

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 52. No. 11

SATURDAY, 19 AUGUST, 1972

7p (1s. 5d.) Fortnightly

Pentagon Papers*

MAKE A NOISE IN THE EAST

By MEDFORD EVANS

(Continued)

The Pentagon Papers certainly made a noise in the East. We were invited to study and argue *ad infinitum* about the origins of our involvement in Southeast Asia. Forty-seven volumes, 7,000 pages, 2 million words—about twice as long as the Bible, and seven times as controversial. What was all this supposed to get our minds off of? (That's what I said, *get our minds off of*. That's the way I learned to talk in East Texas, and this is no time for Brahminical purism.)

I suggest that all this Proustian recall of the allegedly shameful beginnings of the Vietnamese War is intended in the first place to get our minds off the far more shameful conclusion of that war. Or, at a more neurotic level of consciousness, to fill us with such compunctions and remorse over the beginnings that we accept a conclusion by abject surrender as a merited act of national penance. (The war *has* been shameful, but not because it was "escalated" against the Communists—because, rather, it was so conducted as at all times to play into the hands of the Communists, above all in this final phase.)

On July 15, 1971, two weeks after the Supreme Court signaled the *New York Times* to go ahead with publication of the stolen Pentagon Papers, thereby re-engaging much of the nation in interminable arguments (most of them moot) over the origins and early conduct of the Vietnam War, President Nixon made a brief and fatal announcement on national television. Not necessarily fatal to the United States. Perhaps for us nothing is lost save honor. But for Chiang Kai-shek, for most of the 15 million people on Formosa, and for a vast if indeterminable number of the allegedly 750 million people of mainland China, † President Nixon's incredibly craven crawl to Peking is a death sentence.

Even "Liberal" historians do not deny that Mao Tse-tung on achieving power over the "Peoples' Republic of China" defined the word "people" to mean those who accepted the rule of the Communist Party, and classified all others as enemies of the people. The latter Chinese were, except the ones who escaped to Formosa or Hong Kong, destroyed in the largest mass executions in history. As a result there are no known opponents of Mao Tse-tung in mainland China today. Estimates of the number of Chinese killed by the Communists in their first six years of rule vary from 20 to 50 million.

*From *American Opinion*, Sept., 1971, from last issue

†The figure is ridiculous—450 million would be a more sensible estimate—but the point is not essential in this context.

Chinese who may have hoped until recently that the cruel tyranny of Communism—made more maniacal in the late 1960s by the obscene convulsions of the so-called Cultural Revolution †—must have felt their hopes die in their guts when they heard the gutless groveling not merely of the American President, but of most of the American Congress who were quoted in the Press as having commented on the President's announcement. ("Why before May?" my wife asked, as we watched Richard Nixon in his brief horror movie on television. "So that the Communists can celebrate their triumph on May Day," I guessed in reply.)

This is the way the world ends—not with a bang or even a whimper, but with a great nation as lickspittle.

"We can't ignore one-fourth of the world's people," said a Congressman from a Western state where men were once men. But that is exactly what we are doing in this masochistic approach to Red China. We are ignoring, among others, the hundreds of millions of Chinese who are the slaves of Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai.

And our Chief Executive may not even get to surrender directly to the Number One man in Peking. There is presently no evidence that Mao will deign to grant Richard Nixon an audience. It is the Number Two man in Peking with whom our President must confer. Where are those experts who continually tell us that in the Orient face is everything?

Some of them are already planning to turn Formosa over to Peking, where presumably Chiang Kai-shek will be taken for Oriental torture and execution — doubtless with a final merciful bullet in the base of the brain. That's what happened to South Vietnam's President Diem. Come to think of it, it happened to our President Kennedy, too. The bullet in the base of the brain. The Communist signature.

It was in *National Review* of July 13, 1971, that I read about a "Council of the Fund for Peace" which met in the Regency Suite of the Pierre Hotel to discuss a coming "Convocation" on Red China. Speakers at the Pierre included Najeeb Halaby of Pan Am Airways (we talked about him in "East-West Trade", *AMERICAN OPINION* for May 1971) and Harrison Salisbury of the *New York Times*, who probably already knew that Henry Kissinger would soon be taking a secret trip to Peking. At any rate, Salisbury noted that Red Chinese representatives would soon be coming over here.

(continued on page 4)

†Of which we have had echoes in the United States in the Manson Case and other "underground" activities.

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. 16

Saturday, 19 August, 1972

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

The *Business Observer* of July 2, 1972 published a graph headed "The Shrinking Pound". This charts the purchasing-power of the Pound Sterling on a percentage basis, with 1914 as the base at 100%. In 1946 the purchasing-power was 38%, and in 1947 35½%. From that point the decline of purchasing-power is very nearly a straight-line graph, representing an average loss of approximately 0.85% per annum to a value of 14%. This linearity, however, conceals an exponential function: the rate at which purchasing-power is halved. Thus purchasing-power fell from 35½ to 17½ in twenty years; but by extrapolation it can be seen that it will be halved again in ten years—i.e., about 1977—and halved again in a further 5 years—1982. Thus inflation is a graduated income-tax on lower-income earners, 'graduation' being, in this case, a function of time.

The linearity also reveals that measures taken to "control" or "halt" inflation have virtually no effect. Now the terminology of economic discussion treats inflation as if it were a disease, susceptible of cure; but when a disease fails to respond to what is regarded as appropriate treatment, it strongly suggests a misconception of the nature of the 'disease'.

It is obvious that a fall in the purchasing-power of the unit of money requires an increase in the number of units required to shift a constant volume of production. Thus rising prices are necessarily accompanied by an increase in the money supply if distribution is to be maintained or increased. In this way an increase in the money supply is associated with a rise in prices, but it is not (as is commonly assumed) a necessary deduction that an increase in money supplies causes a rise in prices, any more than, say, an increase in lung-cancer causes an increase in the consumption of cigarettes, or the development of baldness causes ageing. And, in fact, if other factors raise prices (as they do) it is correct to say that rising prices cause an increase in the money supply if the existing level of distribution is maintained or increased. Economists call this 'stimulating' the economy.

Let no one underestimate the importance of this matter. A large volume of criticism of government "mismanagement" is based on a misconception of the relationship between money and prices, and this criticism progressively destroys confidence in parliamentary so-called democracy and, indeed, as Professor Toynbee recently remarked, "we cannot be sure that even in Britain parliamentary government is going to survive" (our emphasis). It is already evident that the public has largely lost confidence in the Heath administration's 'competence'.

It is now beyond any reasonable doubt that 'official' economic theory is indeed based on a misconception—but a misconception that is deliberately propagated through the institutions in which the economists who advise governments are indoctrinated. The objective is the destruction of the monetary system as a mechanism of genuine economic democracy (the control and distribution of production in the interest of individual consumers) and its replacement by some form of rationing—what Professor Toynbee calls a reversion to a stable (i.e., government-regulated) way of life. Or as Goebbels put it, "guns instead of butter".

The whole matter is simply the economic aspect of conspiracy. Inflation could not only be halted, but reversed, tomorrow, if the Conspirators were exposed and dealt with; but not otherwise. We are up against a situation of which the Irish 'troubles' are only the beginning of the conflagration which within the foreseeable future will engulf the non-Communist world if not dealt with realistically now. We warned of what would happen if the Conservatives neglected their opportunity as an Opposition. It was not an alternative Government the country required, but an alternative policy: less management, not more, and an exposure of the conspiratorial root of our troubles.

None Dare Call It Conspiracy

"FDR once said: 'In politics, nothing happens by accident. If it happens, you can bet it was planned that way.' He was in a good position to know. We believe that many of the major world events that are shaping our destinies occur because somebody or somebodies have planned them that way. If we were merely dealing with the law of averages, half of the events affecting our nation's well-being should be good for America. If we were dealing with mere incompetence, our leaders should occasionally make a mistake in our favor. We shall attempt to prove that we are not really dealing with coincidence or stupidity, but with planning and brilliance. This small book deals with that planning and brilliance and how it has shaped the foreign and domestic policies of the last six administrations. We hope it will explain matters which have up to now seemed inexplicable; that it will bring into sharp focus images which have been obscured by the landscape painters of the mass media."

—Gary Allen in *None Dare Call it Conspiracy**

1 copy, 50p.

10 copies, £3

3 copies, £1

25 copies, £6

100 copies, £18

Other quantities pro rata

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.
245 CANN HALL ROAD, LONDON, E.11

Correction, Please!*

ITEM: From a speech by President Richard M. Nixon on June 1, 1972:

Last Friday in Moscow . . . we took the first step toward a new era of mutually agreed restraint and arms limitation between the two principal nuclear powers. With this step we have enhanced the security of both nations.

CORRECTION: That is not the case! And even honest "Liberals" are saying so. Donald G. Brennan of the Hudson Institute considers this missile-limitation treaty "profoundly unwise," claiming that: "It enshrines a Soviet superiority that can be expanded." And the *National Observer* of June 10, 1972, quotes Princeton University Professor Eugene P. Wagner as declaring that he is "not very happy with the agreement. I'm afraid we gave away much more than we received." It is Professor Wagner's conviction that: "It would have been better if each nation was assured that the other could not destroy it."

In their issue for May 29, 1972, the editors of *U.S. News & World Report* warned their readers about what to expect from such summit deals with the Soviets, observing: "In seven summit meetings between a U.S. President and a Soviet leader, 25 agreements have been reached. The Soviets have violated 24 of those 25 agreements." They then listed the agreements, beginning with the infamous Yalta Conference in 1943, and continuing right up into the Nixon Administration. For example, in 1968 Russia signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty with the United States, promising to work toward disarmament. Instead, noted *U.S. News*, "Russia accelerated its missile construction."

It now seems that President Nixon, in support of his drive to embrace the Communist dictators of Russia in what he calls a "New World Order," is attempting to match the Soviet leaders in committing himself to one position one day and later reversing his field when it suits his purposes. For example, in January of 1968, Candidate Nixon seemed to be sincere when he told a New York audience: "Seven years ago . . . there was no question about our power . . . Today, that power which was at least 6 or 7 to 1 in our favor has been reduced to 2½ to 1 in terms of deliverable nuclear capability. Unless there is new leadership, and a change of policy, within two or three years the Soviet Union will equal us in nuclear capabilities, and will then pass us—unless we do something about it."

As the 1968 Presidential campaign drew to a close, Mr. Nixon reiterated that warning when he stated: "At this time I do not believe that the United States can afford to accept the concept of parity with the Soviet Union. I believe that we face a . . . potentially dangerous situation . . . As you look at today's world, the Soviet Union's goal in the world is somewhat different than ours, strikingly different. They are still in an expansionist stage." Yet, President Richard Nixon has played directly into the hands of the Soviets' global strategy with this latest arms-limitation treaty and related agreements.

Human Events for June third quotes Republican Congressman John Ashbrook as outlining in great detail the

many advantages the Russian Communists gain from this treaty, and then concluding: "The facts are clear. They have not been seriously contested. Under this agreement, the United States would be locked into a nuclear inferiority that will almost certainly be permanent."

Senator Henry M. Jackson of Washington is another who has expressed grave misgivings about the Nixon treaty. He has warned that the Soviets have, under this new treaty, "the authority to retain or deploy a number of weapons based on land and at sea that exceeds our own in every category, and by a 50 per cent margin. Unfortunately, I see nothing in the present agreement that lessens the threat to the security of our deterrent forces. On the contrary, far from freezing us in a condition of stable deterrence, the agreement permits the Soviet Union to continue its offensive build-up in a way and on a scale that could prove highly destabilizing."

On June 11, 1972, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee released a document entitled *Communist Global Subversion And American Security*. The Committee Chairman, Senator James O. Eastland (D.-Mississippi), noted in the introduction that this volume "is particularly important at the present juncture because of the light it throws on the general pattern of Communist behavior and on Communist response to new agreements. . . . The record unfortunately offers little hope that the Communists will respond to new agreements — or new concessions — by calling off their campaign of global subversion."

Senator Eastland goes on to point out that, in spite of such agreements as the Test-Ban Treaty in 1963, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1968, and the SALT talks — all of which were supposed to reduce world tensions — the Communists have continued to engage in subversive activities throughout the Free World. After discussing thirteen examples of such activity, Senator Eastland solemnly observes: "One can only stand in awe before the incredible success the Communist propaganda apparatus has had in persuading so many people that we live in a period of growing detente — while events such as those described above continue to occur on a monthly basis."

Unpleasant as it is to face the fact, President Nixon's assertion that this latest arms-limitation treaty enhances our security is really nothing more than fuel for the Communist propaganda machine, which is already working at top speed to psychologically disarm the American people.—W.E.D.

THE SURVIVAL OF BRITAIN

Contemporaneous Commentaries on linked events of 1968-1970
by BRYAN W. MONAHAN

Edited and arranged by T. N. MORRIS

"This volume is a sequel to *The Moving Storm* which, together with its companion volume, *The Development of World Dominion*, traced the emergence of a long term policy in contemporary political and economic developments. *The Moving Storm* carried the story to late 1968, by which time the predicament of Europe — virtual encirclement by Soviet forces — was plainly visible to anyone not blinded by the episodic view of history. Since then, developments have been catastrophic . . ."

Clothbound — £1.10p. posted

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.

245 CANN HALL ROAD, LONDON, E.11

*From *The Review Of The News*, June 21, 1972.

Pentagon Papers*(continued from page 1)*

Continuing to report items in a planned P.R. job favoring Red China, *National Review* cites also a recent series of articles written from Peking by Seymour Topping, assistant Managing Editor of the *Times*. Topping's message is that hopes for "improvement in government-to-government relations" between the U.S. and Red China depend on our scuttling Formosa and leaving Chiang to his fate. *National Review* observes astutely, "Note: *Taiwan*, now, *not Vietnam* is the 'threat to peace' ". (Italics from *National Review*.)

I cannot leave this stylish fortnightly without reporting to you that in its issue of June 29, 1971, the following words occur in an editorial context: "There now exists a powerful and expanding, if informal, cabal that extends through the military and civilian branches of the government out into the academies, the media and other sectors of civilian life . . .". I am preparing a recommendation to Mr. Robert Welch that the writer of this editorial, if he can be identified, be given an honorary membership in The John Birch Society. Only two things might prevent me from submitting the recommendation: (1) I may learn that the writer already is a (secret) member of J.B.S., and (2) the word "cabal" is a bit more lurid than we Birchers are accustomed to use.

Even if it should be granted that I am correct in suspecting that the Pentagon Papers are, among other things, a diversion to keep us from thinking clearly about phasing the Vietnam War out into a total surrender of Formosa (Taiwan) to Red China (we may have to give Formosa to the Reds to get peace in Vietnam, the argument will run), it may be objected that all this noise and the striking too are in the East. So what is going to happen in the West?

Who knows, for sure? But on July 17, 1971, Associated Press reported from Washington:

Two Democratic senators have urged President Nixon to expand his China trip to include Moscow, a side trip they say is needed to avoid an unintentional affront to the Soviet Union. . . .

[Senator Hubert Humphrey] *noted the critical negotiations under way between the Soviet Union and the U.S. at Helsinki, Finland. . . .*

"I would hope that the trip [to Red China] would not in any way derail the SALT talks," Humphrey said. ". . . one way to prevent that would be for the President to include Moscow on his journey."

The former vice president's remarks were echoed by Sen. Alan Cranston, D-Calif., who said a Russian trip would be most helpful. . . .

Sometimes I think the country is really crazy. Here is the only publicized objection raised to Nixon's surrendering to Peking—that he might by so doing offend Moscow.

But really, from that demented point of view there is not much to worry about. I'm sure President Nixon plans to appease Red Russia as fully as he plans to appease Red China. And the SALT talks are just the place where he can make the greatest concessions. It was July 15, 1971, day of the Nixon horror movie, that I read a report by the Copley News Service's James Cary that the SALT talks may well be "much further along than has been publicly discussed".

Noting the agreement to limit A.B.M.s (see *The Review Of The News*, June 16, 1971, "Mr. Nixon's Program Is Mad"), Cary also reports a theory that "the Soviets are moving now because they feel more secure, have been able to consolidate their position in Eastern Europe, and feel the mood and upheaval in the United States are conducive to favorable (to the Soviets) settlements at this time. The 'Ostpolitik' (Eastern policy) of Western German Chancellor Willy Brandt is believed to have played a part in this".

With Willy Brandt as a messenger boy between Moscow and Washington, we can probably arrange to surrender all of Germany to the Communist bloc (thereby uniting Germany and solving the Berlin problem with a vengeance), and by a suitable treaty growing out of the SALT talks we can participate in the enforcement of Communist hegemony over Continental Europe. Such a Soviet-American "condominium"* would probably be able to enforce "peace" in the Middle East; we rehearsed with Russia for that at Suez in 1956, remember?

We shall be a long time learning the full meaning of the charade of the Pentagon Papers. There can be no doubt that the affair has hurt military security in the United States. That our own defense personnel have been to some degree involved only emphasizes this damage. It is not equally certain, but it is highly probable, that the commotion, which lasted almost exactly a month, from the middle of June to the middle of July, blurred the public apprehension of *how* we are getting out of Vietnam—*i.e.*, by crawling to Peking—and of the tremendous concessions which we seem prepared to make to the Russians in the SALT talks.

This is not to say that the content of the Pentagon Papers is not of great, sometimes intense, interest. The most poignant interest would seem to be in the matter of the assassination of South Vietnam's President Diem. It was an assassination encouraged by our government, with Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge acting, as it were, as lord high executioner, and spade work being done by the Central Intelligence Agency and selected Vietnamese generals. That is all pretty well documented by the Pentagon Papers, but I can't go into it at this time—except to say that you might think the *New York Times*, which has heretofore so solidly backed the Warren Commission, would never publish all this material which rather plays into Jim Garrison's hands, and the hands of others who believe the C.I.A. capable of being involved in the murder of a President whom it was officially supposed to protect.

Any agency—not necessarily the C.I.A.—which could with impunity kill one President might kill another one three weeks later. Such an agency could probably force yet another one to abdicate five years after that. It might even force a third man in Presidential office to violate every campaign promise, and by shameful and pernicious concessions made to acknowledged enemies of his country (not to mention betrayal of a venerable ally) to endanger, under the rubric PEACE, the continued independent existence of the United States of America.

(Concluded)

*That's what the "Liberals" call it; we Rightwingers call it "merger"; I don't know why the difference, unless "Liberals" think people won't know what they're talking about if they say "condominium".