

1968

Cold War Operations

Lyman B. Kirkpatrick Jr

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

Recommended Citation

Kirkpatrick, Lyman B. Jr (1968) "Cold War Operations," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 21 : No. 9 , Article 3.
Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol21/iss9/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu.

COLD WAR OPERATIONS :

THE POLITICS OF COMMUNIST CONFRONTATION



Part XII--Communism in World Affairs

by

Professor Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, Jr.

(This is the last of the series of lectures by Professor Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, Jr., of the Political Science Department, Brown University, given at the United States Naval War College as a part of the Electives Program. These lectures have been selected from those in a course entitled *Cold War Operations* which Professor Kirkpatrick presents at Brown University.)

One of the very important aspects in discussing communism at the present time is to put it in proper perspective. We are so deeply concerned with our own affairs, both domestic and foreign, that we are inclined to overlook the fact that there is almost as deep, if not deeper, turmoil in the Communist world as there is in the non-Communist world. In fact, the events in Eastern Europe, the events in China, and the competition between and among the Communist Parties in the various parts of the world are so intense today that had we

no problems of our own, we might take a great deal of satisfaction in their particular problems.

The best way to analyze communism in world affairs is to briefly discuss the status of communism in the two major areas, China and the Soviet Union, and then to do a brief global survey of the more important developments from the Communist viewpoint in the other parts of the world.

The Soviet Union is undergoing major changes in many different respects: economic, social, and political.

Their entire system has been in the process of dramatic developments in the past several years which indicate that there is going to be a difference in the type of communism that the Soviets are trying to export and a difference in their appeal for other Communist Parties.

One of the principal criticisms that the Chinese make of the Russians in the ideological field is that they are revisionists, meaning that they are changing some of the basic philosophies of Marxism, Leninism, and Stalinism. This indeed is true, from almost any point of view. One of our national news magazines termed the 23d Party Congress of the Soviet Union held in March 1966 a "do nothing Congress."

Under the Constitution of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union there is supposed to be a Party Congress every 4 years. The Party Congress is the supreme ratifying body in the Communist system. A great deal goes on in the interim 4 years, but the Congress is presumed to be called together to ratify what has taken place since the last Congress. In the interim the Central Committee is the dominant body, and the daily working committee is the Politburo. The Communists switch back and forth between calling this body Presidium and Politburo. It is now Politburo, but for the 23d Congress it was the Presidium. It means the same thing. Politburo is an easier name for political scientists because they also have a presidium in their governmental structure, as distinct from their party structure. In any event, the 23d Party Congress in March 1966 came at a time when one of the most critical issues, as far as communism was concerned, was the deepening split between the Soviet Union and China. Consequently, the necessary preparation for this Congress was rather intensive.

Prior to any national Party Congress in the Soviet Union all of the republics have their party congresses. These

bodies review the material the national Congress will consider and after a "democratic discussion" ratify it. In preparation for the 23d Congress, the party issued to all of the lesser party units various documents, some of which found their way to the Western World. Among these were criticisms of the party structure itself in the Soviet Union; criticism of the Komsomol, the youth organization, for being too lax in reviewing applicants—that is, not being selective enough, and not being sufficiently disciplined in the handling of the personnel. This was quite interesting. In other words, they were saying that it was not strict enough from an ideological point of view—not expelling those youths who did not follow the party line strictly or who were not good Communists—and consequently inclined to recommend to the party itself candidates for admission not properly qualified.

Another document criticized the party on several different grounds, most important of which was an identical criticism to that of the Komsomol. In other words, the party too was lax in its discipline and control. From our point of view, perhaps more interesting was a stern indictment of the party for interfering too much in governmental activities.

From an international point of view, the most important document circulated before March 1966 was a study of Sino-Soviet relations, particularly inter-party relations. This was a severe indictment of China. The indictment denounced China for disrupting the international Communist movement, sowing seeds of distrust between Russia and China, and elevating an ideological dispute into a national dispute. This now was becoming an issue between nations, and not just between the so-called fraternal socialist parties.

When the 23d Party Congress met, it ratified all of the prepared reports. (It is assumed that it will ratify all that is

presented to it. If it did not, there would be some drastic changes in the Party Secretariat.) It publicized the Sino-Soviet split to a degree that had not been previously reached except in the continual propaganda barrage which both of these countries level at each other. It discussed economic problems in the Soviet Union. These are matters of concern to us as we watch Moscow trying to run a vastly expanding economy with diminishing success.

Khrushchev used to periodically harangue the world on how Russia was overtaking the United States in gross national product. In 1963 my former organization, the Central Intelligence Agency, presented to the President and the National Security Council a study of the Soviet economy which showed that Khrushchev's statements were a blatant lie for propagandist purposes. The Soviets had been gaining on us in the period of the late fifties, but they had leveled off very sharply in the early sixties and were starting to drop behind.

The result of this was an episode which was a little difficult for those of us in CIA, but the press enjoyed it. The President directed that this document be published, that it be released to appropriate vehicles in the press. Obviously, it was more valuable and would have a greater worldwide impact if it did not bear the CIA label. It was released to various important media in the press, but one representative thought it had more appeal if it had the CIA label on it, so one lead said, "CIA reports that the Soviet economy was falling behind that of the U.S." This caused a great amount of discussion, especially among the economists of the world. The original reaction of some economists was that the CIA was wrong. Within the space of a year most acknowledged that this report had been precise and accurate. (Parenthetically, there was no question in the minds of the CIA analysts in the Economic Section that this report was accurate.) The informa-

tion on which it was based was voluminous.

It is pertinent that the Soviet planning system has been less than successful. They had found that it is difficult to control production without responding, at least superficially, to a basic law of supply and demand. One Soviet economist recently described their system by claiming that if the number of planners in the Russian system continues to increase at the present rate, by the turn of the century everybody in the Soviet Union would be planning, and nobody would be doing anything else. The same economist revealed the fact that it took 100,000 blueprints to build one hydroelectric dam in the Soviet Union.

The gist of this is that obviously the Soviet Union has been overcontrolled and overplanned. Planning has not been directly related to requirements or needs of the system, and, consequently, they have to change something. We have been studying with great interest in recent years the fact that Russia is reverting to an economic system of supply and demand which seems to be almost elementary in its simplicity; second, an incentive motive; and third, even an element of profit. Moscow last year created a new motion picture production concern in which there is a profit-sharing device so that the producers and actors will actually benefit if the films are successful and obviously will suffer if they are not successful.

There is more and more evidence of the decentralization of the Soviet system, of putting the industrial complex on a basis where both the quality of its production and the volume of its production must be directly related to the demand. This is important because many of the Soviet aid programs in various underdeveloped parts of the world were not practical or effective. This is not just Russia alone. It has been true of a great deal of Communist aid. For example, the Czechoslovaks sent

busses to Communist Cuba, not many years ago, which did not last because they were not built for the tropics. Castro had to junk those and is now buying busses from Great Britain. When Nkrumah was running Ghana with a firm but rather indiscriminate hand, he had Russian technicians there by the hundreds. They built a plant for pre-fabricated housing. There were several problems with this multimillion dollar plant. The Ghanaians could not operate it, it was too complicated. Since the Russian technicians have been expelled, it has been rusting as a monument to Russian aid. Secondly, the houses it built, the Ghanaians could not afford.

The Soviet Union has had to respond to the pressures of consumer demand. The simple fact of life in Russia today is that a family of four with the father and mother working earn more money than they can spend. They end up the year with the equivalent of about a thousand dollars which they have been unable to spend because consumer goods are not available. There were not enough automobiles to buy, or television sets, washing machines, or other items that we take for granted. Perhaps the best indication that they had to succumb to this demand is that they are importing automobile plants. Fiat has a contract to build a plant in Russia that will produce about 300,000 cars a year which, together with their production of about 200,000 motor vehicles, is going to give them an annual output of about a million cars for the next 5 years.

As Adolf Hitler found, greatly to his dismay, the Russians do not have many hard-surfaced roads. A reporter from *Izvestia* went to Rostov to the auto factory last winter to pick up his car. It took him several days to drive the 600 miles back to Moscow. It is interesting that *Izvestia* let him print his article because of what he said about the Russian traffic system and the Russian roads. In many areas he had to wait

hours for one-way traffic to come through the snowdrifts. It is indicative of future traffic jams for the socialist system.

There apparently are some very serious head-to-head discussions in the Politburo between the faction led by Kosygin and the faction led by Brezhnev over how much industrial capacity should be devoted to consumer goods production and how much to the development of capital production.

We have witnessed the periodic trials of literary figures such as Sinyavsky and Daniel with sentences of 5 years at hard labor, not because of what they wrote, but because they exported what they wrote, and it was critical of the Soviet system. It is significant that their trial was protested by individuals, including Litvinov's son-in-law and a retired major general of the Soviet Army. In the 23d Party Congress, 40 of the leading literary figures in the Soviet Union urged that the Congress allow a return to Stalinism.

The Soviet Union has had to relax some of the controls and to allow greater freedom. Humor in Russia makes this evident.

There is the story of the old farmer who is brought into Moscow to sit on one of the Leningrad hills to watch for the coming of communism. He is approached by an American tourist who said that he would like him to come to the United States for a better paying job to stand on the hand of the Statue of Liberty and watch for the arrival of complete freedom in the United States. The old Russian says, "No, I would like to stay here where I know the job is permanent, rather than coming someplace where it might be temporary."

Or there's the other, a little more earthy type of humor which was prevalent during the Khrushchev regime, that reflects some of the cynical comment about overtaking the United States in the field of industrial production. One Russian says to the other, "Well, how

does Comrade Khrushchev think we are ever going to overtake the United States when we're running without shoes," and the other Russian says, "Well, it isn't that as much as the fact that if we overtake the United States, they'll see that we've got bare behinds." These, incidentally, are the type of jokes that are printed in *Krokodil* and some of their other journals.

My friend, Professor James Billington of Princeton, one of our foremost historians of Russian culture, visits the Soviet Union about every other year. He is bilingual in Russian and goes as a visiting lecturer to the University of Leningrad and the University of Moscow. He tells the story about a recent visit when he was talking to a student saying that he thought he would go to the ballet that night. The student said, "Professor, don't go to the ballet. That's for party members, 13-year old girls, and American tourists. Instead of that, go to one of our dramas. In fact, there is a new one being introduced tonight, and let's go together." So he went with a group of students. It was an interesting drama which analyzed the Communist system from a metaphysical viewpoint rather critically, at the end of which a man stood up in the audience to critique. This is a Russian tradition. The audience discusses the drama with the cast, and the first man that stood up started to be critical in strictly Communist ideological terms, and he was whistled down by the audience with such catcalls as, "Go tell it to the Central Committee." He finally sat down, after which Billington says there was a very serious discussion back and forth between the audience and the cast on an interesting and politically motivated play.

That is some of what happens inside the Soviet Union today. Now, let us look at the Communists outside briefly. It is interesting to note that since the Czechoslovak Revolution of 1968 took place, just 20 years after the Communist

coup of 1948, there have been seven visits in the space of a little over 2 months between Czech and Soviet leaders, either in Moscow or in Prague. Participants included the Premier of the Soviet Union, the Chief of Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, and others. These and the subsequent events in Czechoslovakia most certainly substantiate the grave concern of the Russian leadership over the liberalization that has been taking place in Eastern Europe.

The Russians are concerned about the world Communist movement. It is not simply the competition from China. It is more fundamentally the fact that the international Communist movement is fragmenting; that no longer is Marxist ideology, which has been called the cement that holds communism together, looked upon with the same interpretation in various parts of the world. In fact, there are probably no two Marxists who use the same interpretation of the founding father of communism.

The Russians are especially concerned about the countries of Eastern Europe shaking off the shackles of Soviet controls. The most drastic and dramatic example in recent years has been that of Czechoslovakia. It was 20 years ago that the Russians thought they could purge the Yugoslavs, or at least Tito, out of the Communist movement. He turned the tables on them. The Russians went to the extent of organizing an international Communist structure called the Cominform, the Committee of Information, which replaced the Comintern, the Third International, which Stalin had unilaterally abolished in 1943.

Some historians claim that Stalin abolished the Comintern as a sop to the British and Americans, then Russian Allies in war. It is more likely that he abolished the Comintern because the party structure of the Soviet Union had reached the point where it could take over all of its functions and carry on just as effectively. Stalin never did like

the international or non-Russian aspects of the organization. By abolishing it, Stalin placed the controls of the international movement under the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

In 1948 Stalin organized the Cominform. Russia, the six European Communist Parties, and Italy and France were the only members. At its opening meeting the Italian and French members confessed some of their sins and said their parties had erred and strayed. The Yugoslavs were critical too, but within a matter of weeks the Cominform expelled Yugoslavia even though its headquarters was in Belgrade.

This must have been one of the most fascinating struggles between secret intelligence services in modern times. The Cominform headquarters was located in Belgrade for obvious reasons—better control over the Yugoslavs. The Russians put one of the top KGB operatives in charge of the Cominform, took over half of the *Bobra* printing plant (*Bobra* is the Yugoslav ideological journal), but all work had to be approved in Moscow. There then apparently ensued an intense struggle between Rankovich's secret police of Yugoslavia and the Soviet secret police.

Tito refused to obey Russian orders. The Cominform expelled Yugoslavia and moved its headquarters to Bucharest. Tito, in effect, told the Russians that he was not going to accept Russian control. It is apparent in studying this period that the Yugoslavs did a better job penetrating the Russian service than vice versa. Tito for 20 years has made clear his independence of Russian control.

Czechoslovakia is trying to do the same thing, and there is one basic common denominator. Neither country has gone anti-Communist, and neither of them has indicated hostility to the Soviet Union. In my opinion, the key to Soviet relations in Eastern Europe is that these countries may be independent, may pursue an independent path

to socialism; but if they become anti-Russian or pro-Western, then the Soviets will probably go to the extent of using force to bring them back in line.

Czech independence apparently, at least as far as an external observer can see, is even more extreme than what has taken place in Yugoslavia. There is freedom of the press. The Russians filed a specific protest with the Czechoslovak Government over anti-Russian articles being picked up from the Western press by the Czech press. Some very strong anti-Russian articles have appeared implicating the Soviet Union in the overthrow of the Benes government, accusing them of defenestration of Jan Masaryk, the Czech Foreign Minister who apparently was thrown out of a window to his death, accusing them of all types of involvement in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia.

Rumania has told the Soviet Union that they are going on their own path; that they will not submit to economic control by Russia.

On the other side of the Soviet Union, no one can presume to speak with authority or accurate knowledge of precisely what is happening in China. It seems that what is taking place is a very severe intraparty struggle to choose Mao's successor. Mao is now an elderly man and has lost control of the party in the most dramatic sense of the word. The Peking-city Communist Party, some of the provincial Communist Parties, and even the army were anti-Mao.

For more than 2 years there has been an intraparty struggle which, at times, has reached the violent stage. It has caused an almost complete breakdown in most of the major elements of Chinese economic life. Schools in China were closed for more than a year. The many foreign students returned to their homes, so the Chinese lost that international impact. Some of the xenophobic practices in Peking, such as harassing the Indonesian diplomatic representative until the Indonesians closed their em-

22 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

bassy, lost a tremendous amount of impact with the Indonesians and with all of the other underdeveloped countries.

The situation in China today is one where they are trying to get the Red Guard back to school, the Red Guard being the youths who were brought out to enforce the discipline Mao wanted to impose upon the country because he did not want to use the army. He tried to use the youth. The youth got out of control, obviously abused many members of party who were Maoists as well as others.

In the meantime, the China of 3 years ago has lost a great deal of its impact in the underdeveloped world. This is not saying that China is not a military threat. The Peoples Army today is in control in the governments of at least 14 of the 26 Chinese provinces.

The Communist Parties of the world, whether in Africa, Latin America, Asia, or Europe are all badly split. Most Communist Parties of the world have a Russian faction and a Chinese faction.

Belgium, for example, has two Communist Parties with identical names. Japan has four Marxist groups. The Japanese socialists have a broader appeal. The Communist role is principally stirring up trouble, rioting, stimulating the students, and so on.

In the United States the CPUSA is generally described as composed of an Albanian faction and an FBI faction, the FBI faction being indicative of the fact that some facetious writer once said that the chief source of financial support of the Communist Party of the United States was the FBI because they penetrated it with so many dues-paying members. In any event the Communist Party of the United States has not made very much progress despite race and urban problems in this country. Probably they recruited a few more members in recent years. Undoubtedly they are stimulating trouble here and there, but

they do not have appeal here because we still have our own dynamic social evolution. Where this takes place the Communists cannot make headway.

Let us look at Africa. In 1960 the U.S. Government was concerned that as African areas acquired independence they would also become susceptible to controls induced by aid and assistance from various parts of the world. My last trip to Africa was in 1959. This was just prior to the independence explosion, and in those areas that by then had achieved independence, such as Ghana, the lineup of people offering aid and assistance was quite formidable to see. My colleague and I stayed in the Ambassador Hotel in Accra; the only other two Americans were two representatives of Kaiser Industries working on the Volta River project. All others in the hotel, with the exception of the Israelis, were from Communist countries. Nearly every Eastern country was represented there. The Russians were offering the Ghanaians a great deal of aid and assistance which Nkrumah happily bought and which his successor government threw out and, incidentally, shot 25 Russian intelligence aides who had organized the palace guard. This was to become the pattern in Africa after 1960.

In 1960 the independence explosion started by the abrupt decision of Belgium to give the Congo its independence. What happened in the ensuing 8 years had not been anticipated in Washington. The Communists are there in large numbers. Of the 38 new African nations today, the Russians have representation in about 30; the Chinese in about 15. But, like Ghana, they have been in and out, and the Africans have not hesitated to expel them. The Soviet Embassy has been closed twice in the Congo because of interference in internal Congolese affairs. The Ghanaians threw out both the Chinese and the Russians. Burundi has thrown out the Chinese. Seven African countries have

expelled the Chinese and even some of the presumably good friends, such as Guinea, expelled the Russians. The Guineans not only threw out the Russians, but the Soviet Ambassador at the time was formerly the chief of the African bureau of the Soviet Foreign Ministry. He was expelled for dabbling in the Guinean Teachers Union which he was trying to organize against Sekou Touré, who controls Guinea with an iron hand and does not want either the Russians or anybody else dabbling internally.

Today there is only one legal Communist Party on the continent of Africa. There are probably somewhere in the neighborhood of 100,000 card-carrying Communists in Africa and probably 10 times or more than that number of Communist sympathizers. Communism has not made major inroads into Africa because of simple factors. First, the African people are not politically sophisticated.

The second factor is that the Africans have their own form of socialism indigenous to the area. The best way to describe this is to quote the Minister of Planning of one country who announced that he was a Marxist, but he did not believe in state ownership of production because African countries have to have Western investment in order to develop, and if they had state ownership of production they would not attract much investment. He did not believe in collectivization of land because the African native has to have his plot of land. He has always had land, and it is important to him. If they took the land away, the natives would be restless. He did not believe in the abolition of religion because the African native has to have some form of religion, regardless of whether it is Christianity, pagan worship, or Islam. Despite all these exceptions, he considered himself a Marxist.

So the point that I wish to illustrate is that a number of African leaders,

Senghor of Senegal and Nyerere of Tanzania and many of the others describe themselves as socialists, but what they actually put into practice is a form of socialism that uses capitalism where it is necessary and accepts aid from all and is determined to resist efforts at control, whether it comes from communism, the former colonial powers, or the United States.

There is one interesting aspect about the competition in Africa for influence, and this has been the competition between the Chinese and the Russians. Aid from the Communist countries--economic aid--has not been a complete success in Africa. They sent the wrong type of equipment. Some of it has been inferior in quality. This was especially notable in Guinea which was cut loose by France when they had the temerity to vote "no" to joining the French union. De Gaulle cut them off without a cent, literally. In fact, the French even took the light fixtures out of the buildings when they went, so Guinea had to turn to the East for assistance. De Gaulle told the United States that if we gave assistance, he would leave NATO. He did leave NATO anyway, but we did not give them assistance at that time.

In any event, the Chinese and the Russians have been fighting with each other in Africa to the degree that the *Chauian Times*, after a meeting of the World Federation of Trade Unions in Algiers, described the discussions between the Chinese and the Russians as disgraceful evidence of hatred and lack of cooperation. The Chinese attack the Russians on a racial basis--they are white like the Americans and the Europeans, and that the Chinese are the people the Africans should tend to work with because they are non-Caucasian and can work with them. They attack the Russians on all of the various revisionist and deviationist bases that they can and, in every instance, do their best to undercut the Russians. In fact, in many areas the Chinese and the Russians are fighting

24 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

each other harder than they are the United States.

Trouble spots that bear watching in South Africa include Brazzaville, the capital of the former French Congo, which is a key center of Communist activity. The Cubans, incidentally, are the palace guard in Brazzaville. There are about 400 Cubans training Africans in guerrilla warfare and all other types of subversion. Brazzaville is a major center for Communist activity and is viewed suspiciously by the Congolese in Kinshasa.

Dar es Salaam, the capital of Tanzania, is also a major center of communism activities, both Chinese and Russian. It is also the base of operations into Mozambique where there is guerrilla warfare between the liberation forces and the Portuguese Army, just as on the other side of the continent there is guerrilla warfare in Angola. This is a war which is occupying about 40,000 Portuguese troops and about 7,000 to 8,000 guerrillas on both sides. The Communists are pouring arms into these areas to try to wrest these colonies from Portugal.

Khartoum in the Sudan is a key Communist center of activity. Khartoum is a key because of its geographical location. The horn of Africa will see some bloody wars because Somalia aspires to parts of Ethiopia, Kenya, and all of French Somaliland. The Communists are active in stimulating that.

Despite my comment that communism is a minor force in most African countries, the Communists are going to make just as much as they can of the troubles that Africa will face. For the rest of this century, at least, there will be tribal warfare, fragmentation, and national frictions in Africa.

Let us take a quick look at Latin America. We have Castro's Cuba, 90 miles from us. Castro's Cuba no longer has the tremendous appeal in the rest of Latin America that it had in the days immediately following his takeover on 1

January 1959. But Castro still has aspirations of grandeur. His sending Che Guevara down to Bolivia to try and raise a revolt there, contrary to Russian urgings, incidentally, is indicative of what he is likely to do. Guevara could

BIOGRAPHIC SUMMARY



Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, Jr., was born in Rochester, N.Y., educated in public schools there and at Deerfield Academy, Deerfield, Mass., and graduated from the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and

International Affairs of Princeton University in 1938.

After graduation he worked for the U.S. News Publishing Corporation in Washington, D.C., as an editor and personnel director. In 1942 he joined the Office of Strategic Services and served in Europe with that organization and as a military intelligence officer on the staff of Gen. Omar Bradley's 12th U.S. Army Group where he was the G-2 briefing officer. He left the military service with the rank of major, and for his service received the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, French and Belgian Croix de Guerre, and the European Theater Ribbon with five battle stars.

After the war he returned to the U.S. News as an editor of *World Report Magazine*. In 1947 he went to work for the Central Intelligence Agency where he served in a variety of positions, including Division Chief, Assistant to the Director, Assistant Director, Inspector General, and from 1962 to 1965 was Executive Director-Comptroller. In September 1965 he resigned from CIA to accept an appointment on the faculty of Brown University in Providence, R.I., as Professor of Political Science and University Professor. His courses at Brown University include one on *Communist Cold War Operations* and one on *American Security Policy*.

In 1960 he received the National Civil Service League annual award as one of the 10 outstanding career employees of the Federal Government. In 1964 he received the President's Award for Distinguished Service, the highest award that can be given a civilian in the Federal Service.

He is the author of *The Real CIA*, published by Macmillan in January 1968, of numerous articles, and has contributed to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica Yearbook*.

not get anybody to fight with him, and the Bolivians were able to eliminate his band. This is what Fidel would like to do in many spots of Latin America. He is sending active aid to guerrillas in Guatemala at the present time. He still tries to stir up trouble in Venezuela. He would like to stir up more trouble in Colombia and anywhere else it seems opportune. Russia is trying to keep the hand on Fidel and trying to quiet him down.

At least three evolutionary or revolutionary governments in Latin America have made considerable strides in reforms and, at the same time, blunted Communist appeal; the governments of Frei in Chile, of Leoni in Venezuela and Belaunde in Peru. Frei is having a very difficult time and whether he is going to be able to succeed and whether his party will win the next election or whether we might see a Socialist-Communist alliance come in is difficult to say.

And lastly, but not least, let me commend to your attention, Mexico. We tend to overlook Mexico because it has acquired a degree of stability since its revolution of 1910. Since the Communist revolution of 1917 in Russia there have been, almost continually, anywhere from one to three Marxist parties in Mexico. Even today the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City operates in the University of Mexico, trying to recruit and develop students. The reason that the Communists have not had a greater success there is because the Mexicans have kept their reforms going and because the Communists have been fragmented.

In the Italian elections of 1968 the Communists picked up a million additional votes, 8.5 million, which is a significant amount of the Italian electorate. The Italian and French Communist Parties are two of the major Communist Parties in the world—very active from an electoral point of view. In both of these countries the Communists have

been trying for respectability from a parliamentary point of view.

In Indonesia we saw one of the most dramatic and horrifying revolutions in modern times, in October 1965, when apparently there was either a major miscalculation on the part of Sukarno, the Indonesian Communists, or the Chinese. Sukarno was giving a speech and had some sort of a seizure. It is possible that somebody misjudged and thought that he was having a fatal attack, and therefore it was the time to make a move because with him dead, the army would take over. Nasution, Suharto, and the other generals would definitely establish control the moment Sukarno passed from the scene.

What happened was that apparently Sukarno had a fainting spell of some nature. He came back to the platform, but in the interim whether he gave the orders or the Indonesian Communists or the Chinese gave the orders is unclear. A battalion of the palace guard revolted, killed five generals, shot General Nasution's 5-year old daughter but forgot to go around to the back of his house. Nasution escaped out the back door, and in the events that followed, Suharto and the army were able to gain control. Somewhere between 300,000 and 500,000 people were killed. This destroyed the Indonesian Communist Party at the moment. It did not destroy communism in Indonesia. It did not eliminate all of the Communists. All of the leaders have been captured or killed, but communism may come back someday in Indonesia. This, of course, was a major setback for the Chinese.

India is one of the major nations in the world; a nation whose survival in the democratic tradition, based upon a strong development by the British of the capacity of self-government is exceedingly important. India's Government has been by the Congress Party up to the last election. The Congress Party lost control of nearly half of the state government in 1967. The Communists

succeeded in gaining, at least, control or coalition control of about half of that half, and control in Kerala. The Congress Party, right at the moment, seems to be staging a comeback. Here the Chinese lost an advantage. The Chinese were the major element among the Indian Communists until they attacked India. China is unpopular in India today, and the so-called right wing Communists have the major influence.

Let me conclude with this comment. Communism is fragmented throughout the world. All the Communist Parties are fragmented, but Marxism has not lost its appeal. There are still tens of millions of Marxists in the world today. Secondly, the Communist apparatus is still in existence. This is not simply the Soviet apparatus but the apparatus of all of the different Communist Parties which have tentacles out of their immediate centers: Castro out of Cuba; China out of Peking; Russia out of

Moscow. This includes espionage, the capacity for subversion, the capacity for guerrilla warfare, propaganda, and a public media that is even greater in volume than the vast American press system. The apparatus will continue to be a threat even though the movement is fragmented. It will prey upon the inequities and the trouble spots of the world. But the most driving force in the world today is nationalism. All over the world the nationalists want to control their own destinies. They will continue to look for assistance. They will continue to watch us, to see what we do internally.

What we do *inside* the United States to handle our problems today--our problem of unrest, our problem of lawlessness, our problem of the cities, our problem of poverty, and our problem of equal rights--will have the most decisive effect upon the way the rest of the world goes.



Initiative means freedom to act, but it does not mean freedom to act in an offhand or casual manner. It does not mean freedom to . . . depart *unnecessarily* from standard procedures or practices of instruction.

Ernest J. King: A Naval Record, 1952