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Dear Readers,

After a two-week trip to Interlaken, Switzerland and Wolfach, Germany, to sit as an uninvited observer at an international convention of "One Worlders," I have noticed, upon my return, that the Wallace bandwagon has doubled its tempo during my short absence. Notwithstanding the mud-slinging attacks of the entire "Liberal establishment," spearheaded by the leftist press, the "Wallace formula" for victory is both baffling and dismaying its opponents.

It seems to me that the "Wallace formula" is an extremely simple one. It is not, as his detractors are inclined to point out, that his apparently successful approach is to say what "the people" want to hear. This is a dangerously superficial and unanalytical judgment of the Wallace phenomenon. It is far more accurate to understand Wallace's burgeoning attraction to millions of voters by realizing that he is putting into words what numerous Americans feel. He is also voicing what currently countless November voters would like to come out and express, but lack the courage to do so. Yet, once they are ensconced in the voter's booth, protected by curtained anonymity, these persons doubtlessly will give vent to their innermost passions and convictions.

The stark truth is that Americans today are in desperate search of guidance and strong leadership. This is as true on the Left as on the Right. The Leftists who boo Humphrey, and in most cases are part and parcel of the Democratic party, are eager to take the last plunge into a socialist totalitarian dictatorship. They prefer Castro to Hubert, and Mao to Lyndon B. They are fed up with halfway measures and the slow (but sure) Fabian Socialist approach. These undisguised Reds are the counterparts of the ones who before them, consciously or unconsciously, hurled Russia and other hapless lands into the depths of Communist tyranny.

On the other end of the political spectrum, the Conservatives (called "Rightists" by the Reds and Pinks) are nauseated by the moral rot corroding our basic institutions. They, too, demand an end to hypocrisy, "truth gaps" and receiving lectures from above by political hacks and disreputable "eggheads," as though most of us were morons. All of which might signify that the "Wallace formula" may be the key to success come November.

Of one thing I am almost sure, the "little people" of America will not submissively tolerate another four years of semi-anarchy and despotic mob-rule by the coddled, subversive, traitorous enemies of our flag and nation.

P.S. In the next issue of INSIGHT, I shall offer my impressions on the highlights of the convention held in Interlaken and Wolfach to "Draft a Constitution for the World" and the creation of a "People's World Parliament." The entire subject of publicly proclaimed "One Worldism" will be contained in a future updated and revised edition of "Blueprints to Abolish the USA." It will be printed under another title.
ONE WAY TO BECOME A BERKELEY LECTURER

In times past when Communist speakers were still a rarity on American college campuses, it was argued by those who were against having youth exposed to the teachings of professional Marxist-Leninist indoctrinators that such a practice was akin to permitting hardened criminals to appear before student bodies to promote their rackets. Well, as things stand now, we can expect to see the day in the not too distant future when not only "militant" Marxists, but also common criminals will be accorded the opportunity of teaching and lecturing in many U.S. schools and colleges.

In fact, at Berkeley, the Board of Regents of the University of California has already assured its students of a "package deal" whereby a man who is both an ex-convict and a Castro-Communist has been invited to "lecture" at that tumultuous campus.

The worthy in question is Eldridge Cleaver, "Minister of Information" of the Black Panther Party, who, besides his other qualifications, no doubt has further endeared himself to the Berkeley Board of Regents by currently being free on bond on charges of assault with intent to commit murder in a two-hour shoot-out with Oakland police officers.

A few weeks ago, Cleaver's sidekick, Black Panther "Minister of Self-Defense," John L. Murray, went down to Havana, Cuba to consult with "Big Boss" Castro. While there, and using the worldwide facilities of Communist Cuba's broadcasting system, Murray described his own and his Party's ideology

*Editor's note: The name John L. Murray was the one used by Radio Havana. It may have been confused with George Mason Murray, the Panthers' "Education Minister."

DEMOCRATS AFTER CHICAGO

— BY ALLAN C. BROWNFIELD —

The events of this past year have made it difficult for many Americans to believe that this is the same America in which they were born, and in which they have lived. The riots in our major cities, the assassinations of public figures, the rise in crime and violence, all have contributed to a feeling of dismay and disillusion. It is as if all of us, together with our physical boundaries, our cities, and monuments, were transplanted into another place, and another country. Our ancestors never believed that this was the kind of nation they were creating. But times change.

The Democratic convention in Chicago provided added evidence of this unreality and this transformation.

Whether the Democratic party can ever recover from this convention is difficult to say. Has Vice President Humphrey come to the leadership of a party, had predicted. . . The Democrats' reputation—and Humphrey's—is indelibly tarnished for millions of television view-
ers who saw Humphrey’s nomination as a piece of ugly mosaic of police clubbing demonstrators, of brawling and booing galleries, and of the party leaders who put Humphrey in office murdering obscenities at speakers who protested the violence.

It is amazing to remember that only several weeks ago the Democrats, and much of the press, were attacking the alleged influence of Senator Strom Thum-ond at the Republican convention. The Republican convention, many now remember, featured no violence, no brutality, no effort to prevent all candidates from speaking, and all delegates from entering and remaining on the convention floor. Vice President Humphrey, it is now clear, is indebted to Richard J. Daley, a man who ruled the convention by brute force and made it clear that those with whom he disagreed were not only not welcome at the convention, but were not welcome in Chicago. The Democrats’ Vice Presidential nominee, Senator Edmund Muskie, is an outstanding legislator, well respected by his colleagues. But a major reason for his nomination was his acceptability to Mayor Daley, primarily because of his Polish ancestry, and the fact that Chicago has more Poles than Warsaw. It is obvious that Hubert Humphrey had to “clear it” with Richard Daley, and he did.

Hubert Humphrey made an acceptance speech which sought to unify the disparate elements of his party. He tried to say something to please each of the party’s groups. He called for law and order, but opposed brutality. He applauded Lyndon Johnson, but said that tomorrow’s policies must not be tied to the past. He tried to gain for himself the best of all possible worlds, and in doing so was very much the Hubert Humphrey of old.

In a recently published biography entitled Hubert, Allan H. Ryskind details in a thorough and effective manner the many sides of this infinitely complex political man. In fact, Mr. Humphrey has been on many sides of most of the important issues facing the nation since his entrance into public life. One example serves to illustrate this.

N 1950, the McCarren Act was proposed in the Senate. The theory behind this measure was that by compelling Communist organizations and their members to register with the Attorney General, the Communists would be forced into the open. They would also be restricted in their activities because those registered were to be barred from security and defense connected jobs.

When it came up for a vote, it passed the Senate 70-7. Humphrey voted in favor of the bill. On September 8, he had opposed it in a speech, but on September 12 he voted in its favor. The bill later went to a conference committee and on September 20 the final version came up for a vote in the Senate. It passed 51-7. Humphrey did not vote at that time. President Truman later vetoed the bill, and Senator Humphrey voted to uphold the veto of a bill he had originally supported. The reason: “The President of the U.S. has said to Hubert Humphrey and I think he has said to other people. ‘This is your chance to come clean. This is your opportunity to vote your convictions. This is your opportunity not to be swallowed up by the hysteria and tension of this hour.’”

Ryskind calls this performance “...a stunning acrobatic performance worthy of a flying Wolanda’s.” But this is not all. In 1954, Humphrey proposed a bill to outlaw the Communist Party and attached provisions to the bill making it a crime to belong to the Communist Party. Party members could be given up to five years in prison and fined $10,000 under the Humphrey proposal, making it much stronger than the McCarren Act. Humphrey stated: “The purpose of this amendment is to come clear. I, for one, am growing sick and tired of having bill after bill brought to the Congress that does not reflect a willingness and the courage to go to the center of the problem.”

Hubert Humphrey “came clean” a number of times on this subject. What his real position is, it is almost impossible to discover. The same is true today. At one time he said that permitting the Viet Cong into a coalition government in South Vietnam would be like “letting a fox into the chicken coop.” Now he talks of negotiation and compromise. Where does Hubert Humphrey really stand? The coming campaign will give him an opportunity to make this clear.

The American political process stands in disarray. Can Richard Nixon and Hubert Humphrey tie it back together? After Chicago, it will be a difficult task. Also difficult is the question of whether the Democratic party is now fit to govern the country. Hubert Humphrey will have to convince many people to change their minds if he hopes to be elected in November.—From “Roll Call.”
Criminals Don't Have to Register Guns

— BY JOHN WOOTTERS —

In January of 1968 the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision in the case of *U.S. vs. Haynes* which is extremely pertinent to the current controversy over firearms registration.

The defendant, Haynes, had been prosecuted under the National Firearms Act for possession of an unregistered sawed-off shotgun, which is one of the prohibited weapons under that act. Before the Supreme Court, he argued that to register his illegal weapon would have been self-incriminating. In other words, when he registered the weapon as required by one part of the act, he would have automatically incriminated himself. Since the Constitution protects citizens from being forced to incriminate themselves, Haynes claimed immunity from the requirement of registration. The Supreme Court agreed with this contention. In effect, the ruling of this highest court in the land was that being forced to register a weapon, the obtaining or making of which is illegal, amounts to forcing a criminal to testify against himself, and therefore violates his constitutional rights under the Fifth Amendment. The Court therefore ruled that Haynes had the legal right not to register his prohibited weapon.

One day after the Court handed down that ruling, the City Council of Chicago enacted a city firearms registration ordinance. In order to protect the ordinance from being overturned on the grounds of unconstitutionality, the city fathers were forced to exempt, specifically, all categories of citizens otherwise prohibited from owning a gun under Chicago or Illinois statute. To put it plainly, the new ordinance required the registration of all firearms owned by citizens except recently-convicted felons, recent mental patients, narcotics addicts, and others. In short, honest citizens and only honest citizens are required under that ordinance to register firearms in Chicago.

For a recently-convicted felon in Chicago to register a gun which he was prohibited from possessing under older laws, in other words, would be a forced confession of guilt, which our Constitution continues on page 15.
So One Vote Isn't Important? Look At These Races

IF YOU THINK your one vote isn’t important, think again.

That’s the gist of a report on close elections prepared by the GOP National Committee’s Research Division which shows some 30 Presidential, Gubernatorial, Senatorial and House elections in recent years turned on just a handful of votes. For instance, look at the following Congressional elections:

• In February, 1966, Theodore Kupferman of New York was elected to the 17th District seat vacated by the resignation of John V. Lindsay. Kupferman was elected by a plurality of only 919 votes out of 95,127 cast in 305 precincts—or slightly more than three votes per precinct. In the November general election, Kupferman won by a plurality of 2,158 votes—or more than seven votes per precinct.

• In Georgia in 1966, Republican Ben Blackburn of the Fourth District defeated his opponent by only 360 votes out of a total vote of 110,138. Blackburn’s plurality amounted to approximately 4.6 votes per precinct.

• In 1966, Republican candidate Truman Branscum was defeated by Tom Steed for the Fourth Congressional District seat in Oklahoma by 364 votes out of 73,074 cast in 373 precincts. This amounted to less than one vote per precinct.

• In 1964, in the Third District of Iowa, incumbent Republican H. R. Gross defeated his opponent, Stephen Peterson, by 419 votes out of a total vote of 166,491. This margin amounted to less than 1.2 votes per precinct.

• In 1964, in the First District of Maine, Republican Stanley Tupper defeated his opponent, Democrat Kenneth M. Curtis, by 203 votes. The total vote cast was 190,593 in 244 precincts, a “winning margin” of less than one vote per precinct.

• In 1962, in Minnesota’s Sixth District, Republican Robert J. Odegard lost to Democratic-Farmer-Labor candidate Alec Olson by 348 votes. Averaged over the district’s 660 precincts, the Democratic plurality amounted to just over one-half vote per precinct.

• In 1962, former Republican Congressman Francis E. Dorn lost to incumbent Democrat Hugh L. Carey in the 15th District of New York by 383 votes out of 110,821 cast. Two more GOP votes in each of the District’s 222 precincts would have brought about a victory.

• In 1962, in Virginia, less than 1,000 more GOP votes would have elected two additional Republican Congressmen. In the Third District, Republican Louis Williams was defeated by Democrat J. Vaughn Gary by 348 votes. Republican J. Kenneth Robinson lost to Democrat John O. Marsh by 598 votes out of 58,057 cast in the Seventh District. Less than three more votes per precinct would have resulted in the election of both Republicans.

• In 1960, Democrat Frank W. Burke of Kentucky’s Third District edged past Republican Henry Heyburn with a plurality of 1,158 votes out of 229,684 cast. The Republican candidate lost by only about two votes per precinct.

• In 1960, Morgan M. Moulder of Missouri barely defeated Republican Robert Bartel. Moulder’s plurality of 361 votes did not even amount to one vote per precinct in the 454 precincts of the Eleventh District. Total vote cast was 149,371.

• In 1960, Democrat Victor Wickersham of Oklahoma’s Sixth District defeated Republican Clyde Wheeler by only 76 votes out of 136,308 cast. The loss was particularly disappointing since the Democratic margin amounts to only one vote per 11 precincts.

• In 1960, M. Blaine Peterson, Utah Democrat, was sent to his first Congressional term with only a 68-vote plurality out of a total vote of 131,810. Republican Walter Stevenson was defeated by only one vote per every 12 precincts.

• In 1960, Seattle Republican John Stender lost to Democrat Don Magnuson in the Washington Seventh District race. Magnuson won by only 139 votes out of 191,187 cast in 911 precincts—or about one vote in every 7th precinct.

—Republican Congressional Newsletter. October 15, 1968, INSIGHT On The News
 Revolutionary Warfare
—The Communist Tool—

Lieut.-General C. A. Fraser of South Africa
Discusses Role of Guerrilla War In Red Plan

(The full text of a talk by Lieut-General C. A. Fraser, S.M., General Officer Commanding Joint Combat Force, broadcast on Springbok Radio on December 17, 1967.)

The world today can look back at some fifty years of widespread and virtually continuous political revolution. Probably more governments have come into being, passed through drastic change, or ceased to exist than in any comparable period in history. Certainly a larger proportion of the world's population has been involved in and has been aware of these upheavals than was ever the case in earlier days. It is the political phenomenon of the twentieth century, this visible wind of revolution, and it is stirring in many continents.

These changes in regime have been brought about, in the main, by a new form of warfare, now widely termed revolutionary warfare. This revolutionary warfare differs fundamentally from the wars of the past in that victory does not come from the clash of two armies on a field of battle. Military operations, as combat actions carried out against opposing forces are, in fact, of limited importance and are never the total conflict. The reason for this is that the guerrillas are merely one of the weapons used by insurgents, the others being political subversion, intimidation, terrorism, propaganda and sabotage. To control these others is the responsibility of a wide range of Government departments and agencies, including Police, Information, Bantu Administration, etc. Thus counter-insurgency operations which are the action taken by the Government to counter a revolutionary war must be a carefully coordinated system of actions; political, economic, administrative, psychological.

(Continues on next page)
nourished in the soil of confusion, social dissension, economic disruptions, etc., causing armed fanatics to spring up where peaceful peasants worked."

Revolutionary warfare has crystallized very rapidly since the end of the Second World War. During the past twenty-five years numerous revolutionary wars have been waged throughout the world, 17 or 18 of them in fact. To mention a few Malaya, the Philippines, Greece, Cyprus, Indonesia, Algeria, Angola, Vietnam, etc., etc. Most, but not all of them have been Communist-inspired.

The great majority of revolutionary wars have been won by the insurgents. It is a sobering thought that in only one have the insurgents been completely defeated—Malaya (Two, if the Mau Mau troubles in Kenya are considered to have been a revolutionary war.) In others there have been partial successes by government forces, but these have been of a temporary nature only. In some revolutionary wars the military campaigns have been won by government troops or nearly so, but the wars have finally been lost politically, Algeria is a classic example of this. A Frenchman has said about the war that they lost with bad politics and administration and worse propaganda, what they had won with good fighting.

Revolutionary war has its own special rules or principles, different from those of conventional war. Whereas in the conventional type the principles of war hold equally true for both sides, in revolutionary war most of the rules applicable to one side do not work for the other. There are two distinct aspects of revolutionary warfare—insurgency and counter-insurgency. Insurgency, as I have said, of which guerrillas are only a part is the agency of radical social or political change. Counter-insurgency is a form of counter-revolution, the process by which revolution is resisted. Many books and treaties on revolutionary war are misleading. For instance—what Mao Tse-Tung calls the "rules of revolutionary war" are, in fact, the rules for the revolutionary side. Those who direct a war against a revolutionary movement will not find in Mao, Che Guevara or many other revolutionary writers the answers to their problems. They will, indeed, find useful information on how the insurgent acts, and they may perhaps infer the answers they are looking for, but nowhere there will they find them explicitly stated.

Fortunately there is an increasing volume of literature on counter-insurgency campaigning becoming available. The experiences of, and the lessons that have learnt by the French, the British and the Americans are being compiled and many of the books are extremely good.

The fighting services of South Africa are studying and training for revolutionary warfare as seriously as we are for the conventional type—and because we recognize that strategy is no longer purely the preserve of the military we are studying it with ever-increasing cooperation with those other Government department and agencies who are as much concerned with counter-insurgency as we are—of course the military aspects, the fighting of guerrillas is our special concern and very important changes are being introduced with the training of national servicemen from next year.

ONE WAY............. (Continuation)

by saying, "The Negro liberation movement is inspired in the Cuban Revolution and in Che Guevara's example... We are convinced we shall only be free... when all of the American imperialists are dead." And, "Every time a Viet Cong guerrilla liquidates a North American soldier, it is one aggressor less to be eliminated by those who struggle for freedom in the United States." Apparently, Murray is doing his utmost to earn academic standing and recognition at Berkeley or some other similar "institution."
Making predictions in this year of the monkey is almost as precarious as going over Niagara Falls in a barrel.

But since most of us have a weakness for trying to anticipate the future based on what we think is evidence from the past and present, it seems to me that an overwhelming percentage of voters this year is demanding a change toward a more conservative direction.

No matter what yardstick of pollings, samplings, and contacts are available, it is safe to say that the combined support for Nixon and Wallace far outweighs the support for Humphrey.

Basically, Nixon and Wallace are the "symbols" of Conservatism at this time, though there is a legitimate debate over whether Wallace really warrants any such identity. However, to spare ourselves the endless argument over this point (which some discerning Conservatives have already made known by their analysis of Wallace as a "Populist" rather than a Conservative), it is fair to say that a great mass of voters adopted Wallace as a "symbol" of Conservatism, whatever may be said to the contrary.

The fear that Wallace will weaken and split the vote needed to elect Nixon, does not yet convince me. If anything, I believe the Conservative trend will be reflected in all elective offices this year. True, some Democrats who have no opponent of outstanding Conservative stature will not face any real threat. But in many contests throughout the country where a substantial Conservative Republican is opposing a Liberal Democrat, the outcome will reveal a majority vote for the Conservative.

This is the year of the "protest" vote in the United States. The Liberals are divided even more than the Conservatives. The McCarthy wing of the Democratic party is faced with the Wallace wing despite the fact that Wallace claims to be running on an Independent third party ticket.

The Conservative faction of the Republican party, which is by far the overwhelming majority of current Republicanism, has been able to find some sort of detente with its Liberal wing thus far which stands to benefit from this united effort behind Nixon, while the Democrats remain divided in their own ranks to a degree where the voters who have been calling for a change realize that a change to any Conservative direction cannot possibly come from the present Democratic leadership, whether it be Humphrey or any other Liberal Democrat. If anything, the "change" demanded within the ranks of the Democratic party stems from the militant wing who wants far more Left-wing programs, policies, and governmental restructuring.

Those who have been clinging to Humphrey as the lesser of the evil in their own party represent the more Conservative element of the Democratic party who are, in the main, uncomfortable with the company they have to keep but who, nevertheless, feel compelled to go along in many instances to maintain their jobs, contracts, patronage and political fortunes.

Nixon and the Republicans, plus the disenchanted Democrats, plus the Independents who shudder at the thought of a Wallace in the White House, add up to a victory not only for Nixon, but for a good number of Conservative candidates for the House and the Senate. How many I would hesitate to say. But I do think the results will be substantial.

The issues, in a sense, are similar to 1952 when, at that time, it was "crime, corruption, and Korea." In this year of 1968, the similarity of "Vietnam, corruption, and domestic crime and insurrection," has apparently reached through to enough Americans who realize that whatever other rationalizations they may have to argue over the lackluster of Presidential choices, the urgency and sense of emergency, which touch every citizen in the wave of lawlessness and disrespect for our flag and our laws, transcend all the other usual pocketbook issues of the welfare state and special interest favors which the Democratic party has used for so long with such great success.

Despite the enormous publicity for the so-called "dove" and domestic "New Leftist politics" of the current state of Liberalism, the overwhelming percentage of Americans have come to that point once again when, in their hearts, they know there must be a change to provide this country with an opportunity to examine wiser alternatives and reshape some of the dangerous commitments at home and abroad which appear . . . . . .Continues on page 15
Economic News and Views

TAX REDUCTION WILL CREATE REAL JOBS

— By WILLIAM S. BAREN —

The next time you hear anyone say that big business makes too much profit, ask him where he thinks the tools and equipment to make job opportunities will come from if they cannot be paid for out of profits. There can never be too much profit. Only an economic illiterate who doesn’t understand free, creative capitalism, or a subversive demagogue makes such a statement.

Some years ago, one of our manufacturing companies bought a lathe for $12,000. Each year, it set aside $1,000 into a fund so that it could be replaced when its estimated life of fourteen years had expired. Thirteen years later, it sold the lathe for $1,000. When it went to the lathe manufacturer the identical model was priced at $67,000. They needed an additional $53,000 needed for the new lathe.

This company earned a gross profit before taxes of about 10% on its sales. In order to pay the government its taxes, the firm had to earn $112,000 and the other vast business enterprises which compete with private industry and increase the tax paying burden of our people. The payment could be made in long term bonds and notes paying interest to the government, as well as taxes which would also be produced when they are run efficiently by capable people, and not by plundering politicians.

Within ten years, such a program could cure more poverty in this country than all the social reformers could dream up in a century. Remember, when the government takes YOUR PROFITS it collects in CASH; what you have left may be in the form of accounts receivable, inventories, or even fixed assets. But the only way a private business can grow and prosper is to make higher profits. Instead of an economic evil PROFITS ARE SO INDISPENSIBLE NO FREEDOM WOULD EXIST WITHOUT THEM!

Who Is William S. Baren?

William S. Baren is the “authority” on the merchandising of securities in this country. Under the pen name of John Dutton he has written a regular weekly column for the Commercial & Financial Chronicle for the past 25 years. He is a contributing editor for Investment Sales Monthly, the magazine of the investment industry read by the nation’s leading stockbrokers and investment men.

Mr. Baren has authored two books on security salesmanship and has had over forty years experience in the investment business. He also has one of the largest personal statistical libraries gathered together over many years, which provides him with factual data he will use to offer an affirmative capitalist alternative and solution to our present social and economic problems which have been created and perpetrated by the coercive and socialistic policies advocated by the Lefist Liberals.
WHAT ARE THE "CLEAN GENE" FORCES DOING?

Up to this moment and during the entire presidential campaign, the Daily World, leading mouthpiece of the Communist Party, U.S.A., has been offering a glowing blow by blow account of Senator Eugene McCarthy’s political activities. Frequently adorning its front pages, Senator McCarthy is one of the Daily World’s most featured “stars.”

It therefore seems appropriate and logical that in order to discover what the McCarthy forces are planning, the Daily World should be consulted as an authoritative source of information. Writing in its September 18 issue, U.S. Communism’s crack reporter Mike Davidow shed the following light on the current and future activities of Senator McCarthy’s extreme Leftist cohorts.

Wrote Davidow:

“Anti-Administration forces held together before Chicago by Senator Eugene McCarthy’s candidacy are today seeking anxiously to register maximum impact on the 1968 elections and after.

“It is a search for alternatives without a McCarthy candidacy.

“The search is proceeding in various forms and on different levels reflecting the fragmentation that exists in the movement. The various groupings include followers of McCarthy, the late Senator Robert Kennedy and now Senator Edward Kennedy, Senator George S. McGovern, fourth party forces clustered around the New Party, and Peace and Freedom and Freedom and Peace parties. Just listening to the groupings indicates the problem of fragmentation.

October parley set.

“The national conference called by the New Democratic Coalition, October 5-6 in Minneapolis, represents one of the efforts to achieve coordination and common purpose among anti-Administration Democrats. A chief organizer is Al- lard Lowenstein, a pioneer in the McCarthy movement who sought to achieve a similar unity around the Coalition for an Open Convention prior to Chicago.

“The Coalition for an Open Convention lost considerable steam when it called off its planned rally at Soldiers’ Field, Chicago, in the face of Mayor Richard Daley’s refusal to grant a permit for the meeting. Some dissident Democrats felt that the Coalition did not fight hard enough for the meeting.

“Lowenstein, while retaining considerable popularity within the McCarthy movement, does not appear to enjoy much support in the Coalition for a Democratic Alternative, the New York State coordinating body of the McCarthy forces. His Democratic campaign in Nassau’s 5th Congressional District is, however, receiving strong support and is viewed as one of C.D.A.’s key concentrations.

“Like most leading McCarthy followers in New York, Lowenstein has thus far refused to support Humphrey.

To map strategy.

“The Oct. 5-6 conference is expected to result in an initial exchange among a significant segment of anti-Administration Democrats on the tactics to be pursued and candidates to be supported. It will focus attention on consolidation of these forces within the Democratic party and the mapping of strategy for 1969, 1970 and 1972.

“On another level, the search for an alternative and for a permanent fourth party is being pursued by forces gathered around the New Party, headquartered in Washington, D.C.

“The New Party, too, is calling a national conference on Sept. 23 in Washington, to take stock of the new situation. It will also elect a national leadership.

“The New Party is not a party but a loose alliance of groups containing Democrats in various stages of disillusionment, as well as those who have broken with the two-party system.

“It tends to concentrate particularly on the states where it will be on the ballot: New York, Oregon, Washington state, New Mexico, North Dakota, Montana, Colorado, Iowa, Delaware and Minnesota. It also expects to qualify in New Hampshire. McCarthy’s name is expected to be on the New Party line in Minnesota. His consent is not required by law in that state.

“Write-in campaigns are planned in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, possibly inserting McCarthy’s name. The New Party is also supporting the candidacy of Dick Gregory in a number of states where he is on the ballot.”
Communist Aims Pushed by Front Publications
Show How They’re Sold to People, Bit-by-Bit

CURRENT COMMUNIST GOALS

1. U.S. acceptance of coexistence as the only alternative to atomic war.
2. U.S. willingness to capitulate in preference to engaging in atomic war.
3. Develop the illusion that total disarmament by the United States would be a demonstration of moral strength.
4. Permit free trade between all nations regardless of Communist affiliation and regardless of whether or not items could be used for war.
5. Extension of long-term loans to Russia and Soviet satellites.
6. Provide American aid to all nations regardless of Communist domination.
7. Grant recognition of Red China. Admission of Red China to the U.N.
8. Set up East and West Germany as separate estates in question by free elections under supervision of the U.N.
9. Prolong the conferences to ban atomic tests because the United States has agreed to suspend tests as long as negotiations are in progress.
10. Allow all Soviet satellites individual representation in the U.N.
11. Promote the U.N. as the only hope for mankind. If its charter is rewritten, demand that it be set up as a one-world government with its own independent armed forces. (Some Communist leaders believe the world can be taken over as easily by the U.N. as by Moscow. Sometimes these two centers compete with each other as they are.
12. Resist any attempt to outlaw the Communist Party.
13. Do away with all loyalty oaths.
14. Continue giving Russia access to the U.S. Patent Office.
15. Capture one or both of the political parties in the United States.
16. Use technical decisions of the courts to weaken basic American institutions by claiming their activities violate civil rights.
17. Get control of the schools. Use them as transmission belts for Socialism and current Communist propaganda. Soften the curriculum. Get control of teachers’ associations. Put the Party line in textbooks.
18. Get control of all student news-

The following list of 45 current Communist goals appeared in the Congressional Record, January 10, 1963. They were taken from "The Naked Communist," by Cleon Skousen, who began his intensive study of Communism during his 16-year term of service with the FBI. Mr. Skousen is now field director of the American Security Council, which maintains offices both in Washington and Chicago.

The list confirms the "line" pursued in Communist publications in this country such as "The Daily World," "The People’s World," and a number of front publications. The checklist provides an interesting opportunity for each individual to determine how much enemy medicine he buys himself, and to observe the sources, both national and local, from which it is merchandised in quantity.

This is on the theory that a few grains of poison occasionally might not kill us but that large doses, repeatedly, can be lethal. At least we ought to know what it is we are asked to swallow.

stitute shapeless, awkward and meaningless forms.”
23. Control art critics and directors of art museums. "Our plan is to promote ugliness, repulsive, meaningless art."
24. Eliminate all laws governing obscenity by calling them "censorship" and a violation of free speech and free press.
25. Break down cultural standards of morality by promoting pornography and obscenity in books, magazines, motion pictures, radio, and TV.
26. Present homosexuality, degeneracy and promiscuity, as "normal, natural, healthy."

27. Infiltrate the churches, and replace revealed religion with "social" religion. Discredit the Bible and emphasize the need for intellectual maturity which does not need a "religious crutch."

28. Eliminate prayer or any phase of religious expression in the schools on the ground that it violates the principle of separation of church and state.

29. Discredit the American Constitution by calling it inadequate, old-fashioned, out of step with modern needs, a hindrance to cooperation between nations on a worldwide basis.

30. Discredit the American Founding Fathers. Present them as selfish aristocrats who had no concern for the "common man."

31. Belittle all forms of American culture and discourage the teaching of American history on the ground that it was only a minor part of the "big picture." Give more emphasis to Russian history since the Communists took over.

32. Support any Socialist movement to give centralized control over part of the culture—education, social agencies, October 15, 1968. INSIGHT On The News

Continues on page 15
More trouble brewing at the University of Miami, scene of some demonstrations last year by the United Black Students—an offspring of the so-called Students for a Democratic Society, a group branded by the FBI as subversive—which Dr. James Tedeschi, a psychology professor, couldn’t quite put over.

Tedeschi has had more success with militant Negroes, but recruitment of white students and imports from other universities coupled with their continued militancy spells more trouble.

At the University of Florida, Major Ramsey, assistant professor of military science, proved that a West Point degree and a regular Army commission is no vaccination against radical Leftist venom. The former instructor in counter-insurgency—of all things—resigned from the Action Conference after he advocated student radicalism; that male and female students sleep together if desired; that Mario Savio, Berkeley rebel lion leader and Mark Rudd, Columbia rebel, be invited to speak, and that a Negro be named a top administrator, though UF has but 125 Negro students.

The result of the attempted takeover by the radical Left in South Miami was shown dramatically in the abortive efforts at getting rid of Police Chief Sal Vizzini and the unveiled threats to Vizzini’s boss, City Manager L. M. McConnell, to fire Vizzini—or else. McConnell refused to bow to the pressure aimed at getting rid of one of Florida’s most colorful and effective police chiefs.

FLORIDA SUPPLEMENT

NEW TAXES FOR FLORIDIANS?

Is the income tax being secretly foisted on an unsuspecting Florida public if they approve the new Constitution?

While advocates of the new Constitution have been strangely quiet on the subject, they have been very vocal about the great need to scrap, in large part, the Constitution of 1885.

What has deepened the mystery is the ambiguous language of Section 5. Estate, Inheritance and Income Taxes of Article VII on Finance and Taxation, which reads:

“No tax upon estates or inheritances or upon the income of residents or citizens of the state shall be levied by the state, or under its authority, in excess of the aggregate of amounts which may be allowed to be credited upon or deducted from any similar tax levied by the United States or any state.”

According to Conservative attorneys who have carefully read this provision—possibly the most important single item in all the Constitution—the ambiguous wording can be interpreted to permit the state legislature to impose an income tax, and some go further to say that its permissive language would also permit the counties and the municipalities to levy income taxes of their own.

The Legislative Reference Bureau, which conducted an extensive analysis, comes up with no such conclusion, however.

In analyzing this section, they found: “Section 5. Continues the prohibition upon income and inheritance taxes now in Sec. 11, Art. IX, but adds income taxes to estate and inheritance taxes which may be levied if credited upon or deductible from federal taxes (and adds taxes of other states).”

Does the section provide for an income tax or not?

One state organization opposed to the new Constitution makes no such claim, while attacking many other provisions.

This is the Committee for Integrity in Government, Jacksonville, headed by Claude Tompkins, which states that the new document will increase public spending, taxes, bonded debt, centralize government and destroy fundamental principles of constitutional government, while not limiting property taxes (as claimed), increasing Homestead Exemptions or preserving local government.

In urging its members and the public to vote for the new Constitution, the League of Women Voters of Florida makes no mention of the income tax in its lengthy analysis of its provisions.

Neither does the “Miami Review and Daily Record,” which came out with a special supplement with two un-bylined articles on the front page September 6, plus an endorsement by its liberal publisher, Lee Ruwitch.

Now that the question has been raised publicly, perhaps a clear-cut answer will be forthcoming.
GOLDEN GOOSE COOKED?

Is Florida's famous Gold Coast—perhaps the entire eastern seaboard—facing economic disaster from pollution?

The possibility that expansion programs now underway between Miami and West Palm Beach could kill the financial goose that laid the golden egg is now a distinct possibility.

Dade County alone, which produces or owns approximately one-fifth of Florida's statistics generally—more in the field of tourism—has enough projects going to raise the spectre of serious damage to that all important source of revenue.

Sources of pollution are too numerous to be detailed here, but the major points, both existing and in the works, are readily identifiable.

While there has been a lessening of the threat from human sewage from Greater Miami's 1.2 million population alone since establishment of limited treatment, continued growth and lack of an overall sewage treatment system for Dade County poses a growing problem.

Sewage treatment is practically non-existent for vast areas of Broward and Palm Beach Counties to the north. This is the most obvious threat, but one for which treatment systems could provide a cure.

The most insidious type of pollution comes from other sources for which the solutions are expensive and not even planned.

Once Miami's new Dodge Island Seaport is completed, pollution from that source alone will increase by geometric proportions.

While deepening of government cut adjoining Miami Beach will help on one hand, the advent of huge transoceanic liners will spell deeper trouble.

Pollution at Dodge Island and from a bevy of other dockage areas at the Causeway Terminal, Fisher Island and other smaller docking facilities will come from the usual sources:

Human waste, illegal bilge pumping, fuel spillage, garbage and trash.

Smaller in size, but also potent as a source of pollution will be the new and enlarged Miamarina along Bayfront Park. Coupled with the hundreds of other marinas, public and private, dotting the Intracoastal Waterway, including huge facilities such as Bahia Mar in Fort Lauderdale, the threat becomes ominous.

Adding to the ever-increasing flow of pollutants pouring out into the life-giving Gulf Stream which washes onto the hundreds of miles of life-supporting beaches will be the Queen Elizabeth—if the obstacles to its permanent docking at Port Everglades between Fort Lauderdale and Hollywood are removed.

A ship of that size alone, without proper facilities for removing its wastes, and permanently docked (eliminating the possibility of dumping at sea), presents a most serious threat.

Port Everglades itself, with its significant passenger ship business, general cargo trade, but also as South Florida's principal petroleum port, is an important source of pollution.
CRIMINALS says may not be required from any American.

That Haynes ruling of the Supreme Court did not make any and all firearms registration laws unconstitutional, as some people seem to believe. It simply exempted the criminal, to use a broad term, from having to comply with any such law.

As in the case of the Chicago ordinance, criminals, drug addicts, etc., will have to be repealed, or extensively be specifically exempted from, any firearms-registration law, anywhere, or that law will run the risk of being overturned in the courts. To avoid this, according to lawyers, almost every gun law presently on the books, federal, state, and municipal, would have to be amended before any registration law could be applied to those persons the advocates of such laws claim they are aimed at—the criminal and unfit.

The argument has often been made by responsible firearms owners that it is unthinkable that a criminal would voluntarily register a gun he planned to use for sporting purposes.

This argument was given substance, in January, by the Supreme Court of the United States, by saying that the undesirable—and only the undesirables—have the legal right to refuse to register their guns. You and I must register, pay the fee, be photographed and fingerprinted and maybe psychoanalyzed in order to possess a skeet grade shotgun or a deer rifle, but the ex-con who burglaries our home or robs our banks has the official sanction of our highest court to refuse to submit to all this.

Naturally, this state of affairs was not intentional, nor does it reflect, contrary to the spiteful comments of some, a tender concern on the part of the Supreme Court for the welfare of the nation's criminal element. It appears to be, however, a classic example of the confusion and absurdities which can arise out of ill-conceived legislation which is based more upon superficial reasoning than upon a thoughtful study of a problem.

Congress has had before it for three years at least two very fine firearms-control bills, by Congressman Casey and Senator Hruska. These proposals have been supported by a majority of responsible gun-owners and opposed by advocates of the kind of legislation which has led to the grotesque situation of U.S. vs. Haynes. —(Houston Post)

COMMUNIST AIMS
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COMMUNIST AIMS

welfare programs, mental health, clinics, etc.

33. Eliminate all laws or procedures which interfere with the operation of the Communist apparatus.

34. Eliminate the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

35. Discredit and eventually dismantle the FBI.

36. Infiltrate and gain control of more unions.

37. Infiltrate and gain control of big business.

38. Transfer some of the powers of arrest from the police to social agencies. Treat all behavioral problems as psychiatric disorders which no one but psychiatrists can understand or treat.

39. Dominate the psychiatric profession and use mental health law as a means of gaining coercive control over those who oppose Communist goals.

40. Discredit the family as an institution. Encourage promiscuity and easy divorce.

41. Emphasize the need to raise children away from the negative influence of parents. Attribute prejudices, mental blocks and retarding of children to suppressive influence of parents.

42. Create the impression that violence and insurrection are legitimate aspects of the American tradition; that students and special-interest groups should rise up and use united force to solve economic, political and social problems.

43. Overthrow all colonial governments before native populations are ready for self-government.

44. Internationalize the Panama Canal.

45. Repeal the Connally reservation so the United States cannot prevent the World Court from seizing jurisdiction over nations and individuals alike.

CONSERVATIVES

ready to engulf this nation by the very nature of the disorderly and confusing empire of heavy-handed bureaucracy in so many facets of every citizen's daily life.

Our country has a history of paying a heavy price for its apathy and indifference to making long overdue changes. But better late than never, is also an American byword. And as I see 1968, I believe we are in the threshold of making a change far greater than even the most cautiously optimistic yet predict! So paste this away until November fifth, and we shall see whether crow will be the dinner dish we eat that night, or whether we shall have a victory platter of choice Conservative morsels!
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October 15, 1968, INSIGHT On The News
The little British colony of Hong Kong on the south coast of China is in every way a most improbable place. When approaching by ship one becomes initially aware of rough barren mountains and weathered Chinese junks bobbing in the swells—the anticipated picture of an ancient Orient. Then, as one draws close one suddenly sees a vast jungle of modern skyscrapers surrounding the magnificent harbor, and beyond, rising from rocky hilltops, handsome villas and tall sleek apartment houses that would grace New York’s Park Avenue. Hong Kong is 99 per cent Chinese, yet, except for Chinese signs on shops that light up at night with neon splendor, the city presents an almost completely Western appearance.

Perhaps the principal improbability of Hong Kong is that it is a crown colony—one of the few imperial remnants of the British empire, politically controlled by a handful of British colonial officers devoted to the 19th-century laissez-faire, free enterprise way of life. To the north lies the giant totalitarian Peoples Republic of China with its militant commitment to Communism. That the Chinese Communists would tolerate the existence of this humiliating reminder of the colonial past is an anomaly.

Then, too, it does not appear that Hong Kong has the economic and social conditions conducive to survival. Much of its 400 square miles are rocky hills and uninhabited islands. Less than one-fifth of the land is cultivable. For water it must depend on rain and a pipeline from China. It has no significant resources underground. Its trade with China, the traditional source of its income and its very reason for being, has been largely cut off since the Communists gained control of the Mainland. Consequently, Hong Kong has had to depend on the resourcefulness and hard work of its burgeoning population, on manufacturing and service skills at low cost, which obviously means long working hours at low pay. A third of the population is extremely poor, living in appallingly crowded conditions. Though used to crowding and more willing to put up with it than the average Westerner, the Chinese poor in Hong Kong would hardly tolerate living six in a space 10 by 10 feet square if they could afford better. In the crowded tenement areas, some Chinese can boast of nothing more than a bed rented for eight hours; the rest of the time, it is occupied by others.

In contrast to life under these conditions, one finds many wealthy people in Hong Kong who live in extravagant splendor. The contrast is dramatically illustrated by the view of the island from the water off the Wanchai district, a crowded slum. Above the slums, with an increasing show of magnificence, rise the apartment houses of the middle class, and further, the villas and grander apartments of the taipans.

This situation suggests that along with the external threats to Hong Kong’s existence, there are internal problems of an explosive potential that could induce China to seize the colony.

But, miraculously, Hong Kong has not been overrun by China and has not collapsed from within.

From 1950, when the Communists consolidated their hold on Mainland China, to 1967, when Mao Tse-tung’s extreme leftist movement, the Cultural Revolution, came into full ferment in China, Hong Kong not only weathered political and economic crises, but achieved a spectacular growth in physical development and prosperity. Many of yesterday’s impoverished refugees from China are now living better and enjoying a measure of security they failed to enjoy in China before or after the advent of Communism.

There are solid reasons for this. Estimates of Communists and pro-Communists in Hong Kong vary, but the number can hardly exceed 10,000. The vast majority of Hong Kong’s Chinese citizenry, numbering close to 4,000,000, are non-Communists or anti-Communists. This is why they are in Hong Kong and not in China. Hard as life may be in Hong Kong, it is harder in China, and Communism has removed from it the element of chance traditionally dear to the Chinese—that is, with hard work and a little bit of luck, one may achieve security for himself and his family, and even become prosperous. The local population is therefore not a rebellious one; it is willing to suffer, to work long hours and get low pay in the hope that it or its children will achieve a better life.

At the time the Communists took control of the Mainland, Hong Kong’s principal source of income was trade with China. But China had no use for capitalistic middlemen and preferred, through its state agencies, to deal directly with basic suppliers. Consequently, the China trade was drastically reduced. This apparent catastrophe paradoxically proved a boon to the local economy. To fill the China trade gap, Hong Kong set its eyes on the world.
market and turned to manufacturing. Its only well-established industry, textiles, was refined, diversified and expanded. New and varied light industry came into being. Low taxation, the advantages of a free port, and most of all, a cheap labor force that was also stable and hard-working, attracted overseas investment. Manufacturers from abroad set up local factories or assembly plants. Tourism was encouraged and with the building of a dozen new hotels, became a major industry in itself. Thus, by 1967, Hong Kong could boast a productivity in goods and services that was in dollar value treble that of 1950.

On the political front, there were a number of riots, notably in 1952 and 1956, though the origins and focus of the latter remain obscure. There were also segments of the population, not necessarily Communist, who objected to a variety of Government attitudes and actions, including the Government's failure to promote popular representation on its councils. But significantly, until 1967, the Communists were remarkably quiet. Through their press, they paid lip service to objections to Government policy, but little else. Their propaganda concentrated more on the glories of the Motherland than on the iniquities of Hong Kong. It is probably true, as has been suggested, that the Communists were satisfied with the status quo. When the time came to "liberate" Hong Kong, it would be easier to liberate a victim of British imperialism than a self-governing democratic state. And then, it is easier for a totalitarian power to deal with a colonial state than with a democratic one; they have, after all, some traits in common.

Behind the Communist acquiescence to continued British rule, lay the economic value of the colony to the Communists. Most of Hong Kong's food and many other basic commodities (including a significant amount of its water supply) came from China. As Hong Kong grew and prospered, so did the economic dependence of China on it. In addition, many Communist state enterprises found that Hong Kong's international facilities in banking, shipping and insurance were useful. It was both an important market and economic outlet for Mainland China. Indeed, more than half of China's foreign exchange came from Hong Kong. Thus, Hong Kong, at least at this stage of China's development, was very much needed. For the Chinese to take over would have meant not only to lose the colony's economic usefulness but to have a white elephant on their hands.

Hong Kong's future seemed serene, as far as one could see ahead, though in homage to the unforeseen, Hong Kong maintained a five-year psychology about the future. Investments, for example, were geared to get one's money plus interest back within that time. Then, in early 1967, Hong Kong's future suddenly and dramatically lost its "far as one can see" label. Two ominous events occurred. One was the development of the Cultural Revolution in China; the other was the Communist disturbance in the nearby Portuguese colony of Macao.

The Cultural Revolution, if still not wholly understood, was and is an effort to move the Communist movement forward in the classic step-by-step process toward a classless society and the withering away of the state. Mao Tse-tung and some of his colleagues felt the Chinese Revolution was losing momentum. They accused Russia of back-tracking toward capitalist practice, and they were determined that any such evidences of "revisionism" in China should be stopped.

The ferment caused by the Cultural Revolution, the internal struggle with many worker groups as well as high-placed Communist officials opposed to Mao's left-wing extremism, and the resulting chaos were bound to have repercussions among left-wing elements in Hong Kong and Macao. In fact, among those attacked by Mao and placed under house arrest in Peking was Tao Chu, a deputy premier and "boss of South China." The Communists in the two colonies were generally considered to be Tao Chu's men. Thus, it was clear that those who wished to express their solidarity with the Cultural Revolution need...
ed to demonstrate that solidarity or be labeled anti-revolutionaries. Macao's problems came first. A labor dispute involving a clash with the police, in December 1966 led to riots, then to massive demonstrations against Portuguese imperialism. The Portuguese authorities were brought to heel. They agreed to a far-ranging set of demands that made them little more than a shadow government with Communist labor leaders and others in de facto control behind the scenes, particularly in matters concerning the Chinese population and political affairs. Significantly, however, it is reliably reported that when the question arose of Portuguese abdication, an emissary sent to Canton to discuss the question with the Chinese Communist authorities was rebuked. Obviously, the Communists were happy to have their cake and eat it, too—a Macao that could still function as an earner of foreign exchange and an outlet to the rest of the world, and a Macao controlled by Communist interests. But inevitably, the cake grew smaller. Business in Macao declined, most tourists, a major source of income, canceled their visits and general depression set in.

Though these events troubled some people in Hong Kong, most felt that "it couldn't happen here." The value of Hong Kong to China was too great, much greater than was Macao; the Communists would not be so suicidal as to kill a major economic asset like Hong Kong. But this agreement did not take into account the fanaticism of the struggle in China which overrode coolheaded economic considerations, or the pressure upon the local Communists which were aimed not at the British Colony as such, but rather, at demonstrating allegiance to Mao's Cultural Revolution.

Hong Kong's troubles began in early May as a result of a strike at a plastic flower factory. The police intervened when the striking workers, who belonged to a Communist-led union, tried to interfere with non-striking workers of a right-wing union. A riot followed: cars were overturned, a bus burned, the police pelted with stones, and a number of leftist workers and their supporters arrested. When the arrested workers were arraigned, organized Communist sympathizers showed up outside the courthouse with little red books of Mao Tse-tung's sayings, shouting slogans from the book and denouncing British imperialism. After a number of these demonstrators had been ejected from the court, another riot developed. As the month progressed, more riots and demonstrations developed, slowly getting larger and uglier. Day after day, demonstrators presented petitions at Government House, demanding release of their "patriotic compatriots," compensation for those injured and punishment of the police who were responsible. At the same time, left-wing unions promoted sympathy strikes, almost, but never quite, paralyzing the city's transportation system.

Throughout this period, the government and the police showed remarkable restraint. Although attacked and stoned, the police used tear gas or other non-lethal weapons to break up rioting mobs. At the same time, there was no relaxation of authority: apprehended rioters were quickly tried, and if found guilty, sentenced and jailed.

This condition persisted until mid-June. During that six-week period, it was reasonable enough to wonder if Hong Kong would survive. Macao had survived by buckling under, but this the Hong Kong authorities refused to do, and could not afford to do. The loss to the economy would have been far more calamitous than that suffered by Macao. It was, for the British, an all or nothing position. There would be no sacrifice of authority, no giving in to unreasonable Communist demands (and there were no reasonable ones). If this was a gamble with the very existence of the colony, the authorities evidently decided they must take it. They believed that if they held firm, the Communists would back down: they did not believe Peking wanted to destroy the colony no matter how fanatical its new revolutionary mood.

By mid-June, there was some evidence to back Hong Kong's position on the disturbances. Support from China for the local Communists was belated and purely verbal. Indeed, it has appeared that the disturbances in Hong Kong, as was probably the case in Macao, developed spontaneously. The final agreements reached between the Communists in Macao and the Portuguese authorities were not planned by the Communists, but followed on events. In Hong Kong, it was in essence the same: if the local Communists won concessions, well and good, but it was not a planned project of Peking. Then, too, the Hong Kong authorities presumably knew of the report that the Communists in Canton had turned down the suggestion that the Portuguese abandon Macao.

To these considerations was added a factor Macao had not enjoyed. The people did not rise in support of the Communists. In one demonstration in Macao 50,000 people paraded in denunciation of the Government, or roughly, a fifth of the population. In Hong Kong, the demonstrations were not more than several thousand at a time, and Hong Kong's population is 15 times that of Macao. Undoubtedly, the Communists counted on far larger support, owing to prior criticisms from many segments of the population of various Government policies and of the police. But as events showed, criticism of the Government did not extend to a desire to replace it.
with a Communist regime or one manipulated by the Communists. Then, too, many people were revolted by Communist violence, destruction and disregard of the general public interest. It was the laboring class who suffered most from the Communist disruptions of everyday life.

Presumably with this evidence before them, and aware that the spreading disturbances could not be allowed to continue without undermining the well-being of the colony, the Government turned from merely seeking to maintain law and order to a get-tough policy. When demonstrators kicked at police or jabbed fingers at their eyes, the police struck back with their truncheons. (In one fracas, girl demonstrators were observed busily wrapping the heads of their uninjured male colleagues with bloody bandages they first wiped on the heads of those who were injured in order to present a more vivid picture of police "atrocities.") At the same time, unauthorized demonstrations were banned, and a series of raids were initiated against Communist centers responsible for organizing the disturbances. This led to increased bloodshed, but it also led to a restoration of close to normal conditions in the colony.

Balked at intimidation of Hong Kong through demonstrations, the Communists continued to foment strikes but with less and less success. A seamen's strike and a fisherman's strike failed completely to disrupt ship traffic or the supply of fish. The Communists then turned to terror bombing. Increasingly through the summer, bombs—some real, some fake—were planted through the city. Inevitably, people were killed, but considering the number of bombs, sometimes close to a hundred in a single day, casualties were very few. Most were defused or were exploded harmlessly by bomb disposal units.

This activity plus the pasting up of inflammatory posters, a practice that had been banned in June, continued through the summer and early fall. Barring pure piety at their failures, it is hard to understand the rationale of the Communist bombing viewed in the context of the struggle against British imperialism. The bombs hardly won friends; again the principal victims were the common people. It can only be assumed that in the complex and only partially understood progress of the Cultural Revolution, where factionalism had developed and groups within groups were fighting each other, one element in the Communist infrastructure in Hong Kong was perhaps seeking a place in the sun or seeking to discredit another

Certainly the reaction of China to the situation in Hong Kong did not offer any explanation for the persistent struggle in Hong Kong. In the early summer the Peking government had sent a stern note to London demanding a quiet end to "persecution" of the "compatriots" and a redress of their grievances. London did not reply officially but let it be known that the Hong Kong government was maintaining law and order and would continue to do so. Nothing happened. There were several border incidents, one in which Hong Kong policemen were killed, apparently by shots from across the border; but there was never any significant build-up of troops to indicate a plan to go to the rescue of the "persecuted" masses in Hong Kong. Instead, there were signs that Communist China's leaders were largely indifferent to the struggle of their colleagues in Hong Kong. The local Communists needed funds to finance strikes and apparently could get little from the Communist mainland. In fact, Communists from China sometimes subverted the local Communists; this was true when boats from China appeared to sell fish the very day the local Communists had called their unsuccessful fishermen's strike!

On October 1 the Communists showed their first real sign of calling off the struggle. A vital supplement to Hong Kong's water supply in recent years has been the pipeline from China. In the summer it is generally shut off because of ample rain, but there is an agreement that in times of drought it can be turned on. The year 1967 being a dry one, the Communist authorities in Canton ignored the Colony's request for a summer water supply, though the reservoirs were so low that water was supplied for only four hours every fourth day. Clearly, the Chinese action was in support of the local Communists. Thus, when they turned on the pipe on October 1, it was both evidence that China would drop its quarrel with Hong Kong and a sign of no further support for the local Communist struggle.

The bombings declined and dropped abruptly at the year's end. This decline followed a British agreement to six demands made by the Communists in China. They were not significant; they involved such matters as removal of barbed wire at the border and the exchange of two captured Hong Kong policemen for several Communists held in the colony. The demands were "dressed up a bit," as one British official put it, to sound more important than they were. But this "dressing up" was important in itself, for it provided the Communists a facesaving device to offset the humiliating defeats they had suffered since the start of the disturbances, thus relieving the unhealthy stalemate, with its eroding effect on Hong Kong's economy and security.

As of the end of 1967 the troubles seemed to be over, at least as an organized movement to wring concessions out of the government. Hong Kong now appears to have reverted to the old status quo. During the height of the riots some Chinese of means left the colony, but a

.............. (Continues on next page)
number of these have since returned. For the great majority who stayed and suffered through the year, it was a time of anxiety and of inconvenience, but not of unusual hardship. Surprisingly, the number of tourists increased by 11 per cent over 1966 to a record 25,000. The economy also expanded; in dollar value, exports for 1967 totalled HK $8,750,000 compared to HK $6,350,000 in 1966.

The immediate future of Hong Kong therefore appears secure, particularly in those areas where it has been most vulnerable to the threat of domination or outright seizure by Communist China. As to the threat of China, some observers feel that a Mao victory or partial victory will increase the life potential of the colony, for it will delay and inhibit China's economic development, and therefore enhance the value of Hong Kong to the Mainland and extend that value over a longer period. Be that as it may, there is still the question of the lease under which all of Hong Kong, except a few square miles of Kowloon and Hong Kong Island, reverts to China in 1997. This would mean a loss of four-fifths of the colony's land area, including its principal reservoirs, its airport, major manufacturing plants and agricultural areas. It would not be possible to maintain the colony as now constituted on the remaining portion. Indeed, the British would hardly attempt it. However, the lease on the new territories does not seem to mean much these days. The realistic view is that Hong Kong will revert to China as and when China thinks it advantageous; the Chinese will simply ask for it and if refused will take it by force of arms.

As external threats to Hong Kong's lease on life once again appear to be indefinitely suspended, perhaps two internal problems pose a greater threat to the colony's security. One involves the political course the colony will follow, the other its economic well-being in the face of an expanding population.

Politically, Hong Kong could get into difficulties that might induce China to act. There is a small but significant number of responsible citizens in Hong Kong who feel the government must allow elected representation on its governing councils. That no such steps have yet been taken appears to be based on the belief that popular elections would either be dominated by the Communists or the Nationalists linked with Taiwan. These two groups are the only ones with developed political organization in the colony. If Communist representatives joined the Legislative Council, then Communism would win what it failed to win in its 1967 struggle—the opportunity to influence Hong Kong affairs. If the Nationalists became a factor in government affairs, China would not tolerate a Hong Kong that was influenced by Chiang Kai-shek. Some people, however, think representation from a third group interested in Hong Kong rather than either China would dominate an elected body of representatives. In any event, the pressure for some popular representation will almost certainly increase, and the government which considers support of big business a necessity will come under mounting attacks from the mass of the working population if this issue is ignored. Whatever develops, the government will have to walk a tightrope in the years ahead.

In the economic field the assets of ingenuity and hard work will no doubt continue to keep Hong Kong prosperous, but always with the provision that sheer numbers of people don't overwhelm Hong Kong's available resources and its many housing, medical and social services for the lower income segments of society. The problem is not the influx of refugees from China. Since the mass "invasion" of refugees in 1962, immigration from China, both legal and illegal, has been a trickle, approximately 6,000 to 8,000 a year. And this number has been partly countered by a flow of emigrants to other countries. The main problem is the local birth rate. Fortunately, it has been declining for the last five years; it is now down from 115,000 a year to 90,000. The death rate has remained static at about 20,000. Birth control measures have been energetically pushed by an enlightened citizenry, and it is likely the birth rate will continue to decline in the next few years. Still, half the population are children or young people, so that in spite of successful control measures there may be an increase in birth rate once again in the not too distant future. The population, now a little under 4,000,000 could reach 6,000,000 in another 10 years, a number that might prove intolerable.

All these problems, the uncertain external situation, the question of internal political security and the population growth, could singly or in combination bring an end to Hong Kong as an independent state under the British flag. But one is tempted to be optimistic. Hong Kong has shown remarkable resilience and survival value. It was considered doomed as a British colony when it was captured by the Japanese in 1941. It was written off by many observers when the Communists took over China, and again when the disturbances were at their height last spring. But here it is stronger than ever in 1968. That it will someday revert to China seems a certainty, but to name a date is impossible. It may still be going strong in the year 2,000 with a future ahead of it as unpredictable as the present one.
MAO-COMMUNISTS TO FORM
NEW PARTY IN INDIA

The birth of a blazing Red Communist Party believing in Mao Tse-tung's version of Marxism-Leninism, and committed to save world Communism from "revisionists and neo-revisionists," may soon be announced either from Vijayawada or Calcutta.

The extremists, who unfurled their banner of revolt against the "opportunist" leadership of the four-year-old Marxist Communist Party at its Burdwan plenum in April, convened a conference of their supporters at Vijayawada on June 29 and will hold another at Calcutta some time this month.

Though two separate conferences are being held, the organizers have set up an all-India coordination committee of Communist revolutionaries and are in touch with like-minded Communists all over the country.

The circle is now on the verge of completion. Only in June 1964 the "Marxists" led by P. Sundarayya, A.K. Gopalan, E.M.S. Namboodiripad, Jyoti Basu and M. Basavapunnaiah broke away from the United Communist Party ignoring the Marxist-Leninist principle of democratic centralism. They accused the leadership of the united party of adopting "disruptive and dictatorial methods." It is ironic that the same charge is now being levelled against the leadership of the Marxist Party.

Big Blow

The 1964 split gave the first big blow to the Communist movement in the country. Apparently not wiser in "historic" developments, a section of the Marxists has now chosen to deal another blow to the movement.

The gravity of the development can be realized by a recent "admission" by INSIGHT On The News, October 15, 1968

the Marxist Party's general secretary, P. Sundarayya. He said the breaking away of the extremists would deal a "heavy blow" to the movement in the country, particularly in Andhra Pradesh, one of their strong-holds.

But Sundarayya had no regrets for the expulsion of the veteran T. Nagi Reddy, and his ban of "ultras." While conceding that the extremists had some influence, more so in his own home state, Andhra, he defended the disciplinary action taken against them saying that these leaders had continuously defied the party line and discipline in spite of several chances given to them to retrace their steps.

Peiping Backing

The extremists or the "ultras", as they are known, were in fact encouraged in their postures by Radio Peiping broadcasts and Red Chinese writings which assumed aggressive tones after the 1962 invasion. The broadcasts and writings became more furious and vitriolic after the Naxalbari episode which the leadership of the Marxist Party did not approve of.

It is interesting to note that the very same Red Chinese, who forced a schism in the international Communist movement in 1959, and described the leadership of the United Communist Party as "revisionist" in 1961, are using the same epithet for the leadership of the present Marxist Party from about the middle of last year.

The politburo of the Marxist Party itself in a recent open letter pointed out to these Chinese broadcasts and writings and asked how was it that the extremists did not object to the party line until August 1967 when it was dubbed "neo-revisionist in character."
MAO-COMMUNISTS

The politburo letter also accused the extremists, specially in Andhra Pradesh, of "thoughtlessly and uncritically" stomaching the Chinese point of view.

Charge Against U. S.

The extremists, accused of following a "left sectarian adventurist line" characterize the Soviet government as imperialist and hold that it was working in collaboration with the United States to subvert national liberation movements. The Marxist leadership regards this as "fantastic."

The leadership considers the Soviet party as a Communist party and the Soviet state a socialist state, though it holds that the Soviet leadership had given up some basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism and had become revisionist.

It also denies the Chinese Communist Party the right to guide the revolution in India though respects the former's contribution to Marxism-Leninism. The leadership reserves to itself the right to come to its own judgement in the light of subjective and objective conditions in the country.

The extremists believe in "revolution through armed struggle as it was inevitable under bourgeois landlord dictatorship." But the politburo letter said: "This is the result of seeing only scattered militant struggles of peasants and tribes here and there which constituted but mere islands in the midst of the oceanic mass of peasantry in our country."