

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 54. No. 3

JUNE, 1974

15p Monthly

K.G.B.: The Secret Work of Soviet Secret Agents *

This is your horoscope. No matter what your sign is. Just so you are sure nothing can happen in America like what happens in Soviet Russia. Just so you don't know, when you come right down to it, what *does* happen in Soviet Russia. The stars say that, given a continuing American ignorance of how the terror police control the Russians (and other nationalities in the Soviet Union), there will not be enough motivation to resist the drive to merge America with Russia. And the stars say that, given the continuing American refusal to face the presence of Soviet agents in America, Americans will be incapable of resisting the Great Merger whether they want to or not.

John Barron's extraordinarily important *K.G.B.* will persuade any normal American who reads it that the methods of the Soviet terror police are intolerable, and constitute full contemporary justification for the motto: *Better dead than Red*. A noble kind of cheating is involved there. We'll all be dead some day anyhow, whether we accept the fact or not; but we don't ever have to be Red unless we sign the compact with the Devil. Revised motto: *Never Red, not yet dead*. (The best life is after death anyhow. M'mm. So is the worst.) Barron's book, based on five years and more of research, will convince any rational reader that—as Solzhenitsyn has testified from personal experience—the ongoing reign of Soviet terror is hell on earth.

The problem is (in part) getting normal Americans to read. Surely publication by *Reader's Digest* might be expected to help. Incidentally, the sheer volume of information in *K.G.B.* may be suggested by the fact that the world's leading experts in digesting and reducing written work to essentials still require 462 large pages (six by nine inches) to describe and document adequately "the secret work of Soviet secret agents."

And even so, the work in one respect is by no means adequate. That is, it does not tell enough about *K.G.B.* activities in the United States itself, where they are most important—not only to us, but also to the Soviets, as repeated designation of the U.S. as a number-one target area demonstrates. (See, for example, pages seventy-nine, eighty-one, and eighty-seven, where in several *K.G.B.* directorates there is a listing of departments by geographical areas of the world, and the United States is always in the first department.)

Early in my reading of this book I checked the index for references to *K.G.B.* activities in the United States, and to my surprise found that, though there are entries for all well known European countries, there is no entry for the United States. I can only presume that the omission is deliberate—and, I must say understandable, since to follow

the *K.G.B.* into the United States at all might create serious encounters with both the F.B.I. and the C.I.A. Yet such an omission leaves a lacuna, as if an index of the Great Lakes should omit Lake Superior.

The book does document specific cases of Soviet espionage in America, but little treatment is given the general campaign to subvert and defeat the United States preparatory to absorbing it into a World Soviet Union. (Which by logical necessity is the second most important campaign of the *K.G.B.*—the first being, as Barron correctly recognizes, to keep its present stranglehold on Russia itself.)

There is a list of exposed Soviet spies in the U.S., centering to a degree around the Rosenberg case. But, especially telling is a brief account of the 1944 visit to a Siberian slave-labor camp by our then Vice President Henry Wallace and Professor Owen Lattimore. Lattimore's cagey pro-Soviet style is illustrated by well-chosen passages from his meretricious prose. The man is a consummate liar, as the Senate Internal Security Sub-committee demonstrated in 1952; and his experience and associations are among the most sophisticated on this planet in this century. The Senate Sub-committee formally reported that Owen Lattimore "was from some time in the middle 1930's a conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy." Yet the index of *K.G.B.* contains the entry: "Lattimore, Owen, duped at Siberian concentration camps, 168." That Owen Lattimore was duped by the cosmetics the *K.G.B.* applied to the "most barbarous of the Stalinist concentration camps" (as Barron labels the site visited by Lattimore and Wallace) is about as likely as that Casanova was duped into amorous intrigues and liaisons.

Most startling of omissions from Barron's book is any treatment of the Oppenheimer case. If Oppenheimer's wife's friend, Steve Nelson, was not a *K.G.B.* agent (and one of the most important), then the *K.G.B.* never had an agent in America. Or is the omission of Marina Oswald's name even more startling? According to the Warren Commission Report (can you believe anything in it?) the uncle who reared her was an M.V.D. (*K.G.B.*) official in Minsk.

Yet I do not wish to dwell churlishly on these omissions. It is even conceivable that they increase the utility of the book. By exercising such extreme restraint Barron escapes being labeled an extremist, and may gain credibility in certain quarters. And I must say *Reader's Digest* quarters

*A book review, from *American Opinion*, May, 1974, of *K.G.B.: The Secret Work of Soviet Secret Agents* by John Barron: Reader's Digest Press, distributed by E. P. Dutton & Company, Incorporated, New York; 462 pages, US\$10.95.

are very important quarters. Of course I don't know, I wouldn't hazard a guess, how many *Reader's Digest* readers will even pick up a 462-page book. (So many of them want to save time—want just a quick rundown on the world situation in five hundred words or less. And then if anything unusual is said they won't believe it because it isn't fully documented.) But some of them will no doubt pick up *K.G.B.*, and *because* it contains so little "McCarthyism" may be all the more startled to read such an item as the following:

The most celebrated K.G.B. agent of disinformation [systematized, bureaucratized lying to brainwash whole populations], Vitali Yevgenneovich Lui, is an unctuous operative better known as Victor Louis. Born in 1928, Louis stands just under six feet tall, has a pale, pink face that smiles often, blue eyes, and wavy brown hair. He possesses a quick mind, and some people profess to find him charming. Twice Louis has been received at the White House: by Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey on October 17, 1966, and by Presidential Adviser Henry A. Kissinger on November 13, 1971. His writings, or those of the Disinformation Department [of the K.G.B.] promulgated under his name, have appeared in numerous Western newspapers, including the New York Times and the Washington Post.

I like that detailed personal description and those precise dates. They somehow give Hubert and Henry and the *Times* and the *Post* something to explain. And the cross-examiner is retained by *Reader's Digest*, no less! But then you are an *American Opinion* reader. You don't want pabulum, you want lean meat, maybe spiced a bit for flavor and streaked with enough fat to keep it from being too tough, but in the main solid protein. And in *K.G.B.: The Secret Work Of Soviet Secret Agents* you get it, omissions or no omissions.

Let me quit complaining about what is not in the book and start indicating what is.

Barron and a "colleague" named Kenneth Gilmore (so designated in the preface but not given a by-line, implying joint responsibility for research but not for writing) give the purpose of the *K.G.B.*, describe its organization and the scope of activities, illustrate with particular cases from every part of the world, quite notably the Soviet Union itself, and establish beyond reasonable doubt the thesis that, in the words of the book's jacket: "The *K.B.G.*, or Committee for State Security, is the principal instrument through which the Soviet Union is ruled and Soviet foreign policy is executed." Since Soviet foreign policy is simply to sovietize the entire world, the nature, purpose, and power of the *K.G.B.* are of concern to all of us. Barron states the matter well:

No one of the techniques the K.G.B. employs in executing Soviet foreign policy is an end unto itself. All are part of the same continuum of attack. All are synchronized into an unremitting campaign by which the Soviet Union seeks surreptitiously to expand its own power while sapping the will and capacity of other nations to resist its ambitions.

I suppose no one will argue that the Soviet Union is not already a major power in the world. (Others say a "super-

power"; I, stubbornly, say merely a "major" power.) The *K.G.B.* is the Soviet Union in action. Even the Red Army is in practice subservient to the *K.G.B.*, as Barron later explains.

Quoting Lenin's statement, "The scientific concept of dictatorship means neither more nor less than unlimited power resting directly on force," Barron continues:

Today the K.G.B. primarily constitutes the force Lenin envisioned: the principal force by which Communist Party chieftains sustain their dictatorship over the Soviet people and try to project it into other societies. Hence every person affected by the actions of the Soviet Union is affected by the K.G.B.

Consider what the foregoing means in a context of détente:

No one can run the world—or if you prefer that I use Henry Kissinger's own words, no one can "construct an international order" (Kissinger, *American Foreign Policy*: Norton, 1969, Page 49), without either

- (a) destroying the *K.G.B.*, or
- (b) taking over the *K.G.B.*, or
- (c) making an accommodation with the *K.G.B.*

Obviously, Kissinger and other such operators (for Henry is not, alas, a lone wolf) aim at (c). Not at all obviously, but possibly, they aim at (b). They evidently do not intend (a). If the *K.G.B.* were to be destroyed, the Soviet Union would simply fall apart, as would the bloc of its European and Latin American satellites. From the contagion, Red China, too, would doubtless disintegrate. That kind of happy day is hardly what Henry has in mind.

—The parent organization from which the *K.G.B.* directly descends was Lenin's Cheka, whose first chief, Felix Dzerzhinsky, stated flatly: "We stand for organized terror." Barron says, "No one incited the Cheka more enthusiastically than Lenin . . . he sent telegrams to Cheka officials in Penza commanding them to employ 'merciless mass terror.'" Thus the deified atheist whom Communists adore. (Solzhenitsyn, as you know, vigorously confirms that terror is the quintessence of Communism, and that Lenin so recognized it.) Barron has the interesting footnote that "Cheka," formed from the organization's full title, is also a Russian word, which, "fittingly enough means 'linchpin.'"

If Stalin carried the terror to more spectacular lengths, Brezhnev is equally dependent upon its use. And any "international order" of which the Soviet Union is a part must itself incorporate and employ the Soviet Union's indispensable agency of terror, the *K.G.B.*

It is difficult even to suggest, impossible to summarize, the illustrative material with which Barron documents the meaning of terror in a world where the Soviet regime is tolerated. But perhaps the most important phase of the book is that dealing with the terror in the Soviet Union itself. Chapter V, "How To Run A Tyranny," begins:

While endeavoring to shatter the status quo in foreign lands, the K.G.B. strives even more fiercely to preserve the status quo in the Soviet Union. To this end it engages in far more multitudinous and brutal operations against the Soviet people than against any other.

What, then, could be plainer than the prospect that, once merger is accomplished, operations against the American people will be equally multitudinous and brutal? Or rather,

will be more savage, since the Americans will have to undergo a period of initiation into the meaning of terror in action which the people of the Soviet Union have already experienced. Yet Barron's vignettes of life in the U.S.S.R. may serve as a somewhat expurgated preview of life in America after the merger. You say we would never stand for it? If we stand for the merger, we shall probably have to stand—at least for far too long—for what follows the merger.) Barron reports

In the village of Dubrovny, Byelorussia, in April 1966, plainclothesmen dragged two sisters, Galya and Shura Sloboda, aged eleven and nine, from their classroom. Ivan, their father, who was working near the schoolhouse, heard his daughters' screams and ran to help them. The plainclothesmen shoved him away, and when he held on to their car as it started off, they beat his hands until he fell to the ground. . . . The Slobodas had become Baptist believers, and for that reason alone the K.G.B. took away the two eldest of their five children.

That was only the beginning of the persecution which the Slobodas suffered for their religious beliefs. Eventually, the K.G.B. carted off the other three children also, and sentenced the mother to a concentration camp. The five children were placed in five different orphanages. The father, though a radio through which he had heard religious broadcasts was confiscated, was left to enjoy his "freedom".

What freedom means in the U.S.S.R. is suggested by the use of "internal passports," which Soviet citizens may, or may not, receive when they are sixteen. Without such a passport no one can travel in the Soviet Union, much less move his or her place of residence. (I recall Senator Allen Ellender of Louisiana, and rather a Russophile he was, having traveled there twice in such style as the country afforded, saying that outside the very largest cities there were few hotels in Soviet Russia, and very little in the way of paved roads. Those are largely unnecessary, since few people go anywhere. One can hardly help wondering whether our present energy crisis is a move to reduce America to a similar condition.) But one of the most interesting features of the internal-passport system is reported by Barron as follows:

. . . collective farmers, with few exceptions, are denied passports. [Emphasis in the original.] Thus the Party forces many millions to remain in regions most would abandon if they could, and keeps manageable the problems of urbanization that beset most advanced nations. . . . For the most part, because they are denied internal passports, the collective farmers are just as effectively chained to the soil as were the serfs of the last century.

Can't you just see the pointyheads along the Potomac scribbling notes to themselves on their scratch pads to see whether some such approach might not be made to our "problems of urbanization"?

One final quote, and then you'd better go read this book for yourself. (You don't have to be so snobbish you won't read a *Reader's Digest* book.) "The supervision of Soviet science," says Barron, "is even more stringent than the regulation of religion. The Party both needs and fears scientists." He follows this interesting observation by telling us about the G.N.T.K. (State Scientific and Technical

Committee), an agency "heavily staffed with K.G.B. officers," which, among other things, "decides which needs should be fulfilled through original research and which best can be met through scientific and technical espionage in North America and Europe." That the latter option is the generally preferred one, and that the Party neither needs nor fears scientists very much, is suggested by the following:

The economic lot of a Soviet physicist, Alexey Levin, who fled in 1968, was fairly typical. With nine years of higher education, he earned 150 rubles a month. After deductions for income tax, the childlessness tax [N.B!], and union dues, his net pay was 125 rubles. His wife, an engineer, earned 140 rubles monthly. They lived in a one-room apartment of eighteen square meters, or less than two hundred square feet, sharing a kitchen and bath with five other people. . . . The Levins had no savings and no prospect of accumulating any.

Barron continues, "There is little to justify any expectations that the economic plight of the typical Soviet citizen will improve significantly in the near future." He does not add, but I do—even if Kissinger et al. succeed in accomplishing the merger. But in that case, there is every expectation that the economic plight of the typical American citizen will plummet to the Soviet level.

And both, thereafter, to the Third World level. You see, slavery is simply not a viable system for an advanced society.

—MEDFORD EVANS.

Secret Ballot

Under the above heading, the following letter appeared in *Truth* (England), Dec. 13, 1946, and was shortly afterwards reprinted in *The Social Crediter*:

SIR,—Your correspondent, Mr. Clifford Rivington, appears to overlook a number of factors, many of them highly technical, which make it altogether too superficial to "agree that a genuinely secret ballot is the bedrock of political freedom". It may easily be exactly the reverse. The first of these factors was the fundamental cause of the American Revolution, and it is operating in this country today. It is the assumption that anyone can vote about anything, or anybody, and that a genuine mandate is thereby conferred upon Parliament, which Parliament can delegate to a Cabinet, upon which it confers the right to legislate without limitation by Common Law, or as the American colonists called it, "natural" law.

"The Common Good", always invoked by tyrants, is the excuse given for the transfer by a legal process, which inverts the protection given by Common Law, of privileges acquired by individuals to a bureaucracy subject to a junta whose primary concern is to retain power. The secret ballot is a most ingenious method of facilitating this process by attributing power to an electorate which cannot exercise it, and suffers collectively, not for its unidentifiable vote, but for the deterioration of morale which always accompanies the divorce of power from responsibility. Many, if not most, of our political premises demand serious reconsideration; and the real nature of our so-called democracy stands high upon the list.

—C. H. DOUGLAS.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER
FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY

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. Six months £1.30, Airmail one year £3.50.

Offices—
Business: 245 Cann Hail Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11 3NL.
Tel. 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London, NW1 7PX.
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)

"Axioms" of Society

It must now be evident generally, as we have been doing our best to proclaim for twenty-five years, that it is absurd to challenge the logic of modern politics and economics, which are irrefragable. It is the so-called "axioms" which demand examination. In what time may remain to us, we propose, at intervals, and as objectively as possible, to examine these "axioms".

Fifty years ago, a Conservative Member of Parliament replying to a criticism made at a private dinner-party, said, "Well, you know, politics is a dirty business, always has been a dirty business, and always will be a dirty business".

We have here, a *fact*, which is stated as an *axiom*.

Fifty years ago, politics were far cleaner than they are to-day—probably at their cleanest. The explanation of this is simple—they were less professional. The average Member of Parliament was a man of private means and diverse interests. It was not a matter of life and death to him to retain his seat, and there were limits beyond which he was not prepared to go to retain it. The Member just quoted was of this type, yet he did retain his seat, and he admitted that he was employed in a dirty business. If he had troubled to justify himself, he would no doubt have said, "Politics is the art of the possible".

It is not necessary to look very far for an explanation of the *fact*. It is stated with admirable clarity in the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, and is of course, the basis of Machiavellianism. The real reason that the *Protocols* have roused such furious denunciation is precisely this—that they explain the divergence between public and private honesty. Protocol I, XI reads: "The political has nothing in common with the moral. The ruler who is governed by the moral is not a skilled politician, and is therefore unstable on his throne. He who wishes to rule must have recourse both to cunning and to make-believe. Great national [*sic*] qualities, like frankness and honesty, are vices in politics. . . . Compare "Full employment"; "Public Ownership"; "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat"; "*Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité*", etc.

At this point, we are clearly confronted with a difficulty. Have moral qualities any real existence and justification, or as the Socialists contend, are they merely a trick to make the mob easier to control? Socialist politics, while only a few steps further on the road, are obviously not hampered by any doubts on this point—they are completely a-moral. Their objective is the supremacy of the bureaucrat so long as he obeys orders. Nothing else.

Fortunately, we are not thrown back upon authoritarianism for an answer to this vital question—it can be obtained

from one of the most thoroughgoing exponents of the empirical technique—Gustave le Bon. *A mob has no morality; an individual depends for his individuality on his morality.* Lying and corruption disintegrate a man. No society can survive a-moral leadership.

In consequence, a Collectivist Government is inevitably the most corrupt form and must lead to a tyranny unredeemed by any virtues.

—C. H. DOUGLAS in *The Social Crediter*, Sept. 15, 1945.

The Aid Myth

Bishop Huddleston and other officials of War on Want wrote an enthusiastic letter to *The Times* (March 13, 1974) to welcome "the re-establishment of direct ministerial responsibility for Britain's overseas aid activities," and hoped to ensure wider support for the "principle of interdependence."

But in *Encounter* (March, 1974) P. T. Bauer writes an intelligent criticism of Foreign Aid which he calls a "Myth of our time." Aid still goes to President Amin of Uganda as well as to such oil states as Bahrein, Iraq, Kuwait, Libya and Saudi Arabia.

The case for it, he notes, is usually taken for granted, yet aid is not needed for a country to emerge from poverty and he gives Mexico and Malasia as instances. Aid in fact has damaging repercussions, for it increases the power of governments, provokes the struggle for this power and diverts energy from economic activity to politics and may well retard development.

He further points out that while aid removes resources from the donors, "this does not mean that it improves the living standards of the recipients. To make the rich poorer does not make the poor richer." And recipients usually resent the donors. British aid contributed to the rise of President Amin; the Tanzania regime has continued to receive aid despite the brutalities of Zanzibar.

Sectional interests in the West, however, do benefit from aid, and he mentions the staffs of international agencies, the churches "which increasingly look upon themselves as secular welfare agencies and exporters." And some favour it "as an instrument for promoting what they call social change", the establishment of socialist societies.

Yet other kinds of aid are promoted, for the World Council of Churches sponsors a more violent kind of beneficiary. The General Secretary of the W.C.C., Dr. Philip Potter, speaking recently at Hinde Street Methodist Church, mentioned "my own inability to forgive myself for the contempt I have for white people and the resulting contempt I feel for myself." (*Catholic Herald*, March 8, 1974). His words are a far cry from the Gospel precept, "Love your enemies . . . and pray for them which despitefully use you." Hatred seems to have replaced love as the motive force in WCC religion.

Dr. Potter spoke of Britain's "heavy responsibility for creating the situation in South Africa as well as Rhodesia." He mentioned, too, Ethiopia where "100,000 had recently died of famine." But he omitted to recall the considerable achievement of Rhodesia where, owing to the skill of responsible people, such a disaster was avoided in comparable conditions.

—H.S.