

# CACC

## NEWSLETTER

June 15, 1970

### [FIDEL CASTRO APPLAUDS THE SOVIET UNION](#)

#### [WILL RED CHINA INTERVENE MILITARILY IN THE INDO CHINA WAR?](#)

#### [A BRITISH VIEW OF THE AMERICAN ACTION IN CAMBODIA](#)

#### [FORTRESS GUARDIAN DANGER](#)

The record of Fidel Castro proves that he is a serious and efficient revolutionary strategist. Unlike so many of those revolutionaries active today, he was not content with learning only the arts of destruction. He gave serious thought to the question of establishing his permanent political power once the destructive phase of the revolution was complete. The fact that he has retained dictatorial power for more than 10 years, bears tribute to the effectiveness of his plans.

His long-range goal is the destruction of the United States of America which he regards as the fountainhead of imperialism. He judges individuals, organizations, and nations by their relationship to the struggle to destroy America. If they contribute to the weakening of American power and prestige, they are good.

Recently, Fidel Castro eulogized the Soviet Union in most laudatory language. This indicates that he regards the Soviet Union and not Communist China as the great threat to the United States of America. He most certainly does not believe that the Soviet Union is mellowing and that it has renounced the objective of Communist world conquest. He believes that it is working efficiently towards this goal. His opinion merits respect.

On April 22, in Havana, Cuba, Fidel Castro made a speech in honor of the centenary of the birth of Lenin. He discussed the influence of Lenin on revolution in general and the Cuban revolution in particular. He claimed that knowledge of the science of Marxism-Leninism (communism) was essential armament for a successful revolutionary. He stated categorically that revolutionaries who were deficient in this regard, were doomed to failure.

“There are men who want change, who have many of the conditions required for being a revolutionary; there are even men who understand some of today’s problems; . . . Some men are beginning to understand the problems and to become aware of the economic exploitation of imperialism; they have revolutionary potential and they act like revolutionaries. But, nevertheless, those who are not acquainted with Marxism-Leninism are undoubtedly at a great disadvantage, and will encounter immense difficulties. Because what can be said—and we have a right to say it because we have tried to learn a lesson from the experience of our country—is that there is only one revolutionary science; there is only one political science; and that political and revolutionary science is Marxism-Leninism.” *World Magazine*, May 30, 1970, Pages M-4 and M-5.

### **Success of the Cuban Revolution**

He attributes the success of the Cuban revolution to three factors: (1) The tradition and history of Cuba, (2) An understanding of Marxism-Leninism, and (3) The existence of the Soviet Union.

(1) The tradition and history of Cuba:

“We must say that the development of our revolutionary thought was strongly influenced by our country’s history, by the emancipation struggles in our country. . . . A country without Cuba’s tradition and history would never have been able to attain a victory of that nature, a step forward of that nature, at the time that Cuba did. But neither would a country with Cuba’s tradition but lacking the essential concepts of Marxism-Leninism—above all on a series of basic questions—have been able to take such a step forward.” *World Magazine*, May 30, 1970, Page M-4.

(2) An understanding of Marxism-Leninism:

“We must state that Lenin’s ideas have had great influence on the Cuban revolutionary process. Following the October Revolution, Lenin’s ideas spread all over the world and in our country these ideas found fertile soil and men were inspired by them. And already in the process of the revolutionary struggle of 1930 and 1933, the Cuban revolutionaries were deeply influenced by Lenin’s ideas.

“And some of those works served for some of us as a guide, a doctrine, a means of understanding, without which we would have lacked certain truths that are absolutely essential for a revolutionary process.

“We remember how in the months that preceded July 26, 1953, most of the small group of comrades engaged in those tasks read books of Marx and Lenin.

“. . . And the 26<sup>th</sup> of July Movement was not a communist movement. What could be said was that some of us who had organized that movement were strongly influenced by Marxist-Leninist ideology.

“I recall this because we were able to draw decisive conclusions from Lenin’s works—when I speak of Leninism I speak of Marxism as well, naturally, of the essential ideas of Marx developed by Lenin—and very specifically from Lenin’s *State and Revolution*, which cleared up many concepts for us and served as a light to guide our revolutionary strategy in the struggle for revolutionary power. It was decisive to our being able to work out that strategy.

“Marxist theory was never a pattern: it was a conception; it was a method; it was an interpretation; it was a science. And the science is applied to each concrete case. And no two concrete cases are exactly alike.

“And peculiar conditions also existed in our country, and Marxist ideas could also be fully applied in our country.

“. . . And it could be said that the conception which inspired the revolutionary strategy which resulted in the 1959 victory was the union, the hybridization of the essential ideas of Marxism and Leninism with the peculiar experience of our country.

“This means that Marxist-Leninist ideas are spreading and will continue to spread all over the world.

“It is now almost universally recognized that without Marxism-Leninism there is no revolutionary theory, science or politics.” *World Magazine*, May 30, 1970, Pages M-4 and M-5.

(3) The existence of the Soviet Union:

“However, there has been another influence of fundamental importance: the influence of Lenin’s Revolution, the influence of our country’s revolutionary process of the Party and the state created by Lenin.

“. . .Without the October Revolution of 1917 it would have been impossible for Cuba to become the first socialist country in Latin America!

“Our own case: 1,500 million pesos in armaments received from the Soviet Union! And we certainly do not believe that we are the ones who have received the most. We don’t say this as a protest or demand, but to state the fact that more is needed elsewhere. It is my opinion, for example, that many more weapons have reached the Middle East as a result of the situation there.

“In other words, the value of the armaments received by various countries runs into the thousands of millions. In our case, for instance, what could we have done without those weapons?

“Therefore, the existence of the Soviet state is, objectively—I repeat, objectively—one of the most extraordinary privileges enjoyed by the revolutionary movement.” *World Magazine*, May 30, 1970, Page M-5.

### **Scorn for Those Who Attack the Soviet Union**

He is caustic towards those revolutionaries who berate the Soviet Union and claim that it is “revisionist.” He does not mention by name the countries and organizations he attacks, but there is no doubt they include Red China, the Progressive Labor Party, the Weathermen and Revolutionary Youth Movement II of SDS, the anarchists, and associated independent revolutionaries. Fidel Castro attacks these people as follows:

“There are many scoundrels in the world. Everybody knows that. In some intellectual circles there’s quite an abundance of such blackguards. And, unfortunately, the imperialists have succeeded in arousing in some of those circles what we could describe as profound anti-Soviet feeling. I repeat, in some of those circles. They are the circles that are linked to all of that imperialist technique that tried to diminish Lenin’s role.

“As we all know, there are today superrevolutionary theoreticians, superleftists, veritable Supermen, if you like—to call them some name—capable of disemboweling imperialism in two seconds, in words; many superrevolutionaries who haven’t the slightest notion of reality or of the problems and difficulties involved in a revolution; urged on by that feeling nurtured by imperialism, they bear tremendous hatred. It is as if they could not forgive the Soviet Union for existing, and this, from the leftist positions.

“They forget the problems of Cuba, Vietnam, and those of the Arab world. In other words, wherever imperialism is launching its criminal attacks, there is one country, one state, that sends weapons in the amounts needed for the peoples to defend themselves from that imperialism.

“We are speaking of the existence of a whole plague of pseudorevolutionaries, of writers paid by imperialism, who write against the Soviet Union with incredible animosity and practically refuse to forgive the Soviet state for existing.” *World Magazine*, May 30, 1970, Page M-5.

### **The Menace of the Soviet Union**

The Soviet Union remains the source of the most serious external threat to the United States. Its industrial and military power is obvious. It is equally obvious that it is using this power to advance the cause of revolution all over the world. Castro states clearly what the Soviet Union is doing in Cuba. The support given Cuba promotes violent revolution throughout all Latin America.

The great bulk of the weapons used by the North Vietnamese aggressors in Indo China come from Soviet sources. The Soviet is engaged in a game of dangerous brinkmanship in the Near East. Not satisfied with arming the Arabs for the overthrow of Israel, they have introduced Soviet military personnel into Egypt to fly the planes provided and to man the missiles sites. Soviet fleets cruise the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean, and Soviet diplomacy and propaganda invade every area.

This is no time for roseate dreams. It is the time for sober confrontation of reality, intelligent analysis of the doctrines, psychology and policies of those dedicated to the destruction of the United States so that prudent policies may be pursued for the survival of freedom.

#### WILL RED CHINA INTERVENE MILITARILY IN THE INDO CHINA WAR?

The possible entry by the military forces of Red China into the war in South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia is the nightmare which haunts the waking hours of thoughtful people throughout the world. It induces fear which paralyzes the will and prevents decisive action.

The statement by Mao Tse-tung on May 20, 1970, urging action by the people of the world against the United States, is printed below. It is significant that this statement contains no commitment to military activity by the Red Chinese.

“People of the world, united and defeat the U.S. Aggressors and all Their Running Dogs!

“A new upsurge in the struggle against U.S. Imperialism is now emerging throughout the world. Ever since World War II, U.S. Imperialism and its followers have been continuously launching wars of aggression and the people in various countries have been continuously waging revolutionary wars to defeat the aggressors. The danger of a new world war still exists, and the people of all countries must get prepared. But revolution is the main trend in the world today.

“Unable to win in Viet Nam and Laos, the U.S. aggressors treacherously engineered the reactionary coup d’etat by the Lon Nol-Sirik Mitak clique, brazenly dispatched their troops to invade Cambodia and resumed the bombings of North Viet Nam, and this has aroused the furious resistance of the three Indo-Chinese peoples. I warmly support the fighting spirit of Samdech Morodom Sihanouk, Head of State of Cambodia, in opposing U.S. Imperialism and its lackeys. I warmly support the Joint Declaration of the Summit Conference of the Indo-Chinese Peoples. I warmly support the establishment of the Royal Government of National Union Under the Leadership of the National United Front of Kampuchea. Strengthening their unity, supporting each other and persevering in a protracted people’s war, the three Indo-Chinese peoples will certainly overcome all difficulties and win complete victory.

“While massacring the people in other countries, U.S. imperialism is slaughtering the white and black people in its own country. Nixon’s fascist atrocities have kindled the raging flames of the revolutionary mass movement in the United States. The Chinese people firmly support the revolutionary struggle of the American people. I am convinced that the American people who are fighting valiantly will ultimately win victory and that fascist rule in the United

States will inevitably be defeated.

“The Nixon government is beset with troubles internally and externally, with utter chaos at home and extreme isolation abroad. The mass movement of protest against U.S. aggression in Cambodia has swept the globe. Less than ten days after its establishment, the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia was recognized by nearly 20 countries. The situation is getting better and better in the war of resistance against the U.S. aggression and for national salvation waged by the people of Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia. The revolutionary armed struggles of the people of the Southeast Asian countries, the struggles of the people of Korea, Japan and other Asian countries against the revival of Japanese militarism by the U.S. and Japanese reactionaries, the struggles of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples against the U.S. – Israeli aggressors, the national-liberation struggles of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples; and the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of North America, Europe and Oceania are all developing vigorously. The Chinese people firmly support the people of the three Indo-Chinese countries and of other countries of the world in their revolutionary struggles against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys.

“U.S. imperialism, which looks like a huge monster, is in essence a paper tiger, now in the throes of its death-bed struggle. In the world of today, who actually fears whom? It is not the Vietnamese people, the Laotian people, the Cambodian people, the Palestinian people, the Arab people or the people of other countries who fear U.S. imperialism; it is U.S. imperialism which fears people of the world. It becomes panic-stricken at the mere rustle of leaves in the wind. Innumerable facts prove that a just nation can defeat a strong, a small nation can defeat a big. The people of a small country can certainly defeat aggression by a big country, if only they dare to rise in struggle, dare to take up arms and grasp in their own hands the destiny of their country. This is a law of history.

“People of the world, united and defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs!”  
*Peking Review*, May 20, 1970, Pages 8 and 9.

There is no hint of military intervention in this statement. It is a reaffirmation of the invincibility of the strategy of People’s War.

#### A BRITISH VIEW OF THE AMERICAN ACTION IN CAMBODIA

Anthony Eden, now the Earl of Avon, was British Foreign Secretary in 1954, when the Geneva Accords in Indo-China were made. A year later, he became Prime Minister. He recently delivered a speech in the House of Lords which contains significant statements on the Vietnam situation:

“There can be no doubt that by the invasion of Laos and Cambodia and by the establishment of new basis in Cambodia, North Vietnam has tried to disrupt the pacified area of the Mekong and to turn the United States withdrawal into a rout. That was the object of the exercise. But I think they would have done better not to attempt it. As they have attempted it, can we with any justice condemn President Nixon or the United States Command for taking action to counter that attempt? I do not think we can.

“Personally I dislike very much the policy which is called ‘search and destroy.’ It is generally bad tactics, because it makes enemies where it should have the purpose of consolidating friends. But in this instance, when aimed against an underground complex of ammunition and stores, accumulated in invaded territory to attack South Vietnamese and American forces in the flank and in the rear, a military counter-action to destroy that buildup then appears, to me at least, to be not only excusable but well-nigh inescapable.

“The joint American and South Vietnamese thrust into Cambodia does not seem to me to be evidence of and American intention to delay the withdrawal of their forces from Vietnam, still less to try to settle the conflict by military means alone. . . I see the thrust rather as evidence that the United States was not prepared to see its plans for withdrawal delayed and the work of Vietnamisation disrupted from bases established during the North Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia, against which Prince Sihanouk had himself earlier and frequently protested.”  
*U.S. News & World Report*, June 15, 1970, Page 92.

## FORTRESS GUARDIAN

In the June 1, 1970, newsletter, we reported an attack on the premises and Marxist personnel of the radical newsweekly, the *Guardian*, by the anarchists and their friends. Following this attack, the building landlord locked the *Guardian* out of its offices to protect the premises from further attack and the *Guardian* printer refused to print the paper, also fearing attack. After publishing clandestinely, the *Guardian* now reports they have secured new premises and that they are now prepared to defend these premises against further attacks.

This battle in the century-long war between the anarchists and the Marxists seems to be following the historic pattern. The Marxists are defeating the anarchists.

The reports published in the *Guardian* are both interesting and informative. They give insights into the doctrinal conflicts raging within the Left, and reveal starkly the infantile arrogance of the claims of the leftists that they are competent to create men and women of superior intellect and character and to produce a society of harmony and justice. Extracts from the report are published below:

“The *Guardian* moved into a new headquarters in New York City last week, a month after a band of ‘left’ adventurists attacked and occupied its previous office, forcing the staff to produce the newspaper in several decentralized locations.

“With the move into a new office at 32 West 22<sup>nd</sup> St., New York, NY 10010 and acquisition of a new printer to handle the paper permanently, the enormous technical problems faced by the *Guardian* staff these last weeks have been greatly reduced.

“The cause of the dispute which led to the invasion of the *Guardian’s* former office and the attempt to prevent the paper from publishing was a growing political antagonism between the *Guardian’s* developing Marxist political direct and the small sections of the left movement which identify with anarchist, ultra ‘leftist’ and so-called ‘cultural revolutionary’ tendencies, all of which have been strongly criticized by the *Guardian* in the last year.

“Leading those who attacked the *Guardian* were a number of part-time temporary and full-time workers who had worked on the paper less than four months. They walked out of the *Guardian* after members of the *Guardian* co-operative (full-time workers who had worked for the paper more than four months) rejected a demand that all people who worked at the *Guardian* – including volunteers who might have contributed only a few hours time – have a full vote in determining political positions. This maneuver would have converted the *Guardian’s* Marxist orientation into its opposite in a matter of minutes.

“Those who unsuccessfully sought to ‘liberate’ the *Guardian* from its present political direction have since published two issues of a newspaper called the ‘Liberated *Guardian*,’ using a stolen copy of the *Guardian’s* mailing list. The two issues of that publication have managed to conceal the political dispute which was at the core of the antagonism, concentrating instead

on personal attacks on *Guardian* staff workers, exaggerated in direct proportion to the attempted minimalization of the political issue.

“Their purpose in seeking to obfuscate political realities is two-fold: (1) an attempt to discredit the *Guardian* in one area which is difficult to fight (vague charges of authoritarianism and ‘manipulative practices’), rather than in the political area, which would reveal their adventurism; and (2) an attempt to gain the support of the *Guardian* readers who—generally speaking—would have very little sympathy with their politics.

“Judging from the overwhelming abundance of favorable mail the *Guardian* has received from its readers (a selection is published on page 12), this tactic does not appear to have generated much support from subscribers to the *Guardian* except, perhaps, from those who may have disagreed with the paper’s orientation to begin with.

“Support from the readers, in fact, is among the major reasons the *Guardian* is still publishing. It has enabled staff workers to continue receiving their \$60 a week salaries and has partially paid publishing, moving, communication and equipment costs. A total of two subscribers have cancelled their subs. Several threats have been received, including an unsigned letter postmarked Barberton, Ohio, threatening to burn the *Guardian* office to the ground. Several of those associated with the ‘liberators’ have also pledged, in a letter attempting to gain support from a *Guardian* sympathizer, to ‘destroy’ the paper.

“It was partially with a view toward fending off future attacks that the new *Guardian* office on West 22<sup>nd</sup> St. was selected. It is not vulnerable to easy invasion as was the previous office in a tenement building on the Lower East Side. Since it is logistically possible to defend the new premises, the *Guardian* staff had agreed that, come what may, ‘we shall not be moved.’” *Guardian*, May 23, 1970, Page 9.

## **Fightback**

The officers of the *Guardian* have taken advantage of the attack to rally financial support from their constituency. Apparently their campaign to secure financial aid has been successful. They have titled this campaign for funds “Fightback!”

“Fightback! Considering the world situation with U.S. aggression exploding in Southeast Asia and the domestic antiwar and left movement mounting another offensive against the war coupled with increasing state repression, we think it’s good the *Guardian* published this week.

“Most of our readers (see page 12) agree. Many have given material support to the *Guardian* in order that this newspaper continue to publish despite the efforts by a small group on the ‘left’ to put the *Guardian*’s brand of independent radical journalism out of business.

“Although the *Guardian*’s situation has eased somewhat due to moving into a new office and finding a permanent printer, we lost considerable revenue during the chaos of the last month, not to mention added costs for moving and equipment. The continuing support of *Guardian* readers is absolutely essential if this newspaper is to fully recover.

“If you think our coverage of the Southeast Asian war or of the domestic and world struggle for liberation is worthwhile and if you think it is necessary for some 30,000 people to be exposed to such reportage then we urgently ask that you help participate in the survival of the *Guardian*.

“In ironic communion with our detractors from the right, a small number of misguided people on the ‘left’ have raised the question of whether the Guardian has a right to survive and have taken concrete steps to prevent publication. We see the question differently: does the Guardian have a right NOT to survive at this time? If you prefer the latter formulation, we ask that you, too, take a concrete step and send us a check immediately.”

Extracts from letters of support received by the Guardian are reprinted:

“Enclosed a contribution. We received a copy of the so-called ‘Liberated’ Guardian earlier this week and sent the following letter to the editors of it: ‘We think your seizure of the Guardian office an untenable and indefensible action lacking in either moral justification or revolutionary principle. It is a travesty. Take us off the mailing list you confiscated. We’re not inclined to sanction kidnapped journalism.’ The direction of the Guardian politically in recent months has been vital to the whole movement. We support you. Bettina Aptheker and Jack Kurzweil.”

Bettina Aptheker Kurzweil is the daughter of the leading Marxist theoretician, Hebert Aptheker, and is a leading communist in her own right.

“You have our warmest support in your struggle against the ultra ‘left,’ those ‘revolutionaries’ who, like their revisionist twins, are always more willing to strike out at and destroy the genuine forces of liberation and socialism than the class enemy whom they objectively (and subjectively?) serve so well. The seizure of the Guardian office by the nihilists must be opposed by every genuine Marxist and serious revolutionary no matter what differences they have with the Guardian or they will become the real gravediggers of the embryonic people’s movement in this land. All power to the Guardian! (Albuquerque, N.M.)”

“If you are unwilling to make use of the police you had better start building your own armed self-defense force. (San Francisco, California)”

“Whether or not the ‘liberators’ are police or CIA stooges is perhaps of little immediate importance. In any event they are clearly doing the job of the criminal elements who currently dictate U.S. policies. However, the fact that their attack has been made is in itself a significant tribute to the value of your past activities and hopefully even more so of your future. (Univ. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Canada)”

“Fight on and grow. Enclosed is a contribution to support you in the fight against anarchists and their liberal supporters. Keep up the good work. Add more coverage of the black liberation struggle here and abroad. (Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.)”

“The tragic irony of the not so comic-opera of the so-called ‘liberators’ is that their seizure took place during the month of Lenin’s 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary. Few events in Lenin’s life shocked him more than the execution of his own brother as one of the conspirators in an act of individual terrorism. As we know, Lenin had this tragedy in mind, and others like it, when he finalized his theory: the only way to successful revolution is to organize the working class and poor peasants and not by individual anarchistic terrorism. But the so-called ‘liberators’ cannot even be put in the same class as Lenin’s brother. They attacked a radical newspaper, not an enemy of the people. They are playing a game like spoiled children, with toys, dangerous toys. The establishment must be having a giant belly laugh over their infantile tactics. Carry on! (Los Angeles)”

The *Guardian*, May 23, 1970, Page 12.

## DANGER

“This book will become a Molotov cocktail in your very hands. Jerry Rubin has written ‘The Communist Manifesto’ of our era. ‘Do It’ is a Declaration of War between the generations—calling on kids to leave their homes, burn down their schools and create a new society upon the ashes of the old. . . ‘Do It!’ is a handbook for American revolutionaries comparable to the Che Guevara’s ‘Guerilla Warfare.’ (Publisher’s statement on the jacket of the book ‘Do It!’ by Jerry Rubin.)