

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 52 No. 2

SATURDAY, 15 APRIL, 1972

7p. (1s. 5d.) Fortnightly

Get US Out!*

THE U.N. THREATENS THE UNITED STATES

BY GARY ALLEN

(Continued)

The situation is so serious that when a New York federal grand jury stumbled across evidence of Communist penetration into the American staff of the U.N., it so alarmed the grand jury that it conducted a full-scale inquiry into the matter. Enough evidence was presented to enable the grand jury to release the following statement:

This jury must, as a duty to the people of the United States, advise the court that startling evidence has disclosed infiltration into the UN of an overwhelmingly large group of disloyal U.S. citizens, many of whom are closely associated with the international Communist movement. This group numbers scores of individuals, most of whom have long records of federal employment, and at the same time have been connected with persons and organizations subversive to this country. Their positions at the time we subpoenaed them were ones of trust and responsibility in the UN Secretariat and in its specialized agencies.

The resultant publicity prompted the Senate Committee on the Judiciary to initiate its own investigation—with the same results. The Chairman of that Senate Committee released the following statement at the conclusion of those Hearings:

I am appalled at the extensive evidence indicating that there is today in the UN among the American employees there, the greatest concentration of Communists that this Committee has ever encountered. Those American officials who have been called represent a substantial percentage of the people who are representing us in the UN . . . These people occupy high positions. They have high salaries and almost all of these people have, in the past, been employees in the U.S. Government in high and sensitive positions. I believe that the evidence shows that the security officers of our government knew, or at least had reason to know, that these people have been Communists for many years. In fact, some of these people have been the subject of charges before Congress before and during their employment with the UN. It is more than strange that such a condition existed in the Government of the U.S., and it is certainly more than strange that these people should be transferred to the UN and charged to the American quota.

The point was well summed up by Mr. Joseph Kornfeder, a former top Communist who was trained in Moscow, when he spoke before the Congress of Freedom in 1955:

How many Communists, fellow travelers and sympathizers there are among the UN employees, no one

seems to know, but judging by their number among the American personnel, there can be no doubt that the Communists control the UN and its staff association, and use it for all it's worth; which means that most of the special agencies at UN headquarters are, in fact, operated by them and coordinated through the Communist cell in the UN staff association.

Given the complexion of the U.N. staff, the headquarters of the U.N. could hardly be located in a worse place from the standpoint of American security. When the Rockefeller family donated the land on the East River for construction of the "House That Hiss Built", the Soviets were delighted. One of their delegates, Mr. Saskin, even served on the site-selection committee. And the Manhattan-based U.N. has provided the Communists with the best possible center for subversive operations. As F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover has testified:

Attention is called to the fact that many of the incidents and causes previously cited involved Soviet employees of the United Nations. They are guests of the United States and are supposedly dedicated in the cause of international peace. But they are, in fact, carefully selected envoys of the international Communist conspiracy, trained in trickery and deceit and dedicated to the concept of fully exploiting the freedoms of the countries they seek to destroy. It is too much to expect that they would not subvert the United Nations.

The nationally syndicated columnist Henry J. Taylor adds:

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover reports that 865 Soviet-bloc personnel and more than 1,200 dependents, all with diplomatic immunity against arrest, and most of them accredited to the United Nations and not to the United States, are stationed here. His bureau estimates that about 80% of the Soviet-bloc personnel are intelligence officers and not diplomats at all.

Nothing could be a heavier, easier and quicker blow to Red espionage than to put the U.N. headquarters elsewhere.†

In his nationally syndicated column of October 7, 1971, Paul Scott comments on the effect of adding the Red

(continued on page 3)

* From *American Opinion*, January 1972.†New York newspapermen Pierre J. Huss and George Carpozi Jr. have authored a book titled *Red Spies In The U.N.* which details the more dramatic stories of F.B.I. capture of Communist spies. The punishment for a spy who is caught is to be sent back to the Soviet Union. He is immediately replaced with another U.N.-protected spy.

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. Scouler, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

In our previous issue (for 1st April) the serial number should have been Vol. 52 No. 1.

Brussels, Dunkirk and the British Sovereignty and History

More than four hundred years ago King Henry VIII asserted the reality of British national sovereignty and his country's independence, which came to be embodied as the sovereignty of the King or Queen in Parliament, representing the will and identity of the people of Britain. It became a constitutional tradition too that no Parliament could bind its successor.

It is now proposed that this sovereignty shall be surrendered, that laws, regulations and taxation promulgated in 'Europe' in the past *and* in the future are to be given the force of law in the United Kingdom *without further enactment*. This is rule by Decree, the mechanism of totalitarian government. These 'laws' cover government, taxation, and the methods of justice. This would be the reversal of a thousand years of British history, and of a major influence in the development of civilisation throughout the world.

Law and Sanctions

There can be no law unless there exist sanctions to enforce it. In a democracy, laws are made with the consent of the governed, and that consent supports the forces — the police — which keep the peace.

But when there is no general consent, there is apt to be rebellion; and then the forces to maintain the law become military forces. The most recent example is Ireland; but before that there was Czechoslovakia. And because the use of its own military forces against its own people is repugnant to those forces, foreign troops are employed. That is the meaning of the Brezhnev Doctrine, which commits the use of Soviet troops to the support of socialism — soon, according to Brezhnev, to be extended throughout the world.

So that if Britain rebelled against "Community" law foreign troops could be sent in to quell it; and this would be legal under the European Communities Act, if ever such came into being.

Reparations

By 'joining' the European Community, Britain undertakes to pay hundreds of millions of Pounds sterling annually and in perpetuity to Europe. This is precisely the same as paying *reparations* for having lost a war. And, of course, as wars are fought on one side at least to preserve national

sovereignty, the paying of levies to Europe would mean that we acknowledged defeat in war — without even fighting.

These reparations must be paid out of the *profits* made by outside trade, or else by a lowering of the standard of living of the British. This necessary expansion of trade means a great expansion in the importation of the raw materials of manufacture, and these have to be paid for, together with freight-charges, insurance, and the deterioration of plant. Thus if Britain buys wool from Australia to make clothes for Europeans, most of whom are already fully clothed, or for under-developed peoples who cannot pay for them anyway, it is only the profit on manufacture which is available for the extra taxation to meet the European levies.

But further: Nobody has yet stated what actual benefits Britain — or rather the British people — would gain by joining Europe. Indeed, it has been suggested even by the Government that no benefit at all might be felt for several years to come. Worse still, it is felt in certain influential quarters that the poor countries are poor because the rich countries are not only rich, but wastefully rich, calling for, as the *Times* newspaper put it, "a re-direction of the collective energies of men [by] a drastic revision of political and social energies". As in Eastern Europe for example. Even Chairman Mao could hardly have put it more succinctly.

The Ills of Europe

All the countries of "The Six", and Britain — even America! — are suffering from rising unemployment and rising prices — a deadly combination — with consequent social unrest and increasing disorder. But if you have several people suffering from smallpox, you do not cure them by bundling them into a common ward. But you make it easier to administer unpleasant treatment, for hospital "warders" are not inhibited by family feelings.

Inflation and unemployment in several countries are not abolished by making them one. But the draconian remedies which may be necessary are more easily ordered *and policed* by a Government remote from the people. You can probably have a drink with your local Councillor at the pub; but some of those European bureaucrats might be hard to get to know.

The Will of the People

Democracy is supposed to be government in accordance with the will of the people — or at least a majority of the people, so far as that can be ascertained. An election is a test of a government's ability to retain the consent of the majority — which Mr. Heath now seems pretty sure he could not. Hence his *threat* of an election — a tacit admission that many of his Party would lose their seats. This of course reflects his own estimate of the degree of consent now obtaining for his European policy.

Every test of public opinion concerning joining the Common Market has shown a majority against; and those who "Don't know" cannot be said to have given their consent, let alone their "full-hearted" consent.

But it is not democracy to manipulate the machinery of Parliament to secure adhesion to a Treaty even before its contents and implications are generally known; or to engage in "intimidation and shady dealing" to coerce Members of Parliament; or to use the immense resources of government to mount a propaganda campaign which cannot be matched by its opponents.

The Assertion of Sovereignty

In this situation it is necessary to assert the fundamental sovereignty of the people. It could be done by an election, if the issue were narrowed. It could be done by a referendum, if the question were properly put. But if these expressions of the popular will are denied to them, the people themselves must move.

This can be done if sufficient *individuals* assert their individual sovereignty and initiative by addressing to their various Representatives in Parliament, their lack of consent — their *opposition* to — Mr. Heath's European policies.

This on a sufficient scale would make it evident to the Government, the people themselves, and the enemies who require reparations from us that there is not that full-hearted consent without which, Mr. Heath promised, there would be no question of joining Europe — just as there was no question when Hitler wanted us to join.

The initiative of the little people saved Britain at Dunkirk. But this time postcards, not fishing-boats, can win this battle for Britain.

The Means to Hand

Among ten people who are prepared to address and post a card to their Representatives, there will probably be one at least who can find ten others; and amongst those ten, another who can find ten more . . . The sum total of these individual acts, all directed to a common purpose, could be a massive demonstration and assertion of the peoples' will, and a unique act of democracy which no government could withstand.

We must ourselves SAVE OUR SOVEREIGNTY.

Get US Out!

(continued from page 1)

Chinese to the already huge bank of Communist spies in the United Nations:

Espionage will be an even greater danger now that Red China has been admitted to the U.N. Since the size of each country's U.N. delegation and staff reflects the size of the country's population, and since Red China has between 700 and 800 million people, she might be allowed 3,000 or more diplomats and staff members, each of whom would possess diplomatic immunity. Their suit-cases and trunks could not be examined by American Customs officials. Would that suggest wholesale, unimpeded importation of heroin into this country, in addition to countless spying activities? The most obvious and practical solution to the drug and spying dangers to our country is to get the U.S. out of the United Nations and the U.N. out of the United States.

Before the admission of Red China to the U.N. J. Edgar Hoover testified concerning the consequence of such a development:

Communist China represents one of the gravest long-range security threats and the FBI is continuing to devote its close attention to coverage of possible Chinese Communist agents and sympathizers in the United States. There is every likelihood that Chinese Communist intelligence activities in this country will increase in the next few years, particularly if Communist China

is recognized by the United Nations and is thereby able to have a diplomatic mission in this country.

And Red China has wasted no time in moving its spies into the U.N. headquarters. As *Human Events* reported in its issue for November 20, 1971:

Red China's 22-man United Nations delegation received a tumultuous reception upon its arrival in New York last week, with the press seeming to tumble over itself with compliments for the "high quality" of Mao's diplomatic representatives. But even as the new delegation was being hailed by various groups in this country, evidence is accumulating that Red China intends to employ the U.N. as a major tool for promoting Maoist-style espionage and subversion.

China's Deputy Foreign Minister, Chiao Kuan-hua, head of the first Peking delegation to the U.N., is a top intelligence operative for Peking. Chiao's deputy, Huang Hua, is described by American intelligence sources as "a gifted saboteur and espionage artist".

The radical *Chicago Sun-Times*, displaying typical "Liberal" nonchalance toward the Communists' use of the U.N. as a base for spying, said it was assumed Red China would include spies in its delegation, "but Peking, moving into the international diplomatic spotlight for the first time, had not been expected to get into the game so soon"—especially with men of such flagrant reputations for espionage as Chiao Kuan-hua and Huang Hua.

Never in recorded history has a nation permitted an avowed enemy openly to pursue its policies of conquest, on its home territory, within so vast a diplomatic sanctuary—a sanctuary supposedly dedicated to peace. At least Steuben should be employed to remodel the glass palace on the East River in the shape of a Trojan Horse.

On the surface, however, the U.N. often appears to be ludicrous, a sort of Mad Hatter's dream. More than half of the nations in the U.N. have fewer people than New York City. A fifth of all U.N. members have populations under 2 million. These are the microstates. Their per capita gross national product is as low as \$50 annually. Yet each of these nations has a vote equal to ours, with the result that "nations" such as Qatar, Bahrein, Bhutan, and Oman now hold the balance of power in the General Assembly. This has been caused by the fragmentation of the former French and British empires into a veritable plethora of tinhorn nations.

All of which resulted from a deliberate policy of the *Insiders* of international finance, who know that in most cases they can buy the political leaders of the new ministates, each of which has a vote equal to ours. "Liberal" propagandists, however, beg us not to be upset by this. As journalist William Ryan recently put it, "attempts to downgrade the voting status of present smaller members could, in the view of seasoned diplomats, do much damage". Ah, those *seasoned diplomats!*

While America has only 1 of the 168 votes in the General Assembly, it pays approximately one-third of the U.N.'s bills. Periodically the United States also buys U.N. bonds to keep the Trojan Horse from sinking into a quagmire of red ink. These bonds are guaranteed to be repaid the day after the Confederate war debt is amortized in full. The Communist bloc is the major debtor in the World Organization, being a grand total of \$118,753,898 in arrears, and accounting for two-thirds of the U.N.'s total debt.

The fact that the U.S. must carry a vastly disproportionate share of the U.N.'s financial load, even as the Reds shirk theirs, quite naturally makes Americans angry. But it is probably the least important complaint about the U.N. The real threat it poses to our nation lies in the fact that so many "responsible" Americans, many of them in high political office, are committed to a program to convert the U.N. into an international superstate—the longtime goal of the *Insiders* who manipulate the Communist Conspiracy.

If the *Insiders* of international finance and industry intend to own and control the resources of the entire planet, then it follows that there must be a government empowered to protect their property and empire. So the Conspirators work to establish their world superstate, both through their eminently respectable fronts like the Council on Foreign Relations (which openly proclaims that its goal is a "new world order") and through the Communists who forthrightly maintain:

... dictatorship can be established only by a victory of socialism in different countries or groups of countries, after which the proletariat republics would unite on federal lines with those already in existence, and this system of federal unions would expand . . . at length forming the World Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

This is why Red China had to be admitted to the United Nations. As James Reston, resident savant of the *New York Times* and apparent spokesman for the Establishment *Insiders*, has expressed it:

... the President's forthcoming talks with Chou En-lai are only the beginning of a long process in which disagreements on specific questions are unavoidable, but the clear objective of which is the creation of mutual respect leading to a better world order.

... it is clear that no really effective new world order can be created without the help of the Chinese Communists . . .

The most vocal organization working to convince Americans to accept such a "new world order" is the United World Federalists, a group whose membership is heavily interlocked with that of the Council on Foreign Relations. The openly expressed purpose of World Federalists is to convert the U.N. into a world government encompassing both Communist and non-Communist states. Speaking for the *Insiders*, financier James Warburg, whose father was primarily responsible for creation of the Federal Reserve System, and whose relatives financed the Communist Revolution in Russia, told a Senate Committee on February 17, 1950: "We shall have world government whether you like it or not, if not by consent by conquest."

According to the United World Federalists, "the United Nations offers the best available basis for world peace if it can be given adequate power to make, interpret and enforce world law. We believe this can be achieved by amendments to the United Nations Charter". The amendments which they recommend include turning over all military weapons to a U.N. army, giving the U.N. authority to tax, removing the veto from the executive branch, requiring universal membership without the right of secession, and empowering a court system with jurisdiction over all nations and individuals.

President Nixon is, of course, far too clever actually to join the World Federalists, but he has actively supported their legislative program since his early days in Congress. In

the October 1948 issue of the United World Federalist publication *World Government News*, on Page 14, there appears the following announcement:

Richard Nixon: Introduced world government resolution (HCR 68) 1947, and ABC (World Government) resolution 1948.

Of special interest to the U.W.F. throughout its history has been its campaign to repeal the Connally Reservation, whereby the United States has reserved to itself the power to decide what matters are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the U.S., and therefore may not be brought under the jurisdiction of the World Court. The Federalists want repeal of the Connally Reservation, which would mean that the United States would accept "as binding the ruling of the International Court of Justice [*World Court*] on disarmament, on interpretation of the U.N. Charter and laws, and of international treaties".

The abolition of the Connally Reservation would leave us at the mercy of the Afro-Asian and Iron Curtain blocs that dominate the U.N. It would be tantamount to surrendering American sovereignty to our enemies, and would thus be a gross violation of the Presidential oath to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States".

Yet Richard Nixon has for many years advocated the repeal of that Connally Reservation. Incredulous patriots who wrote Nixon about his advocacy of its repeal were "sent a copy of a letter dated April 14, 1960, from Richard Nixon to Eugene Pulliam, publisher of the *Phoenix Republic* and *Gazette*, in which Nixon flatly stated that he favored such repeal, declaring: "I believe . . . that the intervening years have shown that our so-called 'self-judging reservation' is no longer necessary."

President Nixon, whose warm endorsements of their program are widely distributed by the World Federalists, actually goes far beyond seeking repeal of the Connally Reservation, and openly advocates "world rule through world law"—the official slogan of the United World Federalists—in which the World Court is to be made the Supreme Court of the World.*

(To be continued)

*See the *New York Times*, April 14, 1959.

ST. GEORGE'S DAY

The St. George's Day Society has pointed out to us that Monsieur Pompidou is holding his referendum on 23rd April. They suggest that special efforts should be made to mark that day here by activity tending to preserve the freedom of this country.

Instruct your M.P. Send for printed postcards and take action in your constituency.

18 for 10p., 36 for 20p., 72 for 40p., 144 for 80p.

POSTCARD CAMPAIGN
K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.
245 CANN HALL ROAD, LONDON, E.11 3NL