

87th Congress }
2d Session }

COMMITTEE PRINT

WORDSMANSHIP
Semantics as a Communist Weapon

A STUDY
PREPARED FOR THE
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES SENATE



Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1961

77359°

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JAMES O. EASTLAND, *Mississippi, Chairman*

ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee	ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina	EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas	ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska
SAM J. ERVIN, JR., North Carolina	KENNETH B. KEATING, New York
JOHN A. CARROLL, Colorado	NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire
THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut	HIRAM L. FONG, Hawaii
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan	
EDWARD V. LONG, Missouri	

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, *Mississippi, Chairman*

THOMAS J. DODD, *Connecticut, Vice Chairman*

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina	ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas	EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
SAM J. ERVIN, JR., North Carolina	KENNETH B. KEATING, New York
	NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire

J. G. SOURWINE, *Counsel*

BENJAMIN MANDEL, *Director of Research*

FOREWORD

Words are only as good as their definitions. Our greatest disappointments and defeats in the last 15 years have come to a great extent because the representatives of the free world have tended to define Communist words with a Western dictionary.

For example, we in the free world have rightfully regarded the word "peace" as meaning a situation where nations exist side by side with mutual respect and without hostility. But representatives of the West have wrongfully assumed that the Communists accept our meaning of this and many other terms. As Dr. Stefan Possony points out in this study, the Communist definition of "peace" means the time when there will no longer be any opposition to the paramount aim of bringing the entire world under communism.

I urge the members of the subcommittee and of Congress to read this brief study. Khrushchev's speeches need interpreting now more than ever. Here is a scholarly, but lucid explanation of how to evaluate the seemingly innocuous declarations of Red leaders which are in reality setting forth a plan for conquest of the world.

JAMES O. EASTLAND.

WORDSMANSHIP

SEMANTICS AS A COMMUNIST WEAPON

By Stefan T. Possony, Director of International Studies, Hoover Institution, Stanford, Calif.

Without language as the basic tool of logical communication, human life in organized society would be impossible. Yet this extraordinary tool, which distinguishes man from animal, lacks perfection and precision. No verbal expression describes an object adequately. Simple terms cannot nail down complex notions; and complex terms usually are misunderstood and change their meaning with place and time. Moreover, language is ambiguous. Words come and go, and become transformed. Two expressions like "number" and "figure" may describe one "object," namely numerals, but these words also describe additional "objects"; and both are verbs in addition to being nouns. By contrast, two different terms, with diametrically opposed mental impacts like defeat and victory, may be used to describe the same event. And among so-called technical languages, political idioms are the most confused and the most easily misinterpreted.

This natural confusion of language invites artificial manipulation. A medieval French king said: "He who can't dissimulate, can't rule." Hence language is not only a tool to communicate. It also can be used, or abused, as a weapon, to mislead, to create wrong impressions and to induce false thinking. The weapon of words is more subtle and less immediately destructive than nuclear bombs but, just like the winds and the seas which can hollow out the hardest rock, it has the power of eroding society.

The Communists like powerful weapons, especially when they come cheap. Strongly impressed by the potential of language as a means of deception, they not only trained themselves as experts in verbal artfulness, they also created a special vocabulary as the cutting edge of their semantic weapon. The Communist vocabulary consists of two types of expressions. Their standard lexicon for internal use among Communists is replete with terms like "exploitation," "class warfare," and "violence." Their "Aesopian" lexicon, which is for external communications to non-Communists, contains words mostly taken from Western political terminology, such as truth, morality, and justice. Aesop (600 B.C.), who originated such expressions as "sour grapes," "the wolf in sheep's clothing," "the dog in the manger," and "belling the cat," invented the technique of hiding moral and political points behind seemingly innocuous stories.

Lenin employed Aesopian expressions to get by the tsarist censor. He masked "Communists" as "strict Marxists" and instead of using the taboo word "revolution," talked about "the reform," not to be confused with "reforms" which became an Aesopian term dear to moderate Socialists. By now, most of the original Communist vocabulary has been given an Aesopian equivalent. "Dictatorship of the proletariat" grew into "democracy," "expropriation" was trans-

formed into "planning," "revolution" was camouflaged as "liberation," "the party" became "the people" or "the peace movement," and "communism" was disguised as "anticolonialism," "anti-imperialism," and "antifascism." "What's in a name? That which we call a rose by any other name would smell as sweet."

Thus, like the zebra which has a day and a night bark, the Communists are using different languages to suit their audiences. In their external communications they talk sweetly about cooperation, disarmament, and peace. But when they talk to each other, their internal language concerns itself with winning the struggle for the world through force, violence, and war. To the Communists, words are tools to achieve effects, not means to communicate in search of truth.

Let us now look at a few examples.

CAPITALISM

In the American dictionary, capitalism is more commonly referred to as "free enterprise system." A person's incentive to advance himself economically is the key to the success of "capitalism." In this system, individuals and corporations own property and use it, by their free will, to invest, sell, buy, build, trade, associate, and enjoy life. With a legal framework formulated by democratic legislature, corporations compete, enlarge their profitable and discontinue unprofitable activities. In a capitalist system, public authority manages the money, exacts taxation, and imposes or lifts restrictions as may be required by the common good. It operates an effective social security system and builds much of the basic structure, e.g., schools, hospitals, and roads. The capitalist system created a society of opulence in which the largest number of people dispose over "middle class" incomes and satisfy most of their consumption needs. Capitalism works and continues to progress successfully.

According to the Communists, capitalism is a system in which a few property holders have absolute rights, make the laws to please themselves and maximize their profits, and exploit the toiling masses. The consumers have no rights because they have no money. The majority suffers economic deprivation and is sinking ever lower. The Communists claim that capitalism which lacks central planning and management institutions is economic anarchy. A modern version of slavery run by financial magnates, it will collapse when the capitalists no longer can procure employment and food for their "slaves."

Since capitalism is bad and beyond reform, the Communists assumed the mission to "liberate" the world from this evil. In their private conversations, however, they know that "capitalism" has been successful and that their own system has failed. Khrushchev admitted that "the slaves of capitalism live well," adding lamely that the "slaves of socialism also live well." This lapse hardly will make the grade as a basic postulate of Soviet ideology.

COMMUNISM AND SOCIALISM

In the Marxist interpretation, the establishment of socialism after the proletarian revolution would constitute the first stage on the road to communism. Socialism means the establishment of common

ownership, state management of all resources, income according to performance, and the abolition of social classes. Communism means a classless society without antagonisms and struggles, and without privileges or discriminations. Also, in Stalin's words, "science and art will enjoy conditions conducive to their highest development." "The individual freed from bread and butter cares and the necessity of cringing to the 'powers that be' will become really free." All nations, possibly speaking one world language, would be living together within a global stateless system.

The Kremlin claims that the Soviet Union is now in transition from socialism to communism. It is not clear what great advantages were reaped from socialism, but it is confidently predicted that communism will come into existence sometime soon.

According to a Soviet rather than Marxian version, communism is a system of planned economy which, by enlarging heavy industry and pushing technological discovery, is aiming at maximizing industrial growth and military potential.

Our dictionary would agree that the professed goals of communism may be worth considering—some are derived from Christian teachings. But how to create a society in which the wolf and the lamb can rest peacefully together? While striving for a society without struggle, the Communists are embarked upon incessant and "protracted conflict" (Mao Tse-tung's term).

After nearly 43 years, the Soviet rulers can think of no more attractive slogan for their economy than to "reach and overtake the United States." Soviet-type economics were paid for by enormous impoverishment of the peasants, horrible housing conditions, extreme speedup work at low wages, extensive forced labor, and millions of casualties to police terror and class liquidations. In addition, the usurpation by the government of all economic functions has destroyed the prime requisite of democracy, the separation of powers: Never before in history did a government succeed in concentrating so much power in so few hands. Yet, although the Soviet system had a free hand, it produced results exactly contrary to those which it expected and promised. The Communist dictatorship of fanatics, cynics, and terrorists stays in power, not because it performed well, but because it perfected the techniques of domination.

In 1956, Khrushchev defined communism realistically: "Communism means the abundance of the best products for the population. Communism means that a man should have good clothing and a good place to live so that people can learn to work with self-denial for the good of society and make use of the achievements of science, culture, and art." The United States achieved this goal years ago by democratic means and without expropriation and violence. In the Soviet Union, despite enormous pressure, this goal is not yet in sight. Khrushchev did not say why, in his opinion, the American accomplishment does not prove more than mere Communist promises.

DEMOCRACY AND DICTATORSHIP

To Americans, democracy is lawful government of the people, by the people, and for the people: government by a nation's own kind; government with full participation by the people; and government in the interests of the people. Legislatures composed of elected

representatives enact laws under which the government rules as an executive. Free, equal, secret, universal, and frequent elections are held for many offices at different levels and in different branches of government. Electoral systems are designed to ensure workable majority rule. Minority parties, in one way or the other, participate in the government. Majority and minority parties expect to exchange roles. Political action by the opposition is considered a constituent element of good government. Americans also believe that for literate populations, democracy is the most productive and least abusive form of government—irrespective of the “economic system” under which a nation may be living.

To Americans, dictatorship is personal and arbitrary government by decree, based on ridiculous assumptions about the excellence, indispensability, and infallibility of the dictator. Usually the dictator comes to power by fraudulent or violent means and stays in power by falsifying democratic procedures. Dictatorship cannot be changed by the will of the people and it usually lasts beyond the time when the dictator’s mental and physical health gives way. Americans do not accept the thesis that dictatorship can be justified if it fulfills a historical mission. They believe only in those short-lived “missions” which responsible voters entrust to elected representatives.

The Communists claim that they have created a democracy of a “higher type”: The people is “represented” (how?) by the proletariat which, in turn, is “represented” by its “vanguard” from which the party is recruited. The party members are “represented” by the apparatus which is run by the central committee; this committee is “represented” by the presidium, the party secretaries, and the first secretary. Don’t read it again if you did not understand it the first time. The point is that the first secretary speaks for, and commands, everybody.

In 1936, Stalin asserted that “Soviet democracy” is for all. He hailed the Soviet constitution as the “only thoroughly democratic constitution in the world.” In 1956, Khrushchev claimed that a classless society already has been established in the Soviet Union. “Therefore why found another party? That would be like voluntarily letting someone put fleas in your shirt.”

The Communists affirm that bourgeois democracy promised the rule of the majority but that, so long as private ownership exists, this type of rule is impossible. Since the function of parliament is to hide that freedom is reserved for the slave owners, Stalin claims that “the principles of democracy are violated * * * by the bourgeois constitutions.” To Khrushchev in 1958, “bourgeois democracy is democracy of the rich. * * * The masses cannot take part in the discussion and decisions of social and political questions concerning the people as the whole.” But in Communist “democracies,” the workers supposedly are not threatened by destitution and unemployment, and are free from exploitation.

In their internal doctrine, the Communists make no bones about their opposition to democracy. Lenin wrote that freedom and democracy, usually considered identical or interchangeable, are incompatible. Democracy is a form of state and stands “for the systematic use of violence by * * * one section of the population against another.” Hence democracy “excludes freedom.”

Lenin defined democracy as "formal equality." But the people must advance to "real equality, i.e., to apply the rule: from each according to his ability; to each according to his needs." Through the proletarian dictatorship, "communism alone is capable of giving really complete democracy and the more complete it is the more quickly will it * * * wither away of itself." Consequently, *true* democracy must be created by dictatorship and it will disappear as soon as it functions.

What is the dictatorship of proletariat? In 1918, Lenin defined it as "power based directly upon force * * * and maintained by the violence of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie." This power "is unrestricted by any laws." The situation is deemed to be like in the United States where members of government are "representatives of monopolist consortiums," and "serve those very monopolies and banks whose servants they are" (Khrushchev). Thus, "dialectically speaking," because American democracy really is capitalist dictatorship, Communist dictatorship really is Russian democracy.

DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM

This term has no meaning in the Western political vocabulary. To the Communists, the state is not the highest political organ but an instrument to execute the wishes of the Communist Party which is the "leading core of all organizations * * * both public and state" (Article 126 of the Soviet Constitution).

The Communists pay lip service to the idea of intraparty democracy. According to theory, party members elect party officials and the party congress, allegedly the highest party organ, elects the central committee which sets up the presidium. In theory, all party bodies are elected. In practice, all party officers are appointed. "Centralism means the guidance of the party from the center * * * and the strict subordination of the minority to the majority."

In 1920, Lenin called for "iron discipline bordering on military discipline" within the party and for broad powers to its directing center. Otherwise the party would not be able "to perform its duty." Both Lenin and Stalin outlawed the formation of "factions" within the party because those would disintegrate the dictatorship and weaken the "proletariat" in its power struggle.

In 1956, Khrushchev criticized Stalin for his policies and his crimes. Stalin virtually had become insane and almost lost World War II to the Nazis. Instead of being removed, Stalin, because of "democratic centralism"—the "center" "decides" unanimously what the top leader wants—maintained himself in power by murdering thousands of his party comrades. Despite this telling negative justification of democracy even within the Communist Party, Khrushchev, in an Aesopian expression all his own, cutely called Stalin's bloody tyranny the "cult of the personality." He conveyed the impression that merely the adulation of a leader had been wrong. As the emergence of the cult of Khrushchev's personality proves, one-man dictatorship is an integral part of communism.

EQUALITY

In the free world, equality often is interpreted to mean that people are equal in their capacities, needs, and tastes. The democratic

doctrine of equality merely states that, irrespective of race, nationality, creed, rank, position, etc., all are equal before the law and the law is equal for all. The principle also intends that people should enjoy equal opportunities and because of handicaps should not be denied their chances.

Originally, the Communists considered equality as their main and possibly only objective: all wealth must be distributed equally and no one is to earn more than the other. Despite reservations by Marx, Engels, and Lenin, notions of leveling and equalizing played a significant role in the Bolshevik revolution.

Lenin ridiculed what he called "formal or judicial equality between the * * * exploiter and the exploited." The deceptive "plea of allegedly absolute equality between individuals" is contrived to counteract the Communist program.

The notion that everybody should wear the same clothes and eat the same quantity of the same dishes was termed a slander of Marxism by Stalin. He quoted Lenin to the effect that "equality * * * means the abolition of classes." Hence before the classless society is born, no equality is possible. But then equality denotes the equal emancipation of all working people, "the equal duty of all to work according to their ability, and the equal right of all working people to receive wages according to their needs."

Up to the early thirties, the Soviets were trying to create a "classless society." But in 1934 Stalin rejected equality. To boost production, the Soviets, conforming with the "Socialist" rule of "each according to his ability," began to pay money bonuses to the more diligent and productive workers. A Marxist smokescreen concealed the deliberate reintroduction of the class society.

In 1959 Khrushchev equated equalization with "unjust distribution." In a system where the good and the bad workers receive the same compensation, he said, the idler would be ahead. Hence, "equalization would mean not a transition to communism but the discrediting of communism." The doctrine had come full circle. There is indeed no equality in the Soviet Union: the spread between incomes is larger than in the United States. But isn't the rule that compensation should be proportional to accomplishment one of the mainsprings of capitalism?

FREEDOM AND PROPERTY

(a) *Freedom*

The two most important components of political liberty are: *first*, the freedom to vote and, on this basis, the freedom to have different parties, including effective and active opposition parties; and *second*, freedom to change the government by constitutional means, including the *practice* of changing it periodically. There are, moreover, "freedoms from" restrictions and oppressions—the civil rights; and "freedoms to" undertake anything allowed by law and morality. Rights and freedoms are constitutionally guaranteed, with provisions to correct abuse and violations. The "freedoms to" are in the nature of actual and continuously practiced powers attributed to the individual, not just paper declarations. They include the freedom to use property for one's own benefit.

In their external language, the Communists praise freedom and claim that the Soviet Union is the freest country on earth. According

to the Soviet constitution, judges are independent; citizens have the rights to old-age and disability insurance, to education, and, rather astonishingly, to work, to rest, and to leisure. Freedom of religious worship, including antireligious propaganda, is recognized. The freedoms of speech, press, assembly, the inviolability of the person, and privacy of home and correspondence are "guaranteed." Basic freedom is defined as "the freedom of the working masses from exploitation, unemployment, and poverty." These purely declaratory freedoms are nullified by the provision that the Communist Party runs all Soviet institutions. In any event, "freedom from poverty" cannot be guaranteed constitutionally and it is quite obvious that it has not been implemented by the Communist regime.

The Soviets argue that their constitution "guarantees the right to work for all workers" and imposes "corrective labor" only on convicts who are serving a sentence. They refused to sign a U.N. convention which proposed to eliminate "the use of forced labor, concentration camps, and deportation of national minorities * * * as a means of coercion * * * or punishment for holding * * * views * * * opposed to the established * * * system." The Soviets alleged that in the capitalist countries millions of workers are deprived of the "necessary means of existence and are constantly haunted by the fear of unemployment, poverty, and hunger." Hence Soviet labor is "free," q.e.d.

The Communists pretend that the "Soviet peoples" are so convinced of the excellence of their government's performance that they just do not criticize it, though they have freedom to do so. Entire series of arrests and executions without trial as well as the party rule against factions contradict this assertion. The Soviet subject possesses only one freedom: to obey Communist orders.

The internal Communist doctrine of freedom was formulated by Engels: "So long as the proletariat still uses the state, it does not use it in the interests of freedom but in order to hold down its adversaries." While the dictatorship of the proletariat lasts, there can be no "universal freedom * * * no freedom of speech, press, etc., for our bourgeoisie," by which statement Stalin implied that Communists enjoy these freedoms, which is untrue. According to Lenin, freedom can exist only in a Communist society after capitalism and imperialism have been liquidated, and the state has withered away.

In 1958, Khrushchev declared that so-called freedom in the capitalist countries "exists only for those who possess money and who consequently hold power." To him, freedom is "liberation of the people from the horrors of unemployment and misery, from racial, national, and social oppression." His meaning is clear when we remember that "liberation" is Aesopian for revolution or war. Freedom, in short, is predicated upon the annihilation of the United States. Khrushchev promised *socialism* to our American grandchildren. He promises *freedom* to the grandchildren of his Soviet subjects.

(b) *Property*

To Americans, property is a basic human right, inherent in the freedoms to work or loaf, to tell off the boss, to look for better jobs, to carve out an independent existence, to save, invest, and get richer—or poorer. Property is the key to the success of the free enterprise

system and a method of profiting individually from the nation's overall economic growth. It is one of the foundations of political liberty and social responsibility.

To the Communists, property is the worst social institution of all. Marx summarized the entire Communist program in one demand: "Abolition of private property." He defined "modern private property" as "the final and most complete expression of the system * * * that is based * * * on the exploitation of the many by the few."

Although communism has the overriding purpose of "liberating" mankind from property, this is the one subject of which the Communists are most blissfully ignorant. They still talk about "capitalists" as though they never understood the essence of stock ownership, apply one label to dozens of types of property, and ignore the fact that "property" has been changed hundreds of times by routine modifications in the law.

If we were so impolite and apply the interpretative method to Marxism to the Communists themselves, we would say that Communist thinking reflects the social conditions of a precapitalist and primitive capitalist system of production. Marx believed that the "profit rate" tends to decline and predicted that sooner or later only a handful of property owners would be left. Although ownership has been spreading all over, and although Communists in the free world complain loudly about rising capitalist profits, the Communists still *must* believe in Marx's "law." In 1947, the Soviet party tried—in court—an economist on the charge that he neglected the Marxian "law of absolute and relative impoverishment" of the proletariat (which in this form does not even appear in Marx). But no Soviet economist has yet arisen to spell out the contents of this and other "laws." None ever *tried* to prove the chief dogma that the abolition of property would create a social system producing the greatest welfare, the highest social justice, and the largest human freedom.

IMPERIALISM

In Western usage, this word denotes a policy of empire building. Americans believe in and practice national self-determination. Although they recognize that many backward peoples still need help and protection, and that "colonialism" has brought modern civilization to places which needed it, they support independence movements and eagerly assist "underdeveloped" peoples in establishing self-government.

To the Communists, imperialism is exploitation of colored peoples. According to Lenin, imperialism is instituted when capitalism cannot continue without massive "export of capital" and when the "trusts," to avoid mutual destruction through competition, must "divide the world." Colonial possessions are needed for capitalism to endure, but once the capitalists are thrown out, capitalism must break down. This very false prediction, which reflects Lenin's ignorance of the American economy, still influences Kremlin strategy.

The Communists have done less for self-government in Russia than the United States has done, and still is doing, in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Yet they ride the "anti-imperialist" line and pretend there is a natural alliance between all "dependent peoples" and the

U.S.S.R. Khrushchev asserted in 1958 that the "imperialist circles" prevent the industrialization of backward countries to preserve them as "war material appendages." U.S. economic aid, technical assistance, foreign investment, and trade programs are called "neocolonialism" and "neoimperialist exploitation of backward peoples." But military occupation, denial of democracy, and economic exploitation by the Soviet Union of highly advanced nations in Eastern Europe are called "liberation."

The Communist howl about Western "imperialism" is a device to divert attention from the Soviet brand of empire and colonialism. Lenin said that "if any nation is detained by force within * * * a certain state and * * * is not given the right," undisturbed by foreign troops or other types of pressure, "to determine the form of its state-life by free voting," "the adjoining of that nation by the stronger state is annexation, i.e., seizure by force and violence." This criterion was applied by Lenin to the nations "detained by force" within the Russian Empire of 1917. In 1961, his test still is applicable. Since the Soviets preach the abolition of imperialism and national oppression, why don't they start liquidating their own empire?

INTERNATIONALIST

An internationally minded American believes that, in the modern world, the fate and welfare of nations are interrelated and that policies should take this interdependence into full account.

The Communists read it differently. In 1927, Stalin said: "An internationalist is he who * * * is ready to defend" and "to strengthen" the Soviet Union, "the fatherland of the proletariat." This obligation may include treason against the Communist's homeland.

In 1948, Vyshinski brought this often reiterated concept up to date by telling "real internationalists" that they must get busy providing "practical and maximal help to the U.S.S.R." "Every honest man everywhere and not only the citizens of the U.S.S.R." have this "holy duty." Thus, "honest men" owe allegiance not to their own countries, but to the Kremlin. What would happen if the United States were to proclaim that every "honest man" in the Soviet Union has the holy duty to defend and strengthen American democracy?

NEGOTIATION

To an American, negotiation is the least troublesome method of settling disputes. Negotiation may be exploratory and serve to formulate viewpoints and delineate areas of agreement or contention. Or it may aim at working out practical arrangements. The success of negotiation depends on whether (a) the issue is negotiable (e.g., you can sell your car but not your child); (b) the negotiators are interested not only in taking but also in giving, are able to exchange value for value, and are willing to compromise; and (c) the negotiating parties trust each other to some extent—if they didn't, a plethora of safety provisions would render the "agreement" unworkable.

The Soviet purpose in negotiation is "to get and not to give." It is a method of agitation and of weakening the opponents of communism. It is not designed to settle disputes but is a conflict technique to facilitate conquest on the installment plan.

The Soviets have an excellent chance to gain from negotiation. The West, which can be put under public opinion pressure, always risks being trapped into undesirable concessions and into postponing decisions while negotiations last. Negotiations can be made to look promising whenever this is opportune, and threats and incidents are useful in hypnotizing the free world into believing that it is more "profitable" to give up than to stand up.

In 1958, Khrushchev declared, "we shall never settle controversial problems in relations between states by means of war. We shall endeavor to solve problems of this kind peacefully, by negotiation." Communists consider "interstate" problems as unimportant. The crucial problems deal with the relations between capitalism and communism as social systems. Khrushchev said in effect that he would negotiate about routine matters, but that the decisive questions could not be settled so easily.

Communists sign agreements whenever, in Khrushchev's words, "life and the interests of the cause demand it." Lenin taught the Communists to sign treaties as "a means of gaining strength." Stalin asked that respite achieved through arrangements must be exploited "to secure future strategic advantages."

Still, agreements must have "revolutionary significance." They must not, in Stalin's words, "hinder the Communist Party from conducting its independent, political, and organizational work * * * and from preparing the conditions necessary for the hegemony of the proletariat." If a treaty becomes onerous, Communists adhere to Lenin's rule not to tie their hands with "considerations of formality." In 1955, the Senate Judiciary Committee reported that the Soviets, within 38 years, had concluded nearly 1,000 treaties. The Soviet "government has broken its word to virtually every country to which it ever gave a signed promise."

According to Communist doctrine, no Western concession can be final before ultimate surrender. If one problem is settled now, another must be posed immediately thereafter, and so forth in an interminable sequence. The Communists believe that negotiation is a game which they cannot possibly lose.

PEACE AND PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

To Americans, peace means freedom from dissension, strife, or conflict. It denotes absence of aggressive design, political disinterest in the "social systems" of foreign nations, and a lack of problems which could not be solved amicably. Americans realize that lasting peace may be unattainable. But they also think that, in the past, peace was broken far too frequently, and too often for too trivial reasons.

To Communists, "peace" is, *first*, an invitation to non-Communists never to resist Soviet aggression. "Peace" means, *second*, the utilization of conflict methods short of war, such as propaganda, political warfare, uprisings, and guerrilla fighting, and refers to the nonmilitary phase of *armed* conflict, such as the creation of optimum conditions within which battle can be risked. "Peace" means, *third*, the terminal point of Communist world conquest, and, *fourth*, the period after the consolidation of the classless society.

The term "peace policy" does not imply that the Soviets have become reconciled with capitalism. "Peace policy" "is merely an-

other and—under given conditions—a more advantageous form of fighting capitalism.” It provides, according to a Comintern resolution of 1928, “the best basis for taking advantage of the antagonisms among the imperialist states.” “Struggle for world peace” is Aesopian for “cold war.”

Irrespective of how successful “peace policy” can be, durable peace with the imperialists is impossible. “In the process of the proletarian world revolution, wars between proletarian and bourgeois states * * * will necessarily and inevitably arise.” It is indeed obvious that the world dictatorship of communism cannot be established through democratic elections.

“Peaceful coexistence” is the current version of “peace policy.” Khrushchev does not like the capitalist system and does not “want capitalism to exist but * * * cannot help but recognize that it does exist.” People sometimes don’t get married for love but nevertheless live their whole lives together. Yet “if you live among dogs, keep the stick with you,” he warned.

In 1957, Khrushchev challenged the United States to compete in the production of meat, butter, clothes, footwear, housing, vacuum cleaners, television, and radio sets: in this particular race the Soviet people are confident of victory! The intent of this astonishing assertion was to belittle the economic success of the United States and induce us to indulge in a consumer goods “race” rather than worry about defense. Contrary to an often cited *nonexistent* statement by Lenin that Communists would win if through an armaments race they forced the United States into bankruptcy, the Soviets fear nothing more than American strength. They want us to gorge ourselves to death with luxury.

Khrushchev argues that peaceful coexistence has become a vital necessity. “To think otherwise is to lead matters to war, which modern weapons would make the most frightful and devastating ever.” This type of talk is just for external consumption. In 1925, Stalin defined “the essence of the question” as follows: “Who will defeat whom?” Upon his return from the United States, Khrushchev explained peaceful coexistence by referring to Lenin’s flexible foreign policy in signing the peace treaty with Germany in 1918. This language is crystal clear to all trained Communists. It tells them that before resuming the “advance of communism,” the Soviets require what Lenin called a “breathing space.” The Communists are not disclosing how much time they need to catch their breath, but it is certain that they do not desire to coexist in perpetuity.

Coexistence does not mean “to live and let live.” It is a strategic deception in order to gain strength. Khrushchev promised the free world to bury it, presumably to celebrate the final success of “coexistence.” When Communists think of *lasting* coexistence, they envisage the peculiar relationship which the dog shares with the bone and the rope with the executed.

WAR AND DISARMAMENT

(a) *Disarmament*

Americans hold different views about disarmament. A moderate view would be that states which harbor no hostile designs against each other agree to reduce their military forces and control each other’s compliance with the agreement. To be acceptable, disarma-

ment agreements must not upset the international balance of power but preserve the status quo.

For Communists, disarmament is another deception technique to change the balance of power in their favor. Lenin held that a sincere demand by Socialists for disarmament is "reactionary," "illusory," and "tantamount to the complete abandonment * * * of revolution." Since, however, "revolutionary war * * * is a continuation of revolutionary peace policy by other means" (Comintern resolution, 1928), the Soviet Government, to buy time, "dialectically" accompanies its armaments by disarmament talks—not acts.

Khrushchev is familiar with Lenin's dictum, "every 'peace program' is * * * a piece of hypocrisy." He is not naive enough to expect that his 1959 plan for 100 percent disarmament and 10 percent control, as Ambassador Lodge put it, can be accepted. Khrushchev is opposed to control because, in the absence of "confidence," inspection allegedly is impractical. According to him, confidence must precede inspection. Yet, the doctrine teaches that true confidence can prevail only after the world revolution has been accomplished. Obviously, in a world empire under a single Communist dictatorship inspection would be redundant.

Since 1922, although they never thought "for a moment that the imperialists would accept Soviet disarmament proposals," the Communists have made seven radical disarmament proposals. These proposals were put forward "to recruit sympathizers, eradicate pacifist illusions, * * * overthrow the bourgeoisie, and establish the proletarian dictatorship."

Khrushchev seems to assume that free world military strength can be reduced by *mere talk*. Using their language weapon skillfully, the Communists risk nothing trying the "just talk" ploy. Otherwise they faithfully follow Lenin's advice to work toward "the arming of the proletariat * * * and the disarming [of] the bourgeoisie." Among themselves, Communists are agreed to hold onto their weapons at least until communism is established globally.

(b) War

To Americans war is horror and hell, to be avoided except in extreme circumstances, a method like surgery to prevent a disaster like enslavement, but not a method of making constructive contributions to human happiness.

The Communists consider war to be a creative force. Marx said that war is "the last word of social science on the eve of each general reconstruction of society." In Lenin's opinion, "great historical questions can be solved only by violence." War is the "locomotive of history." "War * * * waged * * * with the object of strengthening and extending socialism * * * is legitimate and 'holy'." Stalin reasserted in 1952 that so long as imperialism exists war remains inevitable. To make war avoidable, "imperialism" (meaning the United States) "must be destroyed." Mao Tse-tung believes in the "omnipotence of war" and the "solution of problems by war." All Communist classics have believed in the "unification" of revolution, national uprisings, and war.

Communists distinguish between predatory and imperialist wars which are waged by non-Communist states, liberation wars undertaken by oppressed peoples, and revolutionary wars fought by Communist

forces. Only liberation and revolutionary wars are "just." The state fighting the "unjust war" always is called the aggressor. According to their nomenclature, the United States always would fight an unjust war, even if it were to defend itself against direct attack.

In his external messages, Khrushchev never tires of promising that the Soviet "armed forces will not be used * * * at any time for predatory purposes." By Communist definition, the Soviet armed forces never can be used for "predatory purposes." Khrushchev is slyly promising that he *will* not visit us 2 years ago when snow will fall in July.

Immediately after Khrushchev left the United States, he went to China and reassured his Peking listeners that Communists still "recognize" just wars as well as wars of liberation. Khrushchev presently uses the term "just war" as an Aesopian translation of "revolutionary war." Any war waged by the Soviet Union, especially a war waged to bring about the victory of communism, irrespective of whether they started it or not and whether they fight it with nuclear weapons or guerrillas, would be a "just" war. Would the Communists fail to do what they consider just or to declare "just" what they are doing? The "justest" war of all would be a war against the worst predator, the United States.

Khrushchev did not explicitly refute Lenin's theory that "every revolution must be established through the process of wars." Nor did he take issue with Mao Tse-tung's statement that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." Yet on November 6, 1957, Khrushchev did say: "A world war would lead to inconceivably great destruction and losses. The use of atomic and hydrogen weapons, of ballistic rockets would result in enormous calamity for all mankind." "We Communists * * * will never strive to achieve our aims by such terrible means. This is antimoral and it contradicts our Communist outlook * * *. Wars are not needed for the victory of socialism."

Was this external or internal language? Was this a modification of the doctrine of inevitable war? "The forms of social revolution vary," Khrushchev averred. In a number of capitalist countries the violent overthrow of the "dictatorship of the bourgeoisie" still is "inevitable," but some small states, seeing the hopelessness of resistance, may surrender. "The use or nonuse of violence in the transition to socialism" does not depend on the proletariat (read: Soviet Union) but "on whether the exploiting class" (read: United States) "resorts to violence." "Mighty social and political forces possessing formidable means" (read: Soviet nuclear weapons and non-Russian pro-Communists) can prevent the imperialists (read: United States) from unleashing war.

The perennial doctrine that the ultimate showdown with capitalism inevitably must take the form of violent conflict was changed by placing the word "almost" before "inevitably." But, unfortunately, Leninism "teaches that the ruling classes will not surrender their power voluntarily." Khrushchev, as he told us, is not going to abandon Leninism before the shrimps start whistling. Hence he must be convinced that capitalism will launch the war which is not "fatalistically inevitable." As a result of this fatal war, the capitalist system "would perish and the Socialist system would win," especially if the Communists, in line with their brand new military doctrine, succeed

in "preempting" the capitalist attack and launch the first strike themselves.

The Communists have set themselves the task of persuading the "capitalists" that they should not mess up the predestined revolution with nuclear bombs. Like reasonable businessmen, the capitalists should go out of business the cheapest way and prefer bloodless surrender to bloody war. The Communists have not changed their doctrine. But their estimate of the internal security, external strength, and moral courage of the free world has become more scornful and contemptuous. The Communists are banking on the specter of nuclear holocaust to frighten the free world out of its wits.

* * * * *

ETHICS AND TRUTH

According to Western thinking, a proposition or statement is true when there is evidence that it corresponds to facts. A conclusion is true if it is derived, through correct logic, from two premises which were proved to be true, and when subsequently its accuracy is verified through observation or other objective methods of evidence.

Religious people believe that absolute truth about some of the highest theological questions has been obtained from divine revelation.

Ethical and moral prescriptions are deemed to be absolute in the sense that they are binding under all circumstances and on all humans, although in real life absolute or firm principles, each involving strong obligations, may come into mutual conflict.

In science, truth is a provisional presumption which is very strong with respect to the rules of logic but weak with respect to "knowledge." We always anticipate that newly observed facts will disclose errors in our previous thinking. Our ability to formulate a true proposition is limited. Even the most accurate sentences never cover "all" but only "most" of the cases. We know from experience that most propositions are only partially true.

Propositions dealing with social phenomena reflect distortions arising from the observer's personal perspective. Hence, like in our attempts to bring out legal truth, we systematically analyze the same subject from different viewpoints.

Thus, scientific truth is an abstraction which denotes the class of all true propositions. Since "truth," in its essence, is open-ended and changeable, we are involved in an endless process of rethinking and retesting, in the hope that ultimately we may be approximating full knowledge.

We reject the assumption that anyone ever said the last word on any scientific subject. Since Aristotle we have ruled out reasoning by invoking prestige or authority.

Because we believe that policies can be effective only when they are predicated on objective knowledge, we also assume that the pursuit of truth for the sake of truth has importance overriding other considerations, including political interests.

Communist thinking originated from Western philosophy and, in a fashion, shares some of its concepts. While denying the possibility of absolute truth in the religious sense, the Communists assign absolute truth value to their atheistic beliefs and to their metaphysics of materialism. In ethics and morality they relativize all command-

ments and subordinate prescriptions on human action to the interests of the class struggle, as formulated by the party. Thus, in one of the very few Communist books devoted to ethics, we read: "Marxist Communist morality knows no dogmatism. It has no norms or rules which would be equally applicable to all situations. Class-conscious workers in the bourgeois society and in the Socialist fatherland must ascribe an entirely different meaning to one and the same rule, e.g., love for the fatherland." However, they formally accept traditional ethical teaching any time murder, theft, and other crime is directed against the Communists themselves.

Thus, ethics no longer is based on a set of objective rules derived from suprapersonal authority, divine or philosophical, conscientious or traditional, let alone on notions such as the rights of man and natural law, but on orders issued from a subjective source—the party leaders who are deemed to be infallible until they die or are overthrown. These men act on this principle: "The purpose of ethics is to contribute to the advance of human society and to the liberation from labor exploitation." Compliance with party orders, which may include the suppression of conscience and morality in the Christian sense, is given the highest ethical value. One Communist ideologist wrote: "Ethical and moral is only what contributes to the destruction of the old world, to the abolition of exploitation and poverty, and to all that supports the new Socialist system." Lenin said: "The basis of Communist morality is the struggle for the consolidation and perfection of communism." The social result of an action decides whether it was good or bad. Personal motivation is a factor of sorts, but the social position of a person, i.e., his belonging to this or the other "class," is the main determinant of his actions.

Marx and Engels postulated that true propositions are possible, that truth can be established objectively, and that truth-finding is an incessant process. However, their writings were given dogmatic character by Lenin who in 1908 said: "Marx's theory is the objective truth. Following the path of this theory we will approach the objective truth more and more closely, while if we follow any other path we cannot arrive at anything except confusion and falsehood." Subsequently, Lenin's writings and Stalin's utterances also were dogmatized. Communists "reason" by quoting copiously from their classical writers, and devote much of their efforts to proving the validity of various so-called "laws of social development" discovered by Marx, Engels, and Lenin. No evidence has ever been adduced for these "laws."

Communists claim that truth is class-oriented and changes with history. In their view, it is a function of social change, not of scientific or logic discovery. Proletarian truth and bourgeois truth differ. The bourgeois is unable to see the truth because his "class interests" conceal it from him. The proletarian, by contrast, is capable of discovering the truth because the interests of the proletariat will be satisfied by the historical process. The proletariat's "vanguard," the party, determines the truth for all proletarians.

Lenin wanted to evaluate "anything which takes place" openly and directly from the standpoint of the party. He justified this requirement for "party-mindedness" by asserting that bourgeois ideologists hide behind false objectivity but really are party-minded themselves. Although they disclaim it, they are apologists for the

crimes of capitalism. Consequently—this type of non sequitur is typical for Communists—every “truth” has party character.

This argument contradicts Engels’ assumption that truth can be established objectively. Lenin denied that there is “such a thing as abstract truth, truth is always concrete.” He meant that statements should not be made because they are right or wrong, but because they are useful in the class struggle. Success or failure in the class war is the ultimate criterion of “truth.” Hence to subject politically relevant Communist statements to the test of evidence would be “objectivity” or “toothless vegetarianism,” as Zhdanov once described this horrid sin.

In sciences like physics whose utility for the Communist state is beyond argument, the Communists like to ignore this philosophical monstrosity. In sciences which like biology are of significance to the Marxian doctrine, they are inclined to tamper with the evidence and to sidestep findings which do not coincide with their dogmas. In the social sciences, arguments, facts, evidence, documents, and texts are manipulated from A to Z, to conform with the current party line.

In brief, the Communists only pretend that they have a special theory of truth. They have a trick and obscure argumentation through which they justify their politically motivated manipulations of logic and fact and their continuous and contradictory reinterpretations of doctrine. “Truth” is what party leaders order the comrades to *pretend* to believe, irrespective of whether the new “truth” is in absolute contradiction to beliefs the comrades were asked to feign at an earlier time. The Communist “theory of truth” is an attempt to rationalize incessant lying.

* * * * *

Is it possible to translate communism into plain English? There are 10 steps to it. *First step:* Communism is based on the wrong diagnosis that property is the cause of all evil and that its abolition is the solution to all problems. *Second step:* Communism argues that although only a small and declining minority owns property, this little “class” firmly controls all politics. The starving majority which owns nothing does not believe in the abolition of property. Hence democratic reform is impossible and extreme violence must be employed to overthrow the “bourgeoisie”—the 60 wealthiest families. *Third step:* After Communists seize power in one country, they abolish property, democracy, elections, equality, welfare, justice, truth, culture, friendly human relations, and internal peace. While professing their admiration for democracy, progress, and peace, they establish history’s most ferocious and oppressive dictatorship, kill their opponents, and arm to the teeth. *Fourth step:* The Communist state exports the revolution. The world is plunged into a 50- to 100-year crisis which culminates in the bloodiest wars of history. *Fifth step:* If the Communists lose, the world has paid heavily for a foolish dogma and its inability to convert fanatics to reason and moderation. If victorious, the Communists extend their dictatorship to the entire globe, abolish freedom, national independence, democracy, equality, justice, etc., and put an end to decent living conditions. The terror regime liquidates hostile groups, elites, classes, religions, and a few nations, and, for good measure, exterminates scores of pro-Communists and Communists. By the end of that period, the

casualty list of the Communist world revolution numbers perhaps a billion people. The indirect losses to mankind are incalculable. Yet while the eggs have been broken, the omelette is still inedible. *Sixth step:* Since industry has been destroyed and economic resources have been depleted, forced labor is established, under the directives of a bureaucracy of planners who discourage all individual initiatives, to rebuild the economy of the world. After a 100-year war, reconstruction never will be finished; hence Communist dictatorship will be perpetuated. *Seventh step:* As an unlikely variant considered reasonable only by orthodox Communists, the dictatorship, carried to its extreme, suddenly functions as promised by the doctrine. As a result, the oppressive state begins to "wither away." The party, having accomplished its mission, becomes a sort of veterans' organization. The holders of absolute political power, without exception, retire voluntarily into obscurity. *Eighth step:* Men live together in free association. The state no longer is needed and politics is superseded by mere administration. Government becomes a task as simple as running a small household. It can be accomplished by anyone with the experience of a housewife. Money no longer is a problem and gold is used to improve bathroom fixtures. With the exception of democracy, the good institutions return in a much improved form: full freedom, full equality, full satisfaction of everybody's personal needs, little work, much cultural leisure and physical exercise, no crime, no national or racial trouble, all-pervading confidence and cooperation, eternal peace, one world language, and great progress in creativity—Shakespeares, Mozarts, and Einsteins galore. *Ninth step:* All public problems having been solved, the emergence of new challenges is being prevented by foresighted planning on the part of the housewife-administrators. Communism at long last has been realized. The wheels of history stop turning and mankind returns to paradise. *Tenth step:* Some snake tells restless Eve that privately owned trees bear the best apples. Eve tempts Adam with the idea that he can recreate himself from an ant into a real man. After that experience of human self-recognition, the wheels of history start turning again. The eternity of communism will founder in the immortality which the Huns and Mongols achieved—the everlasting curse in the memory of mankind.

In brief, communism is the dogmatic worship of a self-righteous idol derived from logical absurdity and deceit, and sustained on fanaticism, power, and blood.

CONCLUSION

Is there a way for the United States and the free world to defend themselves against the semantic war waged by the Communists? There is no simple method except eternal vigilance based on profound skepticism. But some rules may be helpful.

1. Always remember that the Communists have not changed and remain committed to their doctrine as it was formulated by Lenin and Stalin in Marxian and not Aesopian terminology. The Communists aim at seizing power everywhere, by any means fair or foul, including war. They intend to liquidate their opponents as persons, destroy democracy, and abolish all political, economic, intellectual,

religious, cultural, and personal freedom. They desire to establish a worldwide totalitarian system under the dictatorship of a party elite.

2. To facilitate this enormous task, the free world must be deceived about the true means and ends of communism and must be induced to believe in the humanitarian and progressive motivations and intentions of the Communist movement. Language manipulation, which is applied incessantly through an extremely large, flexible, and provocative vocabulary, is a primary means of this deception.

3. Never assume that a word used by Communists—or Russians—has the meaning which you ascribe to it intuitively.

4. Determine whether a particular Communist expression is employed only in their external or only in their internal communications, whether it is used in both languages and, if so, whether there are differences in meaning. In particular, determine whether the external language usage is contradictory to basic Marxist doctrine and whether there is any evidence that the expression ever had the meaning which current Communist propaganda ascribes to it.

5. Determine whether the Communists, in their internal and external languages, are using expressions amplifying, modifying, and limiting the term you are analyzing. Specifically, find the time and space parameters which apply to the term. Also look for expressions employed conjointly within one paragraph or within one line of argument.

6. Determine whether, in previous usages, a particular term was utilized for deception.

7. Make it a habit to test whether the Communists are using their customary double standards, to throw all the blame, failure, and obligations on us and attribute all the praise, success, and rights to themselves.

8. Ask yourself whether and how it would serve Communist interests if you interpreted a particular term in line with normal American usage. And don't ever confuse hopes and possibilities with reality—don't act "on the silver lining" but only on factual and durable evidence.

Naturally, the average American cannot perform analyses of this type without becoming a full-time expert. He cannot change his profession but he should insist that our decision makers become fully aware of semantic trickery and clarify for the American people the real meaning of Communist doubletalk.

The Communists are trying to entrap us by the words which we like best. They are attacking democracy where it is weakest: in its predilection for wishful thinking. In the words of Noel Coward, "It is discouraging to think how many people are shocked by honesty and how few by deceit." In order to survive, the democracies have nothing to lose but their short memories.

