

1972

Commentary

Eugene H. Methvin
Washington, D.C.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/sclr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Eugene H. Methvin, Commentary, 24 S. C. L. Rev. 57 (1971).

This Article is brought to you by the Law Reviews and Journals at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in South Carolina Law Review by an authorized editor of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu.

COMMENTARY

Eugene H. Methvin*

I'd like to read you a portion of the resolution on foreign policy adopted by the Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union just twenty days ago. The Soviets speak of the fact that in the capitalist states "there are growing forces which favor a revolutionary remaking of society. The large scale actions are appearing as forerunners of new class struggles, which can lead to fundamental social transformations, to the setting up of the authority of the working class, in alliance with other strata of the working people. It is important to fully utilize opportunities which emanate from the present sharpening of the general crisis within the capitalist system, in order to strengthen the positions of peace and social progress. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union will further continue, consistently, to implement a policy of community and international solidarity with the workers' movement in the capitalist countries. Imperialism is being subjected to a greater pressure from forces which have grown from the national liberation struggle."

Now, what does that mean? That means, of course, that they are taking note of what happened last May in this country, when seven hundred universities shut down all at once, after Kent State, and after the Cambodian invasion. That means they're taking note of what is going on in Washington, last week and this week, and on Monday morning, and on Tuesday morning; the so-called "Stop Washington" plot to riot and shut down the government. And that means that they're proclaiming their solidarity.

Now, what does that mean in terms of practice? It means, for example, that the KGB has already carefully trained large numbers of Cubans, in the Cuban intelligence network, who are meeting regularly with our own Weathermen, and our own Black Panther types, and who are planning and operating so-

*Eugene H. Methvin, a Washington-based associate editor of *The Reader's Digest*, received his AB in Journalism degree, with a supplementary major in law, from the University of Georgia. He is author of *The Riot Makers, the Technology of Social Demolition* (1970), and *The Rise of Revolutionary Radicalism*, to be published in 1972.

cial demolition within the United States.¹ The export of terrorism from the Soviet Union is not something that happens to small Latin American countries only, or small African countries only. It happens to us.

For example, let me cite a little statistic by Sam Lubell, who is one of the reporters who makes a career of going around asking questions of people. He surveyed, in the four years prior to 1969, eleven hundred college students at thirty-seven campuses, probing the roots of the campus rebels, to see why politics of violence was growing in academia. And he concluded that easily the most important single strain contributing to this situation was "the sons and daughters of one-time socialists, communists, and other leftists; these students comprised the organizing core for the SDS. They also supplied the revolutionary ideology and tactics. Far from being in family revolt, a generation gap, the offspring of the old leftists were projecting the radicalism of their parents. Their sense of grievance did not originate in any current performance of our society, nor was it caused by the war, nor could any possible restructuring of the university satisfy them. For them, the specific issue of agitation was less vital than to be against something."²

One of the key leaders of the climatizing of Kent State, for example, was Howard Emmer, who was the son of an old-line Communist Party member and his wife, in Cleveland.³ One of the leaders of the Weathermen bombing group out of Seattle is the son of an old-line Communist Party organizer out there, who in his old age has gone off with his sons into left-wing infantilism, which Lenin warned against in 1919.

You find this throughout, as you look into our college campuses and into our terrorist groups at home. Now, this export by a generational indoctrination has created within, here, a major domestic threat which the Soviets now see rising. Gus Hall, incidentally, was represented at this Soviet Party Congress. They discussed very carefully our internal troubles and

1. See e.g., *Testimony of Thomas Edward Mosher Before the Subcomm. on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary*, 92d Cong., 1st Sess., (1971).

2. See S. Lubell, *The Hidden Crisis in American Politics* (1970).

3. See James A. Michener, *Kent State: What Happened and Why* at 85-113, 142-43, 162 (1971).

tribulations and what the Soviet Union can do to contribute to them.

Sometime before Kent State, an underground press editor, a radical theology school dropout, wrote an article which appeared in the underground press and which said, "Street demonstrations and mass demonstrations are our most effective revolutionary weapon. The police cannot distinguish between the hard-core revolutionaries and the innocent onlookers who are attracted to see what our slogans and chanting and so forth are all about. When they crack down with their clubs, their clubs, instead of becoming instruments of repression, become instruments of recruitment for us, the revolutionaries. If we sustain our demonstrations over a period of years, sooner or later the forces of repression will blunder and will provide us with a massacre, which will rob the regime of all popular support and which will bring about the general uprising."

Now, this young theology school dropout was quite "some time before Kent State," in fact. His name was Joseph Djughashvili, and he was leading demonstrations in Tiflis, in Soviet Georgia, Russian Georgia. Seventy years ago today he led a demonstration of about two thousand students and workers, which the police fired on, wounding fourteen.⁴ And after that demonstration, he wrote this essay for what came to be called the Stalin scenario, because Joseph Djughashvili later took up the name of Stalin. And the Stalin scenario is a guerrilla theater scenario written by the revolutionaries, and it's being played out in Washington right now, today. Monday morning they're going to have a guerrilla theater scenario, trying to provoke just the kind of reaction that occurred at Kent State.* They do not know when and where it will hap-

4. See *Eugene H. Methvin, The Riot Makers*, chapter 12 (1970).

*On Monday morning, May 3, 1971, an estimated 20,000 radical protestors deployed for a "stop the government" action in Washington. They were there in response to a massive "movement media" publicity campaign that included blatant calls to violence and "massive civil disobedience," issued with detailed maps and instructions to aid guerrilla groups in paralyzing the city. The hit-and-run guerrilla bands overturned cars, smashed windows, slashed motorists' tires, set fires and attacked police. On a steep hill overlooking a thoroughfare they cleared a path through the underbrush, tied a truck in place with cables, and at a strategic moment cut the cables, sending the truck plummeting down into the roadway. Overwhelmed, police abandoned their usual field arrest forms and made mass arrests. Among the 12,000 caught in the sweeps were many

pen. They just know that if they keep staging this same scenario, sooner or later some National Guardsman, some State Police, some local police, are going to play the role assigned to them, of cossack. And they think that they can demolish our society by this kind of what I call macromedia event, an event which involves all media, to communicate the message that they want to get across with their guerrilla theater scenario.

Now, these techniques — what I have called the technology of social demolition — have been exported, and are being exported by the Soviets into our own internal revolutionaries. They have the backdrop, for example, of the Russo-Japanese War of 1905, which is in some ways parallel to our own in Vietnam today. They have the doctrine of revolutionary defeatism, which means that the internal revolutionaries ally with the external armed forces, fighting the government, just as Lenin allied with the Japanese intelligence and took the money to finance his own underground press in Russia in 1904 and 1905, and just as he allied with the German General Staff during World War I, and used their money to finance strikes in the armaments plants around St. Petersburg.

These same techniques are being applied to us today. The money does come in from outside, through various channels, smuggled in. But the money, of course, is not as important as the technology and the psychological shot of adrenalin that our own revolutionaries get on going to Cuba, and visiting, and being received; and we know how they're treated when they go down there, because we have defectors who've had the treatment and who come back and tell us.⁵ And we have also had Cuban defectors who have been on the other side of the game, in planning the handling of these revolutionaries, and teaching them how to go about internal social demolition in the United States, and in motivating them, sending them back psychologically cocked, with their fuses lit, ready to explode.

And so you may be sure that the resolution of the Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has real

innocent bystanders, understandably outraged. Most of the cases had to be dismissed for lack of supporting documents and identification. The ACLU and other civil liberties groups sharply protested and Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson and Attorney General John Mitchell defended the police response. The very controversy was a major propaganda victory for the radicals staging the action, since it allowed them to depict the government as "repressive" and "fascistic."

5. See *Testimony of Thomas Edward Mosher*, *supra* note 1.

meaning to us at home. You may also be sure that we will not get a major easing of pressure in Vietnam, because when they say that they intend to sustain the pressure in support of the forces which have grown from the national liberation struggle, what they're saying is that the longer they can keep the United States bogged down in Vietnam, the longer they can keep the protests going at home, the greater is their chance of bringing about the final act of the Stalin scenario, which ended up, as you recall, in 1905, with the Bloody Sunday march of 1905, which, indeed, did do exactly what Stalin predicted, and it wound up with open street fighting for a couple of weeks in Moscow, in which the Army had to use artillery against the people of Moscow, and there was full street fighting. And this is exactly the scenario they're working on in this country.

And if you say, "Oh, this can't possibly happen," just ask yourselves if three hundred sixty-five days ago today we had sat down and asked ourselves, "You know, is it really possible that the National Guard is going to fire on white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant students in this country? Oh, no, it will never happen. Is it possible to imagine seven hundred universities shut down all at once? Oh, no, it will never happen." Ask yourselves if, given a few macro-media events like this, is it possible that we could have five hundred thousand people converging on Washington at one time, to march on the Capitol and the White House, to attempt to storm the Capitol and the White House, to put the military in the position of having to shoot down large numbers of people to defend the White House or the Capitol or the Supreme Court Building? Is this possible? Just think about it.⁶

6. The one Supreme Court Justice who has best understood and written about the problem of defending against totalitarian street tactics and "mass actions" in an open society is Robert H. Jackson. See his dissent in *Terminiello v. Chicago*, 337 U.S. 1, 13 (1949), and his concurring opinion in *Dennis v. U.S.*, 341 U.S. 494, 561 (1951).