

5/13-19

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE AND INTERNATIONAL  
COMMUNISM

In the Soviet definition, peaceful coexistence furthers the cause of International Communism; it pertains only to relations between governments but not to relations between the actual political forces standing behind these governments. Therefore, Soviet doctrine and Soviet practice continue to teach and promote the destructive and subversive mission of International Communism in the Free World.

In 1958 the State Publishing House for Political Literature in Moscow for instance published a textbook called Foundations of Marxist Philosophy. This work sets out Communist world philosophy and strategy for the benefit of Soviet students at higher educational institutions and for self-study. The book has been favorably reviewed in the Soviet press and can therefore be regarded as an authoritative source.

005668

Chapter Fifteen of this work is devoted to the crucial problem of the class struggle, i. e., the proposition that Communist Parties everywhere will ride to power by inciting, manipulating, exploiting and organizing class hatred. One lapidary sentence in the book cited reminds us forcefully that the fundamental long-term aim of Soviet/Communism remains unchanged. I quote from page 497, "The final aim of the class struggle of the proletariat is the destruction of capitalist society...." The term proletariat is of course synonymous with the Communist Party and its auxiliaries which organize and control the class struggle everywhere.

On page 485, Foundations of Marxist Philosophy teaches further that "the proletariat conducts its struggle against capitalism in three main forms: economic, political, ideological...." Considering the economic struggle inadequate for the destruction of capitalism, the book turns to the "political struggle" as "indispensable...towards this aim."

Lest we forget what this political struggle implies, the work reveals on page 488 quite frankly that "The political struggle ranges over many forms: from participation in elections to governmental organs to mass demonstrations, from peaceful exploitation of a parliamentary forum to the revolutionary struggle for power. The main task of the political struggle of the proletariat is the overthrow of the power of the capitalist class and the establishment of its own regime, the dictatorship of the working class, and afterwards, when this end has been achieved, the strengthening of this regime as a tool for the establishment of a Communist society."

On page 560 we receive the timely reminder that "peaceful coexistence between socialism and capitalism signifies by no means a cessation of the struggle between them." "This struggle, however,"--the work continues-- "does not necessarily acquire the character of armed collisions but unfolds in the spheres of economics, politics as well as ideology."

1959

The November issue of the Soviet controlled review Problems of Peace and Socialism, the successor publication to the Cominform journal which transmits the Soviet line to the International Communist Movement, contains an article "Peaceful Coexistence and the Struggle of Two Ideologies"--written by a high-ranking Soviet Party functionary. The article further advises the International Communist Movement authoritatively on the extent and limitations of the concept of peaceful coexistence. First, the article makes abundantly clear that the fundamental orientation of Communism remains unchanged, i. e., "In the ideological field there never was peaceful coexistence between socialism and capitalism, and there never can be. The Communists conduct and will conduct their struggle on behalf of Communist ideas, the revolutionary ideology of the working class." The article asks "Can for instance, the Communists give up their struggle for the victory of the proletarian dictatorship?" and answers, "No, they cannot,

for this would mean the perpetuation of the capitalist system. "

The article artificially divorces the problem of maintaining peaceful relations between governments from the problem of subversion as a means of interfering with the national sovereignty of free countries. The fact that Communists mean by peaceful coexistence only an improvement of relations between governments is made quite clear in the definition of coexistence given in the cited article: "Coexistence--that is essentially no less than a continuation of the struggle between socialism and capitalism by peaceful means, no less, furthermore, than a form of the class struggle which has been generated in the period of the transition from capitalism to socialism. "

One need not be an expert in Communist ideology to understand that any form of the class struggle is aimed at the "destruction of capitalist society," i. e., the Free World and especially the United States. This concept is basic and

prevails today as always. As if to dispel any doubt in the minds of Communists anywhere as to their destructive and subversive mission the article warns, "But deeply mistaken will be the one who thinks that in the trading of one or the other concession concerning political or economic relations, he may possibly receive from the socialist /i.e., Communist/ states concessions of an ideological character, or that the road toward the normalization of international relations may possibly lead to a reconciliation of ideologies, to a renouncement of principles." In brief, the Soviets define peaceful coexistence as a stage in the development of international Communism during which the Soviet Union finds it advantageous to trade political and economic concessions without, however, giving up its fundamental enmity towards the Free World.

Again, the cited Soviet textbook Foundations of Marxist Philosophy illustrates this point when it deals with Khrushchev's much advertised thesis of peaceful transition to socialism,

i. e., the proposition that Communist Parties are now instructed to seize power by democratic means only. The evasions and deceptions found in these fundamental teachings are useful object lessons in peaceful coexistence.

In one place we find a statement which appears to be sweeping, i. e., "Peaceful seizure of power by the working class excludes such forms of the class struggle and organized use of violence as armed insurrection or civil war." Close by, however, we find a qualifying statement teaching that it depends entirely on circumstance whether or not power can be conquered peacefully, i. e., "The possibilities for peaceful development of the socialist /i. e., Communist/ revolution may contract or, in turn, expand according to changing historical conditions and the relation of class forces."

Right around the corner we are reminded that peaceful seizure of power does not proceed without a serious struggle or even an armed insurrection, i. e., "At first sight, one

could maintain that peaceful seizure of power by the working class is carried out without a revolution. But such a concept is erroneous. The conquest of power by the working class is always a revolution, whether or not it is carried out peacefully or by means of armed insurrection." And further on, we are told that "It would be erroneous to think that the concept of peaceful seizure of power by the working class excludes a class struggle, No, without a class struggle, and consequently without the smashing of the opposing class enemies of the proletariat, a socialist transformation cannot be realized." How peaceful a seizure of power does Soviet doctrine actually prescribe for the International Communist Movement? In answer to this question, we find in the cited text that armed struggle on a grand scale may be entirely justifiable. I quote "There may arise such historical circumstances when the armed struggle in the first stage of the revolution creates the conditions for a relatively peaceful development of the

revolution during the later stages." The book continues "Such was the case, for instance, in China in the course of the transformation of the democratic to a socialist revolution." In plain words, Soviet teachings on the so-called peaceful transition to socialism include full approval of and justification for a protracted civil war of enormous proportions on the Red Chinese model. Such teachings necessarily invalidate the professed principle of peaceful coexistence.

The ideological positions of the Soviet leaders cannot be dismissed lightly. They represent--as always--guides to action, and available evidence bears this out.

The proposition that peaceful coexistence is only another form of the class struggle which will inevitably climax into the complete annihilation of capitalist society has been accepted by many Communist leaders in the Free World. In their confidential talks with Free World Communists the Soviet leaders maintain that it will eventually be easier to carry off

revolutions in free countries under conditions of peaceful coexistence because the US will not be able to act as a deterrent. Free World Communists have been told that under conditions of peaceful coexistence not only can the US be expected to become weakened militarily, but also that US public opinion will gradually soften to the point where there will be little desire to oppose the Soviets and reinstate "Cold War" conditions. Such developments in the US would directly undermine opposition by other Free Nations to Soviet/Communist encroachments. Meanwhile, Sino/Soviet Bloc accomplishments in the economic and scientific fields would further demoralize Western public opinion. ~~Some of the Communist leaders in the Free World appear to be greatly encouraged and are beginning to entertain notions about a possible take-over in their country.~~ This kind of evidence which shows that peaceful coexistence is regarded as a tactic by Communist leaders in the Free World makes

it impossible to believe in the sincerity of the Soviet peace campaign.

The Soviet leadership has gone to great lengths in order to conceal the aims of the peaceful coexistence tactic. At the 21st Extraordinary Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, for instance, the assembled leaders of Free World Communist Parties were requested to omit from their Party literature all references to the leading role of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union within the International Communist Movement. The reason for this move was clearly to conceal Soviet domination of the International Communist Movement and to strengthen its facade of respectability. However, the Soviet leadership did not go beyond a verbal camouflage. The evidence shows that the Soviet party/government still claims for itself the exclusive role of controlling and coordinating the Communist movement, with the exception perhaps of a

few countries in South East Asia where the Soviets recognize the predominance of Communist China's subversive interests. The best confirming evidence comes from sporadic resistance within the International Communist Movement against Soviet hegemony.

The complex apparatus of the Soviet Communist Party for control and coordination of the International Communist Movement is expanding. We estimate that there are at least 1300 Soviet party and government officials involved in one form or another in international activities relating to the support and guidance of the International Communist Movement. This estimate does not include the Soviet espionage apparatus.

The staff organization of the review Problems of Peace and Socialism in Prague probably exceeds in number and quality the staff of the defunct Cominform which included a Soviet colony of about 200. Among the various sections identified there are some concerned with the coordination

of the propaganda of international Communist front organizations and, more ominously, with the so-called national liberation movement. The World Peace Movement, in the past one of the most prolific producers of the most slanderous anti-US propaganda, has been instructed to intensify its subversion of the many genuine and non-Communist pacifist groups, individuals and organizations existing throughout the world. The Afro-Asian Solidarity Movement is reorienting itself primarily towards the penetration of the nationalist movements in Africa. The World Federation of Trade Unions has placed penetration of the African labor movement on a priority basis and has begun to train and indoctrinate African trade unionists in its school in Budapest. The by now traditional efforts in Latin America of the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Union of Students as well as the international Communist women's front, continue unabated.

Under recent Soviet guidance, the Communist Parties of Western Europe are seeking new ways and means to disrupt European integration and to isolate West Germany from the European community. Their leaders met recently in Rome to coordinate their programs in a secret conference. In the Middle East the Communist Party of Iraq has slowed down the tempo but not the intensity of its effort to penetrate the power structure of the country. Faced with the shock-effect of Red Chinese pressure on India, the Communist Party of India is regrouping and concentrating on penetration and subversion, particularly in the State of Kerala where elections are pending. The evidence indicates careful coordination with the Soviet leadership. In the Far East, new democratic governments, from industrial Japan to helpless Laos, are subjected to an unrelenting pressure from a militant Red China, in coordination with the subversive activities of their own Communist parties.

Upon Soviet and Red Chinese advice, the Latin American Communist Parties are continuing to exploit and manipulate the Cuban revolution and to incite throughout the hemisphere nationalist elements against "Yankee imperialism". Take, for example, the current situation in Panama. The question of Panamanian rights in the Canal Zone have long been a favorite basis for local agitation. The Communists also have long played on this theme. However, since the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in February 1956--at which the theme of "peaceful coexistence" was expounded by Khrushchev--the Soviets have intensified their efforts to precipitate a crisis in Panama. They have done this through a variety of clandestine channels and have used the camouflage of nationalism. They have sought to make the "sovereignty issue" into the main political issue in Panama so that every ambitious politician will have to attack the US or risk defeat. They have carefully studied the history of Panama and have used

the books and articles written by the most fiery nationalists. These they have republished for an international audience, and have encouraged the writing of more, particularly through the medium of covertly sponsored nationalist magazines. In October 1956--the first year of the "peaceful coexistence" policy--the number of new crypto-Communist publications increased significantly. In one of those published in Mexico, for example, we find an editorial citing the history of the Panama Canal as a case of "United States aggression and imperialist penetration committed not only through soldiers with fixed bayonets, but also through the replacement of a legitimate sovereignty by another which shows itself to be illegitimate and unacceptable."

Through their clandestine Communist network, the Soviets sought to build a parallel between the Suez Canal issue and that of Panama. They have continued tirelessly to promote a crisis. We know that the anti-American demonstrations of November 3rd were inspired by Communists

and Communist-influenced nationalists. Subsequently, the Cuban Communist newspaper Hoy gave wide coverage to the demonstrations, though emphasizing that they represent the "culmination of a long struggle by the Panamanian people". Similarly, the Communists helped inspire the anti-American demonstrations of November 28th, which they were prepared to cover, for propaganda purposes, through correspondents and cameramen from the Communist-infiltrated news service Prensa Latina. It is safe to say that the chief agitators in these demonstrations have been under the influence of the Soviet Union, exerted through clandestine channels. The chief exploiters of these demonstrations are again the agencies or agents of the Soviet Union, and the chief beneficiary--should US control of the Panama Canal be limited--is again the Soviet Union.

This is the pattern of Soviet subversion in Latin America. Examples from other Latin American countries could be cited. They all reflect the same strategy, however: cultivate

irresponsible nationalism; develop, manipulate, and then publicize hatred of the US; subvert and compromise government officials, legislators, and opposition leaders so that they must adopt anti-American policies; and, simultaneously, charge that the US government is reluctant to follow a policy of peaceful coexistence.

Beyond the propagandistic exploitation of the "Camp David Spirit" the record does not indicate any basic change in the ideological and activity pattern of the International Communist Movement as directed by the Soviet leaders. The latter are clearly bent on strengthening the operational capabilities of International Communism. The ambitious training program for Free World Communists at the Higher Party School in Moscow and Chinese Party establishments in Peking is going full blast. Communist Parties in the Free World have been urged by the Soviets and the Chinese to improve their clandestine/illegal

organizations, and the Soviets have indicated to the International Communist Movement that they desire-- in this era of peaceful coexistence--a stepped up campaign for the penetration and subversion of armed and security forces.

In brief, the evidence does not bear out the often repeated Soviet claim that the Soviet regime does not interfere with the national sovereignty of free countries through the medium of International Communism. Khrushchev and his ideologists tell the Free World reassuringly that Communist doctrine expressly interdicts the "export of revolutions." The record, however, shows that the Soviet regime continues to import and re-export revolutionaries, for instance, great numbers of foreign trainees as well as delegations and individuals from Communist Parties and front organizations; that it exports funds for the support of Communist Parties and international

front organizations, especially in support of election campaigns of Communist Parties; that it exports enormous amounts of propaganda and agitation materials; that it exports specific guidance to the International Communist Movement through travelling Soviet officials and Soviet diplomatic establishments abroad; that it exports its disciplinary measures through which it holds the Communist movement together; in short, that it exports all the component parts which go into the making of a revolution.