

# THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 52. No. 14

SATURDAY, 30 SEPTEMBER, 1972

7p (1s. 5d.) Fortnightly

### Moscow's Move\*

#### THEY'VE PUT POISON IN THE SALT

By MEDFORD EVANS

(Continued)

Well, someone will say, it may be pretty bad—giving up our national sovereignty and all—but at least the Russians are in the same fix.

Not exactly. It seems worth noting that the *Moscow Declaration Of Principles*, signed for our nation by our President, was not signed by the President (N. V. Podgorny), nor yet by the Premier (A. N. Kosygin), of the Soviet Union. It was signed, in fact, by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Brezhnev. Richard Nixon, whatever his ideology, officially represents a nation, the United States of America. Leonid Brezhnev, whatever his relationship to the Soviet Union considered as a nation, represents Marxist-Leninist ideology. In the case of the Czecho-Slovakian crisis of 1968, Brezhnev enunciated a "doctrine" (which was given his name) that nations which depart from the Marxist-Leninist Line may be forcibly disciplined by nations which maintain ideological purity—provided, of course, that adequate power is available to the enforcers, who are assumed to be an international collective . . . . a kind of incipient World Authority.

The President of the United States has no authority over anyone not a citizen or resident of the United States. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has authority which we outsiders cannot precisely define, but which obviously extends far beyond the bounds of the Soviet Union.

Nixon and Brezhnev did not sign the *Moscow Declaration* as equals. The pretensions of Marxism-Leninism are world-wide; the pretensions of the United States are not. To sign this *Declaration*, and the A.B.M. Treaty and the Interim Agreement which preceded it, our President, who represents but one country, had to journey to the Kremlin, which is the Communist Vatican and represents Marxist-Leninists in every part of the world except possibly Red China and Albania. In fact, Brezhnev has many followers in the United States—not just Communist Party members, but the much more numerous class of individuals who have been influenced by the more vogueish intellectual trends of the times. On the other hand, Nixon has no followers at all in the Soviet Union. If our President and Soviet citizens move in the same direction, it is not because any of them is following him, but because all are following the Party Line—they religiously, he possibly by coincidence.

But it is nonsense to say that the President of the United States follows the Communist Party Line by coincidence. Presidents of the United States do not act alone or unad-

vised. Presidential actions of the magnitude of the pilgrimage to Peking and the mission to Moscow are taken only after prolonged consideration of the whole international environment. The White House always knows what the Communist Party Line is. To be sure, when the White House follows that Line, such following is not necessarily subversive; after all, there can well be occasions when it is expedient for American policy to coincide with Soviet policy. But such coinciding is never coincidence. It is deliberate, either from some diplomatic wish to gratify the Kremlin, or from pursuit of the same objective for either the same or different reasons. In any case, in such matters the President is always thoroughly if not well advised. Who advised President Richard Nixon in the matter of the SALT agreements?

Obviously, Henry Kissinger among others. Not only does he hold the formal position of Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, not only is he reputed to have the mesmeric powers of a Svengali or a Rasputin over Mr. Nixon, but he has established himself as one of the most persuasive of counselors of the intellectually elite corps of scientists and scholars who since the Second World War† have established themselves as a syndicate for control of all matters relating to the nucleus of the atom. Strictly speaking, Henry Kissinger is not part of this nuclear syndicate. He would no doubt be the first to admit that he is not qualified, scientifically or philosophically, to sit in the inner circle where Albert Einstein and Bertrand Russell, James Franck and Julius Robert Oppenheimer, have sat. Nor does he have the brilliance of that half-mad genius, the late Leo Szilard—a key figure in the founding, during the years 1939-1941, of the project which gave the atomic bomb to the United States and a key figure in the years from 1944 to his death in 1964 of the effort, eventually known as the Pugwash Movement, to take the atomic bomb and all its nuclear descendants away from the United States.†

(continued on page 2)

\* From *American Opinion*, September, 1972.

† And I know not how long before, but surely they were embryonically organised as long ago as the 1920s at the University of Goettingen in Germany.

† Dr. Szilard told a dinner meeting of *The Nation Associates* in New York in December of 1945: "During 1943 and part of 1944, our greatest worry was the possibility that Germany would perfect an atomic bomb before the invasion of Europe . . . . In 1945, when we ceased worrying about what the Germans might do to us, we began to worry about what the government of the United States might do to other countries." Who is "we"?

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

### FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free: One year £2.60 (52/-), Six months £1.30 (26/-).

Offices—

Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11. Tel. 01-534 7395  
Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Tel. 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001  
Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001 (Editorial Head Office)

### THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2603. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougement, P.Q., General Deputy Chairman and Secretary, H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

Vol. 51. No. 19

Saturday, 30 September, 1972

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Sometimes, when disaster threatens, it is possible to take steps to avert it, or at least to mitigate the consequences. But when disaster is foreseen as a probability or a certainty, and nothing is done towards precluding it in time, the time will come when nothing *can* be done. Mr. Enoch Powell warned years ago that British (?) immigration policy was leading towards disaster — and was reviled and disowned by the Establishment for doing so. Now the time has come when disaster is beginning without hope of mitigation.

British immigration policy, however, is only part and parcel of a more comprehensive policy which, as Mr. Heath boasts, has been pursued by successive Administrations; and it is a policy leading to a more comprehensive disaster than the immigration crisis. The British face extinction as a nation; and individual survivors and their descendants face absorption in a soulless international tyranny of population control, miscegenation, direction of labour, and rationing. If salvation is possible, it may come from outside — by the overthrow of the Conspiracy by patriotic Americans *in America*. Only that which is intrinsically stronger than evil can prevail. Our work of exposure must continue.

## Melting-pot Policy

"So Charles Swift believes that Peterborough has room for a further 400 Asians to add to the 1,000 already resident in town. It seems that he is interested in everything and everyone apart from the residents who originally supported him." In these words, "Puzzled Peterborian" neatly describes the callous attitude of politicians to their electors, for Mr. Heath at national level is only the local Mr. Swift writ large. Another Peterborian, Clive Farrar, also protests at the "burden and indignity" of all these Asians being "thrust on us", and asks what of those "who would wish to retain a Britain for our children" with a British people identifiable as such (*Peterborough Evening Telegraph*, August 22, 1972). I wonder what these worried citizens would think of the view of *The Times* (Aug. 14, 1972) that "immigrants already settled here stand to suffer more than any one else" from a greater rate of immigration than the country can digest "or than its prejudices can tolerate".

Mr. Powell has disclosed (*Daily Express*, Aug. 16, 1972) that "as long ago as 1963 Cabinet Ministers were aware that the Asians in East Africa could present a huge immigration problem". But they decided to keep quiet. Mr. Derek Marks points out that "the last years of British rule in East Africa were significant for the Asian support of rabid African nationalism" and holds that the 1968 voucher system of 3,500 admissions is "the sum total of our legal responsibility". Sir John Fletcher-Cooke expresses sympathy for the Asians but adds that they and the British Government "failed to realise that peoples of one culture and background will never willingly share power, political or economic, with those of another culture" (*The Times*, Aug. 15, 1972). Sir John Lomax hopes that the "sting of rebuff to our envoys" may lead to drastic measures to safeguard the nation from the next flood, adding that "there are several—some worse—impending" (Aug. 17, 1972).

The Asians themselves, who are clearly and rightly tenacious of their cultural traditions, can only find home among people of the same culture. We used to have little respect for people who were "going native" by abandoning their own culture. They could find such communities in their country of cultural origin, if allowed to go there, or in South Africa, where the Indian community has a status free from harassment. I do not know how many, if any, would be welcome there at this time, but at least South Africa has recognised possibilities of friction and only expels those who interfere with their system. Decades ago, they repatriated the Chinese because they could not cope with another race and culture, but they did not expel them in the Ugandan manner which leaves the victims high and dry, shuttled about in some cases and in many others forced on reluctant hosts.

The *Daily Express* article refers to the "negligence" and "incompetence" of politicians, but in view of Mr. Heath's boasted accomplishment of doing what neither Napoleon nor Hitler could achieve and of his deliberate flaunting of British opinion and eroding of British sovereignty, it would take a huge measure of credulosity to accept that politicians were incompetent or negligent in their unpatriotic work. In fact one politician can do as much damage to Britain as a thousand Asians.

—H.S.

## Moscow's Move

(continued from page 1)

But though Henry Kissinger is hardly a full-fledged nuclear academician, he is a remarkably able factotum of the intelligentsia—most admirably equipped to be chief liaison officer between the Vedic pantheon of Pugwash and the comparatively rude melee of the political arena. Kissinger made his reputation with a book entitled *Nuclear Weapons And Foreign Policy*, published for the Council on Foreign Relations (that's right) by Harper in 1957. The work then seemed conservative, even militaristic, compared to previous (and subsequent) positions of the intelligentsia on disarmament. Kissinger wrote:

*Because harmony between different social systems is explicitly rejected by Soviet doctrine, the renunciation of force in the face of it will create a vacuum into which the Soviet leadership can move with impunity. . . . "We will bury you," Nikita S. Krushchev has said, and the democracies would have been spared much misery but for their penchant on insisting that*

dictators do not mean what they say. "Political power," Mao Tse-tung has said, "grows out of the barrel of a gun. . . ."

The dilemma of the nuclear period can, therefore, be defined as follows: the enormity of modern weapons makes the thought of war repugnant, but the refusal to run any risks would amount to giving the Soviet rulers a blank check.

In his concluding chapter the C.F.R.'s Professor Kissinger wrote:

*Whenever peace—conceived as the avoidance of war—has become the primary objective of a power or group of powers, international relations have been at the mercy of the state willing to forego peace . . . . Peace, therefore, cannot be aimed at directly; it is the expression of certain conditions and power relationships. It is to these relationships—not to peace as such—that diplomacy must address itself.*

Can you believe that those passages are from the same man who has been hailed as our President's chief advisor on the pilgrimage to Peking and the mission to Moscow, both of which Mr. Nixon described to the Congress on June first as "part of a great national journey for peace"? Henry Kissinger's apparent militancy, not to say belligerence, against Communist Russia and Communist China (with emphasis on the former) fooled many Conservatives in 1957. It did not fool the Council on Foreign Relations or the Rockefeller Establishment. They evidently foresaw correctly that, given the power to do so, Kissinger would be as quick as the next man to prepare an American President for a diplomatic journey of which "peace" was, allegedly at least, the primary objective.

You don't suppose, do you, that Nixon, Kissinger, and their whole entourage were fooling the Chinese and Russians, and actually went to Peking and Moscow as spies? You know I don't really believe that. If I did, I wouldn't tip their hand. No, the Peking and Moscow trips were made as giant steps toward realization of the master plan of the international fraternity of (let us call them) political "scientists" who, using the U.S. atomic bomb project as their springboard, made their great political breakthrough at the conclusion of World War II, and have increasingly determined foreign policy for the United States.

The history of atomic politics cannot be, and should not be, written until the political struggle for control of the atom is finally decided. Until now, virtually everything that has been published about the atom has been written to influence the outcome of that struggle rather than simply to record it. First we were persuaded that nuclear weapons are too horrible to use, even in defense of our wonderful country against the wicked Communists. Now we are being persuaded that our racist, imperialist, corrupt, and polluted country is not worth defending, and that what we really need is to learn about acupuncture from those marvelously patient and peaceful Red Chinese, and about space exploration from those incredibly clever and peace-loving Russians. (Meanwhile, we should quit wasting money on our own Apollo moonshots.) Our President journeys to Peking and Moscow for who knows what specific purposes, but obviously for the general purpose of promoting a merger with the Communist world. Sample news bulletin as I write: We are to sell the Russians—"The Soviet Union has agreed to buy"

is the way the announcer put it—\$750 million worth of grain—ON CREDIT. You know that emphasis is mine. The media sure didn't emphasize it. It means American taxpayers foot the bill.

But that is a detail. The merger that counts is the merger of nuclear weapons. The SALT agreements of May 26, 1972, do not of themselves effect such a merger, but they are one giant step, and the *Declaration Of Principles* of May 29, 1972, spells out the intention. The war for control of nuclear weapons is being won by opponents of American independence because Americans don't want to think about all that atomic stuff. And remember that whoever controls the world's stockpile of nuclear weapons can destroy nations at will. There will be no "deterrence" once the World Authority has its monopoly.

Establishment of an international "Atomic Development Authority" was officially first proposed in March 1946 in the so-called Acheson-Lilienthal *Report On The International Control Of Atomic Energy*, conceded to have been largely authored by Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer. The *Report* recommended that the proposed world atomic Authority construct and operate nuclear-weapons plants in countries around the world to achieve "strategic balance." The Authority would own and control all atomic energy laboratories and production plants, and all fissionable (now called special nuclear) materials. No nation would own or control any nuclear weapons, nuclear power reactors, or basic nuclear research laboratories. Nations would be forbidden to own uranium 235 or plutonium more strictly than Americans are forbidden to own gold.

The *Report* did not spell out the machinery of enforcement, but by emphasizing the internationalization—one could more accurately say, denationalization—of nuclear materials and products, by emphasizing the ownership of all these by the world Atomic Development Authority (A.D.A.), it laid the foundation, which has never been essentially altered though it has been greatly enlarged, for the coming World Authority which the SALT agreements now so far advance, and which the Brezhnev-Nixon *Declaration Of Principles* places on the agenda for further negotiations in the future.

Professor B. T. Feld, writing in the *Bulletin Of The Atomic Scientist* for June 1972, while praising the SALT agreements as "the greatest step towards world peace since the Sermon on the Mount," yet demurs at certain "deficiencies" and says, "We are torn between the impulse to cry 'bravo' and the desire to shout 'fraud'" —which is very likely the way he also feels about the Sermon on the Mount. Particular "deficiencies" mentioned are the failure to have "a total ban on ABMs" (the treaty allows each nation defense of its capital and one other defense site, as we noted at some length above); the failure to prohibit M.I.R.V.s (multiple independently targettable reentry vehicles—they enable one I.C.B.M. to carry several warheads, each aimed at a different objective); and, the failure to put "a lid on improved accuracy."

Professor Feld (he is not eccentric in scientific circles—he is a scientist *a la mode par excellence*) does not want the United States (or, let's be fair, the Soviet Union either) to be able to defend itself, nor does he want offensive weapons to achieve maximum accuracy. (An inaccurate weapon aimed at a military target might hit an open city.) Professor Feld

obviously is quite sincere in wanting both the United States and the Soviet Union to be disarmed. He wants all arms to be controlled by a World Authority.

The title of Professor Feld's article is "Looking To SALT-II." Correction of the indicated deficiencies in SALT-I, he writes, "must be put at the top of the agenda for SALT-II; and *we must not tolerate* any unnecessary delays in getting on with the job." I have added the emphasis in the quoted words to highlight the arrogance which I suspect Professor Feld is not conscious of having revealed. But *you*, Richard Nixon, had better take notice. The *Bulletin Of The Atomic Scientists* since 1945, and its scion the Pugwash Movement since 1957, have been used successfully to chart the course of international relations, influencing both the United States and the Soviet Union. The scientists of the *Bulletin* and of Pugwash are *Insiders'* insiders.

But there is no fear that the President will not heed them. As long ago as the spring of 1950 it was Richard Nixon, then a Congressman from California and a notorious *anti-Communist* (Alger Hiss had just been convicted), who vouched for the patriotic loyalty of Dr. Julius Robert Oppenheimer when ex-Communists Paul and Sylvia Crouch testified that they had seen Doctor Oppenheimer at a closed Communist meeting. Richard Nixon had long known about all that a layman could be expected to know concerning atomic scientists; he knows how many of them have been correctly charged with Communist sympathies; more important, he knows how faithfully they have for twenty-five years adhered to the line that national sovereignty must be abrogated and a World Authority established which would disarm all nations by assuming full and absolutely monopolistic control of nuclear weapons. As Congressman, Senator, Vice President, and President, Richard Nixon has followed the speeches and writings of the "atomic scientists" well enough to understand that *nobody can control the world until somebody controls all nuclear weapons*. Thus the most exigent demand of one-worlders has been since 1945 international—or to use a more accurate word which was a favorite of Einstein's—*supranational* control of nuclear weapons. Richard Nixon understands this command.

And he understands the uses of power.

Say this for Mr. Nixon: While the *Insiders* of nuclear science have spoken and written and perhaps acted in secret, *he* has acted in the full blaze of world-wide publicity. As early as 1950 he was calling for a World Authority with its own army under the United Nations. And he has carried on his campaign without seriously adverse political repercussions; indeed we are told that he is more popular now than before he crawled to Peking and Moscow. How can this be so? Because people do not believe that Nixon is doing what everybody sees him doing, for nobody would do things like that where anybody could see him.

It is a brilliant psychological game.

The struggle for the world, or significant subdivisions thereof, is carried on by Communists through largely psychological means. There is nothing psychological, however, about the executions which followed victory when Communists seized Russia, China, and Cuba. But Communists will hardly use nuclear weapons physically to conquer the United States; such an undertaking is wholly impractical for any number of reasons, including the Potemkin-village aspect of Russian and Chinese nuclear installations. Yet what cannot be done

by nuclear weapons physically can be done psychologically. Americans have been induced to fear *their own* nuclear weapons. Like a conscientious drunk they want somebody to take the stuff away from them. Nuclear weapons *in general* are bad (it is felt), and really should be taken away from people and locked up somewhere. Though our President has not yet put us on cold turkey, he has imposed a limited ration in SALT-I, and with SALT-II we shall no doubt be completely cured of our addiction.

The analogy is not good enough to pursue very far, but before dropping it we may observe that the cure of this addiction could be worse than the disease, if the physicians in charge of the drying-out tank used all the booze they confiscated to keep themselves perpetually drunk with power. A World Authority with a monopoly of nuclear weapons would be a greater object of terror than an arms race between nations. Nineteen-Eighty-Four is worse than the Old West.

Richard Nixon is not the first U.S. President to play this deadly game. The Acheson-Lilienthal Report was produced under the Truman Administration. Dwight Eisenhower in 1953 set up an "Atoms for Peace" program promoting international control of the atom; in 1958 he unilaterally suspended U.S. nuclear tests, though just two years earlier he had condemned Adlai Stevenson for even suggesting bilateral suspension. John F. Kennedy secured the rehabilitation of atomic-security risk Julius Robert Oppenheimer, and counted as a triumph of his Administration the Test-Ban Treaty with the Soviet Union in July 1963. Lyndon Johnson promoted the Nonproliferation Treaty of 1967. All these acts (more could be mentioned) are indicia of influence of the *Insiders* of the *Bulletin Of The Atomic Scientists* and the Pugwash Movement, for all were incubated in the pages of the magazine and meetings of the participants in the Movement.

What President Nixon has done that is unprecedented is to sign with the top Soviet Communists a declaration looking toward "general and complete disarmament" of the United States. Yes, and of the Soviet Union as now constituted, too, though for the time being she is allowed a position superior to ours. But there is to be "an effective system of international security," and this system will *not* be disarmed. It will have a monopoly of arms. And there is no provision that it will not be a Communist system. In point of fact, since it will rest—already does rest—upon a coalition with the world's leading Communists (Professor Feld has called for inclusion of Communist China during SALT-II, and what Professor Feld and company call for they get, so far), it can only conclude by being Communist, as all such coalitions do.

These negotiations with Communist China and Communist Russia, which may well mean the end of the Free World, could never have come about if various atomic scientists and Pugwash participants had not previously made contact with Communist leaders. It is tragic that the President of the United States evidently did not realize what Mario Puzo's young Godfather and his *Consiglieri* knew so well: That whoever had made the contact had turned traitor.

(Concluded)

---

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., 245 CANN HALL ROAD, LONDON, E.11, FOR BOOKS ON SOCIAL CREDIT AND THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL-COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY. FREE BOOK LIST ON REQUEST.

---