

# THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 52 No. 5

SATURDAY, 27 MAY, 1972

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

### Get US Out!\*

#### THE U.N. THREATENS THE UNITED STATES

BY GARY ALLEN

(Continued from our issue for 15 April, 1972)

A world government naturally necessitates a world tax system. The U.N. has already requested a worldwide sales tax which would, coincidentally, fall on items purchased in greatest abundance by Americans. But Americans would not now sit still for being taxed directly by the U.N., and such propositions as the global sales tax will have to wait until we are locked into a world superstate from which we have no right of secession. In the meantime, the Nixon Administration is preparing schemes to ship as much tax money out the back door to the U.N. as possible.

The *Department of State Bulletin* for October 5, 1970, contains Mr. Nixon's message entitled "Foreign Assistance For The 'Seventies,'" in which the President states: "The future of American youth is directly related to the future of the United Nations", and recommends that foreign aid be greatly expanded and channeled through the U.N. and its subsidiary organizations, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. It has long been a goal of the internationalist *Insiders* to channel American foreign aid through the U.N. The next step will be to have the General Assembly determine the amount of foreign aid that we will be required to pay, and to whom.

On December 17, 1968, President-elect Nixon told reporters following a visit to the U.N.: "[It is] our intention in these days ahead to do everything that we can to strengthen this organization . . ." The ultimate move to strengthen the U.N. is to give it a monopoly on military power. Up until that time, the U.S. can still get out of the U.N., regardless of how anyone may interpret the Charter.† The object is to disarm the United States in favor of a U.N. Army.

On June 23, 1961, John J. McCloy, Special Advisor to the President on Disarmament, sent to the White House the draft of a bill to create a U.S. Disarmament Agency. Mr. McCloy was at the time Chairman of the Board of the Council on Foreign Relations. In his letter of transmittal to the President, he revealed that the fundamental purpose of the Disarmament Agency would be to bring about world government. In September 1961, Congress passed the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, conferring on the director of the new Disarmament Agency broad authority, under the general supervision of the President and the Secretary of State, to do just about anything the director might believe to be in the interest of "peace".

Many Congressmen supported creation of this Disarmament Agency because they were afraid of being accused of opposing peace. Not all, however, withered under "Liberal" pressure. Congressman John Ashbrook of Ohio referred to it

as "The Surrender Agency", and declared: "The testimony is replete with evidence which indicates this Agency may well be the back door for the one-worlders to accomplish their goal . . ." The late Congressman James Utt commented that it was "almost word-for-word duplication of a disarmament proposal advanced by Khrushchev in 1959".

This formal disarmament proposal was later published in a nineteen-page report entitled *Freedom From War: The United States Program For General And Complete Disarmament In A Peaceful World* (State Department Publication 7277). It calls for transferring control of U.S. nuclear weapons to the United Nations, restricting the American military to the role of an internal police force, and establishing an all-powerful U.N. Army. This U.S. disarmament plan further provides: "The Parties to the Treaty would progressively strengthen the United Nations Peace Force . . . until it had sufficient armed forces and armaments so that no state could challenge it."

The Disarmament Agency's Dr. Lincoln P. Bloomfield (C.F.R.) has written:

*Short of a major catastrophe, the difficulties in obtaining widespread public approval and explicit Senate ratification of a genuine world government are obvious . . . without disarmament such a system [of world government] is probably unobtainable. . . . If it [world government] came about as a series of unnerving trips to or over the brink, it could come about at any time.*

Thus the threat of the Soviets dropping nuclear bombs on us is built up so that we can be blackmailed into accepting world government through national disarmament in favor of a U.N. "peace" force. The *Insiders* have no intention of destroying that which they intend to own and control. If there truly were a military threat from an independent Russia, the crowd at the C.F.R. would be leading the parade for American independence and arms superiority; they would *not* be promoting disarmament.

(continued on page 3)

\* From *American Opinion*, January 1972.

†The U.N. Charter is a treaty, and the Supreme Court has ruled that a treaty supersedes the guarantees and safeguards of our Constitution. In 1953, the Bricker Amendment, which provided that no treaty could take precedence over these Constitutional safeguards, was defeated in the Senate by one vote—thanks to the behind-the-scenes pressure from Vice President Richard Nixon. It may well be that we are even now technically at the mercy of the U.N., although there is as yet no way for the body to enforce its will. Certainly U.S. foreign policy has slavishly followed U.N. guidelines.

## 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.

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"A liberal estimate of the percentage of the electorate of Great Britain at this time who have an even approximate idea of what is being prepared for them, *whether they vote Labour, Socialist, Communist or Conservative under the present electoral conditions* would be one half of one per cent. . . .

"We are not sure that there is any effective answer at this late date. What we *are* sure of, is that there is no possibility—not the very slightest—that an Administration could be elected under the present ineffective Constitution under any title or with any available personnel which could be left to 'put things right' . . . .

"The Omnipotence of the Cabinet has to be challenged. It has no traditional basis, no pragmatic justification. It has led us from one disaster to another, and we are most unwise to tolerate it. Vicious and unsound in itself, it automatically selects inferior Ministers."

—C. H. Douglas, June 7, 1947\*

Under the heading "Curse of the Age", the following letter from Victor Montagu appeared in the London *Daily Telegraph* on April 21, 1972:

SIR—I wish that Mr John Scott-Taggart (April 19) would vent his spleen not on the British working man—albeit that his union leaders are Lefty and aggressive—but on the Government; and not on this Government particularly, but on all post-war Governments.

For they are, by their outrageous taxing and spending policies, the real authors and progenitors of the waves of inflation which have hit Britain in this stormy and unpleasant quarter-century.

It is futile to blame the workers alone, it is wrong even to blame them at all. It is not the workers, merely, but the whole of society which is seeking more easeful living standards and for relief by salary or wage claims from the direct and indirect taxation and other spiralling costs involved in the giant programmes of national and local government—

\**The Development of World Dominion*, p. 83. K.R.P. Publications Ltd.

many of them irrelevant to the real evils of the day, such as poverty and unemployment.

The curse of the age is excessive government, itself the product of competitive partisan democracy. Let Mr Scott-Taggart organise his once-for-all confrontation and general strike against this, now and at election times; and let him show more sympathy with his fellow men when their struggle against the consequences of it comes to a head, as all struggles must.

We sympathise with the objectives of many of the anti-Common Market organisations, campaigns, movements, etc. But on the whole they all suffer from a fundamental defect—that of putting all one's eggs in one basket. This is demonstrated by the derisory treatment given to the demand for a referendum on joining the Common Market. Once people who, as individuals, have a common objective, surrender their individual initiative in respect of that objective to an organisation, they have to a large extent lost the initiative. It is much easier for an omnipotent Cabinet to engage and defeat an *organisation*. But if a majority of *individuals* in every electorate made it clear to his Representative in Parliament that he would withdraw his vote if the Member voted to ratify the European Communities Treaty to end British national sovereignty, the mechanism of centralised government would receive a possibly mortal wound. Such an assertion of *personal* sovereignty would in all likelihood have world-wide repercussions.

". . . Power which has been obtained by electoral means can be maintained, if necessary, by other means. Nor would any true Marxist cavil at those means, however fraudulent or violent they might be.

"Chile may be 'a far-off country of which we know nothing'. But it has an urgent lesson for us here. Never forget that there are powerful forces in Great Britain working, in often unsuspected ways, towards a Chilean situation. Are we making sure now that when the time comes for us to resist it will not be too late for us?"

— Peter Simple in *Daily Telegraph*  
14 April, 1972

Whether Mr. Heath is conscious of the fact or not is difficult to know; but the Treaty of Brussels represents the Communist take-over of Britain. Communism (or 'Fascism', is simply fully-centralised and irremovable total government) the ultimate objective of International Finance—or, as Professor Toynbee prefers to call it, 'our' "modern economic internationalism"—i.e., control of the individual in all his functions by control of his access to the prime necessities of life. For a considerable period this control has been exerted through control of finance; but the progress of the industrial arts is eroding that control; and the time has come for the substitution of police-state control. Look at the enormous and arbitrary powers to be given to the officials of the Value Added Tax for an indication of the shape of things to come.

There remain perhaps weeks, perhaps months — but surely not years — to block that substitution. And in Britain, that means saying *NO!* to the Common Market, by saying *NO!* to *your* Member. The Common Market Policy *MUST* be defeated to Save Our Sovereignty. A Postcard will indicate your will in this regard.

## The Chinese Bridgehead

The euphoria of Bishop Huddleston, the new schools in Tanzania, the wind of change outlook, all disregard what is now happening in that country. The facts appear in an article by Aida Parker which appeared in *The South African Financial Gazette* and was reprinted in the March, 1972, issue of the *Britain and South Africa Forum*.

The writer notes the reaction of Western diplomats when Tanzania and Zambia, unable to attract capital to build the Tanzan rail link, agreed eighteen months ago to let Peking build it. The diplomats said, Let them get on with it, it will sink China in Africa. They had reacted similarly when Russia undertook to build the Aswan Dam, calling it economically not feasible, but Russia went ahead and "is now master of most of the Middle East and the whole UAR". Before that, an Italian, C. Pellizzi, had suggested that the European nations should each help build up a part of Africa and "go in" to it, but I do not think his suggestion met any response, even scornful, from the diplomats.

The "denim-clad" men have, however, shown their capabilities and recently handed over the first 502 km. of the line. The other 1,100 km. are not due for completion until 1976, but the Chinese may well advance their finishing date by two years or more, a great "status symbol". President Nyerere had insisted that no more than 3,000 Chinese should be engaged on the project but conservative estimates put the figure at 20,000, whereas Tanzania's army numbers 10,000.

Pretoria has been aware of the military threat from the start, of the facilities for terrorists and of Chinese expansion in Africa through trade and through ideas. The West has belatedly shown some concern, while the Americans feel worried about Ethiopia and wonder why Haile Selassie recently visited Peking. A. Parker entitled the article, "Mao's Drive South".

Western politicians could well have fought shy of an enemy's proposals, even if reasonable, and the phrases of MacMillan seem to have hypnotised them. But in recent years they have failed both in morale and in political and financial ability when confronted by the aggressive régimes of Russia and China and—with the exception of Portugal—have turned their backs on their responsibilities.

Unfortunately, instead of hearing the real news of the continent, we read of the tragic local dispute in South West Africa which has resulted in Bishop Winter's expulsion. The bishop objected to the South African system of recruiting labour and the barrack-like housing. But, according to *South Africa News* of March, 1972 — published by the Britain and South Africa Forum—a new system governing the employment of Ovambos in South Africa came into force on January 21, and one of the strike leaders has stated that the new proposals "had met most of the grievances that led to the mass walk out in December". Another Ovambo strike at Walvis Bay fish factories (*The Times*, March 18, 1972) will doubtless be resolved as "negotiations with the employers are reported to have been started".

But the Chinese problem will not be so easily settled.—H.S.

### POSTCARD CAMPAIGN

Send a postcard to your Member of Parliament to indicate your will.

18 for 10p.; 36 for 20p.; 72 for 40p.; 144 for 80p.; 500 for £2. 50

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E11 3NL

## The Human Cost of Communism

Washington, March 7 — The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee releases a study asserting that a Communist victory in Vietnam would lead to the slaughter of several million people. The study, "The Human Cost of Communism in Vietnam," is based on the writings of such men as the late Bernard Fall, Douglas Pike, and Professor P. J. Honey. It declares that Communist terror has already cost about 500,000 lives in North Vietnam and more than 30,000 in South Vietnam, with another 54,000 kidnapped in the South. In an introduction to the study, Senator James O. Eastland (D.-Miss.) says that while "it is, of course, impossible to provide mathematical proof for the proposition that a Communist victory in South Vietnam would result in a bloodbath . . . there are documents and historical indices that permit one to make an intelligent assessment of what is likely to happen if a Communist regime ever should come to power in Saigon." Among the indications pointing to probable mass murder, says Eastland, are the following: "(1) The merciless body of Communist doctrine — from Lenin to Stalin to Mao Tse-tung to Ho chi Minh — which justifies and insists on the imperative need for mass terror. (2) The historical record of Communist bloodlettings — in the Soviet Union, in Red China, in North Vietnam, and wherever they have come to power. (3) The record of Communist terror in South Vietnam during the entire period of the so-called insurgency . . . (4) The Hue massacre with its systematic killing, from prepared rosters of more than 3,000 victims . . . (5) The considerable body of evidence of Communist intentions contained in captured documents and in the testimony of defectors." Previous SSISS studies, "The Human Cost of Soviet Communism" and "The Human Cost of Communism in China," said that at least 21.5 million persons have been murdered by the Communists in the Soviet Union and that at least 34 million have lost their lives under Chinese Communism.

—The Review Of The News, March 22, 1972

### Get US Out!

(continued from page 1)

The original plan of the Conspirators for the disarmament of the United States, and the transfer of our weaponry to the U.N., called for its completion by 1972. But American Conservatives, led by The John Birch Society, gave the plan such exposure in the early Sixties that the timetable had to be altered. Conservatives ordered and distributed to their alarmed friends so many copies of the State Department Publication 7277, that the Department was forced to let it go out of print. An article in the Communist *World Marxist Review*, emphasized the need for patience, advising the Comrades: "Communists do not adhere to the 'all or nothing' principle. Anything that brings disarmament nearer is a step forward . . ." It was back to "patient gradualism".

Americans were not yet sufficiently fed up with protracted no-win wars, nor were they sufficiently frightened by nuclear propaganda, to swallow disarmament in favor of a U.N. Army. A Gallup Poll in 1961 determined that eighty-one percent of Americans said they would rather fight an all-out nuclear war than live under Communist rule. More time was needed for anti-military and defeatist propaganda. The Vietnam War has provided the excuse for an enormous escalation of such propaganda. Creation of the mood for acceptance by America of the program outlined by the State

Department in 1961 has obviously been a high priority of the International Communist Conspiracy.

Meanwhile, disarmament talks have been going on with the Russians for nearly eight years. During that time we have negotiated with them the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (with no inspection, of course), the Outer Space Treaty, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and the Seabeds Treaty. All of these were steps toward S.A.L.T.—and S.A.L.T. is another step toward complete disarmament and world government. The objectives laid down by the *Insiders* in State Department Document 7277 have not changed. In 1968 an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency publication called *Arms Control And National Security* explained what has been happening:

*Since 1959 the agreed ultimate goal of the negotiations has been general and complete disarmament, i.e., the total elimination of all armed forces and armaments except those needed to maintain internal order within states and to furnish the United Nations with peace forces. U.S. and Soviet plans for general and complete disarmament were proposed in 1962 and they are still "on the table". Some basic differences between the two plans are brought out by the key issue of timing and verification of reduction of nuclear delivery vehicles . . .*

Under the Charter of the U.N., this International Peace Force, with its (our) nuclear weapons, would be under the command of the Under Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs, who has control over all U.N. military affairs. Except for one two-year term, when it was occupied by a Yugoslav Communist, this post has by agreement always been held by a Soviet national. Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations from 1946 to 1953, writes in his autobiography *In The Cause Of Peace*:

*Mr. Vyshinsky did not delay his approach. He was the first to inform me of an understanding which the Big Five had reached in London on the appointment of a Soviet national as Assistant Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs . . . Mr. Stettinius [under the influence of Alger Hiss] confirmed to me that he had agreed with the Soviet Delegation in the matter.*

Former U.N. Secretary-General Lie then observed:

*The preservation of international peace and security was the Organization's highest responsibility, and it was to entrusting the direction of the Secretariat Department most concerned with this to a Soviet national that the Americans had agreed. What did the Americans want for themselves? To my surprise, they did not ask for a department concerned with comparable substantive affairs, like the economic or the social. Rather, Mr. Stettinius proposed that an American citizen be appointed Assistant Secretary-General for Administrative and Financial Services.*

Despite the fact that this agreement was to be binding for only five years, a Russian continues to occupy that key U.N. military office today. Mr. Nixon has not been so rude as to suggest that the office be given to anyone other than a Communist.

If everything else concerning the U.N. were favorable to the United States, the very fact that its military affairs are always in the hands of a Communist should be more than sufficient reason to get us out. But "Liberal" apologists for the U.N. are not bothered one iota by Communist control of

the Organization's military. They explain, if you can believe this, that while the Soviets hold some posts by custom and tradition, the U.S. holds others. It just happens to be the custom, thanks to Comrade Hiss, that the Communists control the military while an American controls mosquito abatement projects. Fair's fair, you know!

Is that U.N. Army a possibility in the near future? United Press International has reported that, early in October 1971, Communist Poland offered the U.N. a standby force from its army for possible use in "peacekeeping operations". Poland is the second Soviet bloc nation to offer its troops for "peacekeeping", the other offer having been made two years ago by Czecho-Slovakia. Add to this the fact that Richard Nixon has long advocated just such a military force—which, as we have pointed out, would serve under the command of a Russian national at the United Nations. As the *Los Angeles Examiner* reported on October 28, 1950:

*A strong effort to obtain approval of his resolution calling for establishment of a United Nations police force will be made by Congressman Richard Nixon when Congress reconvenes November 27th, the California Senatorial nominee said today . . . Nixon's resolution suggests that a UN police authority be set up on a permanent basis, to consist of land, sea and air forces. It would swing into action against aggression under decision of a simple majority vote of the police authority.*

Establishment spokesman James Reston declared in his *New York Times* column of May 21, 1971: "Nixon would obviously like to preside over the creation of a new world order, and believes he has an opportunity to do so in the last 20 months of his first term." If Mr. Nixon gets what he wants, his "new world order" could well include a nuclear-equipped U.N. Army controlled by a Soviet national.

Given such dangers, why do we retain membership in the United Nations? Certainly the U.N. has not brought peace to the world. During the first twenty-five years of its existence, noted the "Liberal" *Houston Chronicle* for September 25, 1971, there have been seventy-five wars! Since the inception of the U.N., over one billion people have been enslaved by the Communists. This is a *peace* organization? The fact is that the existence of the U.N. makes war neither more nor less likely. But our continued participation in it could well guarantee our eventual enslavement. The U.N. is *not* harmless. It is *not* a guarantor of peace. It is a Trojan Horse and a death trap. It is a threat to our national security.

We are not unaware that the pet propagandists of the Establishment *Insiders* will shriek and scream that this warning is biased and unfair. They will beg you to pay no attention to doomsayers and then predict doom if America abandons the U.N. They will implore you not to pay attention to the growing danger, not to worry about it, not to come to conclusions which favor the national interests of your country. Have faith, they will say. Have faith and Believe!

But more and more Americans are coming out from under the ether of twenty-five years of U.N. propaganda. They are reaching the only possible conclusion that an American can draw when presented with the facts. That conclusion is that it is time to Get US out of the U.N. and the U.N. out of the U.S.

(Concluded)