

**Series on Defence Problems**

**No. 2**

# **RADICALISM and SECURITY**

**International Documentation and Information Centre  
(INTERDOC)**

This booklet is the second study in the series on defence problems

**1. THE ARMED FORCES  
IN THE PSYCHOPOLITICAL  
EAST - WEST CONFRONTATION**

The Hague: INTERDOC

1968

70 pp.

**RADICALISM AND SECURITY**

**INTERDOC CONFERENCE**

**Noordwijk aan Zee**

**April 17-18, 1970**

© 1970

**International Documentation and Information Centre  
(INTERDOC)**

Van Stolkweg 10, The Hague, Holland

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. <u>Introduction</u> <u>Radicalism and Security</u> by Rolf Geyer	5
2. <u>Political Radicalism and Defence</u> <u>The Situation in North America</u> <u>(Canada and the United States)</u> by Prof. Dr Eric Waldman	14
3. <u>Right &amp; Left-Wing Radicalism and</u> <u>Security in the United States</u> by Nils-Eric Brodin	40
4. <u>Political Radicalism and Defence</u> <u>The British Situation</u> by Stephen Kreppel	75
5. <u>Right-Wing Radicalism and Defence</u> by Lt. -Col. Curt Schlieker (Federal Republic of Germany)	79
6. <u>Left-Wing Radicalism and Defence</u> <u>in the Federal Republic of Germany</u> by Hans-Joachim Woehl	91
7. <u>Radicalism and Security</u> by Ivan Matteo Lombardo (Italy)	113

On April 17-18, 1970, Interdoc held an international conference in the Netherlands (Noordwijk aan Zee) attended by forty-six participants from Belgium, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United States of America. Eight written papers, together with several oral contributions, were presented to the conference. These papers and contributions, reflecting to a large extent Interdoc's own views, stimulated much wide-ranging and varied discussion and provided an opportunity for a useful exchange of views at international level. We have attempted in the ensuing pages to put forward a representative selection of the papers read at the conference.

INTRODUCTION  
RADICALISM AND SECURITY

by Rolf Geyer\*

The viability of any community rests decisively on whether and to what extent its members are prepared to play an active part on behalf of that community. This is especially true of the state.

The state is an organized social structure representing all the members of a nation both internally and externally. The state works on their behalf through the collective efforts of its members and safeguards their existence in that society by means of generally accepted rules - constitution, laws etc. How these rules may have come about is unimportant for our purpose. They may, as for example in Great Britain and the Netherlands, have strong links with tradition: in other cases, e.g. in the Federal Republic of Germany, they may have come about as the result of a catastrophe.

The decisive factor is that these rules and the principles and values on which they are based are not only accepted by the overwhelming majority of society but are also felt by the individual to be so compelling as to warrant his active engagement in support of his own people (and state).

This activity can be expressed in many ways: e.g. by the exercise of the franchise and the eligibility to vote and by active participation in social organizations. Another form of activity is the performance of military service as an expression of a readiness to protect society - embodied in the state - and to lay down one's life for the security of one's own people in the disastrous event of war.

Clearly the fundamental affirmation of one's own society, regardless of its momentary defects and despite all overt desires for improvement, is of crucial importance for such an extreme case of civic engagement.

The existence of values worth defending is essential. Furthermore, these values must live so vividly in the civic consciousness of the individual that to safeguard and preserve them is

\*Writer on international affairs

worthy of the final sacrifice.

In Western states (and societies) these values, in that they affect the individual, are seen and felt to be reflected in the concept of "freedom and equality of the individual" and in the individual's capacity to develop independently. In the social sphere, on the other hand, they are seen and felt to be reflected chiefly in the democratic, parliamentary form of government. This form of government, based on the principle of no coercion at any cost, sets out to enable the individual to enjoy the above-mentioned basic rights, while seeking to safeguard and improve the well-being of all in the best conceivable way.

It is also essential that this form of society should be felt to be fundamentally "open" and "pluralistic". In other words the societies of the West should accept a wide array of political groups competing among themselves together with a correspondingly wide range of political and intellectual "world-outlooks", in so far as they do not make any claim to "exclusivity" and are prepared to accept co-operation and the political compromise. They must therefore recognize the basic character of the society on the basis of existing norms.

It may be assumed that the majority of citizens in our states do in fact accept the basic values laid down in the constitution and that there exists a "consensus" of opinion.

Nevertheless in every society there are, and always have been, individuals or groups who reject the rules and values accepted by the general public and who, under certain circumstances, wish to change them. If necessary these changes are to be achieved by violent means. When referring to cases such as these, we generally use the term "political radicalism".

The German "DTV-Lexikon" defines the concept of radicalism as follows:

"Die-hardism, inflexibility, stringency of outlook, extremist orientation. Radical thinking is an attitude and as such the logical consequence of views which seek to go to the root of things. Ultimately it is a process whereby action is taken stubbornly pursuing a hidden aim to the

exclusion of all compromise. In the sphere of ethics radicalism is branded as rigidity, in science as doctrinairism. In politics the term 'radical' generally refers to that school of thought which pursues its own ideas and interests and refuses to understand the views of others ('extremism')".

(DTV-Lexikon, vol. 15, p. 30, 1968, Munich)

The above definition reveals the basic inaccuracy of the expression "political radicalism". The essence of these political currents is conveyed more exactly by the term "political extremism" than by the more usual expression "radicalism".

In general, political radicalism lays claim to exclusivity and also to the absolute validity of its value concepts and demands. Consequently it rejects other schools of thought, denies them the right to put their case and in the final analysis refuses to co-operate. Co-operation, as far as it is unavoidable, is conditioned by tactical necessity and regarded as temporary.

Another expression of political radicalism (= extremism) is the placing of extreme emphasis on values which are also recognized in a more moderate way - certainly not to the same extent - by other social groups (e.g. national feeling).

Thirdly, it is common to all shades of political radicalism that they not only feel that their society in its present state needs to be improved - a fact obviously accepted by non-extremists - but that they describe it as "corrupt and evil through and through". They make the promise that through the realization of their aims the ideal society can be attained.

This society which they extol is

- either presented as an absolutely new society which has nothing in common with the old social structure
- or it is described to the effect that in it the old values, felt implicitly by man to be "eternal" and unchangeable, would flourish once again.

Finally, it is common to all forms of political radicalism that while they

- purport to serve the individual, they nevertheless
- allow society to take unconditional precedence over the individual until the realization of the final state of Utopia.

(Since man is a social creature and can only exist within society, he acquires worth and dignity only through service to that society).

It emerges from what has been established so far that fundamentally all radical currents pose a potential threat to any existing society for the sole reason that they reject the generally accepted values and norms of social co-existence and also the present state of society. In their eyes society in its present form is not only not worth defending, but must be opposed and even destroyed. This attitude has implications for the defence capability of our society (in the broadest sense). As will be shown, however, distinctions have to be drawn.

This rough outline of the essential features of radicalism is readily borne out by historical examples ranging from the emergence of Christianity, over the peasant and Hussite wars and the French Revolution, to communism and national socialism.

It is characteristic of the present situation that we see ourselves confronted by two principal types of political radicalism:

right-wing and left-wing radicalism.

In general we are in the habit of describing "right-wing radicalism" either as "neo-fascism" or as "neo-nazism", although subtle observation would reveal the inaccuracy of such classifications. The following explanatory definitions are offered for the terms fascism and national socialism:

"The term fascism is used in the dual sense: it is at once a generic notion and a reference to the historically defined phenomenon of Italian 'fascismo'. The critics of fascism, in particular, use the term in the broader sense

to characterize the striving after domination, which grew in various European countries following World War I out of an extreme nationalism. The aim envisaged was the establishment of an authoritarian and totalitarian one-party nationalist state which would secure a reputation as a counter-force against communist, socialist and liberal-democratic state and social systems". (Fischer-Lexikon, vol. 2, p. 63, 1957, Frankfurt/Main)

The same lexicon defines the term neo-fascism as follows:

"Neo-fascism plays . . . a leading role in the right-wing radical movements of post-war Europe, which, despite their differences are usually referred to collectively by means of the term 'neo-fascism' or (in view of their close journalistic and organizational ties) 'neo-fascist international'.

This marks the readoption of the wider meaning of the term fascism in its general political usage. . . .

Of course, as a concept and programme neo-fascism contains the same contradictions as fascism:

as a nationalist, extremist movement it has no supra-national potentiality and therefore its various politico-historical factors can only be defined and understood in the light of its special national characteristics" (ibid., p. 68-69)

A salient feature of right-wing radicalism, in addition to the emphasis placed on the role of the state, is the inherent nationalism detectable in all shades of radicalism. At the same time there is implicit in this characteristic nationalism an acceptance of military-mindedness, i. e. of defence obligations.

National feeling and military preparedness are essential

features of service life. Consequently there is, on the face of it, a certain affinity between the military tradition and right-wing extremism - (a movement which accepts military-mindedness and thinks along national lines cannot be wholly bad). Within the right-wing radical movements this affinity may find expression in the creation of quasi-military organizational structures or the assumption by former officers of leading roles. Admittedly, this is not the case in Germany today following the lessons learned from national socialism, but certainly applies in other states, e.g. in the USA (General Walker).

To assume that right-wing radicalism poses no threat to the defence capability, despite the emphasis which these movements place on military-mindedness, is erroneous.

Extreme nationalism regards international and supra-national commitments as fundamentally suspect, arguing that as a result national interests are neglected, while the nation's strength is misdirected to foreign advantage. It follows therefore that neutralist and isolationist currents can be detected in all forms of right-wing radicalism.

Given the impossibility in the nuclear age of an individual nation basing its national defence on its own strength exclusively, the extreme nationalism of right-wing radicalism presents a threat of the highest order to national and supra-national security. For this reason alone, and quite apart from all its other inconsistencies with a social order based on parliamentary democracy, the soldier should reject it.

Within the ramifications of left-wing extremism we can distinguish between the "established" organizations, represented in general by the Communist Parties and their subsidiary organizations, and the so-called "New Left".

In contrast to former times, the "established" forms of left-wing radicalism, for the most part represented in parliament (Communist Parties), formally acknowledge the principles of the existing order. However, they continue to adhere to their own values and aims. Their theoretical approach to agitation has changed in the interests of efficacy; at least they claim that their methods are constitutional. The CPs of Great Britain, France and above all Italy provide good examples of this strategy.

We need not dwell on the reasons which have led to this attitude. They include doubts about the feasibility of creating "revolutionary situations" as well as the hope that by means of popular fronts they will be able to break out of their isolation and become fit to govern.

Nevertheless, established or orthodox Marxism-Leninism must continue to be regarded as left-wing radicalism and a threat to the defence capability of society, as long as

- it persists in its ultimate objective of one final communist society and as long as
- the national parties explicitly regard themselves as integral parts of one world movement, orientated largely on the CPSU.

The fact that the Communist Parties of the West are "legal" parties will doubtless add to the difficult and urgent task of confronting them.

In contrast to the rigidly organized Communist Parties the "New Left" is a hard core of multifarious groups, of which only a proportion have a solid organizational structure. Common to all of them is the fact that they have their basis in so-called neo-Marxism, which in addition to Marxism proper also displays anarchist and syndicalist tendencies. They further have in common the fact that

- they are based almost exclusively on intellectual minorities;
- they disapprove of established communism and in particular the communist state system;
- they are neither willing nor able to propound theoretical arguments in support of their final objectives: the emancipation of society.

Thus the New Left depends for its effectiveness on constantly starting new acts of agitation, keeping its adherents up to scratch and winning over fellow-travellers.

In the interests of creating the necessary mass basis New

Left groups are prepared (for a limited period) to enter into alliances with other movements. Examples include the Civil Rights Movement in the USA and the 1968 May disturbances in France. In most cases, however, it is not long before the partners come to regard such alliances as obstructive to their own aims.

Despite its positive aim to "embody Utopia" in the form of an emancipated final society, the effect which the New Left is at present having on the majority of society is destructive and repugnant. This applies particularly to the workers. Nevertheless, the New Left constitutes a threat to the defence capability of our society, inasmuch as it disputes fundamentally the possibility of social improvement through evolution and thus opposes positive co-operation of any kind. For this movement the existence of values worth defending is absolutely out of the question.

The combatting of this movement is rendered more difficult by its hostility to organization. Thus efforts to combat the movement - apart from attempts to mould public awareness - can all too easily degenerate into the prosecution of solitary individuals who have committed punishable offences. Tackling the New Left is also rendered more difficult by the "diffuse elements" which make up the movement and by a partially outdated criminal code, with equally outdated laws on demonstrations. It is hard at times to reconcile such laws (e.g. in the Federal Republic of Germany) with rights guaranteed under the constitution.

The task of the Noordwijk aan Zee conference, due to be held from April 17 to 18, 1970, and entitled "Radicalism and Security", will be to examine the possible effects on military preparedness of right and left-wing radicalism, as outlined above.

Right and left-wing radicalism in our countries varies in strength and so also in importance. In the present period, characterized by an economic boom pervading almost every sector of the population, radicalism, it may be felt, constitutes a source of annoyance, but not a threatening problem. Another reason why radicalism fails to receive the serious attention it deserves is frequently to be found in the almost euphoric expectation that an East-West détente is imminent. Whatever our

hopes, the present situation is not bound to continue. Right and left-wing radicalism may emerge as a deadly danger. There is the possibility that they may interact and that, despite the mortal enmity between them, they may even form alliances against the "Establishment". This is the lesson taught by history - and German history in particular.

Furthermore, the increasing number of conscientious objectors in Germany and the figures for deserters in the USA show that the problem is not unimportant even today.

The participants representing the individual countries will now examine the concrete situation prevailing in their respective countries.

POLITICAL RADICALISM AND DEFENCE

THE SITUATION IN NORTH AMERICA (CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES)

by Prof. Dr. Eric Waldman\*

Introduction

A discussion, analysis, and evaluation of the impact of radical political movements and their activities upon the security of the North Atlantic Community appears to be more than justified because of a number of developments which might be symptomatic for a potential or actual decrease of the defensive capabilities of the Western world. Western political, social, and economic institutions, generally reflecting or implementing our prevailing value system, are still supported by a substantial majority of the populations in these states. However, the persistent attacks upon these values and institutions seem to have influenced the attitudes of a growing number of people who are no longer willing to defend them or to make sacrifices in order to maintain the contemporary political system.

The challenges and attacks are coming primarily from three different sources. The ambitious and expansionist foreign policy objectives of the Soviet Union constitute probably the most formidable and most dangerous challenge to Western security. This threat had been recognized in the past and was the reason for Western rearmament after World War II and for the formation of a North Atlantic collective defence arrangement. The extent to which some of the leading statesmen of the NATO countries still acknowledge the continuance of this situation is one of the crucial issues of the present time. Their failure to recognize the persistence of the Soviet threat is usually the result of their own wishful thinking combined with the unrealistic practice of superimposing Western concepts and values upon Soviet behaviour and of the inability to understand Soviet long-range objectives.

The other two sources of danger for Western security are of domestic origin and derive from the activities and influence exerted by left and right-wing political extremism. The purpose

\*Professor of Political Science at the University of Calgary (Alberta)

of this paper is an attempt to discuss the impact of radical political groups and of their activities upon the defensive posture and security of the two North American countries, Canada and the United States.

It is outside the scope of this study even to attempt to identify and analyse the numerous "ideologies" which fall under the broad heading of political radicalism or extremism. In North America political extremists are organized in many groups, clubs, committees, and "movements". Most of these "organizations" are quite small and many of them short-lived. In spite of the great diversity of views found among political extremists, there are at least three significant aspects which apply to all of them and which warrant our acknowledgement. They will also assist us in evaluating the attitudes and actions especially of the left-wing extremists.

(1) The concept of political radicalism implies a basic departure of political thought from the prevailing ideological and value system both in terms of its fundamental criticism of the present society and its institutions and a determination to bring about decisive changes. In other words, the present system is negated for all practical purposes in its entirety and therefore only merits destruction and replacement by a new order. Political radicals of the more militant variety are determined and willing to utilize any means which, according to their views, will contribute to the destruction of the deeply hated "system" and therefore they are even supporting developments which might lead to a military defeat of their own country by an outside power, especially if this state claims to have implemented some of their so-called progressive notions concerning political, social, and economic institutions. It is entirely logical and consistent for the North American radical of the left to work consciously for a victory of the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong in South-East Asia and to do his utmost to impair American efforts to achieve any settlement of the conflict other than accepting military defeat at the hands of the communists.

(2) Political radicalism defined as an ideology which is violently opposed to the basic or fundamental values of the prevailing system and its institutions should be regarded as a relative concept, i. e. it should be recognized as the absolute negation

of its specific ideological environment. For example, the democratic creed must be classified within the Soviet ideological environment as political radical thought, while on the other hand Marxism-Leninism obviously constitutes a radical departure from the political and ideological environment characteristic of the Western democracies. The significance of this observation of the relative nature of political radicalism is that it readily explains the mystery of the "one-sidedness" of the criticism of the political radicals. For example, they vehemently denounce the United States for continuing underground nuclear testing while keeping entirely silent when the Soviet Union explodes an underground nuclear device. Alleged US "terror" in South Vietnam has become a world-wide propaganda issue, while on the other hand the perpetual and systematic terrorist activities of the Viet Cong do not influence in the least their foregone conclusions.

(3) And finally, the left-wing political radicals have accomplished an effective adaptation of the time-tested tactics of the communist movement of utilizing so-called front organizations. This type of organization continues to be useful as, for example, the many Moscow-directed peace groups seem to demonstrate; however, the variation of the old theme is found in the utilization of any popular issue which might get people involved and eventually used for entirely different objectives. It has been recognized by many observers that student groups of the New Left have made excellent use of the legitimate issue of university reforms in order to obtain through confrontations with the forces of the so-called establishment a "revolutionary consciousness" of the student body. In a similar way the most reasonable desire for a peaceful world and most recently the fight against pollution of our environment are being used to gain respectability and influence among various segments of the population. Considering the ulterior motives of the political radicals, it is reasonable to assert that for them the issue of peace or pollution control measures have become means, tools, or even weapons in order to achieve entirely different ends, such as the destruction of our society.

#### Canada and the United States

Viewed in absolute terms, the contributions made by Canada

and the United States to the overall security of the North Atlantic Community are of considerable quantitative and qualitative difference. However, when considering the impact of left-wing political radicals upon the security situation, it is Canada which has a direct, though minor, influence upon certain aspects of the developments in the United States as a result of providing a haven for US draft dodgers and deserters. On the other hand, the groups of the Canadian New Left, one category of the agents of dissent, borrowed heavily from their American counterparts. Thus it might be asserted that the US influence upon Canadian security is more of an indirect nature. As will be shown later in this study, the actual impact of these groups in Canada is of little significance. A decrease of the overall American deterrent power directed against possible common aggressors would be of far greater consequence to Canadian security.

As far as a detailed analysis and evaluation are concerned, this paper will deal more with the situation in Canada than the developments in the United States for at least two major reasons. The activities of political extremists in the US have received a great deal of publicity outside the North American continent. This preoccupation with the American situation is readily understandable because of the concerns of Washington's allies which correctly regard the United States as the main factor in their own security.

The second reason is more of a personal nature. This observer, as a Canadian resident, finds himself in a better position to comment upon the developments in his country of residence.

Actually a third most valid reason might be added to justify this approach. As will be seen, in addition to the utilization of Canada as a refuge for young dissenters, there are two further factors which deserve our attention and which have no equivalent in the United States. One is the existence of a latent anti-Americanism which can and is channelized for various purposes. The second factor is provided by the activities of a left-oriented political party of appreciable size and influence, the New Democratic Party (NDP), which is an articulate opponent of Canada's own official defence policies and of all manifestations

of an alleged "US imperialism".

The Influence of Right-Wing Political Radicalism upon the Security Situation in Canada and the United States

As far as Canada is concerned, right-wing political radicalism is with the exception of miniscule groups, such as the Canadian Nazi Party with about a dozen members, non-existent. Also the danger of political developments influenced by a right-wing backlash is only a very remote possibility for Canada. The racial strife plaguing the United States and the severity of the physical confrontations instituted by white and black militant extremists have with very few exceptions no Canadian counterparts. The violent actions, including numerous bombing incidents, committed by extremists within the Quebec independence movement, have so far remained localized and have not resulted in a nation-wide backlash of "concerned citizens" demanding stronger and more authoritarian control measures.

The only observable reaction to left extremist activities on the university campuses is the emergence of small groups of conservative students who under no circumstances fall into the category of right-wing extremists. They are genuinely concerned with keeping the universities as institutions of learning and research and are attempting to prevent them from becoming academic breeding grounds for juvenile revolutionaries.

Quite in contrast to the Canadian situation, the existence of widespread right-wing extremist organizations can be observed in the United States. Some of these organizations, like the John Birch Society, led by the retired candy manufacturer Robert Welch, exercise considerable influence through the conservative wing in the Republican Party or more directly on the local level through their work in various civic committees and school boards.

Other right extremist organizations such as the Minutemen or the Rangers have a very pronounced military character. Their main concern, like the John Birchers, is the prevention of a take-over of the country by communists. According to these extremists, just about anybody who opposes their views might be classified as a "communist". Robert Welch, for example,

referred to President Eisenhower, to his brother Dr Milton Eisenhower, and to former Chief Justice of the US Supreme Court Earl Warren, as "communist agents".

Robert Welch strongly opposes a large American defence establishment because according to him, the enormous military budget is pure waste and only serves the purpose of enlarging the power of the leftish and communist-infiltrated Federal government. In his opinion Moscow would never attack the United States because the Soviet leaders are afraid that an external war would trigger off a revolutionary uprising within the Soviet Union. However, there is no indication or evidence which would indicate that either the John Birch Society or any of the militant groups have in any way attempted to influence young men to evade the draft or desert from the armed forces. They all consider themselves to be good American patriots and therefore would not consciously undertake anything which could increase the weakness of their "mismanaged" country. They generally support all the forces which are attempting to maintain law and order and have conducted a number of successful campaigns under such headings as "support your local police".

Within the domestic area the danger of these organizations rests in their capability to provide authoritarian and reactionary objectives to an increasing and nation-wide backlash movement.

As a result of their supernationalism, the right-wing extremist organizations also serve as a matrix for isolationist tendencies. It is difficult to assess to what extent some of the elected public officials who are expressing neutralist or neo-isolationist views are in fact influenced by these organizations. However, it is reasonable to conclude that a further increase in strength of the right extremists might be accompanied by stronger support for their views from an increasing number of elected officials.

The United States experiences at the present an "unholy alliance" or symbiosis consisting of left-liberal members of Congress, motivated by their "liberal" tradition, and arch-conservatives at least in part persuaded by the isolationist views of the right-wing extremists. Their common objective, prompted by entirely different reasons, is to remove the United

States from her international involvements.

### Left-Wing Political Radicalism and Security

#### A. Canada's Anti-War Establishment

The influence and significance of the hard core of the so-called peace and anti-war groups in Canada is negligible. If it were not for that part of the news media which strives for sensationalism and for left and anti-American oriented reporters and news analysts, the activities of these groups and committees would not even have reached the present nuisance value.

Some of the peace and anti-war groups and committees have close ties with the extremist "parties" of the left such as the miniscule Maoist Progressive Workers Movement, now the Canadian Communist Movement Marxism-Leninism. Also the Trotskyist Young Socialists and League for Socialist Action are active in the anti-war establishment. The Communist Party of Canada with a total membership of about 3,500 (and this includes the Communist Party of Quebec) attempts to capitalize on the "peace movement" by supplying propaganda objectives and by working to create a popular front based on the various "peace" issues.

However, most of the numerous peace groups and committees are the offshoots of, or are still aligned with, the New Left or are front organizations connected frequently with international organizations directed by Moscow, such as the World Council of Peace and the Women's International Democratic Federation with headquarters in East Berlin.

Not even the occasional participation of prominent members of the New Democratic Party and of local organizations of the New Democratic Youth have given any significant impetus to Canada's anti-war establishment.

In all probability, the most important negative influence upon Canada's security derives from the anti-military policies of the NDP at the national level and from the "agents of influence". At the NDP Convention held in Winnipeg in October 1969 the radical elements within the party succeeded in getting their foreign policy platform adopted. This platform includes the demand for total withdrawal from NATO, the condemnation of US actions

in Vietnam, the acceptance of Finland's proposal for a meeting of Warsaw Pact and NATO nations, the pulling out of the defence-sharing agreements with the US and the bomber defence system under the North American Air Defence Agreement (NORAD), assistance to the People's Republic of China in the field of peaceful economic development and the demand for total US withdrawal from Vietnam. The foreign affairs resolution also included an approval of the "liberation movements" in Latin America and a condemnation of the US for using the Organization of American States "as an instrument of domination in Latin America" <sup>1</sup>.

Prior to the October 1969 Convention of the NDP, a number of party members had published a statement "FOR AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST CANADA", which was printed and circulated by the NDP publication Canadian Dimension. Two paragraphs from this statement will suffice to convey the new NDP spirit.

The American empire is the central reality for Canadians. It is an empire characterized by militarism abroad and racism at home. Canadian resources and diplomacy have been enlisted in the support of that empire. In the barbarous war in Vietnam, Canada has supported the United States through its membership on the International Control Commission and through sales of arms and strategic resources to the American military-industrial complex.

The American empire is held together through worldwide military alliances and by giant monopoly corporations. Canada's membership in the American Alliance system and the ownership of the Canadian economy by American corporations precludes Canada's playing an independent role in the world. These bonds must be cut if corporate capitalism, and the social priorities it creates, is to be effectively challenged.

"Agents of influence" are frequently individuals who as a result of their professional standing, prestige, expertise or

1. Toronto Telegram, October 30, 1969

position have the possibility of influencing elected government officials and the policy-making process. The "expert adviser" is indeed not an institution of recent origin. Throughout known history many governments have actually been run by so-called "grey eminences". In the present age not only technical experts are consulted. Political and economic specialists often have the ear of the highest government officials and thereby find themselves in positions of being able to affect important policy decisions. It appears that a good number of these individuals, many of them belonging to the academic community, have, for example, been trying very hard to get Canada out of NATO and NORAD.

A more overt method of persuasion is used by some of the leading personalities of the news media. Their targets include not only the policy-makers but also the general public which might in turn exercise pressures upon the elected officials. One recent example of this type of manipulation of influence was a lecture given by Norman DePoe, an influential news analyst of the government-supported CBC news service to a teachers' convention in Calgary. Mr DePoe questioned the wisdom of Canada's further participation in NATO and NORAD. The Albertan of February 27, 1970, reported his comments as follows:

The NATO alliance was formed in 1949 when a monolithic communist power existed whose satellites were unquestioningly loyal.

But the communist bloc is breaking up now, and there is no more point in "holding the hand of West Germany", he said.

Canada joined NORAD in 1957 in "a blind fit of enthusiasm", and despite a 40 per cent cutback by the United States, has retained its original involvement.

The US has now spent \$40 billion on anti-ballistic missiles, said Mr DePoe, and plans to upgrade its nuclear strike capability to 9,600,000 nuclear warheads by 1973.

He said it was "absolute lunacy" for Canada to tie itself to a power that continued to escalate its nuclear capability.

Canada should consider getting out of both NATO and NORAD and devoting itself to the United Nations, "not just in peace-keeping, but in peace-making".....

The propaganda character of Mr DePoe's statement is quite evident.

He deliberately uses factually incorrect information in order to give justification for his emotional anti-American and anti-Western Alliance appeal.

In spite of the great efforts exerted by the anti-military alliance lobby, they could register only a partial success. But neither the recommendations made by Parliamentary committees and the Ministers in charge of defence and foreign affairs were adopted. The Prime Minister decided in April 1969 to cut Canada's military forces stationed in Europe by half and to eliminate gradually Canada's participation in any nuclear weapons systems.

This observation might indicate that as far as Canada is concerned, political radicalism's only effective method of influencing Ottawa's security policies is to infiltrate the ranks of the "agents of influence". The question if or to what extent this has been accomplished is one of dispute.

As indicated before, the far more dramatic and articulate activities of the groups and committees of the anti-war establishment and of the "parties" of the extreme left are only of nuisance value at the present time. Surprisingly enough, not even their highly publicized support of US draft dodgers and deserters seem to have much significance. A discussion of the activities of a selected number of these organizations will have to suffice to verify and substantiate this assertion.

Perhaps the best example for this study of the activities of front organizations can be provided by an evaluation of the largest of these organizations in Canada, the Voice of Women (VOW). The VOW was founded in 1960 by a number of women who were deeply concerned about certain controversial issues all involving the problem of "peace". The first president, Mrs Jo Davis, quit the organization because of the fact that, according to her, extremists had moved in and seized control of the VOW.

"A machine-like juggernaut moved in and the Voice of Women was taken over by really hard-liners", she recalls. "It was rather horrifying to see and frightening to experience" 2.

After Mrs. Davis' resignation, VOW membership dropped from nearly 10,000 to less than 2,000 members. Figures are very difficult to obtain and vary considerably. The Toronto Globe and Mail (October 7, 1969) reported the present membership at about 2,000.

The VOW maintains close relations with extreme leftist "peace" organizations throughout the world and VOW delegates have participated in congresses and conventions of such organizations as the Women's Strike for Peace (US), the NATO Women's Peace Force, and communist-dominated peace congresses from Helsinki to East Berlin. Views expressed and actions initiated by both of the VOW presidents who followed Mrs. Davis, Mrs. Kathleen Macpherson (1963-1967) and Mrs. Muriel Duckworth (1967-present), give ample proof for the extreme leftist character of the VOW.

VOW's main campaigns can be divided into two categories. There are those designed to gain influence and respectability in order to broaden the support basis, such as the VOW campaign against the sale of war toys, the support of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (though it should be noted that the petition papers circulated by the VOW only cited the text of the Soviet proposal) and most recently the demand for pollution control measures 3. The second type of activities are very much the same as those of other left extremist organizations and therefore collaboration in specific actions is the rule, regardless of who happens to be the main sponsor of the event.

Some of the most important stands and actions taken and propagandized by the VOW are:

- 
2. Peter Worthington, "Anti-War Moral Dilemma," Toronto Telegram, February 6, 1968
  3. The Albertan, March 20, 1970

- (1) Canadian withdrawal from NATO and NORAD 4.
- (2) US immediate withdrawal from Vietnam 5.
- (3) Canada's recognition of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam 6.
- (4) Stopping the sale of arms and strategic materials to the United States 7.
- (5) Canadian recognition of the People's Republic of China and Canadian support for admitting Peking to the United Nations 8.
- (6) Opposition to Canada joining the "American-dominated" Organization of American States 9.

In support of these demands the VOW has sent position papers, resolutions and protest notes to government officials and has disseminated their views through press conferences and news media coverage of their annual conventions.

The VOW has been directly involved in most of the anti-Vietnam demonstrations protesting against "US imperialism and aggression in Vietnam" and "Canada's complicity".

One VOW resolution adopted by their 1969 annual convention not only demands unconditional US withdrawal of all troops from Vietnam and elimination of all bases, but also that the US authorities should have to make reparations for all damage caused to Vietnam "during the period of their illegal and

- 
4. Cf. Voice of Women, Why Canada Should Withdraw from NORAD, Victoria, B.C., December 1967; 14 pp. and Voice of Women Statement on Some Aspects of Canada's Foreign and Defence Policies, presented to Secretary of State for External Affairs Mitchell Sharp, Toronto, February 19, 1969; 23 pp.
  5. Calgary Herald, Oct. 26, 1965; Ottawa Citizen, Oct. 4, 1969
  6. Globe and Mail, Oct. 7, 1969
  7. Ibid.
  8. Calgary Herald, Oct. 26, 1965
  9. Ottawa Citizen, Sept. 11, 1968

immoral occupation" 10.

The VOW has also led, or participated in, various anti-military demonstrations and vigils such as those directed against the chemical and biological warfare research conducted at Suffield Experimental Station in Alberta and at the Shirley Bay Defence Establishment in Ontario 11.

And last but not least the VOW takes an active part in the support of US draft dodgers and deserters. Mrs J. M. C. Duckworth, national president, declared that "the VOW is helping to find jobs for them and we hope to make them productive citizens if they become Canadians" 12.

The Canadian anti-war establishment originates from several sources. The oldest organizations of the "peace movement" go back to the period following the end of World War II. They are the direct product of the communist-sponsored Peace Congress in Paris of 1949 which laid the basis for the utilization of the wide-spread and strong sentiments throughout the world against war and nuclear weapons. This was during the time before the Soviet Union became a nuclear power. The Canadian Peace Congress founded in 1949 by Dr James Endicott, who remained as its chairman until the present day, is still active and faithfully affiliated to the communist-controlled World Council of Peace. Dr Endicott admitted that about one third of the members of the Canadian Peace Council are professed Communists 13.

Other organizations founded by the communists were the Toronto Peace Council and the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Prior to the American involvement in Vietnam, the so-called

---

10. The Edmonton Journal, Oct. 10, 1969; The Calgary Herald, Nov. 15, 1969

11. e.g. The Calgary Herald, Sept. 9, 1968

12. The Calgary Herald, Oct. 17, 1967

13. The Calgary Herald, May 5, 1967

peace movement had lost most of its appeal and it was not before the 1960s that a new impetus became evident as a result of the war in Vietnam. As pointed out before, most of the present anti-war groups and committees are the products of the New Left or the creation of left-wing intellectuals, except for the small groups comprised of Maoists or Trotskyists. All over Canada, especially in Toronto and in the other bigger cities, numerous committees emerged with the purpose of mobilizing the youth, primarily on the university campuses, against the "establishment". The "war in Vietnam" and "Canadian complicity" served as most useful issues for actions and the manipulation of confrontations. Within a couple of years every city and most universities had their own "End the War in Vietnam" committees under various headings or names. The now defunct Canadian Union of Students (CUS), a federation founded as early as 1926 of about 40 campus unions with a secretariat in Ottawa, was taken over in 1967 by left-wing extremists who had just succeeded in breaking up the Student Union for Peace Actions (SUPA). CUS officials attempted to co-ordinate, in addition to various "anti-establishment" actions, militant anti-Vietnam demonstrations and other types of anti-war actions on the campuses throughout Canada. But CUS lost its chance to revolutionize Canada when in 1969 several student unions of major universities voted to quit the radical organization. The financial loss of these withdrawals forced the student extremists out of business at least for the time being.

The life spans of the groups and committees of the anti-war establishment vary considerably. Some of them have been in operation for several years, while others are created with the purpose of organizing one specific action, such as a particular anti-Vietnam demonstration. In general, two categories of activities can be clearly distinguished: (1) Anti-US and pro-left propaganda and (2) a variety of direct actions.

As far as the left extremist propaganda is concerned, the main issues run quite parallel to those discussed for the Voice of Women. Two interesting points deserve to be mentioned. The Canadian University Press served as a kind of centralized student propaganda enterprise and furnished campus newspapers with material. The second point of interest is that much of the literature and flyers for the End the War in Vietnam com-

mittees are printed by the Communist Party 14.

Assistance to the anti-war movement is a matter of communist self-interest and is extended not only to those organizations which from the very beginning are Moscow-oriented. For example, the Canadian Tribune, the official organ of the Canadian Communist Party dealt in its issue of December 5, 1960, in great detail with the Combined Universities Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CUCND). The article praised the objectives and the work of the CUCND which, according to the report, was able to spread in one year from Montreal to fourteen additional campuses and as far west as the University of Alberta in Edmonton. The Tribune appealed to its readers to help in financing the good work of CUCND aimed at keeping Canada out of NORAD and keeping nuclear weapons out of Canada.

The direct actions of the anti-war activists are of several kinds. The most popular activity up to the present day are the periodic anti-Vietnam demonstrations, with anti-military actions such as protest marches at the time of the American underground nuclear testing on Amchitke Island in the Aleutians or the prevention of on-campus recruitment by "war companies" running a close second.

Left extremists have indeed succeeded on several occasions on a number of campuses in preventing job interviews by representatives of Dow Chemical Corporation, Canada's producer of napalm or of Hawker Siddeley Aircraft Co. 15. Examples of other anti-military actions are the condemnation of military research, the blacklisting of any organization, such as the Defence Research Board, which provided money for this type of research 16.

Some of these committees, especially those which enjoy the active support of members of the clergy, direct their main activity towards inducing American youth to evade the draft and

---

14. Peter Worthington, "What the anti-war movement is all about", Toronto Telegram, Jan. 27, 1968

15. The Calgary Herald, Dec. 11, 1968; "Campus Canada", Campus, Vol. 1, No. 3, Toronto, January 1969, pp. 10-11

16. Globe and Mail, Sept. 4, 1968

to support American draft dodgers and deserters in Canada. For example, in 1968 a twelve-page pamphlet advocating the firebombing of US Selective Service offices and describing ways and means of terrorizing individuals involved in the US draft were prepared in Toronto and mailed to New Left and anti-war groups in the United States. Another seventy-seven-page booklet explaining the various methods of how US citizens could dodge the draft was also mailed to US centres 17.

The Canadian Council of Churches openly supports draft resisters and military deserters from the United States and believes that this is in keeping with the tradition of welcoming "immigrants escaping oppressive military service" 18. Officials of the Canadian Council of Churches have established liaison with the National Council of Churches and the inter-denominational Clergy and Layman Concerned about Vietnam in the US in order to obtain additional funds 19.

The actual work is carried out by small committees which exist in virtually every Canadian city under such names as Committee to Aid American War Objectors (Vancouver), Montreal Council to Aid War Resisters, Saskatoon Committee to Aid American Deserters, or the Calgary Committee on War Immigrants.

In addition there are a number of American organizations in Canada which have the purpose of organizing and utilizing the exiles for revolutionary activities. Among these organizations is the American Deserters Committee, founded in December 1968. Its members published a "manifesto" in which they declare their support and solidarity with the National Front of Liberation in South Vietnam and their opposition to "US imperialism". The Union of American Exiles was formed in Toronto with the same mission. Some of its activist members founded the Front of Independent Revolutionaries, claiming a membership of about 200. In July 1969 a Peking-oriented Vancouver American

---

17. Globe and Mail, Mar. 9, 1968

18. Montreal Star, Dec. 4, 1969

19. Montreal Star, Dec. 10, 1969

Deserters Committee was created which developed a "Five-point programme for the duration of the mass movement of deserters into Canada" 20.

Our discussion of the Canadian anti-war establishment has shown the great variety of its groups and organizations, but it also has indicated their numerical weakness, "ideological" diversity and lack of any substantial impact. The anti-war establishment has, as asserted before, at best a nuisance value. The encouragement it provides to potential draft evaders or deserters might probably be of some concern to the US authorities. However, through its very existence it is of considerable propaganda value to the opponents of the NATO countries.

#### B. The Anti-War Movement in the United States

The anti-war movement in the United States presents, quite similar to the anti-war establishment in Canada, a composite picture comprised of elements of the New Left, of the parties and movements of the extreme left and of various front organizations. The great difference in the situations existing in these two countries is primarily the result of at least seven factors:

- (1) America's direct involvement in the Vietnam war.
- (2) The need for a large military establishment as a result of the world-wide commitments of the US.
- (3) The reliance on a military draft in order to maintain the required size of the armed forces.
- (4) The marked aggravation of the domestic situation resulting from the deep-seated racial tensions and from America's tradition of violence.
- (5) The fact that the United States as the leading power of the "Free World" has been for a long time the main target of Soviet, respectively communist, propaganda and subversion.
- (6) The greater experience of the American anti-war movement in the struggle against the "establishment", especially against the military and police, than their Canadian counterparts as a result of their longer existence.

---

20. New York Times, Jan. 31, 1969; Yankee Refugee, Vancouver, July 1969

- (7) And finally the substantial legal and financial assistance the alleged "dissenters" receive from a fairly large and influential group of confused "libertarians" who consistently misinterpret subversion as legitimate dissent.

An examination of those Americans who give expression to their anti-Vietnam War attitude reveals that by far the great majority of them - some might even advocate a total American troop withdrawal from South-East Asia - are not part of the hard core anti-war movement. They rely rather on established constitutional methods in order to pursue their opposition to the policies of the Administration in Washington.

It is beyond the scope of this study to evaluate their motives and to pass judgment upon the validity of their position. However, it can be asserted with great confidence that they are entirely in support of the American constitutional system and its institutions. We might consider their oppositional attitude to a specific foreign policy implementation, i. e. the war in Vietnam, as a clear case for dissent.

This judgment does not apply to the ideological positions and actions of the numerous organizations and committees of the extreme left which have as their primary objective the destruction of our society and institutions. They utilize the "peace issue", as they might use any other issue, as a means towards their final goal.

The number of these organizations, their numerical strength as well as their scope of activities exceeds on a percentage basis those of the Canadian anti-war establishment for the reasons stated before. Also, in the United States, these organized activists constitute only a very small, though highly articulate and dedicated hard core of revolutionaries. Just to cite one example, the most publicized radical student organization, the Marxist-revolutionary Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), claimed in July 1969 a membership of 70,000 out of a total of 6.7 million students in the United States. It also asserted that it had active units at 350 of the 2,200 American universities and colleges. There is good reason to believe that as a result of internal strife and the perpetual diversion of revolutionary talents to other organizations and committees these

figures are highly exaggerated. According to FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover, many of the sabotage incidents can be linked with the SDS. At the national convention at Michigan State University in 1968 a workshop on sabotage and explosives was conducted. "It was only a short time after this convention," he declared, "that the wave of bombing and arson occurred throughout the country" 21.

As in Canada, practically every city and university in the United States has several competing committees and action groups comprised of radicals, left-oriented intellectuals, professionals, clergymen and pacifists.

The only difference might be that in the US the high schools have also become centres of anti-war activities. The plurality of organizations and groups does not prevent them from combining their efforts for specific actions, such as anti-Vietnam demonstrations which in the past have been successfully co-ordinated by the Vietnam Moratorium Committee. As a rule anti-war activists are able to mobilize a large following of opponents to the war in Vietnam, even though the "masses" are not interested in the revolutionary objectives of the organizers. Richard H. Sanger, a recognized authority on causes and patterns of political violence, estimated that of the approximately 50,000 protesters on the occasion of the anti-war invasion of the Pentagon on October 21, 1967, about 40,000 were pacifists and opponents to the war in Vietnam, about 9,500 were "hippies" and "flower children" and the group of activists, comprised of left extremists and communists which managed the entire "protest programme", was only about 200 strong 22.

Mr Sanger also believes that no more than 2 or 3 per cent of the anti-war movement are dedicated revolutionaries who are determined to destroy our society 23.

The left extremist parties such as the Communist Party, USA

---

21. The Calgary Herald, March 19, 1969

22. US News & World Report, Dec. 25, 1967, p. 34

23. Ibid, p. 37

with about 13,000 members and the Maoist Progressive Labour Party with a total membership of about 1,000 consider the racial and anti-war ferment as the best opportunity which has presented itself to the cause of the revolution since the depression years of the 1930s. It might be taken for granted that these revolutionary parties have realized that the chances for a social revolution in the United States do not exist within the foreseeable future; however, a series of insurrections against the "establishment" is considered within the realms of possibility. Insurrections would serve at least a twofold purpose. They could substantially weaken the American defensive position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union and they would escalate the revolutionary situation in the country at large. J. Edgar Hoover reported that communists have indeed succeeded in infiltrating some of the most active anti-war organizations and are thereby able to expand the party's influence. He cited as an example Arnold Johnson, public relations director of the Communist Party, who also became a member of the executive committee of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam. Besides Johnson there are a number of other members of the New Mobilization steering committee who are or have been affiliated with old-line communist groups. The international character of the communist movement also facilitates the co-ordination of activities as was shown when the November 15, 1969, demonstrations, sponsored by the New Mobilization, were accompanied on the same day by anti-US demonstrations in other countries throughout the world 24.

In addition to the types of activities already discussed under the anti-war establishment in Canada, the United States anti-war movement has organized anti-draft demonstrations, usually accompanied by draft card burning "ceremonies", as well as bombing and setting fire to Selective Service offices.

A relatively new method of attempting to subvert the US military is the so-called "coffee-house movement". Probably the first coffee-house, the UPO, was organized in 1967 near Fort Jackson in South Carolina.

---

24. The Daily Herald, January 3, 1970

Usually they are managed by a "coffee-house collective", which consists of about a dozen young people, including some soldiers, activists and girls. Their anti-war propaganda is primarily carried on by disseminating underground newspapers and by personal discussions. It also seems that this method employed to subvert the military has had little or no success. For example, of the approximately 30,000 soldiers stationed at Fort Dix, 21 are known by the command to be "dissenters". There are possibly twice as many additional "dissenters" who have not been found out <sup>25</sup>.

The anti-Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) campaigns on the campuses have caused some concern to the government because the military establishment obtains a very high percentage of its officers from the ROTC programme. In 1969, for example, 52 per cent of the Army's new officers, 36 per cent of the Air Force's, 10 per cent of the Navy's and 5 per cent of the Marine Corps' came from the university campuses. About one third of the 148,394 Army officers on active duty in March 1969 were ROTC graduates.

However, in spite of the demands for abolition of the ROTC and the actual withdrawal of academic credits accorded to ROTC courses (Harvard, Yale and Princeton had already done so in early 1969) the number of students interested in getting ROTC commissions has increased. In June 1969 an estimated 25,000 college graduates received their commissions as compared to 22,426 in 1968 and 17,896 in 1967 <sup>26</sup>.

The isolated incidents in which militant anti-Vietnam war groups have actually succeeded in interfering with rail shipments of Vietnam-bound material <sup>27</sup> indicate that these revolutionaries do not hesitate to use physical violence in pursuit of their objectives. This is indeed a considerable difference when compared with the "peaceful" Canadian demonstrations against the shipment of war material to the United States.

---

25. Stewart Alsop, "The Coffee-house", Newsweek, March 16, 1970

26. The National Observer, March 17, 1969

27. The Calgary Herald, March 19, 1969

The main question still remains to be answered and this is the question to what extent the anti-war and anti-draft movements have succeeded in reaching their objective, the impairment of the security position of the United States by lowering the morale of the fighting forces. This goal the anti-war radicals are attempting to achieve as a result of the impact of draft evasions, deserting and through the various anti-war demonstrations and other anti-war actions.

The morale of the soldiers employed in Vietnam, according to many on-the-spot observers, has not been affected. Even the high incident rate of draft evaders and deserters, as reported by the Defence Department, are, when compared with comparative figures for the Korean War or World War II, not as exorbitant as they appear at first sight.

Precise and consistent statistics about the desertion rate are not easy to come by, but the material collected does provide us with enough facts to permit a number of observations. It must be kept in mind that the Army defines desertion as unauthorized absence of more than thirty days with the intent to stay away permanently. A deserter is, after thirty days, dropped from his unit roll.

Table I lists the Defence Department's figures for the desertion rate for the different services from the fiscal years 1967, 1968 and 1969. (A fiscal year begins on July 1 of the preceding year and ends on June 30; e.g. fiscal year 1967 covers the period from July 1, 1966, until June 30, 1967. The figures with an asterisk are the numbers of deserters given in a Report of the Committee on Armed Services of the US Senate. The figure marked with two asterisks is a New York Times estimate).

TABLE I 28

Desertion rate per 1,000

Fiscal Year	1967	1968	1969
Army	21.4 26,782*	29.1 39,239*	42.4 74,000**
Marines	26.8 6,654*	22.4 8,104*	40.2
Air Force	0.42 375*	0.44 393*	0.63
Navy	9.7 6,416*	8.5 5,621*	7.3
Total	40,227*	53,357*	

Table II contains World War II desertion rates for the Army (the Air Force was then part of the Army) for the years 1944 and 1945.

TABLE II 29

Desertion rate per 1,000

Fiscal Year	Army/Air Force
1944	63
1945	45.2

By way of comparison, the Army desertion rate per thousand was 22.5 for the peak year in the Korean War 30.

The desertion rates of the Army and the Marines have almost doubled from 1967 to 1969, but they are still less than the figure for 1945 and considerably lower than the desertion rate in 1944. The increase in the desertion rate is probably the result of at least three factors. First of all the effect of the anti-military propaganda of the anti-war movement and secondly the increasing disillusionment among soldiers of fighting a

28. Evening Star, Jan. 1, 1970. Report of the Committee on Armed Service, United States Senate, Report No. 91-93, Washington, US Government Printing Office, 1969, p. 24. (hereafter cited as Senate Report)

29. Evening Star, Jan. 1, 1970

30. Ibid.

"limited war" which has the tendency to drag on. Americans usually like to get unpleasant things over and done with. A third factor is the very mild treatment deserters experience on their return. This is the definite opinion of the US Senate Committee on Armed Services.

The possibility for deserters to find refuge in Canada, Sweden or Mexico or to go underground in Germany apparently plays only a very minor role. The Defence Department reported that since July 1, 1966, 1,403 soldiers have crossed international boundaries to desert in foreign countries. The Pentagon claims that only in 107 cases was there clear-cut evidence that the desertion was a protest against the war in Vietnam. Of the deserters abroad 371 have returned. 468 deserters were alien members of the US armed forces who deserted to their native countries. 349 were in serious financial trouble or had other personal problems. As of December 18, 1969, the Pentagon listed 576 American deserters in Canada, 88 in Mexico and 85 in Sweden 31.

Figures of deserters supplied by members of the Canadian anti-war establishment are considerably higher (e.g. William Spira, a Toronto business dedicated to assist American draft dodgers and deserters, estimates that there are about 60,000 draft-age Americans in Canada, among them 3,500 deserters 32), but they might for propaganda reasons also include a good number of draft evaders. The number of draft dodgers reported by the Administrative Office of US Courts are for 1966 - 516, for 1967 - 996 and for 1968 - 1,192. These figures are considerably lower than the violators of the draft laws given for 1945 at 4,287 33.

Conclusions

In the opinion of this observer the activities of the political radicals of the North American anti-war movement have been

31. Evening Star, Jan. 1, 1970

32. Maclean's Magazine, October 1969

33. Senate Report, p. 29

of some consequence to the security situation. Indications in support of this finding are the dramatic increase in the US Army desertion rate, the growing influence of communists among the discontented people by means of the popular "peace" issue and the consistent utilization of reports of civil disobedience and disorder by the communist propaganda apparatus. To what extent the noticeable passive resistance among a growing number of soldiers can be directly linked to the activities of the left radicals is difficult to ascertain because there are other factors, such as the very nature of the Vietnam war, which may be the cause of it.

Left-wing activists have been able to make effective use of popular front tactics and thereby have established important precedents for future applications to other issues. As a matter of fact, the ground-work for the post-Vietnam war period, or the next phase of the "anti-imperialist fight", has already been prepared. The next great issue will be the "liberation of Latin America" from "American imperialist aggression". A number of committees and conferences such as the Third World Information Service in Canada, which works closely with the Tri-Continental Information Centre in New York, the Latin American Working Group and the Fair Play for Cuba committees have been created precisely for the purpose of continuing and intensifying the struggle against the United States as the most important obstacle to the revolutionary objectives of the left extremists of all shades. (Cf. also the positions on Latin America taken by the Voice of Women and by the left wing of the New Democratic Party).

At the very conclusion of this paper this author wishes to point out that the developments analysed and evaluated in this study received important though unintentional support from the permissive attitude of government officials, political party leaders and the "silent majority". Repeatedly one is cautioned not to over-react to provocations from the radical left and thereby a psychological climate marked by insecurity was created among the population and especially among the members of the agencies charged with maintaining order and tranquillity in our society. The left extremists almost enjoyed a privileged position of immunity from the legal limitations placed upon every other element of our society.

Not only is this permissive attitude of great assistance to the left extremists, who are out to destroy our values and institutions, it is also largely responsible for the individual cases of over-reaction committed, for example, by police officers or soldiers who have been the targets of prolonged and systematic provocations and who also feel the lack of support from the society they are pledged to serve and defend.

RIGHT & LEFT-WING RADICALISM  
AND SECURITY IN THE UNITED STATES

by Nils-Eric Brodin\*

Part I: The Right Wing

The radical and extreme right-wing movements in the United States today are not faring well. At the same time as there is a gradual move towards greater conservatism by the voting public, right-wing radicals feel increasingly alienated from the society in which they live. Political life under Nixon appears to be characterized by the same "government by consensus" after which his predecessor strove. The extreme right-wingers do not have any consistent policy in regard to defence policy. Some who look back wistfully to the good old days before Franklin Roosevelt would do away with the income tax, "the root of all evil" as Frank Chodorov put it. Without tax revenues the government would have to undertake a massive reduction in its military budget. Some of the right-wing libertarians are both anti-military, anti-draft, anti-defence. Yet these opinions have not had any impact to speak of on American defence programmes. American military and defence policy is formed from opinions drawn from both wings, of both parties, by such people as Senators Henry Jackson, Russell, Goldwater and Gov. Rockefeller. On the whole, US defence policy has been dictated by three basic factors, which, for the most part, are beyond the left-right dichotomy of politics: (a) technological change (b) strategic moves by the USSR and (c) budgetary limitations.

We cannot therefore legitimately speak of the Radical Right Wing as having any major impact on the programmes and policies of the two major parties. The reappearance of George Wallace as a candidate on an independent ticket might have an electoral impact on the Republicans, but it is extremely doubtful that the Republicans would undergo any metamorphosis as a result of this threat. Nixon's alleged "Southern Strategy" does not carry with it any appeal to those segments of the population of the southern states which would threaten American security.

The right-wing radicalism which might be mentioned in this context is therefore to be found almost wholly outside the

\*Political scientist, currently studying at the Institut  
Universitaire de Hautes Etudes Internationales in Geneva

partisan structure of American politics. As such these extremists have already alienated themselves and, being even more than the Extreme Left subject to fragmentation, have no real power base (as the Left does in Berkeley and New York, the Colleges and the Negro slums, for example) from which they could launch a successful offensive against American security or its defence capabilities.

In different degrees there are a number of organizations which might be mentioned as carrying within themselves the potential for violence towards other persons and towards the government.

JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY. There has not been a great deal of mention in the American press about the John Birch Society in the last year or so. The radical content of The Blue Book and the Black Book by JBS founder, Robert Welch, has long ago been dismissed from the press pundits' conception of "good copy". The John Birch Society programme, although the almost suffocatingly pervasive conviction about the omnipresence of the "International Communist Conspiracy" is there, does not call for the violent overthrow of the "communist-ridden government in Washington". Nor does the Blue Book call for the assassination of the President or the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, although it calls for their impeachments. Welch, in other words, agrees to work within the political order of the United States, which he insistently regards as "a Republic, not a Democracy". Mr. Welch and others in the JBS have advocated a withdrawal from all commitment in South-East Asia, the same demands so shrilly made by the extreme left, but of course for different reasons. Welch sees the Vietnam crisis primarily manufactured to embroil "Fortress America" in an unwanted war abroad. The war between the North and the South in Vietnam is not between communists and non-communists, but between two groups of communists which keep up this "phony" war to delude the United States, to bleed it dry of its young men's blood and dissipate its financial resources. If the membership of the JBS was large enough, there might be reasons for thinking that it could contribute to the weakening of US military preparedness. But not even all of the JBS members agree with Welch's views. Several leaders have resigned in disagreement, in no small part due to this issue.

**LIBERTY LOBBY.** This group and several hundred very much like it are anti-communist, "patriotic" groups, which, although they may siphon off funds which would otherwise go to the political parties, have been content in the past to encourage Veterans' Day parades and bake cookies for "our brave boys in Vietnam" rather than demanding "bring our boys home". Two weeks ago 50,000 of this "silent majority" from "Middle America" marched up Pennsylvania Avenue for a rally at the Washington Monument. In contrast to so many of the other rallies about Vietnam in that city, this time the banners and placards read: "Victory in Vietnam". With Bible reading and militant Christian hymns such as "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" and "Onward, Christian Soldiers" the march took on the flavour of a sacred cause. Dr. Carl McIntire, the leader of the march, and a right-wing, fundamentalist minister from New Jersey, called it a Holy Crusade..... This may be the great turning-point in the world-wide crusade against communism" <sup>1</sup>. It is difficult to see how this kind of right-wing extremism can be seen as a threat to American security. That it was right-wing, about that there can be no doubt, attested, if by no other means than the fact that the march was sponsored by Sen. Strom Thurmond (R., S. C.), Representative L. Mendel Rivers (D., S. C.) chairman of the House Armed Services Committee Governor Lester Maddox and former Governor George C. Wallace.

To speak of right-wing extremism in America, we would have to turn to other groups than these two mentioned, if by right-wing extremism we mean a movement which embodies principles directly threatening the order and security of the United States. All the sins attributed to the Extreme Right may in fact not belong there.

Fascism, for example, has been characterized as a "right-wing" movement, as has nazism. Yet both of these movements found their provenance among socialist, rather than conservative groups. Although Hitler's ideas have been characterized as "right-wing aberrations" they were, after all, more socialist than nationalist. Nor is "racism" a characteristic to which the "right" has exclusive title -- you need read only a few pages of some of the Black Power advocates to become conscious of their "racism" and no one would presume to doubt the

---

1. International Herald Tribune. (Paris) Apr. 6, 1970, p.1.

authenticity of their left-wing label. To discuss right-wing extremism in America, we would therefore have to apply criteria other than the neat categorizations to which we have become accustomed. For the purpose of my remarks, I shall regard as radical or extreme those groups or organizations in the United States, which in their programmes, and by their actions, advocate acts of violence, against people, or against the state, thus constituting very real threats against American security.

**KU KLUX KLAN.** One of the oldest racist, nationalist and religiously bigoted groups in the United States, which for the past century have fomented unlawful acts in the name of their hatred for "Kikes, Koons and Kommunists". KKK started around 1865, as a reaction to the enfranchisement of the southern Negro by the Reconstruction Period's "Carpet Bag" Government. At times KKK held sway over large parts of the Deep South, burning crosses outside victims' homes, lynching Negroes, harassing (or worse) the "Jew Nigger-lover" and lamenting the take-over of the American government by "International Capitalism".

There have been waves of activity from time to time, notably during the 1920s when large mass migration into the United States stimulated KKK's Xenophobia. The latest wave of activity came in 1964-65 in segregationist reaction to the newly passed Civil Rights Acts. KKK membership is drawn primarily from the economically depressed areas, among the so-called "poor white trash", to use a commonly applied term. Activities during 1967 and 1968 were found to be centred in Mississippi, around the towns of Jackson and Meridian. There Negro and Jewish communities suffered seventeen burnings and bombings, but no loss of life. In the autumn of 1967 the home of a rabbi and a synagogue in Jackson were bombed. In May the following year a synagogue in Meridian was bombed. In 1968 law enforcement officials in Mississippi said that the "White Knights" were suspected of having committed nine murders and 300 other violent acts, including bombings, burnings and beatings. Unable to solve this pattern of violence, the FBI finally felt constrained to bribe the Klansmen for \$ 36,500 to set up a trap for their unaware fellow-klansmen; the result was the death of one klanswoman, the wounding of another and a thirty-year jail term. But "the reign of terror ended after the shooting, and there has been hardly any violence in Mississippi since. The

White Knights have virtually disbanded" <sup>2</sup>. Nation-wide, KKK can probably not count more than 40,000-65,000 members. A recent book reported: "The present United Klans are a sorry vestige of the first and second Klans. They are fighting a losing battle against the advance of Southern urbanism and industrialization as well as against the progress of the Negro people" <sup>3</sup>. It does not appear that American security has much to fear from the KKK in the future.

THE NATIONAL STATES RIGHTS PARTY and WHITE CITIZENS' COUNCILS are both southern-based, segregationist groups. They have some local appeal in the south with their anti-Negro sentiments, but efforts to set up chapters among the frightened whites in the North and West have not yielded any measurable result. I recall a group known as the Citizens' Council meeting in a Berkeley Hotel, but after being continually infiltrated by left-wingers from UC (having shaved and put on a suit for the occasion) they finally gave up trying to hold public meetings.

CHRISTIAN DEFENCE LEAGUE and AMERICAN NAZI PARTY might be mentioned as specifically anti-semitic groups, which have been known to advocate violence in the pursuit of their aims. The latter is reputed to have no more than a dozen members. One "Captain" came to speak at the University of California in 1965, only to be howled down by the hostile audience who didn't like to be bored by the Captain's lecture on the relativity of cranial capacities. Since the assassination of Nazi leader, "Commander" Rockwell, by one of his former lieutenants, American Nazi Party activities have failed to create any stir in the press.

Threats about which we might speak in terms of the subject of this conference might be posed most seriously by several para-military groups in the United States. Three of these groups are (f) the Rangers, (g) Paul Revers Associated Yeomen (PRAY), but chiefly (h) the Minutemen. Of the activities of the first two groups, there is little to be said. They are informal groups

---

2. Ibid., March 14-15, p. 3

3. David Annam. "Ku Klux Klan". Secret Societies. Norman MacKenzie (ed.), (Aldus Books, London, 1967), pp. 266-298

meeting in members' homes or to be found on a week-end at a firing range practising the handling of their rifles. PRAY warns that unless all Americans stock up on firearms and lots of ammunition "your wives and daughters will be chattels in Mongolian and African brothels" <sup>4</sup>. Their weekdays are spent getting their friends, working companions and neighbours to sign petitions distributed by the National Rifle Association declaring "registration of firearms" to be "unconstitutional".

The MINUTEMEN is by far the largest of these three organizations. Conceived, it is alleged, during a duck hunt in 1960, the organization with perhaps as many as 25,000 members is led by Robert Bolivar de Pugh of Missouri. They are preparing for the day when the communists will attempt a take-over (an event expected by 1973) by practising guerrilla manoeuvres against the enemy. The Minutemen recruitment booklet informs the prospective member that "when murdering communist bands come roaming through your community, they must find a vigorous and well-armed civilian population" <sup>5</sup>.

Nor have I found that the MILITARY has played any significant role in right-wing extremism in America, to the degree that it would pose a security threat. It is true that the names of retired military officers are often found as "figureheads" or "advisers" to various patriotic and anti-communist groups, but that is far from assigning to them the role of the plotting military in a Seven Days in May scenario. General Curtis Le May (Ret., USAF) was prevailed on to join George C. Wallace on his independent ticket in 1968. The American Security Council, a highly responsible body of people and organizations concerned with an effective defence, has a number of retired officers as advisers. (Of 49 members listed on their National Strategy Committee, 21 are retired military men, 11 can be identified as academicians, and there is a sprinkling of "honourables") <sup>6</sup>. General Walker, although to many minds he has served as a bogeyman on the right, has not been able to live up to the expectations

---

4. Carl Bakal. The Right to Bear Arms. (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1966), p. 106

5. Ibid.

6. Washington Report. (American Security Council, Washington, D. C.)

of leadership people assigned to him. His almost total inability to communicate his thoughts clearly has rendered his ideas, however extreme, ineffectual.

S. E. Finer in his book, The Man on Horseback: The Role of the Military Man in Politics, makes no mention of the United States at all <sup>7</sup>, and Samuel P. Huntington's Changing Patterns of Military Politics is primarily concerned with the lobbying activities of the National Guards Association <sup>8</sup>. The military man in politics has always been suspect in the United States; only a few of the American Presidents have been military men (notably U.S. Grant and "Ike" Eisenhower.)

Although violence has been characterized as "as American as cherry pie", it is seldom a violence which has been used for political ends. Fascist parties have never been represented in the American Congress (nor for that matter have communistic ones). Occasionally a Huey Long or a Father Coughlin would arise and with the talents peculiar to demagogy succeed in developing a large following for a period of time. Occasionally such persons have also been seated in the US Congress. The nearest thing the United States has had to a violence-prone mass political movement was the CHRISTIAN FRONT followers of Father Coughlin. Seventeen members were arrested in New York while allegedly plotting to assassinate the congressmen and dynamite several buildings, in order to accomplish the overthrow of the government <sup>9</sup>. During the war years local nazis and fascists had their groups, the Silvershirts, Fritz Kuhn's Volks Bund and , at certain times and under certain conditions, a Gerald L.K. Smith could rally members to his National Christian Party or Christian Mobilizers could conduct their pamphleteering activities. But the United States has never had

---

7. S. E. Finer. The Man on Horseback: The Role of the Military in Politics. (Praeger, New York, 1962)

8. Samuel P. Huntington. Changing Patterns of Military Politics. (Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1962). p. 190 et seq.

9. Harold Lavine. Fifth Column in America. (Doubleday, New York, 1940) p. 78

anything like the fascist and nationalist movements which from time to time have sprung up in Hungary, Austria, Finland, Germany, Spain, France and Italy and elsewhere. No Action Francaise, no Movimento Sociale Italiano or an Ordre Nouveau.

By this I do not mean to presume that such movements could not arise. The skills of an astute demagogue, at a time when one group of the people fears another group and when insecurity and instability have prepared the ground for the growth of reaction, could well start such a movement in the United States. Today, when Middle America is so fearful of the demands of its militant blacks and the protests of its alienated college generation, might just be such a time. The reaction to the real and the imagined dangers from left-wing radicalism might provide the support for the rise of a new Huey Long, or Father Coughlin, as it has today produced a George C. Wallace. It is devoutly to be wished that this will not come about. It has been said that "extremism in defence of liberty is no vice" - to use the now historic phrase -, but we have seen all too often how such extremism frequently becomes nothing more than extremism in defence of extremism and it is from this that tyranny and dictatorship are made.

## Part II: The Left Wing

When on the strife-torn Berkeley campus of the University of California in 1964 Mario Savio issued his challenge to "the Establishment", he did so in these words: "There is a time when the opposition of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart that you can't take part, you can't even tacitly take part and you've got to make it stop. And you've got to indicate to the people who run it, to the people who own it, unless you're free, the machine will be prevented from working at all" <sup>10</sup>.

Student protests in the United States have changed tactics since the days when they borrowed the principle of "non-violence" from the sit-down demonstrators at Southern States' lunch-counters. Since the days of the highly misnamed "Free Speech Movement" at Berkeley student protests have become increasing-

---

10. Mario Savio. "An end to History". Humanity. December 1964

ly strident and militant in tone and tactics. Student protest today is characterized by what one of their participants called "revolution for the hell of it". This revolution does not shun violence and becomes ever more extreme in the forms of its charges and challenges.

Berkeley has become a pioneer, a pace-setter, for student protests in other places in the United States and in other nations. "The Berkeley model was copied at Berlin (Free) University a few years later, with Paris following suit soon afterwards", Daniel Cohn-Bendit assures us of the Paris May revolt<sup>11</sup>. That a later, more violent Berkeley has also inspired violence elsewhere is evident from the war-cry: "The war began last winter on the western front, in the rainy season. The guns of February were four Molotov cocktails through a naval ROTC building on the Berkeley campus of the University of California"<sup>12</sup>.

It would be tempting for me to pursue the development of the various protests at Berkeley in detail, as I was at the time of the FSM conflicts a student leader, a teaching assistant and a political columnist of the student paper, but the scope and significance of student protests have changed so radically since 1964 that, whereas the threat then was primarily directed against the university, it is today the security and internal order of all of the United States which is being seriously threatened.

American student radicalism has been fostered by a number of left-wing organizations. Some of these were ostensibly organized for Negro civil rights (Students' Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, for example, which since 1965, however, has ceased to be non-violent); others have been more or less openly communist groups (such as the Du Bois Clubs, Youth Against War and Fascism, and the Trotskyist Young Socialist Alliance). Others, yet again, have been concerned with US Foreign Policy and the US involvement in Vietnam (National Mobilization Committee, Students' Mobilization Committee, New Mobilization Committee, etc.). But no organization can

---

11. Daniel & Gabriel Cohn Bendit. *Obsolete Communism: Left-wing Alternative*. (André Deutsch, London, 1968) p. 24

12. *Mayday*. vol. I: 4. Nov. 8, 1968

better exemplify the growth towards radicalism and violence by the Radical Left than the Students for a Democratic Society<sup>13</sup>.

The SDS was organized in 1962 when it announced a programme which stressed idealistically motivated intellectual analysis, emphasizing in its official Port Huron statement that they were "committed to deliberativeness, honesty and reflection"<sup>14</sup>. The most cursory glance at the present tripartite form of the SDS makes it clear that none of these ideals are currently upheld. A sympathetic article in 1968 describes this metamorphosis as follows: "The SDS, which in the last twelve months has evolved from an anti-imperialist to an anti-capitalist perspective is on the precipice of embracing socialism or, in the terminology of a considerable number of SDS members, revolutionary communism"<sup>15</sup>. By 1968 through a process which has been called Fanonization (after the white-hating African revolutionary, Franz Fanon)<sup>16</sup> SDS had begun to develop tactics of deliberate provocation which would be used "to pursue Americans who are influential in foreign policy decisions into their homes and offices", according to SDS leader Robert Gottlieb<sup>17</sup>. "We are working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment", explains another SDS leader, Gregory Alvery. "We are actively organizing sedition"<sup>18</sup>.

It was to a large extent at Columbia University where the new forms and methods of SDS activity were tried out on the first massive scale. Admitting that the stated reasons for his protests were "a lot of bull" Mark Rudd also admitted that Columbia Institute for Defence Analysis was not an important

---

13. see "SDS: Engineers of Campus Chaos". *Readers' Digest*. October '68

14. "The Port Huron Statement". (Pamphlet). Students for a Democratic Society, New York, 1964

15. *Guardian*. (New York). June 22, 1968

16. see Franz Fanon. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Grove Press, New York, 1963

17. *Ibid.*, Nov. 16, 1967

18. *New York Times*. (New York). May 6, 1967

issue, that in fact he opposed student participation in reforming the university <sup>19</sup>. His intentions were more clearly defined in his (open) letter to Columbia President Grayson Kirk in which he explained: "... we will take control of your world, your corporation, your university .... Your power is directly threatened since we shall have to destroy that power before we can take over " <sup>20</sup>. In the name of this revolutionary take-over they occupied five Columbia University buildings, barricaded the Dean of Men in his office, invaded the President's office where they destroyed his files (and the research papers of a professor they particularly disliked), defaced photographs of Kirk's family, smoked his cigars and used his wastepaper basket as a urinal. Finally they put up posters of Lenin and "Che" Guevara on the walls while proclaiming "Lenin won, Fidel won, we will win" <sup>21</sup>. British writer Stephen Spender saw none of this, but romantically compared Columbia with Civil War Spain <sup>22</sup>.

As the radical left is faced with increasing fragmentation of its forces, it has a tendency to become more radical in its strategy, methods and pronunciamentos. The SDS today is split into three factions: (a) the "Weatherman", (b) the Revolutionary Youth Movement (RYM) and (c) the Worker-Student Alliance (WSA). The RYM group was expelled by the SDS in June 1969 and all three groups are competing for past SDS membership (which at one time was reputed to have reached 100,000), while they conduct fierce feuding between themselves. What all of them do have in common is a devotion to the idea that society cannot be changed except by violent means and that their chief ideological guide-lines are to be found in the writings of MAO Tse-tung.

The "Weatherman" faction, regarded as the most "violence-

---

19. New York Times Magazine. (New York). March 9, 1969

20. New York Times. (New York). May 19, 1970

21. *Ibid.* May 1, 1968

22. Stephen Spender. The Year of the Young Rebels. (Weidenfeld & Nicholson, London, 1969) pp. 5-6

prone" of the three, outlined its programme at a convention in December 1969 with an attendance of about 400 persons. The hall in which they met was decorated with large posters of communist leaders such as "Che" Guevara, Ho Chi Minh, Fidel Castro and such "Black Power" advocates as Malcolm X, Eldridge Cleaver and Fred Hampton, the Black Panther now regarded as a martyr to the revolution <sup>23</sup>. At the same time, in Connecticut, the Worker-Student Alliance (WSA) was meeting. This organization, which is the youth-wing of the pro-Maoist Progressive Labour Party, also claims to be the authentic successor to the SDS. Its convention was characterized by an extensive discussion whether or not the group was to engage in programmes for the betterment of social conditions for the workers or broader issues such as "an offensive against the USA's military complex " <sup>24</sup>. In addition to the three successor groups to the SDS, a new communist youth organization was being founded in the early Spring of 1970 to take the place of the Du Bois clubs <sup>25</sup>. At the same time as the SDS groups were meeting in conference, a national convention was held of the Young Socialist Alliance. The convention emphasized the importance of the Vietnam war and the anti-war movement, calling it "an evidence of the central confrontation between imperialism and the world revolutionary forces" <sup>26</sup>. A resolution was passed calling for full support for mass actions against the war. In addition to these radical-left organizations there are also, as has been mentioned, the various organizations within the "mobilization movement". It is these groups which have sought to maintain some sort of control over the mass demonstrations against the war in Vietnam, often jeopardized by smaller, more violently inclined groups which have sought to utilize the demonstrations for purposes other than the peaceful dissent to American presence in Vietnam.

---

23. "Liberation News Service" release, Reproduced in Christian Anti-Communism Crusade Newsletter. Feb. 1, 1970, pp.1-2

24. Guardian. (New York). Jan. 10, 1970, p. 3

25. "Washington Report". (American Security Council, Washington, D.C.), Dec. 15, 1969, p. 1

26. Guardian.(New York). Jan. 10, 1970, p. 3

1968 was an important year for the development of what Professor Milorad Drachkovitch has called the revolutionary protester (as opposed to the pragmatic, or the existential, protester)<sup>27</sup>. It was the year of the Columbia University protest - which was "about power and disruption". "The more blood the better", according to a Columbia SDS leader<sup>28</sup>. It was also the time for the extended strike at San Francisco State College (about which I also have personal and unhappy experiences) and of course the time of the political conventions, especially the confrontations at Chicago.

The Chicago convention confrontations had been carefully planned. Already at the end of June the National Guardian was quoting David Dellinger (then head of the National Mobilization Committee against the War in Vietnam) as saying: "We are planning tactics of prolonged direct action to put on the Government and its political party. We realize that it will be no picnic but responsibility for any violence that develops lies with the authorities, not the demonstrators"<sup>29</sup>. The leaders of the Chicago riots ("The Chicago Seven") precipitated violence, sought every occasion to promote it through mass groups, through the shouting of insults, invective and even showering the police with bags of human excrement. Of course Mayor Daly's police answered with counterforce, making the youthful protesters "martyrs" according to such, somewhat less than passionate, reporters as Jean Genet<sup>30</sup>.

This is of course what the revolutionary leaders of the demonstrations had counted on (and probably hoped for). Tom Hayden addressing a rally in a Chicago park cried: "If they want blood to flow from our heads, the blood will flow from a lot of other heads around this city and around this country. We must take to the streets, for the streets belong to the people.... It may well be that the era of organized peaceful and orderly

27. Milorad M. Drachkovitch: "Radicalization and Fragmentation of the New Left", in Liberty Under Law - Anarchy - Totalitarianism: This is the Choice, American Bar Association Standing Committee on Education about Communism and its contrast with Liberty Under Law, Washington, D. C., 1969 pp. 3-38. see also: Interdoc, The New Left, The Hague, 1969, pp. 3-34

28. New Republic. (New York), May 11, 1968

29. David Dellinger in National Guardian, as quoted in Allan C. Brownfeld, "The Growing Use of Violence as a Political Tactic". Religion and Society. (Bayport, Minnesota): Vol. II:5. October 1969, pp. 23-33

30. Esquire. (New York). November 1968

demonstrations is coming to an end and that other methods will be needed" <sup>31</sup>.

At about the same time a "manual", of unknown authorship and printed in Toronto, Canada, was being distributed to more than 300 anti-Vietnam groups throughout the United States. It discusses the details going into the steps of obstructing and disrupting the "US War Machine", including how to shut down military induction centres by arson and bombing. There are drawings illustrating how to make incendiary bombs and Molotov cocktails, how to sabotage automobile tyres, gas lines etc. Obviously these militants were coming of (violent) age and increasingly resembled Russian narodniki, but with less justification for their actions.

The student-led protests against the military methods and the US involvement in Vietnam have taken the form of opposition to and actions against (a) ROTC programmes on campuses, (b) institutes and centres at universities involved with government research of military impact, (c) military induction centres, (d) the system of the military draft, (e) military installations and transport systems, (f) private industries and companies involved in making war-related goods. Let us take a closer look at these forms of protest and by means of specific examples, illustrate to what extent many of these revolutionary activities pose very serious threats to the military preparedness and to the internal security of the United States.

(a) The University of California, as in so many things revolutionary, proved to be an example in the nation-wide opposition to the Reserve Officers Training Corps, commonly abbreviated ROTC. Even before the days of the Free Speech movement, militants at the University of California, Berkeley, had demonstrated against compulsory ROTC, and interrupted ROTC exercises, in order to get it away from the campus completely. In 1969 they demonstrated their opposition simply by setting fire to a ROTC building on campus. This spread to other campuses and before long a bomb at the University of Michigan had blown out 40 windows in the ROTC building there, fire gutted the ROTC building at Howard University (the largest predominantly negro university in the USA) and at Harvard and Dartmouth

31. Tom Hayden as quoted in Brownfeld, op. cit., p. 31

Universities. Deans were forcibly ejected by SDS students as a means of putting pressure on the colleges to eliminate ROTC from their curricula. Responding to the pressures of a small minority, Dartmouth and Columbia universities terminated the programme altogether. A total of more than fifty colleges have been affected by anti-ROTC protests, most of these protests being led by SDS groups which in their leaflets announced that "the end of the ROTC programmes would strike a genuine blow against US imperialism"<sup>32</sup>. Another SDS directive outlined their actions in these words: "There is at present no acceptable source of Junior (military) leadership if ROTC is driven from the college campus . . . . a nation-wide attack against ROTC would severely hurt the military"<sup>33</sup>. Not only is the removal of ROTC under these circumstances a capitulation to mob rule, but what is so patently unjust is that in many cases a majority of the students want to retain the programme for a variety of reasons, in some cases perhaps in order to avoid the draft. Thus during the height of the Harvard conflict, a small number of anti-ROTC SDS students demonstrating at Northwestern University was opposed by a large majority of 2,000 pro-ROTC students and the protesters had to make a sortie by a side-door. A referendum gave ROTC a four to one student endorsement. At UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles) 74 per cent of the voting students indicated their approval of the retention of the ROTC programme and at Stanford, where ROTC buildings were bombed and later burned to the ground, the majority of the students indicated that they wished to keep the voluntary ROTC programme on campus. At Columbia 67 per cent of the students voted for "open recruiting" to include ROTC<sup>34</sup>.

The Reserve Officers' Training Corps was established in 1916, when, after American participation in World War I, a reappraisal of US Defence Forces became necessary. ROTC

---

32. as quoted in Kenneth Y. Tomlinson, "ROTC Under Attack". Readers' Digest. November 1969, p. 231

33. Ibid.

34. John Meyer. "Revolution at Columbia". Seeds of Anarchy: A study of Campus Revolution. Frederick Wilhelmsen, (ed). (Argus Academic Press, Dallas) 1969. p. 53

serves to provide a corps of potential officers for the armed forces, especially in the event of war. Its importance can be seen by the fact that by 1920 ROTC was organized on 220 US campuses and during World War II 60,000 of the 100,000 reserve officers mobilized came from ROTC programmes. Currently the ROTC programme is established on 365 campuses, in which 200,000 men are studying military leadership while pursuing full-time studies. "Thanks to this programme the nation gained 150,000 college-educated military officers in the last decade alone", concludes one report on ROTC<sup>35</sup>.

The student radical, dedicated to violent protests ostensibly on behalf of peace, saw that the programme might well be attacked on the pretext that ROTC did not have a place in a scholarly environment (although it would hardly appear as if a scholarly environment is what these revolutionary fire-brands are after). The students and left-inclined professors attempted to force the college administration to discontinue granting academic credit for ROTC courses, thereby weakening its attractiveness to students (although these same left-wing radicals did not find it unacademic to continue granting academic credit to dancing and golf). The demands were often accompanied by the usual display of "body rhetoric" including mass demonstrations, sit-ins, interruption of ROTC exercises and classes, heckling of fellow-students in ROTC uniforms and finally burning and bombing ROTC buildings on campus. In a few instances attempts were made to bring about change by parliamentary means, but the method was abandoned in favour of more direct, violent, extra-parliamentary means, when it transpired that the majority of the students wanted to retain the programme. Fire-engines accompanied my sojourn as an instructor at the University of California, Berkeley, and the same sound of passing fire-trucks on the way to a burning ROTC building followed me during my term as a Visiting Scholar at Stanford's Hoover Institution. Since the burning of the buildings at Berkeley and Stanford the universities of New Mexico, Washington, Oregon and Delaware have been hit.

(b) Some of the recent student conflicts have been connected with war-related research being conducted at research centres

---

35. Tomlinson, op.cit., p. 233

attached to various universities. Thus the Stanford-associated research faculty was forced to sever its rather tenuous relations after repeated mass lie-ins and other forms of harassment prevented the work from being conducted. Similar protests have taken place at Columbia's Institute for Defence Analysis at the University of Michigan's Institute for Science and Technology and at Massachusetts's Institute of Technology. There are infinite ways in which such important research work can be interrupted. To interrupt the work of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at the University of California, Berkeley, for example, electric towers were dynamited and electric power cables were cut. "I had to do something to stop their machines so that this war would be stopped", answered a University of Colorado drop-out student, when he turned himself in, in order to publicize his acts <sup>36</sup>. He did not seem to be concerned that the laboratory is also involved with much research for peaceful uses or that 30,000 homes were left without electricity as a result of his sabotage. Another saboteur, a twenty-six year old Army deserter, Cameron Bishop (SDS), became the first student radical to make the FBI's "Ten Most Wanted List" when in January 1969 he dynamited defence-plant transmission line towers in Colorado <sup>37</sup>.

(c) Military induction centres have again and again been popular targets for radical left-wing and related highly unpacific war-protesters. Gangs have invaded military induction offices, poured blood or red ink over files, harassed employees, destroyed files by fire and in some cases threatened human life by Molotov cocktails and bombings. Closing down an induction centre for a few hours is not enough, says an SDS leaflet. "On the other hand is there anyone who doubts that a small home-made incendiary device with a timing mechanism planted in a broom closet at the Oakland induction centre could result in fire and smoke damage to the entire building, thus making it unusable for weeks or months?" <sup>38</sup>. The military recruiters on campus are being constantly harassed and driven off campus in many cases. This is often in spite of the wishes of the student majority. At Columbia, as we have seen, 67 per cent of the students wanted

---

36. as quoted in Brownfeld. op.cit., p. 31

37. William Schulz. "Intelligence Report on Today's 'New Revolutionaries' ". Readers' Digest, October 1969, p. 123

38. as quoted in Brownfeld, op.cit., p. 28

open recruiting, which would let army and other armed forces recruiters on campus, but the administration has since banned them out of fear of the small SDS cliques <sup>39</sup>. But at Long Beach State College, when a group of 500 SDS sought to drive defence recruiters off campus, a counter group of young conservatives, 300 members of Young Americans for Freedom, prevented them from doing so <sup>40</sup>.

(d) The system of the draft has of course been under attack for a long time in the United States, not only by any means from the left wing, but also by many on the right wing. A Committee on the Voluntary Military combined every shade of political opinion. Conservative Republicans such as Barry Goldwater have supported the gradual elimination of the draft and it was an important part of Richard Nixon's election platform. He has recently presented a proposal to the appropriate congressional committee for the elimination of the draft system <sup>41</sup>. One would think that this would please the left wing radicals, but such is hardly the case. What they apparently want is to see the total elimination of any defence system by the United States altogether. The fear of the draft is also somewhat unrealistic among American college students, considering the fact that only 69.6 per 100,000 of college students are drafted, and that the probability of any drafted male college graduate being killed in Vietnam is 30 per 100,000 <sup>42</sup>.

(e) Military installations of various kinds have become the sites of repeated demonstrations. Picket lines would form in front of gates, protesters would chain themselves to gates to prevent the access and egress of trucks and troops. In Berkeley demonstrators would lie down on railroad tracks where they knew troop-trains would pass. Cases of more effective devices have been, however, sabotage against strategically located centres for the storage of war material. Army trucks have been bombed. At the same time an active propaganda offensive has been launched for the potential "pacification" of the inducted

---

39. Meyer, op.cit., p. 53

40. Palo Alto Times. (Palo Alto, Calif.) May 6, 1969 p. 33

41. International Herald Tribune. (Paris), Feb. 23, 1970, p. 1

42. George F. Kennan, Democracy and the Student Left. (Little-Brown, Boston, 1968), p. 163

draftees. Leaflets have been distributed throughout military installations, appealing to the soldiers to go AWOL (Absent Without Leave), to break military discipline or to declare themselves conscientious objectors. The number of CO applications has been growing as liberalized conditions for their acceptance have been adopted by the courts. Such applications have increased from five in 1962, to 993 in 1968 and an estimated 2,000 in 1969<sup>43</sup>. Not only has such propaganda been effective in defence installations in the United States, but abroad as well, in Vietnam, at "R and R" (Relaxation and Recreation) centres in Japan and elsewhere. Sweden, I am sad to say, has been especially active as several anti-US and anti-Vietnam organizations there are supporting wholesale propaganda with paid pamphleteers at various US bases to encourage US soldiers to "defect" and seek "humanitarian asylum" in Sweden. More than 325 have done so (although more than two dozen have since returned to the USA), taking advantage of Sweden's offer of free board and lodging, a weekly "allowance" and free education. The American Deserters' Committee in Stockholm conducts a five-part programme (a) to encourage desertions, (b) to politicize the deserters, (c) to provide tape-recordings for North Vietnam and the Viet Cong, (d) to subvert soldier morale and (e) to bring about a new "social order" in the United States<sup>44</sup>.

(f) The latest development in the form and expansion of student protests is moving away from attacks on simply military targets, to those of the industrial-military complex and to attacks on all major forms of "US capitalist institutions", industries, stores, banks etc.

The Dow Chemical Company was the first company in this field to be faced with nation-wide protests, as they, like all other major US companies and industries, recruited their future executives from top college graduates. The left-wing programme of harassment against those whom they regarded as "capitalist" and of "the military-industrial complex" was announced in the

---

43. Brian Donovan, "The Man Who Beat The Army". New Republic, (New York), Jan. 31, 1970, p. 17

44. ABC Telecast, San Francisco, Nov. 28, 1969

July 1969 issue of the pro-communist publication Guardian (formerly National Guardian). "Many other prominent US corporations are engaged in the manufacture of incendiary weapons for the Vietnam war. In order to identify these corporations and hopefully inspire more widespread opposition to the Vietnam profiteers, the Guardian is publishing this list..."<sup>45</sup>. What followed was a list of 54 American corporations, many of which were well-known US companies, whose output related only to a very small degree, or in a peripheral way, to defence products. In November 1969 a group by the name of Youth Organizing Project at Roosevelt University sponsored a conference at which Staughton Lynd spoke. He suggested a more sophisticated form of protest, moving from the massing of bodies to the packing of the board meetings of major US corporations. By buying one share in the company they had the means of access to these meetings, which then could be effectively interrupted. "We need to develop forms of action which offer roles to persons at many different stages of radical commitment ...", Lynd concludes<sup>46</sup>. The plan seems to have been adopted by the peace movement in America as a whole, planning "anti-tax rallies, (and) stockholder protests within corporation meetings .... of war contractors with legal proxies in hand"<sup>47</sup>.

Such sophisticated and relatively non-violent methods have been eschewed by such militant groups as the "Weatherman", however. In November 1969 they bombed Chase Manhattan Bank, General Motors and Radio Corporation of America Buildings, and on March 12, 1970, Socony-Mobil Oil, International Business Machines and the General Telegraph and Electric Company Buildings, all located in New York. These bombings all followed a similar pattern. The companies were informed of the bomb and told to evacuate the workers, but not given sufficient advance warning to locate the bombs. On March 12, 1970, workers were sent away from twelve other buildings, against which threats had

---

45. quoted in Washington Report, (American Security Council, Washington, D.C.) Dec. 15, 1969, p. 31

46. Ibid., p. 2

47. International Herald Tribune, (Paris), March 28-29, 1970, p. 2

been made in New York City. Not only has New York been hit, Seattle, for example, has had thirty-two bombings during a year, San Francisco 100 successful and unsuccessful bombings. Detroit had twenty-four incidents in 1969 involving police stations, draft board offices and army recruitment centres. US News and World Report in March 1970 reports that "since the year began barely three months ago, more than a score of bombs have exploded in more than a dozen cities, killing at least six persons and injuring at least fifteen. Property damage has run into millions of dollars" 48.

Most of the bombing attempts have been against government buildings. "Since July 1, 1969, there have been 1,964 bomb threats against government buildings", according to another report, "106 of them since January 1. The government estimates that bombings and arson have caused \$ 372,805 in damage to its buildings alone. In addition, private companies, draft boards and college campuses have been hit" 49. President Nixon has rapidly prepared legislation for presentation to Congress which would invoke heavy punishment. "Clearly many of these bombings have been the work of political fanatics", says President Nixon, "many of them young criminals posturing as romantic revolutionaries". "They must be dealt with as the potential murderers they are" 50.

Sometimes the bombing attempts will "blow up in their faces" to use an apt phrase. In one case at San Francisco State College one bomber succeeded in blinding himself, when a time bomb he was attempting to explode, exploded too early 51. A blast on March 6, 1970, which destroyed a building in Greenwich Village in New York, killed three young radicals, identified as "Weathermen". The building, as it turned out, was practically a bomb factory.

---

48. US News and World Report (Washington D. C.), March 30, 1970, p. 15

49. Ibid., April 6, 1970, p. 20

50. quoted in David Lawrence, "Squelching Revolutionaries". Ibid. p. 96

51. Terry A. Francois, "A Black Man looks at Black Racism", Readers' Digest, September 1969, p. 210

In response to the verdicts on the "Chicago Seven", radical students throughout the United States went on a rampage burning, smashing windows, looting, apparently without any relationship to the issue of the trial. 500 militants from George Washington University marched on the deluxe residential apartment home of Attorney General John N. Mitchell. In Boston 5,000 turned out. Evanston, Illinois, Ann Arbor, Michigan and Santa Barbara, California, were other college towns hit by great damage to property 52.

It is not within the scope of this presentation to attempt an analysis of the many and complex factors which go into the pre-conditions for the acts of these revolutionaries, sons and daughters of the prosperous American middle, and upper-middle class. That subject has been explored again and again, by both the knowledgeable and the amateur. It suffices for us at this time to realize with profound disquiet the immense seriousness which these revolutionary students pose to the security and the order of the American body politic and body social. And we had better not dismiss these revolutionaries as some sort of aberration which will disappear if ignored for long enough. When the student body president at Washington University assures us: "I want student power to demand revolutionary reforms", he is deadly serious, because he goes on to assure us: "What I mean by revolution is overthrowing the American government and American imperialism" 53. When we attempt to "buy them off" or stall them by providing reforms which we think they are demanding in their often inarticulate demands, we should recall the SDS officer who tells us: "It's not reform we're after, it's the destruction of your stinking, rotten society - and you better learn that fast" 54. American people and American society are fearful of what these revolutionary members in their midst might portend. The young revolutionaries realize these fears and capitalize on them. They know, in the words of an eighteen-year-old freshman

---

52. US News & World Report (Washington D. C.), March 16, 1970, pp. 24-25

53. quoted in Ronald Reagan, "The Key to Understanding", Seeds of Anarchy, op. cit., p. 20

54. Schulz, op. cit., p. 123

girl at the University of California at Santa Barbara, that "If society is afraid of us like they're now afraid of the Black Panthers, they'll give us what we want" 55.

With this in mind it is perhaps time to take a close look at the violence in America as a result of the revolutionary activities of the Black Panthers and other militants among America's 20 million Negroes.

### The Black Revolutionaries

"The genie of black revolutionary violence is here, and it says that the oppressor has no rights which the oppressed are bound to respect. . . . The cities of America have tasted the first flames of revolution. . . . But a hotter fire rages in the hearts of black people today: total liberty for black people or total destruction of America" 56.

Eldridge Cleaver.

There are a number of militant left-wing Negro organizations in the US prepared to use violence. Often they co-operate with one another, on other occasions there is bloodshed between them. Of the main groups these could be included: Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM), New York; Republic of New Africa (RNA), Detroit; US, Los Angeles; Black Liberation Front, Black Students Union, Students (non-violent) Co-ordination Committee. But overshadowing all of these in membership force, leadership and violence is the Black Panther Party (BPP). The BPP has been regarded as a strong threat to the security of the United States. Attorney General Mitchell, for example, has officially labelled the BPP "a subversive threat to the national security". In January 1969 and in July the same year FBI chief J. Edgar Hoover called the Panthers "the greatest threat to the internal security of the country among black militant groups" 57.

---

55. US News and World Report, (Washington D. C.) March 16, 1970, p. 25

56. Tariq Ali, (ed.) New Revolutionaries: Left Opposition (Peter Owen, London, 1969), p. 90

57. Christopher Chandler, "The Black Panther Killings", The New Republic, (New York), January 10, 1970, p. 25

The Black Panther party was started in Oakland, California, with about 125 members. It now claims to have 60,000 members and sympathizers in chapters in a score of cities throughout the United States. (And as we well know it does not take even this number to start a revolt or a revolution). They are able to extend their influence beyond that of their own membership by working arrangements, not only with the organizations already mentioned but with white, Negro and Puerto Rican big-city teenage gangs, such as the Appalachian white gang called the Young Patriots, the Puerto Rican gang, the Young Lords, or Chicago's teenage gangs, Black P Stone Nation and East Side Disciples, whom they have admitted to full Panther membership 58.

The leaders of the Panthers learned many of their techniques during the riots in the large cities during the long hot summers of 1967 and 1968. One of the leaders of the Detroit riots, Fred "Ahmed" Evans, affiliated with the pro-Peking RAM, declared that the coming Black Revolution was to coincide with a "war between Red China and the United States" 59. (It was this same Evans who was responsible for the death of three policemen and the wounding of 14 others during a shoot-out in Cleveland). Phil Hutchings, revolutionary leader of SNCC, sees the riots as "the first stage of revolutionary armed violence" 60. But the spontaneous violence of a few years ago is now becoming a violence which is a conscious policy of planned political tactics.

Stokely Carmichael, Panther Party "Prime Minister", during a visit to Cuba, puts it this way. "We are moving toward a guerrilla warfare within the United States. . . . . When the United States has fifty Vietnams inside and fifty outside this will mean the death of imperialism" 61. "We live in the stomach of a monster and we can destroy him from within", says H. Rap Brown 62. And the ex-convict turned presidential aspirant

---

58. Ibid.

59. quoted in Brownfeld, op. cit., p. 24

60. quoted in Ibid.,

61. quoted in Ibid., p. 26

62. quoted in Ibid.

of the "Peace and Freedom Party" Eldridge Cleaver (Minister of Information) suggests. "I hope you can take your guns and shoot judges and police. Kill some white people or make them act in a prescribed manner" <sup>63</sup>. "Let us make clear that the Panthers do not seek the objective of civil or legal rights", said Panther Party "Minister of Education" George Mason Murray in Cuba in 1968 <sup>64</sup>. This same "Minister" extols a "black revolutionary culture", in which "our painters must show piles of dead businessmen, bankers, lawyers, senators, congressmen, burning up inside their stores, being blown up in cafes, restaurants, night clubs (to).... the battle cries of men, crazy black men and the screams are coming from the honkey's throat as he and his wife are strangled to death and robbed, looted (and) then set afire ..." <sup>65</sup>. Harry Edwards, a "professor" of sociology at the Berkeley campus of the University of California (where he presumably teaches what he preaches, says that "blacks should order the white businessman out of the ghetto and that if he doesn't understand burn him out, kill him, murder him" <sup>66</sup>. Although we might be inclined to dismiss statements like these as coming from racist fanatics, one must keep in mind that they are being featured in campus press releases, magazine interviews, radio programmes and telecasts throughout the country, often at exorbitant fees. Thus the purveyance of this violence-filled language is aided to an unfortunate degree by sensation-hungry representatives of the press and other public media. For every time these views are given free rein on the radio or television waves, their influence in hate-peddling becomes magnified to audiences of far beyond their own resources.

It is evident, and painfully so, that this message of violence is finding an appeal among an increasingly younger generation of Negroes. Willingness to use violence as a means to obtain

---

63. quoted in Ibid.

64. Schulz, op.cit., p. 123

65. New York Times, (New York), February 9, 1969

66. Francois, op.cit., p. 210

rights is ten per cent higher among young Negroes than among Negroes generally <sup>67</sup>. In a poll conducted by Opinion Research Corporation in January 1969 "only six per cent said they agree with the views of Stokely Carmichael and five per cent with those of H. Rap Brown <sup>68</sup>. But in a Harris poll in January 1970 among 1,255 Negroes on a national basis nine per cent, more than 2 million, count themselves "revolutionaries" and believe that only "a readiness to use violence will ever get us real equality" <sup>69</sup>. The "readiness to use violence" is appreciably higher among the younger Negroes. This is not so surprising. Young people especially seek heroes. As Indians and cowboys used to be heroes for the white child and teenager, so many black militants have become heroes to the younger generation of Negro Americans. The often romanticized exposure which Black Panthers receive on national television is naturally absorbed by the highly television-watching, impressionable Negro children. This apotheosis of violence is even conducted at the primary school level. The Black Panthers in their highly advertised "breakfast programme" (which is financed by local shopowners through "shake-downs" or extortion techniques) distributes "comic books" which feature white policemen, as uniformed pigs, being butchered, beaten and shot by Negro youngsters. Some "adult education" classes in negro neighbourhoods teach "how to stage a community demonstration", while other less official courses teach how to make a Molotov cocktail, how to manufacture bombs etc. Panther's 'Field Marshall' Donald Lee Cox held such classes for young Negroes in Alabama in 1968. The result: 59 bombings by means of acid bombs <sup>70</sup>.

The relationship between the various militant Negro organizations in the United States has fluctuated between successful co-operation on certain issues during brief periods and bloody warfare. Not only have Panthers and other militant Negroes been known to plot the death of moderate Negro leaders, but

---

67. Le Monde, (Paris), March 31, 1970, p. 2

68. Readers' Digest, January 1969, p. 15

69. Time, (New York), Apr. 6, 1970, p. 18

70. Schulz, op.cit., p. 123

one of the Panther leaders is currently on trial for the death of a fellow-Panther in Connecticut in 1969. Open warfare between the Los Angeles-based organization US led by Ron Karenga and the Panthers occurred in Los Angeles, during which four militants died. Later at a meeting of the Black Students Union two negroes were killed. Still another two were killed in May 1969 <sup>71</sup>. It is this internecine warfare which makes one suspect sometimes that some of this violence is for violence's own sake - little else seems to be accomplished.

At times the inexpert handling by the would-be bomb throwers has caused their own deaths. Reference has already been made to the nineteen-year-old Tim Peebles, who in a totally senseless bombing attempt at the San Francisco State College maimed himself for life <sup>72</sup>. On March 9, 1970, a car exploded in Maryland. Identified as the passengers were two well-known black militants, Ralph Featherstone and William H. "Che" Payne. In the exploded auto was found a note which said: "Dynamite is my response to your justice" <sup>73</sup>. On March 29 an apartment in New York's Lower East side exploded, killing one and seriously injuring another Negro. In the apartment were found Black Panther flags and literature. The refrigerator was filled with enough explosives to bomb many of the police stations which had been indicated as target sites on a map also in the apartment <sup>74</sup>. There are thirteen Black Panthers currently awaiting trial in New York City alone for bombings of department stores, police stations and railroad tracks <sup>75</sup>.

One of the very real dangers with many of the terror actions by Black Panther and similar Negro militants is the strong element of irrationality behind their actions. Without saying that these are "rebels without a cause", they are nevertheless rebels who do not in reality know how their cause could be furthered by the acts they perform. They are the people whom

---

71. Bertil Häggman, Swedish Radio Broadcast, Jan. 31, 1970

72. Francois, op. cit., pp. 209-211

73. US News & World Report, (Washington D. C.), March 23, 1970, pp. 26-27, and March 30, 1970, p. 15

74. International Herald-Tribune, (Paris), March 30, 1970, p. 3

75. Ibid., Feb. 26, 1970, p. 3

the distinguished female Negro judge Edith Sampson advises: "Don't tear down the old homestead until you have a clear idea of what you'll build in its place" <sup>76</sup>.

The Black Panthers, and the groups and the gangs associated with them in their ventures in violence, do constitute a very real danger in America. We have seen the conflagrations in Los Angeles, in Detroit, in New York and elsewhere. The senseless destruction, not, for the most part of white-owned homes and enterprises, but their own homes and shops.

The Negro militants in the United States today "schooled in Marxist-Leninist ideology and the teachings of Mao Tse-tung" according to an FBI report <sup>77</sup> have an impact on the security and internal order of the United States far beyond their relatively small number among America's 22 million Negroes. There is fear in the United States today, among whites and Negroes alike for the consequences of this violence. This fear was, I think, so well expressed by a friend of mine who, in a letter to me last December, wrote: "I'm still on the Federal Grand Jury - they've extended our term again until mid-April. I can take drug peddlers, bank robbers, counterfeiters, draft dodgers etc. - but I'm afraid I can't "take" the Black Panthers - they truly frighten me. I don't think people here are aware how deadly serious and dangerous this element is" .

A militant minority, armed with dangerous weapons which they, "deadly serious", would employ against their "enemy" has (in the words of "an intelligence report on today's revolutionaries") "a capacity for disruption that far exceeds their numbers". By carefully selected issues - from the Vietnam war to "police brutality" - and by exploiting them fully, they have stirred to action thousands who would normally not become involved. And the havoc they have wreaked has had far-reaching consequences. It has jeopardized the struggle for civil rights, severely disrupted the normal processes of our academic system

---

76. J. D. Ratcliff, "Justice-Edith Sampson Style", Readers' Digest, November 1968, p. 170

77. quoted in Schulz, op. cit., p. 122

and posed a major threat to the continued existence of our democratic system" 78.

American Left-Wing Contact With International Communism

"... we share with you a common struggle. We have a common enemy. Our enemy is white Western imperialist society - our struggle is to overcome this system" 79.

Stokely Carmichael

Of the enemies of America's democracy, none would rejoice more, or would be willing to support it with more alacrity, than the various communist centres of the world. One need not be a believer in the John Birch Society's concept of an all-pervasive communist conspiracy to realize that there is indeed ample proof of close collaboration between the left-wing radicals of the United States, both students and Negroes, and communist propaganda centres from Moscow to Cuba, to Hanoi, to Peking, to Algeria.

Senator John McLellan (D., Ark.) of the Senate Subcommittee of the Judiciary charged with investigations of threats against United States security has concluded that the alliance of terror which has forged a revolutionary menace from a highly dangerous minority derives its main strength from about 20,000 activists among an overall movement of about 200,000 radicals. Many members of the leadership which make up the paramilitary left have been frequent and enthusiastic visitors to Castro's Communist Cuba.

Black Panther "Minister of Education" George Mason Murray, for example, during a visit to Cuba in August 1968 proudly proclaimed: "we are organizing as guerrillas with the intention of assassinating police, blowing up bridges, burning factories" 80. A substantial part of the literature which teaches the techniques of this revolution of sabotage can be traced to Cuba. One such tract advocates extensive "sabotage, the derailing of trains, how to use fire bombs, home-made flame throwers and ex-

78. Ibid., p. 126

79. quoted in Tariq Ali, *op. cit.*, p. 91

80. Schulz, *op. cit.* p., 126

plosive booby traps" 81. A twenty-three year-old SDS leader, Christopher Milton, told an SDS convention how he had spent three years in Red China and had been a Red Guard there. He had also visited Cuba 82. A tour organized by the Progressive Labour Party (Maoist) had brought thirty-two-year old Robert Steele Collier to Cuba, where he had received training in the use of explosives by a North Vietnamese army major. He returned to the United States maintaining close contacts with Cuban diplomats at the United Nations and has become a leader in the Black Liberation Front 83. Tours to Cuba are still being organized : in August 1968 a group of SDS members went there by way of Mexico and while there received "instruction" from a member of the NFL of South Vietnam" 84. The instruction which they had been given may well have been "Che Guevara's Gospel of hate" which he has expressed in words such as these: "Hatred is an element of the struggle... relentless hatred of the enemy that impels us over and beyond the natural limitation of man, and transforms us into an effective, violent, selected and cold killing-machine" 85. (My underlining).

In the US Senate on March 16, 1970, James Eastland (D. Miss.), pointed out that 1,000 American youth have gone to Cuba as part of "sugar harvesting brigades" in recent months. He pointed out that "looking at the record of past performances, it does not take a trained imagination to envisage the trouble which can be expected when young revolutionary activists - already committed to aiding an adversary of their own country - return to the United States after weeks of instruction, training and indoctrination by hand-picked Cuban communists, Viet Cong, North Vietnamese and a delegation from the Soviet Union 86.

81. Ibid.

82. Ibid.

83. Ibid.

84. Ibid., p. 124

85. quoted in Tariq Ali, *op. cit.*, p. 93

86. US News & World Report, (Washington D.C.), March 30, 1970, p. 16

Ralph McGill in his syndicated columns has also talked about "Havana money"... "In early 1966 talk of 'Havana money' became current. SNCC, unable to meet payroll, was suddenly able to form a front and purchase a \$65,000 building" 87. There do not appear to have been any attempts to deny this by the SNCC leadership. After the Tri-Continental Conference in Havana in 1966 Cuba became a centre for the "anti-imperialist" revolutionary struggles in the world. "Internationally, systematic links with the "revolutionary Third World organizations" and "national liberation movements" were established, with the aim of solidifying the front against a common enemy: 'U. S. imperialism' " 88. A report on the Black Panthers points out that "the Panthers are not reticent to express their views, they will explain patiently at a press conference that their political ideology is based on Marx and Lenin, and that they look to other revolutionary leaders, including Mao Tse-tung, for example, for guidance on how to translate ideology into political power" 89. This revolutionary internationalism is not only current among Black militants. Carl Davidson, theoretician and former leader of the SDS, and now a prolific writer for the Guardian, explains in a study called Crucible of the working Class: Long Range Strategies for Student Power Movement how the formation of "Student Defence Leagues" on various college campuses would later lead to forming " a nucleus of a new international union of Revolutionary Youth which would include the Zengakuren in Japan, the German SDS, the French situationists, the Spanish Democratic Student Syndicates and the Third World revolutionary student organization" 90.

Whether or not definite proof can be documented about financial and political connections between communist nations and left-wing groups in the United States (and I believe it can), it is obvious that, in any case, the anti-military crusades

---

87. Palo Alto Times, (Palo Alto, Calif.), Sept. 14, 1966, quoted in Drachkovitch, op. cit., p. 9, f.n.

88. Drachkovitch, op. cit., p. 9

89. Chandler, op. cit., p. 24

90. Kermit Roosevelt, "Blueprint for Campus Disorders", The Wanderer (Chicago), May 8, 1969

waged in the United States in the name of peace by the Students' Mobilization Committee and other ostensibly "pacifist groups" are highly appreciated in the communist world, by Hanoi in particular. This has become evident from the many references they make to their "American friends" in their press releases and on Radio Hanoi, The stratagem is not difficult to perceive. As Ho Chi Minh once told the French, he now tells the Americans: "You will kill ten of our men, and we will kill one of yours. And in the end it will be you who will tire of it" 91. It was not the Dien Bien Phu defeat which broke French resistance in Indo-China, it was the collapse of the will to fight within France. Hanoi and its "American friends" are engaging in the same campaign within the United States today and the will to fight communists in South-East Asia is gradually being eliminated from the American spirit.

Hanoi is very much aware of this and the North Vietnamese paper on February 27, 1966, joyfully analyses America's "anti-war movement as a sharp knife stabbing them in the back". On November 6, 1966, Radio Hanoi quotes Dr Le Dhin Tham, chairman of the Vietnamese Peace Committee, as viewing the anti-war struggles in America as "a valuable encouragement and backing for the Vietnamese people...." Two days later Radio Hanoi declared that the "Vietnamese people value highly the protest movement of the American people". In February 1967 Radio Hanoi views "the American people's protest movement..... (as) a real second front against US imperialism on the very soil of America". The former head of the Viet Cong delegation to the "peace talks" in Paris writes to American students in these words: "We greatly admire the active and massive participation of the American youth and students in this movement. You are entering a new, seething and violent struggle phase". And so it continues almost every month. One message in November 1969 expresses "our militant solidarity with and gratitude to the true sons and daughters of the United States.... our American friends" 92.

---

91. Edmund A. Gullione, "Why Hanoi Fights on", Readers Digest, February 1970, p. 53

92. "From Hanoi with Thanks", Readers' Digest, February 1970 pp. 51-55

## Conclusions

The decade of the 1970s in the United States may turn out to be the most violent in its history. The radical left on American campuses reveal, in the words of former ambassador George Kennan, "a dreadful incongruity ... in place of slowness to take excitement, we have a readiness to react emotionally, at once to a great variety of issues. In place of self-possession, we have screaming tantrums and brawling in the streets. In place of thorough talk, we have banners and epithets and obscenities and virtually meaningless slogans" <sup>93</sup>. But in the final analysis, the slogans may not be meaningless at all, for in the sick minds of these radicals of revolutionary vanguards, they have taken on an awesome, if inarticulate, meaning. They have become symbolic of, as one of their mentors puts it, "a total protest not only against specific evils and against specific shortcomings, but at the same time a protest against the entire system of values, against the entire system of objectives..... which they feel is rotten to the core" <sup>94</sup>. "We are against everything that is good and decent", declares "Weatherman" John Jacobs and assures us it is more than just rhetoric <sup>95</sup>.

These then are the modern-day nihilists, racists and totalitarians. They espouse a "racism" which includes a wholesale condemnation of the white race (this is where Fanon's writings particularly apply), so succinctly expressed by Susan Sontag who says: "The white race is the cancer of human history" and by Jean-Paul Sartre who proclaims that as white people "we are the enemies of mankind" <sup>96</sup>. This is a form of totalitarianism nurtured on the ideas of "repressive tolerance" expressed by Herbert Marcuse, "the philosopher en titre of the New Nihilists",

---

93. George F. Kennan, "The Student Left, Rebels without a Program", Readers' Digest, Jan. 1969, p. 80

94. quoted in Drachkovitch, op. cit., p. 11

95. quoted in Christian Anti-Communism Crusade Newsletter, February 1, 1970, p. 1

96. quoted in Drachkovitch, op. cit., pp. 11-12

to borrow the title of an excellent essay by philosopher Eliseo Vivas <sup>97</sup>. It is Marcuse who assures the would-be authoritarian of today that "certain things cannot be said, certain ideas cannot be expressed, certain philosophies cannot be propounded, certain behaviour cannot be permitted..." <sup>98</sup>. He, of course, reserves the right to determine which these banned thoughts and acts are to be. No wonder we hear a Cohn-Bendit, with ideological authoritarianism, explain that "we demand freedom of expression within the university, but we will refuse the freedom to those who support the Americans" <sup>99</sup>.

The left-wing fanatics about whom I have spoken are suffused with an anti-Americanism which borders on psychic masochism. They condemn with vehemence that very capitalism which has provided them with the education, the leisure and the opportunity to express such ideas. They travel to Cuba on their capitalist fathers' "Yankee dollars" and while there condemn America as "the great imperialist monster..."; "the vilest exploiter of all peoples in the history of mankind" is how a young American puts it while swinging his machete at the sugar-canes the Cubans themselves are unwilling to harvest <sup>100</sup>.

These are the possessors of the inarticulate vision of revolt, they are secular gnostics who feel that they alone have the answers and the concomitant rights. In a sickening departure from reality they have romanticized force and violence without without any clear ideas as to the dire consequences to which these notions would invariably lead.

The United States is facing the 1970s with real threats posed against its foundations of security and order. The threats are reinforced through the erosion of law enforcement brought about

---

97. Eliseo Vivas, "Herbert Marcuse: 'Philosopher' en titre of the New Nihilists". Intercollegiate Review, (Bryn Mawr, Pa.) vol. VI: 1-2. (Winter 1969-1970). pp. 51-71

98. Herbert Marcuse, A Critique of Pure Tolerance, quoted in M. Stanton Evans, Intercollegiate Review, (Bryn Mawr, Pa.) vol. V 3-4, (Spring 1969), p. 165

99. quoted in M. Stanton Evans, "The New Totalitarians", Seeds of Anarchy, op. cit., pp. 76-90

100. International Herald-Tribune, (Paris), March 30, 1970, p. 6

by coddling courts, the over-inflation and frequent romanticization of the left elements by irresponsible public media, by the fears and failures of college administrators to perceive that the chief function of the university is to provide education to the great majority who so much want it and by public officials and politicians who are unable or unwilling to provide swift and proper punishment for transgression of the law - all this contributes to the weakening of the will and the loosening of the fabric of American society. Unless a revitalization takes place, which involves not only the central government, but officials on every local level, college deans and professors, yes every American student and parent, the disease of lawlessness will continue to spread its cancerous growth.

May I conclude by quoting the words of William K. Lambie, Jr., administrative director of the American Security Council ?  
"Those who have dedicated themselves to revolution have committed themselves to winning. It is a total commitment, one that will not be deterred by momentary set-backs or reverses. The educators, businessmen and government officials who lead our free society and who are the stated targets of the revolution desperately need to develop and express an equal dedication and commitment to win the all-important struggle that still lies ahead" 101.

101. William K. Lambie Jr., "A Plan to Win", Washington Report, (American Security Council, Washington D. C.), Dec. 15, 1969, p. 4

## POLITICAL RADICALISM AND DEFENCE

### THE BRITISH SITUATION

by Stephen Kreppel\*

This is a brief paper, as the defence policy of this country is remarkably free from the influence or interest of politically radical groups. The only exception is the Communist Party whose influence in Great Britain is small, weakening and confined to industry. This is largely because of the nature of the radical movements themselves and, more importantly, because of two factors; in combination probably unique to Great Britain.

The first fact is that we have no conscription and our armed forces consist of volunteers. The opportunities for political agitation are few. The level of intelligence of the average recruit is quite high. He is unlikely, having chosen to join an authoritarian and hierarchical group, to be receptive to agitation.

But there is also another important fact. The British Armed Forces have a tradition of being uninterested in politics and a clear record of having exerted no political influence. The Army is not responsible for the maintenance of the social order and has not been for a long time. The Services have in no way been a channel for even attempted political change. It has even been extremely rare to see retired officers of high rank in active politics. Current members of the armed services must, of course, remain absolutely uninvolved in politics. This is a rule that is very strictly applied.

The Armed Services, therefore, offer no obvious channel for the politically ambitious on the right and their voluntary nature makes them uncongenial to the left. Thus attempts to subvert the Forces directly have been rare and are likely to remain so.

Disputes or mutinies have occurred. These have usually been on a localized basis over pay or conditions. There have been small mutinies, over demobilization at the end of World War I, and in the Navy at Spithead in, I think, 1931.

Political disquiet has been very much more limited. During

\*Former Chairman of the Federation of Conservative Students

World War I there was a certain amount of pacifist agitation. This was a result both of the shock of trench warfare and the harsh attitude adopted by the authorities. There was no concerted opposition to the war as there was in the French Army, for example. In 1914 however it appeared that the British Army in Northern Ireland might take up arms against the British Government if it tried to impose Home Rule on Ireland. This was never tested as World War I intervened. Recently there were suggestions that the Army, especially the officers, might resign or even mutiny rather than take part in action against the rebel regime in Salisbury. This has never been substantiated and remains conjecture.

Tradition is strong in Britain, and even our revolutionaries are very British. Extremism is not a traditional feature of British life and our extremist groups are small and divided. I propose to give a brief outline of their natures.

The Right is weak. It consists of a number of organizations, the most important of which have recently come together in the NATIONAL FRONT. Their programme poses no threat to national security, or defence policy as such; it is a modern British version of fascism - insular, racialist, chauvinistic with emphasis on the corporate state. No doubt the right has some sympathizers in the Army and its strength is slowly growing especially at the edges where it blurs into Enoch Powell support movements.

The Left wing ranges of course from the pacifist to the supporter of violent revolution; in no case sympathetic to the aims of British security. They are, however, not to be found in the Army. They are also very much divided. The impetus to what we may call "the New Left" in Britain came with the disillusionment of socialists with the Labour Government in 1965. It has grown, especially amongst students, since then - the Labour Party is now regarded as a capitalist party and most socialists are on its left. In the Universities at any rate it began in 1965 as a Utopian and almost anarchistic movement. Its more important sections have since acquired a modern Trotskyite philosophy and have learned to accept organization and discipline. They have been influenced by American example in tactics. There has been no attempt to radicalize the armed forces (for the reasons that I have already mentioned) nor has defence policy

been considered important. This may seem surprising in view of the strength of the campaign for nuclear disarmament in the 1950s but it is probably a product of the British sense of island security and a recognition that internal rather than external forces have been and are likely to be the causes of change in British society. They have concentrated their attention on the Universities and on the radicalization of students. The chief agent for this has been the RSSF - the REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISTS STUDENTS FEDERATION - an amalgam of various groups with the addition of various disoriented American refugees. The leading group intellectually has been the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISTS, who have extensive European contacts. A very powerful group this last year, smaller and more intellectual but not terribly distinct in philosophy from the IS, has been the INTERNATIONAL MARXIST GROUP, the British section of the 4th International. They believe in a slower revolutionary process than do say the Maoists who have been increasing more in numbers than in influence but who have succeeded in causing a certain split. There are also various other groups. Their difference lies largely in their beliefs as to the immediacy of the coming revolution.

As I say, these people have concentrated on the Universities trying to discover issues where the political morality of the mass of students could be outraged. There is now a split in the movement which has resulted in a tendency to concentrate more on the schools and the factories. When in the latter they are unlikely to be successful, as groups of Trotskyites who believe that workers, not students, will lead the revolution are far more effective than they are. The IS tend to be too middle-class.

In the last few months, however, successful attempts have been made, probably co-ordinated nationally by the IMG, to interfere with firms coming to recruit students on the campus whom they disapprove of and to discover and oppose Government defence research contracts in the Universities.

Since the Ministry of Defence has its own research establishments this threat is unlikely to be serious.

### Conclusions

1. It probably would be unwise in the immediate future to intro-

duce conscription in Great Britain in view of the influence of left-wing ideology on many students. This could mean a reduced capacity to fight a war which did not pose any obvious immediate threat to our security - for example in South-East Asia.

2. There may be some difficulties as far as conducting defence research in University establishments is concerned.
3. The threat of military subversion from the Left is weak. They have a negligible involvement with the armed forces. Being strongly anti-communist themselves it will be difficult for them to summon up much energy to denounce a European security policy.
4. A threat from the Right is equally unlikely. While the Right most certainly seems to be more established in the armed forces, its political appearance is conceivable only as a response to an incompetent, probably left-wing, Government in a time of economic failure, racial tension and civil unrest. Political intervention in such an event, and the threat does not seem very real, is unlikely to come from the ideological Right anyway.
5. The danger, therefore, to British defence policy from political extremism is not very real. The parliamentary system may be more fragile than many suppose, and I think it is, but the attack on it and our system of government will be direct. The external security of this country is likely to be the last thing affected in such a process rather than the first.

## RIGHT-WING RADICALISM AND DEFENCE

by Lt. -Col. Curt Schlieker\*

Right-wing radicalism, or rather right-wing political extremism, as represented today in the Federal Republic of Germany by the NPD in particular, differs quite essentially in its policy utterances on defence questions from left-wing political extremism.

The extreme left-wing groups, irrespective of their special political aims at any given time, fundamentally reject any form of military defence for the Federal Republic. In their political propaganda they generally portray the soldier as a negative symbol for death, destruction, suppression of freedom and inhumanity.

In contrast to this the extreme right professes its unqualified belief in defence. It sees in the hierarchical military order a model for the state and social order also. It regards the soldier, clearly integrated into the principle of command and obey, as the example of the ideal citizen.

Viewed in this way, there would appear to exist a positive relationship between right-wing political extremism in the Federal Republic and defence. In other words, the NPD would appear not to constitute any danger to the defence and security of the Federal Republic. This, however, is by no means the case.

Not only is the NPD a domestic and international burden on the Federal Republic, in that it gives the impression that national socialist ideas are still alive or in the process of revival. In addition, the realization of its national defence conception would pose a genuine threat to our security as well as promoting Soviet expansionism.

### NPD Policy on Europe and National Defence

In Section XIV of its official Party Programme passed in 1967 (see Appendix I) the NPD put forward seventeen "Theses and Demands on National Defence Policy and European Defence".

\*Senior Government Counsellor to the Federal Ministry of Defence in Bonn

Of these some are positively welcome, while others at least merit discussion. The majority of the theses, however, if put into practice - to the extent that this is economically, technically and internationally feasible - would be to the detriment of the security and defence not only of the Federal Republic but of the whole of Europe or even the Western world.

The NPD defence conception is geared towards European military defence (i. e. limited to European territory) within the framework of an all-European security system (Section XIV, items 1, 3 and 5). In addition the NPD demands the withdrawal of "troops of foreign continents" (item 3) and favours the creation in Europe of "a military force sufficiently strong to deter any potential adversary" (item 2).

In total these demands amount to an unequivocal renunciation of the NATO alliance. The situation is in no way altered by the fact that item 4 of the "Wertheim Manifesto 70" (see Appendix 2) accepts the Atlantic Alliance "for a transitional period". The NPD's attitude to party programmes emerges from a statement in its "Political Lexicon" under the heading "Parties": "Ever since the end of World War I party programmes have been devoid of meaning. The electorate has come to accept its inability to draw any binding conclusions from a party's published programme as to what policies that party will pursue in practice".

Europe as the "Third Power" between East and West - thus could one sum up the foreign and alliance policy conceptions of the NPD, were it not for one defect in this NPD Europe: nowhere in any Party Programme or national defence statement is specific reference made to its eastern frontiers.

Will this Europe or to quote the "Wertheim Manifesto 70" item 4, this "federation of European states" which is envisaged, comprise only Western Europe without the Eastern European states? If so, one can hardly describe it as "Europe", since Europe from the geographical point of view even includes that part of the USSR lying west of the Urals. Or is this federation of states also to include the East bloc states and perhaps even the USSR? Official party statements leave both possibilities open.

In the course of the Czech crisis the NPD's conduct was such

as to raise doubts about the party's otherwise negative attitude towards communism or communist states. As early as June 19, 1968, i. e. before the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, von Thadden, writing in "Deutsche Nachrichten", the official party organ of the NPD, declared:

"As long as West German policy is pursued entirely within the framework of an Atlantic bloc formation rendered obsolete by history and current reality, the Kremlin will reply in kind within the framework of the Warsaw Pact...

The alternative therefore lies in a continental European policy.

This is the only way to find a compromise with the East which will safeguard the continued existence of the entire German people".

What form will this compromise take? No hint whatsoever is provided in the political programme of the NPD, unless the views expressed on August 7, 1968, in the official NPD news service by Prof. von Grünberg, a member of the NPD Executive Committee and together with Prof. Anrich, a "party ideologist", are a reflection of official party thinking:

... "Our only possibility is to convince the Russians that in no area of Central Europe vacated by them will there ever arise forces which might, in a possible moment of weakness, turn against Russia.

If necessary it will be the task of a new Germany and the new Europe to protect Russia's rear - and to do so more effectively than is at present the case with Ulbricht, Dubcek, Gomulka etc. and their Russian-hating populations for ever in revolt.

This task also means that at some time in the future Germany and the whole of Europe will take action to curb the Russian-haters in Central Europe just as Bismarck did with Austria and that the dogmatic apostles of liberalism with sacred missions against Russia will be restrained just as effectively as Bismarck restrained the ideologically anti-Russian liberalism of England and the German south and west - directed at that time against Tsarism ..."

The fact that the party leadership has these demands in mind is confirmed by von Thadden in his "policy of realities" speech of October 1968:

"Two weeks before the Red Army invasion (of Czechoslovakia - author's note) we emphasized what kind of all-German policy would have to be pursued in a new Europe vis-a-vis the Soviet rear, in view of developments confronting the Soviet Union in Asia.

The Soviets must be certain that, if they unbolt the door in Central Europe, this evacuated area now lying to their rear will not take advantage of any possible Soviet weaknesses in the future..."

That these statements are still valid today was confirmed by von Thadden's "annual report" to the NPD Party Conference in Wertheim: "A settlement based on firm agreement which, as defined in my Stuttgart speech, will dispel the fears of Western Europe (and consequently ourselves) and will give the Soviet Union freedom of action in the rear".

The official NPD statements quoted above signify no more and no less than that Western Europe and (after its emancipation by the Soviets) Central Europe as well shall secure the Soviet claim to hegemony over the non-Soviet states of Eastern Europe and shall guarantee Soviet "freedom of action in the rear".

At the last NPD Party Conference in Wertheim the NPD Land Chairman Hermannsdörfer demanded that the party leadership should dissociate itself from these and other statements by Professors Anrich and von Grünberg. The demand failed, whereupon Hermannsdörfer resigned from office and left the Party Conference. In the Executive Committee ballot both professors were reelected: thus the NPD continues to stand by these statements.

It is not the intention here to examine whether such a guarantee might be of interest to the Soviets as a counter-consideration for the evacuation of Central Europe. More important seems to be the fact that, notwithstanding its persistent anti-communist propaganda, the NPD is still prepared to offer security guarantees to the USSR ensuring the unhindered continuation of communist

dictatorship both in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. One might conclude from this that the "NPD Europe" is to comprise only Western and Central Europe.

In addition to these official party statements there are others which at first sight seem contradictory, but which in reality constitute a further development.

In a study by the "NPD Working Group on National Defence Policy", published in "Deutsche Nachrichten" on January 10, the following statement is made under the heading "Reform of the Federal Armed Forces":

"Commitments outside Europe and far-reaching differences of opinion are threatening the destiny of NATO. The aim therefore should be to bring about a transformation by means of an autonomous European security system. This should be of such a nature as to accommodate all European states, irrespective of their social system and form of government, provided that the emphasis is on common vital interests".

In that case not a "Little Europe" but a "Collective Europe" - at least as far as the "European Security System" is concerned? After all, if one is prepared to offer the Soviet communists security guarantees, then one can also invite them into a "Collective European Security System", together with all the other communist states of Europe.

There can be no doubt, however, as to the result: the communist states would occupy a dominant position inside this security system and thus a "Collective Europe" would mean a communist Europe.

But - cf. the study by the Working Group on National Defence Policy - the NPD does in fact believe that "common vital interests" exist with these states - more so, at any rate, than with the USA, Canada and Great Britain. The party programme demand for the withdrawal of "troops of foreign continents" can only refer to the troops of these states and nowhere in the Party Programme or in any other official statements is there any mention of an alliance between an "NPD Europe" and these states. On the contrary: anti-Americanism is an integral and all-pervading factor in the NPD's entire political conception.

Two examples will serve to illustrate this:

- "This is not a policy of security (allusion to NATO - author's note), but the dutiful execution of an American commission, in which the role assigned to us Germans will consist of allowing ourselves to be overrun and burnt out in the first phase of war".
- "It amounts to a national emergency when our people is exposed to a wave of criminality and sex, the American explanation of which may perhaps stem from the Wild West, but which is intolerable in Europe for the simple reason that we are confronted with the communist East, where they have their methods for dealing with such decadent symptoms".

(Both quotations are from the speech by the NPD Chairman von Thadden at the 1967 Party Conference in Hanover).

In the second quotation communist methods for "dealing with such decadent symptoms" are held out as an example. This interpretation is not based on mere supposition. There are statements in the same speech which justify allegations that the NPD does not disapprove of the Soviet system on principle, but even pays it a certain amount of tribute:

"There is no doubt that the peoples of Russia have suffered much in the first half of this century, but they have also experienced in these five decades cultural-historical developments, which have yet to find their modern parallel. Today the Soviet Union is not only the strongest military power in the world - and this was visibly demonstrated on the 50th anniversary - but she has reached a level of intellectual, technical and cultural-political achievement which - measured against its starting point - calls forth respect and approval".

The attitude of the NPD towards communism is singularly dubious.

On the one hand it champions a nationalist, anti-communist course where the questions of reunification, recognition of the Oder-Neisse line, the Munich agreement or the bringing to trial of Nazi war criminals are concerned; on the other hand it acknowledges the Soviet's model national policy ("Deutsche Nachrichten", Sept. 13, 1968, under the heading "The

communists are pursuing a Russian policy"), while evolving plans for an all-European security system, in which, in the final analysis, the communists would occupy the predominant position.

If, therefore, the defence policy conceptions of the National Democrats are based on the assumption that the Federal Republic's national and security interests can be better protected in a European security system incorporating the Soviet Union and the East European communist states than in the NATO alliance, then the question whether the right-wing extremist policies of the NPD are a danger to the defence and security of the Federal Republic must be answered with an unequivocal "yes".

#### NPD Prospects?

If one forms a positive conclusion, then the inevitable question arises: are there any prospects in the Federal Republic today of the right-wing extremism represented by the NPD achieving its objectives?

Since its foundation on November 28, 1964, this party seemed to be enjoying a continuous upward movement: in 1965 it contested the Bundestag elections, polling 2.1% at the first attempt. In the Land Parliament elections of the following years (up to 1968) it obtained between 5.8% and 9.8% of the votes and was represented in the Federal Land Parliaments by 60 deputies. (Some of these deputies have, in the meantime, resigned from the NPD). At times NPD membership exceeded 30,000. The party leadership as well as political observers at home and abroad were convinced that the Party would clear the 5% hurdle in the 1969 Bundestag elections and so enter the Bundestag.

It is no wonder, therefore, that this apparent break-through by an openly nationalist, extreme right-wing movement should create anxieties at home and abroad as to the ability of post-war German democracy, young and inexperienced, to withstand this development.

The extreme left in the Federal Republic and the communist world outside took the NPD as a further reason for reproaching the Federal government with charges of fascism, militarism and revanchism.

The NPD results in the 1969 Bundestag elections - 4.3% - were a bitter disappointment to right and left-wing extremists alike:

- the NPD, which already regarded its entry into the Bundestag as a foregone conclusion, was given a flat rejection by the German electorate.
- left-wing extremists in and outside the Federal Republic saw themselves robbed of the chance to point to an NPD faction in the German Bundestag as proof of the continued existence or revival of national socialism in the Federal Republic.

The possibility of the NPD exercising any determinant or even co-determinant influence on Federal government policy and consequently on the defence conception has been ruled out by this election result.

As emerged particularly clearly in the course of its election campaign, the NPD had been counting on high returns from voters in the Federal Armed Forces, particularly in view of its successful recruitment of a number of Federal soldiers of all ranks to stand as candidates. An assessment of election results in the barracks showed this assumption to be false and the NPD Executive Committee Working Group on National Defence Policy even admitted as much in a circular dated December 15, 1969.

### Conclusion

The purpose of this study has been to examine and portray whether and to what extent right-wing political extremism in the Federal Republic of Germany, as represented by the NPD, constitutes a threat to defence.

The study has therefore been deliberately limited to an analysis of military and alliance policy conceptions. The findings may come as a surprise to many people, since the sole criterion outside and also inside the Federal Republic has usually been whether this party gives rise to a "renazification" danger.

Its blatant and to some extent pathetic affirmation of military tradition and military defence usually obscures, for the most part, any suspicion that not only might the Party constitute a

threat to freedom and democracy applicable in a constitutional state, but a genuine danger to security and defence into the bargain.

The danger of the NPD national defence policy conception does not lie in any desire on its part to weaken or do away with the military defence of the Federal Republic, but in its attempt to draw the Federal Republic out of the alliance with the Free World.

However, an equal danger to national defence and security may arise out of over-estimations in the mass media of friendly or allied countries of the existence of an extreme right-wing party in the Federal Republic. The populations of these countries could easily form the impression that we really are facing an imminent resurgence of national socialism. The result could be a genuine crisis of confidence, coupled with the possibility of political repercussions. Nor would any renewed mistrust abroad over the state of democracy in the Federal Republic be without its repercussions on the population here at home and thus new impetus would be given to those forces which have learned nothing from the past. Yet this is precisely what we should all be concerned to prevent.

Appendix I

Extract from the NPD Party Programme

XIV. National Defence Policy and European Defence:  
Theses and Demands

1. National defence policy must be geared towards European defence and must serve the objective of preserving peace through a balance of military forces in Europe.
2. Since there must never again be a war in Europe, we will require a military force sufficiently strong to deter any potential adversary. This goal can be achieved by a joint European effort.
3. National defence policy should be keyed to taking over from the troops of foreign continents. The independent military defence of European existence is a prerequisite for the restoration of national German unity and the surmounting of the division of Europe.
4. The NPD therefore affirms military service in the Federal Armed Forces which, as the upholder of the nation's will to defend itself, constitute an inalienable and integral part of our democratic system.
5. German military forces must not be the tool of international great power politics. The NPD regards the creation of an all-European security system as absolutely essential.
6. The NPD regards universal compulsory military service as the only solution to effective defence and as a valuable contribution to the education of the citizen.
7. A willingness to accept responsibility, outstanding ability, impeccable personal standards and unremitting care were and still are the prerequisites for military leadership. The NPD therefore regards as incongruous all measures which purport to reflect essential democracy but which must inevitably lead to the destruction of order and discipline when transferred to the military domain.
8. The organization, equipping and arming of the forces must be

determined solely by requirements for the greatest possible degree of military preparedness in the framework of the defence responsibility.

9. The officer and non-commissioned officer corps are the backbone of the military leadership. In our society the soldier must enjoy the respect which is due to him. The duty to provide for his care and welfare lies with the employer.
10. The Federal Armed Forces must stand outside the influence of party political interests. There is no place inside the barracks for pressure groups of whatever kind.
11. Supreme command of German soldiers must be vested in German hands.  
The creation of a German General Staff is essential.
12. Responsibility for the supervision of troops should be transferred to the commanders-in-chief and commanding officers. Troops cannot be supervised, but must be led.
13. The NPD demands the return of military jurisdiction. Commanding officers and unit leaders must be given the necessary disciplinary powers to maintain discipline.
14. Provision for disabled Armed Forces conscripts and ex-service invalids of both World Wars, as well as their dependants, is part of the defence responsibility. To this extent the administration of such provision should be incorporated in the Ministry of Defence.
15. Soldiers of the former SS have an equal claim to the same provision and treatment as all other soldiers of the former Armed Forces.
16. In virtue of the crucial importance of military research and military technology the accomplishment of the defence mandate must be expedited by the immediate construction of a limited national armaments industry geared to European interests. Foreign purchases of armaments and equipment may only be made where these are superior to home products and will increase the fighting strength of the Federal Armed Forces.

17. It is the duty of the democratic citizen to serve his country as a soldier to the full extent of his ability. The soldier is required to perform his duty to the extent of laying down his life; compulsory military service is thus a moral duty discharged towards the German people.

Appendix 2

Extract from the "Wertheim Manifesto 70"

passed at the 4th NPD Party Conference on February 15, 1970, in Wertheim/Main.

"Federation of European states

4. The NPD demands the creation of a federation of European states. It accepts the Atlantic Alliance for a transitional period, until a federation of European states is itself in a position to guarantee the security of member states".

LEFT-WING RADICALISM AND DEFENCE  
IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

by Hans-Joachim Woehl \*

CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
1. Essential features of left-wing radicalism	92
2. Short historical survey up to Autumn 1969	94
3. Past "successes" of left-wing radical groups	95
4. The pre-military service arena: point of main effort	96
5. Why no "hot summer 1969" in the Federal Republic?	97
6. Changes in strategy and tactics	98
a) an apparent process of disintegration and frustration in the APO section	
b) a growing radicalization in the anarchist-revolutionary section	
c) an apparent integration of the non-communist left-wing radicals in the Establishment	
d) changing the state of consciousness through extra-parliamentary actions and basic work	
7. Effects on NATO	105
8. Does defence still make sense today?	107
9. Is there a future for left-wing radicalism in the Federal Republic of Germany?	109
List of abbreviations	112

\* Senior Government Counsellor to the Federal Ministry of Defence in Bonn

### 1. Essential features of left-wing radicalism

The last Bundestag elections in Autumn 1969 have shown that radicalism in the Federal Republic of Germany - at least for the present - has no prospects as far as parliamentary methods are concerned. This applies equally to right and left.

There are quite fundamental differences between right and left-wing radicalism in the Federal Republic, and both must be considered together. For approximately five years right-wing radicalism has been forming, to all intents and purposes, in one single party, the NPD. Though irrelevant at home, the NPD is seen abroad as an ostensible and dangerous manifestation of a resurgence of right-wing radicalism in the Federal Republic and, not least because of our recent past, its importance has been over-estimated.

By comparison left-wing radicalism in the Federal Republic is split into so many groups of varying strength, aims and ideological alignment that so far it has not even been possible to find a uniform definition for these groupings, much less any fixed form of organization.

One could all too easily draw the wrong conclusions from this. What is certain is that owing to their disunity these left-wing radical groups have so far not managed to obtain by democratic means the 5% majority necessary for entry into a Land or Federal Parliament. Thus the left-wing radicals in the Federal Republic have been forced to date to voice their opinions through extra-parliamentary channels, i. e. by taking wide-ranging action, inciting public opinion on the streets and by the use of such incisive slogans as "Smash NATO", "Paralyse the Federal Armed Forces".

The left-wing radicals in the Federal Republic are in no way concerned with long-term reforms; what they say is to "refunction" our state and social order as fast as possible. Thus the following automatically become the focal points of left-wing radical attack:

- the police and judicial authorities both as "elements of state law and order"
- the Federal Armed Forces as a "military power instrument"

- universities, schools; freedom of opinion, conscientious objection, the right to demonstrate - in other words, institutions and subjects affecting and restricting their own actions.

This means that for the whole of the radical left wing the Federal Armed Forces constitute only one part of the Establishment. However, in the APO's struggle against the allegedly "fascistoid, authoritarian system" in the Federal Republic the Armed Forces have in the meantime, together with the police and the legal authorities become one of the chief objects of attack, if for no other reason than because of the intense vulnerability of this highly technicalized army. Notwithstanding the variety and diversity of their objectives, all the left-wing radical groups are agreed on one point: the Federal Armed Forces, as the "military power instrument" of this state, must be destroyed, "undermined", "ridiculed" and if possible, provoked to react improperly.

Unlike the NPD, no soldier has yet allowed himself to stand for a Federal or Land Parliament as a candidate for one of these left-wing radical groups. Yet, beneath the surface it has been noticeable for years that certain developments have been steadily gaining momentum which represent no small threat to the continued existence of our democracy and our liberal-democratic judicial code:

With psychological insight the left-wing radicals play on an uneasiness which is latent, and even justified to a certain extent, throughout our society, and especially among the soldiers. With such themes as:

- "The soldier is being trained to kill"
  - "In cases of emergency the Federal Armed Forces shall also be deployed against demonstrating students, schoolchildren and workers" (cf. Art. 87a, Basic Constitutional Law)
  - "Do only fools join the army?"
  - "Build schools and hospitals with the money spent on arm-aments"
  - "Time spent in the forces is time wasted"
- they aim at:
- appealing to the soldier, not only to win him over to their cause but, first and foremost, to rouse him against the present

- form of society, and
- publicly portraying the soldier as a "negative symbol" for death, destruction, suppression of freedom and inhumanity.

## 2. Short historical survey up to Autumn 1969

The result of the left-wing radical poll in the Bundestag elections (ADF: 0.6%), the absence of the "hot summer of 1969" announced by the APO, the impression of a momentary, apparent calm and the shattering defeat of the ADF could easily lead to the idea that the APO has been eliminated, its percentage poll bearing no relation to that of the other parties. One could conclude that the APO is no longer a factor to be taken seriously in German politics, and certainly not vis-à-vis the Federal Armed Forces.

It would be dangerous to draw such a false conclusion. Firstly, the ADF and APO are by no means identical. That is to say, miscalculations are inevitably reached, unless one differentiates between the individual left-wing groups. From the defence policy angle it is therefore a matter, primarily, of keeping a close watch on those very groups that are opposed to Federal military preparedness, the Federal Armed Forces and NATO. Certainly the spectacular events of Spring 1968 are past history. However, merely to focus on this "small, radical minority", students protesting predominantly about student affairs, would be to fall victim to a dangerous simplification in assessing the situation. Inside the APO the situation is by no means "calm".

At the beginning of the Sixties there was a wave of pacifist neutralism which, however, soon came under communist influence (Easter March Movement, BdD, DFU). By 1967 a new movement had suddenly emerged which steadily became more radical - the student APO. With the founding of a new German Communist Party (DKP) and the simultaneous appearance of a communist youth organization (SDAJ), which quickly became active, 1968 marks the positive start to a consolidation of communist forces hitherto believed impossible in the Federal Republic of Germany. The period up to mid-1969 was marked by the following developments:

- a continuous effort to ensure political awareness ("politicization") and ideological radicalism in the APO;

- further consolidation within the DKP and SDAJ;
- the almost total disintegration of the purely pacifist-neutralist elements of left-wing radicalism.

## 3. Past "successes" of left-wing radical groups

Up to Summer 1969 certain APO "successes" pertaining to the "Anti-Federal Armed Forces Campaign" remain irrefutable. What is understood by this "campaign" is the co-ordination of all actions concentrating on the creation of uncertainty in the Federal Armed Forces, and in particular on conscientious objection. The unrest, especially of the left-wing radical youth, had the initial effect of rendering the Establishment more active but also, to some extent, of intermittently "undermining" it. Without here wishing to dramatize this "undermining" process, certain "successes" can in fact be traced, above all in the police, legal and university fields.

Nor did these phenomena fail to leave their mark on the Federal Armed Forces. There were instances, for example, of soldiers distributing leaflets, even in uniform, here and there the formation of so-called "Base" or "Project Groups", acts of military sabotage, so-called group reporting as conscientious objectors, disturbances at swearing-in ceremonies, distribution of leaflets among conscripts or outside army corps area recruiting offices, burning of service papers, distribution of leaflets outside US barracks in support of Vietnam deserters, and so on. These multifarious activities, which had come to a head by early Summer 1969, were bound to have repercussions on the combat readiness of the troops and also on the reputation of the Federal Armed Forces in NATO.

Generally speaking, the following may be listed as APO "successes":

- "political involvement ("politicization") of our entire social life, i. e. an increased consciousness of joint political responsibility shared by a wide public;
- intensified awareness of the need for essential social reforms (above all in the field of education).

However, the APO in no way regards such developments as a measure of its "success". The anarchist-revolutionary element sees these past successes in reforming the Establishment as

"stabilizing the System", because these reforms are strictly in the interests of the Establishment. What the left-wing extremist section of the APO, on the other hand, counts as "genuine successes" are, for example, the continuously rising number of conscientious objectors up to Summer 1969 and the so-called group representations resulting from the APO-induced transformation of political consciousness vis-a-vis the entire existing state and social order.

As a result of this "transformation of consciousness" new and different forms of "conscious attitudes" among officers belonging to the war generation and young Federal Armed Forces officers have emerged which cannot be explained by the "generation problem" alone. APO concepts such as democratization, frustration, manipulation, "fascistoid", anti-authoritarian, to name a few, almost automatically find their way into the vocabulary of the young officers in particular, without their even being aware of it. Different processes of reasoning gradually emerge between the two generations of officers, and the inevitable effect on the internal structure of the Federal Armed Forces can only be described as a "transformation of consciousness".

#### 4. The pre-military service arena: point of main effort

This "transformation of consciousness" goes back to the pre-military service period (mainly the secondary school or trade school stage). There are over 2,000 secondary schools in the Federal Republic of Germany - a large field for the left-wing radical groups

- to infuse their Marxist-socialist-anarchist-revolutionary-Utopian-communist and other ideas with the appropriate variations,
- to set in motion a process of consolidation seeking to encompass a wide cross section of the Young APO (Young Workers, Young Academicians, Young Socialists etc.), in order to come one step closer to achieving their mass basis objective,
- to extend "youth unrest" to the secondary schools, to "politicize" the secondary schools, and make them active.

In the case of APO efforts to exert influence over secondary school pupils, we are dealing here - as in the case of the SDS -

with only a "hard core", a "small radical minority". But today approximately 10% of secondary school pupils are already favourably disposed towards these ideas. The process continues.

Subjects like conscientious objection, military injustice, the use of Federal Armed Forces for domestic purposes, the Emergency Legislation, training of soldiers to kill, are today more or less the main topics discussed by secondary school pupils, i. e. those liable for military service in the future. School and student organizations see to it that this flame is constantly kindled and unrest fomented through actions and publications, ready to be channelled into "anti-system" activity.

On account of our Federal constitution the Federal Armed Forces themselves, which have a special interest in these trends, only have the chance to obtain a hearing on questions of military preparedness in a third of the secondary schools. The officers concerned are experiencing ever-increasing difficulties. They not only encounter resistance from the young people themselves i. e. the conscripts of the future, but also very often from the teachers and headmasters. The two conscientious objectors' organizations (VK and DFG/WRI) are also working along these lines. Both are endeavouring:

- to introduce into the schools the subject of conscientious objection for political reasons and
- to form "cadre", "basis and project groups" which will one day work inside the Federal Armed Forces on behalf of conscientious objection and subversion.

They are opposed, however, to any suggestion that the subject of national defence policy should even be discussed (eg. by the youth officers) let alone taught in schools.

#### 5. Why no "hot summer 1969" in the Federal Republic?

The transformation of socio-political conditions at all costs is the left-wing radicals' answer to the CDU slogan for the 1969 Bundestag elections "Safely into the Seventies". A mere ten years ago the bond uniting members of the left-oriented younger generation was a certain uneasiness, - to some extent thoroughly legitimate and widespread. Today a sweeping change of consciousness has occurred. Now young people are united in their

total over-estimation of the concept of freedom, in their demolition of old values and traditions in their extreme negative attitude towards the state, the older generation and all forms of authority - particularly authority as manifested in the Federal Armed Forces. They are not in agreement, however, on purely tactical questions, such as the use of force against people or property in the furtherance of their own objectives.

Since Summer 1969 a transformation has taken place in the behaviour, strategy and tactics of the extreme left-wing younger generation. Consequently, spectacular demonstrations, long hair, the red flag etc. - even in the view of the APO - are today no longer an appropriate, and what is most important, an effective means of implementing extreme political intentions by extra-parliamentary methods.

The result is that since the end of Summer 1969 there has been a marked decline in militant mass activity. It would be wrong, however, to imagine that left-wing radicals have been worn out by their own activities or become revolution-weary. The power struggle today is simply being waged by far more subtle means. In the meantime there has been a swing to unpretentious spade-work. Translated into APO language this means: left-wing radical groups are giving priority at the moment, not to blind performances, but to practical problems and activities designed to mould a sense of consciousness.

#### 6. Changes in strategy and tactics

After the formation of the new Social Democratic-Liberal Federal government in October 1969 the extreme left-wing groups were forced to adjust their strategy, tactics and methods to this new situation. The following tendencies have since become apparent in the extreme left-wing groups:

##### a) an apparent process of disintegration and frustration in the APO section

To begin with, since Summer 1969 a certain process of disintegration and erosion has become apparent inside the student youth. In addition there is evidence of power and policy struggles in the two conscientious objectors' organizations and signs of disintegration in other left-wing radical organizations.

Furthermore a renunciation of the "personality cult" can be seen from the transfer of authority to collective leadership groups or to middle and lower groups. Thus, as a result of the subsequent regional power changes, Federal Armed Forces units in smaller garrisons may in the future become essentially more vulnerable to ad hoc action by left-wing radical groups than they were in the past.

Among a section of left-wing radical youth there is an intellectual, indeed, fascinating "retroversion" to the nineteenth century, to the concepts of Marxist ideology, to the theory of the class struggle and to communist orthodoxy with, as we believe today, all its outdated values, slogans and idols. Thus, the simultaneous efforts of the DKP to make ideological and conspiratorial inroads into the Federal Armed Forces cannot be ruled out in a small section of the Armed Forces susceptible to this communist propaganda.

Even if, for the time being, there is little likelihood of intensified action, it is still uncertain what line the Federal Government will take in its Ostpolitik and defence policy. An insufficient willingness on the part of the Federal government - in the view of leftist anti-military groups - to "accede" to communist demands will present the new Social Democratic-Liberal coalition with considerable coalition and internal leadership difficulties in its own left wing, the left-wing trade unions and young socialists.

##### b) a growing radicalization in the anarchist-revolutionary section

According to the latest figures published by the Federal Ministry of Justice, 4,000 demonstrations took place in the Federal Republic of Germany in 1968 and 1969 alone. Of these, 1,346 were "not peaceful". The demonstrations were staged predominantly by students, schoolchildren and young white-collar workers.

To this should be added the fact that from March to May 1968 attention still centred round the Emergency Legislation. After September 1968 conscientious objection for political reasons came increasingly to the fore. In Frankfurt/M. for example, the VK had been holding week-end "soldiers' conferences" since the end of February 1969 to recruit soldiers for work in the

barracks. By means of "simulated examinations, legal consultation, mutual exchange of experiences and the discussion of political questions connected with conscientious objection these conferences should "realistically" prepare the soldiers for the "examining panels and boards". The main topics at that time were:

- Article 87a of the Basic Constitutional Law (internal deployment of Federal Armed Forces)
- the extension of conscientious objection for political reasons into a "right to oppose" based on what the APO regards as a new "understanding of the fundamental principles of the law".

It was in fact Article 87a of the Basic Constitutional Law (formation, strength, deployment and duties of military forces) which was polemically "reinterpreted" by a wide variety of APO groups as "internal deployment of Federal Armed Forces" against demonstrating workers, students and schoolchildren, on whom the soldier may have to open fire even in peacetime. In this way the APO sought to attribute to the Federal Armed Forces a new image of a "police and civil war force". In their fundamental rejection of parliamentarianism and especially representative democracy, in their advocacy and use of force against people and property up to as recently as Summer 1969 (techniques still recurrent today), it is perfectly legitimate to speak of a form of "intolerant left-wing fascism" among the anarchist-revolutionary section of left-wing radicalism. The stage has been reached where an open criminalization, American style, is being aimed at. The following is an example of left-wing radical aspirations on the subject of conscientious objection: ("Time-table 13", Frankfurt/M., 1968, p. 149):

"The political rejection of military service in the USA has no chance at the present time of damaging the efficiency of the military machine. On the other hand the political effect is immeasurable. A nation which makes criminals of tens of thousands of its most intelligent young men is training tens of thousands of revolutionaries, who are used to illegality and whose political experience grows with every day that passes".

c) an apparent integration of the non-communist left-wing radicals into the Establishment

The APO maintains that "the long march through the institutions by the force transforming society has been for some time not a mere theoretical notion, but a reality". In the wake of the "spectacular events" of 1967-68 an "inner institutional" or "inner party" opposition has been growing almost unnoticed inside the non-communist section of the left-wing youth. In practical terms this means that there has been a relatively rapid decline in the "anti-authoritarian phase". These elements have realized that transformation, in the APO sense, is not feasible by means of reforms which "integrate the system" but rather by reforms which "overthrow the system" i. e. by means of an apparent integration into the most important institutions of the Establishment, including the Federal Armed Forces and the political parties (above all the SPD as the present ruling party).

Unless appearances deceive, it is likely that Rudi Dutschke's theory of "self-education and self-enlightenment" through "active confrontation" with the police is a thing of the past for the majority of non-communist left-wing radicals. For example, "consciousness-moulding action" is no longer seen today as the staging of "professional demonstrations" but as active participation in "basis" and "project groups", i. e. entering and staying in the Federal Armed Forces for the purpose of engaging in extreme political activity, creating uncertainty and fostering subversion and disaffection.

The danger of this development lies in the fact that the public, shocked by the spectacular events of 1967-68, is still apprehensively anticipating new action and new confrontations, while in fact the situation has developed along entirely different, but at the same time far more dangerous, lines.

For the Federal Armed Forces this means coping today with two kinds of "internal disintegration":

- the classic communist, illegal form ("iceberg theory")
- the new process of "moulding consciousness through action" (active participation in basis and project groups, remaining in the Federal Armed Forces for politically subversive purposes). Ultimately both these techniques have the same aim in view: the elimination of the Federal Armed Forces as the

"military power instrument of the Establishment" and as a serious NATO partner.

At the same time it is becoming increasingly difficult to judge the implications of such action because:

- the communists operate mainly by subversive methods on a long-term basis, while outwardly appearing to be democratic,
- the majority of the left-wing radical groups, on the other hand, operates just within the bounds of legality. By stretching to the limits those rights granted by the state, the left-wing radicals have adopted the well-known "salami technique" of attempting to cut away slice by slice: through the sustained efforts of the permanent groups they hope to sabotage the inner structure of the Federal Armed Forces from within.

d) Changing the state of consciousness through extra-parliamentary actions and basic work

These tactics, pursued by all leftist anti-military service groups, are being met in the Federal Republic by a changed politico-intellectual basic attitude:

- the "left" has become less forbidding,
- the "right" less attractive.

In other words, the formation of the new Social Democratic-Liberal Federal government indicates a trend towards a general political change of consciousness - a development which will certainly continue with increased vigour when the eighteen to twenty-year-olds reach voting age.

The socio-political evolutionary process of change is already beginning in the kindergartens and schools, extending over the colleges and young workers and not even stopping at the young officers.

This change of consciousness cannot be arrested. The question will always remain

- whether social necessities (force of circumstances) and political consciousness can be reconciled or
- whether at the same time certain leftist forces in the Federal Republic may transmute and so abuse this development in their own particular way, i. e. by extra-parliamentary action

or basic work.

The Federal Armed Forces provide an example of this. In accordance with the express wishes of the APO, conscientious objection has long since ceased to be a decision of conscience by the individual citizen. Art. 4, Par. 3 of the Basic Constitutional Law, which guarantees the individual citizen the right to refuse "to perform armed military service on the grounds of conscience", has long since been "transmuted" by the APO into a political weapon against the Federal Armed Forces and consequently the state. During the "Anti-Federal Armed Forces Campaign" it was stated categorically that the "production of conscientious objectors . . . would be almost valueless, unless they were also made politically conscious". In other words, it is not the conscientious objector's conscience which is of interest, but only the intensity of his political engagement. For all their differences of opinion the two conscientious objectors' organizations are agreed on one point:

"A non-committal 'no' is no longer enough. Anyone wishing to create peace must take the offensive against direct or indirect militarization".

In their actions on behalf of conscientious objection for political reasons the individual leftist anti-military service groups never tire of pointing repeatedly to the alleged aims of Federal Armed Forces training:

- The soldier - in their view - is being trained or used as cannon-fodder for murder, killing and genocide.
- The Federal Armed Forces exist to get every soldier out of the habit of thinking in a critical and democratic way.

Under the slogan "Democratization of the Federal Armed Forces" these radical leftist anti-military service elements are trying to create unrest in the Armed Forces. In addition the APO uses two recurrent catchphrases to brand what it calls the "System":

- it is "authoritarian",
- it is "fascistoid".

In the first phase of this "democratization" campaign the anti-military service groups are aiming at nothing less than the

"politicization" of schools, colleges, judiciary and not least the Federal Armed Forces. The ultimate aim of this "politicization" is the ideological conversion and transformation of consciousness, along APO lines, of the appropriate Establishment groups. Only when this moulding of consciousness is considered to have attained a broader basis, would the APO regard the time as right for the second phase of change.

Thus the real long-term objective of these groups is the ultimate abolition of any form of authority whatsoever. By means of these briefly outlined methods these forces hope

- to "create uncertainty" in the Federal Armed Forces from within,
- to sow mistrust between superiors and subordinates and
- increasingly to undermine the authority of superiors and consequently the combat effectiveness of the troops.

Despite the fact, also recognized by a section of the APO, that a pre-revolutionary situation would first have to be created in the Federal Republic, we must under no circumstances forget that - however calm the situation may appear at present - the APO will never lose sight of its real aim. This is the total transformation of the existing state of things in the Federal Republic by means of

- a basic change of consciousness (short-term objective)
- the revolutionary assumption of power in all areas of our social, economic and political life (long-term objective).

Another more pacifist section of the APO favours calls for wide-ranging legal activities culminating in "civil disobedience" or "resistance". In the last resort - and this should never be forgotten - calls for "civil disobedience", "violence against persons or property" and "non-violent resistance" all have the same aim: removal of the existing ruling order, and revolution at various levels, the only difference being in the methods employed.

Admittedly, there is no unanimity inside the APO either on the question of violence or on the real form which the revolution and its aftermath should take. But it is precisely in this apparent lack of conception that the great danger lies. Because the APO is not committed to a definite concept, it can constantly employ

surprise and flexibility in its actions and reactions, as it has currently proved - at least so far - in its dealings with the Federal Armed Forces also.

#### 7. Effects on NATO

Following an assessment of the left-wing radical groups in the Federal Republic, the question arises: what effect is this having on NATO?

Owing to its geographical position and economic potential, the Federal Republic of Germany is of strategic importance both to NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Not in vain is the Soviet bloc, first and foremost the Soviet Union and the GDR, also at pains to gain influence over the Federal Republic's national defence policy conception. This occurs at various levels and only brief mention is made in this connection of the subversive level.

- By means of massive propaganda "uncertainty" shall be "created" among the West German population, thus rendering it susceptible to "peace-loving", i. e. communist, ideas and aims.

In past years approximately 10 million items of subversive material have been officially seized in the Federal Republic. About 10% of the subject matter was concerned with national defence policy themes.

- The direct exertion of influence on soldiers aimed at destroying army morale.

One way in which this occurs is by the direct transmission of inflammatory military material to the soldiers, aided by the two communist radio stations in the GDR, "DFS 904" and "DSS 935", which in their themes, vocabulary and objectives aim expressly at the soldiers of the Federal Armed Forces. In contrast to the NVA, Federal Armed Forces soldiers are not forbidden to listen to these radios. Both stations deliberately try to "create uncertainty" in the Federal Armed Forces by means of their propaganda. Thus the possibility arises that the communist ideas propagated by both radios may be passed on by the soldiers during their active service and afterwards through perfectly normal channels. If the radios succeed, however superficially, in winning over soldiers on active service

for their propaganda theses, the result may be that these soldiers will infiltrate other comrades and, after leaving the service, other civilians as well. In other words, both radios are attempting by skilful camouflage to multiply their communist theses.

- Thus communist propaganda does not miss any opportunity to drive a wedge between the individual NATO partners. Its prime aims are to push the Federal Armed Forces, as an effective military defence factor, out of the Western political and defence alliance system, to weaken NATO and thus shift the military balance in favour of the Soviet bloc.
- Not for nothing does the DKP advocate universal compulsory military service in the Federal Republic. In contrast to a professional army, fluctuation is substantially higher and so too the possibility for communist cadre infiltration and the spreading among the population of communist ideas by the ex-servicemen.

Apart from the communist organizations (DKP and the prohibited KPD) and the communist front organizations, these communist theses receive conscious or unconscious support from such forces as the anarchist-revolutionary SDS and SDAJ and the pacifist DFU, BdD and the so-called left-wing theologians. According to their ideological orientation these groups champion the following, at first sight, totally contradictory theses:

- the military strength of the Soviet bloc is so superior that, in the event of a Western attack on the Warsaw Pact, the West's chances of survival would be nil
- the "peace-loving" Soviet bloc has no intention whatsoever of attacking the West.

Both theses have one thing in common: their aim is to undermine

- the will of the Federal Republic, and also of the West, to defend themselves
- to present Western defence as senseless from the start
- to present the Federal Armed Forces, and consequently the Federal Republic, as an uncertain factor within NATO in the framework of this global world political situation
- to present the Federal Republic vis-à-vis its other NATO partners as either "militarist", "nazi" or "revanchist" or, by attempting to neutralize it militarily, to isolate it at the

same time politically and militarily.

The intention behind these wide-ranging propaganda objectives and themes, as envisaged by the leftist groups, is as follows:

- to appeal to completely different groups of people in the Federal Republic - pacifists, communists, anarchists, neutralists, but above all to indifferent and dissatisfied people opposed to present government policy
- to drive the Federal Republic into enforced isolation between the two great military blocs (NATO and the Warsaw Pact) by propagating these theses
- to achieve a foreign policy effect by the propagation of seemingly domestic objectives, thus changing the status quo to the disadvantage of the West (e.g. by a reduction or cut-back in US troops stationed in the Federal Republic).

#### 8. Does defence still make sense today?

From the point of view of the anti-military leftist forces in the Federal Republic the decisive question inevitably arises whether or not there is any sense in Western defence - and also in the existence of the Federal Armed Forces. Clear distinctions must be made, however, when answering this question, since left-wing groups today approach this problem from totally different standpoints, depending on their political objectives.

It is the avowed aim of pacifist groups to bring about total disarmament, complete waiving of expenditure on armaments, abolition of mass destruction agents and the abolition of the Federal Armed Forces in general. In the case of a small group of genuine pacifists, a few individuals at most, their attitudes towards defence questions really are based primarily on ethical, religious or moral considerations.

The communist groups (DKP, SDAJ), on the other hand, are maintaining an air of apparent democracy, in that they simply want to see a reduction in compulsory military service (twelve months instead of eighteen) and limitations on arms expenditure. Then again, the anarchist-revolutionary groups (SDS and the two conscientious objectors' organizations VK and DFG/WRI) reject from the start compulsory military service, arms ex-

penditure and the Federal Armed Forces in general. The two last-mentioned groups today constitute the overwhelming mass of conscientious objectors, with whose differing methods and activities the Federal Armed Forces are having to contend to an increasing degree.

Thus the communists, for example, are attempting by two different methods to influence the population's desire for defence and also to gain influence over the Federal Armed Forces.

- By supporting the actions of other left-wing groups (the Easter March Movement, conscientious objectors' organizations and leftist student organizations) opposed to military preparedness, they attempt to further their ad hoc aims by employing, mostly in spontaneous actions, various groups of the population (conscripts joining up, soldiers' mothers and girl friends, reservists, secondary school pupils, students). At the same time, they themselves remain in the background and are not interested in fostering genuine, lasting co-operation
- Trained cadres, subversively infiltrated into the Federal Armed Forces, have instructions to undermine the Armed Forces from within.

The anarchist-revolutionary groups and the conscientious objectors' organizations (SDS; DFG/WRI), on the other hand, are trying to activate conscripts along two courses by intensively exploiting the right of conscientious objection, guaranteed under the constitution (Basic Constitutional Law):

- the "morally weaker members" should refuse to perform military service from the start
- the "morally stronger members" should enter the Armed Forces and, by wide-ranging action, undermine them from within (group representations, continuous complaints, distribution of leaflets in front of and inside the barracks, ridiculing of superiors).

Direct action is the favourite method of these radical groups, bringing them more readily to the attention of the people. On this, however, the communists differ strongly from the anarchist-revolutionary elements.

For purely tactical reasons the communists reject a violent confrontation with the forces of order (police, Armed Forces).

They are not prepared to risk the possible prohibition of the now legal DKP and see it share the fate of the KPD in 1956. Furthermore, communists in the Federal Republic correctly assess the attitude of the population: the average German is in favour of "law and order" and rejects acts of provocation. Thus the DKP is trying, with increasing success, to present itself as a "democratic workers' party". Yet never for one moment do the communists lose sight of their real objective: to obtain exclusive power in the state by "cold methods", i. e. without war or revolution.

The anarchist-revolutionary forces, in contrast, are prepared for anything. Where it is tactically desirable, they will join in ad hoc activities, violence not excluded, with any extra-parliamentary group. For them the difference between violence against persons and violence against property is merely a formal, tactical question.

#### 9. Is there a future for left-wing radicalism in the Federal Republic of Germany?

Between the communist and non-communist left-wing radicals in the Federal Republic there exists a conflict which will scarcely be resolved:

- The APO blames the DKP for "reformist tactics", which will ultimately help to "stabilize the system"
- The DKP accuses the non-communist left-wing radicals of working, to all intents and purposes, "for the benefit of the bourgeoisie".

One could arrive all too easily at the view that left-wing radicalism in the Federal Republic will eventually "burn itself out". If, however, one ventures to make a short-term forecast of future left-wing developments in the Federal Republic vis-à-vis defence, one is led to the following inevitable conclusion:

- So far there are no signs that 1970 is likely to produce a "hot summer". The frustration process affecting non-communist left-wing radicals will continue for the time being. One decisive sign for the future will be the fact that the APO does not want the "Revolution" to take place tomorrow, but is preparing itself for a longer wait.

- The apparent calm now prevailing should not obscure the fact that the long-term consequences for the Federal Armed Forces of this current moulding of consciousness could be far more dangerous perhaps than the 1968 and 1969 increases in conscientious objector figures
- Developments so far favour the communists. Already the DKP is a firmly based organization with an active youth organization (SDAJ) which is increasingly coming to the fore. The DKP enjoys financial and organizational support from its "sister party" (SED) in the GDR, has a unifying (communist) ideology at its disposal and benefits from the many years' experience of the SED
- Drastic developments will become apparent only over a longer period, since
  - (a) it is not clear so far whether the non-communist left-wing radicals are going through a process of dissolution or a kind of "pupation";
  - (b) the communist left-wing radicals are being compelled for the time being to pursue their revolutionary aims subversively, if only to avoid discovery and consequent prohibition.
- The Federal Armed Forces will have to contend in the future with at least three varieties of leftist anti-military consciousness-moulding and activity:
  - (a) Soviet-communist propaganda (especially the SED and prohibited KPD);
  - (b) communist propaganda from the legal DKP;
  - (c) socialist propaganda from the traditionally uncommitted communist APO.
- Any political or even economic crisis situation in the Federal Republic would mobilize forces on all sides and have consequences which are absolutely impossible at present to foresee
- In the foreseeable future the following trends could prove dangerous for the Federal Republic:
  - (a) a general and false assessment of the situation in the non-communist left-wing radical camp based on the apparent prevailing calm;
  - (b) a false estimate of (illegal) activities by the communist left-wing radicals, especially the hitherto seemingly democratic DKP;

- (c) negligence in the face of attempts by the communist left-wing radicals to become "presentable" and integrate themselves into the established Left;
- (d) possible failure to solve the problem of the generation gap in a positive manner, i.e. democratically, and failure to initiate sufficiently effective counter-measures against the wide variety of left-wing radical groups.

If one weighs the dangers of radicalism vis-a-vis the defence of the Federal Republic, one is bound to conclude that left-wing radicalism constitutes a danger that cannot be taken too seriously - not only in its domestic implications, but also in view of its repercussions on the Federal Armed Forces and consequently NATO. The question is whether left-wing radicalism today, as in the period prior to 1967-68, is getting underway again in the Federal Republic. During that time the anarchist-revolutionary section of the SDS taught the West German community to take left-wing theories seriously and learn from them. Perhaps - and this will become apparent in the immediate future - left-wing radicalism in the Federal Republic may for a second time confront a transformed public consciousness with patterns for socialist thought and action - in the factories, in the schools, perhaps even in the Federal Armed Forces.

List of abbreviations

ADF	Action for Democratic Progress
APO	Extra-Parliamentary Opposition
BdD	League of Germans
CDU	Christian Democratic Union
GDR	German Democratic Republic
DFG/WRI	German Peace Society/War Resisters International
DFS 904	German Freedom Radio 904
DFU	German Peace Union
DKP	German Communist Party
DSS 935	German Soldiers' Radio 935
FDP	Free Democratic Party
KPD	Communist Party of Germany
NPD	National Democratic Party of Germany
NVA	National People's Army (East German Army)
SDAJ	Socialist German Working Youth
SED	Socialist Unity Party of Germany
SDS	Socialist German Students League
SPD	Social Democratic Party of Germany
VK	Association of Conscientious Objectors

RADICALISM AND SECURITY

by Ivan Matteo Lombardo\*

I

Individual and collective liberties and the stability and security of a community can only thrive when law is sovereign and order is the framework within which human beings are competing in the political, economic and social fields.

The fabric of a society, particularly when it is economically and technologically developed, cannot stand for long the strains and stresses of violent agitations, of internecine struggles, of disorderly conduct, of the withering of law. Decay will start to set in at an accelerating rate and will lead inevitably to the disintegration of that society.

The greatest foe of human social order is violence as an outlet for rabid instincts, as a substitute for norms and laws. In organized societies it stems from the radicalization of the political and social struggles. Throughout history numerous indeed have been the tyrants, the adventurers, the madmen, the sophists, the demagogues who have exalted violence as the most creative fact of historical progress. And every time, invariably, they have found people eager to listen to them, ready to put their words into deeds, and active minorities allured and ensnared by all sorts of irrational and criminal paeans and gospels of hatred and havoc.

One should not forget that, after all, man's instincts are what they are. If not restrained by self-discipline and constrained by the rules of organized societies, primeval urges and lust for power, domination and unfettered licence let such instincts loose so that they become homicidal, rapacious and destructive.

Possibly, it befits only "homo sapiens" to indulge in the defilement of his own image and to revert to the troglodytical caveman incapable of behaving according to elementary rules of co-existence within a clan, a tribe or a community. In the animal reign sheer hatred and a lust for violence "per se" are

\*Vice-Chairman of the Atlantic Treaty Association (ATA)  
and President of the Italian Atlantic Committee

the uncanny prerogatives of "homo sapiens" who quite often would appear to deserve the more appropriate definition of "homo insipiens". Inasmuch as he never learns, even from his own experience...

## II

Any community (and above all an organized society) must be an orderly one, lest the worst mishaps and misery befall the whole of that human congregation because of the misconduct and misdeeds of a small section. Moreover when human beings damage and tear the weft and filling of the society they are living in, they are substantially hurting and imperilling themselves together with the society they combat. It seems they are unable to grasp the point. Paradoxically enough, the paramount stupidity of sawing the branch upon which one is sitting could only bloom in the mind of the "naked ape".

An organized society may not be suicidal, may not prescind from the imperatives of self-preservation and survival, must not fall prey to violence and chaos; therefore it ought to use every possible means to prevent anarchy from installing itself in its midst. Order being the pre-theoretical condition upon which all civilized political alternatives rest, governments are obliged to maintain that essential condition. Violence in itself is sterile, but when it is exercised against order, upon which civility and freedom are based, it is essentially criminal.

We can concede that the shrill advocates of violence are generally bred by an ethical-political crisis, caused by the weakening of the beliefs, creeds and values which are at the basis of the institutions ruling the community. The motives for such an anomalous and devastating situation ought to be traced to some ethical deficiency, or excessive permissiveness, or the insufficient - maybe wrongful - utilization of the means at the disposal of a community for its preservation and continuity. That situation is never accidental, but represents the consequences of a series of wrong actions or inactions, of inconsiderate will or the lack of it, of dejection or omissions, or of a combination of them all.

## III

Even strong social structures, guaranteed by liberal-democratic institutions and established governments, could be

ultimately wrecked by the mushrooming of groups which indulge in continuous action-stirring agitation aimed at the destruction of the system.

If a state, wherein such happenings take place, does not exercise surveillance over the disruptive groups, does not prevent the degeneration of labour conflicts into unlawful and high-handed acts, does not check the subversive infiltration in its police and armed forces and civil service, does not prevent the misuse of the modern mass communication media (and more so when they are state-owned monopolies), does not quell violence in good time and with the necessary energy by means of the instruments of law and legal force at its command - then that state cannot escape a dire fate.

Permissiveness breeds licence, licence breeds violence, violence culminates in anarchy and terrorism. Both destroy the fabric of society by creating insecurity and fear in civil life, the further weakening of governments, doubtful loyalty in its forces of order and lack of security in the military defence of the country. Finally, in the wake of anarchy and terrorism, guerrilla warfare and/or civil war will inevitably blaze a wild fire throughout the country.

## IV

Sad omens indicate that the phenomenon of the explosion of extremism in the most acute forms which we are confronted with in the present epoch is liable to settle in most of our countries as a permanent feature of disorder, as a cancer gnawing at their vitals.

The globality and suddenness of the expansion of this phenomenon is rather new in the history of mankind, in the sense that it is not limited and/or justified by some specific motivation related to a single country, but has been spreading as an epidemic among the people of societies, either actually affluent, or still bent on expectations. It has reached every level of the society: it derides and antagonizes respectable and consolidated traditions; it aims at destroying the established system, its foundations and structures, its protagonists and makers; it questions and indicts every value of our society: ethical, religious, cultural, political, economic and social.

We are confronted with clamorous expectations bordering upon revolt, with repudiations and negations exploding in an iconoclastic fury, with such excesses and mischievous conduct as to be identifiable with sheer anarchy.

Political frontiers fail nowadays to protect the people from the spirit of subversion, from the anarchical and terrorist endeavours which are promoted, supported and fed by common matrixes, at a world level.

It seems as if a substantial portion of mankind has cancelled the word "tomorrow" from its mental schemes; it is for today that everything, no better specified, has to be acquired and "pronto".

Numerous human beings hysterically repudiating superior ethical laws and trampling on every valuable tradition are blindly yielding to an urge of irrational, unlimited violence. Mesmerized by the audio-visual media which are universally and simultaneously feeding their crass ignorance and their aping and parrot-like dispositions with somebody else's words and deeds reacting as a drug on their neurotic and woozy minds, they seem to be going amuck.

V

Technical progress and economic development are nothing more than instruments at the disposal of men and communities for the purpose of ensuring them a wider freedom, a more stable order, the most equitable justice. When law is abused, order trampled, freedom downgraded to licence, a crisis develops and breeds various aspects and forms of slavery, in accordance with the circumstances in which coercion is being exercised on man: then comes the end of a society organized along liberal-democratic lines. As Will Durant reminds us: "Civilization begins with order, grows with liberty and dies with chaos", and "when liberty becomes licence, dictatorship is near".

The anarchical movements having suddenly exploded (mainly in the Western world, and more so in societies fully affluent, or on the way to becoming so) are something different from the ancient patterns of classical anarchism: either an emotional "anti-exploitation" brand motivated by the poverty of the past century in the under-developed countries of those times; or

a bloody gesture against symbols of despotism, accomplished by austere and often self-sacrificing individuals.

Instead, most of the contemporary species of parlour and campus neo-anarchism of youthful millionaires, of well fed mini-"nihilists", burgeoning in the midst of the widespread prosperity of industrial countries in this second half of the century, are freakish exhibitionists expatiating between masochism and sadism, dope and violence, ignorance and arrogance. A few exceptions do confirm the rule.

It is worth pointing out that, in the final analysis, the resurrected anarchist vogue has very little to do with the character of formerly libertarian individualistic anarchism. The present trend is connoted by a type of authoritarian caste anarchism. Most of the Italian neo-anarchists, for instance, stem from the bosom of the so-called upper classes, thereby giving credit to one of Lenin's aphorisms, according to which "ideologically, an anarchist is just a bourgeois turned inside out".

The self-styled "revolutionaries" of the movements, groups and grouplets of the "New Left" and "extra-parliamentary opposition" do not have the nerve openly to proclaim that their struggle against the liberal-democratic, pluralistic, Western-type society aims at a single-centred, anti-democratic, illiberal, totalitarian one. We have already known something of the kind almost half a century ago in Italy, and it was called fascism and it pretended to be a "revolution"....

These New Left "revolutionaries" generally belong to "bourgeois" layers of society, the most well-to-do predominating. They claim to be, or pose as, "intellectuals" and "elitists", and easily take hold of a half-educated mass of students, university "drop-outs" and followers of some more or less learned cranks who adore publicity. They all have in common, essentially, two traits: they despise the toilers and their noisy mingling with or enticing the workers to join them is merely instrumental; they feel themselves to be the only anointed ones for the task of participating (to-morrow in the "new order") in the ruling class or caste. In fact, the ill-defined "revolution" configured by the "New Left" appears to be of a peculiar brand: it appeals to those who have much and is slated to be imposed upon those who have less - or nothing. But its essential and

awesome feature is that it has to be total and thoroughly destructive of the present system, with the inescapable result that it would lead to an uncompromising despotical pattern.

As Gilbert Seldes wittily remarked some time ago, "there is nothing more old-fashioned than the radical revolutionary; revolution as a method is 5,000 years old and 100 years too old" . . . . . In fact our rabid left extremists are chewing with a Marcusean denture the cud of Bakunin's century-old primitivism, of Tkachev's and Nechayev's lust for power, violence and murder. And since the three have contributed a good deal to Lenin's thinking for his organizational model of the Bolshevik Party and its pattern for the conquest of power, no wonder these extremists proclaim to be, or are at bottom, full-blooded Leninists.

The New Left wholly negative "philosophy" about the present society is essentially determined by its scorn for democratic institutions. And the petulantly requested blind act of faith in the character of the world that would eventually emerge out of their arrogant and wild assumptions does not conceal - notwithstanding all the chattering - that through sheer violence and instinctive rioting, the veritable aim is the outcome of a system heading towards a totalitarian tyranny which they consider, implicitly, as the best thing for the masses. Their high-pitched heralding for "participatory democracy" is nothing different from the well-known pattern of "Soviet democracy" or "popular democracy", which are the bouncing cheques by which are settled the wonders promised, but not fulfilled, in terms of freedom, justice and prosperity. . . . .

At the roots of rampant neo-anarchism, of the multi-faceted New Left, of freakish forms of dissent, one finds as common denominator: the total rejection of the ethical values - be they in the realm of the supernatural, or within the boundaries of the natural, or related to living realities - of the societies modelled on the Western liberal-democratic pattern.

Those who are old enough, are able to recognize old tunes in contemporary refrains; to acknowledge the revival of the methods of a "topsy-turvy democracy" by which small minorities lay down their law which the greatest majority have to suffer and

abide by; to witness the violent and disruptive means adopted once again for creating havoc and for grabbing power.

The common features of communism, fascism, nazism and of other movements akin to them have been borne to mankind by bolshevism. They are the natural offspring of the same Leninist matrix of horrors. The political and behavioural chromosomes and genes of the contemporary explosion of extremism acknowledge that kinship. Even when it pretends to disprove or antagonize Muscovite communism, it is practically playing into its hands; and while pretending not to be moulded by a totalitarian mentality, it is striving hard to open the way to a system which cannot prescind from despotic, totalitarian rule.

Nothing is new under the sun.

When in my country I hear ruffians of the New Left hurl at somebody the "dirty" word "fascist", I cannot refrain from smiling, because they avow the same mentality, they follow the same methods, they relish the same lust for violence, they denounce the same shallowness of thought which were the peculiar traits of the rowdy bullies of fifty years ago in their struggle for power allegedly for the sake of "Giovinezza" (Youth).

When one reads a sentence of this kind: "Down with the state, the state of yesterday, today and tomorrow, the Bourgeois State and the Socialist State. There remains for me now nothing but the consoling religion of Anarchism", one wonders who wrote it. It was Mussolini in 1921 (cf. "Popolo d'Italia"), and in 1922 he had grabbed power. Yet, as a practical example of humbug, it sounds so strikingly coeval.

And when one is being taught: "The one means that wins the easiest victory over reason: terror and force" and "The very first essential for success is perpetually constant and regular employment of violence", and when one realizes that they are embedded in Hitler's "Mein Kampf" (1935), one is well briefed on the antecedents of the "philosophy" of the present New Left.

As in the case of the fascists in the Twenties, the nazis in the Thirties and the communists for half a century, contemporary extremists across the entire spectrum relish such words that can create tensions, fan hatred and stir up riots, all of which will lead to the use of the weapons of mob violence and massive

civil disorder.

It therefore becomes a sort of gibberish to try to assess fundamental differences between political extremisms, inasmuch as they can be interchangeable as has often been proved in my country. For instance, when after the "march on Rome" - and for a number of years thereafter - the once most rabid communists and leftist extremists flocked in the Fascist Party; and when, after Liberation, quite a host of former "black-shirts" turned their allegiance to the Communist Party. And today too, individual transmigrations between the followers of leftist extremism and those of right wing radicalism are not uncommon.

What is highly distressing, in my country, for an unbiased observer with an instinct for pertinence is to witness how history can be repetitive and how it fails to teach human beings something out of past experience. The democratic institutions are weakening day by day, their strength is sapped, their charisma is on the wane because the civilian leadership, far from taking corrective measures and mustering the necessary toughness, which is indispensable for the safeguarding of a liberal-democratic system, actually lets things decay, banking upon some miracle and hoping for the best...

Events and developments, general situations and specific trends, bear an ominous resemblance to happenings which took place in the early Twenties in Italy, belying Premier Facta's trust in a turn for the better and leading to dictatorship; to what occurred throughout the lifetime of the Weimar Republic until it floundered disastrously; to the three years which saw President Benes' Czechoslovakia relentlessly undermined and eroded until its model democracy ultimately expired under the "coup d'état" of 1948.

## VI

To strive to abolish legal authority is the quickest way of destroying the liberal-democratic institutions and agencies which keep a pluralistic society in shape. In the absence of law and order the community and individuals are exposed to such abuses, coercion and impairing of personal freedom that they are inevitably led to react by eagerly invoking a strong authority. I have witnessed in my country the phenomenon of leftist ex-

tremism in the early Twenties, which provoked and eventually justified the inception of fascism, the creation of a totalitarian state and the ensuing dictatorial adventurism. And again, when on the brink of another lapse into chaos, heading towards red totalitarianism - because of communist and socialist extremism - in the late Forties: luckily the memory of the Italian people was still vivid enough to recall one score years of dictatorial rule and they prevented the catastrophe by defeating the "popular front" at the general elections of 1949. We have been witnessing again for some years the unmitigated folly rampant in Italian politics and trade unionism, and I can honestly state that the very wish, either explicitly formulated or deeply nurtured within his bosom by the man in the street, pleads for a return to strong authority.

I can testify about white and blue-collar workers, petty civil servants, housewives, craftsmen, store-keepers, retired persons, grumbling today about the necessity of a "strong man" to restore order, no matter how. A number of them either advocate authoritarian rule by "colonels" or are frankly nostalgic about the "orderly old times", meaning the fascist dictatorship..... In a recent poll, conducted by a demoscopic institute ("Doxa") and in answer to a question put forward by the interviewers in a rather dulcet and tranquillizing way to gather the most sincere answers, 63.7% of the males and 67.6% of the females interviewed expressed their aspiration for a Providence-sent strong man<sup>1</sup>.

Conversely, there are managers, entrepreneurs, magistrates, administrators, technicians - going through agony over the general situation, the anarchists' threat, the general climate of disorder and unruliness - who are not loath to admit that the communists may be the ultimate solution for quelling the extremists' fury and putting the house in order. Their reasoning is that, after all, compared to the nonsensical and disruptive

---

1. The question was formulated as follows: "If a disinterested, honest, strong man, solely concerned about the welfare of all the Italians, were to be found, would you vote for temporarily vesting him with full powers for the purpose of accomplishing the most urgent reforms? "

agitation of the so-called "New Left", the CP has its own logic in terms of enforced discipline and limitation of freedom for stamping out anarchy: something which is worth "trying"..... Of course, they do not realize that it is not a matter of a "trial", but of a "final solution", and an irreversible one.

Consequently there is utter confusion in the minds and hearts of the majority of the Italian people: in order to put an end to unruly and rowdy extremism, which creates an unbearable situation and aims at destructive solutions, the final recourse should be dictatorial rule. Those who want law and order to be restored are, thus, contradictorily advocating another undemocratic, illiberal, despotic solution, either by the so-called "right" or by a communist take-over... Extremism either by vicarious, or by direct ways, leads inevitably to a tyrannical outcome, regardless of what this would mean in terms of human freedom, safeguarding of the free political institutions, stability and efficiency in the economic field, security for the defence of the independence and integrity of the country.

## VII

Affinities of conduct between the insurrectionary tyranny of the leftist extremists and the potential excesses of a so-called right-wing radicalism lead of course to reciprocal antagonism and clashes. But the one thrives on the other and the interacting and counter-vailing effects of the two extremisms have a strong impact upon the attitude of the populace and the formation of a political climate.

For the Communist Party the existence of a neo-fascist one (MSI) is a boon indeed, because it motivates once more the insistently heralded but stale slogan for a choice between fascism and communism: the choice between black fever and red cancer.

It cannot be denied that, in Italy today, those who have the guts to counter-parade against, and sometimes attack, the leftist bullies are the followers of the MSI, together with elements from other groups and grouplets of right-wing radicalism. As they are generally dealt with by the police, with greater energy than is the case when it deals with the leftist extremists, they thus acquire a halo of victimization which may have some future bearing on the public.

Flying the national colours against the black and the red flags of the leftists, and chanting "Italia, Italia" when their opponents holler the names of Ho Chi Minh, Mao, Guevara, Lenin, they certainly exert an influence on numerous men in the street who view with distaste the antics of New Left extremists; with repulsion the terrorist activities of the neo-anarchists; with a longing for a more orderly daily life the succession of strikes, the outburst of violence, the meek and resigned behaviour of the forces of order when they have to confront the reds.

Were general elections to have taken place after the Milan bomb, and following the events of the "hot Autumn", I have no doubts that the MSI would have reaped a considerable increase in votes. Parenthetically, while the communists and the whole leftist establishment are making a daily fuss about an alleged shift of the country, to the far left, they have been furiously and aptly manoeuvring lest the Legislature should come to an end ....

Moreover, between the two extremisms there does not exist a strong and sedate centre. The antonym of extremism is "moderatism", but this has become in my country another "dirty" word. Its veritable meaning has gone astray among the proliferation of generalities and catchwords, all redundant of leftist demagoguery. Even among sensible people, extremist trends and jargon have a right of citizenship which is denied, instead, to the "moderate" ones. Most of the non-communist parties are undergoing a process of fragmentation and involution, mostly on account of a process of radicalization on their left. Two, three, four "left" sprouts may burgeon in formerly organized and balanced political congregations, thus introducing a trend to further deterioration.

Parties, once well defined in terms of moderate political philosophy and/or behaviour, look today like queer birds wingless on their right side, with multiple wings on their left and a big paunch and a voracious beak. No wonder the freakish animals cannot soar from ground level and are compelled to feed upon their own droppings.

One has to admit that even in the domain of generalities, platitudes and catchwords, Italian politics are heavily conditioned by the Communist Party, by the communist-led trade

unions, by their "front organizations", as well as by the mass-media dutifully infiltrated by "commies" and leftists of every denomination.

### VIII

It is not dissent in itself, even with its eventual oddities and shrillness and nonsensical recitals, that should worry us. It is the institutionalization of violence, of that "socialism for the fools", that should command our utmost attention.

And not only as an aspect of the neo-anarchists' and neo-nihilists' negation of the society in which they enjoy the freedom of striving to destroy it; not only as a proof of the hatred of the New Left for the ideals, the methods and the institutions of democracy, still so fragile in my country; not only because it may provoke imitations and stir up counter-action on the opposite side of the political spectrum, but mainly because it is being adopted on a general scale for any sort of protest, vindication, claim - in the labour field and in the political domain as well - and is being shrewdly and deftly manipulated by the Communist Party, on behalf of and for the benefit of the Kremlin's policies.

The gist of the politics of the Communist Party, trying by every possible means to climb to power, could be summarized in the concept: "Tanto peggio, tanto meglio" ("The worst things go, the better off we are"). From this mentality derive most of our present and our future evils.

It is true, in a sense, that the "established" organizations represented by the Communist Party, and those akin to it, and their subsidiary organizations derive political headaches and some worries for their official image, from the often miscreant and accusatorial behaviour of portions of the New Left.

But they also derive fundamental benefits towards their ends from the manipulation of the New Left violence and from the hypocritical attitude of appearing, in comparison and in contrast with it, sedate, disciplined and "constitutionally"-minded. Nothing can stand comparison with the communists' double-talking, double-dealing, double-scheming capacities: they are the embodiment of multi-duplicity.

As a matter of fact, full and open support by the Communist

Party for the extremists of the various groupings of the New Left would have revived the identification of communism with lawlessness and wholesale violence, which would be quite detrimental to the CP's efforts to conquer power via parliamentary means.

On the other hand, a total withholding of support and an open proclamation of total antagonism to the leftist extremists would have allowed the latter to usurp for themselves the exclusivity of the revolutionary "spirit" and slogans of the communist patrimony.

The middle course chosen by the CP to convey a restrained, supercilious sympathy for the claims and vociferations of the extra-parliamentary movements, trying to identify them with its own slogans against the "unjust, violent, repressive societies whose leaders insist on imperialist policies". Besides, the CP finds leftist extremism convenient, and rather useful, for its "broad anti-imperialist campaigns"; for relentless attacks on NATO, on the Atlantic Alliance, on the US etc., etc.; for the "struggle for peace", and against "militarism, neo-fascism and neo-nazism"; for clamouring for the "relaxation of tensions", "active neutralism", anti-Israeli policy, anti-Zionism, support in favour of the "Fedayeens" etc., etc.

But the most cunning and proficient utilization by the CP of the extremists' lust for violence, in my opinion, has been its harnessing to labour agitations by exploiting their methods and means, attributed to the "spontaneous creativity" of the masses, though practically imposed on the workers and mainly upon the reluctant ones.

The radicalization of public opinion by the communists is no longer centred on ideological motivations, which are less and less appealing to the people. It is being fostered by the agitators and trade unionists in favour of the struggle for immediate interests. There, the violence of the extremists has found a convenient outlet under labour labels.

To the progressive deterioration and depreciation of the traditional role of the political parties in their functions of providing the people to be governed with choices and trends correspond the progressive interference and attempts at re-

placement by the trade unions, which are heavily conditioned politically. The most important of them is the communist-dominated one (CGIL) which has always been, and remains, the "transmission belt" for the CP's policies. The second and third in importance are the formerly free and democratic ones (CISL and UIL, originally of Catholic and social-democratic orientation respectively), created to break the communist labour monopoly of the CGIL: now they are practically led by the latter.

During last Autumn (and one may foresee the same events liable to happen this Springtime and next Summer) the phase of collective bargaining has been very hot and made more vehement by the syndicalists with political issues, either openly declared or camouflaged, in accordance with the union's strategy. That phase has been heavily marked by a crescendo of lawlessness, disorder, violence and extremist language. After that the syndicalists, supported by their henchmen in Parliament and powerfully aided by our notorious TV "desinformatzia" as well as by the timidity of most of the non-communist political forces, have engineered another confrontation versus the democratic institutions: a high-pitched protest against alleged "repression" by the police and the courts in regard to the crimes and offences committed throughout the period of unrest, disorder and violence during the labour agitation. They have also decided to circumvent and mock the law by forcing the Parties supporting the coalition government to yield to their imposition for a general amnesty.

The political callisthenics and the show of strength of the unions (or the weakness of the Government, if you prefer) have considerably increased the power of the syndicalists (also in their secondary role as puppet-manipulators), who are aiming at usurping the decision-making function once the prerogative of the political parties. Neither the representation nor the mediation of the latter in the parliamentary regime appear to them necessary any more. Under certain aspects the Italian socio-economic structure is practically reverting to corporativism with a salty sprinkle of that anarcho-syndicalism which had enjoyed some popular favour almost six decades ago.

#### IX

It is in the monopoly of the utilization of large masses of

people - under the sham of labour interest, but in practice for a sort of future political test of strength, which the CP, with all the leftist fringes of every denomination, may decide to engage in - that lies, in my opinion, the greatest threat for the defence capabilities of our society and the security of the country.

Were we to have to gauge the threat posed by right-wing and left-wing radicalism to military preparedness and defence obligations, there is no doubt that one should exclude the existence of any menace from the former and should admit that the most dangerous one is posed by the latter.

Neo-fascists, monarchists and right-wing movements uphold military traditions and are respectful of ideals which are connoted by some of the essential values of a society. Maybe they are still a bit too rhetorical, but they still cling to concepts hitherto held as deeply honourable.

They favour military preparedness, they are strongly concerned about the Armed Forces and their efficacy in the face of the country's defence obligations. Notwithstanding their ingrained nationalism, they are not - in their majority - negative in terms of supra-national commitments in the European sphere. Maybe they feel like this in opposition to the communists, who are against European unification and the relevant supra-national structures.

Up to now there is no indication of neutralist and isolationist currents of any importance among the right-wingers. They are, on the whole, (even when they voice technical or contingent political criticisms) in favour of the Atlantic Alliance, of NATO, of the necessity of strengthening collective defence. Reserves have been expressed by them as far as adherence by Italy to the "Non-Proliferation Treaty" was concerned and in their advocacy of greater, more responsible, more autonomous European collective strength for defence, within the Alliance.

Rumours are spread from time to time about the existence within the right-wing radical movements of strong quasi-military organizations, but one should discount them as exaggerations. Some veterans and former military men have not forgotten their ancient training, drilling and fighting experience, but it does not seem that there is any sort of OAS being organized in the shadows.

There are undoubtedly strong feelings of dissatisfaction and uneasiness within the veteran's associations, mainly in consideration of the persistent decay of traditional ethical values in the conscience of the nation, but this cannot be construed as right-wing extremism, inasmuch as such feelings are merely vented quite exclusively at conferences and congresses with outbursts of rhetoric and lyricism.

Yet, one should not disregard the possibility that, given the mounting bad mood over the political situation among the people forming the "silent opposition", rebellious impatience may be brewing to the point where right-wing radicalism would blaze. I mention a "silent opposition" and not the "silent majority", though they both combine quite extensively, because I wish to point out the growing impatience of the people with the despicable conformism of the alleged non-conformists, the people's dissent from the dissenters and their mute protest against the protesters. But, at present at least, it is hard to imagine that the "silent opposition" could impair the security of the country and jeopardize the defence obligations and the country's commitments within the Alliance.

The situation is totally different, however, with regard to the impact on the security and military defence of the country, if viewed from the angle of left-wing radicalism.

First of all it vents with wrath and hatred its enmity against the "military establishment", the Armed Forces, the police. The soldier is portrayed as a negative symbol of inhumanity, suppression of freedom, destruction and death. Naturally these feelings are one-sided, since no reference whatsoever, on this count, is being made in the direction of the Soviets, the Chinese, the Warsaw Pact Armed Forces, the Viet Cong, the Arabs, the Cubans etc., etc.

One should not forget that left-wing extremists are in the forefront of the so-called "anti-imperialist" and "struggle for peace" campaigns; that they are the regular chanters of slogans such as "make love, not war", but also "no to war, yes to guerrilla action".....

Their hatred of the military is expressed not only in some slanderous campaigns, but eventually also in the nasty squabbles organized against individual, or groups of, soldiers and sailors

by using the variegated bunch of ruffians they can throw in (the Italian versions of the beatniks, hippies, yippies, provos, etc., etc.). Many incidents have taken place in cities like Pisa, Leghorn, La Spezia, when leftist rowdies have provoked and attacked paratroopers, sailors, marines, draftees. There is no doubt that their continuous abuse and slandering of the Armed Forces, their mouth-to-ear propaganda, their subversive seduction of the comrades - when some of them, being drafted, join the troops - have negative consequences. It is quite easy to brew discontent among recruits and, one step after the other, turn it into anti-militarist feelings. A method rather extensively applied is, for example, that of letters to the editor on their abundant printed sheets, by which they make the reader believe all kinds of slanderous humbug about military life, its discipline, its miserable aspects, and so on and so forth. Besides, one has to be on the watch against possible espionage, eventual mutinous attitudes sparked off by some "activists", chancy endeavours, theft of arms and ammunition and explosives.

But, more essentially, there is something worth meditating upon. Those extremists (neo-anarchists, New Left groupings, violent "pacifists", "one-way" neutralists etc., etc.) rally, and perhaps even act as the forerunners of, the undisguised communists and disguised pro-communists, in order to indict the Atlantic Alliance, blast at NATO, reject our defence commitments, advocate "active neutralism" for Italy, intimating a reversal of her foreign policy, and denounce the dangers of war ("inevitably" bound to turn into a nuclear holocaust) on account of the "capitalist system" and the membership of my country in the "Western bloc".

Even our "Maoists", Trotskyists and other communist heretics - generally embattled against the "Moscow revisionist clique", the "Kremlin's new czars", "Russian social-imperialism" etc., etc. - never fail to join the CP and its "front organizations" and political allies, when it comes to vituperating the Atlantic Alliance and polemicizing against the defence of the Western world. None of them object one iota to the Warsaw Pact, to the tremendous Russian militarist build-up. The military and dictatorial regimes aligned in favour of, or mere satellites and "proxies", of the Kremlin's policies, are never discussed. The worst slander, the most outrageous abuses, the most vitriolic

invectives are heaped upon the United States and their "imperialist allies". But they become hysterical when it is a question of Greece, Portugal, Spain, South Vietnam, South Africa and what not.....

Nothing new or unusual in this behaviour, nothing we may look upon as unexpected; but nothing that might be considered exclusively Italian and not connected with an international strategy inspired from afar. There are too many facts on record and too many, even trifling, episodes confirming that aspect. Just an example: at the end of November last year an "Anti-NATO Congress", promoted by left-wing youth organizations, convened in Amsterdam. Fifteen hundred participants from quite a number of countries - and supposedly not all of them belonging to the most rabid species - participated for a few days in an orgy of anti-NATO hysteria. I do not intend to deal with all the superficial, nonsensical, biased, unilateral blah-blah disgorged there.

But I wish to point out, as I consider them ominous in view of the tide of events, a couple of sentences embedded in their resolutions: "The progressive forces in Europe and America are called on to give practical and material aid to movements which are against NATO and which fight against the policy of NATO and against the activities in Asia, Africa and Latin America which are assisted by NATO", and "This Congress is the first push to a long-term action against the whole of NATO as a military and economic system. It will be a long-term action because of the great interrelatedness of NATO and the existing structure of society. An action against NATO must be an action against the actual political and economic order"

## X

The security of a country does not merely rest on the military structure. The latter is fundamentally correlated with, and conditioned by, the country's morale, the psychological and political situation, the economic and financial growth, scientific and technological developments, stability and normal functioning of the institutions. Well, there are three aspects truly jeopardizing security, of which we must be aware:

- a) It is not solely a question of Italy (albeit she is in a rather difficult situation) when we try to estimate the consequences, and gauge the impact, of left-wing extremism on the military and political security of the country. The onslaught is general. The aim is global. The danger is common and interdependent. One should not make the mistake of classifying it. Of course some nations are going to be attacked first and fiercest because they offer - at least apparently - the most alluring and promising rewards to the communists: and this may be the case in my country. Just recently, according to a quotation by the well-informed French daily "Le Monde", Brezhnev stated in a "classified" speech: "the Communist Party could conquer power in Italy by a continuous succession of strikes aimed at seriously impairing her economy".
- b) The leftist extremists should not be considered separately from the so-called "established" Left. They may become the "shock troops", the "commandos" of the struggle against the system and the security of the country, but the essential threat is posed by the whole leftist alignment of which the New Left is merely an active component. The great assault will be launched by means of the great masses, coalesced in a "unitarian" labour front, under the communist spur, against NATO and the participation in it of my country. "NATO out of Italy, Italy out of NATO" is not a new chant: it strictly derives from the directives imparted at the Karlovy Vary Conference of the Communist Parties in 1967. Taking advantage of the labour mobilization for syndicalist motivations, the attack will turn political and the fundamental target will be the Atlantic Alliance. Playing upon the war-scare, abusing our allies for their allegedly "imperialist aims", deluding the masses with the wonders of a neutral "status" which would preserve Italy from a possible nuclear war, uproariously exalting the benefits that would accrue to "peace" from the proposed Pan-European Security Conference, they might be able to create such an intimidating, perturbing, pervasive atmosphere as to obtain, by sheer pressure of political agitation and social rioting, the result they are aiming at.

c) I see leftist extremists settling in for a long-term action based upon all sorts of plots and subversive endeavours, specializing in wild riots, terrorist activities and urban guerrilla action. Cities and towns are extremely vulnerable to the latter, on account of the complexity of the highly organized, electrified, mechanized character of the big and medium-sized human conglomerations and of the way of life in modern societies. The wholesale use of bombs, "Molotov cocktails", road blocks, strikes by public utilities, the clogging of street traffic, the invasion of public offices and so on and so forth, would create paralysis. Urban guerrilla action is an immeasurable threat to the security of a civilized country. It would be the inevitable follow-up to the violent and intimidating activities of the left-wing extremist "commandos". And urban guerrilla action, again, is something which derives from an international strategy of subversion, with an international scope and an international implementation, adapted to a national scale.

## XI

When violence culminates in terrorism and anarchy - no matter whether "per se", or harnessed to the support of supposed disputes and/or specious political campaigns, however motivated - it is inadmissible to view, and comment upon, these events as "political" extremism.

There are acts which fit into the pattern of sheer gangsterism of the worst possible species. Bombs like those which exploded - or were planted in buildings - in Milan, Rome, Frankfurt, New York; arson such as destroyed a Belgian department store; kidnapping of individuals for ransom; sky-jacking of aeroplanes and the planting of bombs in them; sabotage and attacks on foreign airports; abduction and murder of foreign diplomats; blackmailing of governments with requests for ransom money and/or the release of prisoners on trial before the courts or already convicted, failing which the helpless and innocent hostages would be slain; terrorism in whatever guise inflicted upon peaceful citizens, does not belong, nor can it be considered as belonging to political action, but to mere unmistakable criminality.

No sympathy, no indulgence, no tolerance should be shown to such bandits. They are outlaws in both the juridical and ethical conception and they have to be dealt with as such.

And this not only because, after all, any common burglar, arsonist, killer, forger or madman could easily claim a "political" motivation for his dastardly actions (there have been a few recent clamorous examples of this in my country), but also because a modern democratic society ought to moralize politics, safeguard them from contamination, constrain political competition on a basis of civilized coexistence, civic discipline and responsible behaviour.

It is about time that the romantic halo which is so easily and irresponsibly placed on the heads of cranks, criminals and outlaws, posing as "revolutionaries", should be replaced by a brand of disrepute and indictment.

Probably, this work of sanitation has been delayed too long; probably the involutory process has progressed to such an extent as to have become irreversible.

Yet it seems to me that in order to deal with the scourge of terrorist and anarchical waves of violence and destruction sweeping over so many countries, our democratic societies, if they are to defend themselves and survive, ought to adopt a concept of "selective intolerance".

Crimes of the kind I have just listed as examples, deprived of the fraudulent and unwarrantable connotation of "political", ought to be considered as capital offences; those having committed them, as criminals; the criminals pursued wherever possible and prosecuted, when caught, for felony and criminal action. No extenuating circumstances should be considered under the pretence of a "political" motivation or justification.

But since those capital offenders belong to, or are associated with, an international web, there must be internationally organized counter-action.

Just as there exists an "Interpol" and international co-operation for stamping out the traffic of drugs, there must exist among the civilized nations full co-operation for their defence against the drug of violence and terrorism, the intoxicated

extremists, be they of right-wing or left-wing extraction.

We establish international agencies for combatting pollution of the atmosphere and water, but we disregard the pollution of human minds. We take, at international level, drastic measures to combat human epidemics and animal diseases, with the purpose of protecting human societies, but we disregard the far more hideous and destructive consequences of the lust for violence and the practice of terrorism.

Someone once quipped that a conservative is one who is enamoured of existing evils, while a radical is one who wishes to replace them with other evils . . . .

One may not be enamoured of existing evils, and may have battled all one's life against them, and yet not feel upset at all, today, at being labelled with a word which, in our hectic and nonsensical present times, sounds sort of derogatory: conservative.

Because, taking into consideration what kind of evils are in store for mankind, on account of what is being advocated with the vilest demagoguery by self-proclaimed "progressives", "revolutionaries", radicals, pseudo-"liberals" and by New Left extremists and neo-anarchists, in conjunction with old-line leftists, it seems logical and sensible to choose to preserve some of the existing and tried evils, rather than to contribute to the advent of the new ones, the most hideous features of which can be unveiled already, to show the ghastly future they reflect.

### **INTERDOC**

The purpose of INTERDOC is to promote a better and wider knowledge of East-West problems through the exchange of documentation and information.

INTERDOC **specializes** in the collection of information, the preparation and dissemination of periodicals and special studies and the organization of conferences.