedom the basic issue concerning the nature and purpose of man. "Peaceful co-existence" impossible permanently, said Khrushchev. Major strategic factors in global struggle include: British Commonwealth and the U.S.A. working in close co-operation; The U.N. danger to the free world; "Trade" with the Reds — its consequences; and The Captive Peoples — "our secret allies." Building an organisational structure through which realistic action can be taken. The power of the individual to change the course of history.

Lecture 1

How Serious is the Communist Threat?

This lecture seeks to answer the first question raised in this Course: *"Is the Communist Threat Really Serious?"* By "really serious," we mean: Is the threat so great and imminent, that it is not merely a question of academic interest to be discussed in the abstract when we have a few spare minutes, but rather a question, literally, of life or death?

The first point to be made clear is that, whether we know it or not, we are at war. At a Kremlin reception in 1956, Khrushchev made his famous statement, which summarises the Communist viewpoint: *"Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you."*

Now, as Khrushchev himself made clear, the Communists do not propose to bury us literally with shovels. But they are firmly convinced that they are directing against the non-Communist world a programme which will ultimately destroy Civilisation as we understand it, and replace it with World Communism.

The first great architect of Communist strategy for winning the world for Communism, Lenin, was a close student of the famous German military writer, Clausewitz, who enunciated the principle that war is the pursuit of a policy by methods which enable one side to impose its will on the other side. In the minds of most people, a military conflict is the only way for imposing one's will upon an enemy. But the Communists see military force as necessary only after the non-Communists have been confused, divided and psychologically disarmed by non-military tactics.

A NEW TYPE OF WARFARE

Lenin outlined a new type of warfare, in which propaganda, subversion, espionage, brain-washing, 'trade', and perversion are all weapons fitted into a total programme designed to convince large numbers of people in the non-Communist world that it is futile to resist what Communists constantly stress is the *historical inevitability*, of the Communist victory. Communist warfare is, therefore, directed primarily against our minds, and is designed to weaken our will to resist. When we grasp the reality of this new type of warfare, we can more readily see that inside the non-Communist nations today there are already tens of thousands of casualties of psychological warfare.

It is a frightening truth that few of these casualties realise what has happened to them. One does not need to be a member of the Communist movement in order to spread the type of ideological diseases sapping the nation's health from within.

An analogy may be helpful here in order to deal with the view that, as the overwhelming majority of people in the free world would strongly affirm their opposition to Communism, how can there be any real, internal Communist problem. Everyone is opposed to typhoid. But mere verbal opposition of itself does not prevent one from getting it, or any other disease. And one of the biggest problems with a highly contagious disease like typhoid is not the people who actually have the disease, who can be isolated and appropriately treated, but those who never actually contract the disease themselves but who are its carriers. They do not realise that they are carriers. Our community is full of people who are the unconscious carriers of various manifestations of the Communist disease. Many become hotly indignant when it is suggested to them that they are carriers of this disease. This is one of the most difficult problems in coming to grips with the Communist type of warfare.

How far, then, has Communist psychological warfare "softened up" the non-Communist world? This is very difficult to assess in concrete terms. We are dealing with an intangible.

Once again analogy may be helpful. We can take a frog, throw it into boiling water, and its reflexes will immediately cause it to jump to safety and save its life. But if we place the same frog in cold water, and slowly increase the temperature, we can bring the water to the boil without the frog's jumping. We can boil it alive. So long as the temperature is not increased *too suddenly*, the frog never decides to jump. He *adjusts* himself to the increased temperature.

Now we in the non-Communist nations are like that frog being slowly boiled. Occasionally, the temperature is increased suddenly when there is a crisis. For a moment we become alarmed, but then tend to adjust ourselves, overlooking the fact that every new phase of softening us up takes us closer to the boiling point — to the point where it could become too late to make the effort to jump to safety.

WHY WE HAVE "MARXISM-LENINISM"

The most effective way in which to make a concrete assessment of how far the Communist advance has gone, is to make a brief historical survey.

Now, although Karl Marx and his friend and collaborator, Engels, were the creators of what can be termed the *philosophical base* of the Communist movement, and although Marx and Engels taught that the world was inevitably moving towards Communism, it was not until the arrival of Lenin, who might be described as the organisational genius of the Communist movement, that any progress was made towards reaching the Communist objective.

Lenin accepted the "revelation" of Marx concerning the inevitability of the new Communist Civilisation. But he felt that a well-trained midwife should be available to help with

the delivery of the new Civilisation. Because Lenin made a vital contribution to the teaching of Marx, we have what the Communists refer to as "Marxism-Leninism." Lenin saw that a certain type of organisation with a comprehensive programme was essential. But it was some time before Lenin persuaded sufficient of his Marxist Socialists to adopt his viewpoint.

Lenin achieved his objective at the famous London Congress of 1903. If dates mean anything, 1903 should be regarded as one of the most significant in modern history. But, although the decisions made at the London Congress decisively helped to shift the course of history, and to lead to the world of crisis in which we live today, we will search in vain in any history book to discover the real significance of the date 1903.

Because the majority at the London Congress supported Lenin's concept, they were termed the first Bolshevik Party — "Bolshevik" being the Russian for *majority*. We might observe here that Lenin had exactly 17 supporters at the London Congress, not a very impressive number to set out on a mission, not only to overthrow the greatest Civilisation ever created by man, but to conquer the whole world for Communism. Surely, when we recall the world of comparative stability in 1903, a world which appeared to be achieving in every field of human activity, the decision by Lenin and his small band to destroy that world and to replace it with a new type of world, a world in which there would be a completely new type of human being, is one of the most dramatic events in the recorded history of man. We would have to go back to the time of Christ, when His small group of disciples set out to carry their teaching to a dark and pagan world. After approximately 2000 years, hundreds of millions of human beings have still never even heard the message of the Christian Gospels. And amongst those who have, only a small percentage, comparatively, take it very seriously.

But let us consider the rate of progress, and impact of the "Gospel" of Marx and Lenin.

In terms of human history, 1903 is but yesterday. Today is little more than an average man's lifetime since Lenin and his "disciples" set out to conquer the world for Communism. Every part of the world has heard something about the promise of Communism. At one time Christians could claim that the Bible was the world's best-seller. This is no longer true. *The Communist Manifesto* has now become the world's best-seller.

Fourteen years after Lenin formally launched his programme for world conquest, he and no more than 40,000 supporters seized control of that vast territory which today is known as Soviet Russia. In 1917 the Soviet Union was established as the base for promoting world revolution, conspiracy and subversion.

A GLOBAL STRATEGY

Lenin, the master strategist, soon realised that the Western nations could not be defeated by a direct assault, and so he outlined a global strategy of encirclement, this to be developed while the Western nations were subverted from within. Lenin started by enunciating the principle that the shortest route to Paris and London was through Peking. Conquer the East first, he said; and then with the East, the West could be defeated. Special attention was given to China, this attention eventually paying big dividends when it fell to Communism after the Second World War.

Lenin's successor, Stalin, took up the Lenin strategy and emphasised the importance of attacking the Western nations, particularly the British, through their colonies. The worldwide anti-colonial campaign has played a major role in advancing Communist strategy — particularly in Africa, where the retreat by the European colonial powers has left renewed tribal conflicts and chaos, and opened the way for

Communist penetration.

In 1936 the Comintern formalised the strategy with a three stage plan; following a "victory of socialism in different countries or groups of countries," there should be a uniting "on federal lines," with eventually "this system of federal unions . . . at length forming the World Union of Socialist Soviet Republics." Soviet leader Brezhnev updated that strategy at the 26th Soviet party congress in 1981 when he projected the establishment of a "new and historically unprecedented kind of international relations" within the "Socialist community" controlled by a collective Politiburo. Krushchev had, before being overthrown in 1964, advanced the strategy to the stage where there was to be an announcement about the "federation" of all Eastern European Communist-dominated nations into one Soviet system. The strategy was put aside while Brezhnev consolidated his position. The Czechoslovakian crisis of 1968 resulted in a further delay. Then came the controversy with Communist China, the long Vietnam affair, and the period of detente during which credits and economic aid was obtained from the West on a greatly increased scale. But the grand plan was not forgotten.

From time to time the Communists up-date and modify their strategy in accordance with the developing situation. But the *ultimate objective* never changes. An up-dated outline of global strategy was provided by the Chinese Communist leader, Lin Piao, first appearing in the *Peking Review* of September 3, 1965, and endorsed by both Moscow and Peking at a special conference — the Tri-Continental Conference — held in Cuba in January, 1966. Lin Piao's thesis was that the encirclement of the two "global cities" of the world, Western Europe and North America, required complete control of the main "global rural areas" of the world, Asia, Africa and Latin America, depriving the "global cities" of sources of raw materials and bases. Lin Piao concluded that "*In the final analysis, the whole cause of world revolution hinges on the revolutionary struggles of the Asian, African and Latin*

American peoples..."

Towards the end of the seventies Brezhnev started to represent the strategy in a more grandiose manner. He proposed a federation, not only between the Soviet and the Eastern European bloc of Socialist States, but also including Cuba, Laos and Vietnam, the federation later to include the Soviet conquests on the African continent, Angola, Mozambique and Ethiopia. The proposed federation of Latin American nations "liberated" by Cuban-backed guerrillas is merely an extension of the strategy. Brezhnev's "unification" programme was to have been launched at the 26th Soviet Congress early in 1981. But then the Polish crisis developed and the proposed announcement was greatly watered-down.

Impressive though the Soviet strategy may be, it is only possible because of the huge credits provided by the international bankers with which the Soviet can obtain vital economic bloodtransfusions from the West. The same international bankers are now seeking to build up Communist China, the argument being advanced that this will contribute towards the establishment of a balance of power in the world. But linked to this argument is the concept of creating the World State via The New International Economic Order. One of the major organisations promoting the New International Economic Order is The Trilateral Commission, the creature of Mr. David Rockefeller and his fellow international bankers. Leading Trilateralist Dr. Kissinger told a group of United Nations delegates whom he gave a dinner in New York on October 4, 1973, that "I pledge you that the United States is ready to begin the journey towards a world community." In 1974 the United Nations formally endorsed the New International Economic Order. A flood of literature started to appear on the subject, one of the most important documents being the Brandt Commission Report, the Commission being chaired by former West German Socialist Chancellor Willi Brandt, the man forced from office because of the Soviet agent discovered working close to him. The Brandt Com-

mission Report has been adopted as a type of new gospel by the pro-Marxist World Council of Churches.

Like the Peking Communists, the Soviet strategists not only welcome the programme for creating the New International Economic Order, a feature of which is the shifting of vast resources from the "Have" nations — called the North — to the "have-not" nations — called the South, but Soviet writers claim that the programme is a Marxist-Leninist concept. Soviet economist Obminsky writes that "the question of restructuring international economic relations on a just and equitable basis was originally put on the agenda of international affairs by the first socialist state in the world."

There are many groups, some of them consisting of starry-eyed idealists, movements like the World Federalists, or Parliamentarians for World, all aiding, consciously or unconsciously, the programme to create the World State. But the supporters of these groups must be considered amongst Lenin's "useful idiots."

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL "FRONT" ORGANISATIONS

Communist *front* organisations are a tactic stemming from Lenin's teaching. In 1920, Lenin first conceived of the idea of using other organisations, trade unions, youth organisations and co-operatives, as "transmission belts" for advancing Communist propaganda. Otto Kuusinen, the veteran Finnish Communist, advanced this concept further when at a meeting of the Cominteran Executive Committee in March, 1926 proposed "creating a whole solar system of organisation and smaller committees around the Communist Party . . . actually working under the influence of the Party, but not under its mechanical control." (International Press Correspondence, Vol. VI, No. 28, April, 1928).

The task of developing these organisations was given to the German Communist, Willi Munsenberg, who described them as "Innocents Clubs."

Fronts are designed to make an appeal to people who are not Communists, and who would resist any ideas coming from a *known* Communist organisation. "Peace" and "anti-war" *fronts* are the best known, but over the history of Communism thousands of different *fronts* have been evolved to appeal to different sections of people: women, writers, scientists, teachers, artists of all types. Once a *front* has served its purpose, it is disbanded.

The Communists have evolved methods whereby they maintain real control of *front* organisations without ever appearing publicly. The creation and manipulation of *fronts* has been one of Communism's most successful tactics of warfare — valuable for spreading propaganda, creating confusion, and also for recruiting. It was the famous Communist leader, and instructor in political warfare, Georgi Dimitrov, who gave the advice to "let our friends do the work," pointing out that clergymen and generals who were not Communists, but who supported Communist policy, were worth more than hundreds of known Communists.

Some of the more permanent national *front* organisations are linked with what might be described as their parent *international fronts*. The Communist strategists are constantly striving to make their tactics more flexible. Even Stalin was attempting to do this when he formally abolished the old Comintern in 1943, the Young Communist International, the Red International of Labour Unions, and other groups. The Young Communist International became the *World Federation of Democratic Youth*. The Red International of Labour Unions was changed into *The World Federation of Trade Unions*.

In an attempt to make greater impact amongst the intelligentsia, *international fronts* like the *World Federation of Teachers' Unions*, the *World Federation of Scientific Workers*, the *International Association of Democratic Lawyers*, and the *International Medical Association* (formerly known as World

Congress of Doctors) were brought into existence.

The women of the world were also deemed to be important, and so that national *front* organisations like *The Voice of Women* in Canada could be properly guided, the *Women's International Democratic Federation* had to be created. Another important international *front* organisation at present, with increasing "democratic student action" on University campuses throughout the world, is the *International Union of Students*.

The vital importance of the media has not been neglected, so there is the *International Radio & Television Organisation* and the *International Organisation of Journalists*.

All these *International* organisations issue journals and publications, mostly in a number of languages.

Apart from creating and exploiting *fronts*, Communists also penetrate into other organisations which they feel can be used to advance Communism. No section of the non-Communist societies is neglected, including the churches. Educational systems are given special attention. In his *Techniques of Communism*, Louis Budenz, former Communist editor, stresses that infiltration penetrates "into every possible non-Communist organisation and institution. When an organisation has been infiltrated to the point where it has come under Communist control, it becomes a captive organisation, being as readily manipulated by the few Communists who have penetrated it as is the Communist front . . . All groups which the Communist Party is seeking to penetrate are termed 'mass organisations' in Communist parlance, and by Red penetration and eventual control they are made into 'transmission belts' for broadening the influence of the Party."

SECRET COMMUNIST AGENTS PENETRATE WESTERN GOVERNMENTS

There is another aspect of Communist infiltration which comes under the heading of high-level espionage, this being generally concerned with penetration into top official positions where Governmental policy-making takes place.

Some of Communism's greatest successes have been achieved by placing highly trained and dedicated secret Communists into key positions in the non-Communist nations. The most dramatic case of this type of Communist warfare to date, is that of "Kim" Philby, an Englishman who played a vital role in helping to change the course of modern history. The son of a brilliant father, H.A.R. Philby, suffered no material wants; had a university education (Cambridge); became an outstanding correspondent for *The Times*, London; entered British Intelligence, travelled extensively, and was sent to Washington to help the C.I.A. From 1949 to 1951, he was assigned by M.I.6 to its most important post, representative to the British and American Intelligence Committee in Washington, and was at one stage considered as the man most qualified to become the head of British Intelligence. But in 1967 the world was staggered with the news that Philby, who had gone to the Soviet Union from Lebanon in 1963, had openly admitted that for nearly 30 years he had been a secret agent for International Communism! And in a press interview, Mr. Philby boasted that he was optimistic about the future for International Communism because he had many good friends still in key positions in the West.

Twelve years before he left for the Soviet Union, Philby had successfully "tipped off" the two top officials in the British Foreign Office, Maclean and Burgess, that they were about to be arrested. This enabled them to escape to Moscow. Maclean and Burgess had also served the Communist conspiracy well over many years, in the Middle East, in Washington and in London.

Even more shattering than the Philby affair was the publication in 1981 of *Treason Was Their Trade*, by the outstanding British authority on intelligence, Mr. Chapman Pincher, who charged that Sir Roger Hollis, Director of British Counter-Intelligence, MI5, between 1956 and 1965, had also been a K.G.B. agent. In 1979, the publication of Mr. Andrew Boyle's work, *The Climate of Treason*, paved the way for the revelation that no less a person than Sir Anthony Blunt, subsequently stripped of his knighthood, art adviser to the Queen, had also been recruited to the Communist conspiracy along with Philby and others while at Cambridge.

It was the Soviet's Foreign Minister Litvinov who first propounded the strategy of infiltrating the British Upper Class through cells in the Universities from which Britain's future leaders so often came.

It is not too much to say that Philby, Maclean and Burgess alone rendered such vital services to the Communist Empire at a critical time that they must be regarded as three of the most important figures in modern history. But they have had many eminent colleagues, men like the top American State Department official, Alger Hiss, who provided Roosevelt with such disastrous advice, and Stalin with so much support, at the Yalta Conference early in 1945. It was only after he had helped establish the United Nations that Hiss was eventually exposed as a top Communist agent.

Igor Gouzenko, the Russian cypher clerk whose defection in 1945 triggered the Canadian spy trials, has told of how he tried to warn officials of the American State Department that Hiss was a Soviet agent, only to be greeted with friendly smiles and a suggestion that he see a good doctor. It has become a common tactic to call effective anti-Communists "sick," requiring psychiatric treatment. Or they are described as "witch-hunters" looking for Communists under their beds. This is psychological warfare against anti-Communists.

Apart from Hiss, Maclean, Burgess and Philby, there have been many more caught in their treacherous activities on behalf of the Communist conspiracy. Many still remain unexposed, working stealthily to create a Communist world. The activities of these conspirators prove that truth is stranger than fiction. *And they will not be found by looking under beds, but in high places.* Some of Communism's greatest victories have been negative ones: secret agents have been responsible for blocking and frustrating effective anti-Communism drives. A classic example was the campaign against Senator Joseph McCarthy, who was successfully making a frontal attack on Communist infiltration inside American Government agencies. The abusive term "McCarthyism," now a widely used political swearword, was actually coined by the Communists.

Another major Communist victory by blocking tactics, was the use of intelligence to prevent General Douglas MacArthur from taking the obvious steps that would have defeated the Communist enemy in North Korea and led to the overthrow of the Red Chinese Government. The British and Americans still had a complete monopoly of the nuclear bomb at this time. But MacArthur was thwarted, fired — and Vietnam followed, and was used to divide the non-Communist World and to erode resistance to Communism by a major propaganda and psychological assault.

The far-reaching implications of Communist espionage and subversion have been brought to light in Britain by a book, *Espionage and Subversion in an Industrial Society*, in which the author Peter Hamilton, an officer of the British Security Industry Association, deals with a new kind of Communist threat to the non-Communists — "industrial espionage." It is shown how the full resources of the well-established Communist political and military espionage system are being placed at the disposal of their industrial spies. In a foreword to Hamilton's book, Sir Richard Jackson, former President of Interpol, states that Communist indus-

trial espionage "can be employed not only to obtain such things as research secrets but to determine at what point subversion can be most effectively employed to bring about moral degeneration and industrial anarchy in a country in order to weaken its economy..."

Hamilton makes the following penetrating comment on the true nature of subversion: "It is a hidden persuader, acting through the mind . . . It overthrows by attacking the fabric, the foundation or the mind of the target. Its attack is insidious and at first not perceptible; like certain types of cancer, its presence may not be detected until the body is completely corrupted. It is highly flexible, adapting itself to the nature of its target; if one method fails, it will try another — if the timbers are too sound to be battered down, it will use white ants. It also fosters and uses natural disintegrative forces such as moral and physical perversion for breaking down whatever order or institution it is attacking."

MASSIVE COMMUNIST ADVANCE

Communist subversion inside the West, particularly the U.S.A. has assisted the Communist strategists to make massive advances since the end of the Second World War, taking the whole of Eastern Europe from the Baltic States in the North to the Balkans in the South, North Korea, China, Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea (Cambodia). The Communists obtained their first firm geographical base in the Western Hemisphere with the Castro conquest of Cuba in December, 1958.

The programme set in motion by Lenin at the beginning of this century has placed one thousand million human beings, approximately one-third of the total population of the whole world, under Communist control. But this spectacular Communist achievement is only part of the story. There are countries which do not have Communist governments, but which are little better than satellites of the Communist

Empire.

Communist influence is growing in Japan amongst the younger generation, being fed through the Universities.

Nearly every day the press brings further reports of revolutionary activities from Latin-America.

It is often overlooked that the Soviet Union played a decisive role in the establishment of the Zionist State of Israel in 1948. In his prophetic book, *There Goes the Middle East*, (1957), Dr. Alfred Lilienthal, distinguished American Jewish authority on the Middle East, warned that unless the West understood that the Soviet had backed the creation of Israel, which resulted in the Palestinian refugee disaster, in order to penetrate a vitally strategic part of the world, one from which much of its oil supplies came, they had no hope of averting another major Soviet advance. Dr. Lilienthal wrote: "Because the media of information refuse to relate cause and effect, no one knows why American chickens in the Middle East have been coming home to roost and are laying red eggs. And each day it becomes more probable that, unless the grave injustice to the Palestinian Arabs is immediately mitigated, the entire Middle East will be lost to the free world."

Subsequent events have unfortunately confirmed the fears of anti-Zionist Jews like Dr. Lilienthal, with the result that much of the Arab world is now linked with the Soviet and anti-Western.

Early in the Vietnam war the Communist government in Hanoi issued a booklet entitled, *The Resistance Will Win*, the essence of which was that the Communists did not care how long the war with the Americans and their allies continued, as the longer the duration the greater the damage which would be inflicted *inside America*. Pursuing a "no-win" policy in Vietnam, with the American military leaders shackled by the same influences in high places which had prevented MacArthur from winning in Korea, America was torn to pieces internally with a carefully orchestrated "peace" cam-

paign. Eventually Dr. Henry Kissinger negotiated a "peace" settlement with the Communists, the end result of which was the complete subjugation of South Vietnam by the Communists early in 1975. The great Russian exile, Alexander Solzhenitsyn spoke: "*The Third World War was over. The West had lost.*"

When the Soviet Union airlifted Cuban troops, trained by the Soviet, from Cuba into Angola, Africa, Solzhenitsyn said that the Fourth World War had started, and that it would decide the future of Civilisation. The Soviet has since used its client Soviet troops, with the aid of East German military advisers, to extend its influence right throughout Africa. The Soviet is firmly established in Angola, Mozambique and Ethiopia. It played a major role in backing the terrorist campaign against Rhodesia, a nation of the greatest strategic importance which was finally completely betrayed by the West. As the result of a phony election, Marxist Robert Mugabe came to power. Rhodesia (or Mozambique as it is now termed) is doomed to the same tragedies which have overtaken every part of Africa where European colonial powers prematurely retreated from their responsibilities.

Only South Africa now remains, and the international campaign against the West's last major strategic base on the African continent is being intensified.

The truth is that, apart from the one-third of the world's population directly under Communism, at least another third, in the vital, strategic "rural areas" of the world, are either becoming tied economically and militarily to the Communist Empire, or have been neutralised to the point where they refuse to stand with the West against Communist strategy. *Neutralisation is one of Communism's more sophisticated tactics.*

This means that the "global cities" of Western Europe and North America, and the European communities in Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, are already being en-

circled and isolated; while inside the "global cities" the Communist conspiracy is firmly entrenched as a fifth column, using mainly innocent dupes and "moderate" Socialists to spread demoralisation. Communist strategists are confident that growing international encirclement and pressure, plus increasing demoralisation within, will result in the eventual collapse of the "global cities."

Countries like France and Italy have numerically strong open Communist Parties. Inside the "global cities" the cry grows louder that it may be "better to be Red than dead," that Communism, at least in the Soviet Union, is "mellowing," and that "peaceful co-existence" is possible. But "peaceful co-existence" is a major Communist tactic for waging psychological war, as made extremely clear by American Communist Party leader Gus Hall in *Political Affairs* for December, 1963:

"Some honest people believe that the importance of peaceful co-existence lies in the need of the socialist world for peace in order to become stronger. That is, they consider it a policy that sacrifices other ends so that socialism will have conditions of peace in which to build. But this approach infers that in order to have peace, the Soviet Union must lessen its fight against U.S. imperialism, must soften up on exposing racism, must withhold aid from national liberation movements or must even sacrifice the interests of other socialist countries. This idea is both completely erroneous and highly dangerous.

"This approach distorts what is actually a policy of struggle into a policy of appeasement. Moreover, there is nothing in the events of the past ten years to give any substance to such inferences. On the contrary, the Soviet Union has consistently waged a vigorous and effective struggle against U.S. imperialism, and has at the same time consistently pursued a policy of peaceful co-existence.

"The Soviet Union has made its military and nuclear

power a shield of protection for other socialist countries and for the newly-liberated countries whenever these have been threatened with imperialist attack. This shield of protection has provided a powerful stimulus to the struggle against colonial oppression. To this must be added the economic and technical aid to the new countries, socialist and non-socialist — aid which has given them a degree of independence that has enabled them to inflict repeated defeats on the imperialist powers.'

MAJOR SHIFT IN BALANCE OF WORLD POWER

The overall picture of the world is clearly one in which the balance of total power has been progressively tipped towards International Communism. The situation appears to support the Communist claim that history is on their side. Let us consider what Khrushchev had to say about the development of Communist strength:

"Prior to the Second World War, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics was the only socialist country, with not more than seventeen per cent of the territory, ten per cent of the population, and about ten per cent of the output of the world. At present the socialist countries cover about one-fourth of the territory of the globe, have one-third of its population, and their industrial output accounts for about one-third of the total world output." — Foreign Affairs, October, 1959. Vol. 38, No. 1.

"Capitalism long ago ceased to be an all-embracing system which used to rule the world. In the last ten years many countries who took to the road of socialism broke away from the capitalist system. In these countries new, socialist relations are being created, great material and spiritual values produced; the international forces of the working class of the whole world and all progressive mankind are uniting more and more closely." — Moscow Broadcast, May 9, 1958.

"We live at a time when new millions upon millions of

people are coming under the great banner of Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism is our main weapon. We will conquer the capitalist world by using this mighty ideological weapon and not a hydrogen bomb.'

— Moscow Broadcast, November 4, 1958.

The total membership of the world's Communist parties when they met in Moscow before the Second World War was four million. In 1965 the Communists claimed to have 90 parties throughout the world with a total membership of 42 million. Even if the Communist claims are exaggerated, there has been an enormous increase in membership, reflecting the dramatic world-wide growth of the Communist movement.

It is clear that if the past rate of Communist expansion continues, what remains of Western Civilisation is now in its twilight. Another 25 years of Communist expansion like the last 25 would certainly write "finish" to Civilisation. On August 30, 1960, Khrushchev told the Vice President of the United States that his "children will live under Communism."

In his last book, *The Bolshevik Invasion of the West* (1966) Louis Budenz, former Managing Editor of the Communist paper, *The Daily Worker*, warned that Communism's "gigantic advance continues through a war that Americans do not understand as yet, and in which they experience a great disadvantage because they have not yet learned 'to grasp the true nature of Communism'."

Time is not unlimited in which the peoples of the non-Communist world may grasp the "true nature of Communism" and take appropriate action.

TRAINING AND DIRECTING THE COMMUNIST ARMY OF REVOLUTIONARIES

It is essential for an understanding of how the Communist strategy has been developed, to look at organisational, propaganda, conspiratorial and other methods used. As soon as the Soviet base had been established by

Lenin and his colleagues, they set up special institutions for the training of specialists who were to work in different parts of the world.

The Communists are thorough. The first institution was the **University of the Peoples of the East**, established in 1921. A *Scientific Group for the Study of the Orient*, provided for a study of every aspect of Asian history and life in preparation for a fully co-ordinated attack on Asia.

Then came the famous **Lenin Institute** for the training of Western Communists. Later came Institutes for Africa and Latin-America.

Then it was essential to have schools for students in all aspects of Communist revolutionary and ideological warfare. These have been aptly described as "Schools of Subversion." African students have revealed that even witchcraft is taught in Moscow as a means for advancing Communism in Africa.

The Red Chinese also have their schools, such as the **Institute for South American Affairs**, and the **Association for Sino-Latin-American Friendship**.

The Communist strategists in Moscow place tremendous importance on educating a sufficient flow of experts to operate in every part of their international programme. Colleges for overseas students concentrate upon political and psychological warfare. Sabotage and espionage are not taught at these schools, although their role in overall strategy is mentioned. Listed in the comprehensive curricular used in these schools is "The strategy of winning over or demoralising the middle classes."

One of the Soviet Union's major departments involved in global strategy is AGITPROP — the Department of Propaganda and Agitation. It controls all Communist propaganda, both internal and external. It has an enormous budget, reflecting the importance the Communist strategists place on this Department. Communist propaganda floods into the

West, much of it through the non-Communist mass media, with comparatively few people realising how they are being influenced. Those who say they are not influenced might ponder on how the Communist propagandists turned Khrushchev, "the butcher of the Ukraine," the greatest Stalinist of all, into a benign old statesman who introduced "peaceful co-existence." In the numerous beautifully-produced pictorials entering the non-Communist countries, there is little direct reference to Communism.

Few people understand the importance of the Communist international journals to ensure that Communist activists all over the world are immediately informed on the current Communist "line." In his *Techniques of Communism*, Louis Budenz has explained the vital role of the Soviet press as follows:

"The Communist press is distinctly different from all other forms of journalism. It is the telegraphic agency sending directives from Moscow throughout the world, and passing them on and making them understandable to the comrades in each country. Every attempt to analyse official Communist publications is futile unless this distinctive characteristic, its very essence, is appreciated . . . If the Kremlin were able to cable every week to its fifth columns throughout the world: 'Work up a synthetic campaign for peace in order to aid Soviet aggression', it would soon be clear what Moscow had in mind to persuade American public opinion to believe."

Some of the most important of the Marxist-Leninist international journals are *Peking Review*, *World Marxist Review*, *International Affairs*, *Political Affairs*, and *New Times*. But in order to read these journals intelligently, it is essential to have some knowledge of what Marxism-Leninism is, and also to understand the type of Aesopian method of language, with its inverted meaning of words. A major feature of Communist propaganda warfare is the perversion of the meaning of the words, "semantic sabotage" as it has

been termed, to confuse people and have them accept false ideas. Communists are, for example, always "peace-loving" and "progressive." Those who resist them are "aggressors." Anti-Communists are termed 'Fascists,' "Nazis," "hatemongers" and "anti-Semites."

One little understood aspect of Soviet propaganda techniques is the use of what is known as "disinformation." John Barron, in his impressive work, *K.G.B.: The Secret Work of Soviet Secret Agencies* explains how disinformation is used. "To influence policies of foreign governments, disrupt relations among other nations, undermine the confidence of foreign populations in their leaders and institutions, discredit individuals and groups opposed to Soviet policies, deceive foreigners about Soviet intentions..." A full fledged Soviet Disinformation Department known as Department D was established in 1959. Later that year, on Christmas Eve, swastikas and slogans, "Germans Demand Jews Get Out," triggered off an international anti-German campaign, the charge being made that there was a Nazi revival. It was subsequently discovered that Communists had been responsible.

PROGRESSIVE RETREAT CANNOT END IN VICTORY

The exploitation of sex-deviates is commonplace in the Communist political underworld. Pornography is encouraged, while Red China makes use of the drug traffic as a national policy.

Reference must also be made to the Communist use of brain-washing on an international scale as a tactic of psychological warfare. The central feature of brainwashing is to disintegrate an individual by creating fear and tension. At the critical point of the tension, new ideas are introduced to the individual. Communist international policy is to provide world-wide tensions from time to time for the purpose of producing a state of mind amongst people in order that they

will be more susceptible to Communist propaganda when the tension is relieved. The Cuban crisis in 1962 was a classical example of this type of technique. Khrushchev emerged from this with an enhanced reputation as a "peace-lover."

The Communist strategists can continue to produce international crises at will, while they maintain an internationally co-ordinated offensive against a non-Communist world which merely reacts to the initiative of its opponent and has been constantly on the defensive. We cannot legitimately claim that the rear-guard action the non-Communists have been waging, which has led them from one disaster to another, is going to ultimately turn into victory. The evidence is overwhelming that Civilisation is now gasping for its very survival.

Recommended Reading for Lecture 1 (in following order):

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| <i>The Red Pattern of World Conquest</i> | — Eric D. Butler |
| <i>You Can Trust the Communists</i> | — Dr. Fred Schwarz |
| <i>Secret Communist Agents Who
Changed the Course of History</i> | — Patrick Walsh |
| <i>The Real Communist Menace
Brainwashing</i> | — Eric D. Butler |

QUESTIONS ON LECTURE 1

1. How serious do you regard the Communist challenge?
2. Have you seen any evidence of Communist "front" organisations in your country?
3. What aspects of the Communist challenge concern you the most?

Lecture 2

Recruiting, Moulding and "Dialectics"

It is a most necessary preliminary to a study of how people are recruited into the Communist movement, and then moulded to serve Communist purposes, to first remove two of the most widespread misconceptions concerning Communism.

The first misconception is that because the number of Communists — at least, known Communists — is comparatively small in non-Communist countries like Canada and Australia, therefore there is no real *internal* Communist problem. This misconception is the result of the general ignorance about the type of Communist movement Lenin set out to produce, and which he formally launched in London in 1903 when he established the first Bolshevik Party. Lenin coined many famous slogans to guide his followers, and one was "the fewer the better." *Lenin never at any time taught that Communism would come to power through numbers.* He taught that a Communist movement consisting of a *dedicated minority* of the community, prepared to accept a type of rigid military discipline, could decisively affect the course of history. In order to grasp completely the significance of Lenin's teaching, it is essential to bear in mind that the Communists believe that while Marx demonstrated "scientifically" that the coming of Communism was "historically inevitable," history has also produced the Communist movement as the *custodian of the truths* discovered by Marx and his collaborator Engels, and the *midwife* to help bring the new Communist Civilisation to full fruition. The Communist, therefore, regards himself as a member of an *elite*. Numbers, as such, therefore do

not greatly concern him. What is important is the *quality* and *dedication* of the members of the elite.

Anyone who believes that the Communists are primarily concerned about increasing the numbers of the Communist Party, can easily test whether his belief is valid or not, by making his way to the nearest Communist Party headquarters, offering his subscription and expressing a desire to become a member. Anyone who attempts to join the Communist Party, whether he is genuine or not, will quickly find that unlike other Parties, the Communist Party will not accept a new member until he has been tested in some spheres of activity and until his background has been thoroughly examined. Because anyone can easily join the orthodox Parties, merely by paying a membership and expressing some interest in the Party, is why the secret Communist can, and does, readily penetrate these Parties for the purpose of working within them.

The Communist Party is not a Party in the usual meaning of the term. It is both a *recruiting* and a *sifting instrument* for the Communist Movement, of which the Party is but the visible part. Like an iceberg, most of the Communist Movement is submerged below the surface of what can be readily seen. Now, not only does the Communist Party make it difficult for prospective members to join; it also makes it very difficult for the new member to stay in the party. Upon hearing this statement for the first time, most people find it incredible. But this is because they have never assessed the purpose of the Communist movement correctly. The reason why the Communists work to eliminate members, is because the Movement must be constantly striving to ensure that all members are so disciplined that there is no fear of a break under tension and crisis. From the Communists' viewpoint, the sooner they can get rid of those who clearly cannot be conditioned to become reliable instruments for advancing Communism, the better. By purging out those who are not

suitable material for further Communist conditioning, the Communists rightly believe that they are making their Movement stronger, not weaker. It is a fact of history that on occasions the Communists have deliberately purged the Party ruthlessly because their current strategy required a much "tougher" line.

The Communist Party must, therefore, be regarded primarily as a *selection and sifting instrument*, designed to discover those human beings who can be then moulded into the completely dedicated Communist. We will return to this moulding process later.

THE "EMPTY-BELLY" THEORY

The second misconception about Communism, is that people become Communists primarily because they are short of the material things of life, that they are in many cases hungry. This has been aptly described as the "empty-belly" theory concerning the growth of Communism. And because people become Communists because they are hungry, the simple solution is to fill people's stomachs, and that will solve the Communist problem. The West's major strategy in Asia, Africa and Latin-America is based largely upon the belief that by the mere raising of living standards, Communism can be defeated. In showing that the "empty-belly" theory is a major and dangerous fallacy, there is no suggestion that the abolition of poverty, where it exists, and the improving of material living conditions, are not highly desirable objectives. The Christian should not need to be told that he should support such objectives, and act charitably towards his fellow-human beings — not because of the belief that he will thus check Communism, but simply because of his desire to act in accordance with rightness.

However, whilst it is undoubtedly true that people suffering hunger or any other physical disability, can be used for Communist purposes, the truth is that from the time of

Karl Marx until today, the effective leadership of the Communist Movement has *not* been recruited from those suffering from empty stomachs. Marx was the son of a well-to-do German-Jewish family, while his close collaborator and financial supporter, Engels, was one of the very "capitalists" he and Marx were railing against.

Neither Marx nor Engels had any real love for the poor. What they *were* concerned about was the obtaining of power to produce a new type of society, one in which the worship of God was to be replaced by the worship of man.

Marx did not produce a single new economic theory. He and Engels produced a new philosophy, the philosophy of *dialectical materialism*. And it is this philosophy and its underlying implications which have attracted many people who, in some cases, have been actually possessors of great wealth.

Lenin was the son of a minor nobleman, while even in China today it will be found that, contrary to the general belief, the leading Communists are not products of poor peasant families who became Communists as a result of revolting against their lot. Mao Tse-tung became a Communist while studying at the National University at Peking. Chou En-lai, the Prime Minister of China, is the son of a wealthy Chinese aristocrat. We should note that he was converted to Communism as a university student in Paris. Liu Shao-chi is regarded as one of the most brilliant Marxist-Leninist theoreticians of the whole world Communist movement. He was also introduced to Communism as a young student. And Chu Teh, the Commander of the Chinese Red Army, is the son of a wealthy father and was converted to Communism by Chou En-lai.

In India it is the same story about Communist leadership as it is in China. M.R. Masani, in his authoritative work, *The Communist Party of India*, (New York, The Macmillan Co. 1954, p. 237) writes: "*The fact that Communist propaganda is*

making much more headway among the bourgeoisie and prosperous groups, such as administrators, educators and scientists, than among the peasantry and the working class lends support to the thesis that it is not poverty or even starvation that primarily predisposes men to the attraction of communism. While economic factors undoubtedly play a part, the basic motivations are psychological and emotional. It is the psychological and emotional void created by the loosening of the hold of the traditional religions of India that provides room for what is essentially a new religion of materialism. It is the literate middleclass man so affected who utilises and exploits the economic conditions of the rural and urban toilers.'

Further striking evidence of the truth that a material well-being does not prevent people from becoming Communists, is to be found in Sweden, a small nation with a highly-developed Welfare State providing the average Swede with one of the highest material standards of living in Western Europe. And yet the Swedes freely elect to their Parliament known Communists.

The big Communist vote in Italy comes from the industrialised and relatively prosperous North. In the U.S.A. the greatest support for the Communists comes from the wealthy States like California and New York. The big French Communist vote does not come from the peasants.

Louis Budenz, the former American Communist leader, in his book, *The Cry is Peace* (1952) observes that: "The 'picket-line' Communist is still the general conception of the typical party member, instead of the well-manicured influential gentleman of the type of Alger Hiss. This conception is cultivated by the Communists themselves who constantly represent their 'movement' as of and for 'the masses' and who keep their most effective agents carefully concealed."

In America even millionaires like Vanderbilt Field have become open supporters of Communists. In England the

eldest son of a well-known aristocratic family, educated at Eton, took his seat in that holy of holies, the House of Lords, as a declared Communist. Obviously, it was not an empty stomach which turned this man into a Communist.

Any realistic study of Communism must face the fact that it is the philosophical appeal of Communism, best described as a false religion, which has attracted so many of its effective leaders to its ranks. Lenin's slogan about capturing the student-intellectuals of the world has been translated into reality. It is the best educated, all well fed, who are filling the ranks of the Communist movement, not the poverty stricken. The sooner this truth is generally faced, the sooner something really effective will be done to counter the Communist challenge.

RECRUITING THE COMMUNIST

Communists are recruited in a number of ways, but there is one basic feature concerning the outlook of the majority of those who are recruited: They either *hold no clear-cut philosophical or religious beliefs*, or those they have held *have been shattered*. Marx was an athiest *before* he became a Communist. The reason why so many student-intellectuals are attracted to Communism is because the Marxists not only offer a coherent philosophy which claims to be scientific but, paradoxical though it appears to those who have never examined this question, appeals to the natural idealism of youth.

When Marx and Engels were fashioning their philosophy, they were not content with the older schools of materialism, all of which fostered a feeling of helplessness in the individual. These philosophies were all mechanistic. What Marx was looking for was an energising principle, and he claimed to find this in the *law of dialectics* as developed by the great German philosopher Hegel. Hegel was not, however, a materialist, but an idealist. His conception of dialectics was in the sphere of ideas.

But Marx claimed that *matter* was the only reality, that matter contained within itself the *clash or opposites*, out of which all progress and development came. In the Marxist philosophy of materialism, there is not only matter, but, much more important, *matter in motion*.

While it was a remarkable performance to take Hegel's dialectic as applied only in the sphere of ideas and to apply it to materialism, even more important is the claim by the Marxists that, because they allegedly discovered the laws governing all development in the Universe, the Communist Movement is therefore the *custodian* of this revelation. And because of this, the Communist Movement must consist of an elite acting to further the "scientific laws" which they alone fully understand. It therefore makes a powerful appeal to those who see it as the only means of solving the problems of man. The appeal is even more powerful to those who believe that Science is a type of new God, and that through Science not only a new type of society, but a new type of man can be produced. It is not without significance that many scientists have been attracted to Communism.

It will be seen from what has already been said, that the basic appeal of Communism, particularly to the educated, is *philosophical*, not economic. Marx was a plagiarist who borrowed freely from the early Socialists, many of whom, like Robert Owen, were motivated by Christian ideals. There is nothing original in any of his material on economics. But having borrowed, without acknowledgement, from the early Socialists, Marx spurned them with a sneer. They were mere "reformists" who believed that Socialism would come through man's good-will, intelligence and voluntary co-operation. Marx's philosophy of *dialectical materialism* postulated that socialism would only come through *violent crises*. And the Communist Party would supply the will to ensure that these crises were resolved in favour of what was claimed to be historically inevitable. It is therefore *crisis*,

however produced, and the claim of the Communist Movement to solve the crisis in accordance with the laws of history revealed by Marx, which are *primarily* responsible for men becoming Communists, not economic theories concerning Socialism.

One of the most penetrating and authoritative comments ever made on this matter comes from the pen of the late Whitaker Chambers, one of the very few men ever to break with Communism after having been moulded to act as a highly placed under-cover Communist in the U.S.A. In his great book, *Witness*, Chambers wrote:

"I have met few Communists whom I thought knew more than the bare rudiments of Marxian economics, or cared to. But I have never known a Communist who was not acutely aware of the crisis of history whose solution he found in Communism's practical programme, its vision and its faith.

"Few Communists have ever been made simply by reading the works of Marx or Lenin. The crisis of history makes Communists; Marx and Lenin merely offer them an explanation of the crisis and what to do about it. Thus a graph of Communist growth would show that its numbers and its power increased in waves roughly equivalent to each new crest of crisis. The same horror and havoc of the First World War, which made the Russian Revolution possible, recruited the ranks of the first Communist parties of the West . . . The economic crisis which reached the United States in 1929 swept thousands into the Communist Party or under its influence. The military crisis of World War II swept in millions more; for example, a third of the voting population of France and Italy. The crisis of the Third World War is no doubt holding those millions in place and adding to them . . .

"Under pressure of the crisis, his decision to become a Communist seems to the man who makes it as a choice between a world that is dying and a world that is coming to birth, as an effort to save by political surgery whatever is sound in the foredoomed body of a Civilisation which

nothing less drastic can save — a Civilisation foredoomed first of all by its reluctance to face the fact that the crisis exists or to face it with the force and clarity necessary to overcome it.

“Thus, the Communist Party presents itself as the one organisation of the will to survive the crisis in a Civilisation where that will is elsewhere divided, wavering or absent . . .

“It is the crisis that makes men Communists and it is the crisis that keeps men Communists. For the Communist who breaks with Communism must break not only with the power of its vision and its faith. He must break in the full knowledge that he will find himself facing the crisis of history, but this time without even that solution which Communism presents, and crushed by the knowledge that the solution which he sought through Communism is evil against God and man.”

Communism is therefore a Faith offered to a Civilisation which is buffeted from one crisis to the next, and most of whose members no longer clearly understand, still less have any real faith in, the values and principles upon which it was so slowly and painfully erected.

It is appropriate to pose the question here of how many professing Christians would make the type of sacrifices for their faith which the Communist is expected to make for his.

At the University, it is easy for the lecturer in economics to show that what is called the “capitalist” system has, over the past 100 years, suffered many crises. He could select the worst features of that system, and leave his students with the impression that it lacks any underlying, coherent philosophy, and that it must therefore be changed drastically. He draws attention to the never-ending struggle between employers and employees concerning wages and conditions. To the Marxist-Leninist this is, of course, part of the *class struggle*.

The student’s mind is also directed towards the fierce struggle for markets amongst what he terms the “imperialistic

powers,' and the crises which result from this struggle. The Communist claims that all the developing crises in the non-Communist economic structures, *crises which must affect the political structure*, are inherent in the system of private ownership of property and production based on the profit motive. Those who really desire to defeat the Communist challenge must, therefore, come to some clear understanding of basic economic truths with a view to ensuring that necessary changes are made in economic and financial policies in order that the crises which help produce Communists, are eliminated.

"MODERATE" SOCIALISM NO BARRIER

While it is outside the scope of this lecture to make suggestions as to what might be done to eliminate crises, it is important to make reference to the widely-accepted view that only some forms of "moderate" Socialism will avert and defeat the challenge of Marxian Socialism. The essence of all forms of Socialism is the progressive *concentration of power*. And the more power is concentrated in a few hands, the less power is left in the hands of the individual members of the community. One of the most alarming features of contemporary Western societies is that increasing numbers of individuals, in the face of progressively centralised power, have lost faith in their own capacity to affect their own destiny. This erosion of individual will leaves the Communists in the formidable position where they claim to possess the only will to deal with crises.

Far from Fabian Socialism, which is generally described as "moderate," having halted the advance of Communism in the English-speaking world, including the U.S.A., it has in fact provided an effective smokescreen for Communist activities, and has also provided a most fertile recruiting ground for the Marxist-Leninist.

In his *Appreciation of the Communist Manifesto for the*

Labour Party, issued in 1948 to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the basic Communist document, the famous Fabian Socialist theoretician, and influential lecturer at the London School of Economics, Professor Harold Laski, asked the revealing question, "Who, remembering that these (policies of high taxation and centralisation of credit power) were the demands of the Manifesto, can doubt our common inspiration." The Fabians openly proclaimed early in their history that the use of high taxation was one of their principal proposals for creating the Socialist State.

It was Laski who, after visiting Stalin in Moscow in 1946, made the historic statement that while British and Russian Socialists were marching on separate roads, they were marching towards the same Socialist objective. Solzhenitsyn records how heavy taxation was the first weapon used in an attempt to destroy the peasants. When this failed, Stalin used naked force. The use of machine guns to drive farmers into collectives would not be tolerated in an English-speaking country. But the Fabians believe that the same objective can be reached by financial policies. The philosophy of "get bigger or get out" is one which leads eventually to the complete Socialist State. Debt, high interest rates, heavy taxation and inflation forces farmers, like other producers, into progressively bigger units. The small man is being driven out, a development welcomed by all Marxists.

Under the late Pandit Nehru, "independent" India moved steadily towards Socialism. Nehru himself had been influenced by Marxist thinking. His daughter, Mrs. Gandhi, maintained her father's pro-Soviet attitude, with the result that Soviet influence has steadily increased.

It is true that the Communists verbally assail other Socialists, whom they sneer at as "reformists"; but they also believe that so far from the "reformist" policies of the "moderate" Socialists resulting in harmonious, evolutionary progress, they merely result in further crises. These crises are then used to show the "moderate" Socialists that nothing less

than the revolutionary approach of the dialectical materialists can possibly deal with the situation. The result is that many of the "moderate" Socialists accept the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint. What has been said is no reflection upon the sincerity or integrity of many Socialists, some of whom have been genuinely horrified by the brutal policies of the Communists. But Communism is the logical end product of any policies of centralising power; and for Socialists to complain about the end-product is analogous to the complaint of the single girl having a baby, who said that she had thought that just a little bit of pregnancy would be quite all right!

In a statement to the 21st Soviet Communist Party Congress in 1959, Khrushchev outlined the classical Communist attitude towards Socialism: "*Society cannot leap into Communism from capitalism without going through a Socialist stage of development.*"

Another aspect of crises which the Communists exploit to recruit supporters, is the conflict between national interests. The last two world wars are described as having been the result of "nationalism." Therefore the solution is to abolish nations. It might just as logically be suggested that because individuals in society have problems living together, problems which often result in friction, the solution is to abolish individuals. Communist propaganda, therefore, favours the breaking down of local loyalties.

In the Canadian Royal Commission Report on Communist Espionage, one brilliant chapter deals with what is called *ideological motivation*, a necessary preliminary to recruiting Communists and those willing to act in Communist espionage activities. The Report draws attention to how the Communists exploited the weakening of loyalties to the Canadian nation, and easily persuaded those whose loyalties had thus been weakened, that they could transfer their loyalty to an international ideal. They could then be developed to the stage where they saw it their *duty, not a crime*, to engage in espionage.

age, allegedly to further that international ideal.

There are some students of the Communist conspiracy who believe that, while the recruiting of most Communists is only possible because of the reasons we have touched upon, there are some leading Communists who are in fact born criminals who see in Communism a means of obtaining great power and wealth. This is probably true. It is also true that some are recruited to Communism because they are filled with a type of false pride, while others are recruited from those suffering from some type of "chip on the shoulder" concerning society. But most Communists are recruited from people who have lost any faith they might have had in traditional society and its undergirding values, and have had that faith replaced with a faith which promises them the way to a new heaven on earth and promises them a leading role in producing that heaven.

MOULDING THE COMMUNIST CADRE

As soon as an individual is recruited into the Communist Party, his real training starts. The moulding procedures of the Communist Movement are designed to produce an entirely new type of individual. One of the most difficult tasks in dealing with Communism, is to convince the normal person that the completely moulded Communist is a different type of human being. He may look like other people, dress like them and even talk like them. But he is not a human being as generally understood, because the objective of Communist conditioning is to make him see reality differently and to react differently to it. He is devoid of the emotions which move most people.

Even the worst of people have some sense of morality. The dedicated Communist accepts Lenin's teaching that the only morality acceptable to the Communist is that which furthers Communism. The fully-conditioned Communist cannot be reached through the normal thought processes. This

fully-conditioned Communist is one who can be relied upon to act as directed with total obedience at all times. The following is an extract from Stalin's speech at Lenin's grave, a speech often used as a sort of peroration by the Communists at their schools or on very important occasions:

*"We Communists are people of a special mould. We are made of special material. We are those who comprise the army of the great proletarian strategist, the army of Comrade Lenin. There is nothing higher than the honour to belong to this army. There is nothing higher than the title of member of the Party founded and led by Comrade Lenin. It is not given to all to be members of such a Party. It is not given to all to withstand the stress and storm that accompanies membership in such a party . . ." ("The Lenin Heritage," in Joseph Stalin, *Lenin*, Little Lenin Library. New York, International Publishers, 1934, Vol. 16, p. 15).*

The Communist movement therefore sets out to produce what has been described as the "ideal Bolshevik type." This ideal, according to former Communist leader Douglas Hyde, is "the vision which fortifies men against prison and torture and against their own inner revulsion when they accept or participate in frightful atrocities or unprincipled deceptions."

In one of the most revealing works yet published on the methods of moulding Communists, *The Moulding of Communists*, by the former Communist Frank S. Meyer, it is stated that "the ideal type of Communist is a man in whom all individual, emotional, and unconscious elements have been reduced to a minimum and subjected to control of an iron will, informed by a supple intellect. That intellect is totally at the service of a single and compelling idea, made incarnate in the Communist Party: the concept of history as an inexorable god whose ways are revealed 'scientifically' through the doctrine and method of Marxism-Leninism. Such a vision of reality gives its possessor a tremendous feeling of power and a certain kind of freedom, the 'freedom' which, in Hegel's phrase, is the recognition of necessity'."

What is called the *cadre* Communist is the inner core of the Communist conspiracy. This cadre represents Lenin's "organisation of professional revolutionaries." The cadre Communist is produced as the result of a long period of psychological training. The technique of self-criticism must be mastered. Personal and vicious attacks must be accepted as essential for the advancement of the Communist cause. Every individual becomes responsible to some other individual. This Communist discipline is far greater than that demanded in a military army. In the military army there is always some arena of activity or thought to which the individual can retreat. But Communist discipline demands that the individual gives his very all for Communism. Lenin said that a *total demand is necessary to get a total response*.

Slowly but surely, as the individual is moulded by the Communist conspiracy, learns to think differently, identifies every thought and action with the advancement of the Communist movement, he is purged of all those characteristics which are regarded as normal in the ordinary human being. All human qualities such as self-respect, independent judgement, pity and just plain decency are eliminated. The conspiratorial techniques condition him to accept double-standards and double-speak as normal. As the ideal Bolshevik type must be a thoroughly reliable weapon in the hands of those controlling the conspiracy, few of whom are known even to members of the Communist Party, it is essential that any with weaknesses be driven from the movement before they are promoted to positions of great importance to the Communists. This constant purging of members, or the defection of others, is regarded by the Communists as an essential part of providing greater strength and reliability.

It is a thought-provoking fact, that while some quite important Communist Party leaders have over the years defected, there have been no defections from those operating at the core of the conspiracy. It can only be concluded that those who have reached the core have, in fact, been so

perfectly moulded to conform to the ideal Bolshevik type, that they are immune to any normal influence. They are, in reality, completely dehumanised. They are the perfect tools of the Communist conspiracy.

THE APPLICATION OF THE DIALECTIC

Because the Communist philosophy of *dialectical materialism* postulates that all progress and advancement is through violence and crises — the class of opposites — a most fundamental feature of Communist training is that all Communists will only be in harmony with reality if they think and act dialectically. The trained Communist must look at every question dialectically. One of Lenin's slogans was that it is necessary to take one step backwards in order to take two or more steps forward. What the non-Communist regards as a Communist retreat is, to the Communist, *but part of his overall advance*. When moving away from his objective, the trained Communist must do this just as enthusiastically as when moving towards the objective. It is part of a total. Time and time again, superficial non-Communists have been fooled about Communism because they thought that there was a Communist retreat. In Communist dialectics, there is no such thing as a genuine retreat.

Many people often charge Communists with being liars or hypocrites because they deny today what they proclaimed yesterday. But in Communist dialectics, that which advances Communism is true and moral. So that if claiming that something is white one day will advance Communism, that is true; but if tomorrow Communism will be better advanced by calling the same thing black, that is also true. According to Communist dialectics, they are morally justified in using violence and trickery against the "capitalists" because the "capitalists" refuse to face the truth that Communism is "historically inevitable." By resisting this truth, the "capitalists" must be regarded as the aggressors, and treated as such!

The Communist hero in one of the most significant novels to come out of the post-war era, *When the Gods are Silent*, struggles with himself as his Communist faith is eroded by events. But he clings desperately to the dialectics of freedom-through-slavery: "We shall come to power over the system through subjection to the system." To a "real Stalinist the groans of human beings . . . are his 'symphony of construction'."

According to Communist dialectics, there can be no such things as Communist mistakes, inconsistencies or deviations. For example, are not Communists against oppression? Is not the Soviet State a denial of this? Felix Dzerzhinsky, the former chief of the Soviet secret police, gave a classical Communist dialectical answer:

"One must have the inner consciousness of the necessity to meet death for the sake of life, to go into slavery for the sake of freedom, and have the strength to survive the whole hell of life with open eyes, feeling in your heart the great sublime hymn of beauty, truth and happiness wrung from it." (Quoted in Igor Gouzenko's *Fall of a Titan*).

What is the *dialectical* answer on the question of war? The Communists claim to be against war — but only when war does not serve Communist aims.

"The Soviet Union . . . is opposed to an imperialistic war," solemnly declared the famous Communist leader, Karl Radek. "It recognises as equitable only one war, the war for the defence of Socialism, the war of the enslaved peoples for their liberation."

The Chinese Communist leader, Mao Tse-tung, put it even more clearly: "We are for the abolition of war; we don't need it. But war can only be abolished through war. Thus, if you want to do away with rifles, grasp your rifle."

The Communist dialectician, therefore, believes that he is serving the truth when he says he is working for peace —

even though he is, in fact, advocating war.

Communists claim to be for the independence and self-determination of people. But what is the *dialectical* answer when it is pointed out that they do not practice what they preach? Stalin quoted Lenin:

"The particular postulates of democracy, among them self-determination, are not something absolute, but a small part of the general democratic . . . world movement. In some cases the small part may conflict with the whole, and then it must be rejected."

In *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Stalin wrote:

"There are occasions when the right of self-determination conflicts with the . . . higher right . . . the right of the working class that has assumed power to consolidate its power. In such cases — this must be said bluntly — the right to self-determination cannot and must not serve as an obstacle to the exercise of the working class of its right to dictatorship."

Every policy advancing Communism is, *dialectically*, the "right" policy. Self-determination for Tshombe in Katanga, when the Belgian Congo exploded, for example, did not help Communism; therefore it was a "reactionary" policy! The Biafrans experienced this also, when they sought "self-determination" separate from the rest of Nigeria. The Soviet Union backed the Federal Government.

If some find what has been outlined so far on the use of the dialectic to advance Communism, as being almost unbelievable, they are now invited to pay close attention to the use of Communist dialectics by the Communists on the international stage. At the moment the non-Communist world is being invited to lower its psychological and other defences against Communism, and to accept with great relief the fact that there is a major "split" between Moscow and Peking. There is in fact no such "split." There is a genuine difference of

opinion concerning the funeral arrangements for the non-Communist world, but even such a difference of opinion is regarded by the Communists as the correct dialectical manner of best deciding how and when to arrange the funeral. First Mr. Khrushchev, and then his successors, have been presented most successfully as "different," and "moderate" types of Communists. They are "anti-Stalinists," while Mao Tse-tung is a "Stalinist warmonger."

So far from being an "anti-Stalinist," Khrushchev is only alive today because he was a dedicated Stalinist. He was known as the "Butcher of the Ukraine." It was not Mao Tse-tung, but Khrushchev, the "moderate," who took nuclear weapons down to Cuba. It was the same Khrushchev who ordered Mongolian troops into Hungary in 1956 to drown the patriotic uprising in blood, and who threatened to drop nuclear bombs on England at the time of the Suez crisis.

Khrushchev demonstrated during the Cuban crisis of 1961 what a brilliant exponent he is of dialectics. When his fellow Marxist-Leninist, Castro, proclaimed, probably a little too prematurely, that he was in fact a dedicated Communist, and not a Christian social reformer, there was a wave of great concern right across America and a demand that Castro be dealt with. The Americans were alarmed at having an open Communist base right on their doorstep.

How did Khrushchev deal with this threat to his forward base in the Western Hemisphere? In order to understand fully the answer, it is important to stress that the Communists do not propose to blow up the world with nuclear weapons; they propose to conquer it. And so Mr. Khrushchev did not take nuclear weapons to Cuba in order to use them against America, which would be no use to him as a radio-active rubble-heap. But he quickly assured President Kennedy that he would take his nuclear weapons away when Kennedy, in the middle of an election campaign, challenged him. Now, when Khrushchev took his nuclear weapons away, everyone

except those who grasp dialectics, said that the Communists had at last suffered a major defeat. But they forgot that Mr. Khrushchev had also received something in exchange for his apparent retreat. He had a written assurance from the President of the United States that there would be no physical invasion of Cuba by America. And so the Soviet dictator secured his real objective, protection for his base in Cuba — which he wants, not as a nuclear base, but as a base to foment revolution throughout Latin-America.

It is most urgently necessary that more people in the non-Communist world understand the use of the dialectic weapon by the Communists, so that they do not mistake Communist advances for Communist retreats; so that they know how the Communists think and operate.

History provides many examples of tyrants and would-be tyrants deliberately lying, murdering and stealing for the purpose of obtaining power. But for the first time in history, mankind is threatened with a philosophy which not only justifies lying, murdering and stealing, but which claims that these and other violations of the traditional norms which have undergirded all civilisations, can be "scientifically" demonstrated by *dialectics* to be essential to the advancement of Truth.

Irrespective of whether Communists sincerely believe in *dialectical materialism*, and must therefore be regarded as a type of insane fanatics, or whether they cynically exploit this philosophy for the purpose of waging psychological warfare and disarming their opponents, the future of Civilisation depends upon sufficient non-Communists understanding the real significance and meaning of the *dialectical* challenge.

Recommended Reading for Lecture 2 (in following order):

Dialectics

— Eric D. Butler

The Naked Capitalist

— ????? Skousen

*The Fabian Socialist: Contribution
to the Communist Advance*

— Eric D. Butler

None Dare Call it Conspiracy

— Gary ?????

QUESTIONS ON LECTURE 2

1. **Would you agree that Marxism is a type of false religion?**
2. **What major flaws can you see in the philosophy of "dialectical materialism"?**
3. **Does Socialism have any answers to the Communist Challenge?**

Lecture 3

Strategical and Tactical Measures to Defeat Communism

In considering realistic strategical and tactical measures necessary to defeat Communism, it is essential to be quite clear what we are against and, equally important, what *we are for*. Unless there is this clarity of understanding, there is always the danger that one can tend to become that which one fights. While it is possible to learn a great deal from the Communists, particularly in the field of organisation, it is always essential to come back to the philosophical roots of communism and to be clear that a genuine anti-Communist policy must stem from a philosophy *fundamentally opposed to the Communist philosophy*. The observation that it is impossible to get figs from thistles is as true today as when it was first made.

The effective anti-Communist must have a coherent and positive philosophy of life. The fundamental point of cleavage between the Communist philosophy and the Christian philosophy concerns the nature and the purpose and destiny of man. The Communists claim that man is but a higher animal and that he can have little real effect on the stream of history, which is, as we saw in my first Paper, determined by dialectical materialism.

What, then, do we *stand for*? Western Civilisation was created on the basis that the individual does count, that he derives both freedom and rights from God and not from the State, and that institutions exist to serve individual purpose. The West must, therefore, stand for the free society, and cannot compromise with any attacks upon that freedom from without, or with any *undermining of it from within*.

But today there is compromise, and a marked reluctance to face the truth that war has been declared upon individual freedom and individual rights by International Communism. This war cannot be won by a policy of what is termed "containment." The Communists do not accept any type of stalemate. As Khrushchev has said so clearly, "peaceful co-existence" cannot continue permanently; either the "capitalists" must go to their grave, or the Communists go to their grave. The necessary will to win by the West will not be found until the harsh reality of Khrushchev's claim is faced.

The West, then, urgently requires a *positive* programme if it is to be successful. This programme may not be *immediately* realisable, but it should be clearly understood and held up to encourage individuals to strive towards ultimate victory. A comprehensive programme not immediately realisable does not mean that emergency steps are not urgently necessary. But these emergency steps should also be seen as part of a positive campaign for ultimate victory, not merely as a negative defence policy. For example, adequate military defences are essential to prevent any further physical advances by the Communists. Any other attempted offensives by Communists must be firmly met.

MAJOR STRATEGIC FACTORS

In considering a realistic strategy, it is first essential to understand what are the major strategical factors in the present world situation. We can list these as follows:

1. *The British Commonwealth.* In outlining his strategical concepts for his international programme, Lenin realised that the British Empire was one of the major obstacles to Communist expansion. The disintegration of the British Empire was, therefore, one of Lenin's major objectives. The problem of furthering disintegration was made difficult by the comparative internal social and political stability of the British nations and the character of their people. This stability was

the result of the evolving of constitutional and political principles which enabled the individual to work with his fellows towards solving his problems *without revolutionary activities*. Marx made a famous observation to the effect that the British would never make their own revolution and that foreigners would have to make it for them.

Communist strategy has therefore welcomed all attacks, irrespective of their source, which weakened the British World in any way. *The Red Pattern of World Conquest* shows how even the Communists welcomed the economic attacks upon the British by "dollar diplomacy" during and after the last war. The drive to push Britain into the European Economic Community (the "Common Market") must have really thrilled the Communists, because the surrender of sovereignty and traditional institutions by Britain would have meant the complete disintegration of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

It is instructive to note that as the British have withdrawn from all over the world, the Communist strategists have thrust forward to fill the gaps left. It has now started to dawn upon many Americans that their future has been jeopardised by the British retreat from previous world-wide responsibilities.

In considering the plight of the world, it is essential to recall how the British Commonwealth was developed, by the progressive *decentralisation* of power. This decentralisation of power, and the growth of British institutions right around the world, produced a deep *unity* based upon *diversity*. It was a most successful example of the way forward by man in his search for the establishment of international order. Reviving and strengthening the British Commonwealth by every possible means, must therefore be regarded as one of our major strategic policies in the war against International Communism. Those who spread defeatist propaganda about the impossibility of reviving the British Commonwealth, are in

fact spreading the very psychological disease which the Communists are relying upon to erode the British nations from within.

The economic resources and the technological skills of the peoples of the British Commonwealth are enormous, and by appropriate economic and financial policies, could be developed to demonstrate a realistic answer to the Communist challenge. In the military field, the British Commonwealth is still a major force, and could be an even greater force if there were the will. In defending the British Commonwealth, working for its greater strength and cohesion, its citizens are not only being realistic about their own immediate affairs; they are making a vital contribution to the victory of Civilisation over its Communist enemies.

The Americans belong to the same stream of history as the peoples of the British Commonwealth, and are a major factor in the struggle for the world. In spite of their many internal problems and divisions, they possess the greatest military and economic strength of any one nation. The future of Civilisation clearly depends upon the English-speaking nations of the world.

2. *The "United" Nations*: It is time for all realists to reassess the value, if any, of this international organisation, and to ask whether it is making any contribution to the evolution of a true international order based upon respect for the rights and freedoms of both individuals and nations. While the creation of UNO did capture the imagination and idealism of many people, its history has been one long record of serving the Communist advance. Those who want to make a realistic study of UNO can do no better than read the book, *The Fearful Master*. This book shows how, from its inception, UNO was Communist-inspired, and how it has consistently served the Communist programme. It has not brought peace anywhere, and has been unable to prevent brutal aggression, such as in Hungary in 1956 when the Soviet drowned in blood

the patriotic Hungarian uprising; and in Czechoslovakia in 1968.

Pravda, the official Soviet newspaper, of March 23, 1946, quoted Stalin as saying, "I attribute great importance to U.N.O., since it is a serious instrument for preservation of peace and international security..."

Following the defection by a top U.N. official, Mr. Arkady Shevchenko, one-time Under Secretary General of the U.N., this former Soviet representative appeared on a BBC programme in September, 1979, and alleged that "The U.N. is the tallest observation tower in the world for the intelligence activities of the Soviet Union."

The defection by Shevchenko prompted *The Sunday Telegraph*, London, to conduct an investigation in depth of the Communist influence in the U.N. In a report published on April 30, 1978, *The Daily Telegraph*, made public the following disturbing facts:

Of the approximately 700 Russian officials at the U.N., nearly 200 of these are members of the K.G.B. or G.R.U. One of the most notorious K.G.B. officers at the U.N. is Vasily Samsonovich Bogatyrev, who began his career with the Communist Front World Federation of Democratic Youth in 1940 before moving on to diplomatic postings, one being as First Secretary of the Soviet Embassy in London.

In Paris, where the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) is based, the K.G.B. is strongly represented. 30 per cent of the permanent delegation of 21 Soviet officials are K.G.B. agents. The most blatant of these is Sergei Koudriatsev, Soviet permanent representative at UNESCO. This man was involved in the atomic spy ring in Canada during the Second World War, later serving in Cuba where he directed subversion in Latin America.

In Vienna the two important U.N. organisations, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the International Development Organisation, have a number of K.G.B. agents.

Confirmation of *The Sunday Telegraph* report was provided by Mr. Ulrich Hubacher, spokesman of the Federal Justice and Police Department of Switzerland, who said early in May, 1980, that approximately 200 of the 650 Soviet diplomats and U.N. agencies working in Switzerland were Soviet intelligence agencies.

Early in 1982, Mr. William Ebster, Director of the American F.B.I., said that about 35 per cent of all Soviet diplomats at the U.N. were working for the K.G.B.

One of the most significant, and dangerous developments in UNO has been the exploitation of the Afro-Asian bloc, constantly growing in numbers as the result of "decolonisation." The campaign against Rhodesia, South Africa and the Portuguese territories of Angola and Mozambique, fits into Communism's strategy for neutralising or conquering the whole of Africa, and cutting the Cape of Good Hope sea route between all "East of Suez," including Australia, and Western Europe. The main front line for Southern Africa, preventing a development of the chaos and bloodshed so prevalent in "liberated" Africa, is Rhodesia. The economic and psychological war was declared on Rhodesia through the UNO when that small nation decided to take a stand for law and order, and Civilisation. Rhodesia was declared a "threat to world peace" by Communist nations which have been engaged in an international war without parallel in man's history!

Australia has also been under Communist attacks, through UNO, over Papua-New Guinea. There is the same campaign for "independence" which hastened the European retreat in Africa. There is also a steady campaign by the Communists, supported by idealistic dupes, to break down Australia's immigration policy. Social stability is much more easily sustained when any nation has a homogeneous people. The Communists back all campaigns which they feel will produce race problems where none exist at present. They have promoted and directed the Aboriginal Land Rights cam-

paign.

If the fate of Western Civilisation is going to be decided in the "United" Nations, then for the first time in the recorded history of man a Civilisation could be destroyed by having a vote against those who themselves have not yet demonstrated their capacity for upholding a Civilisation of any description. The "United" Nations is a most dangerous farce when the pretence is maintained that it is serving the high-sounding purposes for which it was allegedly created. The fact has to be faced that it is impossible for the Communists and non-Communists to work together to their mutual advantage in any project, for the elementary reason that the Communist believes he must use every situation to push home the war against the enemy. The time has come when the non-Communist world starting with the English-speaking nations, has got to give serious consideration to creating its own forms of international co-operation.

3. *Trade*: In recent years Australia, Canada and, to a lesser extent, France, have been sending grain exports to Communist China. The U.S.A. joined in this export policy by sending grain surpluses to Soviet Russia. This is justified by various shallow arguments. But while the apologists for this policy claim that it is either "economically inevitable," or is likely to produce better relations between the Communist and non-Communist nations, it is much more realistic to heed carefully what the great Communist strategist, Lenin, had to say. It is now just 35 years ago that Communists persuaded the newly-elected President Roosevelt to recognise the Soviet Government. Roosevelt was given firm assurances that in exchange for American recognition, the Soviet would prevent all Communist subversions in the U.S.A. But the Soviet representative, Litvinov, was busy assuring the American Communists within hours of giving this assurance, that it was only a piece of paper and not to be heeded. Now Roosevelt managed to get American support for recognition on the basis that this would enable credits to be extended to Russia, and

that Russia would thus help the U.S.A. out of its economic difficulties (the Great Depression was then at its worst) by purchasing from America. This is just how Lenin had predicted events would develop when he said that the Communists must "express desire for the immediate resumption of diplomatic relations with capitalist countries on the basis of complete non-interference in their internal affairs'."

Lenin continued: *"They (the 'deaf-mutes' as he called the 'capitalist' nations) will even be delighted and fling wide open their doors, through which the emissaries of the Comintern and Party Intelligence agencies will quickly infiltrate into these countries disguised as our diplomatic, cultural, and trade representatives...*

"Capitalists the world over and their governments will, in their desire to win the Soviet market, shut their eyes to the above-mentioned activities and thus be turned into blind deaf-mutes. They will furnish credits, which will serve as a means of supporting the Communist parties in their countries, and, by supplying us with materials and techniques which are not available to us, will rebuild our war industry, which is essential for our future attacks on our suppliers. In other words, they will be labouring to prepare their own suicide."

History is repeating itself today, and once again the Communists are inviting their enemies to labour to prepare their own suicide. Trade, to the Communist, is but a part of his warfare upon the non-Communist. The Communists preach that the "capitalist" countries are so decadent, so unable to solve their economic problems under their system, that they will be compelled to turn more and more to the Communists for salvation. If it is determined to win the war declared upon it, the non-Communist world must not enable trade to be used as a weapon. No Australian suggested during the last war that Hitler's Germany provided an excellent export market for Australia's wool, that Hitler's troops could use this wool for winter uniforms in Russia. If anyone had

suggested such a policy, it would immediately have been branded as treason. No Canadian urged sending surplus Canadian wheat to Hitler.

But the war being fought today is just as real, and certainly more dangerous, than the war against Hitler's Germany. Treason must not, therefore, be encouraged. During the Second World War the Australian Government helped the individual wool grower because he was unable to sell his wool under war conditions. This was a drastic policy. Drastic Governmental action is required in the West today to ensure that genuine production surpluses are used for the benefit of the Western and other peoples fighting to resist Communism. Realistic trade policies are essential. Individual wheat growers cannot solve the problem on their own. A change in national direction is required, one which will not harm the individual wheatgrower or any other producer. Those who are so foolish as to claim that a change of policy is impossible, are merely agreeing with the "economic determinism" preached by the Communists.

When the great Alexander Solzhenitsyn first came to the West, he tried to warn them about the suicidal policy of providing the Communist nations with economic bloodtransfusions. In his 1975 New York address, "A Legacy of Terror," Solzhenitsyn stressed that the Soviet economy depended heavily on Western food and technology. "You're helping the Soviet police state," he told his audience, and called for a cessation of economic aid, this forcing the Soviet to spend less on armaments and more on food and consumer goods for the people of the Soviet Union. When Solzhenitsyn first came to the West, he was front page news. But when he started to oppose Western economic aid for the Soviet, he was soon given the silent treatment. The distinguished British-born research expert, Dr. Anthony Sutton, was a Research Fellow at the prestigious Hoover Institute, Stanford University, California, when he started to document how the Soviet Union had been sustained economically from the West ever since it

had been established. When he published *National Suicide*, followed by *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, he became, to use his own terms, a "non-person" at Stanford University. No one challenged his facts, but, like Solzhenitsyn — and others — Sutton discovered that powerful groups did not want publicised the truth about the Soviet.

President Carter of the U.S.A. expressed great shock when the Soviet moved massive forces into Afghanistan late in 1979, while Prime Minister Fraser of Australia said that the Soviet move was the greatest threat to world peace since the end of the Second World War. But Western technology and food continued to move from the West to the Soviet Union. In spite of his strong anti-Soviet rhetoric, Prime Minister Fraser of Australia presided over a massive increase of Australian exports to the Soviet.

The introduction of martial law in Poland late in 1981, resulted in a strong reaction from President Reagan of the United States, with a call for international economic sanctions against the Soviet. But the call fell on deaf ears. Western economies, and that of Japan, were increasingly geared to exporting to the Communist nations. The Soviet strategists met to consider the situation and concluded that the depressed economic conditions in the West made it impossible for anti-Soviet economic sanctions to be applied. They echoed the views of the West German and French Governments, who said that a cessation of exports to the Soviet would worsen their unemployment and other problems. American business organisations and primary producers openly expressed opposition to the proposed sanctions policy, recalling what had happened in 1932 during the Great Depression of that period. As Lenin correctly predicted, the Achilles heel of the non-Communist nations is their internal finance-economic policies, which force them to compete feverishly to export in an endeavour to make their economies work. Even the Reagan Administration backed away from its anti-Soviet sanctions policy and, even more important, at the

height of the Polish crisis, announced that it was accepting responsibility for that part of the Polish debt owed to international banks in the U.S.A. The Polish crisis brought to general public attention for the first time the fact that the Communist world had been sustained by massive credits provided by international banking organisations, some of which had been involved in the financing of the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia in 1917.

Lenin insisted that the creation of a World State would be impossible without the establishment of an international economic system. So far from opposing the elimination of decentralised, small-scale production, Lenin taught that the development of Monopoly was essential in preparing the way for the establishment of a World State. Progressively centralise all power, encourage all policies of centralisation, irrespective of who is promoting them, was the major thrust of Marxist-Leninist strategy.

The more the non-Communists permit the Communists to solve their internal economic problems, such as food shortages, by making themselves progressively more dependent upon the Communist market, the more vulnerable they become to various forms of Communist blackmail. If the Communists urgently want wheat for their economy, for example, the West might consider offering the wheat in exchange for the freedom of, say, the Hungarians, or the East Germans, or the Czechoslovakians. The Communists should have the trade weapon turned against them. If the West were to use its economic strength to demand that the Communists set at least some of their victims free, it would be striking a positive blow of tremendous importance. Which brings us to the fourth factor of great strategical importance.

The "Captive Nations": It is generally overlooked in the West that the best allies we have to help defeat Communism are the *victims* of Communism. These people do not need "freedom" broadcasts to tell them how bad Communism is. They know all about it from painful first-hand experience. What they

want to know is how the West regards them. Are they merely expendable by the West in a futile attempt to buy a little time and security? Or does the West really care about them? These are two of the great questions of our day, and how they are faced could be decisive in the struggle. The Communists fear their millions of victims. Hungary demonstrated how the victims are likely to rise up. The Communists are always faced with the problem of internal dissent. They have sought to deal with this by "letting off steam" through "liberalisation," such as first in Poland and then in Czechoslovakia, without losing Communist control. The "liberalisation" tactic has been used to fool Westerners, who then become more susceptible to the argument that they should extend more economic support to the Communists. But support, without demanding real concessions from the Communists, leaves them in the position where they can persuade their victims that the West is not prepared to make a stand on their behalf; that it is in fact prepared to forget them in an attempt to come to terms with the Communists.

While at the moment, or in the immediate future, it may not be possible for the West to take any practical steps to free the victims of Communism, it can at least make it clear that it does not regard the situation as permanent, that it looks to the day when there is freedom for all the victims of Communism. Such a policy, based upon moral principle, and rooted in the philosophy which is supposed to motivate the West, would sustain the morale of the victims of Communism and enable the West to keep the Reds under constant diplomatic pressure.

Initiative in the diplomatic field will only come, however, when there is a strong determination to act *positively*. The Governments will not do this until there is sufficient public support. The *will* to win must, therefore, be strong in Western communities. Nothing less than a widespread determination to translate the philosophy of personal freedom into

practice, will enable the basic strategical factors we have mentioned to be used as they could be used in the struggle.

INITIATIVE WILL NOT START WITH GOVERNMENTS

All of what has been outlined still leaves untouched the vital question of how such a programme for victory against Communism, and victory for a Civilisation based upon the spiritual principle of personal freedom and personal responsibility, is to be achieved. When people ask, "Well, why doesn't the Government do something about it?", they are not only indicating that they do not grasp the true nature of political realities; they are also indicating that they are them-

selves afflicted to some extent with the disease which encourages them to believe that they, as individuals, are helpless and that they must look elsewhere for salvation.

It cannot be stressed too often that salvation of all Civilisation depends upon the salvation of the individual. This is the starting point, and any encouragement of any suggestion to the contrary is disastrous. The Communists are not seeking to recruit a majority of people to Communism. They believe that so long as the great majority can be confused, misled, filled with fear, or neutralised by soothing platitudes, a government will, in a crisis, find it almost impossible to adopt a definite policy. Sounder and more positive governmental policies will not come until there is a sounder, better informed, and more dynamic public opinion. Not only must this type of public opinion be created, but, just as important, realistic organisational principles must be followed in order that this public opinion is effective in expressing itself.

Truths do not of themselves make things happen. We all remember the old teaching that faith without works only results in death. The truths of this Universe, which man can only discover, but not invent, must be *released* through *appropriate mechanism*. For example, it is not the *law* of thermo-dynamics which drives big ships across the ocean, but

the *application* of the law through engines, connecting shafts, etc., which results in the use of a tremendous force. People in association can get what they want, can exercise their power, only by *applying* the *correct principles of organisation*.

This is not a theological paper, but as we come to our starting point of an adequate programme for survival and victory, we must consider the most difficult question of *motivation*. Those individuals who are going to be really effective must be strongly motivated by some strongly-held views or faith concerning the nature, the purpose and the destiny of man. Appeals to people's love of freedom, loyalty to the Crown in British countries, love of one's children and concern for their future, and love of country, are very good as far as they go, and must be used. Such appeals do move some people. But it is suggested that to produce that dedicated group which can be decisive against the dedication of the Communists, we require individuals with a deeper and more realistic faith than that of the Communists. This requires an awakening of the deepest religious sense of sufficient people to become an effective and guiding force in society. *Nothing less than this will be sufficient for the perilous task ahead.*

It is overlooked far too often that the concept of freedom which has undergirded Western Civilisation, and has found expression in so many of its institutions, did not always exist, but was given to man by Christianity.

The Christian concept of freedom is not a type of free-for-all, but is perhaps best expressed in those beautiful words, "In Whose service is perfect freedom." Perfect freedom might, therefore, be said to come through loyalty to God and His laws. Loyalty to God is the basis of all loyalties, and should be considered before other loyalties, important though they are, are disguised. We can consider this matter briefly by reference to a little catchecism with which I would think most Christians would agree. It goes like this: "Is God omnipotent?" Of course.' "Then why does not God control

human purpose?" "Because that would interfere with free will."

Individual purpose, individual will, personal freedom of choice, the freedom to choose right or wrong, good or evil, are part of God's purpose. Loyalty to God would, therefore, demand that personal freedom of choice, and the acceptance of personal responsibility for the choices made, must be defended and upheld against all attacks upon them. Let us remember that it is not only the Communists who deny that the individual should have control of his own purpose. They are assisted by large numbers of other people who preach a similar doctrine. Many nominal Christians might well be motivated to positive action in the current world drama, if they could be shown that defence of personal freedom is a defence of God's purpose for man, and that those who refuse to enter the lists are in fact disloyal to their Christian faith and heritage.

The individual who firmly grasps the truth that, contrary to the teachings of the materialists, he is not merely matter in motion, that he has another destiny rather than to be like a piece of lifeless flotsam floating down a stream of events over which he has no control, is the one factor in the world situation which the Communist fears. The individual who believes that he is a spiritual being, that he possesses free will, and that he can change the course of events by exercising his freedom and talents, holds the answer to the world situation. By this example, he can motivate others to follow his lead.

TRANSLATING FAITH INTO WORKS

While many will agree with what has been said concerning what should basically motivate individuals, they still say, "But really what can one individual do to be effective?" And this brings us to the difficult question of translating — perhaps we should use the term, "incarnating" — a principle into practice.

The first essential, before attempting to act too boldly, is *knowledge*. In fact, it is obviously impossible, even dangerous, to get people to act unless they have knowledge. Those who would be decisive must therefore do something which, if they possess the will, they can do for themselves. Unless the individual is *first prepared to help himself*, he cannot help his fellows. How, then, should the individual who wants to be an active participant in the shaping of history, start to equip himself?

First, he must read and study at least a few books which will provide him with an adequate background knowledge of Communism and associated subjects. He must also subscribe to at least one journal which will regularly provide him with vital, factual material not readily available elsewhere, and which will assist him to relate his background knowledge to current developments. Without this clear understanding of the relationship of events to a basic background, the individual can never be completely effective.

But while the individual of initiative and resourcefulness can equip himself exceptionally well by reading, experience has demonstrated that systematic study at schools such as this is absolutely essential for a deepening of knowledge and understanding. More and more schools are required right throughout the nation for the purpose of ensuring that those who are going to spearhead the campaign against the Communist challenge, are as fully equipped as possible.

In building his movement of the dedicated minority, Lenin stressed two important points:

1. **The individual would never make a total response to the Communist cause unless he was challenged with a total demand; and**
2. **That the Communist cause required individuals who gave not merely their spare evenings to its advancement, but were prepared to give "the whole of their lives."**

Those who are going to challenge Lenin's dedicated minority must, therefore, ask how far *they* are prepared to take their faith. Clearly a sufficiently large, dedicated minority is not going to grow unless there is a realisation that a number of people have got to make some drastic alterations in their *priorities* in life. They have not only got to give more of their time, both for learning and the application of that learning, but they have also got to give more of their *substance*. Because without adequate financial support, what is proposed can never be made a reality.

We, therefore, come back to what we have mentioned: that only those spiritually motivated are going to be able to lead the battle for Civilisation. Only these will regularly give of their time and money. Yes, others will assist, from time to time, as the situation moves them. Some will be motivated because of the fear of losing material possessions. Others for other reasons. These reasons may all be legitimate, but those motivated by them only must, without being in any way critical of these members of the community, be regarded as a type of fellow-traveller who, in the absence of the dedicated leadership we are talking about, has no chance of surviving the struggle.

BUILDING EFFECTIVE ORGANISATION

Although we have now dealt with motivation and the development of a dedicated minority, we are still left with the difficult question of how this dedicated minority can act effectively. The Communists are not concerned unduly about dedication and understanding, if these are not translated into practical political action. Note that we are talking about political action, that is, action concerning policies governing society: we are not talking about *party* political action which, while obviously related, is a very different thing. Now the political action which we must consider is that which is motivated by a determination to advance *principles* which will benefit *all individuals*. For example, a dedicated minority

taking appropriate action against Communist policies, cannot be truthfully described as a pressure group concerned only with its own "selfish interests." *We have to consider this dedicated minority as having taken upon itself the responsibility of acting as a custodian for those principles and values upon which our Civilisation was erected.*

The dedicated group we are considering would have a number of tasks. But the most important of those are:

- (a) Constant basic educational work with the use of both the printed and spoken word. This educational work must be directed primarily to the more responsible members of the community, those who are respected in their own circle and, therefore, influential. It is from those responsible members of the community that the dedicated minority is most likely to gain further recruits to expand its numbers.
- (b) To use every possible vehicle in the community for *immediately* influencing public opinion on an issue as it arises. The League of Rights is developing a national structure whereby issues can be dealt with as soon as they arise. The Communists have such a structure because they have worked hard over many years to produce it.
- (c) To translate public opinion into a concrete political force which will be effective. Politics has been aptly described as the art of the possible. The fundamental reality to grasp about politics, a reality which the Communists understand, is that most politicians are primarily concerned about either the possible loss of votes, or the gaining of votes. So long as we still have a political democracy and constitutional Government, it is essential to make use of the only instrument possible to influence Government policies.

Genuine democracy requires that the individual use his initiative at all times; that he does not become a passive instrument of whatever a Government decides is best.

If the individual cannot at least influence Government policy, then he has little protection against whatever power-group can use the Government for its purposes. Just as money is a sanction whereby the individual consumer can penalise those who will not give them what he requires, so the political vote is a sanction which the individual concerned about democracy and the free society must learn to use, intelligently. And he must encourage others to do likewise.

But what can a minority do? A minority can be a decisive force in politics and the nation's life if it consists of dedicated individuals pledged to uphold principles. It is a political fact of the greatest significance that a disciplined vote of not more than 5 percent of the electors could defeat or elect a government. The balance of political power rests with a comparatively small percentage of what is described as the "swinging vote." This generally consists of electors not tied to party politics in any way. If Members of Parliament could be approached by five percent of the electorate and have it made clear that support at the next election would depend upon supporting certain policies, then a Member would either have to take some action or risk defeat. Five percent of the electorate could remove from Parliament those who refuse to act on fundamental issues. Such removals would soon start to produce a healthier attitude amongst politicians on basic principles and issues. In a nutshell, *what is desperately required is a patriotic watch-dog in the community consisting of a sufficient minority to be effective.*

What has been suggested does require, however, an appropriate organisational structure and technique for action. The first essential is the creation in every Constituency of an Action Group of at least, for a start, a few individuals, who will meet as regularly as possible to discuss ways and means of extending their knowledge and of increasing the number of contacts within the electorate. The Action Group would undertake a thorough survey of its Constituency, preparing, for example, a list of all the papers in the

electorate, a background of the editor, whether letters or any other material can be readily published, etc. A list of all the leader personnel of the electorate should be prepared, men like the clergy, municipal councillors, prominent citizens active in organisations, and this list gradually sifted to discover which can be usefully placed on any mailing list. A list of general contacts likely to be useful should also be built up.

From time to time, MPs, for example, could be requested by the Action Groups — which might be called Voters' Policy Associations, or some such name — to state their views on certain issues. Their answers could then be publicised in the most effective way throughout the electorate. Action along the lines suggested would, before long, bring a new consciousness into political and public life.

League of Rights actionists should be regarded as the yeast working in and through the community, slowly but surely influencing the climate of opinion.

The creation of a national, structure such as that outlined, enables concerted, national action to be taken within hours on any issue. It enables effective counter-action to be taken to meet Communist strategy in a crisis. A flood of letters and telegrams can be on their way to the National Parliament from all parts of the nation within hours of such action being suggested. It is important to bear in mind that a Member of Parliament is greatly influenced by even two letters on the one issue. Members of Parliament can also be informed by consistent, intelligent letter-writing.

While individual sense of purpose and initiative is the most basic essential for winning the battle for Civilisation, the individual can only gain national objectives in *association with fellow individuals*. It is also essential that the problem be presented in such a way that the solution is within our mental vision. Very few individuals will move unless they are certain that others are moving at the same time, and that there is a chance of success. The structure outlined enables individuals

to be encouraged to act, confident in the knowledge that they are members of a dedicated army moving as one. More and more successful Action Groups are demonstrating what is possible.

The essence of the problem is, then, to first produce a dedicated, well-informed group of competent individuals, using their initiative and resourcefulness, but also acting as a team "captained" by individuals in whom they have every confidence.

The type of approach suggested is now developing right around the British Commonwealth and in the U.S.A. Individuals in all these nations can, therefore, move towards making their contribution, confident in the knowledge that similar action is being taken elsewhere. Loose liaison among the anti-Communist groups of the non-Communist world is developing and will be encouraged to continue. Unity of purpose, with diversity of approach, is the basis for ultimate victory.

But nothing, absolutely nothing, can be done without sufficient dedicated, informed individuals. This is the starting point, because each individual has to decide for himself whether or not he accepts or rejects the Communist view of man as but a higher animal, possessing no spiritual attributes whatever. Let us all, therefore, meet the challenge in our individual lives, and then move forward to victory.

Recommended Reading for Lecture 3 (in following order):

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| <i>The Fearful Master</i> | — G. Edward Griffin |
| <i>National Suicide</i> | — Anthony Sutton |
| <i>Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution</i> | — Anthony Sutton |
| <i>The Essential Christian Heritage</i> | — Eric D. Butler |
| <i>The Liberal Death Wish</i> | — Malcolm
Muggeridge |

QUESTIONS ON LECTURE 3

1. Do you feel that it is preferable to work for a revived British Commonwealth, working in close association with the U.S.A., than to strengthen UNO?
2. Have you any constructive criticism to make of the type of organisational structure outlined?
3. Do you believe that the individual has the power to change the course of events from what they otherwise would be?

Appendix

Communism and Christianity

— By Professor John W. Hallowell —

Everyone knows that there is a world-wide struggle or controversy raging today, and that it is sometimes referred to as *Communism vs. Christianity*. But not everyone understands the basic issues involved in this conflict, or can meaningfully define what the protagonists stand *for* and *against*. A contribution to a better understanding may be found in the following excerpts from a penetrating address by Professor John W. Hallowell which was delivered in 1951 and published by *The Canadian Intelligency Service* in 1965.

THE "INEVITABLE WAVE OF THE FUTURE"

The economic interpretation of history finds philosophical support in the metaphysical conception of dialectical materialism. Each part of this philosophy is linked inseparably to another, and each conclusion derives logically from its premises. Marx did not invent socialism, and he was not the first socialist. What he did, and this followers believe with success, *was to provide socialism with a "scientific" undergirding.*

He did not argue, in his theory at least, from moral or humanitarian grounds for the superiority of socialism but rather contended that he had discovered the laws of history which inevitably decree the victory of socialism over capitalism. Marx depicts the coming of revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the classless society as events of natural necessity. It *must* happen this way since the laws of history and of economics decree it. It is not a matter of choice but a matter of necessity.

MARXISM: A NEW RELIGION

Now it is clear that this is something more than a political or economic theory. There is a sense in which it might well be described as a religion; for it offers a complete explanation of life, requires total commitment of the person who espouses Communism as a cause, and holds out to men the promise of redemption from evil in a new society in which mankind shall be truly free and equal. It is a gospel of salvation by revolution, and therein lies its most powerful appeal, especially to those who feel, and with reason, estranged from the society in which they now live.

It holds out a creative mission in life, a creative role to play in the redemption not only of the proletariat but of mankind itself. For it is nothing less than the redemption of mankind from corruption and evil that is its professed aim.

But only when a "scientific" conception of life is substituted for a religious conception is this redemption possible. Marx, so his followers believe, has discovered this scientific explanation. Marx was aided in that discovery by the previous writings of Ludwig Feuerbach, who had declared that God is just a projection of human hopes and aspirations. God is a beautiful illusion, a dream which men manufacture.

From Feuerbach, Marx learned that it is not God who creates man but man who creates God. And this discovery had an intoxicating effect upon him — because, if this is so, then absolutely nothing stands in the way of men to do what they will.

Marx proceeded to draw more revolutionary conclusions from Feuerbach's "discovery." And this is what he said:

"Man makes religion; religion does not make man . . . Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature . . . It is the opium of the people . . . The people cannot be really happy until (they have been) deprived of illusory happiness by the abolition of religion . . ."

Religion has taught us that man is a stranger in the world, a pilgrim seeking the kingdom of God. Feuerbach's discovery frees us from this illusion. And freed from this illusion, mankind can now transform "the condition which needs illusion." It is the world that is wrong; it is man that is right; and "the root of things is man himself." The only reality is human action.

The emancipation of mankind depends solely upon a radical revolution (by which) the proletariat liberates not only itself but mankind. It establishes ultimately a classless society in which each shall contribute according to his ability and receive in accordance with his needs.

Marxism offers a complete explanation of existence, it provides a vision of a new society which is attractive in its justice, and it offers the downtrodden and oppressed no less a role in history than the emancipation of mankind from exploitation. Certainly Marxism has elements of nobility and it provides a cause for which many individuals might well think it worth the sacrifice of their lives. It is no mere selfishness that attracts many to the banner of Communism, but rather a cause and a mission which seems to them to restore meaning to life though it may demand self-sacrifice and even death. The disinherited of the earth are attracted to Communism less by the material promises which it holds out, which promises they know they may never live to see fulfilled, than by the creative role they are called upon to play in the emancipation of mankind.

Communism presents itself as an appealing alternative to those who, for one reason or another, have lost their faith in God.

CHRISTIANITY vs MARXISM

In Christianity everything derives from and is referred back to God; while in communism everything derives from a material process. For the Marxist, the universe is not the

creation of God and subject to His purpose, but rather it is regarded as self-creating and self-sustaining. To the question: Which is the primordial element in the universe, spirit or nature? the Marxist answers: Nature. In the words of Marx, "nothing exists outside nature and man."

There is a sense in which Christianity is materialistic. The central doctrine of Christianity is the Incarnation — "the Word made flesh." The Christian God is not an Idea, but a Being, a Person. And Christianity holds out to men the promise not simply of the salvation of their souls but of the redemption of their bodies "in a flesh that shall be incorruptible." Like Marxism, Christianity rejects idealism, that philosophy which absorbs matter in mind and affirms the sole reality of the idea. But unlike Marxism, Christianity regards the material universe as the creation of the living God and subordinates matter to spirit.

Thus Christianity avoids the pitfalls both of materialism and of idealism. It denies that the ultimate reality can be reduced to ideas or to matter. It does not deny the substantial reality of matter but subordinates matter to spirit. And it is in the sacraments that the peculiarly Christian conception of the relationship between spirit and matter is best exemplified. It is the spiritual utilisation of a material object for a spiritual purpose. As William Temple has expressed it: "In the sacrament . . . the order of thought is spirit first and spirit last, with matter as the effectual expression or symbolic instrument of spirit."

For the Communist the primordial element is nature. For the Christian it is spirit. And it follows from this that the Communist seeks a natural explanation of history while the Christian espouses a supernatural or spiritual interpretation. There is a semblance, however, between the Marxist and Christian philosophies of history, and probably the Marxist interpretation could not have developed apart from an intellectual soil prepared by Christianity. For the Christian con-

ception of the Garden of Eden, the Marxist substitutes a primitive communistic society. Corresponding to the Christian fall of man, there is in Marxist theory the establishment of the private ownership of the means of production. From then on human history is a history of corruption, but of corruption gradually being overcome; of mankind, if you like, being "redeemed."

The history of the world is a history of class struggles between the exploiters and the exploited. Corresponding to the Incarnation, which the Christian conceives as uniquely revealing the meaning of history, there is the advent of Karl Marx, in the light of whose teachings the long-suffering exploited class may, for the first time, understand the meaning of its suffering and the meaning of history. And, just as those in Christ constituted the Church, so those who are enlightened by the teachings of Marx constitute the vanguard of the proletariat, leading the proletariat and, through them, mankind, to redemption from evil. Just as history ends for the Christian on the Day of Last Judgement, so history culminates for the Marxist in the Revolution that will inevitably result in the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, and in the establishment of a classless society in which man shall ever after live in peace and harmony with his neighbour.

But, of course, there are significant differences. One locates evil in man, the other in a social institution. One regards evil as a defect of will, the other regards evil as residing primarily in the institution of the private ownership of the means of production. Christianity regards all men as sinners, but Marxism regards the proletariat as the innocent victims of a system for which they are in no way responsible. Where Christianity attributes perfect innocence alone to Christ, the Marxist attributes perfect innocence to the proletariat. Where one looks to Christ for redemption from evil, the other looks to the proletariat. The price demanded for redemption from evil in Christianity is repentance and a new

way of life responsive to God's will and purpose. The price demanded for redemption from evil in Communism is enlistment in the cause of the proletariat under the direction of the Communist Party.

Where one finds redemption from evil through the body and blood of Christ, the other looks for redemption through slaughter of the capitalists.

By attributing absolute righteousness of the proletariat, and hence ex-communicating all other social classes from the human race, it leads in practice to the most brutal and ruthless suppression and extermination of its opponents. The Communist thinks of his enemy as an enemy of mankind, and perhaps this is why he does not call the extermination of his opponents murder, but the liquidation of unsocial elements . . . (On the other hand,) though not always practiced by Christians, certainly the commandment of Christ that we should love our enemies is central to the ethical teaching of Christianity. Though we may hate his ideas and battle against them, we must love him as a person, desiring his good as we desire our own.

The Christian conception of man is a realistic conception for it neither overrates man's motives nor underestimates his potentialities. If man is a sinner, he is also potentially a saint. Though defaced by sin, there remains in every man the image of God. The Marxist denies not only that man is sinful, but that he is created in the image and likeness of God. Human nature is rather conceived by him as the product of society, as the image or reflection of social conditions. That is why the Marxist believes that if you change social conditions you may create a new human nature.

There is no conception in Marxism of the human being as a *person*. But it is precisely the conception of the human being as a *person* that is one of the distinctive teachings of Christianity. We are persons *because we are created in the image and likeness of a Personal Being*. Through sin that image is

defaced, but through Christ it is restored. There is a sense in which it might be said that the restoration of personality is the essential meaning of history for the Christian. God's purpose for man is his redemption from evil and history has no other purpose. For the Marxist, history is "the activity of man pursuing his own aims." For the Christian, history is a dialogue between man and God, with God taking the initiative and man either fleeing or responding to His call.

There is a sense in which Marxism also holds out to men the promise of redemption from evil, but the important difference between the Marxist and the Christian view is that the Marxist promises this redemption at some future date in time through the medium of revolution and the establishment of a socialist society. The Christian holds out to men the promise of redemption here and now if only they will turn to Christ in love and with repentance for their sins. The Kingdom of God is not something that is to be established at some future date in time, but it exists here and now. Every moment of time for the Christian is eschatological; in every action he stands under the judgement of God. In every action he chooses or rejects the Kingdom of God. He can, if he chooses, be one with Christ now, and even now enter upon that eternal life of blessedness which God promises those who do His will. Or he can, if he chooses, even now live the life of the damned.

It is here in the world that we choose our ultimate and eternal destiny, and we choose it by the way in which we respond to God's will and love. The way in which we respond to God's will and love will certainly be reflected in our relations with our neighbours, in our political, social and economic systems; but those systems, whatever they may be, have no ultimate significance. The Kingdom of God cannot be identified with any particular system, but exists as a judgement upon them all. Thus the Christian will find himself in any and every society in the position both of a critic and a leaven.

(End of excerpts from Professor Hallowell's address)

The excerpts from Professor Hallowell' paper quoted above should be sufficient to show that Communism is more than merely an idea, a theory, an economic system, a life-view or military imperialism. It includes all these ingredients, imposed and impressed upon those it 'liberates' with incredible brutality. But it is more than this. It is, indeed, a *religion* — not a religion, as some of our 'Social' gossellers' have led us to believe, akin to Christianity, but a religion which, when closely analysed and examined in practice, is seen to be the very *antithesis* of Christianity.

Marxism, in spite of its theory and practice, still seems to have an "idealistic" appeal to many 'intellectuals' who, having rejected God, still yearn for a vision and meaning to life — for a religion.

And, keeping in mind the source of the finance and leadership which promoted and executed the Bolshevik Revolution, we are satisfied that the inspiration behind this phase of Communism had no remote connection with any genuine idealism, but was rather a crafty move to seize Russia as a home base and harness her resources and people in a gigantic effort to destroy Christian society and reconstruct it along quite different lines.

The Objectives of the Australian League of Rights

- (a) To promote loyalty to the Christian concept of God, and the Crown, and to the Country as part of the British Commonwealth of Nations.
- (b) To advocate genuine competitive individual enterprise and personal initiative.
- (c) To defend private ownership and advocate its extension in order that individual freedom with security shall be available to all.
- (d) To attack and expose Government -by-Regulation and bureaucratic interference with economic and social activities.
- (e) To take steps designed to secure to the individual very definite rights which no Government can take away, and especially by defence of the written Constitution.
- (f) To defend the Rule of Law which makes all equal before the Law.
- (g) To stress the value of our system of Common Law, built up in Great Britain, to protect the rights of the individual; and to that end to expose corruption and partiality in all their forms.
- (h) To expose the manner in which the safeguards of individual rights and liberties are being destroyed.
- (i) To emphasise the value of Legislative Councils and the Senate.
- (j) To expose and oppose all anti-British propaganda, and actions, irrespective of their origin.
- (k) To take such other actions as may be deemed desirable to promote the policy of this League.

For further information write to The Australian League of Rights, G.P.O. Box 1052J, Melbourne, Victoria, 3001.

**Published by The Australian League of Rights,
273 Little Collins Street, Melbourne. Ph: 63 9749.**