

REFERENCE: Vol. 132 No. 36

TITLE: FREEDOM'S FUTURE: THE FREE WORLD AND THE SOVIET EMPIRE

SPEAKER: Mr. **GINGRICH**; Mr. WEAVER

TEXT: The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Gingrich] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, this special order and one other which will follow is on freedom's future, the free world and the Soviet empire.

I want to focus on the reality of the Soviet empire, the Soviet transnational threat to freedom and security and the necessity for a sophisticated free-world response led by the United States.

There are three propositions to this analysis. First, the reality of the Soviet empire, the Cuban colonial army, and a transnational strategy for tyranny. Second, the need for revolution in American ideas, in American political understanding, in American policies, in American institutions to match on the side of freedom this transnational Soviet imperial threat. Third, the degree to which the Reagan administration as well as the Congress and the American people has failed to understand intellectually the scale of the Soviet transnational threat and has failed to develop a response of sufficient power.

Let me expand: First, on proposition 1 that there is a Soviet empire whose threat is real and whose transnational strategy has made obsolete our containment policies and has made ineffective and out-of-date our political, diplomatic, legal, and military doctrines and that our difficulty in recognizing and responding to this transnational reality is first intellectual and second psychological.

Second proposition, that it is possible to design a new transnational strategy of freedom to defeat the Soviet empire's transnational strategy of tyranny, that this new transnational strategy of freedom requires a revolution in ideas, in doctrine, and in institutions comparable to the 1945 to 1950 Truman-Marshall-Vandenberg cycle which defined the Soviet threat to freedom, filled the vacuum of power around the world to contain the Soviet empire, explained pro-democratic anticommunism to the American people so they accepted it, invented the Central Intelligence Agency, the Marshall plan, the Point Four Program, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, created the unified Department of Defense, raised the most powerful peacetime forces in American history, began decolonizing the old Western European empires in the Third World, helped establish Israel, and helped lay the seeds of the European Common Market, developed a democratic Japan and West Germany, used American covert aid to defeat communism peaceably in Italy and in France and used American overt aid to help defeat communism militarily in Greece and the Philippines, helped integrate our World War II enemies into a pro-freedom, anti-Soviet alliance and recognized that there really were Soviet spies, that some people really were security risks, and that we really did have to protect ourselves from enemies within as well as without.

These enormous achievements, the achievements of the Truman-Marshall-Vandenberg team were immense and the conflict within American society was as vivid and emotional as one would expect for a change of that scale.

The saga of the Harry Truman-Hubert Humphrey-Ronald Reagan Democrats, as Reagan then was a Democrat, in recognizing and identifying leftwing radical elements in their own party, in labor unions, and in American life, and in fighting them overtly through arguments, through free democratic methods is a saga which the modern leftwing news media and academics seek to ignore. Yet it was a saga which helped save freedom in the Western World.

This proposition's corollary is that a response to transnational tyranny large enough to be successful will be as big, as complex, and as controversial as the rise of the containment in the Truman-Marshall-Vandenberg effort.

My second special order will outline a proposed transnational strategy for freedom and the institutional and doctrinal changes it will require. The central difficulties in proposition two are essentially intellectual, managerial, and political. That is, once we accept the reality in proposition 1 of the Soviet empire, the Communist Cuban colonial army, and a transnational strategy for tyranny, our problems in dealing with that, in responding to it are essentially problems of intellect, problems of management, and problems of policies.

Proposition 3, measured against the scale and momentum of the Soviet empire's challenge the Reagan administration has failed, is failing, and without a dramatic fundamental change in strategy will continue to fail.

Let me be clear: I have the greatest respect for President Reagan. I think he personally understands the threat of communism. He personally understands the history of Lenin's adaptation of czarist secret police oppression to the new purposes of a Soviet governing dictatorship.

President Reagan personally knows there is a Soviet empire and it is a global transnational threat to America and to freedom. President Reagan personally appreciates the threat to Israel in a more powerful Soviet empire, the threat to civilization in a more powerful Soviet-encouraged network of terrorism, the threat to African freedom in the Soviet use of the Cuban colonial army to impose Communist dictatorships, the threat to freedom in the Western Hemisphere through the Soviet empire's Cuban and Nicaraguan colonies, and finally that the long-term persistence, the massive dedication of resources, and the serious professionalism of the Soviet empire combined with its development of a transnational strategy makes it a mortal threat to the survival of America.

President Reagan knows all this. He ranks with Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Nixon in trying to focus attention on the Soviet empire and in trying to protect freedom. Yet President Reagan is clearly failing.

Whatever tactical successes he is winning in El Salvador, in Grenada, or in rebuilding our defenses, are successes built on the quicksand of his personal popularity. As he himself said last Sunday, he has less than 3 years left to serve. Yet there are not the institutional frameworks, the political movements, the massive public education that are the necessary permanent base for a true American response to the rising Soviet imperial challenge in the form of a transnational strategy of tyranny using Cuban colonial forces.

The fact is that George Will, Charles Krauthammer, Irving Kristol, and Jeane Kirkpatrick are right in pointing out the enormous gap between President Reagan's strong rhetoric, which is adequate, and his administration's weak policies, which are inadequate and will ultimately fail.

Sincere, decent, committed anti-Communist Members of the House and Senate who question \$100 million in aid to the Nicaraguan freedom fighters and ask in vain for a strategy are fundamentally right. The Reagan administration has a huge gap between its President's correct visionary warnings of the transnational Soviet empire and the rest of the executive branch's incorrect, ineffective fumbblings and inadequacies.

The burden of this failure frankly must be placed first on President Reagan; he is the President.

In addition, to making good **speeches** it is his job to ensure that others design good policies, that they implement them effectively, and that they reshape existing institutions and invent new ones as necessary. He is more than just the greatest communicator of our time, he is the President and therefore the head of the executive branch as well as the head of his political party.

Second, the burden must be on his White House staff, which has systematically failed again and again for 5 years now to understand that the real problems of developing a transnational strategy for freedom of confronting the Soviet empire and the Cuban colonial army are problems much more fundamental than a Reagan **speech**, much more difficult than a Pat Buchanan editorial, much more difficult than once again using the CIA to ineffectively manage to do the best it can when the best it can is simply not good enough. I say this not as in any way a comment on any personality but on an institutional crisis of the first order about American Government and the American Government's inability as an institution to meet the challenge of the Soviet empire.

Third, the failure must be borne by the senior executives in the Cabinet, the Department of State, Defense, and the Central Intelligence Agency; not as individuals, not because they do not mean well, I believe they do, not because they are not serious, I think they are, not because they do not work hard, they work terribly hard; it is reasonable for these three fine gentlemen to wonder what it is that is being asked of them. But the answer is simple: They are the heads of great institutions. Those institutions currently do not have an understanding of the transnational Soviet empire, do not even use the language that describes that empire, have no strategies to defeat the empire in countries the President has identified.

The gap between Ronald Reagan's United Nations **speech** in which he courageously called for support for freedom fighters in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Angola, and Nicaragua, the gap between that **speech** and the reality of our pathetically incompetent efforts is a gap that should be a scandal if only we took it seriously.

Fourth, the burden be borne by House and Senate Republicans who agree with President Reagan's vision and have not fought hard enough to force the changes in the executive branch. We can hardly expect our friends on the left who do not agree with this policy or our friends on the left who do not agree with this policy or our friends who are pressured because as Democrats they believe Reagan is right, they exist in a caucus whose majority clearly does not believe Reagan is right, to lead the way in forcing the executive branch to become competent or to lead the way in articulating the case to the American people.

The burden must be borne by House and Senate Republicans who agree with the President's vision, who are afraid of the transnational Soviet empire, who understand the Communist Cuban colonial army, and who understand that what we are doing today simply is not good enough.

Fifth, the burden of responsibility must be borne by our own political supporters who have not held our feet to the fire and who have not focused on results rather than intentions.

It is all too easy in this complex national capital to be so exhausted by daily crisis that we forget that good intentions are not good results, that meaning to do well is not the same as doing well, that thinking that doing today's **speech** is somehow achieving tomorrow's success. It is not necessarily true.

Our supporters across this Nation, the people who were aroused by Goldwater in the sixties, the people who, for generations, have believed in Reagan, the people who understand the terrible threat of the Soviet empire, those supporters should be tougher, firmer, harder on us, in insisting that we do a better job, that the measure is whether or not we are capable of defeating the Soviet empire in Angola, not whether we mean well for Savimbi. The challenge should be whether or not we can achieve a democratic pro-Western Government in Nicaragua, not whether we like the Contras.

The challenge should be whether or not we help the Afghans regain their country, whether we wish them well as they are butchered by the Soviet Army.

Sixth, the burden must be borne by the intellectual and cultural community in America, which has been unwilling to deal honestly with the Soviet empire.

It said a great deal about the American cultural intellectual community that the "Killing Fields" is a movie about Cambodia in which, according to one critic, the word "Communist" was never used. It was not easy to write an emotional, powerful screen play, to film a powerful movie about the Communist genocide of one-third of the population of Cambodia and manage to avoid the word "Communist."

Yet it is essential to understand why the "Killing Fields" had rave reviews from leftwing intellectuals, while "Rambo" was laughed at. The "Rambo" was overtly anti-Communist, while the "Killing Fields" managed to somehow pin the blame on America for what was clearly a Communist genocidal action in Cambodia.

The American intellectual and cultural communities are all too blind to the threat of communism, are all too willing, just as their predecessors were in the twenties and thirties, to apologize and excuse Communist atrocities, to somehow never quite understand or deal directly with the threat of the Soviet empire.

Just as H.G. Wells was taken in by Stalin, all too many American intellectuals and American academics are taken in by Gorbachev. Just as intellectuals in the twenties and thirties always found one more reason to apologize for the Soviet police state, so today all too many intellectuals and all too many academics find one more excuse to apologize for Castro's police state, for Nicaraguan Communist atrocities or for the Soviet empire's atrocities in Afghanistan.

Seventh, and finally, the responsibility must be borne by a news media which is critical if a dictatorship is pro-American, but tends to ignore a dictatorship which is anti-American, which uses Soviet language to explain Soviet behavior, which pretends that Jaruzelski is an independent leader of Poland, when clearly Jaruzelski is the dictator imposed by the Soviet army, which ignores if possible the 35,000 pounds of Communist documents captured in Grenada when we liberated that island, and which ignores when it can the real nature of Ortega's Communist dictatorship.

All too often the news media itself is grotesquely uncritical and grotesquely willing to use Soviet language to explain Soviet behavior. Possibly it reached its epitome when ABC News put on a paid Soviet propagandist following the President of the United States.

The American news media stands, I believe, guilty all too often of failing to learn the lessons of 40 years of competition between freedom and the Soviet empire.

In the context of all of this, if the Reagan administration is to succeed, it will have to launch a fundamentally new effort of enormous proportions aimed, I think, at five steps: First, to establish right language; second, to establish right policies; third, to establish right institutions and strategies; fourth, to establish right public understanding; and fifth, to establish the right legislation. And I believe the steps come in that order.

If the State Department has no real knowledge of Leninism, it can hardly understand the Soviet empire. If as recently as last Friday, the Central Intelligence Agency was not aware that in its own files it had records about a Cuban general who had served in Syria against Israel and who then went to serve in Angola against the freedom fighters, and was now being assigned to Nicaragua -- not, mind you, that the CIA did not know who he was and what he was doing -- but it had not occurred to the Central Intelligence Agency that the fact that the Cubans had served against Israel was of rather considerable importance in

explaining both the Soviet empire and in explaining to our friends who believe and are concerned deeply about Israel why the Soviet empire and its Communist Cuban colonial army is a threat for the very survival of Israel.

If the State Department, the Defense Department and the Central Intelligence Agency cannot think of using right language, then as George Orwell put it in his Essay on Politics and the English Language, it is impossible to think clearly about it. The failure of right words leads to failure of right policy.

Yet, I can say flatly on this floor, after 4 years of arguing and talking with three different National Security Advisers, after talking with the Secretary of State, of talking with the Assistant Secretary for Latin America, of talking with the Presidential **speech**-writers, that after 4 long years, it is virtually impossible to get the word "Sandinista," which is a propaganda word stolen by the Communists in Nicaragua to deliberately mislead nationalists, it is virtually impossible to get that word out of the current government language. So last Sunday night, Ronald Reagan, who understands better than anyone that he is dealing with a Communist dictatorship, used the word "Sandinista" 15 times.

Now, if the most anti-Communist articulator in this administration uses a Communist propaganda term, it should not surprise him that the bureaucracies of defense and diplomacy use old language and fail to think clearly. If the President of the United States cannot discipline himself to use the correct language, he can hardly expect those who understand less than he does to understand what is at stake.

Yet Sandino was a nationalist. He was repudiated by the Communist Party of Mexico in 1934 because he stood for Nicaragua and against the Soviet empire.

The true Sandinistas are precisely the freedom fighters who are nationalists who were in the countryside who were fighting against the Communist dictatorship.

So, first, before this administration can do anything else, it has to use the correct language, or else it has no hope of either articulating for the American people, for our allies or for our bureaucracies what it is we intend to do.

Second, we have to develop right policies. Right policies, I think, have to be fundamental. If you do not have right policies, you can hardly expect to develop the right solution. After all, policy is to solution what a cookbook recipe is to dinner. With a bad recipe you get a bad dinner; with a bad policy you are bad to get a bad solution.

The best case is Afghanistan. If one were to examine seriously the West's efforts to help the Afghan freedom fighters, the freedom fighters who are the most universally supported on this planet, the freedom fighters who have the best case for their activities, the freedomfighters who are most courageously standing up against the direct overt Soviet invasion of their country, if we were to look seriously at the West's efforts to help those freedom fighters, we cannot help but cry at the impotence, the incompetence and the effectiveness of the West.

Where is the Sony hand-held anti-helicopter missile that is cheap, user friendly and can be trained so that anyone can use it while carrying it in a backpack? Where are the inexpensive radios that are easy to use that allow light infantry, which is all the guerrillas are, to communicate and stay out of the reach of the Soviets? Where is the light hand-carried radar that allows them to know when the helicopters are coming to set up the antihelicopter missiles to knock down the major Soviet advantage? Where are all the kinds of high-tech equipment which could be there if we had taken seriously in 1980 the job of inventing the computerized, light, high technology, the inexpensive user-friendly systems that would have driven the Soviet Army out of Afghanistan or made its stay there a thousand times more expensive? Where is the free world training academy to take young Afghan leaders and train them in light infantry tactics and train them in the habits and doctrine of the Soviet Army?

Oh, we have people in camps in Pakistan, we have irregulars, we have advisers; but the simple fact is that our response, just as in the Spanish Civil War in the thirties and the democracies were ineffective, our response in Afghanistan has been pitiful, and we should all be ashamed.

But then our policy has never been to be militarily good enough with regular light infantry that we could defeat the Soviet Army or drive up the cost dramatically.

Where is the diplomatic strategy, the public diplomacy, that knits together throughout the Islamic world a league for the protection of Islam freedom against the Soviet empire? Where are the public policy efforts that should be ongoing every day that focus people across the world on the fact that even as we speak, there are Soviet troops butchering Afghan. Even as we rest this evening, there will be Soviet helicopters butchering Afghans. Even as we have a nice weekend, there will be Soviet columns butchering Afghans.

We have simply been incompetent in Afghanistan, in Angola, in Ethiopia, in Cambodia and Nicaragua and we must confess it.

Third, we lack the right institutions and the right strategies. There is no institution in America today charged with developing irregular light infantry weapons. There is no institution in America today charged with designing the tactics and the strategy and the doctrine that will defeat Soviet forces or Communist Cuban colonial forces in the field. We do not have those institutions, we have not invented them, and without those institutions, we can hardly invent the strategies that will make them successful.

Fourth, how can you possibly have right public understanding of what we are doing if you do not have the right language, you do not have the right policies, if you don't have the right institutions and strategies?

When people listen to the President's strong language and look at the pitiful request for \$100 million, can they be surprised that there is no sense of, "Oh, yes, this is urgent"? "This is like Franklin Roosevelt in World War II"?

When we look at our strong language about Afghanistan and our totally ineffective response, can we be surprised that there is no public understanding?

When we look at how little film comes out of Communist tyrannies, can we be surprised? Every night on American television, every night on European television, every night on Latin American television there should be footage of the barbarism of the Soviet empire, and we should pay higher prices to those courageous enough to go into the Soviet empire to get that footage, and it should become commonplace to develop documentaries and films about just how horrible the Soviet empire is.

Yet, American television does not do it. American commercial television does not do it. The U.S. Information Service does not do it. And then we wonder why our allies and ourselves are so ignorant of the truth about the Soviet empire and the Cuban Communist colonial forces.

Finally, only within the framework of right language, right policies, right institutions and strategies, right public understanding, can we expect to get right legislation.

For 6 long years now, the Reagan administration, day in and day out, has followed a fundamentally flawed strategy of dealing with the Congress, largely because the senior leadership of the Reagan administration remembered the Rayburn years. It has dealt tactically behind closed doors with people who either cannot deliver votes or will not deliver votes.

The fact is that the U.S. Congress is shifting from a Rayburn model, closed door, handful of leaders model to a grassroots Congress led by the Nation at large; whereas in Rayburn's day, a dozen men meeting in what they called the board of education, could make major decisions. Today it is millions of Americans across this country writing, telephoning, wiring, and visiting their Congressman to help make decisions. This is a much healthier body now that it has television, now that it is open, now that the citizens can participate by mail, by jet airplane, by telephone and by town hall meetings.

Yet there has been no adequate Reagan administration vision in strategy to develop the grassroots Congress. In the long run, we have to have long throughout, deliberate strategies in operation, focusing on educating the country at large, rather than focusing on just this Congress.

This morning at a press conference, we had an illustration of the gap between what I am describing and what this city is used to. One reporter asked me, "How could you want a more aggressive administration than Pat Buchanan's article in the Post the other week?" Yet, her question was exactly my point. With a long-term well-thought-out strategy, this administration would have had 30 to 50 people outside the administration writing that article. There would have been people across America writing that article. It would not have been tactical work to be done by the Director of Communications.

Because there is no strategy for the grassroots, there can be no effective strategy for the Congress. Congresses should follow the will of the people. If the administration cannot educate the Nation into understanding why it needs over time to develop a transnational strategy for freedom to counter the transnational strategy for tyranny of the Soviet empire and its Communist Cuban colonial forces, it should hardly expect the Congress month in and month out to be able to do that.

This is not to say that Congress should be cowardly or that Congress should have no role. It is simply to say flatly that if the Central Intelligence Agency will not declassify documents, if the State Department will not use the right language, if the Defense Department will not develop the right doctrines, if the White House will not develop the right legislative strategies, it can hardly then turn in a crunch and complain because Representatives and Senators cannot quite figure out how to do all that which the executive branch has failed to do.

As I said, I want to in these orders outline three propositions. First, the reality of the Soviet empire, the Cuban colonial Communist army and the transnational strategy of tyranny.

Second, the need for a free world strategy of a transnational campaign for freedom to match and then defeat the transnational campaign for tyranny.

And, third, the specific steps necessary for the Reagan administration to communicate the first and implement the second.

To understand the intellectual principles of strategic thinking and why we have been losing the struggle with the Soviet empire, the Communist Cuban colonial army and their transnational strategy of tyranny, it is necessary to focus for a moment on the basic system of thinking of our conflict.

I would suggest that the first place we lose is intellectually in the issue of thinking about the art of survival.

Sun T'zu, in "The Art of War," written 500 years before Christ, said, "Know the enemy and you have won half the battle; know yourself and the battle is yours."

He said that the process of survival is vital to the state and should be the first duty of study of every statesman.

The key to survival and thinking about survival is recognizing that competition occurs at four levels, and they are a hierarchy; that the top level is vision, the second level is strategy, the third level is operations or projects, and the bottom level is tactics. And they are a hierarchy in the sense that vision dominates everything else. Strategy, how you are going to implement your vision, dominates the other two, operations or projects. What are the definable tasks you can assign will dominate tactics, and tactics is at the base.

This is particularly important because in this country we think almost always at the tactical

level. We ask about Nicaragua, not the Soviet empire; we ask about General Lopez only in Nicaragua, not about General Lopez in Syria fighting the Israelis, in the Soviet Union being trained, or in Angola dominating the freedom fighters to form another Soviet colony.

Let me give you an example of what I mean by hierarchy and use a common, every-day nonmilitary example. If you have the vision that you are going to cook a Thanksgiving dinner, you have a very different vision than if you have a vision that you are going to fix a picnic in July. That vision changes what kind of strategy you will have, in terms of what you will buy at the grocery store, how long it will take to fix it, whether or not you need to use the stove, how many people you are going to invite over, a whole range of issues, even what kind of silverware you may use.

If you think you are going to fix a Thanksgiving dinner but in fact you adopt the strategy of a picnic lunch, so you buy watermelon, you buy sliced ham, you buy lots of potato chips, you may confuse all of your friends who show up for what they thought was a Thanksgiving dinner.

On the other hand, if you think that you are going to go out on a picnic or your strategy is to set the table with the family's best China and best silver, you may confuse those who show up in their shorts and their bathing suits prepared to go to the local park.

Therefore, the strategy, operations, and tactics have to fit the vision. This is particularly important, because historically we need to study the vision, the strategy, operations and tactical framework of events to understand what is happening.

For example, the German Wehrmacht, the German Army in World War II, was brilliant at operations and tactics, probably the best army in World War II. But at the vision and strategy level, Germany lost the war. And because vision and strategy dominate operations and tactics, in the end the German Army was defeated even though it was a better operational army than any of its competitors.

The British Army in the American Revolution was clearly the superior operational and tactical army. George Washington could never have built an American Revolutionary Army capable of defeating the British Army. In fact, it is the arrival of French regulars that made it possible, finally, for the British to be trapped at Yorktown. The British lost one army at Saratoga because of a massive strategical mistake, not because on any single day the Americans could tactically defeat General Burgoyne at Saratoga but because strategically the British Army at Saratoga had gotten too far out of touch with the rest of the army and, therefore, was defeated by the strategic mistakes, not by its operational or tactical skills. Yet clearly the British lost the war, they lost the war because at the vision-and-strategy level, the American Revolutionary Army was superior to the British Army.

Similarly, the table was turned on us in Vietnam. While the American Army in Vietnam was clearly operationally and tactically superior to the Communist North Vietnamese Army, we never had a vision or strategy of that war which would have enabled us to win it; so although we defeated the North Vietnamese Army every single time we met them in battle,

in the end we did not succeed. Indeed, in Harry Summers' brilliant study of the Vietnam war, he begins his book with a personal story as an Army colonel of having gone to Hanoi at the end of the war, and he said to a North Vietnamese officer, "You never defeated us on the battlefield." And the North Vietnamese officer said to him, "That is irrelevant." And in that one quote, I thought Summers caught the central lesson of vision, strategy, operations, and tactics.

If you have the most brilliant tactic in the world but your opponent can defeat you operationally, you will lose. If you have the greatest operational and tactical skills in the world but your opponent beats you at the vision and strategy level, you will lose.

It is precisely at the vision and strategy levels that the Soviet empire today is superior to the free world in our concept of the competition we are engaged in.

In the late 1940's Harry Truman, George Marshall, Arthur Vandenberg, and others invented the containment strategy to contain Joseph Stalin and the Soviet empire. It was for its time a brilliant vision-and-strategy response. It required tremendous arguments in America, impassioned pleas by Republicans and Democrats alike, fierce fights over the future of this country, the definition of communism, the nature of spying, the threat to survival.

In the end, it created an answer which lasted I believe for about 20 years.

In the mid-1960's, the Soviet empire began to develop a new transnational strategy. Contained at the top by nuclear weapons, contained in Europe by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Soviet empire began to hunt for new battlefields, for a new way of dealing at the vision-and-strategy level with Western freedom.

Beginning with what Khrushchev called wars of national liberation; that is, deliberately establish Communist efforts to train guerrillas, magnified in the 1970's by a deliberate networking of terrorist groups, many of them trained and supplied by the Soviet empire, the Soviets developed a new approach, a new threat.

With the death of John F. Kennedy, the Democratic Party lost its greatest articulator of the threat of communism. Throughout the 1960's and early 1970's, compounded by the chaos of Watergate, the American Nation lost its way, the free world failed to analyze what was happening, and a new, powerful Soviet transnational strategy emerged. It is the Soviets who have invented this transnational strategy while we cling to the 19th-century European models of sovereignty, clear-cut choices of war and peace, recognition or nonrecognition. It is the Soviets who have studied our system. They have invented disinformation systems of massive scale and remarkable sophistication. We have no defensive measures to protect us from \$300,000 a year Washington law firms who take Communist money to repeat Communist lies to help Communist foreign policy.

We have no techniques to explain and deal with domestic front groups guided by Communist foreign governments. We are faced with a disinformation campaign of enormous sophistication, of great power, which the Grenada documents indicate clearly has impact on

the U.S. Congress, on our own staffs, on the national news media and on our intellectual community.

It is the Soviets who have created a Communist Cuban colonial army of enormous power. Remember, Cuba is dangerous for many reasons. Cuba is dangerous as a Communist colony because it makes Castro a great puppet figurehead presumably independent of the Soviets, while his very survival depends every day on the Soviet empire's money, the Soviet empire's secret police, the Soviet empire's permission; yet Castro can posture as though he were independent.

The Soviet transnational system in Cuba gives them their largest spy base outside the Soviet empire. At Lourdes in Cuba they have more electronic equipment to spy on the United States than anywhere else outside of the Soviet Union. The Soviet colonial occupation of Cuba gives them 11 airfields, a set of aircraft carriers that are permanent and stationed in Cuba itself. The Soviet use of Cuba as a colony gives them additional trainers in the Cuban Communist secret police who work closely, as Claire Sterling and others have proven, with the terrorist networks of the Palestine Liberation Organization and with Qadhafi in Libya.

The Grenada documents document clearly and systematically for anyone willing to read them the degree to which the Grenadian Communists and the Cuban Communists were intimately tied to terrorists in Libya and elsewhere.

The Cuban colonial system the Soviets have established in their transnational method gives them a great training ground, for example, for the Nicaraguan Communists, most of whose leaders were training in Havana, most of whom met with Castro, most of whom who had worked with the Libyan terrorists, and most of whom who have a direct relationship in our allies to the Soviet empire's most anti-Israeli and anti-American activities.

Finally, it is the Soviet transnational system creating a Communist Cuban colonial army which has given them remarkable assets. Thirty-five thousand Cuban soliders occupying Angola in what is now a Cuban Communist, Soviet Communist imperial colony replacing the Portuguese colony. Thousands of Cuban soldiers occupying Ethiopia in what is now in effect a Soviet colony. Thousands of Cuban soldiers now in Nicaragua in what is a Communist Cuban colony. Again and again, the Soviets have developed a pretty inexpensive investment in a Cuban colonial army which helps them immensely.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I will yield just for a moment.

Mr. WEAVER. I was just wondering if you would oppose our own Government doing the same thing. I mean, do we not have the right to put bases in Turkey? Do we not have the right to send our warships on the high seas? Do we not have the right to use or would you oppose our using troops? Mercenary troops?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad you raised that; I was going to comment on that a little bit later. But I am glad you raised that issue, and I am only going to yield briefly because I want to finish this, then I will yield longer if I have time.

I had a gentleman the other day, when I was talking about Gen. Nestor Lopez who the Cubans have now sent to Nicaragua. General Lopez was sent to Syria to fight on the side of the Syrians against Israel in charge of a Cuban tank regiment. He was sent to Angola in charge of a division to impose communism in Angola, and a colleague of mine on the left said to me, "But isn't that exactly like our generals?"

My answer was simple: If you do not believe there is slavery and freedom, there is no functional difference between those who use guns to impose slavery and those who use guns to protect freedom. Just as there is no difference between the criminal who uses a gun to rob a store and the policeman who uses a gun to protect a store.

If you are willing to say that a Cuban colonial army imposing a Soviet dictatorship on Angola is morally acceptable, then there is no difference. But in fact my dad was stationed in France and we moved out of France in 1959, and when Charles de Gaulle and the French said to us, "Take all of your troops and leave," we left.

When, on the other hand, the Polish people said in 1956-57, "Russians leave," the Russian Army came in harder. When the Hungarians rose in rebellion, the Russian tanks crushed Hungarian freedom fighters.

When the East Germans in 1953 rose in rebellion, Russian tanks crushed East Germans. When the Czechoslovakians tried to become free in 1968, Russian tanks crushed the Czechoslovakians.

I think that my good friend from Oregon raised exactly the difference between those of us who think there is a transnational strategy for tyranny on the part of the Soviet empire and who see the Cuban colonial army as a colonial army, and those on the left who in fact do not think it is an empire, do not see it as colonialism, and do not seem to understand the difference, the fundamental difference between tyranny and freedom.

Remember, recently when we talked about our bases in the Philippines, no one suggested, "Let us send an American army of occupation to kill Filipinos so we can keep Clark Field and we can keep Subic Bay." What we said was, "If a Philippine Government comes into power and asks us to leave, we will leave." Because, after all, we believe in freedom and in a free people being our allies, not our puppets.

Let the people of Poland tomorrow morning ask the Russians to leave, and they will be met by machine guns. Let the Cuban people tonight ask the Russians to leave, and they will be met by Hind helicopters with gatling guns.

My good friend from Oregon explained precisely the difference between those of us who fear tyranny and those of our friends on the left who do not seem to be able to understand the

difference between John Brown who was trying to free the slaves and those who used rifles to keep the slaves in slavery.

Furthermore, it is the Soviets who have encouraged a worldwide network of terrorists who attack Israel, undermine the West, and threaten our security as individuals and our very survival as a civilization. Yet we do not even to this day have an adequate doctrinal strategy for transnational terrorism developed by states. Otherwise, how could Qadhafi recently have threatened us when he has a tiny dictatorship and we are the most powerful free country in the world.

It is the Soviets who have developed negotiations as a screen behind which to consolidate dictatorship, train the next cycle of guerrillas and terrorists, and it is the Soviets who have developed gradualism as a strategy. First, Castro took power in Cuba. Then he imposed a Communist dictatorship. Then he developed Communist secret police. Then he accepted a few Soviet trainers. Then a few helicopters. Then a few Mig fighters. Then a couple of submarines. Now he has an army in four different countries occupying colonies for the Soviet Empire.

Inch-by-inch, step-by-step we were told let us negotiate. What happened? The Communists grew stronger in Cuba. Then we were told let us draw the line, and what happened? A year later, 2 years later when we were not paying attention, the Communists crossed the line. What are we seeing in Nicaragua today? It is Cuba all over.

First comes the dictatorship, but let us negotiate. Then come the secret police, but let us negotiate. Then comes training guerrillas, but let us negotiate. Then come the Cuban advisers, but let us negotiate. Then come the Soviet advisers, but let us negotiate.

Then come the Hind helicopters, but let us negotiate. Then come the Czechoslovakian light fighter-bombers, but let us negotiate. Finally come the Mig-23's, but let us negotiate. Then comes the training brigade of Soviet troops, the heavy tanks, then come the missiles.

Not a single thing I have just described failed to happen in Cuba and two-thirds of it has happened in Nicaragua. What is the answer of our friends on the left? It is to not notice it, to explain it away; but frankly what is the effect of our executive branch? It is to fail to develop a diplomatic response, a political response or a military response that is effective.

Finally, it is the Soviets who have developed language into a war of words of great power. Lenin probably most brilliantly personified this when he and his faction lost a fight for control of the International around 1903, and immediately adopted the Russian word "Bolshevik" which means majority.

As Lenin said, "If we who are the minority, they had lost the vote, but they said if we call ourselves "Bolshevik" meaning majority, and we call our opponents "Menshevik" meaning minority, then after a year or two, everybody will believe that we are the majority and they are the minority.

So they were Bolsheviks ever since. It is Lenin who called the Soviet newspaper Pravda, which means truth. Because he said, "I will own truth." He meant by that not merely a pun, but the literal ability of a totalitarian state, as George Orwell told us in "1984," to redefine reality over and over again.

The Soviets believe very deeply in a war of words and in the power of language to shape reality. They understand George Orwell's essay on politics and the English language. They systematically use words which is why they call their armies "peoples' armies" even if they are dictatorships and thugs and terrorists. Which is why they told their Communists in Nicaragua to use "Sandinista" because they knew that if they were called Communists we would have understood it. Yet, we do not even realize that Leninism as a doctrine for the use of language exists.

All too often we use their words. Our Government uses their words. We sent, for example, last year congratulations on the coup de etat on the anniversary of the Soviet takeover of power illegally in the Soviet Union. A nonsensical concept intellectually if there is a Soviet Empire.

Again and again we forget that words in the long run define reality and that if you cannot think it, you cannot say it; and if you cannot say it, conversely you cannot think it. If we think of the Soviets as "Gorbachov is basically a nice guy," and I can find you quotes, the best of them by George McGovern, on Andropov as a reasonable man.

Now, Andropov was the head of the Soviet Secret Police. He helped invent using mental hospitals as a torture ground for people who dissented. He helped develop the Gulag Archipelago. He was the Ambassador who brought in Soviet tanks to crush the Hungarians. There are no adequate words in the West to describe what the horrible thug Andropov was functionally even if he drank scotch and pretended to be nice personally.

Because we lack the words, we all too often deceive ourselves. We are a little bit like the story of the "Three Little Pigs" in which, if the Little Pigs had said, "Oh, that is not a wolf, that is essentially a well-meaning mammal with a strange appetite for protein," they would, over a time, have decided that we would have, if the wolf had described himself in Leninist terms as a "hairy pig," and said, "Yes, I have nutrition problems, but do not think of me a wolf, wolves are those people over there. I am essentially a hairy pig, and yes, I eat protein, but I will not eat you today." You would understand then far better the nature of Gorbachov, Andropov, Chernenko, and the Soviet Empire.

Vision must lead to words. Our vision cannot exist if we cannot say it. Strategy must lead to policies, to strategies, and they must lead to structures for implementation. Operations must be definable tasks for which we can hold people accountable.

The tactics on a daily basis must be a doctrine that fits our vision of strategy.

It was totally appropriate for this Congress to impose human rights limitations on the Government of El Salvador if we were going to support it. In my judgment, it is totally

appropriate for us to impose human rights limitations on the freedom fighters in Nicaragua if we are going to support them. That is making a doctrine of freedom fit at a tactical level our vision of freedom, but I think you then have to be able to supply the trainers to make sure they are well trained. You must be willing to supply the kind of detailed help that is necessary if the forces of freedom are going to win.

That is why, frankly, I think we should declassify a lot more. If we in fact have, as the Central Intelligence Agency keeps claiming and the White House keeps claiming, if we have massive documentary proof of the existence of the Soviet disinformation network, then our vision of freedom should require our Government to declassify those arguments and let us talk it out here in public and let us look at them and let us learn which ones are important and which ones should worry us and which ones are relevant.

Let me within this framework of vision, strategy operations and tactics, go back to the first proposition. Is there a Soviet empire? Does it use a Communist Cuban army to extend its power, and has it developed a transnational strategy for imposing tyranny on people?

I think it is clear, the Soviet empire is real. It has developed a transnational strategy for tyranny. It does use the Communist Cuban colonial army as a colonial army around the world and it is helping terrorists so that they will undermine the free world.

Why if those are true, and I think it is almost impossible for a reasonable person to deny that at least at a fundamental level they are true, why then do so many people reject this reality so totally?

I would suggest that to an American in the late 20th century the central challenge of the reality of the Soviet empire is intellectual and psychological. Intellectually, many Americans simply do not want to believe in the weird and frightening reality of the Soviet empire. They refuse to read Russian history. They refuse to study Lenin. They refuse to study 40 years experience of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe. They refuse to study 26 years of Castro's communism in Cuba. They refuse to examine the emerging new historiography about the Vietnam war and the success of a Vietnamese colonial imperialism allied with the Soviet empire. They refuse to study the Grenada documents and their clear lessons about the nature of the Soviet empire. They refuse to study the true meaning of Marxism-Leninism as an instrument of tyranny and the deliberate ways in which the Grenadian Communists with Cuban and Soviet training and guidance were lying to the American Government and the American people and were manipulating our sincerity to mask their tyranny.

These Americans who intellectually hide from reality deny the over 16-year pattern of Nicaraguan Communist ties to Cuba and to Middle Eastern terrorism.

They also reject the clearly colonial nature of the Cuban occupation of Angola. They ignore or refuse to confront the gruesome terrible daily reality of a thousand people a day dying in Communist Ethiopia from deliberate actions by the Communist dictatorship designed to strengthen its grip on the country. They ignore or refuse to study the realities of military

power and so they never read "Sun T'zu, the Art of War," Clausewitz on war, Mao Tse Tung on "Guerrilla Warfare," or Lenin on "Totalitarian Power."

This first weakness is the intellectual weakness of ignorance, a weakness which was described by James Madison, who said:

Knowledge shall forever govern ignorance and a people who mean to be their own governors must forever arm themselves with the power which only knowledge can give.

But this first weakness of intellectual weakness is compounded by a second weakness, the psychological block on learning, which psychologists call cognitive dissonance, which is driven by an isolationism and a pacifism, the will to avoid knowledge which might be frightening.

Starting with the horrors of World War I, there has been a growing western world tendency toward pacifism and isolationism. Henry Wallace in America in World War II, George McGovern who campaigned for Henry Wallace, Jimmy Carter who in many ways accepted McGovernism, Walter Mondale who defended McGovernism; today there is a generation of politicians, intellectuals, and religious leaders on the left who I think in many ways find it very, very difficult to deal with the weird frightening reality of the Soviet Union and find it easier to be reassured by a fantasy that is pleasant, but simply does not conform to the real world.

The fact is that there is a Soviet empire of tyranny and there is a rational historical basis for its existence.

The key to understanding the Soviet empire is to recognize how different from us it is.

The key lesson of Charles Krauthammer's essay on "Mirror Images" in his new book "Cutting Edges" is that many of us on the left simply refuse to accept that Khomeini is different from us, Gorbachev is different from us, the Kremlin is different from us, the Soviet tyranny is different from us.

The key lesson of Theodore White's book "America in Search of Itself" in which he talks about how hard it was for the Carter administration to recognize that Khomeini was by Western standards a barbarian, that is, a man outside our culture, which is what the word means, is equally difficult for the rest of us in dealing with the Soviet Union.

Western civilization is a set of values, the importance of the individual, that no one is above the law, the right to private property, the right to a free press, the right to free elections, to give power to those in government and to take back that power, the right to freedom of religion and freedom of **speech**.

Note that in Western civilization these are rights and they limit and control the power of government over the individual citizen, as even Richard Nixon found when we proved once again that no one person is above the law.

A student at the University of Virginia Law School the other night asked me, "Aren't we and the Russians really sharing the same civilization? Don't we and the Russians really have the same heritage?"

The question was based on my discussion of Japan, and he said, "But isn't Russia more like us than Japan?"

My answer in a word is "No."

In fact, there is a form of shallow history and a kind of racism which suggests that because Russians are white and we are white and most Americans are white, that we must be more like the Russians; yet the fact is that Oriental Japanese, Asiatic Indians, Caucasians who happen to be Americans, have far more in common in political and legal values than any of us have with Caucasian Russians.

The fact is that in political values and government systems, India and Japan are more western than the Soviet Union. The fact is that while we have a deep cultural and societal difference with Hindu-Muslim and Buddhist Indians, we share with the people of India a deep reverence for the law, for the rights of the individual, for a free press, for elections.

The fact is that while we have deep differences in culture, history and geography with Japan, we share a similar process of law and government and society.

It is the Soviet Union which is a strange and barbaric country, a throw-back to the Middle East, a medieval czardom with a computerized modern secret police.

The weird frightening uniqueness of the Soviet empire in the late 20th century is captured brilliantly in Paul Johnson's "Modern Times, a History of the 20th Century."

The tragedy of the Russian people and the even greater tragedy of the dozens of other nationalist nationalities, oppressed, colonized and exploited by this weird mutation of a great Russian medieval empire, the Duchy of Muscovy, into a 20th-century empire, shaped by Leninism and held together by terror, is something we have to confront directly.

Solzhenitsyn has explained brilliantly in fiction and nonfiction the grim ruthless savage reality of the Soviet empire. It is there in his books for all who will simply look: "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich," the "Gulag Archipeligo," the "Cancer Ward," and others.

Can anyone read them without tears, think of them without deep sadness, ponder the nature of that evil empire without fear for freedom and humanity?

An American writer, Harrison Salisbury, caught the essence of Soviet tyranny, the savagery of the police state, the brutality of the system that Gorbachev heads in his novel "The Gates of Hell." It is a novel about two characters who resemble Solzhenitsyn and Andropov. Anyone who reads it will understand why President Reagan called the Soviet Union an evil

empire.

The Soviet Union is not only terrible for human freedom and human decency, it is the last great colonial empire.

Ed Luttwak's book, "The Grand Strategy of the Soviet Union," makes clear how obvious the Soviet empire is if you simply ask straightforward questions. What is the Soviet domination of Poland but an empire?

What is the Soviet domination of East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Bulgaria, if not an empire?

Our less sophisticated friends on the left will say, what is the difference between NATO and the Soviet empire in Eastern Europe? The difference is exactly the difference between slavery and freedom.

When De Gaulle left us to leave France, we pulled out.

When the East Germans rose in 1953, they were crushed.

When the Hungarians rose in 1956, they were crushed.

When the Czechs moved toward freedom in 1968, they were crushed.

When the Poles rose in Solidarity in 1980, the Soviet sent a simple message to Jaruzelski, "Either you crush the effort for freedom or Soviet troops will crush it."

Note the American confusion in the Gerald Ford-Jimmy Carter debate in 1976, because it illustrates the failure of vision and strategy in America. Technically, under the old rules of sovereignty, Poland is sovereign and Gerald Ford tried to say that, but he lost ground politically because Americans understood that it is dumb to think of Poland as a free country. While Poland may be technically sovereign by the most gruesome rules of law, it is clearly a colony of the transnational Soviet empire. So Jimmy Carter, who in fact favored George McGovern's policy, sounded tougher than Gerald Ford because the State Department had coached Ford to say that which was technically correct at a technical level, but at the vision level was clearly dumb and wrong.

Poland is not sovereign in any sense except in the most grotesque. Poland is a colony of the Soviet empire.

Similarly, the Ukraine today as we talk has a vote in the United Nations because it is theoretically free. There is a simple test. The United States, the Reagan administration, should ask the Soviet Union to allow us to open an embassy in Kiev, recognizing the Ukrainians. We should recognize the Ukraine as a separate country, or we should insist that the Soviet Union withdraw its phony puppet colony vote from the United Nations.

But note today how the Soviet empire wins both ways. It uses a transcendental strategy of lies and Western gullibility to get both. They get the vote in the United Nations for their colony and they get to keep the colony.

The weird frightening reality of the Soviet empire and the degree to which it is very different from Western values, the rule of law, free elections, freedom of religion and free press, can best be seen in the context of Russian history, Leninist ideology and the recent activities of the Soviet police state and the Soviet imperial effort through its Cuban colonial army.

Paul Johnson's brief description of czarist Russia and Lenin's adaptations of the 19th-century czarist secret police into a 20th-century totalitarian system is brief, concise and conclusive.

The Grenada papers, the 35,000 pounds of documents captured from the Communist dictatorship when Americans liberated Grenada and the 800 pages of documents published by the State Department proved conclusively that modern Leninist governments are systematically trained in Lenin's methods.

Since Gorbachev's wife is a professor of Marxism-Leninism, it should be obvious just how central Lenin's thoughts on power and tyranny are to the operations of the Soviet empire.

To try to understand the Soviet empire without studying Lenin is like trying to understand the U.S. Government with no knowledge of the American Constitution or American political parties; yet Lenin's writings are so ruthless, so savage, so antihuman, so alien to Western values, that most Americans shrug them off and refuse to take them seriously.

There is a real parallel between the psychological will to avoid reality and hide in the fantasy of pacifism and isolationism in the 1930's and the same determined psychological avoidance of reality on the religious left, the academic left, and the political left over the last 30 years.

No reasonable person can read the published open documents, Lenin's writings, the **speeches** of Brezhnev, Andropov, and Gorbachev, Castro's **speeches**, the "Seventy-two Hour Document of the Nicaraguan Communist Dictatorship," and their public statements, the published writings of the Vietnamese Communists since their victory, as cited by Fox Butterfield in his brilliant New York Times article, "The New Vietnam Historiography," the thousands of pages of documents from Grenada.

Given the consistent straightforward pattern of Soviet imperialism and its open published record of telling us what it will do, doing it, and then telling us it has done it, why is it so hard for the leftwing of American life to learn?

Eric Hofer's "The True Believer," John Francois Revel's, "How Democracies Perish," and Walter LeQuer's "The Terrible Secret" give us some of that understanding and perhaps of the three of them, Walter LeQuer's is the most powerful and the most frightening for LeQuer went back and looked at the annihilation of the Jewish people at Auschwitz, at the terrible holocaust of Nazi Germany, and he asked in his book, "How could westerners fail to have believed? How could they fail to have learned? How could they fail to have noticed?"

He cites perhaps most tellingly Felix Frankfurter, the great Justice of the Supreme Court, who when briefed by a European Jew on what was happening, said to the young man, "I cannot believe you."

And the young man started to object and he said, "Please, understand me. I believe the facts you say are true. It is simply impossible for me to believe it is possible for the world to be so horrible. I cannot in my soul, in my heart, believe the world could be so evil."

And yet as our troops walked through those concentration camps, it was clear the world was that evil.