



# World in the Grip of an Idea

Clarence B. Carson

## 25. The Cold War: Terrorizing Many Lands

THE SPREAD of communism around the world is preceded and accompanied by the spread of terror. Even that way of saying it does not put it as directly as it can be stated. The spread of communism *is* the spread of terror.

Terror is not incidental to communism; it is essential and organic. Indeed, terror is the *modus operandi* of revolutionary socialism. Those who will to believe in the possibilities of the revolution of our age

hope that it is incidental. Apologists for communism—and they are legion—attempt to make it appear incidental. Terror was justified, they will say, because of the terror of the regime against which it was used. The terror of a communist regime arises from the history of brutal governments which have beset particular peoples in their past. Terror is made necessary by the recalcitrance of the opposition. Tales of the terror are either fabricated or greatly exaggerated by those who hate the new regime. (This, they said, of the White Russians, of the Nationalist Chinese, of Cuban emigrants, and so on.) But, above

---

In this series, Dr. Carson examines the connection between ideology and the revolutions of our time and traces the impact on several major countries and the spread of the ideas and practices around the world.

all, apologists for communism make the terror appear incidental by treating it as isolated incidents rather than the patterned behavior that emerges when it is surveyed whole.

## Two Faces of Communism

They are assisted in this by communist regimes. Communism is Janus-faced—two-faced—as was suggested earlier in this work. One face may well be called the Ceremonial Face, the carefully conceived and made-up face presented to the world. It is the face that bespeaks regular government, democratic elections, government provided free schools, free medical care, subsidized culture, and so on. It is the face presented by carefully engineered tours for foreign visitors. It is the face of parliaments, written constitutions, cultural achievements, housing projects, prosperous collective farms, of orderly crowds, and contented people. It is the face of justice sought and on the way to being attained, the face which draws recruits from among intellectuals around the world. All these things comprise the facade of communism.

The other face is concealed, or partially concealed, most of the time. It is the Face of Terror, a terror which outruns the imagination in conceiving it and before which many prefer to avert their eyes. Whittaker Chambers sug-

gested that it is a terror the like of which the world had never experienced.

Other ages have known a terror equal to, or a little more than equal to, their powers to endure it. . . . Other ages have known a frightfulness equal to their imagination in inflicting or enduring it. Ours is the first age in which the havoc that men wreak on men has outrun the imagination, which can no longer cope with the plain reality and turns away, helpless, exhausted, and incredulous. . . .

Ours is the first age in history in which duly constituted governments, duly recognized by others calling themselves civilized, practise the extermination of their own people by millions, as a matter of calculated policy. Within [our] lifetime . . . , the Soviet government . . . exterminated so many of its people that it did not dare publish the census figures. . . . The same government decreed, because its peasants were hiding their grain, that they should be starved to death. So they were, from three to six million of them.<sup>1</sup>

That, however, was but one of the cores of the terror stalking the earth.

## Terror Undergirds Power

Terror, I say, is essential to communism. It is essential both to the gaining and exercising of power by communists. Communism is a power theory, and undergirding that power is terror. It is not simply that communism entails rule by a tiny minority. All rule, excepting that in

a direct democracy, perhaps, is rule over the majority by a minority. But communism lacks accepted sanctions for its rule. Its basic theory denies validity to government and thereby any sanction for the exercise of its authority or use of force. Its thrust to transformation pits it against the populace at large; they could only sanction it by willing their own destruction. Its sanction is only that it rules, and it rules by terror.

It may be feasible to divide the terror that stalks the earth in the wake of the spread of communism into four stages. It may be, that is, because our knowledge of communism in action is still fragmentary. Much communist activity is clandestine and secret. As yet, no entrenched communist power has fallen so that its secrets might have come into the hands of a conqueror. (Such as did so many of those of the Nazis, for example.) Thus, we rely on the reports of defectors, immigrants, counter-espionage, revelations (such as those made by Khrushchev about Stalin's rule), deductions from official pronouncements and documents, and surmise, for our knowledge of the inner workings and plans of communists.

### **No Precise Formula**

The evidence certainly points to the fact that much of the terror is planned and coordinated. Yet there

are gaps in our knowledge as to whether or not it is done according to some overall plan. Moreover, there is often no way to determine which acts of terror associated with the international spread of communism are a part of a plan and which are the result of local initiative, which are by communists and which not, or whether the motives of those who commit the acts are the same as those who order or approve of them. In short, if there is a "science" of communist terrorism, it has not become public knowledge.

Even so, a pattern of terror can be discerned from the history of communism. That it was a universal pattern did not begin to become clear until the 1950s and 1960s. Prior to World War II communism-in-power had occurred only in the Soviet Union. The Communist International, the instrument for the spread of communism, was controlled by the Kremlin leaders. Hence, the pattern was the Soviet pattern, not necessarily the communist pattern. But with the emergence of other communist powers, the pattern has been much the same, pointing toward the conclusion that it is a communist pattern. This does not mean that the use of terror falls into a rigid and unvarying configuration. On the contrary, all sorts of variations occur in it. It is rather that if it be assumed that terror is organic to communism,

that it serves certain broad and general purposes, then the general pattern is discernible.

At any rate, there is a discernible pattern of at least four stages of the terror. They frequently overlap one another, and excepting for the second stage there is no predicting in advance how or when they will occur.

### **The Disordering Terror**

The first stage of the terror may well be called The Disordering Terror. It encompasses all that terror which precedes the seizure of power by the communists. It may last for months, for years, for decades, or for as long as it takes to bring communism to power in a given land.

It is disordering because the general object—as distinct from the particular object of any act—is to create the conditions of disorder which will be favorable for communists to seize power. Marx taught that the conditions would be right for revolution when capitalism had reached the stage of development in which the lot of the workers became intolerable. It followed that revolution would come first in what were then the most advanced countries. Lenin altered this doctrine by demonstrating that the conditions were right for revolution when disorder had proceeded to the disintegrating point. Hitler's seizure of power demonstrated the same point, as did that

of Mussolini. Communism spreads by bringing about conditions of disorder. Terror is the most direct means of producing confusion, arousing fear and distrust, and challenging the ruling government.

Specific dramatic examples may best illustrate this stage of the terror. Take the case of Vietnam. The Republic of Vietnam (South Vietnam) was organized as an independent country in 1954. There were communists in South Vietnam, of course, as there were throughout Indochina. At first, they went underground, but they soon began to be heard of by assassinations and became known as the Viet Cong (Vietnamese Communists). "Between 1957 and 1959 the Viet Cong killed sixty-five village chiefs who had tried to resist Communist pressures." In 1959 radio Hanoi (the voice of the Communist government in North Vietnam) proclaimed the desirability of destroying the Diem regime in South Vietnam. In 1960, the National Liberation Front was organized at the instance of the Communist party of North Vietnam. In "1960 and 1961 village officials, schoolteachers, and health workers were being murdered by the thousands. In 1960, through harassment, plus the murder of teachers and sabotage of buildings, the Viet Cong succeeded in closing two hundred primary schools in South Vietnam, interrupting the

education of more than twenty-five thousand students. And this is when the terror was just beginning to explode with full force, warning of horrors to come."<sup>2</sup>

There is not space here to detail the story of the terror that eventually engulfed South Vietnam and sent shocks outward into much of the rest of the world. Those who will to do so may at least know the outcome of it. South Vietnam is now in the grip of a communist regime, as is much of the rest of Indochina. Terror prepared the way.

### The Story in Angola

An even more dramatic use of terror occurred in Angola. From March 14-16, 1961, the northern portion of that large Portuguese colony was ravaged by Bakonga tribesmen from within Angola aided by their kinsmen from the Congo. These concerted assaults were organized in cold blood by Holden Roberto, among others, and fomented by Algerian, Soviet, and Chinese Communists. They were carried out, with a ferocity that can hardly be imagined, by drunken and drugged savages. All the inhabitants of whole villages—men, women, children, black and white—were murdered, the women repeatedly raped, even infants in cribs dismembered, and many people disemboweled. At one village where there was a sawmill, the vic-

tims, both dead and alive, were lashed to boards and run through the saw lengthwise.

Most of the tales by eyewitnesses are too full of horrible things to repeat. Here, however, is a snippet from what happened in the village of Fazenda:

Then the turn came for the women and the children. The beasts made no color discrimination. They slaughtered white, mulatto and Negro alike. They would throw the smaller children high into the air, let them drop on the soil to break their bones and then . . . would play a brutal game of football with the bodies of those dying children, while the poor mothers screamed like crazy in the hands of the beasts. I didn't believe that anything so evil could exist in the world.<sup>3</sup>

The object of this concerted terrorism was to paralyze the will of the Portuguese and drive them from Angola. Had it succeeded then, it would have brought into power men under the sway of communism.

It would be a mistake, however, to conclude from these two dramatic examples that The Disorderly Terror is usually concerted or concentrated so as to accomplish such comprehensive objects. More commonly, the terror which precedes communist take-overs is sporadic, isolated and episodic, rises to a crescendo and subsides, getting nowhere as far as can be determined at the time. Even that it is going to lead to

a communist take-over is a matter of communist faith until it happens. Its immediate object may be much more restricted than that, and frequently is.

Some of the terror may not be planned or directed by communists. Yet, whether it is or not, it becomes grist for the mills of communists. There are at least two general ways this may come about. One of these is where apparently free lance acts of terrorism become a part of the disordering atmosphere which communists can utilize for their purposes. An example would be the terrorist acts by anarchists in the last decades of Czarist Russia. There were many such terrorist acts in the last decade or so of Czarist rule, usually the assassination or attempted assassination of government officials. Most of these were not coordinated or directed so far as is known. But they helped to create the atmosphere of fear and paralysis which enabled the Bolsheviks to bring off a revolution.

### **Terrorizing Presidents**

A more familiar case, one much closer home both in place and time, was what we may call the terrorizing of Presidents of the United States from 1963 to 1973. It began with the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963 and subsided with the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam. It encompassed the assassina-

tions of John F. and Robert Kennedy, Martin Luther King, the wounding and crippling of George Wallace, and, as an epilogue, the two assassination attempts on President Ford.

So far as we know none of this maiming or killing was directed by any communist or revolutionary organization. True, the assassins of the Kennedy brothers were Marxists or communists of some stripe. But no evidence has been forthcoming that they were ordered to assassinate anyone. Indeed, the only assassin, or would-be assassin, with an ongoing revolutionary organizational connection was the would-be assassin of President Ford, a member of the Manson "Family." It is relevant to point out, however, that revolutionary socialism creates a framework both for organizational terror and for individual acts of terror. The preaching of class hatred and allegations of injustice arouse individuals to act on their own and inspire the formation of "free lance" terrorist organizations such as the Manson "Family" and the Symbionese Liberation Army.

At any rate, there was a framework for the terrorizing of Presidents provided by the spread of communism. The American participation in the Vietnamese War was the most obvious part of the framework. More broadly, there was the spread of communism into southeast

Asia, Latin America, and Africa. This, plus the fact that the United States was providing just about the only opposition by any outside nation to the spread of communism.

### **Mao's Cultural Revolution**

The Cultural Revolution in Communist China during these years was also an important part of the context. That revolution spread especially to Germany, France, and the United States, where it was the model for the Youth Rebellion. The Youth Rebellion was not only inspired by Mao's Cultural Revolution spearheaded by students but also by "mind expanding" drugs, psychedelic lights, hard rock music, sexual promiscuity, and hippie lifestyles. Simultaneous with these developments was widespread rioting in the cities, mainly by blacks.

A great many people were terrorized during the turbulent sixties. At the gentler level, there was the terror felt by older people as young people began to crop up in revolutionary clothing, the men sporting Castro-like beards, and girls shedding their femininity by wearing field jackets and dungarees. The sudden change was too swift to be digested; it had the odor of revolution about it, something much more than just a fad. Parents of youth were filled with dread that their children were taking drugs, their daughters might run away

from home, their lifestyles cut them off from their elders.

As demonstrations became the order of the day, many people were harassed and intimidated by them. Riots in numerous cities brought terror to shopkeepers, peaceful citizens, and policemen. Indeed, policemen along with anyone who represented authority were especial targets for terrorization. Deans of colleges, an especially benign breed inhabiting academia, were singled out for a while by their student charges to bear the brunt of terroristic acts.

### **Withdrawal from Vietnam**

What brought all these things into focus as a disordering terror in the service of the spread of communism, so far as they were, was the effort to secure American withdrawal from Vietnam. It was this, too, that led to the terrorizing of Presidents. There is no mystery about why that should have been the case. American involvement in Vietnam was an undeclared war. A succession of Presidents—Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon—took the initiative in dispatching American armed forces and conducting the war. Johnson took the initiative in the heaviest commitment of American forces, and for the last three years of his presidency he became virtually the whole focus of discontent with the war.

Johnson was terrorized. He was subjected to such vituperation as to surpass anything that had happened before. Demonstrators descended upon Washington periodically, picketing the White House, screaming epithets, carrying Viet Cong flags, quoting Mao, emulating Castro, proclaiming their affection for Ho Chi Minh, and yelling unprintable obscenities. Some civil rights leaders joined in the clamor against the war in Vietnam. Following the triumph of Eugene McCarthy—a “dove” on Vietnam, as those who wanted to wind down the war and withdraw were called—in the New Hampshire primary, President Johnson announced that he would not be a candidate for re-election. After the assassination of Senator Kennedy, the President was increasingly cautious about making public appearances. When the forces opposed to Vietnam descended upon the Democratic Convention in Chicago, Johnson declined even to attend a birthday dinner given in his honor. A President had been terrorized.

The pressure was kept up during the early Nixon years. It would mount to a crescendo following the bombing of Cambodia. How far Nixon yielded to the terrorization is uncertain. At any rate, the siege of disordering terror achieved this much. American forces were withdrawn from Vietnam. Communists

came to power there and in surrounding countries. It was a settled mood in many quarters that there should be no more Vietnams. The role of the ROTC in colleges and universities was greatly reduced as a result of student pressures. The draft was suspended. Communist guerrillas continued their incursions in Africa and Latin America, and as this is being written are threatening Rhodesia, Nicaragua, and Iran, among other countries. The revolution did not follow upon that disordering terror in the United States, though communism spread elsewhere, but the softening up succeeded here.

### **Provocative Actions**

The other kind of terror that is not entirely planned by communists but is utilized by them for spreading their ideology is terror they have provoked. Provoked terror from the other side is most useful for propaganda purposes and the swaying of public opinion. It creates confusion in people's minds, making it difficult to decide who is right and who is wrong. The man who became known to the world as Joseph Stalin enunciated the principle, or a part of it, after he had helped to stage a mass demonstration in 1901. In the course of the demonstration, the demonstrators were fired upon by the police. Stalin drew these conclusions: “The whips play on the backs



of all, irrespective of sex, age and even class. Thereby the whip lash is rendering us a great service, for it is hastening the revolutionizing of the 'curious onlookers.' It is being transformed from an instrument for taming into an instrument for rousing the people. . . . Every militant who falls in the struggle or is torn out of our ranks arouses hundreds of new fighters."<sup>4</sup>

Stalin described the technique as one to gain new recruits for the cause, but as it has developed it is much more than that. It enables communism to spread from behind a cloud cover of being on the side of the angels. It enables the makers of terror and consistent users of terror to point the accusing finger at their opponents, to describe the regime which opposes them as corrupt and oppressive. The development of television and satellite transmission brings the evidence of repression into the homes around the world while the provocative acts have either already taken place or are concealed.

Examples are so numerous that they can only be alluded to. In the 1930s, Edgar Snow described the Kuomintang of Chiang Kai-shek as corrupt and oppressive. He told stories in the *Saturday Evening Post* of such things as the burying of peasants alive by minions of the regime. In the 1950s, Americans, and others, were treated to tales of

the cruel tortures in Batista's prisons in Cuba. More recently, there have been stories of terror by the Greek Colonels and the Argentine Generals. The Buddhists who burned themselves alive—who terrorized themselves, so to speak—were the *cause célèbre* which brought down Diem in Vietnam.

### The Kent State Event

There is ample, even overwhelming evidence that much of the violence used against communists and other revolutionaries is deliberately provoked.<sup>5</sup> The reverse terror which communists find most useful is some incident which can be magnified, dramatized and can become the symbol of the repression of a regime. "Bloody Sunday" became such an incident in Czarist Russia. The event occurred in St. Petersburg in 1905 when demonstrators marched on and massed before the Winter Palace. The throng ignored commands to turn back and the firing of blanks, so the soldiers fired into their ranks, killing some of the demonstrators. Here was the dramatic incident which could be recalled over and over again for purposes of undermining the government.

The happenings at Kent State University in the spring of 1970 provide an example of the reverse terror tactic. There is space here only to give a bare outline of what

occurred. Prior to the events that have become known as "Kent State," a radicalization of much of the student body had taken place. The Students for a Democratic Society was the organization most directly responsible. The local chapter was provided with additional revolutionary fervor from time to time by "regional travelers," adults trying to spark activity in the locals. Among the regional travelers to Kent State were Bernadine Dohrn, Terry Robbins, and Mark Rudd. Miss Dohrn professed to be a revolutionary communist, and Terry Robbins was known as "V.I.," the initials used by Lenin.<sup>6</sup>

On May 1, 1970, public announcement was made concerning a series of bombings by the United States Air Force of the access route to South Vietnam used by the Communists. This was made the occasion for student eruptions on a goodly number of campuses. Saturday, May 2, became the target day for action at Kent State. The ROTC building was burned; thugs with clubs beat off those who tried to put out the fire; and an atmosphere of terror prevailed as other buildings were threatened. The National Guard was sent in to restore order. The Guardsmen were subjected to a continual torrent of verbal abuse. A grand jury declared that "the verbal abuse directed at the Guardsmen by the students during the period in

question represented a level of obscenity and vulgarity which we have never before witnessed. The epithets directed at the Guardsmen and members of their families by male and female rioters alike would have been unbelievable had they not been confirmed by the testimony from every quarter. . . ."<sup>7</sup>

The Guardsmen were confused and frustrated—terrorized—after a weekend of such psychological warfare. On that fateful Monday, as the Guardsmen began a retreat to regroup there was a large throng of rioters on their right flank. A contingent of Guardsmen turned back, pointed their rifles toward the throng, and began to fire. Four students were killed.

The revolutionaries had their event now. Hundreds of colleges and universities were closed down. A moment of reverse terror had taken place, one which could be made into a battle cry, one which could be turned into a symbol for an alleged repressive society. The symbolic fire ignited there soon subsided, but there are still smoldering coals which are fanned from time to time in the hope of kindling a flame.

The thrust of the disordering terror is toward civil war. Indeed, the disordering terror becomes regularized when sustained guerilla warfare is underway. Guerilla warfare is terrorism leading directly toward the seizure of power. Since

his death. Ché Guevara has been the symbol of this mode of operation as it has caught on in various places around the world.

The other stages of the terror can only be described in brief here. While it is important to know that they occur, they belong to the story of the consolidation of revolution rather than directly to its spread. They do help to confirm the fact that undergirding communist power is a prolonged and permanent terror. Of course, once communists have seized power they not only monopolize it but the terror as well.

### **The Terror of Suppression**

The second stage of the terror is The Terror of Suppression. This is the terror which accompanies and follows upon the seizure of power. Although there is no timetable, so far we know, it has usually lasted as long as two to three years. In the Soviet Union, its dates were 1918-1921, those that are usually given for the civil war. In Hungary, it was approximately 1945-1948. In Cuba, it occurred mainly within a couple of years of Castro's seizure of power.

This terror has a specific purpose. It is to bring all power into the hands of the communists. Communists do not usually get all power directly. They usually share power with a coalition, such as other revolutionary parties, labor union leaders, peasant and other farmer or-

ganizations, and military leaders who are more or less under their sway. Moreover, the organizations through which society normally operates—business firms, churches, fraternal associations, schools, the media of communication, local governments, and so on—may be independent organizations on which hold over the central government has no immediate impact. Beyond these, there is the matter of the bulk of property being in private hands. All other political parties must be suppressed, all organs of force brought under the communists, social organizations made subservient to communist rulers, and property seized. Terror is essential for a minority to accomplish such a coup.

Such political parties as are permitted for a time are terrorized by the police whom the communists control. Any parties that remain are then fused with the communist party. The leaders are generally disposed of in one way or another. For example, "The Roumanian socialist party had always been very small and weak; it won some importance in 1945 only because it was less disliked by the Roumanian workers than was the communist party. But communist pressure, reinforced by Soviet military power, quickly brought it to heel. At a congress held in March 1946 the party split, the opponents of the communists forming a separate party

which had but a short life. In November 1947 'fusion' took place."<sup>8</sup> Which is to say that only the Communist Party remained.

### **Absorbing Other Groups**

Other organizations survive only to the extent that they are useful to communism and can be controlled by the communists. The old leaders are subjected to such terror as may be necessary to drive them out or subordinate them. In doing this, as well as seizing private property, communists use to good effect the greedy and avaricious have-nots among the populace. Castro's regime in Cuba illustrated how this may be done shortly after the seizure of power. Castro organized militia units to take over organizations and to bully those within them into submission. Paul Bethel says that "Almost without exception . . . the militia units . . . came from the bowels of . . . society. The least productive and the least capable were to be found there. . . ."

Dressed in militia uniforms, authority dangling from the holsters on their hips, hotel bus boys, garbage collectors, taxi drivers and office clerks found that they could intimidate their superiors and receive the support of the revolutionary regime. . . . As organization progressed, instructions began to flow through the ranks, instructions which had no other aim than to bring the whole of Cuban society under the control of government. . . .

Local labor unions began to lose their hold on laborers as militiamen usurped both power and position. Union officials were intimidated, harassed, and threatened outright. . . .

More than one business leader was jolted when a group of militiamen-employees walked unannounced into his office and flatly told him how to conduct his business. . . .<sup>9</sup>

This was but prelude, of course, to the taking over of private property. Quite often this has been accomplished in a mob-like atmosphere as renters seize the places where they live, as employees seize factories, and as peasants seize the land.

### **The Transformation Terror**

The third stage may be called The Transformation Terror. This is in many ways a continuation of The Terror of Suppression, but it is often enough sufficiently separate from it to constitute a separate stage. It is probable that many Russians in the 1920s and Chinese in the 1950s believed that the worst of the terror was behind them. They had undergone The Terror of Suppression. But worse lay ahead—The Terror of Transformation. This is the stage of the totalizing of power, the wiping out of the last relics of independence, the purging of the old revolutionaries, the taking of lands and factories from peasants and workers, if that has not already taken

place, and the molding of the population to the will of the rulers. Terror may be reckoned to be as essential to these tasks as to the others. This was the period of the Stalinist terror in Russia.

Its transformation character may be best illustrated by the Cultural Revolution which took place in Communist China in the mid-1960s. This revolution was promulgated and let loose by the communist leaders. It was a purge, not only within the Party but in the society at large. The instrument used for the purge was students—young people in high school and college. Its purpose was to discredit and shake from power the bureaucracy which exercised authority in China. In terms of communist ideology the bureaucracy had become corrupt and reactionary. In fact, one suspects, power had become to some degree dispersed in China. It is a natural tendency for authority to become dispersed, for those who exercise power, however acquired, to begin to do so as a matter of right. Indeed, some of the harshness of dictatorship is often reduced by the dispersal of authority. At any rate, the government sponsored a rampage by students against authority, and those who had exercised power, as well as the general populace, were terrorized for several years.

The first to be terrorized generally were school administrators and in-

structors. Many of these were brought before students to be judged. They were accused of being corrupt reactionaries. They were humiliated, tortured, often enough stomped and beaten, made to confess and recant, and stripped of their authority. From the schools, the revolution expanded out into factory and field. Students battled with the police and, at times, even took on the army. Civil war raged, instigated by the top leaders of China.

Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai had shown much greater imagination in unleashing terror than had Stalin. To set the young to terrorizing their elders must surely be the ultimate betrayal of a people by the government.

### **The Permanent Terror**

So far as can now be determined, the fourth stage, The Permanent Terror, may be the final stage. When the populace has been terrorized into submission the terror subsides. There may, of course, be new outbreaks of terror, and the possibility of these is surely a part of the permanent terror. But the outward terror is generally greatly reduced. It can be more subtle, be psychological more often than physical, become a permanent war on the spirit of man. Terror becomes an enduring threat, an intimidating force which permeates life.

In its deepest dimensions, the ter-

ror arises from the use of force unredeemed by love. The Reverend Richard Wurmbrand tells this story. It occurred somewhere behind the Iron Curtain, in what country I do not know. Mr. Wurmbrand was no longer permitted to have the forum of a pulpit or any other formal setting for his preaching. So he went about quietly, taking the Gospel to such individuals as would hear it.

One day he fell into conversation with an army officer on the street. They talked for a bit, and Mr. Wurmbrand invited the officer to his home. When they had sat down, Mr. Wurmbrand related to him the story of the life of Jesus, and of his death on the cross, in a simple and direct manner. When he had finished, the officer's eyes filled with tears and he wept unashamedly. In explanation, he said something to this effect: I did not know that there was such a man. I did not know that there was such love.

No doubt, the army officer knew much of hate. He had during his lifetime been subjected to a constant barrage of propaganda aimed at arousing his hatred for the class enemy. No doubt, he knew something of the brutalizing use of force by the regime over him. He must have witnessed the jockeying for power and privilege. Surely, he had experienced sexual appetite, and there must have been those along the way for whom he had affection.

What a relief it must have been to find himself warmed by a transcendent love, a love that had in it no element of calculation, a love that expressed itself through sacrifice, a love that somehow had reached across the ages from a carpenter in Galilee to touch an army office in Eastern Europe!

The ultimate terror is the pervasive use of force in an atmosphere of hate. This is the permanent terror of communism. ☸

---

Next: 26. *The Cold War: The Spread of Gradualism.*

### —FOOTNOTES—

<sup>1</sup>Whittaker Chambers, *Cold Friday* (New York: Random House, 1964), pp. 149-50.

<sup>2</sup>Marguerite Higgins, *Our Vietnam Nightmare* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), p. 14.

<sup>3</sup>Bernardo Teixeira, *The Fabric of Terror* (New York: Devin-Adair, 1965), p. 100.

<sup>4</sup>Eugene H. Methvin, *The Riot Makers* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House, 1970), pp. 361-62.

<sup>5</sup>See *ibid.*, chs. XI-XIII.

<sup>6</sup>See James A. Michener, *Kent State* (Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett, 1971), pp. 85-104.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 222.

<sup>8</sup>Hugh Seton-Watson, *From Lenin to Malenkov* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1955), p. 258.

<sup>9</sup>Paul Bethel, *The Losers* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House, 1969), p. 125.

Percy L. Greaves, Jr.

# The Market Economy VS. The Welfare State

THE HISTORY of the 20th century has been the story of the growth of statism—the ever-increasing control of governments over the lives, actions, earnings, inheritances and other accumulations of their inhabitants. The underlying principle, seldom questioned, has been that those elected or appointed to official government positions are “experts.” They are thought to know what is best for their trusting incompetent charges, even though, in some cases, the same incompetents are considered intelligent enough to choose their supposedly wiser rulers.

The motivating precept of this century has been the basic Marxian fallacy that in a free market society the rich grow richer and fewer in number while the poor grow ever poorer and larger in number. This in

turn is based on the fallacy that employers set wage rates and producers set prices. It is thus almost universally believed that in a free society workers and consumers are totally at the mercy of rapacious business interests.

This ill-founded, but popular, concept of an unhampered economy has stimulated a demand for laws that limit the freedom of business organizations and confiscate the major part of their earnings. Such laws are expected to correct what are considered the undesired trends of a market system. By the use of democratic means, laws are passed in attempts to thwart the ultimate disaster of a plutocratic oligarchy. These laws seize more and more of the wealth of the successful minority, while allocating much of the appropriated