



Premeditated Merger

by John F. McManus

Reprinted with permission from *The New American*, April 25, 1988

Why true Americans insist on sovereignty for this nation

Early in 1987, just after he had been named to the extremely important post of Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressman Jim Wright of Texas made an official visit to the Soviet Union. While there, he appeared on Soviet state-controlled television and offered viewers a lapel pin displaying crossed U.S. and USSR flags. His offer was passed along to Americans by U.S. media representatives. As a result, Speaker Wright began receiving letters asking for pins. He responded by sending them out "as a symbol of peace and friendship."

At the same time, the Soviet Union was in the eighth year of its bloody invasion of neighboring Afghanistan. Soviet troops were maintaining their nation's 40-year domination of Central and Eastern Europe; Soviet supplies and money were keeping Castro and Sandinista Communists afloat in Cuba and Nicaragua; 100,000 American families were still grieving over sons, husbands, fathers, and brothers killed by Soviet-supported Communist forces in Korea and Vietnam; Soviet-backed terrorists and revolutionaries were busily spreading unrest in Africa; and the tax bills of Americans included \$300 billion per year for defense against the Soviet threat.

Is Speaker Wright unaware of the consequences of ignoring the barbaric record of the Soviet Union? Despite its many public relations ploys, the USSR has not changed. Witness the final statement in Soviet leader Gorbachev's three-hour speech in Moscow on November 2, 1987. Celebrating 70 years of Communist rule in Russia, he declared:

In October 1917, we parted with the Old World, rejecting it once and for all. We are moving toward a new world, the world of Communism. We shall never turn off that road.

Mr. Wright's lapel pin showing the crossed U.S. and USSR flags spells grave danger for America. But so, too, do many official policies of the U.S. Government, especially those involving aid to and trade with Communist tyrannies.

In 1969, the U.S. Government permitted France to sell America's silicon microchip technology to Communist Poland, a totally dominated Soviet satellite. Miniature integrated circuits produced in Poland were soon being used in newer classes of Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles.

In 1972, largely as a result of the efforts of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, the U.S. Government authorized the sale of 164 precision ball-bearing grinders to the Soviet Union. These unique machines, manufactured only in America, produce tiny ball bearings with the remarkably precise specifications needed in space weaponry. Once in possession of this vital technological capability, the Soviets were able to MIRV their missiles, that is, place many independently targeted warheads atop a single missile.



By 1978, the Soviet Union had obtained such advanced computers as the Cyber 73 from Control Data Corporation and the IBM 370. Specific exemptions to existing controls had been granted by U.S. officials to allow delivery of this strategically important equipment.

Acquisition of just these key items — silicon microchips, precision ball-bearing grinders, and advanced computers — has given the USSR both a first-strike capability for its nuclear weapons, and a missile defense system capable of neutralizing our own weapons. Attempts to overcome these Soviet advances have cost U.S. taxpayers an additional \$20-30 billion per year in defense spending and, if the Strategic Defense Initiative is ever put in place, that figure will rise.

Not only has the U.S. Government cooperated strategically in arming a menacing adversary; it has also allowed the Communists to obtain much of the equipment and technology they could not get anywhere else on easy credit terms.

As Senator William Armstrong of Colorado stated in an important speech to the Senate on April 13, 1982:

It is hard to put a price tag on the additional burden heaped on our taxpayers by our reckless trade policies with the Soviet Union. But if it were not for these policies, we likely would not need the MX missile or the B-1 bomber to counter Soviet weapons we helped the Russians build.

In the last 10 years alone, the United States and other Western nations have sold to the Soviet Union and its satellites more than \$50 billion worth of sophisticated equipment the Communists could not produce themselves. This equipment has been used to produce nuclear missiles, tanks and armored cars, military command and control systems, spy satellites, and air defense radars. In addition, the Soviets have been able to purchase entire factories, designed and built by Western engineers and financed in large part by American and Western European banks. Much of the production of these factories is devoted to the manufacture of military transport, ammunition, and other logistical items for the Soviet war machine.

Communism is total power. It is the seizure of the reins of government by a few who then impose their will on the many with utter ruthlessness. Because it is so contrary to all normal human aspirations, Communist power can only be maintained through police-state terror, fortified borders, destruction of religion, and suppression of all freedom.

In a 1971 report, the U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee estimated that the Soviet Communists had murdered as many as 45 million of their own people. In another report that year, the same Senate Subcommittee estimated that Chinese Communists had killed as many as 64 million Chinese between 1927 and 1971. More slaughter accompanied Communist takeovers in Cuba, Algeria, Rhodesia, and Vietnam. Approximately three million of Cambodia's seven million people were exterminated when Communists took control of that nation in 1975.

Without provocation, the Soviets established a puppet government in neighboring Afghanistan in 1979. Tens of thousands of Soviet troops were sent across the border to sustain and consolidate Communist power. In the incredibly cruel war they have waged against courageous native resistance, over a million Afghans have died, another four million have fled to other countries, and



countless numbers have been maimed, many of them children whose limbs and eyes have been blown away by Soviet booby-trapped toys.

The reality of Communism includes brutal seizures of power, confiscation of property, enslavement of countless numbers of human beings, mass killings, manufactured starvation, excruciating tortures, and a vast network of prisons and slave labor camps. For sheer horror, Communists stand second to none over the long course of mankind's history. Yet, America has aided and continues to aid this monstrous force for evil.

Still another reality of Communism is its destruction of the economic life of any nation it captures. Under the Communist-socialist system, government regulates, controls, taxes, and constricts workers so completely that the incentive to work is destroyed. Poor performance in Communist nations does not spring from bad luck or an accumulation of mistakes; it follows as night follows day, and it cannot be otherwise. Left alone, Communism would fall of its own dead weight.

There are important questions about Communism, therefore, that must be asked.

- How has its self-defeating socialist system successfully seized more than two score of nations and a third of the world's people?
- How does an economic system that is a complete failure continue to grow stronger and more menacing?
- How is Communism able to continue suppressing hundreds of millions who despise it and would flee if they could?
- How can the Soviet Union afford a military force that occupies Central and Eastern Europe, threatens Western Europe, invades Afghanistan, supplies and trains armies in Cuba and Nicaragua, foments revolution in Africa, and even boasts of a missile capability that is the equal of our own?

The single answer to all of these questions is that Communism receives help in all of its treacherous endeavors from the non-Communist world, chiefly from the government of the United States. Whatever else can be said about this aid, there is an important, fundamental point that cannot be made too often. It is that helping Communist regimes has always been — and continues to be — morally wrong. Treating them with dignity cannot be justified. Overlooking their treachery is wrong. Earning profits by supplying them with equipment, technology, and credit only compounds the problem. And appeasing them with fawning smiles and pleas for peace only strengthens their resolve to continue ravaging the planet, to continue — as Gorbachev has stated — striving toward a “world of Communism.”

The documented pattern of U.S. Government aid to Communism must be broken. Begin with the critical diplomatic help given to top Communist revolutionary Leon Trotsky by President Woodrow Wilson and his closest advisor, Edward Mandell House, that enabled Trotsky to join with Lenin to complete the Communist conquest of Russia. Add the 700,000 tons of U.S. foodstuffs, given to a Soviet government that promptly used the food to consolidate power in the 1920s; President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's extension of diplomatic recognition, legitimacy and credit that saved the Communist regime in 1933; and \$12 billion in U.S. Lend-Lease aid that saved the Soviets from



destruction in World War II and started them on the way to world power.

Winning the War, Losing the Peace

The post-World War II years saw our own nation disarm and return to peace-time pursuits. But those same years saw Communism conquer much of Europe and the vast nation of China. Assistance to Communism in the form of equipment and supplies was now being augmented by vital diplomatic help. No less an authority than U.S. Ambassador to Poland Arthur Bliss Lane tried to tell fellow Americans that Poland didn't so much fall in 1947 as she was pushed into Communist hands by officials of the U.S. Government. His 1948 book, ***I Saw Poland Betrayed***, detailed the incredible story. But his book was smothered and created hardly a ripple. Additional revelations later showed that the same pattern had been followed to push Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia into Communist hands.

The fall of China in 1949 demonstrated even more clearly that U.S. diplomacy was being administered by individuals who favored Communism. Against the expressed wishes of General Douglas MacArthur, Soviet Russia had been welcomed into the war against Japan only a few weeks before the Japanese surrendered. For that gesture, the Soviets were given occupation rights over the Manchurian region of China, where the huge supplies of Japanese war materiel were stored. All of that bonanza was quickly transferred by the Soviets to the Chinese Communists, who used it to attack our Nationalist Chinese allies led by Chiang Kai-shek.

As the civil war in China intensified, U.S. leaders demanded that Chiang form a coalition government with the Communists, a move that he knew would be suicidal. He refused, and immediately all American aid was terminated. Chiang had tanks but no gasoline; he had troops and guns but no ammunition; he had the will to resist Communism, but the ally he had relied upon, the United States, had taken away his ability to fight. In desperation, he fled with his government and the remnant of his forces to Taiwan, and the huge nation of China fell into the hands of the bloodiest murderers the world has ever known.

This immense tragedy prompted a young Massachusetts Congressman to denounce U.S. policies regarding China. In 1949, John F. Kennedy was absolutely correct when he stated:

Our policy in China has reaped the whirlwind. The continuing insistence that aid would not be forthcoming unless a coalition government with the Communists was formed was a crippling blow to the Nationalist government This is the tragic story of China whose freedom we once fought to preserve. What our young men have saved, our diplomats and our President have frittered away.

One of the authors of U.S. policy that betrayed Chiang Kai-shek in the late 1940s was a State Department official named Dean Rusk. But in 1961, President John Kennedy named that same Dean Rusk to be our nation's Secretary of State. Unfortunately, it was Kennedy, not Rusk, who changed his attitude.

Communist conquests in Europe and Asia, and a growing awareness of the complicity of U.S. officials in those conquests caused the American people to begin wondering about our own



leaders. The conduct of the Korean War from 1950 until 1953 raised more apprehensions about America's leadership. There, for the first time, American troops found themselves engaged in combat against Communist forces. But there was no declaration of war, and victory was never the goal. The war that had been brilliantly won by MacArthur's forces in its early days had been converted into a deadly stalemate. Unprecedented restrictions on our own forces were ordered from on high and MacArthur himself was removed from command — for wanting victory. Out of the Korean War, Red China emerged as the most powerful military force in Asia, and U.S. influence in that region declined sharply.

Because the Communist progress we are detailing could not have been accomplished without the vital help of U.S. diplomats, Congressional investigatory bodies began probing evidence of loyalty and security lapses by high government officials. The House Committee on Un-American Activities exposed some of the treachery. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee concluded that there were four Communist cells operating within our government, and that only two had been exposed. Sad to say, the others have never been exposed. Wisconsin Senator Joseph McCarthy publicly exposed more than 100 individuals who were working for the U.S. Government and who also were helping the Communist cause. Despite incredible propaganda to the contrary, in not one of those cases were his actions ever shown to have been unjust. But, after McCarthy had been hounded to his death, many of the persons who had resigned or been removed from government positions because of his efforts were welcomed back to their posts. The congressional committees were subsequently abolished and our once formidable internal security apparatus was completely dismantled.

World Government the Goal

While the motive of those who aid Communists is to have them take control of some nations, a related and more comprehensive goal is to have the threat of Communism force the remaining free peoples to sacrifice their nation's sovereignty to a world government. The not-so-hidden plan calls for simultaneously taking all the steps toward world government, and then creating a universal "new world order" under the framework of the United Nations or some other all-powerful central governing body. That world government would then rule the globe in much the same way that the masters of the Kremlin rule the captive people in Soviet Russia today.

The very first change would require that the United States renounce, or at least ignore, the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution. Not only would the "independence" portions of each have to be cast aside; the references in the Declaration to man's "Creator," "Nature's God," and "Divine Providence" would have to be suppressed. After all, Communist governments reject such notions. They are not going to change. Nor is a United Nations that also has no place for God.

Next, the limitations on government power that were so carefully written down in the U.S. Constitution could no longer stand. It's true that many of these constitutional reins have been broken. But under a world government, no other government's rules could be allowed.



Then, the wealth of the American people would have to be redistributed. It would not be enough to have other nations copy the American free enterprise system that produced our wealth. The Communist nations in the world government would never allow such a thing. Instead, we would see government action to transfer equipment and money over seas, to move jobs and industries from the United States to other lands, and in general to bring the U.S. standard of living more in line with that of Communist and Third World nations. America would end up with state-run industries like those in socialist countries.

There would, of course, be some individuals who would be dissatisfied with the political and economic consequences of world government. In order to keep them from creating problems, there would have to be restrictions on speaking out, publishing, conducting meetings, and even moving about from place to place. Any orderly society should expect its citizens to have a spirit of cooperation, so it would be hoped that none of those rules would ever have to be enforced. But enforcement would take place if needed.

World government would also mean that the only military force of any consequence would be the one possessed by the world government — and it would be used to enforce “peace.” Of course, while this seemingly desirable situation is developing, everyone will be asked to forget that a world government possessing enough military power to enforce peace would also have enough military power to enforce global tyranny.

Not only have millions been persuaded that a world government is necessary, practically all of the specific steps to build one are being taken right now. Just think: God is being driven out of any institution touched by government; the Constitution’s limitations on federal power are consistently ignored; American wealth, jobs, and industries are being transferred overseas; the average standard of living has either declined or wives and mothers have to work to keep pace.

Government at all levels takes so much in taxes from the American people that the paycheck of one spouse is used to satisfy growing tax bills. In the process, the family is the casualty, and America’s children in particular suffer. Isn’t it time for Americans to take stock of where we are being taken?

Alger Hiss the Pacifist

You may have heard of a man named Alger Hiss. A former top State Department official, advisor to Franklin D. Roosevelt at the Yalta Conference in 1945, architect of the United Nations, Hiss was publicly exposed in 1948 as having been a Soviet spy for over a decade. At the time he was exposed, he was serving as the President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. This huge tax-exempt foundation was funding such groups as the Institute of Pacific Relations that played such an important role in undermining Chiang Kai-shek; the Council on Foreign Relations that had been working for the goal of a one-world government since 1921; and other organizations that were busily generating support for and enhancing the power of the United Nations.

By 1952, many of the activities of the Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller foundations, among others, had become so blatantly left-wing that Congress decided to look beyond the government agencies



it was investigating and probe these private foundations as well. What the foundations were doing included providing grants to domestic Communists and socialists, publishing anti-free-enterprise books, pouring money into the hands of leftist groups and individuals operating in this country, subverting the education of America's young, and always promoting the concept of world government and the importance of the United Nations.

The group created by Congress to investigate the foundations became known as the Reece Committee after its chairman, Tennessee Congressman Carroll Reece. One of its top staff members was Norman Dodd, whose subsequent startling revelations have helped to explain why many powerful individuals continue to aid Communism, and where such activity will lead. During the preliminary stages of this investigation, Mr. Dodd went to New York City to interview H. Rowan Gaither, the president of the very powerful Ford Foundation. At that meeting, Rowan Gaither brazenly told Norman Dodd that he and others who had worked for the State Department, the United Nations, and other federal agencies, had for years

... operated under directives issued by the White House, the substance of which was that we should make every effort to so alter life in the United States as to make possible a comfortable merger with the Soviet Union.

Then he added, "We are continuing to be guided by just such directives." When the thoroughly shocked Norman Dodd asked Rowan Gaither if he would repeat that statement to the full House Committee so that the American people would know exactly what he and his powerful associates were trying to accomplish, he said, "This we would not think of doing."

Merge the United States with the Soviet Union? Do so under directives emanating from the White House? Work to accomplish such a horrendous goal with others from the State Department, the United Nations, and numerous federal agencies? Such an incredible scheme could be accomplished only if the United States were pushed toward socialism and the Soviet Union were massively built up. There would also have to be a remarkable propaganda effort in America to destroy the spirit of independence and to overcome the strong anti-Communist and anti-socialist sentiment of the people. In 1953, such a goal seemed completely unattainable. And Norman Dodd must have created more doubts about himself than about the head of the Ford Foundation when he tried to warn many Americans about what he had been told.

It was during the Eisenhower years that the fiction of mellowing Communism was begun. In 1955, our President sat at the table in Geneva with Soviet dictator Khrushchev, and, in 1959, he welcomed the bloody-handed "butcher of the Ukraine" to the United States. The start of what was called "peaceful coexistence" accorded the leaders of the Soviet Union tremendous legitimacy and paved the way for future moves that would build up the Communists and tear down the United States — so that a merger and eventual world government could be accomplished.

In 1957, shortly after the Soviet Union brutally crushed the Hungarian revolt, the Soviets startled the world by launching the first man-made, orbiting satellite. It was called Sputnik. Suddenly, the American people were told that the backward Soviets weren't so backward anymore. We were assured that they had forged ahead of the United States, but furious activity in the United States



was spawned by Sputnik, much of it amounting to huge federal intervention in the field of education. Anyone who cares to do so can trace the tragic decline of American schooling to this period. As more federal money and federal control have dominated the schools, the quality of education has plummeted. The dismal performance of America's schools has become obvious to virtually everyone.

The boost in prestige for the USSR supplied by Sputnik was enormous. And the shock it produced supplied the excuse not only for a federal presence in education, but for higher taxes, greatly expanded government spending, unbalanced budgets, huge federal indebtedness, far more centralization of power in Washington, and a striking increase in the willingness of the American people to appease rather than oppose Communism.

Nine years later, however, it became known that our own government had forbidden U.S. scientists to launch our own orbiting satellite prior to the Soviet launch. General James M. Gavin had been the leader of the U.S. Army's research and development programs. In a speech given in 1966 in Boston, he told of his certainty that our space scientists at Huntsville, Alabama's Redstone Arsenal could have orbited a satellite a full year before the Soviets launched Sputnik. He stated that he "made several entreaties to the Department of Defense seeking authority to launch a satellite, and shortly thereafter I was given a written order forbidding me to do so." He also stated that he knew of the Soviet capability to put a satellite in space months before they succeeded in doing so. In other words, orders from high U.S. officials made sure that the Soviets would be first. The benefits derived from Sputnik for the Soviets and for those who wanted to merge the United States and USSR should never be underestimated.

Building Bridges

During the 1960s, the slogan used to justify helping Communism was "bridge-building." The overall plan to compromise U.S. sovereignty in favor of world government continued, and Rowan Gaither's private admission was now eclipsed by related pronouncements from those who would sit in the very topmost seats of power in our nation.

In 1960, a man named Walt Rostow wrote a book entitled ***The United States in the World Arena***. In it, he stated:

It is a legitimate American national objective to see removed from all nations — including the United States — the right to use substantial military force to pursue their own interests. Since this residual right is the root of national sovereignty ... it is therefore, an American interest to see an end to nationhood as it has been historically defined.

A short time later, Mr. Rostow accepted President Kennedy's appointment as the leader of the State Department's Policy Planning Division.

The 1960s, of course, also saw the United States get bogged down in Vietnam in another undeclared war that numerous high-ranking military officers openly and repeatedly insisted could have been won in a matter of weeks. But more restrictions, even worse than those mandated in Korea, totally contradicted all the lessons of military history and insured that an American victory



would not be achieved.

One of the architects of America's losing strategy in that war was Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. On February 26, 1966, while hundreds of Americans were dying each week in the jungles and rice paddies of Vietnam, Mr. McNamara testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee. Some Senators wanted to know why we weren't winning. So, too, did our generals, admirals, and foot-soldiers. But here is McNamara's answer:

To declare war would add a new psychological element to the international situation, since in this century declarations of war have come to imply dedication to the total destruction of the enemy. It would increase the danger of misunderstanding our true objectives....

Though he failed to state what those "true objectives" were, it is perfectly obvious that his goal was not to defeat Communism, in Southeast Asia or anywhere else. But, if his objectives included helping Communists to dominate all of Southeast Asia, softening up the American people's will to resist, and inducing them to believe that Communist power had grown while American power had decreased, the way he and others forced our military to conduct the war was a grand success.

Along with victory-denying restrictions on our military, President Johnson, in October 1966, ordered increased aid to and special treatment for the Soviet Union, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Mongolia, Poland, and Romania. But they were the suppliers of North Vietnam, then engaged in war against American troops. Hundreds of Americans were being killed every week. And the aid flowing to North Vietnam from the USSR and its European satellites was no secret. On October 27, 1966, the **New York Times** reported: "The Soviet Union and its allies agreed at the conference of their leaders in Moscow last week to grant North Vietnam assistance in material and money amounting to about one billion dollars Poland's contribution will be thirty million dollars, it was said...."

There was never any doubt about which nations were giving North Vietnam the wherewithal to fight Americans in Vietnam. Yet, both the amount and variety of help given to the Soviet Union and its satellites by our own government increased as the war worsened. North Vietnam Premier Pham Van Dong boasted in 1965: "We shall defeat the Americans with Soviet weapons." He could just as easily have stated that the job would be accomplished because America had supplied the money and the materials.

The Soviet Union was indeed North Vietnam's main supplier. In the election year of 1968, the help given by the Kremlin to their Communist allies became an issue. Candidate Richard Nixon addressed the annual convention of the American Legion in New Orleans on September 12th, just prior to the 1968 election. He declared that there should be no trade with any nation, including the Soviet Union, "that aids the enemy in Vietnam." His remarks were greeted with enthusiastic applause, and he won a close election.

No sooner had he taken office in 1969, however, than President Nixon announced plans to expand trade with the Soviet Union's satellites. As the United States eased the Soviet Union's burden in keeping its satellite nations afloat, the USSR itself was able to divert more of its resources to North Vietnam. And it did so increasingly throughout the war.



By 1970, over 1.7 million Americans signed petitions to Congress to stop U.S. assistance to Communist nations. Packages containing 20,000 signatures to a Congressman and 50,000 signatures to a Senator were delivered to over 60 members of the Congress. But the effort expended was not enough, and the aid to Communists grew larger. So did the casualty reports from Vietnam.

By 1972, President Nixon had dropped all pretense of anti-Communism. On October 18th, he signed an Official Determination that said:

I hereby determine that it is in the national interest for the Export-Import Bank of the United States to guarantee, insure, extend credit and participate in the extension of credit in connection with the purchase or lease of any product or service by, for use in, or for sale or lease to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in accordance with Section 2(b)(2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended.

Very few Americans ever saw this document. And Richard Nixon was overwhelmingly reelected three weeks later, winning 49 of the 50 states. It cannot be stressed too emphatically that the Export-Import Bank is a U.S. Government agency totally funded with tax money taken from the American people. It dispenses its funds to foreign governments to give them a capability to purchase American goods. For decades, Communist nations have benefitted from this incredible arrangement.

The war in Vietnam finally ended in 1973. The United States lost. South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia were quickly engulfed in Communist savagery. The toll of death and misery in those three nations is indescribable. But the Vietnam War brought many horrible consequences to the United States as well:

- Over 50,000 Americans killed;
- Over 300,000 Americans wounded;
- Our military leadership converted from men who were winners to men who are accommodators;
- More government (war always means more government);
- Moral decline, especially among the young;
- A huge increase in federal indebtedness;
- A sharp division of our people;
- A marked loss of patriotism among those who never realized that everything about the Vietnam War was a perversion of the American system;
- And a spreading conviction that Communism cannot be beaten, must be further appeased, and should even be merged with our own nation under some supranational authority.

Aid to Communism Accelerates

In 1972, the U.S. Export-Import Bank financed 45 percent of the cost of building the huge Kama River truck factory in the heart of the Soviet Union. Another 45 percent was financed by David Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank in New York City. The Soviets themselves put up a mere 10



percent of the cost. The project, begun during the Nixon Administration, was carried forward by President Ford's team and was completed during President Carter's term in office.

In response to inquiries about this use of the American people's money, officials in Washington insisted that Kama River trucks would be used within the USSR for strictly commercial purposes and that improving the lot of the Russian people would lessen the potential for war. The Russian people, of course, posed no threat of war to anyone. It was the Soviet government, for whom we were building the truck factory, that threatened war. Those who tried to point out these obvious truths were either ignored or told to trust the Soviets.

It was in 1979 when trucks began to roll off the Kama River assembly lines. They had been built with American machine tools, diesel engine technology, computers, electronics, and whatever else was needed to make heavy-duty trucks. And the first of these trucks turned out to be designed for military use and were used by the Soviet army to invade Afghanistan. **Industrial Research & Development** magazine reported in July 1980 that some of the Kama River trucks had been outfitted for use as missile launchers and had been exported from the USSR to Libya, Syria and Iraq. In addition to trucks, the Kama River plant was also producing armored personnel carriers and the engines for the Soviet T-72 battle tanks.

In 1979, President Carter presided over the betrayal of two of America's best friends and closest allies. Aiming an incredibly stringent human rights program at the Shah of Iran and President Anastasio Somoza of Nicaragua — but not at Soviet Russia, Red China, or any Communist nation — the Carter Administration actually forced both nations into unfriendly hands.

In Iran under the Shah, America had military bases that were also listening posts tuned in to what was going on in the Soviet Union. Under the Ayatollah Khomeini, Iran closed the bases and became a seat of anti-American fanaticism and an enemy of other nations in the Middle East.

The campaign that led to Somoza's demise makes sense only if the overall policy of the U.S. Government fits Rowan Gaither's description. Just as the Truman Administration had cut off aid to Chiang Kai-shek and betrayed China into Communist hands, and just as the Eisenhower Administration had sabotaged Batista and betrayed Cuba into Communist hands, so too did the Carter Administration cut off aid to the elected Somoza government and turn that nation over to the Communist Sandinista movement.

It was the Carter Administration that pressured enough Senators to turn over the American canal in Panama to the Marxist dictatorship of Omar Torrijos, and to pay his government \$400 million to take it. A little publicized aspect of this incredible transaction is the existence of two versions of the treaty. The one the United States signed and ratified contained a provision giving the U.S. Government rights to intervene militarily to keep the Canal open. But the treaty signed by Panamanian officials did not contain such a provision. President Carter knew of this incredible discrepancy, but he chose to keep it from the Senate.

The Carter Administration endorsed the SALT II agreement, a treaty so flawed that even the Democratic-controlled Senate would not ratify it. Undaunted, President Carter announced that he would abide by it anyway. The Soviets promptly violated 11 separate provisions of the treaty. But



President Reagan also agreed to abide by SALT II.

In 1979, the Carter Administration, following the lead of the Nixon and Ford teams before it, withdrew U.S. diplomatic recognition from our Free Chinese ally on Taiwan and gave it to the Red Chinese regime in Peking, the most brutal tyranny in the history of the world. As expected the flood of propaganda telling Americans that the Chinese Communists have changed has been followed by massive increases in shipments of technology, military equipment, and credit, and by the importation of vast amounts of goods produced by China's slave labor for the benefit of China's Communist regime.

Reagan to the Rescue?

To many, the arrival of President Ronald Reagan in the White House offered hope that America would reverse decades of harmful foreign policy and stop supplying the Communists. Only a few days after he took office in 1981, Mr. Reagan was asked at a news conference if he felt that detente was still possible. He responded:

Well, so far detente's been a one-way street that the Soviet Union has used to pursue its own aims. I don't have to think of an answer as to what I think their intentions are. They have repeated it. I know of no leader of the Soviet Union since the revolution and including the present leadership that has not more than once repeated in various Communist congresses they hold, their determination that their goal must be the promotion of world revolution and a one-world socialist or Communist state, whichever word you want to use.

Now, as long as they do that and as long as they at the same time have openly and publicly declared that the only morality they recognize is what will further their cause, meaning they reserve unto themselves the right to commit any crime, to lie, to cheat, in order to attain that ... I think when you do business with them, even as a detente, you keep that in mind.

Yet, after only four months in office, the President personally signed a document authorizing a \$120 million loan from the U.S. Export-Import Bank to Communist Romania for construction of a nuclear power generating facility. Two weeks later, he signed a document reducing tariffs and other trade barriers between the U.S. and the Communist nations of Romania and Hungary. And a few weeks after that, in July 1981, he authorized the spending of U.S. taxpayers' money for military education and training for Communist Yugoslavia

In February 1982, Deputy Secretary of Agriculture Richard Lyng conceded that the United States was paying Communist Poland's overdue debts to U.S. banks. The predicament of Poland, which was about to default on loans used to purchase American grain, threatened the economic viability of the entire Communist bloc. But the loans supplied by American banks had been co-signed by the Department of Agriculture. And even though the law required the United States officially to declare Poland in default before the loans could be paid, the Reagan Administration ignored the default issue and the U.S. taxpayers were forced to absorb the \$1.6 billion debt. The Communists had won again.

This gift to Poland (ultimately to the USSR) came just after the Polish armed forces, backed by



Soviet troops at the border, crushed the brief flirtation with freedom begun by Polish workers. The U.S. action saved the Polish regime and extinguished the rekindled hopes of the long-oppressed Polish people.

Communist governments will become less warlike and more friendly, we are told, if we provide aid to them. We even send some of them military hardware. How the Red Chinese will become less warlike when we supply them with armaments is never explained. Nor does our assistance make the recipients of our aid more friendly.

In March 1985, several U.S. banks and the Bank of Tokyo loaned over \$1 billion to Communist East Germany. The East Germans turned right around and sent \$20 million to the Communist Sandinista regime in Nicaragua, the same government the United States was supposed to be vigorously opposing. Legislation to make such loans to Communist bloc nations illegal was introduced in Congress by Senator Jake Garn of Utah. However, it died when President Reagan expressed his opposition.

Another excuse for aid to Communist China is that it will break the Peking regime away from Moscow. In 1981, President Reagan signed an authorization to supply \$57 million of Export-Import Bank money to the Red Chinese for power generating equipment. In 1982, he signed an authorization for \$68 million to help them purchase a steel mill. This is American taxpayers' money being given to a tyrannical Communist regime.

In 1985, the Administration allowed the sale of equipment to enable the Red Chinese to build a factory to produce artillery shells. In 1986, we sold them anti-submarine torpedoes and electronics equipment that enabled them to modernize their jet fighter planes.

Did all of this break Red China away from the Soviets? Did it make the Peking regime more friendly? The Red Chinese answered, but the Administration refused to listen: In July 1985, the Red Chinese signed a \$14 billion trade pact with the Soviet Union. In September 1986, they sent a \$20 million interest-free loan to Communist Nicaragua.

In the single fiscal year of 1985, the United States gave over \$300 million to various Communist countries under direct foreign aid programs. But during that same year, America helped finance Communist regimes with an additional \$6 billion channeled through the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, two United Nations lending agencies. There seems to be no end of ways for the U.S. Government to help Communist regimes.

Far from merely tolerating deals with Communist nations, the Reagan Administration has been an aggressive champion of such practices. In December 1985, then Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige led a delegation of 400 American corporate executives on a trade excursion to Moscow. The businessmen represented nearly 200 American firms. News of this trade mission prompted a writer for an Arizona newspaper to seek the names of those individuals and the firms they represented. After two years of effort and \$20,000 of the newspaper's money for Freedom of Information Act requests and court costs, Richard Lessner and the newspaper for which he labors admitted defeat. The U.S. Government would not allow those names to be made public. Our government knows who these Red-trading businessmen are, and the Soviet Government knows



who they are, so there's no national security reason for this secrecy. We have reached a point where the U.S. Government finds it necessary to withhold information from the American people, and the beneficiaries of the secrecy are the Communists and their trading partners here in the United States.

Organized Red Trading

In June 1973, President Nixon and Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev signed an agreement that led to the formation of the U.S.-USSR Trade and Economic Council (USTEC). Its purpose was to expand trade between the two countries. Then Secretary of the Treasury George Shultz helped to create the group. With 26 U.S. businessmen and 26 Soviet officials as its Board of Directors, USTEC opened an office in New York City in 1973. Hundreds of U.S. firms have been recruited, and the business of helping the USSR is booming.

One of the founders and the eventual Co-Chairman of USTEC is C. William Verity, named late in 1987 by President Reagan to be Secretary of Commerce. During Senate hearings prior to the Verity confirmation, Senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina described USTEC as "quite simply an arm of the Soviet government under KGB control whose purpose is to subvert the U.S. economy." Helms labelled Verity "a key agent of influence for Soviet trade." While expressing his strong opposition to the nomination, Senator Helms indicted Verity as one who seeks "an ultimate convergence, or merging, of the United States and the Soviet Union, into a common culture, economy, philosophy, and despotism." That merger, outlined by Rowan Gaither to Norman Dodd over 30 years ago, is much closer to reality today.

Many Americans were shocked that President Reagan named a man with Verity's pro-Soviet background to any cabinet position. But Mr. Reagan had already applauded Verity's work as Co-Chairman of USTEC. In 1984, in a letter to Verity, he stated: "I appreciate the opportunity to welcome Soviet participants in the plenary session of the U.S.-USSR Trade and Economic Council. It is encouraging that leading representatives of American industry and their Soviet counterparts can meet to discuss trade and economic issues of mutual interest."

Some of the firms known to be participating in USTEC include Allen Bradley, Allis Chalmers, American Express, Archer Daniels Midland, Armco Steel, Cargill, Caterpillar, Chase Manhattan, Coca-Cola, Deere and Company, Dow Chemical, Dresser Industries, E.I. duPont, Ingersoll Rand, International Harvester, Kodak, Monsanto, Occidental Petroleum, PepsiCo, Union Carbide, and Xerox. But we have good reason to believe that there are hundreds of others engaging in Soviet trade.

Senator Helms also took the occasion during the Verity hearings to blast, for their efforts with USTEC to merge the U.S. and USSR, David Rockefeller (Chase Manhattan Bank), Dwayne Andreas (Archer Daniels Midland), Donald Kendall (PepsiCo), and Armand Hammer (Occidental Petroleum). Labelling their efforts "a cabal," the Senator included these men in his description of those "who are willing to seek short-term profits ... while looking the other way at the betrayal of our long-term national security interests."



Yes, they seek profits, but the Senator was even more on target when he described these powerful individuals as working for “a merging of the United States and the Soviet Union into a common culture, economy, philosophy and despotism.”

His mention of David Rockefeller is certainly appropriate. No one has done more to help the Soviet Union than this billionaire banker and political manipulator. In a revealing article Rockefeller wrote for the October/November 1977 *USTEC Journal*, he boasted: “It is of interest to recall that at The Chase Manhattan Bank we can look back to an unbroken relationship with Russian financial institutions that straddles over 50 years The commercial banking relationship of our institution was never interrupted even in the darkest days.”

Those “darkest days” included Stalin’s bloody purges, the brutal conquest of Central and Eastern Europe, the creation of a vast network of slave labor camps, and the murders of tens of millions. But through all its criminal activities, the Kremlin has had a friend at Chase Manhattan. And it still has a very good friend there today.

Disarmament

For years, the U.S. Government has committed our nation to various U.S.-USSR disarmament treaties. Sold to the American people as a method of forestalling nuclear war, these treaties have all been broken by the Soviet Union while they have been honored by the United States. Each new treaty amounts to a further exercise in unilateral disarmament. We disarm; they cheat.

If disarmament were really our own government’s goal, the United States could put a stop to the flow of strategic goods, high-technology equipment, and money that the Soviets need to build their weapons. But help to the Kremlin is not only continued; it is increased. We can’t stress this point too heavily: Disarming the Soviets can be accomplished by stopping all aid and trade. And the related and equally important point is that signing disarmament treaties with the Soviets disarms only the United States, because only our nation honors the various treaties. We are being reduced to a position where the loss of our sovereignty and merger with Communist nations in a one-world tyranny will be presented to Americans as the best available alternative.

Foreign Affairs is a very prestigious publication. The journal of the Establishment’s pinnacle of power, the world government-promoting Council on Foreign Relations, should never be ignored. Its pages carry important elements of the strategy of the one-world merger maniacs. It is in this quarterly magazine that tactics are suggested, and attitudes are forged.

In April 1974, at a time when David Rockefeller served as Chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations, **Foreign Affairs** published a remarkably frank proposal for doing away with U.S. sovereignty. Authored by Columbia University professor and veteran State Department official Richard N. Gardner, the article was entitled “The Hard Road to World Order.” It began with Gardner expressing his disappointment that like-minded internationalists had failed to achieve what he termed “instant world government.” For a new and more effective route to the creation of an all-powerful superstate, he offered:

In short, the “house of world order” will have to be built from the bottom up rather than from the



top down. It will look like a great “booming, buzzing confusion,” to use Williams James’ famous description of reality, but an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece, will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault.

As a more efficient way to form the “house of world order,” Gardner suggested luring all nations into a variety of technological, economic, and political entanglements. The first three of ten he listed were the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Membership of the various nations of the world in these and other organizations would, according to this prominent internationalist, facilitate the erosion of national sovereignty and speed the development of his longed-for world government. In the process, of course, it’s good-bye to an independent United States of America. It cannot be stated too emphatically: Anyone holding the Gardner views would not be able honestly to swear an oath to support and defend the U.S. Constitution.

Both the IMF and the World Bank were conceived at the famous Bretton Woods Monetary Conference held in New Hampshire during July 1944. The chief architect of each was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Harry Dexter White, who was later shown to have been a Soviet spy.

Ostensibly, the World Bank was created to provide loans to member nations for the purpose of reconstruction and development after World War II. The IMF’s stated purpose is to stimulate international trade and promote stability in the realm of international currency exchange.

But the true effects of these two multinational financial institutions, both United Nations agencies, were analyzed in 1963 by respected political columnist Dan Smoot. Cutting through all the propoganda, Smoot said that the two agencies would:

- “Strip the United States of its gold reserves;”
- “Build up the industrial capacities of other nations;”
- “Remove markets from American producers;”
- “Entwine America’s affairs with those of other nations so that the U.S. could no longer act independently.”

In fiscal 1985, these two money spigots doled out the following amounts to Communist nations: Red China \$2.3 billion; Yugoslavia, \$1.7 billion; Hungary, \$1.1 billion; Romania \$768.3 million; Zimbabwe, \$293.6 million; Angola, \$116.2 million; Vietnam, \$11.08 million; Mozambique, \$107.9 million; and Nicaragua, \$36.8 million.

As we mentioned, the Gardner proposal in ***Foreign Affairs*** magazine also called for using the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to build world government. Begun in 1948, GATT takes from its member nations their own decision-making process in the vital areas of international trade relations. Despite warnings that U.S. membership had the potential to affect adversely the jobs and income of every worker and farmer in America, Congress approved U.S. entry into the group at its birth. Many of the problems facing individual Americans, even the problems of our nation’s commerce as a whole, can be traced to GATT, where we have only a single vote among the 95 member nations.



Reagan's Reversal

Early in 1988, President Reagan completely reversed one of his long-standing positions and announced support for the USSR's desire to gain membership in the IMF, the World Bank, and GATT. Membership in the two banking institutions will allow the Soviets to obtain vitally needed hard currency, and also enhance the USSR's ability to acquire additional private credit. Membership in GATT will help the Soviets to improve their trading position in Western markets, especially to gain access to more high technology goods.

The Reagan reversal greatly adds to the power and prestige of these international agencies, dramatically improves the lot of the economically-strapped Soviet Union, and amounts to a significant leap forward along Professor Gardner's "Hard Road to World Order." It also fits exactly into the strategy of tearing the United States down, building the Soviet Union and other nations up, and finally merging all into a neatly arranged world tyranny.

A significant new development in the unconscionable drive to help the Soviet Union is the joint venture program. American firms are being pressured by the Commerce Department and USTEC to build factories in the USSR. America's corporate giants would be permitted by the Soviets to own only as much as 49 percent of each facility they erect, and it would be presided over by a Soviet national. But the lure of great profits has already attracted large American firms who have been USTEC's major participants for years. The opportunity for the Soviets to gain access to American technology and the fruits of free enterprise — with little or no investment on their part — must have the Kremlin's tyrants raising their vodka glasses to toast their good fortune.

More toasts surely accompanied the announcement that a team from Harvard University's prestigious Business School had joined with a team of Soviet researchers to facilitate this joint venture project. The announced purpose is to aid the USSR in modernizing its economy with Western investments. Of particular interest to the Soviets are joint ventures in the high technology area.

Despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary, many Americans continue to believe that so-called capitalists from the West are the archenemies of Communists. Over and over, we hear confused citizens taking solace in the belief that our own leaders — in government and in business — would have so much to lose should America become a Communist or socialist state. And yet, this is exactly what is happening right before their eyes. The very leaders who supposedly would never do what they have indeed been doing for decades do not believe in freedom for all, just freedom for themselves and others at the top. Calling them capitalists is not enough; they are *monopoly* capitalists. The logical extension of their cooperation with Communism abroad and their promotion of Big Brother government at home is the destruction of the free market system in America and the creation of a socialist economy. Would these corporate socialists lose anything? Not at all. They would end up with no more wants than Gorbachev or any of the other elitists who sit atop the Soviet empire. In fact, they would be better off, in their way of looking at things, for they would no longer face any threat of competition. Their allies in government would see to that.



This is the mentality of men like Commerce Secretary William Verity and all of those who aid the Soviet Union through USTEC. This is the mentality of the Harvard Business School. It is what Senator Helms meant on October 14, 1987 when he condemned the Rockefeller-Andreas-Hammer-Kendall-Verity school of thought that he said is working for “a merging of the United States and the Soviet Union into a common culture, economy, philosophy, and despotism.”

Capitalists oppose Communism? Those who truly believe in freedom despise Communism and want nothing to do with it. But there are others who have no qualms whatsoever about cooperating with Communists, or using ruthless means — usually with the government’s assistance — to drive potential competitors out of existence. These are the people who seek only what’s good for business, not what’s good for the country, or what’s just plain good.

Look at the prestigious **Wall Street Journal**. On August 24, 1987, this seat of American “capitalism” published a nine-page advertising supplement for the Soviet Union. Labelled **USSR: New Opportunities for Cooperation**, the spread touts the advantages of trade with the Soviet Union. A tear-out “Reader’s Response Form” directs interested parties to send inquires, not to Moscow, but to **Journal** offices around the globe. Obviously, by becoming an agent for the USSR, the **Wall Street Journal’s** leaders have chosen to ignore the Soviet Union’s unbroken record of lying, cheating, enslaving and murdering that has earned it the distinction of being the most powerful force for evil in the history of mankind. For \$350,000 in advertising revenue, these capitalists at the **Wall Street Journal** have entered into a loose partnership with, and supplied a priceless amount of dignity to, the world’s premier criminal regime.

When the U.S. Government decides to act decisively, it makes things happen. A lightning-quick invasion of the tiny island nation of Grenada deposed a militant Communist regime in a matter of days. But Communism in Cuba is never threatened and the Red regime in Nicaragua has actually benefitted from years of half-hearted opposition — even while we entertain Nicaragua’s ambassador in Washington and while the Soviet Union favors the Ortega regime with billions of dollars worth of armaments.

When America turned on several heads of state who wanted to be friends — the Shah of Iran, Somoza in Nicaragua, Ian Smith in Rhodesia, and others — embargoes and sanctions were effectively employed. Today, the U.S. Government imposes sanctions on South Africa and applies a variety of pressures against Chile — two nations that want to be friendly but receive the back of our hand. These nations, whatever their problems, could never in any way be compared with any Communist tyranny.

But for Communist nations, our demands are few and our relationships include provision of subsidized grain sales, sophisticated equipment, technology transfers, foreign aid, IMF and World Bank loans, Export-Import Bank credits, and “most-favored nation” status — all at the expense of U.S. taxpayers, and all at the expense of human freedom.

At home, the American people are propagandized into favoring interdependence instead of independence, globalism instead of the wonders of our Constitutional Republic, government regulations and controls instead of economic freedom, peace at any price instead of honorable



defense of liberty and property, and cohabitation with gangster regimes instead of refusal to have anything to do with them.

At their summit meeting in Geneva in November 1985, President Reagan and Soviet leader Gorbachev signed a broad range of cultural agreements that included, exchanging instructors and courses for all levels of students even down to the primary grades. One of the agreements, authored by educational experts from both nations, details plans to use computer technology to “restructure the education of young children, beginning in the third grade.” This joint educational venture calls for the United States to supply the computers while the Soviets write the courses. Yes, you read correctly: Soviet educators are writing courses for American school children.

It ought to be obvious to anyone that America is being changed. At the same time, even with its new public relations face, the Soviet Union has not deviated an inch from its evil goals.

What To Do

The picture we have been painting is one of a conspiracy. There is a plan; it seeks to accomplish an evil end; its ultimate goals remain hidden in the shadows; and there are certainly more than a few persons involved. All of the ingredients of conspiracy are present, but the American people have also been encouraged to classify any suggestion of conspiracy as a complete absurdity. We are reminded of the very cogent observation that the first job of a conspiracy is to convince the world it does not exist.

What then should be done? The answer is exposure. If enough Americans can be made aware of what is being done to our own country, and what is being done to other nations and other peoples by our own government, the sinister plans of this conspiracy will collapse.

If more Americans will demand that our leaders cease providing aid, trade, credits, technology and legitimacy to all Communist nations, the conspiracy will be dealt a huge blow. Communism does not have to be fought; it merely has to be isolated.

If more Americans will demand of our leaders that our nation withdraw from the sovereignty-destroying United Nations and make *independence*, not *interdependence*, their goal, the conspiracy will be dealt another huge blow.

If a great many Americans can be made to realize that the mass media is at least deficient, and at worst deliberately misleading, then the conspiracy that relies so heavily on the American people being given a daily dose of misinformation will suffer another crippling blow. The tiny percentage that wants to make America a single province in a Communist or socialist world tyranny is winning — mainly because the great majority of Americans, who want to know what is happening and why, are misinformed and ill-informed.

For several decades, the principles that have undergirded the greatness of America have been subjected to a massive assault. Independence has been portrayed as warmongering; limited government has been likened to selfishness; the Constitution has been mocked as a relic of the past; morality has been made to seem old-fashioned and stupid; traditional family values,



especially the roles of wives and mothers, have been scorned; the fast buck and the fast life have been glorified; and, for too long, the way to get ahead in politics has been to turn left, cut corners and play along. Isn't it time for all of this to be reversed? Isn't it time for you to get informed, and get involved?