



U.S. and the Indecision Decade

The above headline appeared over an editorial in a London paper. It should read: "America and three decades of bad decisions." To start with Western Europe, here is the situation facing America and what was once an alliance against Russian expansion:

President Giscard d'Estaing may appoint Francois Mitterand, the socialist, Prime Minister of France before 1978. Mitterand has declared that without communist support socialists cannot come into power. Communists have preached since the days of Lenin that it is through socialists that communist victory will come. Whether the desperate President tries to buy peace by appointing Mitterand Prime Minister of a country become ungovernable, or socialists attain power at the polls, communists will participate in government and then take it over. Mitterand has been lionized in Washington and accorded support by the most powerful organizations and men in America, with the aim of advancing him in his own country, though neither his intentions nor communism's have ever been concealed. Now that the result is staring Europeans and Americans in the face, Secretary of State Kissinger has announced that the Atlantic Alliance cannot survive "major communist participation in Western governments."

Whether it is a campaign speech to make himself appear anti-communist in the eyes of Americans, or to enable communists to scream that America is trying to tell Europeans what kind of government they can have, is beside the point. This is where support of "the non-communist left" has brought us. Communists headed by Enrico Berlinguer, the nobleman, in Italy, and George Marchais in France have changed tack. They present an open hand instead of the clenched fist and swear that communism is no longer dangerous.

THE LINE BEING DRUMMED HOME in France, Italy, Portugal and by an underground in Spain is: Communism here won't be like Communism in Russia. The theme repeated by British and American politicians is: "The Whites will be welcome to stay on in Rhodesia. They will be protected, because they will be needed." (The same assurance was given before every takeover in Africa to date.) The western media have shrugged off leftist advances within countries and colonies which were liberated only to be grabbed up by expansionist Russia. Professors, politicians and editors encouraged colonial revolt and called it the current of history. It was progress, and it was useless, they said, to try to retard it. Lenin used the same line during the Russian revolution. In "What to do," the pamphlet he published in Stuttgart in 1902, he wrote, "Victory depends on an efficient minority, on organization, secrecy, discipline, and iron centralization, and at the head of the organization a dozen tried and trusted leaders." Now let us get down to specifics.

IN MAY 1974 GISCARD D'ESTAING WAS ELECTED PRESIDENT OF FRANCE by a majority of one and a half per cent. Those who voted for him did so because they distrusted Mitterand and were afraid of his Union of the Left. The first thing Giscard did was give the vote to eighteen-year-olds, thereby making victory for Mitterand a certainty next time around.

Why did he do it? Those who believe in the conspiracy theory have one explanation and those who do not have another. One thing is certain -- there must have been pressure. Mr. Pierre Viansson-Ponté, in "Lettre Ouverte Aux Hommes Politiques," describes the President as "sincere, naive and fragile." Recent district elections put more socialists in office. Regional and national elections will carry them higher. The same can be said of the communists. New social conditions have brought new tactics which will be repeated in every country in the West.

The new reasoning is based on realization that approximately half a million Frenchmen are card-carrying communists. But there are over eight million laborers in what sociologists call the working class. Playing class against class no longer pays, because leftist professors and the media have made potential communist voters out of an additional eight million technicians and middle class office workers who do not consider themselves members of the proletariat at all.

George Marchais, the red boss who was a volunteer laborer in a Messerschmidt plant in Germany when his countrymen were fighting Hitler, was one of the first to recognize this, perhaps with Moscow's prompting. He observed: 1. Reds have attained power in industrialized nations to date under the protection of the Red army. 2. The only Western communist party to reach the threshold of power on its own is the Italian. It got there by convincing Italian Catholics that communism in Italy will not be like communism in Russia. Overnight Marchais threw "dictatorship of the proletariat" overboard. He is following Lenin's injunction: Any contradiction is permissible, providing it advances the victory of the revolutionary class of the proletariat. In "The Infant Maladies of Communism" Lenin wrote: A. It is the duty of a truly revolutionary party not to refuse any form of compromise, when there is no other way of attaining the desired goal. What is important is to know, through all the compromises, when compromises are inevitable, how to remain faithful to one's principles, to one's class and to the revolutionary goal, which is preparation for the revolution and the education of the people for victory. B. One must know how to make any sacrifice; how, in case of necessity, to use any strategy, any trick, to resort to any expedient, to be silent or to conceal the truth if necessary."

25,000 of Marchais' card-carrying members are in Paris. The rest are in 23,000 cells spread over France. 8,100 of them are in giant factories. The announcement that "dictatorship of the proletariat" is out, that the aim of French communism is a "union of all the people of France," brought a flood of praise in the western press. French communists are a party like any other, readers were told, willing to seek power by the democratic process of the polls. Though the threat to plant grimy fists in the faces of management and wearers of white collars was renounced, papers neglected to point out that the irreversibility of communism's advance remains a party credo and, once they are in power, opposition will become reaction and the democratic process will cease to operate.

President Ford and Henry Kissinger watched the communist rise in France, Italy, Spain and Portugal and warned that "major communist participation in western governments" could make America withdraw her troops. European anti-communists watch the primary elections in America and go cold at the thought of a grinning Jimmy Carter across a table from Leonid Brezhnev with the fate of the West at stake. Such is the picture in April of 1976.

IN AMERICA A NUMBER OF POINTS ARE DELIBERATELY FORGOTTEN. The warnings to Europe sound good in an election year, but Americans cleared the way for a red advance in Italy by destroying the throne and strengthening socialists and unions which would make parties hostile to communism unable to govern. "When Italian workmen drive to work in their own cars they will cease to be communists," we were told. What we did was give Italy Fiat-driving communists whom non-communists ceased to fear because they own automobiles.

For years our press, government, labor leaders and professors worked against the anti-

communist governments of volatile Spain and Portugal. There is no middle road in these countries between what we worked for years to undermine and the sort of government President Ford and Henry Kissinger are warning against. While expressing fear of the communist upsurge in France, men holding critical positions in America continue to spur the advance of François Mitterand, through whom French communists expect to seize power. Or, let us put it this way: The Communist Party is Russia's arm in France. America backs the socialists. Yet Mitterand formed a federation of the left and adopted a joint platform with the reds calling for "the simultaneous abolition of the North Atlantic Treaty and the Warsaw Pact." Mitterand and his communist allies have promised, once in power, to give up France's nuclear weapon, abolish the professional army, navy and airforce and cut national military service to six months. But neither he nor France's communists can affect Moscow's military program one iota. This is the Mitterand whom Newsweek hailed on December 25, 1972, as "The man who could be President." Let us take a look at him as a possible French Kerensky before 1978.

FRANÇOIS MAURICE MITTERAND was born on October 26, 1916, the son of a railroad worker. To his credit, he escaped from the Germans. Newsweek did not hold it to his discredit that he accepted the "Francisque," the Vichy decoration, from the hands of Marshal Pétain, for services under the Vichy government. When de Gaulle's star rose he rallied to de Gaulle until 1943. Pierre Viansson-Ponté wrote in his "OPEN LETTER TO POLITICIANS," "If he (de Gaulle) had made you a minister, if you had had the slightest chance of being considered for a position with even the appearance of power, you would have got down on your knees like so many others and rendered homage to the dispenser of all favors. It was because he did not want you that you denounced him for the illegality of his return to power, the fascist tendency of his regime, the turn-about and hesitations in his policies and the ravages of old age on his person....You went out for revenge because the other way was closed to you. This is the only reason for your opposition, you were meant for power, who loved being a minister eleven times in the IV Republic--you, the ambitious, who are yourself a bourgeois and self-indulgent. You have neither principles nor convictions, only an appetite for power."

A small group of French observers watching Mitterand's movements has noted that a trip to America preceded each of his important moves in France. They have taken note of whom he sees there, who sells him to the American public and the means employed. The conclusion is that such trips are made for the purpose of telling whoever backs him in America what is afoot, and cementing approval before the event.

IN MID-NOVEMBER 1967 Mitterand made another trip across the Atlantic. Bobby Kennedy and Nelson Rockefeller reaped publicity by being seen with him. McGeorge Bundy had long talks with him. For three weeks editors and students praised him for being "pro-American," which is to say pro the policies of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), the Washington Post and the New York Times. On December 5, 1967, the Foreign Policy Association assembled what the New York and Washington press called "200 of the most important financial and political figures in America" to hear the man who might someday be President of France. America's "invisible government" was at work.

In the reams of adulation no mention was made of the famous night of October 15 to 16, 1959, in Paris when Mitterand set up a fake machine-gun attack on himself near the Luxembourg Gardens and claimed that "fascist officers" were out to get him. After the hoax was exposed de Gaulle's secret police continued to use it as justification for arresting officers suspected of wanting to hold Algeria. On December 7, 1967, Mitterand flew from New York to Paris, to attend a summit conference between socialists, radicals and communists on December 20, the first anniversary of the formation of his Federation of the Left. Three and a half months later revolutionary students, supported by hoodlums and commanded by communists equipped with walkie-talkies, failed to bring down the government only because the army remained loyal. The usual auto-criticism followed and socialists and communists stepped up sapping operations in the army.

IN NOVEMBER 1975 Mitterand was back in Washington with Henry Kissinger and the CFR. His first question to the Secretary of State on Tuesday, November 25, was to demand why America continues to support dictatorships instead of democracy. Read: why don't you help us topple the new government in Spain? No hint ever reached the public that the CFR and Mr. Robert Pontillon, the national secretary of the French Socialist Party in charge of international affairs, had planned the late 1975 Mitterand campaign in America in minute detail. On the surface it looked spontaneous - the appearance before the National Press Club, the questions that were put to Mitterand through Pontillon as interpreter. Mitterand told his American hosts that there would be no upsetting of alliances, and left the impression that he was referring to the western alliance against Russia. To his followers at home he said, "Do not expect us to break with the communists in our united front."

There were a number of reasons for the American trip - advice, approval of plans already made, coordination of future moves. While he was in America arrangements were made for Ambassador Kenneth Rush to give him Washington's stamp of approval on his return to France. Accordingly, on Thursday, March 18, the leader of the Socialist-Communist alliance lunched at the American ambassador's table in the palace with its wide gardens which America had bought from the Rothschilds. The Rothschilds, incidentally, removed the marble staircase and rich paneling after the deal was made. "What will you do when you are in power?" Ambassador Rush asked his guest. French papers pointed out that the question was put in the future, not the conditional. It was a foolish question. Even with the biased briefings of Political Counselor Herman J. Cohen, Ambassador Rush should know that when François Mitterand is in power, either as Prime Minister appointed by a President who was elected by people who feared Mitterand, or with the aid of communist votes at the polls, he will bring in his allies and, after a period of time roughly equivalent to Kissinger's "peace with honor in Vietnam," the communists will take over.

Not since the afternoon of April 16, 1958, when Robert Murphy summoned Mr. Pierre Commin, No. 2 man of the French Socialist Party, to the American embassy to discuss how they might bring the Socialists to power, had Washington's pro-socialist interference been so high handed.

THE TIMING WAS IMPORTANT. After support was assured in Washington and before the luncheon with Ambassador Rush, Mitterand flew back for the meeting of the Socialist International, in Elsinore, Denmark, on January 17 and 18. What had been approved in Washington can be gathered by what he told the socialist leaders from Britain and Northern Europe. "Union of the left," he insisted, "is the only strategy that will permit the socialists of Southern Europe to acquire credibility." To the Germans, who are taking setback after setback at the polls while red armies mass on their eastern border, he said, "Socialist parties will be strengthened by such alliances."

TWO WEEKS AFTER MITTERAND'S LUNCHEON WITH THE AMBASSADOR the European Parliament held a summit meeting in Luxembourg. Member nations were urged to reject petty national patriotism "for a larger patriotism of Europe." For the first time, their reaction was cool. Red threats in France, Italy, Spain and Portugal were too close for comfort. The most significant report on the turn-about of the Common Market as regards relinquishment of sovereignty came from C. L. Sulzberger, of the New York Times (Paris Herald Tribune of April 10, 1976) and may be considered to express the policy of the Bilderberg group, of which Mr. Sulzberger is a member, though his columns make no mention of their meetings.

Under the heading, "Did you ever see a dream dying?", Sulzberger lamented, "This continent's most splendid dream following World War II has been the European Economic Community, or Common Market, which was designed to lead nations that had lost their global influence into a political confederation based on joint trading and financial interests....All the great hopes that have lingered for so long - a European foreign policy, a European monetary system, an approach to European defense - aren't

even mentioned any more." In Cyrus Sulzberger's wail of frustration there is more than an admission. A suspicion lingers. The fine phrases about the "tide of history" and the futility of opposing premature decolonization, could they have not been part of a greater plan? Could it be that nations did not lose their "global influence" but were stripped of it, so they would have to surrender sovereignty to a super-state in the name of "interdependence?"

BEHIND PART OF EUROPE'S LACK OF ENTHUSIASM for socialist-communist alliances is fear that America is being taken in by détente. Moscow has stated that improved relations between governments will in no way affect communism's revolutionary aims. The Soviet army stands poised toward Europe with its fire-power concentrated on a narrow front, ready for a blitzkrieg westward. Russia's superiority in tanks, her tactical aviation and nuclear submarines are never out of mind.

Through the fears run the contradictions of America's acts and Henry Kissinger's declarations. Every European socialist leader rose in his party with American support. Now when Mitterand's accession to power with communist support appears a sure thing, Mr. Kissinger announces that the Atlantic Alliance will not survive the entry of communists into Western European governments.

If this is not what the Foreign Policy Association and Council on Foreign Relations wanted, why did they assemble "200 of the most important financial and political figures in America," on December 5, 1967, to hear the man they were introducing as France's future President?

From Europe let us turn to China.

IN CHINA A NEW UPHEAVAL is taking place. Briefly, here is the story: When Mao Tse-tung, the leader of the Long March, married an unattractive woman named Chiang Ching who had failed to make a career as an actress, he gave his word to his associates that he would keep her out of politics. She never forgave the party leaders - or their wives - for exacting that promise.

In 1966 she emerged, tough and vindictive, personally directing the purge of Mao's former colleagues by inciting students to run rampant through the major cities. Respected leaders were dragged from their homes and insulted. Among those driven out was Teng Hsiao ping.

H. du B. Report of October 1963 brought Teng Hsiao-ping to the attention of readers three years before the Cultural Revolution started. (By a typographical error his name was spelled Siao instead of Hsiao.) Teng went to France in 1920 and was with Ho chi Minh at the Congress of Tours in December of that year, when the French Communist Party was founded. A year later he helped found the Chinese Communist Party in Paris. In 1926 he was in Moscow and the following year he was given the job of organizing the command of the 7th and 8th armies. By 1940 he was political commissar of the 129th Division which gained fame for its escape from encirclement in Taihang, and in 1952 he became Vice Premier.

In 1963 he set up an intelligence office in Peking and began spreading networks across western Europe. His European pivotal point was Berne, and Chinese machines which printed menus in back rooms of restaurants poured forth a flood of propaganda. Restaurants were his letter drops, meeting places and stopover points for itinerant agents.

The thing to bear in mind is that the man at the peak of the Western European network was always Teng Hsiao-ping. A wave of sympathy for him is sweeping the Western press at the moment, over the way he has again been pulled down.

A MORAL HAS BEEN OVERLOOKED: Those who take up revolutions die by revolutions. The assassinations, the kidnappings, the terrorization of anti-communist students by Teng's networks never got into newspapers. They took place behind closed doors which European militants never penetrated.

Chiang Ching, however, never forgot them. In April 1968 her fear of Teng and those bound to him by years of action together had become paranoiac. "Wherever the Chairman or I go, they install spy holes and set up listening devices," she confided to a friend. "They are planting listening devices everywhere." By "they" she meant the special agents of the public security bureau.

She tried to purge the security offices during the Cultural Revolution, but festering in her mind was always the fear the sleeping cells of Teng's old espionage and liquidation teams were still in place. When Chou En-lai brought Teng back, the warmth with which he was received justified her fears.

She has until Mao's death to put Teng in a position where he will not be able to get her. She and her principal henchman, Yao Wen-yuan, who controls the Shanghai press, hardly dare liquidate him. Too many regional generals have old ties with the man who spread the spy rings across Western Europe, commanded the 2nd Army and liberated Yunnan, Szechuan and Kweichow. That is why it is not over yet. The woman who was supposed to stay out of politics may still learn that those who take up revolution die by revolution, unless they are lucky or awfully smart.

To our subscribers: Address domestic business to H. du B. REPORTS, P. O. Box 786. St. George, Utah 84770. Address foreign correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, 20 Blvd. Princesse Charlotte, Monte Carlo, Principality of MONACO.

Students \$10 per year. Supporting subscribers \$15 per year. Extra copies 30¢ each.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent

Leda P. Rutherford, Managing Editor



Lessons of History

"As an ultimate objective 'peace' simply means communist world control," Lenin wrote in 1920, in his "Treatise on the Tasks of the Youth League." "The task of the proletariat is to create a far more powerful fatherland, with a far greater power of resistance - The Republican United States of Europe as the foundation of the United States of the World," Leon Trotsky wrote in 1918, in "Bolsheviki and World Peace." But a United States of Europe as a foundation of the United States of the World is also the aim of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), The Atlantic Union, the United World Federalists and a host of other fronts and organizations. The task which Trotsky set the proletariat is precisely what initiates of the Bilderberg group are striving to accomplish through foundations, organizations, international banks, newspapers and politicians, as well as radio and TV stations, news services and magazines.

In 1973 Mr. Charles Dupuy, Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of France, speaking for French Masonry (which with its revolutionary aspect must not be confused with the American), declared, "We are working towards a universal republic and that republic starts with Europe." On March 28, 1966, James Reston told millions who read the New York Times and the papers which the New York Times owns or services, "The Senate Foreign Relations Committee (of which Mike Mansfield was the head) has been holding hearings this week on a resolution which would make an Atlantic Federation the aim of American policy in Europe." There would be time, later, to tell Americans that said Atlantic Federation was also meant for them.

A month after Reston prepared the public for acceptance of a federated super-state to replace national loyalties, flags and traditions, Mr. Robert Schaetzel, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Atlantic Affairs, wrote in Foreign Affairs of April 1966, "Washington should work towards an equal partnership with a unified Western Europe." Schaetzel was on leave from his Foreign Service job to write a book for the CFR, selling the Common Market.

Though America financed the very United States of Europe Movement which Trotsky had called for, anti-Americanism was the argument used to get Europeans to join it. Mr. Alain Poher, the interim President of France, told his countrymen in an electoral broadcast on May 22, 1969, "If France wants, with justice, to recover her role in the world, it will be through a united Europe, which will be a match for the size and power of the super-powers." America was the power Europeans were told they would be strong enough to defy if they would give up nationhood. And unmentioned was the fact that the alien super-government in Brussels was meant to slip leftward, carrying a packaged Europe with it. Imagine the disappointment when in early 1976 a few die-hards were still resisting. C. L. Sulzberger puts Bilderberg membership before any nonsense about obligation to inform the public, so, while he never states that he attends Bilderberg meetings, his columns are commercials for Bilderberg objectives. He wrote from Bonn on April 10, 1976, "The continent's most splendid dream following World War II has been the European Economic Community, or Common Market, which was designed to lead nations that had lost their global influence into a political confederation based on joint trading and financial interests." (Emphasis ours)

Translated into plain English, what Cy Sulzberger was saying was that nations which had lost their colonies were to be led into a European confederation - such as Trotsky called for - on the promise that it would enable them to feel as important as when they had an empire. And he was annoyed that they had not bought it. Considering that Mr. Sulzberger and the powerful press empire of his family had worked to strip European nations of their colonies, one does not have to be a "conspiracy theory" kook to agree that they had incited and supported independence movements for the purpose of raking ex-colonies into UN and forcing their mother countries into a United States of Europe. Those behind the European Movement are socialists: The same names run through the story of America's decline and Europe's slide towards relinquishment of sovereignty under socialists with communists as allies. "Society's evolution toward first socialism and after that communism is inevitable," Mr. I. I. Potekhim wrote in his book, "Africa Looks at the Future," and our Sulzbergers and Harrimans and Rockefellers have worked as hard as the Comintern to prove him right. As America's 1976 election approaches, it is clear that every major development in the unfolding of what Mr. Sulzberger called the "world's most splendid dream" meant the fall of a domino. Since no Ford Foundation grant is likely to fund a book on the subject, let us examine a few of the high spots in the dismantling of the West.

THE DRAMA STARTED ON DECEMBER 1, 1943, when President Franklin Roosevelt announced his decision to destroy colonialism, starting with the empires of his two allies, Britain and France. (Page 485, Roosevelt-Stalin meeting, "Cairo-Teheran Papers," by Charles Bohlen. Page 85, "How the Far East Was Lost," by Anthony Kubek.) FDR told Stalin, in the Soviet Embassy in Teheran, that the French should not get back Indo-China, adding, "After one hundred years of French rule in Indo-China the inhabitants were worse off than they were before." Colonies and mother countries, as he saw them, were mosaic pieces for a United States of the World.

Stalin saw them as adjuncts to the communist empire. Both agreed that the solution for India was revolution from the bottom, "somewhat on the Soviet line." Thirty-one years later liberty in India was dead and the Indo-China of a hundred years before returned, but not as the President in his wheel chair imagined it. On February 26, 1975, President Ford asked for ammunition for Cambodians clinging to civilization. Senator Mike Mansfield, who had worked harder than any other member of the Senate in 1955 to destroy the throne and the three private armies which protected Saigon, the Mekong Delta and Tay Ninh Province (See "Reprieve in Vietnam," Harpers' magazine, January 1956), replied that he hoped no more military aid would be granted.

"More money means more arms, more arms mean more killing," he said. "Some day this matter will be resolved by the Cambodians in their own way. I think the sooner the better." He had his way. Phnom Penh fell on April 17, 1975. Prince Sisowath Sirik Matak was erect as he walked out of the French embassy grounds to spare his hosts. He and Long Boret, the former Prime Minister, were executed in front of the Phnom Hotel. General Lon Non, the brother of Marshal Lon Nol, was handed to the mob for lynching and his body thrown in a hole where a tree had been uprooted. Minor officials were decapitated. Oxygen pumps and blood transfusion tubes were disconnected in hospitals and the dying shoved into the streets, to be pushed or carried by relatives herded into the country. Bands of starving dogs ate those who fell by the wayside. Teenage soldiers used dried palm leaves to saw throats. Mass executions were carried out by bulldozers, to save bullets. Grass was stuffed in the mouths of those whose throats were about to be cut, to prevent their screaming. Names were changed, so that men could not trace their wives and children.

So grim were the stories of undernourished Cambodians forced to work 14 hours a day, hitched to plows, or killed because they were no longer productive, the public was soon no longer moved by words. Then pictures began appearing. PARIS Match of April 24, 1976, carried a photo of a villager, stripped of clothing and forced to kneel while a Khmer Rouge, with an expression of delight on his face, killed him with blows on the back of the neck by a hoe.

Youngsters of ten were clubbed to death because they had gone to school. Doctors, engineers, those with educations which made them most needed, were slaughtered like animals in the fury to wipe out colonialism's benefits, which FDR never considered. "Keep Cambodia for the Cambodians," the New York Times of December 3, 1965 quoted Senator Mansfield as advising Prince Norodom Sihanouk. In his interview of February 26, 1975, Senator Mansfield said, "I am sick and tired of seeing pictures of Cambodian and Vietnamese men, women and children being slaughtered by American guns and American ammunition. The more aid we give, the more killings there will be." So no more American ammunition was given. And the Senate Foreign Relations Committee leader who had encouraged the crushing of every valid anti-communist force in Vietnam, was not "tired" by television pictures of bloodshed when Cambodians resolved the matter "in their own way."

Now let us go back to April 1945.

THE UNITED NATIONS WAS FORMED in San Francisco on April 25 and 26 of that year. Those who watched Alger Hiss hold the center of the stage had forgotten, if they ever knew, that he had been Senator Gerald P. Nye's legal counsel when Nye was blocking preparedness, delaying the draft and attacking defense industries on the eve of World War II. On the platform with Harold Stassen was Cord Meyer, Jr., a man so fanatic on one-worldism that he founded and became the first president of the United World Federalists. In 1947 he wrote in "Peace or Anarchy" that "anarchy threatens us in unbridled growth of nationalism and in insistence upon the sovereignty of nations." From the day UN was formed, organizations proliferated to force surrender of sovereignty on the West but not on Russia, whose satellites no longer had sovereignty. Defeat imposed from within was to be the conditioning factor. Later it was called no-winism. Patriotism was an obstacle to no-winism, so patriotism became the target of the university left.

ROOSEVELT'S PLAN FOR INDO-CHINA was far advanced when Alger Hiss and Cord Meyer, Jr., played their parts in San Francisco. Two months later, in June 1945, eight Americans from the Office of Strategic Service (OSS) were parachuted into a jungle clearing in the Tonkin mountains, to train and finance an army with which the communist, Ho chi Minh, would fight the French. OSS officer Robert Knapp never passed on to the British the reports his communist recruit, Le Xuan, gave him on Chandra Bose, who had headed a Japanese subversive movement in India. America's war against her allies had started. Le Xuan went into CIA, successor to OSS, and CIA sent him to Spain where the American establishment's irrational hatred of Generalissimo Franco could only be explained as a covert preference for communism. Spaniards would never suspect that a Vietnamese with a Thai press card was working for Americans determined to destroy Franco. It was the beginning of a tactic which international terrorists adopted in the '70s, by which time Le Xuan's original protector was regimenting students in a Connecticut college for American surrender in Vietnam.

ITALY, 1946. Kings also had to be destroyed. On June 2, 1946, a referendum, in which American sound trucks and American "public relations men" of Italian descent campaigned against the monarchy, made Italy a republic. Since men in uniform could not vote, the referendum was held before the army, which was largely royalist, was demobilized. A leftist professor named Milton Katz was deputy chief of U. S. Intelligence in Caserta, near Naples, when the Italian monarchy was toppled to clear the terrain for the red advance.

IN FRANCE, the research and analysis branch of State Department was handling American intelligence activities in 1946. The man in charge was Jay Lovestone, former secretary-general of the Communist Party, USA. Lovestone and his associate, Irving Brown, used Intelligence money and Marshall Plan aid funds to organize labor unions in Europe and Africa, telling the public as they did so that they were fighting communism. The truth was, they were forming fighting-arms for socialist parties, which in turn formed alliances with communists and in the end were taken over.

In France Brown and Lovestone hired strong-arm thugs with \$15,000 supplied by a CIA leftist named Thomas Braden and later formed FORCE OUVRIERE, the union through which they would influence events in France. David Dubinsky, a labor boss born in a ghetto in Poland, penetrated CIA and used his position to advance labor, which is to say: To fight management, capitalism and non-socialist governments. He was the money-carrier from Braden to Brown and Lovestone. A single theme was repeated to the labor unions they organized abroad: "International labor solidarity is a trade union obligation." Financed by CIA and the Marshall Plan, the drive against national loyalty was on.

IN INDO-CHINA THE WAR ROOSEVELT UNDERWROTE WAS ESCALATING. Robert Schuman, as France's Prime Minister, and René Pleven, first as Minister of Finance and then of Defense, blocked appropriations and the dispatching of troops and supplies, which would have ended the conflict in its infancy. No-winism had become accepted by men in government.

IN BELGIUM IN 1947, Mr. Paul-Henry Spaak, the enemy of patriotism known as "Mr. Socialist," was chairman of the European Movement while his friend, Paul van Zeeland, was President of the International Organization of European Unity.

ENGLAND, IN 1947, was a hotbed of parallel activity. Joseph Retinger, the Pole, and Duncan Sandys were working towards a European super-state, aided by Sir Frank Roberts, of the "British Atlantic Union Organization," a group which included nations bordering on the Atlantic, among them the U. S.

Averell Harriman, the U. S. ambassador to Britain sent Retinger to America in 1946 to sell the Council on Foreign Relations and the Rockefellers his one-world idea. When Retinger returned, he and Sandys were sent to John McCloy, the U. S. High Commissioner for West Germany. McCloy's friend, Robert Murphy, was collaborating with Spaak and Retinger from his post as U. S. ambassador to Belgium. The idea of a Europe without national boundaries was not new to Murphy. He and Jean Monnet, the "father of the Common Market," had encouraged revolt among the natives in North Africa during World War II, with an eye to making France a minor state.

McCloy gave Retinger and Sandys what they needed, from counterpartite funds. These were funds in European banknotes accepted as payment for Marshall Plan material, with the understanding that they would be spent in Europe and not exchanged for dollars. Thus it can be truthfully said that American taxpayers financed the movement to turn Western Europe into a single socialist, neutralist state. Through 1950 and '51 Marshall Plan funds were administered by Mr. Milton Katz. Messers, Schuman and Pleven, who saw to it that the French war in Indo-China was not won, were working for the Common Market, in France.

ENTER THE ICFTU. The Comintern directs communist parties around the world. Walter Reuther, Jay Lovestone, Irving Brown and their henchmen, with labor union money and the CIA money provided by Thomas Braden, proceeded to organize the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, for the regimentation of the free world's labor unions under themselves.

London was the ICFTU's original seat, in 1949. British laborites had no objection to a trade union wing of the Socialist International, but they objected to letting the loud-mouthed Irving Brown run it, so the ICFTU moved to Brussels. Until 1962 when he took over the Foreign Affairs office of the AFL-CIO, Jay Lovestone was the ICFTU's string-puller in UN, while Irving Brown was labor's Kissinger, scurrying between regional bosses and the monster organization in Brussels which fomented strikes, agitated revolts in Africa and had the power to make and break governments.

THE ICFTU SCREAMED AGAINST COLONIALISM AND DICTATORSHIPS, but no investigative reporter has ever attacked the dictatorship Irving Brown and his labor king-makers set up in the colony they "liberated." In 1951 they took a Tunisian named Habib Bourguiba to San

Francisco for an AFL-CIO Conference, and from then on all the presses the AFL-CIO could set in motion poured out drivel on Mr. Bourguiba.

Victor Riesel's column in the New York Mirror of November 1, 1962, is a gem of hypocrisy: "Away back in 1951 some AFL leaders (as though Riesel had no idea who they were) brought this chap over. He was a lonely man, wearing a tarboosh, talking to those who would listen. I remember him sighing over tea about how wonderful it would be if his land were as peaceful and prosperous 'as your country.' His name was and is Habib Bourguiba, of Tunisia, a democratic land, a land of freedom." Riesel knew he was writing nonsense. On August 12, 1961, a year before the fatuous column was written, Bourguiba sent his secretary and two gunmen to kill Salah ben Youssef, his old friend and only opposition, in room 53 of the Royal Hotel, in Zurich. Once in power, the lonely chap those AFL leaders took to San Francisco set up a police state under a one-party system, with himself as President-for-life and his young wife bleeding the country. If a Spaniard or a Portuguese had done it, Riesel and the media would have cried to high heaven.

IN 1954 A NEW, UNELECTED PARLIAMENT WAS BORN. Joseph Retinger talked Prince Bernhard of Holland into sponsoring the Bilderberg meetings, "to combat anti-Americanism." But the same men were pushing the Common Market movement. And the argument used to get Europeans to join it was that only by banding together could they be strong enough to defy America. By then the Atlantic Institute, to work for an Atlantic Union which would include America, was open for business. John McCloy was in the top level of the CFR, the steering committee of the Bilderbergers, a founder of the World Brotherhood and, along with Henry Cabot Lodge, a leader of the Atlantic Union movement.

Cord Meyer, Jr., the man who had devoted his life to the elimination of national sovereignty, was rising higher and higher, under Thomas Braden, in CIA, where patriotism should be a prerequisite.

COINCIDENCES: Every soldier the Vietminh had was thrown into the fight for Dien Bien Phu in 1954, so that Pierre Mendès-France, the socialist, could topple the Laniel Government and impose surrender in Indo-China. A one-hour American carrier strike would have ended the communist threat, but then Senator Mike Mansfield, Kenneth Todd Young in State Department, Leo Cherne and Joseph Buttinger in their CIA front (the International Rescue Committee), Colonel Edward Lansdale in CIA, and the leftists of Michigan State University would not have been able to break up and then abandon South Vietnam.

While Lansdale and the brother of Vietnam's labor union boss crushed the anti-communist religious sects and their armies and deposed Vietnam's Emperor, a new western defeat was being prepared in Algeria by Irving Brown's union-of-unions, and Bilderberg initiatives were preparing to exploit the conditions which events of the year would create.

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION was a synonym for license, to the American left. Daring observers began pointing out that every union Irving Brown had set up, including the confederation of unions in Brussels, was being taken over by the reds. They warned that America was heading for trouble in Vietnam, the rest of Asia, Europe and Africa. At that point the most blatant suppression of freedom of speech America had known to date was put over, supported by the media and America's great foundations.

On January 30, 1962, "GROUP RESEARCH" was incorporated in Washington, D. C. for the "educational" purpose of advising union branches and leftist organizations which speakers they should prevent from lecturing. City central bodies and state federation offices were opened, a newsletter published, and packets provided proclaiming that "Preventive action is best." An attempt to prevent an extreme leftist from saying anything he wanted to would have brought a storm from the Committee on Political Education (COPE). Not a line against GROUP RESEARCH was printed by the paper which defended its right to publish documents stolen from the Pentagon.

WITHIN A DECADE Indo-China was doomed. Italy was sinking. Rioting students and biased media had torn America to pieces. NATO morale was at an all-time low, Russia was about to emerge as the top military power on the globe. Africa and India were in misery. And even George Meany admitted that reds had taken over the ICFTU he and Irving Brown built up with American union money.

Henry Kissinger attended a meeting of the World Peace Foundation, one of the directors of which was Milton Katz. There Mr. Kissinger made the acquaintance of General Paul Stehlin, one of the prominent Frenchmen working for Hanoi victory. Thereafter Mr. Kissinger stayed at General Stehlin's home when he made secret visits to France, and General Stehlin arranged meetings with Hanoi officials. When the tragic war was over, the religious sects Edward Lansdale had crushed in 1955, with the support of Mike Mansfield, was fighting alone.

Nelson Rockefeller loaned Thomas Braden money to buy a newspaper. Whether in gratitude for what Braden had done for him in CIA, or for what Braden could do if he had a paper, is uncertain. Probably both.

Cord Meyer, Jr., had reached the top inner circle in CIA, whether because of his dedication to socialist one-worldism or because his estranged wife smoked marijuana in the White House with JFK, is unknown. Maybe both. Meyer was made station chief in London on the eve of Britain's last desperate attempt to remain a sovereign nation.

In late 1972 Milton Katz received a telephone call from Averell Harriman, "the grand old man of the democrats," as the London SUNDAY TIMES of April 18, 1976, called him, but also the man who bailed out the Bolsheviks in 1922 and helped negotiate "Peace" in Vietnam. Harriman drew Katz' attention to a southerner named Jimmy Carter. They brought him to Nelson Rockefeller's attention and Rockefeller took him into his newly formed "Trilateral Commission" for "training" by Zbigniew Brzezinski. Faceless lieutenants put him up for the presidency and Rockefeller had a foot in both camps. Dean Rusk, George Ball and Averell Harriman got behind Mr. Carter. The forces that had used Watergate to recoup a lost election, and alleged Lockheed bribes (read: commissions) to ruin anti-marxist leaders in other countries took him up.

These are a few of the high points one could develop and link together if Ford Foundation would fund a book covering the downhill years, from Teheran to the day when a horrible possibility had to be faced: That Milton Katz' grinning Jimmy Carter might one day sit across from Brezhnev, with the destiny of America and the West at stake.

To our subscribers: Address domestic business to H. du B. REPORTS, P. O. Box 786, St. George, Utah 84770. Address foreign correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, 20 Blvd. Princesse Charlotte, Monte Carlo, Principality of MONACO.

Students \$10 per year. Supporting subscribers \$15 per year. Extra copies 30¢ each.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent

Leda P. Rutherford, Managing Editor



TO THE POINT

Dear Reader:

It is time for a personal letter to you. There are many things I would like to tell you, things that there is neither time nor space for in a terse report. A conversation with a small group of you would be better. Lacking that I am going to write you a letter.

WHAT ARE PEOPLE THINKING OVER HERE? It depends on whether you mean informed people or the T.V. watchers. There is talk of conspiracy, among those who observe and think. Those who believe that a faceless elite runs the world and decides events, Russian as well as American, are comparatively few. More subscribe to it, however, than express it. Europe was the home of the Illuminati, it gave birth to the Grand Orient Lodges, and the possibility of an international occult force is not rejected out of hand. The more easily-defended theory is that an international socialist elite in the West made bolshevism successful, gave it its base in Moscow and then, aided by communist parties within nations, proceeded to scramble the colonies of the world as one would a jigsaw puzzle, after a United Nations had been formed to pick them up. The mother countries, unable to support great armies and navies, or industries requiring huge investments, were further fragmented so that regional loyalties would clash with national loyalty, thus province status in the socialist super-state would become acceptable.

Since the U. S. was the world's leader after World War II, a small handful of Americans, some without a mandate from anyone, directed the dismembering of empires. Kings were deposed to remove the props provided by tradition. Those who were retained were kept to sign decrees and assume responsibility for what socialist politicians did. Loss of sovereignty was made palatable by hawking "interdependence." Planners in America set up the United Nations, the Rockefellers donated the land in New York for its capital, and gullible taxpayers kept it going. For the day when there would be no more colonies to bring into UN as envious nations to tilt the balance against the West, the American planners provided funds for a regional super-state to be set up by British, French, Belgian, German and Italian socialist One-worlders in Europe. (See H. du B. Reports, April, May, September, October, November-December, 1972, January 1973) Europeans were conned into entrusting their lives and fortunes to "Eurocrats" in Brussels on the argument that only by banding together in the Common Market could they defy America. The salesmen preaching that line were meeting regularly with Americans at meetings sponsored by Prince Bernhard of Holland, to discuss, among other things, how to bring America in.

SOME CONDITIONING WAS NECESSARY. The U. S. had no colonies to lose, but the equivalent of a colonial war was created in Vietnam. The sequence of events by which America was demoralized would have given pause to scoffers at the theory of conspiracy had they been spread on a table. First there were the demonstrations, the meetings, the outbreaks of violence in universities, until defeat in Vietnam was accepted. The West's news media operated as though directed for the enemy from a single desk. A new "news service," financed by the tax-free foundation of the Stern family, which controls NBC television and one of whose members was a Soviet spy, was set up to charge that American soldiers

had killed innocent civilians at My Lai. Simultaneously, the Vietcong and Hanoi were honoring women, children and aged peasants who did not wear uniforms but fought as "Self-Defense Forces" (SDF), or "Secret Self-Defense Forces" (SSDF), which is to say booby-trappers, lookouts and snipers.

The New York Times and the Washington Post published papers which Daniel Ellsberg stole from the Pentagon and made available to the Soviet embassy in Washington and a Hanoi red named Vu van Thai, but a raid on the office of Ellsberg's psychiatrist in search of proof that his protector in Rand Corporation should never have hired him was used as an excuse to legalize both the theft and publication. In the momentum created by Watergate, leftists recouped a lost election, effective security committees were dismantled and the FBI neutralized. All the pre-revolutionary conditions prescribed by red handbooks were realized. Each day the storm built up new force. Bursting out of America, it began toppling governments abroad - those friendly to the West. The media that destroyed America's will in Vietnam were at work at each step. Each news story was as politically motivated as the whipping up of Italian and Japanese emotions over bribes, which until then had been accepted institutions, known as commissions, and without which no deals were made.

SUSPICIONS WERE NOT ALLEVIATED when Senator Frank Church, the most assiduous prospector for muck on the Washington committees, announced his candidacy for the presidency. Before going into the matter of instant candidates, it is interesting to consider the selectivity of mass circulations publications such as TIME, NEWSWEEK, the Washington Post, and the New York Times with its empire of newspapers, radio and television stations, in deciding what is and what isn't investigative reporting material.

Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein are still working the Nixon goldmine, which was largely created by the press, since the same amount of time and effort could have produced equally profitable scandals on LBJ, JFK, Roosevelt and the present Vice President. While W. and B. ride Watergate and its related exposés to death, editors on both sides of the Atlantic still refuse to touch a story that promises no mileage to leftist politicians but which readers have a right to know.

THE FATE OF THE HINDENBURG: A spate of stories have recently appeared on the tragedy of May 6, 1937, thirty-nine years ago, when the Hindenburg burst into flames as she came in for a landing at Lakehurst, New Jersey. Revival of interest in zeppelins renewed interest in the Hindenburg. In France, Jacques Borgé and Nicholas Viasnoff brought out a history of lighter-than-air craft and quoted German documents on the 1937 catastrophe. Charles Dollfus, the noted astronaut, and Captain Pruss, commander of the dirigible, never swerved from their declarations that an accumulation of static electricity could not have caused the fire. An investigation committee was set up at the time, but its findings were suppressed as deliberately as those of the Warren Commission on the Kennedy assassination. Borgé and Viasnoff stated that German files contain information that an incendiary bullet fired from a gun equipped with a telescopic sight was responsible for the destruction of the ship and the death of thirty-six passengers. Perpetrators of the act, according to German reports suppressed on orders from Herman Goering, were anti-Nazi exiles out to avenge co-religionists at home and German intervention in the Spanish Civil War.

French TV Channel No. 1 showed a film on zeppelins in mid-May, followed by a panel discussion which touched on the Hindenburg. In America the account given by the radio newsman watching the Hindenburg burn has been brought out again. But amidst all the new interest, not an editor in Germany or America, even or particularly those hounding Nixon, wants to go into the Hindenburg affair, though a witness who was a friend of the man who planned the terrorist act is willing to testify. According to his story, the planner of the shot fired from the bushes near the landing field was a ball-player with the Boston Red Sox who, during his off season, went around with a communist group in Harvard, Felix Frankfurter, according to the witness, was a friend of the leader of

the plot. Harry Dexter White, who died of a heart attack before he was due to be arrested for espionage (his body was never displayed and requests to open the grave were turned down) was another. The ringleader was not present when the shot was fired, as he had a ball game on that day, but he candidly explained to the man whose testimony editors and Justice Department officials flee as though it would burn their fingers, "We had to do it in order to make that maniac (Hitler) attack us," meaning America.

Four of the men in the plot with him have been known for years, according to the above source, but investigative reporting does not extend to the Hindenburg story. Goering smothered the German findings for fear they might inspire other anti-German acts. Some German editors were afraid to touch it now, lest they be accused of anti-semitism. But this could not be brought against the editors and TV commentators who refused to let up on Nixon, the FBI and Lockheed. The plausible explanation that remains is that they are not going to turn the spotlight on a communist plot which, once exposed, might get out of hand. Why British papers, even conservative ones, have shied off the story of the Hindenburg's destruction by terrorists is harder to explain. One conjecture is that they are not going to give the Palestinians a chance to say that they are doing what Zionists did thirty-nine years ago.

THE WORKINGS OF THE BRITISH PRESS are often hard to fathom. For instance, America has no mass-circulation paper as conservative as the London DAILY TELEGRAPH and SUNDAY TELEGRAPH. Peregrine Worsthorne, the columnist on the Sunday Telegraph, has no equal in the United States. But while the Telegraph is conservative in its domestic, European and Far Eastern reporting, on American affairs it is as far to the left as the New York Times. Whether this is because American leftists are hired as correspondents, or British correspondents become biased on exportation, through association with only leftist colleagues, has never been gone into. What is evident is that in reporting on America the yardstick used at home no longer applies.

An example: Writing on CIA's policy of supporting only the "non-communist left" around the world, in the fight against Russian subversion, the Sunday Telegraph of May 26, 1968, told English readers, "The CIA realised that the liberals, particularly in Europe and the U.S.A., were the best and most effective anti-communists, hence the money behind several unimpeachably democratic organizations." Had a British intelligence officer tried to give "liberals" a monopoly on anti-communism, he would have been sacked. Furthermore, Thomas Braden and the band of CIA leftists responsible for that policy never used the term "liberals;" they said "non-communist leftists," who, at best, are still leftists and at worst communists who say they are socialists.

As for "the money behind several unimpeachably democratic organizations," had the Sunday Telegraph used anything as vague as that about their own intelligence funding, a flood of letters would have poured into 135 Fleet Street, asking, "What organizations?" For the truth is, the communist-infiltrated labor unions, political parties and international organizations of students and journalists which CIA backed were "unimpeachably democratic" only if one regards the left wing of the British Labour Party as moderate and anti-communists as extremists. How deeply Nelson Rockefeller was involved in Braden's throwing CIA power behind leftists and against anti-communists can be estimated by the fact that Rockefeller loaned Braden money to buy a newspaper when he got out of CIA - or said he was getting out of CIA.

On June 3, 1976, the Daily Telegraph carried a story on a Briton charged with smuggling Laetrile into the United States. 21 lines were devoted to "the extreme right wing" character of the John Birch Society and the fact that half of the sixteen "conspirators" charged with possessing Laetrile were members of the society. "Federal moves against Laetrile attracted members of the John Birch Society," Daily Telegraph correspondent Ian Brodie reported from Los Angeles, because they (quotes by Brodie) "saw a threat to their constitutional right to freedom of choice in cancer therapy." The truth is, had a responsible editor ever told Mrs. Margaret Thatcher's party that the ideas held by the John Birch Society are no more right-wing than their own, save perhaps on the matter

of national sovereignty and the Common Market, upholding the right to take vitamin B-17 made from apricot pits if one wants to would not seem ridiculous at all.

CONCERNING BENJAMIN BRADLEE. The Daily Telegraph pays tribute to Washington Post editor Benjamin Bradlee on grounds that, without his courage and constant support, the leaks Bernstein and Woodward amassed through traitors in government - what else can you call them? - would never have been published. On June 4, according to the TIMES of London, Bernstein was in the city to promote the film and the new book, "The Final Days," and Warner Brothers had provided "a limousine as big as a drawing-room to drive him about town." The Daily Telegraph of June 4 reported that senior officials on the staff of Prime Minister Rabin and in the Foreign and Defense Ministeries, in Tel Aviv, had been subjected to lie detector tests to discover the persons leaking secrets to the press. Picture Bradlee's indignation if anyone had suggested such a thing in Washington!

Even as the Telegraph was praising Bradlee for his courage over Watergate, "Conversations with Kennedy" was being read abroad, in which Bradlee admitted that his friend, JFK, had engaged in activities that were petty, vindictive and probably illegal. That his own integrity was nil, both during Kennedy's campaign and afterward, he never denied. Bradlee was campaigning, not reporting, and the nearest he came to apologizing to the readers he duped was to say that he would never be that close to a political figure again. So where does this put the man who accepted a Pulitzer Prize for publishing the sensational "leaks" that made Woodward and Bernstein millionaires? Actually, in the same class with Kissinger, who accepted a Peace Prize for clearing the way to a bloodbath in Indo-China. Worse, had an honest investigative reporter walked into Bradlee's office and spread out the story of the Chicago votes that went into Lake Michigan so JFK could win the presidency, no one can doubt, after reading Bradlee's book, that that story would have gone into the shredder and Bobby would have taken care of the man who brought it. And where was Bradlee's courageous reporting at the time of Chappaquiddick?

THERE ARE OTHER INTERESTING ASPECTS to the story of Bradlee, the editor, stories and indications which open the door to countless opportunities for investigative reporting. In 1956 he was in the Newsweek bureau in Paris. It was the period when CIA backing of the Algerian revolt was at its peak, and the Guy Mollet Government tried to expel Bradlee from France. The stated reason was Bradlee's "close relations with the Algerian leaders." French security services told anyone who would listen that he was a CIA liaison man with the FLN. Back numbers of Newsweek during the Algerian war carry a lot of gems, including the Newsweek reports of October 12, 1959, and November 16, 1959, on personal interviews with one Si Mustapha, "the official spokesman in Germany for the Algerian nationalists and therefore marked for assassination by French intelligence agents." But "Si Mustapha" was a blond German communist named Winfried Muller whom no interviewer could have taken for an Algerian, unless he were a CIA agent acting on orders.

Bradlee was back in Washington by then, campaigning for Kennedy, but the Paris office remained and TIME, as we shall show later, was as deeply involved as Newsweek, the Washington Post and the New York Times. Working for the company that owned the Washington Post, Newsweek Magazine and six broadcasting stations, Bradlee dined with the President, enjoyed his confidences and came to the White House at will. It was a period when Cord Meyer, Jr., the enemy of patriotism who founded and was first President of the United World Federalists, was moving upward in CIA, either because of his dedication to one-worldism or because his estranged wife had become the mistress of JFK and a friend of the Bradlees. Americans were arrested for possessing and smoking marijuana, while the President and Mary Meyer smoked it in bed in the White House.

Mary was mysteriously murdered a year after the President's death and the lone gunman who shot her as she walked along a canal towpath in Washington was never caught, if there was any attempt to catch him. Had a Vietnamese communist been shot in a Saigon suburb under such circumstances, that would have made a story. Mr. Bradlee's newspaper

would have launched a crusade. Bradlee and his boys made no clamor for Mary Meyer's diary, as they did for every scrap of paper Nixon had jotted as an aide memoire. Mary's diary, with its accounts of marijuana trips and rides to the White House in a limousine driven by a secret service man, and who knows what else, was burned by James Angleton, the head of Counterintelligence in CIA. How he happened to have it, or why he burned it, Mr. Bradlee's paper never asked.

TIME MAGAZINE ALSO HAS HAD ITS SELECTIVE MOMENTS. In 1975 the Daily Telegraph's review of the film on the life of Enrico Mattei left the reader in suspense as to who caused the plane crash which killed the Italian oil king in September 1962. The film on Mattei's life glamorized him as a policeman's son who became a billionaire and the most powerful man in Italy, the owner of newspapers, maker and breaker of politicians and backer of the Algerian rebels. (H. du B. Report of April 1962 covered Sick Italy and Enrico Mattei.) The film ended with the crash that killed Mattei and McCall of the TIME-LIFE bureau in Rome, who was with him in the plane, and viewers were left to decide for themselves whether French agents, CIA or the big oil firms had sabotaged the plane, because of Mattei's determination to hold a monopoly on Algerian oil after independence. Strangely enough, TIME made no great stir over the death of its correspondent, saying only that he had gone to interview Mattei and accepted a lift back to Rome. That Mattei was CIA's greatest ally in the clandestine war to defeat our NATO ally in Algeria, and that he never gave interviews, were not mentioned. Spies are expendable but bona fide correspondents are not. Still no one asked for details.

It was ten years before an intelligence officer purged from the French service by de Gaulle told the story of what happened, under another name. Hundreds of French soldiers were killed because Mattei, who got his start by buying oil at half-price from Russia, was determined to take over the oil industry of a Free Algeria. Month after month reports on his actions were fed into a computer. The computer was asked what could be done. The answer, in intelligence parlance, was: get rid of him. Again and again the question was posed. There was no other solution. His country had no power over him. He would listen to no offers of compromise. Nothing but an oil empire, commencing with Algeria, would do. Mattei, on the board of sixteen banks, six mines, eight insurance companies, three chemical trusts and the oil-controlling company of his country, was deeply involved enough that both the NATO alliance and world peace were threatened. Through him and his fleets of boats and planes and secret air-strips, both faceless Americans and the Kremlin poured supplies to guerrillas killing NATO soldiers. After every other possibility had been exhausted, the mechanic who serviced Mattei's private jet was injured while riding from the Geneva airport on his motorcycle. A small group of men with their eyes on the barometer set the date and hour for the telephone call that was to summon Mattei from his mountain hideout to Rome. A new mechanic disconnected three wires in the private jet, then soldered them again, lightly enough that turbulence would break them loose. By chance, the correspondent of the magazine that called Monsieur Jacques Soustelle anti-American and an assassin of governments, on April 28, 1958, because he rejected from the tribune of the National Assembly a letter carried from President Eisenhower by Robert Murphy, ordering France to "negotiate a peace" in Algeria, was in the plane. (The messenger was well-picked: he had sown the seeds of anti-French movements in North Africa as Roosevelt's personal representative there during World War II.)

By another coincidence, the underwriter of the Algerians, with whom the TIME correspondent was riding, was responsible for Mr. Soustelle's arrest at the Milan airport a couple of months before, when Soustelle, who had helped de Gaulle into power, was being tracked across Europe by de Gaulle's secret police. Coincidences abound, and so many of them lead back to events that can only be explained by conspiracy. European can be excused if they seem to have suspicious natures.

W. AVERELL HARRIMAN, described by the London SUNDAY TIMES, of April 18, 1976, as the "grand old man of the Democrats," is a lifetime friend of Robert Murphy, the bearer

of the Eisenhower letter which caused the IV French Republic to fall in 1958 and cleared the way for de Gaulle's return to power. In 1947 Harriman was ambassador to Britain and able to send Duncan Sandys and a Pole named Retinger to West Berlin to get money from his Council on Foreign Relations comrade, John McCloy, so they could start the regional one-world movement that was to lead to the Common Market. Robert Murphy was helping the cause along as U. S. ambassador to Belgium, where he was able to throw America's support behind Paul-Henry Spaak, known as "Mr. Socialist." Forgotten was the fact that the "grand old man of the Democrats," and "fountainhead of wisdom in foreign affairs," as the Sunday Times called him on May 9, 1976, had provided a loan to the communists in Moscow in 1922 when they were about to fall. U. S. News & World Report of August 1, 1966, reported that W. Averell Harriman would like to visit Communist China, adding that he had "had many assignments around the world in attempts to start peace talks in Vietnam."

AS HARRIMAN HELPED NEGOTIATE "PEACE" IN VIETNAM, the sort of peace Murphy delivered, an ultimatum that France negotiate in Algeria, Bradlee's world federalist friend. Cord Meyer, Jr., the ex-husband of JFK's mysteriously murdered mistress and marijuana companion, was rushed to London as CIA station chief. Patriotic Britishers were making a last effort to get out of the Common Market, and Meyer, we must remember, wrote in 1947, while McCloy, Harriman and Murphy were financing Duncan Sandys and Retinger, that "anarchy threatens us in unbridled growth of nationalism and in insistence upon the sovereignty of nations." Henry Kissinger set up the peace talks in Paris, where Harriman was sent to represent America. A French Airforce general named Paul Stehlin helped him make the contacts with Hanoi officials that got them going. Stehlin was working as ardently for American defeat in Vietnam as Murphy and Bradlee and the rest did for French defeat in Algeria.

Kissinger met Stehlin first at a meeting of the World Peace Foundation in which a Harvard anti-victory activist named Milton Katz was a leader. In late 1972, about the time Kissinger and Harriman had South Vietnam bound for delivery, Harriman asked Katz to look over a southerner who was a babe in arms as far as intrigues and world affairs are concerned. His name was Jimmy Carter. In early 1973 they took him to Nelson Rockefeller, the man who put up the money for a newspaper for the top-level CIA official who barred everyone but non-communist leftists from helping America and the West in the fight against Soviet expansion and subversion.

A U. S. News & World Report paragraph on Carter (May 17, 1976) was headed: "First Steps," then continued, "Basically, 1973 was to be a year for education - education of the future candidate and education of the country about Carter." The weekly news-magazine considered by many to be conservative did not add that the institution chosen for Mr. Carter's education - indoctrination would be a better word - was Nelson Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission, and the "professors" were Averell Harriman, Milton Katz and Zbigniew Brzezinski.

To our subscribers: Address domestic business to H. du B. REPORTS, P. O. Box 786, St. George, Utah 84770. Address foreign correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, 20 Blvd. Princesse Charlotte, Monte Carlo, Principality of MONACO.

Students \$10 per year. Supporting subscribers \$15 per year. Extra copies 30¢ each.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent

Leda P. Rutherford, Managing Editor



The CIA

Let us start with a premise: An effective anti-communist intelligence service is essential to the existence of America and freedom of the West. But an intelligence service is good or destructive, according to the integrity and judgment of those who make it up. In March 1976 a three-man oversight committee was appointed to watch over the activities and decisions of our CIA. In this issue we shall look into the fitness, from the standpoint of integrity and judgment, of the most important of the three on that committee and the other positions in which his capacity for harm is unlimited.

MR. LEO CHERNE has for years been director of the Research Institute of America. Less known is the fact that Mr. Cherne has long been a member of CIA's 11-man foreign affairs advisory board. He is now the chairman of that board and the *New York Times* of March 4, 1976, announced his appointment to a still higher post as a member of the CIA three-man oversight committee. A great deal of power and responsibility rests in his hands. The question then is: How good is Mr. Cherne's judgment? How sound is his information on the world's trouble spots and trouble-makers? Most important of all: What sort of men give him his information? Who are his friends? Does he go overboard on "fads" sold as policies by leftists and the media, or has he the gift of common sense and does he use the honest man's yardstick? Is this good for America and the West?

The best way to answer these questions is to go into the subject of Leo Cherne. Powerful forces must have been behind him in his climb upward. His biography lists him as a lecturer at the U. S. Military Academy, a member of the faculty of the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University and of the New School for Social Research. His relationship with the latter is not reassuring. He is listed as chairman of the board of the International Rescue Committee, a CIA front, of which the nominal head, through the years when CIA was educating and funding revolutionaries in the colonies of America's allies, was the wealthy Angier Biddle Duke. One of the greatest insults to the intelligence of newspaper readers ever published was the *New York Times* story of October 12, 1958, which told how a friendless and oppressed African named Ngoroge Mungai happened to find an American pen pal, make his way to America, find a place to stay, manage to ride across the country without money, meet a lady who got him shelter and a scholarship in a medical school, and in the end receive from Mr. Cherne's Rescue Committee money to go home and open a hospital and stock it with medicine. Unmentioned was the fact that Ngoroge Mungai was a relative of Jomo Kenyatta, whose Kikuyu tribesmen; the Mau Mau, were committing unprintable atrocities against the British settlers of Kenya at the time, and that the hospital was to take care of Mau Mau terrorists. Nor was Mr. Mungai's flying carpet treatment through medical school and return to Africa loaded with IRC money ever brought up in later years, when he dropped medicine for politics, became Defense Minister, brought in Russian equipment, and eventually made himself one of the ten millionaires in a country of ten million paupers, as a recently-assassinated member of his relative's opposition put it.

Mr. Cherne's constant companion in CIA-action through fronts as misleadingly named as

the Victory-for-Hanoi organizations with their "Peace" labels was an Austrian socialist named Joseph Buttinger who through marriage to an American meat-packing heiress ended up in the United States. We shall return to Mr. Buttinger later. Whether or not there was a CIA role in Cherne's vice-presidency of Freedom House has so far never been exposed. Like the International Rescue Committee, Freedom House has a high-sounding ring and good Americans on its letterheads. However, "Freedom" when used by the Buttingers and Chernes of this world may mean the delivery of an evolving colony into the hands of a native socialist dictator who will go communist a year later.

Mr. Cherne is also a member of the National Committee of the Council Against Communist Aggression. (CACA) It would be surprising if the CACA is not a CIA front, since former CIA analyst, R. Harris Smith tells us in his book on OSS that the victory of the liberal wing in CIA was the adoption of the Thomas Braden doctrine which committed CIA to overt and covert support of the non-communist left around the world, and it only. This is to say, labor unions, student unions and other leftist organizations which are anti-communist when supporting a socialist candidate in an election, but communism's allies in the fight against free enterprise, capitalism and anything to the right of the Socialist left. The CACA was set up by the Upholsters' International Union, of 1500 North Broad Street in Philadelphia. A study of its members through the late fifties and early sixties shows the usual roster of respectable joiners followed by Mr. Gorin, the Australian leftist; Suzanne Labin, of the 16th Section of the French Socialist Party; Mr. Goldsmith, the enemy of conservatives who from his suite in the Waldorf Tower provided money and smear kits to be used in out of state elections and for a host of other purposes.

The London SUNDAY TELEGRAPH story of May 26, 1966, must be borne in mind in evaluating the international unions and organizations working to sow the idea that non-communist is synonymous with anti-communist: "The CIA realized that the liberals, particularly in Europe and the USA were the best and most effective anti-communists, hence the money behind several unimpeachably democratic organizations." No one has pointed out that leftists are not the best and most effective anti-communists, they are only the ones communists do not attack, and this for the simple reason that they are not effective.

Nor did anyone ask: What "unimpeachably democratic organizations?" Labor unions and their bosses are not loyal to countries, they are loyal to labor. The American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) which they set up in Brussels as a monster machine for shaking and directing governments, have always proclaimed that "International labor solidarity is a trade union obligation." This, if it means anything, means that labor unions should be loyal to labor unions in other countries, not to government and nation. The ICFTU was "neutral" long before the AFL-CIO ceased pouring money into it; today it is openly communist. The reason for the closed-shop is to collect more dues for the advancement of labor politically. The Upholsters' International Union goes to great lengths through its Council Against Communist Aggression to establish an anti-communist image, but, like all international unions, its anti-communism is a come-on to get the help of the uninformed in placing socialists in power. It is not against communism but for socialism that the national committee on which Leo Cherne sits, is fighting.

CIA-FUNDED PUBLICATIONS. It is likely that, like the International Rescue Committee and its sub-front, American Friends of Vietnam, run by the Angier Biddle Duke-Leo Cherne-Joseph Buttinger team, the upholsterers' international organization is also one of CIA's myriad propaganda arms pumping out printed matter to convince Americans that socialist leftists are confronting and defeating communism. During the exposes of February 1967, it came out that student unions, publications and houses such as Frederich Praeger of New York, and many others were funded by CIA, thus forcing the taxpayer to unknowingly finance a campaign for his own misinformation. With Leo Cherne a member of CIA's 11-man advisory board and an admitted director of two CIA fronts, it seems unlikely that his Research Institute of America newsletter would not

be CIA-financed also. Built up as an economist, Mr. Cherne through his newsletter provided information on tax matters, investments and foreign affairs. But if his "inside" information on what was going on abroad and what should be done about it, particularly in Vietnam, was nothing more nor less than Mr. Buttinger's Socialist line, to what extent was his advice as an economist a CIA or socialist indoctrination line as well? It is in this respect that we shall go into both Mr. Cherne's judgment and his integrity. For the moment let us turn to his associate, Joseph Buttinger.

VIETNAM WAS A HEAVEN-SENT OPPORTUNITY FOR THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL. Pierre Mendès-France and his coterie of French socialists in the National Assembly worked to assure France's defeat in Indo-China and then topple the non-socialist government because it lost. What they wanted to do in Indo-China, and were prevented from doing by French patriots, we shall learn from the pen of Joseph Buttinger. Socialists have no nationality. Since their experiment in South Vietnam could not be carried out under French comrades, it was decided to do so under American socialists. Thus His Majesty the Emperor Bao Dai was pressured into appointing one Ngo dinh Diem his prime minister in mid-June 1954. The selection of Diem was as devious as the fight for one form of leftism while pretending to fight another. Diem's brother, Ngo dinh Nhu, was the labor leader in South Vietnam but emphasis was placed on Diem's piety as a Catholic. Colonel Edward Lansdale was CIA's overt man in Saigon, not assigned to find out if American policy was right but to destroy anyone who opposed it, even anti-communists. Back on the American front, Cherne and Buttinger were to protect the CIA rear and convince Americans that all was being worked out for the best.

It was as a labor agitator that Buttinger got his start in his native Austria. In the late 30s he was chairman of the Central Committee of the Socialist movement in Vienna. Many of his old writings can be found in back issues of the magazine, Dissent, under the name of Gustav Richter. Why these leftists hide behind aliases is hard to say. In 1947 he was European director of the International Rescue Committee. This was the period when American intelligence activities in Paris, the most important capital in Western Europe, were in the hands of Jay Lovestone, formerly secretary-general of the Communist Party USA. (Lovestone is today head of the foreign affairs section of AFL-CIO.) America's ambassador to Britain was Averell Harriman and Robert Murphy was ambassador to Belgium. Harriman worked with Britain's organizers of the movement which was to lead to the Common Market, or European Economic Community, within which, if all goes as planned, America will eventually relinquish her sovereignty.

In Brussels Robert Murphy and Paul-Henry Spaak, known as Mr. Socialist, worked towards the same goal. Back in America Mr. Cord Meyer, Jr., founder and first president of the United World Federalists, published his book, "Peace or Anarchy," in which he predicted that anarchy and chaos threaten us in the unbridled growth of nationalism and the insistence of nations upon national sovereignty. (In 1974 Cord Meyer was made CIA station chief in London, in time to help frustrate British patriots in their fight to stay out of the Common Market.)

It was also in 1947 that John McCloy, U.S. High Commissioner to West Germany, provided money from Marshall Plan funds for the European movement to step up its activities. Thomas Braden, of CIA, gave Irving Brown money to hire waterfront thugs for labor activity in Marseille, after which the same gangsters turned their activities to drugs. Later Braden provided the funds with which Brown organized FORCE OUVRIERE, a labor union for political pressure in France's internal affairs. Brown's next move was to organize FRANCE-USA, as a liaison organization between American Unions and FORCE OUVRIERE. FRANCE-USA had its own newspaper financed by the American embassy for the purpose of selling Irving Brown and his programs. This was the post-war Europe in which Joseph Buttinger, the Austrian labor agitator, and Irving Brown, the man who incited revolt after revolt which communists took over, were pushed by faceless manipulators into positions where they could advance labor socialists under the pretext of fighting communism.

BUTTINGER TAKES UP A NEW CAUSE. In late 1954 CIA sent Buttinger to Saigon under his International Rescue Committee identity for the purpose of making him an instant authority on Vietnam. When he returned the "American Friends of Vietnam" was formed but its purpose was to sell Americans a family. In doing so it crushed the aspirations of a country. There is an interesting sidelight to the 1954 farce. Mr. Patrick Moynihan was the International Rescue Committee's public relations man at the time, charged with the job of selling the IRC while it was selling CIA and the family only a small group of Americans wanted in South Vietnam. Could it be that our future ambassador to UN and India was part of the CIA "non-communist leftist" team? On June 27, 1955, THE NEW LEADER, the political organ of the AFL-CIO, brought out a 15-page special edition headed: "ARE WE SAVING SOUTH VIETNAM?" The implication was that we were and the author was Joseph Buttinger. "No other Vietnamese leader could have won this struggle for survival," Buttinger wrote of Diem's first year in power. The truth was, American money and Edward Lansdale's double-crossing and bribing had destroyed Diem's enemies in the army, crushed the private force which protected Saigon and destroyed the Cao Dai and Hoa Hao sect armies which kept Tay Ninh Province and part of the Mekong delta safe from the reds. (Remnants of the two sects are still fighting) There was no communist challenge.

Foreign authorities who advised against what we were doing were denounced as simply anti-American. On page 13 Mr. Buttinger lifted the curtain on international socialism's plan for Vietnam with the lines: "Anti-colonials among the left parties in France have always supported the originally correct solution of giving independence to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, headed by Ho chi Minh, after its establishment in 1945. Although the government of Ho chi Minh was dominated by communists, this regime had a good chance of developing along democratic lines if French colonial policies had not driven the people of Vietnam into the communists' arms." (Emphasis ours) Certainly the claim that Ho chi Minh, who had been trained by Moscow and who changed the name of his party in order to dupe the Americans, would have given Vietnam anything but a red government is enough to put either Mr. Buttinger's integrity or his judgment in question. That French leftists supported such a solution we know, but anyone who claims that it would have been correct should never have been put in print by the AFL-CIO or be made vice-chairman of a CIA front. Buttinger would never have suggested that had the U.S., France and Britain supported Generalissimo Franco he would not have turned to the Germans and Italians. What of the magazine that printed his fifteen spite-filled pages against the non-socialist government in France?

INSIDE THE NEW LEADER. Let us look at the masthead of the New Leader, during the years when Cherne and Buttinger were doing their harm. Melvin Lasky was at the editorial desk, publishing contributions from David Dubinsky, Averell Harriman, Quincy Howe, George F. Kennan, George Meany, Bertrand Russell, Norman Thomas and others. When CIA, American Labor and the International Rescue Committee stepped up their drive to sell the Germans on Willy Brandt, Lasky was sent to West Germany to edit a CIA-backed publication. Brandt became chancellor and Lasky moved to London to take over Encounter, the CIA-funded magazine which in April 1962 published the most vicious and dishonest attack on the anti-communist John Birch Society ever written. Back in America dishonest stories on Vietnam continued in the New Leader. Wesley Fishel, the leftist from Michigan State University, would be hard put to explain his contributions today. By March 1965, Michigan State was setting up local and national "teach-ins" to call for American withdrawal and a Hanoi victory.

On May 12, 1958, Cherne, in his quality as Executive Director of the Research Institute of America, and with no indication that he and Buttinger were friends and associates, reviewed Buttinger's latest book for The New Leader. "There are few readers for whom Joseph Buttinger's The Smaller Dragon will not open the door to the little known drama of an exotic, courageous and strategic nation," Cherne gushed. The book was a research job, with sources carefully selected to support a socialist theme. Buttinger knew nothing of Vietnam, and his book would never have been published by any house but

Praeger, the publisher CIA supported as a means of putting unprofitable tomes in universities and the hands of an information-seeking public. No Senate Committee has ever gone down the list of Praeger publications of those years to ask which were financed by Thomas Braden and CIA and then note the leftist gap between such books and everything associated with free enterprise and our capitalistic system. Being paid to put out expensive propaganda volumes which would not sell on their own entails no financial risk. Praeger acquired Pall Mall Press, in London, the editor of which was Murray Mindlen who headed another CIA front, the Congress of Cultural Freedom. An honest investigating committee might someday find a relationship between labor-socialist governments which brought Britain to the brink of ruin and the CIA fronts and agents which influenced British opinion. Now let us go back to Mr. Cherne of CIA's oversight committee.

BAD JUDGMENT OR ABSENCE OF INTEGRITY? The letter which Leo Cherne wrote on January 6, 1957, in a fit of contemptuous condescension and anger is an excellent example of its writer's lack of balance. Not only was it stupid in its bias, but in his inability as well as unwillingness to reason, Mr. Cherne showed a lack of any qualification for an intelligence job. "I doubt that anything I could tell you concerning my admiration for President Diem and the effective nature of his government and his people's resistance to communism would alter your point of view," he wrote. Read: Anyone who disagreed with Cherne was not worth answering. Actually, Cherne knew nothing about Ngo dinh Diem. He was off on the Diem "kick" which CIA, Buttinger, The New Leader and the clique of leftist professors at Michigan State were keeping inflated, with the aid of an obliging media. There had been no communist threat against Diem at the time of Cherne's writing, for the communists had thrown every man they had into the battle of Dien Bien Phu. The only resistance Diem had shown was against anti-communist South Vietnamese who wanted no part of him, and it was brutal. When Cherne was told that no disagreement with Diem was permitted and that religious sects which kept vast areas free of red infiltration were being crushed, with American encouragement and support, the best reply he could make was: "If a President and a government which have given sanctuary to a million people who fled communism can be called freedom extinguisher, then by that logic, I would expect you to say that Ho chi Minh carries the torch of freedom." It was arrogant nonsense. The million people given sanctuary were Diem's co-religionists, whom he needed since other support he had none, save for the Americans. Grouped together, the people given sanctuary formed a special constituency for the grasping sister-in-law who from early 1963 onward helped her husband carry on secret negotiations with Hanoi. On February 28, 1958, the New York Times carried a report on Mr. Cherne's meeting in the Ambassador Hotel, this time as an economist, to urge Americans to make private investments in South Vietnam. On March 3, 1958, it was the Christian Science Monitor's turn to print a story by Mary Hornaday on a Cherne meeting to advise Americans to invest in South Vietnam. But anyone warning that everything Messrs. Cherne, Buttinger, et al were doing would make the eventual collapse of Vietnam inevitable was an ignoramus capable of calling Ho chi Minh a torchbearer of freedom. What an economist! Where were our blue sky laws? Meanwhile, Mr. Cherne's friend was writing two more volumes for Praeger to publish and Cherne to push.

VIETNAM'S HISTORY - SOCIALIST VIEWPOINT. The two volumes of "A DRAGON EMBATTLED," by Mr. Buttinger, appeared in early 1967. Again, French colonialists were to blame for everything. "The French effectively managed to destroy traditional Vietnamese society," Marvin Seid explained in his review, in the Calendar section of the Los Angeles Times of Sunday, June 4, 1967. But Cherne and Buttinger helped provide the cover-up when Mike Mansfield in the Senate, Colonel Edward Lansdale in CIA and Kenneth Todd Young in State Department took it upon themselves to destroy the throne in Vietnam, to break up the religious communities which had their own defense forces, and eradicate every traditional force which rejected an outside-imposed chief of state intolerant of the traditional religion. Seid recognized that "the communists had always expected to gain control of the south in time" - but these were the people Joseph Buttinger told Americans the West should have backed, in his special edition of The New Leader. This

was what Buttinger called the "originally correct solution."

"The Diem government itself created the conditions that pushed the population to the brink of open rebellion, and this convinced the communist leadership that the South could be conquered by force," Seid quotes Buttinger as writing in his new books. But Diem was the man whose government Leo Cherne admired so strongly ten years earlier that there was no point in bandying words with anyone who tried to open his eyes. Suppose Cherne, with his increased power in CIA goes off on another such leftist-inspired infatuation tomorrow.

Buttinger's footnotes in volumes I and II of "A DRAGON EMBATTLED" are enlightening. Wilfred Burchett's book, "THE FURTIVE WAR," is described as "The communist view, ably presented by an Australian journalist." (An Australian court has recognized Burchett as an out-and-out communist.

Your correspondent's book, "BACKGROUND TO BETRAYAL, THE TRAGEDY OF VIETNAM" remains one of the few books to stand the test of time on Vietnam. Buttinger called it the Vietnamese story "as seen by the 'lunatic fringe' of the American extreme right." He wrote: "The story is that of a conspiracy by American 'liberals' (Leo Cherne, Angier Biddle Duke, Harold Oram, Wesley Fishel, Lt. General John W. O'Daniel, Joseph Buttinger and other members of the American Friends of Vietnam) to sell out South Vietnam to the communists by supporting Ngo dinh Diem. It seems that everyone who ever wrote in support of Diem was either a member of the conspiracy or was used by its leaders."

Well, that Vietnam was sold out to the communists no one can deny. And Mr. Buttinger and Leo Cherne got out from under when everything they made inevitable was about to occur.

In "A DRAGON EMBATTLED," Mr. Cherne's socialist partner, who obviously exerted great influence on many whose ideas were translated into action in CIA, was careful not to mention that when Madame Nhu left Saigon on September 21, 1963, her destination was Belgrade. The French whom Buttinger despised had long been aware that Nhu and his wife were negotiating with Hanoi and that the trip to Belgrade was to ask leaders of the Eastern European bloc to replace the Americans and help Nhu work out an accomodation with the reds.

It is interesting that on page 1109 of volume II of "A DRAGON EMBATTLED," Buttinger is careful to defend himself and Cherne for having worked to sell America on the man they washed their hands of when the game was about to blow up. "I still believe that without Diem, South Vietnam would very likely have been lost to the communists at that time," (1954-'55) he wrote.

Nonsense. The communists were licking their wounds. If CIA in Vietnam and men like Cherne and Buttinger in America had followed a sane policy the Diem family would have fallen but South Vietnam might have had a chance of surviving. To say that "the Vietnam lobby" (Angier Biddle Duke, Cherne, Buttinger, Wesley Fishel, Lt. General "Iron-Mike" O'Daniel, Harold Oram and others in American Friends of Vietnam) were responsible for American involvement in Vietnam would not be correct. That involvement had been decided upon even before Professor Robert Knapp (now of Wesleyan College in Middletown, Connecticut) made Ho chi Minh's protégé an interpreter for an American general and later a long-time employee of CIA.

"The Vietnam lobby" was not set up to involve America in a country; its job was to involve America with the family which would prepare the terrain for Vietnam's sell-out in Washington.

That same page 1109 in volume II of "A DRAGON EMBATTLED" refers once more to your correspondent's book on Vietnam as emanating "from the lunatic fringe of the American Right." With sarcasm and dishonesty Buttinger writes that the author "reveals another secret, namely that I alone (Buttinger) 'was responsible for breaking the anti-communist front in Hungary' (page 119), a statement that well illustrates the level of information and judgment the author has brought to the subject of South Vietnam."

Actually, what the above paragraph illustrates is the dishonesty of the trusted associate and source of information of one of the most important men in CIA. What was actually written on page 119 of "BACKGROUND TO BETRAYAL-THE TRAGEDY OF VIETNAM" (hard cover edition, page 114 of the soft cover) was a statement by Monsignor Bela Varga, the priest who headed the last free government of Hungary.

When asked about Mr. Buttinger, Monsignor Bela Varga replied: "He alone was responsible for breaking the anti-communist front in Hungary." That a priest in position to know made this statement, Mr. Buttinger concealed behind a few glib words about "lunatic fringe" and "the extreme American Right."

If the judgment and/or integrity of Cherne and his closest associate, Joseph Buttinger, is the kind America is stuck with on the oversight committee and foreign intelligence advisory board of CIA, only more Vietnams are in the cards. With the author of the letter we have quoted lecturing to cadets at the U. S. Military Academy and future foreign service officials at Georgetown University, if it is not conspiracy, what would you call it?

To our subscribers: Address domestic business to H. du B. REPORTS, P. O. Box 786, St. George, Utah 84770. Address foreign correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, 20 Blvd. Princesse Charlotte, Monte Carlo, Principality of MONACO.

Students \$10 per year. Supporting subscribers \$15 per year. Extra copies 30¢ each.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent

Leda P. Rutherford, Managing Editor



U. S. Policy

The summer of 1976 was a period of small gains and way-clearing for big setbacks. The Honorable Thomas C. Reed, Secretary of the U.S. Air Force, was invited to brief seventy-some members of the Washington press corps at a luncheon sponsored by the American Security Council, publisher of "The Washington Report" and not to be confused with the National Security Council.

He praised the organization for its service in affording the public a better understanding of the need for military preparedness and traced the crash program of Russian expansion on land, at sea and in the air. If he did not touch on no-winism or observe that forces within America powerful enough to prevent victory in Vietnam are unlikely to go all-out for victory against communism elsewhere, it was understandable. Representatives of those forces were present and they knew and he knew there was nothing to be gained by tackling a newspaper which could boast that it had destroyed a President, security agencies and scores of congressmen.

"War is a tragic waste of life," observed the secretary, but there was no hint that it is a treasonable waste when the most powerful newspapers and name-writers in the country block moves to shorten it, win it or save the lives of American soldiers.

Russia's flagrant aggressiveness and the cost of defense against it were recognized, but the Air Force secretary concluded: "The most wasteful of all would be to lose this worldwide struggle, with or without a fight. For then all that we have struggled to protect over these two hundred years would be gone." Someone should have said those words to Milton Eisenhower, the New York Times, James Reston, Professor John Spiegel of Brandeis University and the nest of professors in Washington with them in mid-July 1968.

THE POISONOUS INJECTION. A thirteen-member commission appointed by President Johnson met in Washington on July 10, 1968, to study the causes of violence and proceeded to turn the discussion of violence into an argument for surrender in Vietnam or elsewhere. Fifty hand-picked "experts" were there and from what the New York Times of July 11 called the country's "brain banks in sociology, history and law." With them to extol defeat as a goal were twelve professors of psychology and, incredible as it may seem, Milton Eisenhower, the brother of a general, was in the chairman's seat. While American boys were dying in the front line of the struggle Mr. Reed was to speak of eight years later, this collection of professors, indoctrinators, really, from the top universities of America were in a huddle to agree on the line they would plant in the minds of teachers, writers, diplomats and politicians of the future. There was nothing secret about it.

The New York Times of July 11, 1968, devoted over 52 square inches to Dr. Spiegel's thesis that "in a world of conflict, losing well is a value to be honored at least as much as winning." The drive to turn America into a nation of losers by intent was no longer concealed. "Education of the public with respect to values," was necessary, he emphasized, to "change the extreme importance of winning so as to make it at least as

important to be a good loser." The Cambodians were good losers. But what if Americans refuse to pass from no-winism to defeat as an objective? "Research has shown," Dr. Spiegel explained, "that minor surgery can interrupt disturbed brain processes before they become violent." Read: It was a crime when Hitler decided who should be marked for surgery, but Dr. Spiegel would sanction it in the cause of peace through acceptance of defeat. On July 12, 1968, it was James Reston's turn to praise the lie-down-like-sheep doctrine in the New York Times. "If we could only understand the glories of defeat, there would be less fighting and therefore less violence," he wrote. Read: Defense brings violence. Reston quoted Harold Stassen as saying: "Winning is obviously the cause and losing the prevention of violence. I am glad the White House has come around to my view." The Vietnamese, Laotian and Cambodian refugees being refused asylum by all the non-communist countries of Southeast Asia are unlikely to ever read those lines. Mr. Reston told a congressman in a telephone conversation on September 8, 1976, that he and the New York Times are proud of their stand on the war in Vietnam.

On July 14, 1968, the New York Times carried a still stronger plug for defeat. Diametrically contradicting Mr. Reed's predictions at the American Security Council luncheon Dr. Spiegel was quoted as telling the educators: "Losing need not mean the surrender of all power, but rather a graceful concession that could resolve potentially violent conflict.....The good losers America can use in greater abundance are those who wield power in public and private life." Men like us, was understood. The only people not advised to let themselves be slaughtered were "those suffering from injustice and deprivation." It was not suggested that these be apathetic or even that they "disavow militant protest."

Almost three years later, on January 4, 1971, New York Times columnist C. L. Sulzberger returned to the no-winism theme. The only purpose of U. S. military preparation, he wrote, "is either deterrence of war or, if need be, war in which there is no winner - that is to say - neither victory nor defeat.....Our military goals should be deliberate stalemate." In other words, though the war can be won, we should sacrifice boys until the enemy decides to call it a day, or our own youth and parents revolt. "The role of our military services," Bilderberg member Sulzberger wrote, "must be to support a national strategy of diplomatic deterrence; failing that, they should merely seek an early stalemate, not defeat of the enemy." What kind of "diplomatic deterrence?" Negotiations by Averell Harriman and Henry Kissinger? And if stalemate is our objective, why should the enemy stop fighting? If he draws the conflict out long enough the New York Times and Dr. Spiegel's professors will give him victory, to avoid violence. This is what the Honorable Thomas C. Reed should have told the dining room full of newsmen and the Washington Report its readers. Now let us turn to a few of the realities the West is facing as all the wheels come to a stop in America for a presidential election, save in the classes of Dr. Spiegel's colleagues.

THE SOCIALIST DEFEAT IN SWEDEN. West Germany's socialists were so afraid their brothers in Sweden would lose on September 19 and that it would bring about their own defeat 15 days later, they threw over \$14 million into the fight to keep Olof Palme in power. It may not seem much by American standards but it is a lot of money for a country of eight million people. It was as shocking a bit of outside meddling as America's moves to destroy the monarchy in Italy, or boost Willy Brandt in Germany, or rig elections for Ngo dinh Diem in Vietnam, or get Britain into the Common Market. In spite of the interference in Sweden's internal affairs - for it is the duty of socialists everywhere to help socialists into power in other countries - socialism's 44-year reign in Sweden came to an end. Olof Palme told the press on September 23: "Sooner or later you lose an election, but then you come back." The come-back is being planned on the international level as this is written. What the September 19 victory means is that in one small country Europe has bought time. Between November 26 and 28, delegates from 56 socialist parties will meet in Geneva to elect the leader who will head their drive for control of the European parliament to be elected in late May or early June 1978.

One of the things that frightened Swedish voters was the visit General Viktor Kulikov, chief of staff of the Russian army, paid to their Prime Minister and military leaders a week before the election. Russia also was afraid of a socialist setback, but Mr. Palme did not mention this. In his September 23 statements to the press he still maintained that the people had not rejected socialism, it was just that the "bourgeois opposition" promised more. "The bourgeois coalition," he said, had played employers against workers and the rich against the power. The truth was, despite international socialist support and years of propaganda picturing socialism as synonymous with social justice, the Swedes had had enough. If Marc Wallenberg, Sweden's leading banker, had been able to hold on for another five years he might not have had to commit suicide.

It was the opinion of David Howell, the British Member of Parliament, that "the Swedes did not vote against the past but against the future." Aside from the ecologists' fear of nuclear power, the issue that turned the electorate against Palme was his plan to take still more money from industry and business and turn it over to labor unions, on top of their members' dues. Palme thought labor leaders would be able to deliver the vote. Instead, Swedish workers, fed up with stories of union bosses' high living, resented the new shakedown. And plans to nationalize land, banks and publishing houses alienated voters further. To the Socialist International the fall of the government that led all others in the financing of terrorists in Africa was the loss of a skirmish, not a war. The men running the campaign to infiltrate European institutions and turn Western Europe into a neutralist socialist superstate via the 1978 elections are not socialists in the old sense of the word; they are technocrat specialists, openly revolutionary and with ties to the Trotskyist International.

HEAD OF THE EUROPEAN TROTSKYISTS is Michel Raptis, code name Pablo. His International is firmly entrenched in Britain, France, Portugal, Spain, Belgium, West Germany and Switzerland. The man he is backing in Britain is Anthony Wedgewood Benn and Benn, in turn complains that Russia refuses to officially recognize British socialists as revolutionaries. At present the Common Market parliament is the "European Assembly," situated in Strasbourg and made up of delegates selected proportionally from their respective representation in national parliaments. After the 1978 elections the Common Market will become supranational with its own 410-member parliament, members of which will be elected from the regions into which the member states have been divided. Luxembourg will have 6 representatives in the new super-state designed to replace nationhood. Belgium will have 24 and France, West Germany, Italy and Britain 81 each. Part of the terrain-preparing process for the new world without patriotism has been the step by step dilution of the Catholic Church, to level off religious differences in the area of the new world order. The destruction of tradition has been the goal. In the past four months that program has been confronted by an obstacle in the person of Monsignor Marcel Lefebvre, the former Archbishop of Dakar and founder in October 1970 of the Seminary of Saint Pius X in Ecône, Switzerland.

THE BITTER RELIGIOUS WAR. At present the most serious religious conflict the world has seen for centuries is being fought. It has surfaced in the press but more is at stake than the public has been told. All the forces of what has come to be referred to as "the Christian avant garde" are out to destroy the archbishop from Ecône and the outcome will have a profound effect on Europe and the West.

The story as conservative European Catholics tell it in essence is this: Monsignor Lefebvre is a traditionalist and an anti-communist. He is a defender of the Latin mass because he sees the rejection of it as a breach in the wall that protects the whole. He sees banning of the old mass as part of a trend to strip the church of its mystical theology, its rituals, its dogma, that it may merge into a single world church, devoted more to an egalitarian social order than precise religious beliefs. Monsignor Lefebvre charges that the new mass, the Ordo Missae introduced in 1969 by Paul VI, will lead to a new catechism, a new priesthood, new seminaries, the charismatic church and the destruction of orthodoxy and the ministry that has been handed down. To the traditionalists, that the church has stood like a pillar through the ages has been due

to the continuity of tradition and the breakdown of that tradition will be the first step in the destruction of the West's bulwark against barbarism. The traditionalists quote the dogmatic constitution of Pius IX, the Pastor Aeternus of the first Vatican Concile, which held that the Holy Spirit was promised to the successors of Peter, not to permit them to publish a new doctrine but to guard strictly and expose faithfully, with its assistance, the Revelation transmitted by the apostles. The fact that Rome had changed was further brought home to them on June 21, 1976, when the Pope appealed to the communist world for more representation in the Vatican. The gulf between the traditionalists and Monsignor Casaroli, the proponent of closer relations with the East, widened daily. Gradually the tone became more acrimonious. The point of no return was passed when Monsignor Lefebvre, warned that he might be excommunicated, exclaimed: "Me? By whom, the Free Masons!" The importance of this may escape Americans who are unaware of the difference between the Scottish Rites masonry common in America and the revolutionary lodges of Europe which have retained their conspiratorial roles of the time of the French Revolution.

Further, Monsignor Lefebvre's words were not shots in the air. For months noted Italian writers, many of them Catholic traditionalists, had been publishing the names of six men holding high posts in the Vatican itself who have joined masonic orders since the act of excommunication was abrogated on December 7, 1965. Among them, and the one the Archbishop was referring to was Monsignor Annibal Bugnini, author of the new mass. In the storm that followed Monsignor Bugnini was sent to Iran and, on July 23, Monsignor Lefebvre was forbidden to celebrate mass, administer the sacraments or preach. The result was an influx of future priests in the Sacerdotal Fraternity of Saint Pius X, in Ecône and the gulf between the two sides widened. (The Fraternity has a seminary in Armada, Michigan, a pre-seminary in Weissbaden, Switzerland, and a study center in Albano, near Rome.)

By mid-September, Europe, where all the old structures are under attack, was torn by the struggle between the avant garde of the church and those who hold that a yielding on one point will lead to other alterations of tradition until everything that has been held to be true is undermined. In his weekly "Nouvelles de Paris," dated September 23, Mr. Paul Dehème suggested that the Vatican had been deliberately misinformed by the authors of a report charging that seminarists in Ecône had been asked to swear an oath of opposition to the Pope. When Monsignor Lefebvre denied the accusation, the respected churchman and powerful men in the Vatican were put in the position of calling each other liars. "A small matter," wrote Mr. Dehème, "if it did not take place in the very heart of the church. Naturally, the spokesman for the Holy See does not want the faithful to know that the Holy Father may have been badly informed and deceived to the point of believing Monsignor Lefebvre capable of what he is accused of, but it would not be surprising if this were the case. It would not be the first time a Pope has been misled, and if Paul VI doubts it, he might recall one of the memories of Monsignor Montini.

"It took place between 1953 and '54," Mr. Dehème continued. "Pius XII, the Pope at the time, sent a trusted layman on a confidential mission to the Bishop of Upsala. In the course of their conversation, the Swedish bishop asked how the secret negotiations between the Vatican and Soviet leaders were progressing. The astonished emissary replied that he had never heard of such talks and doubted that they were taking place. 'Make your own investigation and we'll talk about it when you come back,' the Swedish bishop told him. Pius XII assured his emissary there was no truth whatever to the story and this the emissary reported fifteen days later in Upsala. Informed of the Pope's denial, the Swedish bishop spread the facts on the table. His information was so precise it could not be denied that something was afoot. Pius XII launched his own investigation and found that one of his two Secretaries of State, Monsignor Montini, was, in truth, in secret contact with the Kremlin and had gone so far as to alter reports on Russia before sending them on to the Pope himself. At this time Monsignor Montini was removed from the Secretariat of State in disgrace and sent to Milan as archbishop without being named Cardinal."

Mr. Deheme posed the question: "~~Since Pius XII was deceived by Monsignor Montini, is it not possible that Paul VI has been misled in the case of Monsignor Lefebvre?~~" There the matter rests as the storm, fanned by those working for the new order, gathers strength. Parallel with Europe's struggle to destroy herself is the West's united drive for anarchy in Africa.

SOUTH AFRICA'S PURCHASE OF TIME. The sacrifice of Rhodesia will at best buy only a breathing spell. Before the fire of black Africa, Russia, Cuba and the North African Arab states is directed against the Union of South Africa, a few paragraphs on the historical background are in order.

At the beginning of the XVIII century South Africa was practically uninhabited. Two non-negroid tribes, the Bushmen and the Hottentots, roamed the veldt undisturbed. Portuguese navigators had begun using the port at Capetown as a stopping point on the sea route to India two hundred years before, but their interest stopped at the coast. When the Dutch ran out the Portuguese, land development began for the first time and the Bushmen and Hottentots had a protector. Slaves were imported from Indonesia as a labor force and from them came the race of metis (mixed breeds) which today numbers some two million. Half a century after the whites appeared, the waves of Bantu invasions south of the Zambeze, from Central Africa, began. The Bantus, divided into four distinct linguistic groups and countless tribes, were fleeing from warlike tribes further north. Their destination was the Namibian desert and the Indian Ocean, in search of land where each tribe could enjoy autonomy under its own chief.

The Orange River was the dividing line between white Africa and black as the XVIII century ended, but in 1816 a scourge known in history as the "Mfkané" rolled southward. The Zulus were one of the smallest tribes of the Bantus but under a chief named Shaka they were welded into a black army such as Africa had never seen. Divided into regiments with their own command structure they forced one neighboring tribe after another into their ranks and by 1823 were at the peak of a war of conquest and extermination. Other Bantu tribes fled southward to escape them and in seven years of massacres Shaka exterminated half the black population of the lower part of Africa. All the cattle were slaughtered and cannibalism began. Since Shaka had wiped out the tribes north of the Orange River, the Dutch saw an opportunity to get away from the British and began trekking towards Natal and the Transvaal.

Tribes terrorized by the Zulus looked on the arriving Dutch as saviors. Wherever the British or the Dutch went it meant the end of massacres and starvation. Outside the areas under their protection Zulu terrorism continued for half a century and problems caused by the flights from Zulu brutality remain, namely the patchwork quilt of different tribes and languages. One of Pretoria's hardest jobs has been the reconstituting of dismembered tribes into national communities where they can live together and govern themselves. In one such community, the Transkei, the Xhosa ethnic group is due to become independent in late October. The Bophutatswana group, in the northeast, are still splintered and the Pretoria government is trying to buy up the land separating the divided branches so they can have a united homeland. Mr. Lucas Mangope, the Bophutatswana prime minister, realizes that the territory being given them is rich in minerals and is cooperating with the Vorster Government. He has refused to have anything to do with the trouble-makers in Soweto.

The big question mark remains the Zulus. They are the most explosive element and under the leadership of Mr. Buthe they continue to reject the idea of separate ethnic states. They want a single South African nation which they hope to rule, with white and Indian minorities at their mercy. What Buthe is demanding is a return to the days of Zulu supremacy under Shaka, and the trouble is, Russia and the Cubans are ready to back them. When Henry Kissinger went to West Germany in June to deliver what amounted to an ultimatum to Prime Minister Vorster, there were some 25 million inhabitants in the South Africa where he is turning the clock back. Some 3.8 million

of them are white, in British and Africaans (Dutch) communities. The 17 million Bantus are divided into nine different ethnic groups, some of which already enjoy autonomy. It is worth noting that no one of them has a majority over the whites. Those of mixed blood come to around 2 million. The 600,000 Indians and approximately 50,000 Bushmen hope to be integrated with them in a federal white community for their common protection.

It has been 18 years since labor's revolution-sower, Irving Brown, and New York lawyer, Lawrence C. McQuade, toured black Africa telling the people: "Unite! You have a continent to regain and nothing to lose but your chains!" It has been almost 16 years since Mr. Brown's friend and associate, Mr. Jay Lovestone, onetime secretary general of the Communist Party-USA, wrote his famous letter of Dec. 1, 1960 to the UN representative from communist Mali. Mr. Lovestone rejoiced that 1960 would "go down in history as the year of Africa," and called for greater efforts to free the remaining African nations "still fighting for their emancipation." Already, on March 9, 1960, Walter P. Reuther had called on the labor unions of Africa to demand that the United States recall her ambassador from the Union of South Africa. He called for pressure to make the U.S. cease buying gold from South Africa and, even ready to sabotage our defense program, asked African leaders to insist that we cease buying South African strategic materials being stockpiled for defense.

Mr. Kissinger's recent round of diplomacy opens the way to the final chapter of a policy which has brought forty-four former African colonies a "democracy" that has given them at least one coup d'etat or revolution a year since 1963.

Twenty-three of the "liberated" states changed governments with large numbers of citizens losing their necks. The matter of chains is best not mentioned. Twenty-nine of the new states formed through American pressure on their mother countries now have one-party rule. Rhodesia and South Africa look like business as usual.

NOTE: As a courtesy to the H. du B. REPORT, please refrain from photocopying this material in whole or in part. It takes painstaking work and long hours to produce each issue -- and we earn our income solely from the sale of subscriptions and extra copies. By photocopying the REPORT you would be depriving the staff of part of the benefits of their work. If we are to be able to continue the publication of this REPORT we ask that when you do make photocopies to save time, you send us the price of an extra report for each photocopy made. Thank you.

To our subscribers: Address domestic business to H. du B. REPORTS, P. O. Box 786, St. George, Utah 84770. Address foreign correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, 20 Blvd. Princesse Charlotte, Monte Carlo, Principality of MONACO.

Students \$10 per year. Supporting subscribers \$15 per year. Extra copies 30¢ each.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent

Leda P. Rutherford, Managing Editor



Black Clouds

It is Spain again. Whatever is granted it is never enough. On October 10, 1976, London's leftist OBSERVER called Spain's efforts to satisfy the European and American left "a feeble search for democracy." Indignation over the assassination of Senor Juan Maria Araluce Villar and his three guards was called "an uncontrollable backlash" in which "the Guardia Civile appeared happy to stand by and watch it happen." That Washington policemen went on directing traffic the day rioting blacks looted supermarkets, after the death of Martin Luther king, was as it should be. A leader of the Spanish Worker's Socialist Party told Observer reporter Colin Smith the left had hoped for rougher treatment, which would help them stir up unrest in the form of strikes and demonstrations before the elections in November. The leftist tactic has become classic: Violence, to force government repression. Then more violence because of repression. "The workers in Spain will be the fuse as the army was in Portugal," boasted a leader of Spain's communist-dominated workers' Commission.

The present cry in the western press is that the communist party should be legalized in Spain because its members are Euro-communists, on the Italian model, with no allegiance to Moscow. Forgotten is the violence that emerged as a trait of the Spanish left in the Civil War. The new magazine, Opinion, predicts that under present conditions socialists and communists would get 30% of the vote if an election were held in Spain today. But there is a hint that the percentage could be much higher, because 40% of those questioned refused to answer, and this, Spanish leftists claim, is because people are still afraid to talk politics. It is probably true, but it is just as likely that the Spaniard in the street has more reason to be afraid of what a gang of communist thugs might do to those on their list a few years from now than what the authorities might do today. The London Observer's conjecture as to how the army might act if the government were goaded into measures that would touch off strikes and demonstrations are less expressions of doubt than what the international left wants the Spanish army to do.

Most of the present generals in Spain are over 60 and right wing, according to the Observer, but "below this hierarchy is a strata of much younger, middle-ranking officers, many of whom acquired some democratic notions during long staff and technical courses in the United States. And under them is a rank and file that mostly consists of unwilling conscripts." What the Observer is saying is that officers sent to the United States for training were converted to the left, and the conscripts below them can be counted on for the role draftees from leftist families played in the coup in Portugal.

SPAIN AND HER ARMED FORCES are militarily and geographically vital to the West's survival. The army musters around 210,000 men and the navy some 43,000, about 7,000 of whom are marines. Airforce strength is estimated at 39,000. Nations with the most to lose if Spain were to go the way of Portugal have left nothing undone to keep the country economically and militarily weak, and her volatile left in a state of ferment.

Almost twenty years ago, on May 23, 1958, Richard Fryklund wrote in the Washington Star: "Blow held not decisive if West loses France." The West could not afford to lose any country, but American support of leftists in France and terrorists in Algeria caused the French pull-out from NATO. Today the target is Spain, which the West has worked to subvert for Moscow. Russia has turned Europe's southern flank, Italy is a liability, and Turkey, the West's front line of defense, has been wounded by American politicians. for the sake of Greek votes.

ECONOMIC STRANGULATION. While the American and European press worked to perpetuate Spain's isolation, all the satellite countries of Eastern Europe with the exception of east Germany were establishing commercial missions in Madrid. Spain needs trade and the West needs Spain. Spain had no choice but to accept the Russian, Polish, Bulgarian, Czechoslovakian, Hungarian and Romanian trade missions which brought exports as well as spies. Russia began building an embassy, then halted construction with the promise of full diplomatic relations if American nuclear vessels were evicted from their Spanish base. American press attacks on the Madrid government continued. Peregrine Worsthorne wrote in the London Sunday Telegraph of November 23, 1975, that "Franco, compared to Stalin, was a decent man, and Spain, under his rule, compared to Stalin's, was a free society," but the irrational hatred of leftists and the press continues. Moscow hinted that if diplomatic relations were established the Spanish left would cause less trouble. It is possible that relations with Russia might bring a better press in America as well. Madrid remained firm.

In May 1976 another bid for Spanish membership in NATO was rebuffed. The socialist-dominated Common Market also remained hostile. And there were other obstacles to Russian diplomatic ties besides American bases. Madrid wanted the gold reserves returned which communists took from the National Bank and shipped to Russia in October 1936 "for safe keeping."

IT WAS A SORDID STORY. Jose Diaz, secretary-general of the Spanish Communist Party, and Marcel Rosenberg, the Russian ambassador, cooked it up. First they got the approval of Juan Negrin, the Minister of Finance. The governor of the National Bank distrusted Russian intentions so he was called to a meeting and detained while Valentin Gonzalez, the ignorant railroad worker known as El Campesino, whom Stalin made a marshal, looted the bank. When the shift of guards on duty was relieved, Gonzalez' men in bank guard uniforms took over and loaded 7,800 cases of gold onto 35 trucks and started them for Cartagena before the bank governor came back. Outside Madrid the convoy was drawn up at the side of the road and the drivers were sent back to Madrid. As soon as they were gone, red flags were placed on the trucks to indicate that they were carrying ammunition, so that snoopers would keep their distance.

With new drivers the long line of trucks made its way to the ammunition dump in Galeta to await the arrival of a Russian freighter in Cartagena. On October 25, 1936, a grey ship of 4,000 tons, its name obliterated by scraping, took off for Odessa, via Tunis, and the perfect bank robbery was put over. The ship rode at anchor in Odessa Harbor while lighters unloaded the treasure at night for shipment to Moscow. The three Spanish officials who accompanied the shipment were held on Stalin's orders until he decided to let them leave. But they were not permitted to go home, where they might talk. One was sent to Washington, another to Buenos Aires and the third to Mexico City. Only a few Russians knew what had happened. Grinko, the Finance Commissioner, was in on it but he was later shot. Marquiltz and Cargon, the director and sub-director of the Gros Bank, where the gold was stored, were sent to Siberia along with the treasury representative who helped count it. A short time later Moscow announced the discovery of new mines in the Urals and began exporting gold.

It is worth noting in passing that when the Belgian Socialist Party celebrated the 75th anniversary of its founding, in Brussels, the capitol of the Common market, in May 1960, Valentin Gonzalez - El Campesino - the communist looter of Spain's gold reserves,

was there. He watched as the huge floats of Paul-Henry Spaak's Socialist Party made their way through Brussel's streets manned by a mean-faced rabble giving the clenched-fist salute. It was like old times for El Campesino. The floats showed huge fists smashing the monarchy, the church and capitalism.

THE NEGOTIATIONS WITH MOSCOW DRAG OUT. Russia insists that the Spanish gold rightfully belongs to her in payment for debts owed by the previous regime, this though the Kremlin has never paid a cent on debts incurred by the Tsar. Madrid hints that she might write off the 7,800 cases of gold bars but the King's government maintains that the bilateral accords with America are purely defensive and not negotiable. Now European reports warn that Russia has reviewed the situation and is not averse to American naval presence. America's declining strength vis-à-vis the Russian fleet and reluctance to show resolution in Vietnam make our bases potential targets. Instead of demanding closure of American bases, Russia is offering to complete her Madrid embassy, establish diplomatic relations and even restrain Spain's troublesome reds if Madrid will close the Canary Islands to the American Airforce in the event of future airlifts to the Middle East. (It will be recalled that Ellsworth Bunker, as ambassador to Indonesia, caused the U.S. to deny refueling facilities on American bases to our NATO ally, Holland, when Sukarno moved to seize New Guinea.) With the Canary Islands barred to us, the Azores, which America used in previous airlifts to Israel, would follow. This is the situation in Spain which the free world has worked to undermine since Franco's victory over the communist threat that now hangs over the West.

THE ANTI-SPANISH CAMPAIGN. The propaganda offensive is maintained by the West's leftist press but labor unions still provide the action arm. On February 4, 1963, the Wall Street Journal headed a front-page story: "U.S. UNIONS GIVE CASH SUPPORT TO ORGANIZING AND STRIKES OVERSEAS." The proceeds from AFL-CIO's \$40.6 million warchest would be spent to "support strikes and propagandize pro-union legislation." With the war in Algeria over, the new battlefields for unions using the "just revendications of workers" as a cover for political action were to be Spain and Portugal. Britain's slide to the brink of the abyss, propelled by labor, had already started. Spanish and Portuguese unions were the principal ones to which funds were being channeled through the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) in Brussels to foment unrest. (See H. du B. Reports, June 1974 and November-December 1975)

EXPORTING INFLATION AND REVOLUTION. It is impossible to tell where CIA action stopped and labor initiative began in the drive that followed to boost inflation by boosting wages and to use inflation as justification for revolution. A study of ICFTU daily press communiques of that period shows a constant flow of funds from the labor confederation in Brussels to communist-directed unions posing as non-communist leftists in Spain and Portugal. That the ICFTU got its money from the AFL-CIO and that CIA was using the AFL-CIO as a channel for political agitation through labor abroad was never a secret. Lieutenant-General Francisco Salgado-Araujo, in his book, "My Private Conversations With Franco," tells of the generalissimo's conviction that CIA was trying to overthrow his regime. "They want to implant an American-style democracy the day I disappear," Franco told the general, "but they are mistaken. It will only contribute to disorder and subversion....and only Russia will profit by it." Action in Spain followed a pattern made classic by the destruction of the monarchy in Italy, CIA's undermining of the throne in Vietnam, plots against the monarchy in Cambodia, replacement of the Bey in Tunis by Habib Bourguiba's one-party system and presidency for life.

THE PAWN IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST KING JUAN CARLOS is Prince Carlos Hugues de Bourbon-Parma, the Carlist pretender. Hugues is married to Princess Irene of the Netherlands who learned politics from her father, Prince Bernhard. At the time of Franco's death Prince Hugues told the press in Paris: "Juan Carlos wants to succeed Franco. I and my followers want to make the revolution." In his bid to use Spain's violent left, Hugues promised worker participation in management and government. Unions were promised the same consultative status as parties and Catalonia was promised nationhood within a

federal state. His radical socialist ideas, Prince Hugues declared, were strengthened by his marriage in 1964 to Prince Bernhard's daughter. For an indication of how revolutionary the Carlists are, a terrorist shoot-up took place in Montejurra on May 9, 1976. Ten days later Prince Hugues held another press conference in Paris calling for a "democratic pact" between all opposition parties (read: socialists and communists) against the King. A communique distributed to the journalists stated that Hugues' brother, Prince Sixto Enriques, was responsible for the Montejurra shooting. But Sixto Enriques could only have been acting for his brother. The new name given to Hugues by Paris press men is "the Spanish Sihanouk." Sihanouk is believed to have been killed by the Khmer Rouge, which used him; only Hugues seems oblivious to the fact that the moment Juan Carlos is out of the way the Spanish left he is courting will have no need of him.

SPAIN'S UNDERGROUND LABOR UNIONS, which American labor's international trouble-sower, Irving Brown, and CIA provided with money for years through the ICFTU in Brussels, are calling for a general strike to immobilize the country on November 12. On October 18 a former priest, two civil rights leaders and the communist party held a mass meeting at Madrid University to bring the students into their game. Wheels are in motion for a showdown in Spain this winter. British unions, having bankrupted England and brought the pound sterling to a point where foreign nations are keeping it afloat only because a crash will topple their own currencies, are working to make Spain's Socialist labor union, the UGT, an arm for revolution. Taking the lead are Britain's transport workers and miners. Since January 1, 1976, European labor unions, including British, have sent over \$700,000 to the UGT for political action. In November Mr. Len Murray, secretary-general of Britain's Trade Union Congress (TUC) and Jack Jones of the transport workers will go to Madrid to pledge international support. The explanation given for interfering in Spanish labor-politics by men who have ruined Britain is that they are trying to fend off a powerful challenge from Spain's communist-dominated Workers' Commission and other red union groups. The truth is, when the UGT has completed its work, it will no longer be socialist. This is the situation in Europe's western fortress as America approaches elections and the stock market slides. The London Daily Telegraph of October 16 explained that the drop in the market "reflects a realization on the part of investors that either Gerald Ford or Jimmy Carter will win the Presidential elections."

IN AMERICA Mr. Daniel Ellsberg and 53 other "peace" demonstrators were arrested in front of the Pentagon on October 18, at the climax of a "continental walk for disarmament and social justice," which started in Ukiah, California, nine months ago. Asked if this was the last rally of the Vietnam war, Mr. Ellsberg - demonstrating for America's disarming while Russia prepares to challenge the west shouted: "No! This is the first rally of the rest of our lives."

IN THE WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES emphasis is on military education for the young. A drive is afoot to boost "technical and tactical preparedness and the fighting spirit of future draftees." A special ideological indoctrination program has been introduced for students and soldiers lest they get an idea that talk of detente will make armies superfluous. "Detente," they are told, "is chiefly guaranteed by the growing might of the East and means the sharpening rather than the abatement of the international class struggle." (TIMES of London, May 12, 1976)

RUSSIA'S 40,000-TON AIRCRAFT CARRIER, THE KIEV, was passing through the Dardenelles into the Mediterranean as the Turkish seismographic boat, the Sismik 1, was preparing to take soundings in search of much-needed oil in the Aegean Sea. Instead of uniting with the West against the Russian threat, Greece's first concern was to keep Turkey deprived of oil. The Greek Navy was put on the alert, not against the passage of the Kiev and her escort of two cruisers and two missile-bearing destroyers, but against Sismik 1. Congressman Brademas, of Indiana, picked up the quarrel to gain Greek votes in America's November elections. The Kiev with her 35 Yak-36 vertical take-off fighters and 25 Kamov anti-submarine helicopters brought Russia's naval presence in the Mediterranean to an estimated 70 ships, 12 of them submarines, opposed to America's 44-ship Mediterranean fleet.

The Russian Far East fleet operating out of the ice-free port of Vladivostok is estimated at 750 ships, most of them less than ten years old, against an American force fast approaching obsolescence. Since mid-June Russian warships in the Indian Ocean outnumber the combined total of western ships in the area. On land Russian preponderance is even greater but more alarming is the fact that the T-62 tank is protected against radiation. This means that Moscow war-planners intend to send armored columns through passages opened by nuclear weapons. Faced with such reports, Mr. Kissinger maintains a lofty air. "Russia's growing military strength is inevitable and something the West has to learn to live with," he told NATO leaders in Oslo on May 20, 1976. The catch is: while telling nations they must learn to live with the Russian threat, the mass media of the West support those who would solve the matter by accommodation. The form accommodation will ultimately take is the American-backed new order visualized by Jean Monnet and our one-worlders; a neutralist socialist Europe which by becoming helpless hopes to be permitted to live. Many Europeans feel that invisible planners maintained momentum in civilization's decline by setting Mr. Kissinger's Rhodesia solution in motion the moment Europe passed its point of no return. The parallels of Rhodesia with the Congo of 1960 are frightening.

AFRICA, THE TURBULENT, was the heading of H. du B. Reports of March 1960. Some 115,000 Europeans had brought order and prosperity to a Congo as large as the Indian sub-continent and populated by 13 million blacks. The American government, labor unions and pressure groups joined forces with the most anti-white racists in UN to export disorder. In 1956 the State Department sent Assistant Secretary of State George Allen to the Congo "to sound out the will to independence of the native population, a strong, free and friendly Africa being important to the security of the United States." It was like asking if they wanted to loot. Houseboys had been told they would get the master's house, wife and car. Naturally, they wanted independence. And only a fool or a traitor would have pretended that a free, incited Congo would be friendly to whites. A year after George Allen's fool's mission, George Meany went to Ghana to deliver an incendiary speech that went through Africa like a brush fire. Speaking for America's 15 million "free" workers - men forced to join a union - he compared France's African territories with Budapest and called for support for liberation movements. He described the Algerians as "patriots deprived of liberty, now locked in final, and I am sure, victorious struggle for independence from the clutches of French colonialism, the most degrading expression of an outworn and declining imperialism." Lenin or Stalin might have written it. It was incitement to massacre addressed to the most violent racists on earth and Mr. Meany has never faced up to the tyranny it brought.

There was no let-up to the senseless agitation. A year after Meany's trip, Irving Brown and the New York lawyer, Lawrence C. McQuade, made the same trip and shouted: "Africans, Unite! You have a continent to regain and nothing to lose but your chains." Uganda's Idi Amin being not yet in power, Ghana, where they were speaking, was on the road to becoming one of the cruelest and worst-run countries on the continent.

Unable to hold out against UN, meddling Americans and their own socialists, the beleaguered Belgians agreed to independence in five years. Time was needed to train new leaders. The moment independence was promised, 52 barefoot mobs dignified as political parties wanted it at once. And theoretically intelligent Americans backed them. Witch doctor practices, suppressed for fifty years, reappeared over night but the American media talked of plans to "introduce democracy."

Independence was moved ahead, from five years to six months. With every concession demands increased and the cries became more strident. Still, Robert Murphy praised the maturity and wisdom of the Congolese. Bob Murphy, who in 1947 was U.S. ambassador to Belgium and Paul-Henry Spaak's collaborator when Spaak and his fellow socialists were stripping nations of their colonies so that only by sacrificing sovereignty and in turn becoming colonies of a European super-state could the mother countries exist.

In UN and a flood of newsprint, Europeans in the Congo were assured that Belgian officers would continue to command the 25,000-man Force Publique and see that the riots of January 1959 and the later killings of October would never be repeated.

Lumumba's agents were already whipping up the four ethnic groups that made up the Force Publique, preparing the mutiny that was to come. A story printed in "Our Africa" a month before independence told Congolese that violating a white woman would soon no longer be a crime.

In ten days the magnificent force it took the Belgians twenty years to build up collapsed in an orgy of burning and violence. White officers were strung up on trees and white women were found with their stomachs cut open after having been violated by the formerly well-disciplined Force Publique. Not a protest came from the American Committee on Africa, headed by Eleanor Roosevelt, Bishop James A. Pike, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and their friends. Lumumba went to UN to demand that all the Belgians be pulled out.

Terrorism, torture, looting, cannibalism and all the crimes against civilization an honest magistrate might name had been going on for six months in the Congo when Mr. Jay Lovestone, the AFL-CIO delegate to U.N., wrote a letter to the delegate from Communist Mali expressing satisfaction that 1960 would go down in history as the year of Africa. But other African nations remain to be freed, wrote Mr. Lovestone, and he called for more African independence movements as "movestowards peace."

It is impossible to watch Mr. Kissinger's promises to Rhodesia as they are written off, one by one, without thinking of America's responsibility for the bloodbath in the Congo sixteen years ago. Ian Smith's agreement, under Kissinger's threats, to majority rule in Rhodesia in two years removed all the barriers. On October 18, Robert Mugabe, the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) leader, announced in Lusaka that not a single white exploiter will keep an acre of his property in the future marxist Rhodesia.

This is the country that Henry Kissinger forced Ian Smith to surrender - to keep the Russians out.

NOTE: As a courtesy to the H. du B. REPORT, please refrain from photocopying this material in whole or in part. It takes painstaking work and long hours to produce each issue -- and we earn our income solely from the sale of subscriptions and extra copies. By photocopying the REPORT you would be depriving the staff of part of the benefits of their work. If we are to be able to continue the publication of this REPORT we ask that when you do make photocopies to save time, you send us the price of an extra report for each photocopy made. Thank you.

To our subscribers: Address domestic business to H. du B. REPORTS, P. O. Box 786, St. George, Utah 84770. Address foreign correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, 20 Blvd. Princesse Charlotte, Monte Carlo, Principality of MONACO.

Subscription rate \$15 per year.

Extra copies 30¢ each.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent

Leda P. Rutherford, Managing Editor



Those Important 7s

One of the lessons America will learn in 1977 is that governments put in power by minority groups and labor unions serve minority groups and labor unions.

For Africa, 1977 promises an era of horror. Molotov wrote of Africa in 1953: "We are entering into the period of decolonization which will be followed by a general independence. Then, on those territories that were yesterday slaves, will fall a period of unbelievable disorder. There will be political and economic anarchy. Afterwards, and then only, the dawn of communism will rise." 1977 promises to prove Molotov correct. For the world's oceans it will be the year of the Soviet Navy. For the West it will be the end of retreats. There will be nothing left to yield. There was no lack of warnings as black guerrilla leaders uttered threats in Geneva. The London Daily Telegraph of November 4, 1976, reported that Cuban-led forces of Angola's MPLA government were concentrating on the rival Kwanyama tribe, shooting boys over ten and abducting the women. Terrified refugees were streaming into South Africa, unaware that white intellectuals in America and Britain had marked it for delivery after Rhodesia.

A few leaders in Britain faced the fact that England's black minority will not remain passive when the open season on whites is declared in Angola and South Africa. Peregrine Worsthorne warned Mr. Ian Smith in the Sunday Telegraph of October 31 that America will not come to his aid if terrorists reject the plan Mr. Kissinger bludgeoned him into accepting. "The U.S. Army, being entirely voluntary, is drawn preponderantly from the ranks of the black unemployed," Mr. Worsthorne warned. He should have added: "And revolutionaries who joined the army for its military training."

Communist-directed organizations in every country in the West stand ready to paralyze defense in the name of "peace" as Russian warships and nuclear-powered submarines take up positions astride the free world's lifelines. Western Europe, as the challenges of 1977 unfold, will be preparing to elect a European Parliament in late May or early June of 1978. Socialist regional one-worldism under impersonal meddlers lies ahead.

Zbigniew Brzezinski told Paris' LE QUOTIDIEN just before his man was elected that taking communists into the government of Europe will have the advantage of bringing them into "the democratic system." His memory should have told him that taking communists into unions and governments leads to communists taking over. To a man, the proponents of a Europe without nation states were for Carter and Brzezinski.

Many an historian contemplating the year 1977 must feel with misgiving that there is something ominous about decades that end in 7.

1947 SAW THE LAUNCHING OF THE EUROPEAN MOVEMENT which planners hope to make Atlantic. July 1947 brought the formation of a "Committee for the Coordination of the Movements

for European Unity," with David and Nelson Rockefeller among the sponsors. With them was Sir William Wiseman, a partner in Kuhn Loeb, the bank that financed revolution in Russia thirty years before. American financiers, businessmen and politicians flocked to support the new committee while Adolf Berle, Jr., agreed to lead the American section and John Foster Dulles promised to help advance it. The coordination under a single leadership of all the movements working for European unity was a step towards the effacing of national lines and the merging of workers, languages and religions. Communists and socialists had never known borders so they were for it. America's Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) with its program for regions instead of states was solidly behind it. It was open season on national sovereignty and organizations to bring about its relinquishment began to proliferate.

Mr. Averell Harriman, who saved the bolsheviks from bankruptcy in 1922, was U.S. ambassador to Britain in 1947. Harriman's friend, Robert Murphy, was ambassador to Belgium, and John McCloy was U.S. high Commissioner for Germany. It was a CFR cast. Duncan Sandys, the British leader in the European Movement, was working with Joseph Retinger, the Pole, who was currently living by promoting the Common Market. Sandys and Retinger needed money, so Harriman sent them to McCloy in West Germany. McCloy, as Assistant Secretary of War had approved the order permitting Russians to become officers in the U.S. Army. He had been a delegate at the founding of U.N. and later was to become a key figure in the Bilderbergers, the Atlantic Union and other super-state and world government movements. McCloy, without U.S. citizens knowing what was involved, gave Sandys and Retinger the funds they needed for their European Movement.

Robert Murphy gave it all assistance in Belgium where it was being pushed by Paul Henry Spaak, Europe's "Mr. Socialist," who was working to depose his King before setting up the superstate that would replace national sovereignties. The favorite argument of the left was used: When all Western Europe had the same government law and order would be assured and there would be no more wars. No more perfect trio than Harriman, McCloy and Murphy could have been found for the destruction of patriotism in the West.

American intelligence operations in Paris, the most important capital on the continent, were being handled by Jay Lovestone, the labor agitator, who ten years before, in 1937, was secretary-general of the Communist Party-USA. Lovestone's friend and associate, Irving Brown, was using Paris as a base and organizing labor unions in Europe and Africa, claiming that he was fighting communism. In colonies, Brown's unions, financed by AFL-CIO and/or CIA, were never meant to fight for workers' rights; they were to fight for independence. In countries they were meant to immobilize governments if they tried to win. "ENVOY FOR LABOR. Irving Brown Fights Reds in European Unions," headed the propaganda story in LIFE Magazine of February 3, 1958. Within ten years reds controlled all the unions Brown had set up for them.

In all the furor over meddling in the internal affairs of other countries, not a congressman found anything wrong with the joint financing in 1947 of a labor union in France. David Dubinsky of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and Thomas Braden, the man who decreed that CIA would work overtly and covertly only with the world's non-communist left, furnished the money, and Irving Brown and Jay Lovestone did the organizing. The union was FORCE OUVRIERE - Worker's Force - and when military defeat in Algeria was necessary for world socialism's aims FORCE OUVRIERE fulfilled its role. When Braden ceased financing leftist unions abroad from his desk in CIA, Nelson Rockefeller gave him money to buy a newspaper.

René Pleven and his friend, Robert Schuman, were two of the most important "insiders" in France the year Harriman, McCloy and Murphy were working behind the scenes in the European Movement. The argument used to get Europeans to put themselves and their countries at the mercy of the regional UN the three Americans were promoting was that only by banding together would they be strong enough to defy America.

Pleven was in France's National Assembly in 1947 and Schuman was Minister of Finance until November 24 of that year when he became Prime Minister. It was the period of France's war in Indo-China, of communist-directed pacifist demonstrations at home and a government that provided sufficient appropriations to lull patriots while the nation's will was being destroyed, but never enough to let the soldiers in Indo-China win.

Cyrus Sulzberger wrote in the New York Times of April 10, 1976, that the Common Market was the Continent's most splended post-war dream. It was designed, he said, "to lead nations that lost their global influence into a confederation based on joint trade and financial interests." He was giving his readers gobbledegook. It was necessary to strip the nations of Western Europe of their global importance and demoralize them by defeats in colonial wars, to get them to surrender sovereignty and enter a leftward-sliding confederation. They were told there was no alternative if they wanted to survive. America's synthetic colonial war in Vietnam was for the same reason.

In 1947 a rich man's son from St. Paul's class of 1939, in Concord, New Hampshire, was about to put his theories into practice. His name was Cord Meyer, Jr., and he spent 1947 writing "PEACE AND ANARCHY," in which he predicted that anarchy threatened the world in the unbridled growth of nationalism and in insistence upon the sovereignty of nations. Thomas K. Finletter helped Meyer write his anti-patriotism book and Charles Bolte helped him organize the United World Federalists that same year, with Meyer as the organization's front and first president.

Other sources of Meyer's ideas were not mentioned on his book's acknowledgement page, but it is worth noting that Robert Schuman, the man who helped sabotage his own country's war in Indo-China from inside government and later led his country into the Common Market, was one of Meyer's lecturers at St. Paul's. Making patriotism a dirty word did not disqualify Cord Meyer for a job in CIA. Instead it helped him upward and thereafter Meyer worked from the inside. In 1973 on the eve of a last effort by British patriots to keep their country out of the Common Market, Meyer was appointed CIA station chief in London. Truly, 1947 was memorable in the story of the free world's decline.

BY 1957 FRANCE WAS OUT OF INDO-CHINA AND AMERICA WAS IN. No one protested at the time. The war in Indo-China really started the day in early 1945 when Major Paul Helliwell, of OSS, gave Ho chi Minh 20,000 cartridges. It was a gift that cost the lives of two American boys for every cartridge by the time the red-inspired plan had run its course.

By 1957 France was involved in another war, in Algeria, which Irving Brown, Jay Lovestone and the friends of Thomas Braden and Cord Meyer, Jr., were fanning. It was to break the back of resistance at home, a last spasm before being swallowed by the nation-levellers in Brussels.

In Vietnam Braden's men had swept away the throne, liquidated the private army that protected Saigon, and crushed the forces that kept the communists out of Tai Ninh and the Mekong Delta. Everything that could assure an ultimate red victory was being done.

Back in Europe, on March 25, 1957, the Treaty of Rome was signed and Europe's old cities became communities in a new nation, Europe. A few French generals resented seeing the country's best sons fed into a no-win war for the sole reason of keeping it going until the nation was weary enough to accept defeat. Through 1957 they plotted to bring in a leader who would go all out for victory. They chose the wrong man.

Nationalism was still a virtue when terrorists supported it; it was only bad when patriots embraced it. Irving Brown told a meeting of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, in the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, in New York: "North African nationalists represent the French tradition of liberal thought." (Algeria in Turmoil, by Michael K. Clark)

By the spring of 1957 all was not well in Vietnam. Some Americans questioned the wisdom of destroying a country to strengthen the position of a family which Americans had chosen. The final commitment was at a closed meeting with the Council on Foreign Relations doing the deciding.

On May 11, 1957, the circle of initiates met in the home of John D. Rockefeller III, in Tarrytown, New York, for luncheon. The guest list would have given pause to any honest writer on conspiracy if the tidal wave of propaganda had not brought them to believe that alarm-criers were the conspirators. President Diem was there, accompanied by a red sleeper named Vu van Thai to whom Daniel Ellsberg was to give copies of the Pentagon Papers some years later for transmission to Hanoi. Not an American at the table that day ever came out for victory when America was deemed ready for defeat. What a guest list! There was David Rockefeller, of the CFR and now of the Trilateral Commission. Dr. Henry T. Heald, President of Ford Foundation; Joseph E. Johnson, President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and Dean Rusk, of the Rockefeller Foundation. Anything that was good for America did not have a chance.

John McCloy, who had financed the European Movement ten years before, was present, along with Ogden R. Reid, President of the New York Herald Tribune; James J. Rorimer, of the Metropolitan Museum; Paul J. Sherbert, Director of the Asia Society; Howard C. Shepherd, Chairman of the Board of the First National City Bank, and Kenneth Todd Young, head of the State Department's Office of Southeast Asian Affairs. By late afternoon on that May 11, 1957, America was committed to everything that has happened since in Southeast Asia. The next ten years were to implement what a small group had made inevitable.

1967 BROUGHT THE BEGINNING OF THE END. The planted leak in the January 16, 1967, issue of U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT was full of meaning. It went: "Henry Cabot Lodge, U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, is trying to talk Premier Ky out of the idea of running for office on his own when the time comes to dissolve the military government. The United States would prefer to see civilians, not military men, running things in South Vietnam." Nguyen Cao Ky dug his own grave by wanting to win. When the men who had been at Mr. Rockefeller's luncheon ten years before got Ky out of the way, the pitch about civilian government was dropped and General Nguyen van Thieu was made President.

While the change was being arranged in Saigon, Mr. John C. Guthrie, Deputy Chief of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, was holding talks with Hanoi's man, Le Trang. Hanoi needed a breathing spell. The game was to get word to American organizations, churchmen, professors, students and editors that "peace negotiations" would start if the bombing would stop. The clamor they raised to halt bombing was deafening. All bombing lulls ever brought was a fresh stream of men and materiel southward.

Officials, TV broadcasters and editors reassured Hanoi that military victory was not our objective and told the American public the war was unwinnable. Arthur Goldberg, the U.S. Ambassador to U.N., used the U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT of February 6, 1967, to advise Americans not to listen to their military. On February 8, LBJ sent an appeal to Ho chi Minh and Carl T. Rowan wrote in the Los Angeles Times of that date that the U.S. was quietly and gently nudging Premier Ky and Saigon's military junta towards talks with the Communist Vietcong. (H. du B. Reports, July-Aug. 1967)

Despite the message Rowan sent Ho through the Los Angeles Times, Ho did not reply to the President's letter until February 13. It was the same old story; No talks until all bombing was stopped. Ho's partisans in the American congress and press screamed that the President was blocking peace. When bombing was halted peace talks never started. Editors and TV broadcasters who used every item on Vietnam did not give it a paragraph when David Rockefeller and John McCloy flew to London in March 1967 for the 16th meeting of the Bilderbergers. It was one of the most important meetings the world's new elite of leftist capitalists, who are socially snobs, ever held. Behind a screen provided by a Prince-Consort, Mr. Kohnstamm, Vice-President of the Action

Committee for a United States of Europe, called on those present to work for an Atlantic Community instead of just a European one. (H. du B. Reports, May 1967) Atlantic Community is CFR-Bilderberger talk for Common Market with America in it. While the unelected Bilderberg parliament discussed how they were going to bring the U.S. into their new world order, a feature story appeared in the Los Angeles Times of March 19 under the heading: "Bunker Expected to be Advocate of Viet Reconciliation." The words "national reconciliation" appeared eight times and Bunker's qualification for bringing it about was that he held the Presidential medal of Freedom. Vietnamese refugees, please note.

On May 7 Arthur Goldberg told Americans - and Hanoi - once more that victory was not America's objective. Henry Kissinger at the time was arranging to send Ho chi Minh's old friend, Raymond Aubrac, and another French red whom he had met at one of Cyrus Eaton's Pugwash Conferences in Poland, on a secret mission to Hanoi for LBJ. The two pro-Ho emissaries arrived in North Vietnam on July 21, less than a month before the August 11 arrival in Hanoi of David Schoenbrun and his wife as Ho's guests.

Like Aubrac, Schoenbrun, one of the most important men in Columbia Broadcasting System, had been a close friend of Ho chi Minh since 1946. What a propaganda tour Schoenbrun made to America's explosive campuses when he got home, in payment for the red-carpet trip!

Between Aubrac's visit to Hanoi and Schoenbrun's, a meeting of the Tricontinental Congress unrolled in Havana with the communist world declaring war on the West. Sabotage and guerrilla action would be stepped up from Vietnam to Aden to Chile. In America, emphasis would be on "peace demonstrations." Wars of liberation would be fomented and supported in Angola, Mozambique, Rhodesia and South Africa. GRAMMA, the Havana newspaper, gave full coverage to the Tricontinental meeting and everything the delegates said they were going to do has happened according to plan.

Definitely, 1967 was the year when the campus anti-war movement which Professor Arnold Kaufman launched at the University of Michigan on March 24, 1965, became strong enough to defy the government. Kaufman's follow-up teach-in, in Washington on May 15, 1965, showed how deeply the inroads had gone. Among the government's defenders at the treasonable Washington meeting were Zbigniew Brzezinski, Wesley Fishel who had helped destroy the anti-communist forces in Vietnam, Daniel Ellsberg, the psychiatrist's patient who passed secret Pentagon papers to a Hanoi agent, the Russians and the New York Times, and Paul Seabury, the leftist Berkeley professor.

1967 was a pivotal year for Britain also. A Labor Government had done its job and desperate patriots were not only ready to put their heads in the yoke of the Common Market, many were begging for it. Sanctions against Rhodesia and the boycott of South Africa were costing hard-up Britain over \$77 million a year. Refusal to sell South Africa defensive weapons brought another loss of over \$50 million in 1966. When the \$250 million payment on a \$1000 million loan from the International Monetary Fund fell due on December 2, 1967, the country was ripe for devaluation. And devaluation made the public ripe for Harold Wilson's application for membership in the Common Market in the year ahead.

Britain had never had a Labor Government for more than four years without suffering a devaluation of the pound. (H. du B. Report, Nov-Dec. 1967). At least twenty times, Mr. Wilson and his ministers, during their thirty-seven months in power, had sworn they would never devalue. In the end it had to come. Bankruptcy was necessary if Britain were to be led into the European Community, or Common Market, which Cyrus Sulzberger said had been designed for nations that had lost their global influence. For America the preparatory step was a humiliating defeat. It is impossible to contemplate the military, political and economic position of the West as 1977 approaches without reflecting that sixty years ago the mechanism for destruction was put in place.

1917: THE MONSTER CONJURED FROM THE VASE. For two years the Imperial German Government had been sending money to its embassies, legations and consulates in neutral countries, to finance psychological war in the enemy's rear. A circular of February 23, 1915, from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Berlin called for social agitation, incitement to revolution and demonstrations for disarming and "an end to the butchery of war."

Russia was the main target, and Germany's principal ally in undermining the Tsarist Government was the Frankfurt-born banker, Jacob Schiff, of Kuhn Loeb & Co., in New York. Mr. Schiff had been helping the Tsar's enemies as far back as the Russo-Japanese war. Felix Warburg was Schiff's son-in-law, Paul Warburg was the husband of Schiff's sister-in-law, and the victory of bolshevism had become a family affair.

In September 1917 Trotsky's associate, Furstenberg (known in Russia as Ganetski), sent word to "Comrade Scholnickan," in Haparanda, Sweden, that the Warburg Bank, through the Rhenish Westphalian Syndicate, had opened an account in the name of Comrade Trotsky. Arrangements had been made to transport arms to Luleo and Vardo, (Sweden) where the office of Essen & Son would turn over arms and money to anyone designated by Trotsky.

By 1917 bolshevik terrorists financed in whole or part by Schiff and the two Warburgs had killed 114 Russian governors, high officials and generals. Among those murdered to clear the way for bolshevism were 286 police chiefs, 452 agents, 109 officers and over 7,331 civilians.

On March 19, 1917, Jacob Schiff telegraphed Comrade Milioukoff, the foreign minister of the provisional government, congratulating him and the Russian people on the action they had so brilliantly accomplished and wishing him and his comrades all success. The New York Times or April 4, 1917, published Schiff's telegram.

The dates mentioned barely scratch the surface. Events of the "7" decades could fill volumes and as 1977 approaches the world has less cause than ever for optimism.

NOTE: As a courtesy to the H. du B. REPORT, please refrain from photocopying this material in whole or in part. It takes painstaking work and long hours to produce each issue -- and we earn our income solely from the sale of subscriptions and extra copies. By photocopying the REPORT you would be depriving the staff of part of the benefits of their work. If we are to be able to continue the publication of this REPORT we ask that when you do make photocopies to save time, you send us the price of an extra report for each photocopy made. Thank you.

To our subscribers: Address domestic business to H. du B. REPORTS, P. O. Box 786, St. George, Utah 84770. Address foreign correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, 20 Blvd. Princesse Charlotte, Monte Carlo, Principality of MONACO.

Subscription rate \$15 per year. Extra copies 30¢ each.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent Leda P. Rutherford, Managing Editor



How Carter Appears To The World

Not only death and taxes are inescapable. It is just as certain that the free world will pay for Jimmy Carter's election and that the balance sheet is going to be staggering. The stated \$21,800,000 spent to obtain the 27% of America's eligible voters which put the new President in office can be amortized, the promises never. Those who discovered and formed the candidate knew this, and their ultimate aim was never concealed. When the game is up, America's problems will be dumped in the lap of the receiver that has taken over bankrupt Britain -- the European Economic Community (EEC)--which with America's entry will become Atlantic.

FIRST CAME THE LONG RANGE PLANNING. The Associated Press estimated on November 10 that the 94% of the colored vote which Mr. Carter had received - some 6.6 million in all - had provided the margin for victory. National Broadcasting Company (NBC) estimated that 72% of the Jewish vote had gone to Mr. Carter, 56% of the Catholic, 60% of the voters with Polish surnames, 64% of the blue-collar workers and 70% of the big city residents. But only 53% of the Americans of voting age bothered to go to the polls. Each group that went had been promised something. Obviously, the percentages overlap. Many with Polish surnames could be Jews, Catholics, blue-collar workers and residents of big cities. Carrying the statistics further would only prove more irrefutably that Jimmy Carter is not the President of all the people.

HOW THE PROMISES WERE SELECTED should have alienated more than 53% of any informed electorate, unless it wanted to be conned. London's socialist weekly, THE OBSERVER, reported on June 13, 1976: "Jimmy Carter's conquest of the Democratic Party has been remarkably like a coup d'etat." It told how "four years ago this determined man, supported by only a little group of assistants, almost all young enough to be his children, began in secret to lay his plans." What do they mean - assistants young enough to be his children? Averell Harriman, the veteran champion of leftist causes whom the London SUNDAY TIMES of April 18, 1976, called "the grand old man of the Democrats?" Milton Katz, the Harvard director of legal studies who was with the OSS leftists in Italy when the plotting was going on to destroy the monarchy, which was synonymous with tradition? Katz, at whose World Peace Foundation conference Henry Kissinger first met General Paul Stehlin, the French general whose aim was not peace but Hanoi victory when he set up Mr. Kissinger's first meetings in Paris with the negotiators from Hanoi?

By the time of the New Hampshire primaries, THE OBSERVER continued: "Much of the work had been done. The mood of the American people had been analyzed and it had been established how Carter could turn that mood into votes. Unknown to most of America the Carter coup was already half made." Shocked at the idea of feeding information

into computers for two years before the campaign started, to analyze the mood of the people and determine what line they would fall for, Mr. Howell Raines, editor of the St. Petersburg Times, questioned Carter's press secretary, Jody Powell. Mr. Raines asked if it wasn't "blatant chicanery" when the man using such tactics assures an audience that he is a "strong conservative." "Not at all," replied Mr. Powell. "This is an example of the governor's peculiar gift of being able to explain his liberal policies in terms that make them acceptable to conservatives."

As early as May 17, 1976, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT told how Peter Bourne, the anti-war-in-Vietnam psychiatrist, had been employed to prepare detailed studies on thousands of national organizations, their constituencies and convention schedules. It was part of the "years of meticulous planning, much of it secret," said U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT. It was also a glimpse into the thought process of a man experienced at getting something for nothing: Appointment to Annapolis for a free education. After the required tour in the Navy, a home in a public housing project for the poor, though he had just inherited a share in a half-million dollar peanut business. A taxable income of \$135,000 last year, half of it derived from government subsidies paid to peanut farmers!

THE MASTER STROKE WAS SEWING UP OF THE COLORED VOTE. One of the best accounts was provided by Colin Legum in THE OBSERVER, and it is worth noting that Atlantic Richfield took over THE OBSERVER shortly after the election. Whether this was a coincidence or part of the groundwork to prepare America's entry into Atlantica, the enlarged Common Market, remains to be seen. We shall come back to that. Acquisition of the victory-winning colored vote was slick, deft and worthy of Machiavelli. Mr. Carter helped Andrew Young, a former associate of Martin Luther King, become a congressman in 1972. When the time came, he then had something to hold up as proof that he was the colored voter's man and Andrew Young took the campaign trail for Mr. Carter. "He (Carter) is more genuinely liberal than the northern liberals," Congressman Young told Mr. Legum. Pointing to the 26 blacks out of the 125 on Carter's staff, the congressman continued with what was more than a promise of equality. There was a hint that before they know it, Americans might find themselves citizens of the world instead of a country.

"The only way to ensure economic stability and equality for ourselves," Andrew Young told Mr. Legum, "is by changing the structure of our own society to meet those of the world community." Whether by "for ourselves," Mr. Young spoke as a black or as an American, the interviewer did not say. He did state: "There is one thing he (Mr. Carter) has publicly acknowledged - his debt to 44-year-old Andrew Young for swinging the country's black vote behind him." An initial payment has been made. Mr. Young is America's new ambassador to U.N., a world organization of 146 countries, 80-some of which vote against America and the West. With preservation of peace as its stated reason for being, the U.N. is preparing to sponsor a racial war against Rhodesia and later the Union of South Africa. The anti-communist war in Vietnam was a "dirty war," with no-winism as an objective. The one Mr. Young will back, in the name of America, will be neither. So much for the price Americans will pay for Mr. Carter's colored votes.

The London TIMES, of November 5, 1976, brought up another factor. "Analysis gives rise to questions about to whom Mr. Carter owes his election. His own answer is the people, that he is free of any special interests. However, it is clear that blacks and the trade unions are looking to him for action." Let us take a look at the next note the 47% of the population, who could have voted but did not, are going to have to face.

LABOR'S ROLE IN SELECTING AND ELECTING POLITICIANS could prove more embarrassing than Watergate if the press were not so selective in its investigative reporting. Labor union support goes far beyond endorsement. The rule prohibiting candidates from accepting outside donations is non-existent here. A labor union is free to bombard

its dues-payers with campaign literature, appeals for new party members, and calls for volunteers to help potential voters register and get to the polls. All this on labor union time and at labor union expense. Labor unions mailed a million and a half pieces of Carter literature in Philadelphia alone. Union workers knocked on doors by the thousands, working for candidates their bosses had endorsed. "Six out of every ten union households across the nation responded to the sophisticated, computerized exhortations from labor leaders to vote for the former Georgia governor," the New York Times reported on November 3. The story added: "The most significant finding was the extent to which blue collar workers in labor unions responded to the barrage of leaflets, telephone appeals and personal overtures from their leaders." One advantage of campaigning through labor unions is cheaper postal rates granted to non-profit groups. The savings on 60 million political tracts is considerable, and labor used every dodge to assure the election of politicians who will vote to repeal section 14-B of the Taft-Hartley Act, which permits states to enact right-to-work statutes.

With unions openly vowing to destroy any candidate who supports Section 14-B, the cards are stacked against the honest politician. What union leaders are after in the repeal of that part of the Taft-Hartley Act is the millions of dollars it will bring in for political purposes, and the obedience of compulsory members who, if expelled from a union, will have no right to a job.

Britain is locked in the same struggle for life. "Closed shops will make unions unbeatable," Mr. Denys Randolph told a conference on labor, in London, on November 11, 1976. Mr. Paul Johnson, the British author, declared: "If the fight to prevent the establishment of the closed shop as a legal tyranny is abandoned, I fear that the friends of freedom will lose heart completely." The real reasons for Carter's union support were drowned in a flood of meaningless drivel about the candidate himself. Peter Pringle told readers of the London SUNDAY TIMES: "For a man who has had little previous contact with labor unions Carter performed remarkably well. A typical reaction from a union headquarters was: 'When he came here he didn't understand the basic jargon of trade union bargaining, we had to teach him, but he learns fast. He's the kind of guy you can grow with.'"

Mr. Pringle and his colleagues on the SUNDAY TIMES (the owner of which has 56 newspapers in the U.S.) have probably never read page 20 of the training manual of the Communist Party of Great Britain. It goes: "The interest of the Communist Party in the trade unions is purely political. We do not enter into the economic struggle and work of the trade unions merely to secure improved conditions. Our work in the unions is to permeate them with communist ideas and convert them into revolutionary organizations. Our method is to foster all elements striving for active militant leadership inside the unions." This is what has happened in the unions which free-wheeling American organizers set up in Africa, Aden and in the Brussels-based International Confederation of Free Trade Unions itself. That is why it is frightening that labor outspent business in the drive to elect friendly candidates to Congress last November. U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT of November 8 estimated union donations at \$5.8 million, against \$4.3 million from business firms and corporations. Add the black votes brought in by Andrew Young to the massive votes regimented by what the New York Times called "the sophisticated, computerized exhortations from labor leaders" and Jimmy Carter can by no stretch of the imagination be called the President of all the people.

THE WASHINGTON POST, ON DECEMBER 17, 1976, went further in listing the President's creditors and pinpointing their first demand: "Blacks, women's groups, Ralph Nader, hawks, doves, and most notably so far, the AFL-CIO labor federation, are trying to collect the debts they feel Mr. Carter owes them by influencing his Cabinet selections." The debt for the Jewish vote was not mentioned, but nevertheless, a quid pro quo exists. Now this is compromised by a debt to Saudi Arabia which a vast majority of Americans are likely to find more important than Mr. Carter's promises.

THE STORY OF DOHA. Just before Christmas the thirteen Oil Producing and Exporting Countries (OPEC) met in Doha, in the small oil-producing country of Qatar. Iran, Kuwait and most of the OPEC group were determined to raise prices by 10%. Crown Prince Fahd and the inner council of the Saudi ruling family have a western-orientated adviser in 47-year-old Harvard-graduate Zaki el-Yamani. They have no desire to see either bankruptcies or inflation shake the West. The result would be unemployment, mobs demonstrating in the streets and a bound ahead for communism. Britain, Italy and France are particularly vulnerable. Saudi Arabia refused to raise oil prices more than 5%, convinced that Arabian interests are inextricably linked to those of the industrial powers. The United Arab Emirates sided with the Saudis.

Saudi Arabia went further. Officials announced that they would increase production by 40%, from 8.5 million barrels a day to 11.9 million, to meet the increase in demand at the lower price. Iraq and the Iranians turned on them as traitors. What Algeria will do remains to be seen. Libya's Qaddafi is increasing his capacity for trouble and will undoubtedly join those condemning Saudi Arabia and the United Emirates. Yet, Qaddafi has bought 9.6% of the shares in Fiat, Italy's largest company, with an option to increase his holdings to 13% at a later date. With the \$415 million received from Qaddafi, Giovanni Agnelli, the chairman of Fiat, was able to give Moscow \$650 million worth of industrial equipment on long-term credit, and Moscow can now afford to construct a nuclear center and provide arms for Qaddafi, in return for a naval base at Sidra. What it is is a Moscow-Turin-Tunis axis against the West and against Saudi Arabian leadership of the Arab world.

Signor Agnelli was David Rockefeller's co-founder in launching the Trilateral Commission to which President Carter and at least six of his inner circle belong. And Qaddafi, now that he is Agnelli's partner, plans to turn Fiat into a monster arms-producing empire. Washington will not be able to accuse Russia of arming the Middle East, and Qaddafi, by doing so, hopes to seize leadership from the moderate Saudis. The question is, in the tangle of conflicting loyalties, promises to New York voters and obligations to the Trilateral which Signor Agnelli helped found, what is America's new President going to do.

JIMMY CARTER'S COMMITMENTS. "The U.S.'s first priorities," NEWSWEEK of May 10, 1976, quoted Candidate Carter as saying, "should be our friends and allies: Japan, Western Europe, Israel." A little over a month later, on June 23, 1976, NEWSWEEK reported that the possibility of a U.S. invasion of Middle Eastern oil fields is not out of the question, that "a group of military analysts in examining the question of how long it would take to restore production if the Arabs sabotaged the fields during an invasion." This could be NEWSWEEK's wishful thinking. The fact remains that Mr. James Schlesinger is President Carter's assistant for Energy policy, and according to reliable French sources, it was James Schlesinger who in the early 70s drew up the plan to use military force in the Middle East in the event of an oil embargo.

Mr. Carter told American voters on May 28, 1976: "Never again should our country become militarily involved in the internal affairs of another nation, unless there is a direct and obvious threat." The catch is - those who were powerful enough to make America accept defeat in Vietnam are strong enough to make a war of their own in the Middle East look like a "direct and obvious threat" - particularly to a politician making his decisions by computer. Neither the New York Times nor the Washington Post would see it as a dirty war, or demand a blanket pardon for the thousands who would refuse to fight.

The truth is, the Saudis laid their heads on the line for America and the West at Doha and 1977 finds America and Jimmy Carter at a cross-roads. TIME of November 1, 1976, assured those whom the new President considers most powerful in finance, radio, TV and the press that Mr. Carter "seems considerably less willing than Ford to court the Arabs by granting them economic and military aid and selling them weapons." The

article continued: "While both candidates declare they would not tolerate any future oil embargo imposed by Arabs, Carter specifically warns that such an action would be regarded by him as an 'economic declaration of war.'" It remains to be seen how Mr. Carter will act now that Ryadh and the United Emirates have gone to war, economically, for us. As David Holden put it in the London SUNDAY TIMES: "Saudi Arabia is one of the world's few true enemies of communism." Any attempt to predict what President Carter will do in the four years ahead entails a study of his thinking, his attitude towards communism, and what makes him tick.

ONE OF THE MOST BRILLIANT EXAMPLES OF CARTER'S CUNNING was the way he insured his rear. There will be no investigative reporting, no Watergate scandals, regardless of what he does, as long as he toes a leftist path. He took the precaution of putting a director of the New York Times, a director of the Washington Post and a director of the Los Angeles Times in his cabinet.

Count the number of newspapers, radio and TV stations the above three journals own, and the local papers into which their news services are fed. It is clear that any policy the three above-mentioned directors favor the public will be made to buy.

In his statement quoted by U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT of October 18, 1976, Mr. Carter comes out as a fool or a charlatan. "One of the most embarrassing failures of the Ford Administration," he declared, "is his (President Ford's) refusal to appoint a presidential commission to go to Vietnam, to go to Laos, to go to Cambodia and try to trade for the release of information about those who were missing in action in those wars."

None but a pro-communist commission to any of the three would ever get in, and what an acceptable commission would bring back would be more of what Averell Harriman, Cyrus Vance and Henry Kissinger got for us in Paris.

He (Carter) would take a "much calmer view of possible communist participation in an Italian coalition government than do Mr. Ford or his Secretary of State, Dr. Kissinger," Stephan Barber wrote in the London DAILY TELEGRAPH of May 21, 1976.

Mr. Barber explained that this attitude stems from Zbigniew Brzezinski's Institute of International Change (emphasis ours), at Columbia University. So there is one more institute for advancement of the new world order, and it under the direction of Mr. Carter's principal foreign policy adviser, who is also head of the Trilateral Commission.

There are a number of sugar-coated names under which the new world order, which is to say, America's entry into the European Common Market, is being advanced. In the London SUNDAY TIMES of October 10, 1976, Mr. Carter called it "alternate concept world order politics." The British conservative publication, ON TARGET, of December 18, 1976, stated: "The Trilateral Commission was set up by David Rockefeller to work for a U.S., Europe, Japan merger as a step to one world."

Pierre de Villemarest, Director of the European Information Center, wrote in his report of November 22, 1976: "Mr. Carter's proclaimed intention, on November 5, to promote a new world order instead of a policy of blocs confirms to the initiates that he is employing a subterfuge. He is pretending to negotiate with each European Chief of State. In reality half of them are already in accord with his plans. But the public must be made to believe that he is negotiating individually with each.

"Carter intends to bind the U.S., Europe and Japan in a single package in less than two years for the purpose of then installing the new world order in cooperation with Soviet Russia. According to him, there is no longer an East-West problem, the problem

is to solve, with Russian assistance, the needs of the Third World. Under the cover of détente and humanitarianism he is closing his eyes to the totalitarianism of the East, its repressions and subversive activity in the West."

BY A STRANGE COINCIDENCE - or perhaps as a result of "alternate concept world order politics" - less than two weeks after Mr. Carter's election, a group of Euro-Socialists, working to make the European Economic Community an Atlantic one, held a meeting in Bologna, Italy. Arrigo Levi, the editor of STAMPA, owned by Agnelli, the co-founder of the Trilateral Commission, was there. So was Robert Schaetzle, who left his post as American ambassador to the European Common Market in 1972, to write a book for the Council on Foreign Relations, urging American entry.

Also, in mid-November, Atlantic Richfield took over the OBSERVER, Britain's leftist weekly, as we have mentioned, and Mr. Douglass Cater, onetime Washington editor of Max Ascoli's leftist REPORTER and later director of Aspin Institute, moved to London to help publish the new acquisition.

In early January Mr. Roy Jenkins, the former Home Secretary in Britain's Labor-Socialist Government, moved to Brussels to take up his \$2,000 a week job as head of the Common Market Commission. On January 11, in Luxembourg, Mr. Jenkins called for partnership with the United States. His appeal coincided with the announcement that Vice President Walter Mondale will soon be visiting Europe to sound out Common Market leaders on the possibility of holding a western economic summit conference in the spring.

BACK IN PARIS, French insiders in the two hundred and some-member Trilateral Commission watched the rapidly-succeeding events with approval. Among them was Monsieur Jacques de Fouchier, President of the Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas, through which Moscow conducts its gold sales in France. Another French member is Monsieur Michel Debatisse, director of the Federation of Agricultural Unions. (Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas is the parent body of Parisbas Corporation, in New York)

The best-known Carter henchman in Europe is Averell Harriman, whom U. S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, of December 20, 1976, described as the man "who has the most influence on Carter's choices for top national-security posts."

The same report carried a disturbing item on Mr. Harriman's qualifications in national security matters. It stated: "Harriman, after his latest visit to the Kremlin, gave the President-elect this reason for the big Soviet military build-up: 'Russia is almost surrounded by hostile communist countries. There are only two dependable Soviet Satellites - the Bulgarians because they want to be and the Czechs because they have to be.'

To our subscribers: Address domestic business to H. du B. REPORTS, P. O. Box 786 St. George, Utah 84770. Address foreign correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, 20 Blvd. Princesse Charlotte, Monte Carlo, Principality of MONACO.

Subscription rate \$15 per year.

Extra copies 30¢ each.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent



THE WORLD OF JIMMY CARTER

Last month we provided a profile of President Carter as seen from abroad. This month let us examine the problems the new administration faces and the men President Carter has chosen to help navigate America through the shoals ahead.

VICE PRESIDENT WALTER F. MONDALE is summed up by the European Information Center (CEI) Report of January 23, 1977, in five lines: Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), Bilderberg and Trilateral Commission member. Former leader of the extreme left student movement, STUDENTS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION. Protégé of Senator Hubert Humphrey. Member of the 1975-1976 committee investigating the CIA. Has access to Top Secret papers. Is a one-worlder. To this let us add that Mr. Mondale was elected to the Senate in 1966 on labor union support.

MONDALE AND THE CFR: Vice President Mondale was born in Ceylon, Minnesota, on January 5, 1928, eleven years after the formation of the CFR which was to push him upward. Mondale was four when the CFR was incorporated as an arm to work for world government. In London the Royal Institute of International Affairs was setting up similar bodies in both non-communist and communist countries. The Rockefeller and Ford Foundations provide grants for the CFR, with its some 1,700 members. "New world order" and "interdependence" are the organization's current most popular themes.

THE BILDERBERG GROUP was founded in May 1954. France's no-winism war in Indo-China was being wound up and a follow-up blow to the nation's morale was being prepared in Algeria. Joseph Retinger, a Pole to whom patriotism had long since ceased to have any more meaning than it has for Zbigniew Brzezinski, was working with the Frenchmen, Jean Monnet, Robert Schuman and René Plevin, and the Englishman, Duncan Sandys, to establish a secret, non-elected parliament of one-worlders in Western Europe. Prince Bernhard of Holland became their front, and the Bilderberg group was born.

Americans were told that Retinger and the Prince were working to combat anti-Americanism in Europe. Europeans were told that only by banding together could they defy America. Little did they know that the super-state designed to free them from American "imperialism" was being financed through Averell Harriman, John McCloy, Robert Murphy and agencies which intended to bring America into it. In 1957 the European Economic Community, or Common Market, came into being through the Treaty of Rome, and the long-range campaign to prepare American entry began.

THE TRILATERAL COMMISSION. Still all was not well. Japan was becoming as big a threat as America to European industry. But planners of the "new order" would take care of that. The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) had been set up in Brussels by American labor leaders and their roving trouble-fomenter, Irving Brown.

The ICFTU was a monster union-of-unions, with horizontal loyalty to one another instead of loyalty to parent nations. Brown and the ICFTU spent \$2 million abroad in 1962, financing strikes to bring European wage levels up to American. The New York Sunday News headlines of July 15, 1962, went: "Our increasing Export: Unionism." What we were exporting was inflation. American labor and CIA organized their own labor union, FORCE OUVRIERE, in France, to pressure management and government through strikes.

Americans were told that by financing foreign strikes we would raise prices abroad and halt the outflow of gold because American products would then be competitive on the European market. At the same time the strikes were political. Unions went into the streets when France, Belgium, Britain and Holland moved to suppress colonial revolts which Irving Brown and American labor were supporting.

By the time European products ceased to be bargains, Japan began to make a comeback and Irving Brown flew to the Orient. Organizing Japanese unions and financing strikes, we were told, would bring Japanese wage levels up to European and prevent Japanese workers from becoming communists. Also, Japan would no longer be able to undersell the West. It was a great idea but it did not work. Japanese workmen, unlike their American and European counterparts, stepped up production and gave value received for the increases in pay. Hotel rooms soared to \$2,000 a month in Tokyo, but Japanese industry continued to undersell the West. Action at the bottom had failed, so the obvious alternative was to shackle Japan from the top. Thus, in 1973, David Rockefeller, Giovanni Agnelli and their fellow-workers for world federation founded the Trilateral Commission, which links Japan, America and the Common Market.

Let's simplify it: The CFR is the group of American initiates working to bring America into a socialist one-world federation. At Bilderberg meetings CFR members, without a mandate from anybody but themselves, meet with like-minded internationalists from other countries. The Trilateral Commission brings Japan into line, under the other two. Vice President Mondale belongs to all three. Less than 70 hours after his inauguration President Carter sent Mr. Mondale on a 10-day swing through Belgium, West Germany, Italy, Britain, France and Japan. The East Coast press harped on the President's pledges that the new administration will never impose a "made-in-America grand design" on America's allies.

THERE WAS NO NEED OF CONSULTATIONS. Japan will face more Lockheed scandals and a boycott if she balks. The others are in complete agreement on everything Mr. Mondale's three organizations stand for. Belgium is socialist, dedicated to one-worldism and American entry into "Atlantica." Ditto for West Germany. Communists could have taken over Italy two years ago, but it would have dispelled the rising myth of a patriotic "Eurocommunism." It would also have frightened France, Portugal and Spain.

With Russian power growing by leaps and bounds, Pope Paul VI told our innocent Vice President that Mr. Carter's promise to limit the arms race will be "of immense service to the world." Read these lines two years from now.

Britain is midway between socialism and communism, bankrupt, at the mercy of labor leaders bent on national suicide, and firmly in the Common Market. France is headed by a President who will appoint a socialist prime minister before the end of his term, in return for socialist support for his candidacy for the Presidency of Europe. (Mr. Raymond Barre, the present Prime Minister, is a member of the Trilateral Commission and was formerly Vice President of the Commission of the European Community.)

This is the background of the Vice President's trip. Let us consider what initiates of the triad are giving countries, in place of the principles which made them great. Mr. Gerald C. Smith is responsible for Trilateral Commission affairs in North Africa, directly under David Rockefeller. Mr. Smith declared in October 1976: "The Trilateral Commission must in no sense be anti-communist. Its essential aims continue to be the

improvement of relations between the U. S.-Europe-Japan group and the U.S.S.R. and China." Carter's aim," according to the European Information Center report of November 22, 1976, "is to bring about a great U.S.-Europe-Japan ensemble in less than two years which will be able to speak with a single voice and install a new order, in cooperation with the U.S.S.R.

ON TARGET, the conservative British publication of December 18, 1976, expressed it: "The Trilateral Commission was set up by David Rockefeller to work for a U.S., Europe, Japan merger as a step to one world. Its director, Zbigniew Brzezinski, is Carter's chief foreign affairs adviser." (ON TARGET. The Old Priory, Priory Walk, Sudbury, Suffolk, England. Donald Martin, Editor.)

Now let us look at the "new faces" America was promised.

CYRUS VANCE: CFR-Bilderberg Group-Trilateral Commission. Vance is known in Europe for his connection with Averell Harriman and the termination of a no-winism war through surrender masked as negotiations. Harriman is remembered for his work with the Association for the United Nations, his longtime aid for Russia being largely unknown. In 1947 he was Ambassador to Britain and responsible for John McCloy's providing money with which Joseph Retinger and Duncan Sandys launched the European movement. It, in turn, led to the Common Market, the Bilderbergers and the Trilateral Commission. Guy Mollet, the French socialist leader, organized support in the Socialist International for Retinger and Sandys. It was Harriman who waylaid Prince Souvanna Phouma at airports from Paris to Phnom Penh, hounding the former Prime Minister into taking the Pathet Lao into the Laotian government, with the results we know.

In late 1972 Harriman telephoned Milton Katz, the wartime OSS officer of Caserta, Italy, who had become an activist in the World Peace Foundation. Harriman took Jimmy Carter to meet Katz who, like Cyrus Vance, helped tie the hands of the American airforce when Hanoi needed a breathing spell. Katz took Carter on from there.

AFTER VANCE IN IMPORTANCE COMES HAROLD BROWN, Secretary of Defense. His roots are in the CFR, Trilateral Commission and, since 1959, leftist Pugwash Conferences sponsored by Mr. Brown's friend, the millionaire Cyrus Eaton. World government through complete disarmament under joint Russian and American control is the aim of the Pugwash meetings, which world leftists ranging from the President of the Russian Academy of Science to America's Dr. Henry Kissinger regularly attend. Mr. Eaton's grandson, Fox Butterfield, helped prepare the Pentagon papers exposé for the New York Times. Despite the above background there was no serious opposition when Mr. Brown represented America at disarmament conferences with the Russians between 1969 and '74, and fought every demand made by the Pentagon.

CHARLES DUNCAN, worth \$14 million, a director of Coca Cola and advocate of East-West trade, is Harold Brown's assistant. Mr. Duncan commands the 2,000 and some civilians in the office of the Secretary of Defense. Under Secretary of War James Forrestal the civilian staff was small, and civilian control of the military was never open to question. After World War II America was subjected to an intense press campaign stressing the need of more civilian control over the military, a campaign which was senseless since it was something the civilians already had. It is now apparent that there was a reason for this campaign: Those who had decided that the West would no longer end a conflict victoriously were taking no chances that military leaders capable of victory might refuse to accept negotiated defeat. No-winism is not a policy a patriotic soldier will buy when he knows that victory is possible. Stalemate must be forced on him, or the concept of patriotism and sovereignty destroyed. Different nations require different means.

When the French war in Indo-China was being fought, men already determined to bring France into the Common Market were in power, men such as Robert Shuman, René Pleven, and Jean Monnet who, with Robert Murphy's "vice-consuls" sowed the seeds of revolt in North Africa during World War II. Nations geared to empire status have to be stripped

of colonies and divided by regionalism before sacrifices of sovereignty and membership in a super-state can be put over. French generals would have rebelled if orders from Paris had prevented them from trying to win in Indo-China. The Schuman-Pleven-Mendès-France method was to keep French patriots satisfied by giving generals a free hand without providing the means for final victory. Thus the great battles of Vinh-Yen, Dong-Trieu, the River Day, Nghia-Lo and Hao-Binh were won, and boys died gloriously, but for nothing in the end. By the time it became America's turn for softening up through defeat, the last bit of initiative had been taken from those who were to do the fighting. All the materiel necessary for victory was sent to Vietnam, but those on the spot were prevented from using it as they should. French no-winism was attained by one method and American no-winism by another, but the end was the same.

So cynical was the press, by July 12, 1968, James Reston could write in the New York Times on the need to understand "the glories of defeat." By January 4, 1971, C. L. Sulzberger threw off the mask and wrote in the same paper that "the only purpose of U. S. military preparations is either deterrence of war or, if need be, war in which there is no winner; that is to say neither victory nor defeat." By 1976 the American public had become so conditioned that Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Carter's top advisor, head of the Trilateral Commission and director of Columbia University's "Institute of International Change," could declare without fear of being mobbed that "the fiction of national sovereignty is no longer compatible with reality." So much for no-winism as a prerequisite for surrender of sovereignty, and the new role of Charles Duncan, one-time Coca Cola magnate, in world affairs.

MICHAEL BLUMENTHAL, Secretary of the Treasury, CFR and Trilateral member and trustee of Rockefeller Foundation, grew up in a hard school. With an estimated fortune of \$3 million gained in thirty years, his appointment to the Treasury was with labor union support. Blumenthal's rise should surprise no one. He was eleven years old in 1938 when his family fled Nazi Germany for the International Settlement of Shanghai. Some 40,000 White Russians had been absorbed by the treaty ports of China twenty years before. To these were added an equal number of refugees from Nazism in the late '30s, and the effect was catastrophic.

Eurasians, White Russians and a younger generation of Chinese formed a social and economic level between coolie and white-collar office class. No international organizations stood ready to aid them. The newcomers, with their flow of funds from the Sassoons, the Rothschilds, the Kedouries and co-religionist organizations around the world, could afford to accept a job for half what was paid to a Russian or a Eurasian. The refugee's first thought on getting into a firm was to get someone else out and make way for a friend. It was obvious that a war was coming. With organization money to invest and experience gained in Europe, wheeler-dealers in the new horde knew what commodities the Japanese-encircled city would run out of first. Soap, drugs, aspirin, anything that would be in demand, was bought up before the city knew what was happening.

When merchants limited so many items to a customer, the refugee community, from youngsters to old people in wheelchairs, lined up to corner the market. Used coffee grounds were collected from restaurants and mixed with unused coffee for repackaging. Home industries sprang up, such as the one in which fake aspirin tablets were stamped out to be sold at \$10 Chinese a tablet. Rudy Mayer, the con-man brother of the movie mogul, formed a "company" to manufacture Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer soap with Leo the lion on the package. Nothing was too small. Shanghai's housing problem became desperate as prices and rents soared to what only a rich home-seeker could pay. Agents of a man calling himself "Architect Herper" covered the city with the thoroughness of a horde of ants and grabbed up every available house and apartment. "Architect Herper" then sold a list of places open for rental or purchase, but the "key money" and asking price were so high the premises remained on the market and the list could be sold over and over.

There were many fine people among the refugees from Mittel Europa. Dr. Walter Braun

treated his British and American patients for nothing after the Japanese seized their assets. Others worked hand in hand with the Japanese. John Cook, a 72-year-old British Intelligence agent, was sent to his death via the Myburgh Road torture house and his Chinese network was hauled in when a refugee named Rosenberg betrayed him, to avoid paying a fine over a black market deal. Commander Winfield Scott Cunningham, the hero of Wake Island, was "sold" to the Japanese torture specialists by a refugee who reported his escape from Ward Road Prison.

After V-J Day the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency (UNRRA) set up business, and the Central Arcade on Nanking Road became a furtive market where millions of dollars worth of goods and foreign exchange changed hands. Refugees were given preference for employment and funneled anything in demand to their associates on the sidewalk, while in America the same items were being rationed.

These were Michael Blumenthal's formative years and in 1947, at the age of 20, he embarked for America. Visas at the time were being issued in Shanghai by Hungerford Briggs Howard, the foreign service official whom Ambassador Pat Hurley had sent home from Chungking as a security threat. (See "While You Slept," by John T. Flynn.) Four years after entering America, Blumenthal was naturalized and twelve years later was America's Kennedy Round ambassador in Geneva. The meteoric rise continued: Director of the U. S.-Atlantic Council, member of the CFR, the National Council for U.S.-China Trade and the National Committee on U.S.-China relations. Then, in 1967, he walked out of government in protest over the war in Vietnam. Yet, this is the man who had seen communism come to China. The impression is that Mr. Blumenthal's interests, never America's, were of prime consideration.

Patrick Brogan reported in the London TIMES of December 14, 1976, that Blumenthal and his family were interned by the Japanese. Frank Vogl, the Washington economics correspondent for the London TIMES, more specifically dated on December 15 that the Blumenthal family was interned in 1943. Both reports are open to question, since there was no general internment of refugees. Their number would have made it difficult. Any who were arrested were arrested for specific reasons, usually black market dealing.

So much for the CFR-Trilateral-Rockefeller Foundation director who opposed victory in Vietnam and as President Carter's Secretary of the Treasury will work for U.S.-China relations and the interests of Mr. Blumenthal.

MR. BERT LANCE NOW SUPERVISES SPENDING BY ALL FEDERAL AGENCIES, and according to U. S. News and World Report of December 13, 1976, his appointment is Mr. Carter's assurance to worried business men that his administration's moves will be fiscally sound. Certainly the new appointee's investment sense is above question. The bank of which Mr. Lance is president has \$4.7 million in outstanding loans to the Carter family peanut business in Georgia.

ANDREW YOUNG: Of all the Carter appointments the most disastrous may turn out to be the naming of Andrew Young as Ambassador to the United Nations. Almost unbelievable power is in this young preacher-politician's hands when you consider that as ambassador to the 147-nation U.N. he is in position to play on the votes and emotions of 80-some states which traditionally vote against America and the West.

Mr. Young is attractive and most certainly has more white blood than black. To date, it is with the revolutionaries of Africa that he appears to have cast his lot. He is in a position of worldpower where he has had no prior experience. Forty-four former African colonies, every one of which enjoys less freedom than it knew under white rule, are in league against the last two white enclaves in Africa. The last white land-owners in Kenya are being ordered out as this is written. Twenty-nine of the African states liberated for the sake of "democracy" now have one-party systems and Presidents for life. Uganda, the worst, is openly practicing genocide, liquidating whole tribes

hostile to the one whose man is in power.

Cuban mercenaries and Russian "advisers" are standing by, ready to assist in the take-over of Rhodesia and the Union of South Africa with all of the loss to the free world that the fall of these last two bastions will entail. If Andrew Young fails to throw America's support behind what is about to happen, he will be branded a traitor to his fellow blacks and America as a traitor to democracy. If he lives up to his and President Carter's campaign promises, he will hold the bag before history for the blood bath that is sure to come. A glance at the Middle East is just as discouraging.

EVERY LEADER FRIENDLY TO AMERICA was shaken when headlines splashed across the front page of the International Herald Tribune announced on February 19 that the CIA had paid millions of dollars to King Hussein over the past twenty years.

The only plausible explanation was that someone in Washington was out to destroy the leader on whom any chance of Arab-Israeli peace depends. CIA, since its inception, has subsidized revolutionaries, scoundrels and grafters with never a complaint from the Washington Post. Linking Hussein with CIA in the present climate is tantamount to sentencing him to death.

In three separate paragraphs the "Intelligence Oversight Board, a three-member panel created by Mr. Ford to curb CIA abuses," was credited with having drawn the Jordan subsidies to President Carter's attention. A previous attempt to compromise King Hussein was made while President Ford was in office. He did nothing. He was not about to knife the king who fought and won a civil war against terrorists. The men determined to undermine Hussein simply waited until a new and inexperienced President was elected, then handed in the same report.

Simultaneously they leaked it to the Washington Post and Bob Woodward, the "investigative reporter" who became a millionaire through friendship with a dishonest government official.

By coincidence, the top man on the three member CIA Oversight Panel responsible for all the trouble is Mr. Leo Cherne, who over the past twenty-three years approved CIA's passing of more millions to outright liabilities than Jordan ever received in American aid.

Whether the Washington Post and Oversight Panel exposé was to settle a private score or advance some Byzantine plan, we have not seen the end of it. And falling for it may turn out to be President Carter's first and most important blunder to date.

To our subscribers: Address domestic business to H. du B. REPORTS, P. O. Box 786 St. George, Utah 84770. Address foreign correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, 20 Blvd. Princesse Charlotte, Monte Carlo, Principality of MONACO.

Subscription rate \$15 per year.

Extra copies 30¢ each.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent

Leda P. Rutherford, Managing Editor



The Path to Regionalist World Government

In April 1972 H. du B. Reports began a series on the story of the regional world government toward which a misleadingly named European Economic Community was leading sovereign nations. Few readers were ready to perceive that one of the master conspiracies of history was practicing divide-and-rule on a continental scale, and about to make it global through proliferating organizations such as the Trilateral Commission. Americans particularly were unwilling to recognize that a creeping movement has been at work since World War II, splintering nations into units too small to revolt and too shackled to unite.

THE COMMON MARKET AND REGIONALIZATION were not spontaneous developments from some new master plan. The failure of the League of Nations to form a new world order ruled from Geneva, after World War I, was because its planners did not take the precaution of removing the barriers of tradition and national loyalty first. Vo Nguyen Giap and Ho Chi Minh were not the inventors of auto-criticism: Out of the failure of the League of Nations Monsieur Jean Monnet and those who were making a career out of being one-worlders learned a lesson.

Three empires, six kingdoms and twenty-nine duchies and principalities were swept from the world's face in World War I because leaders had taken their people into a war they did not win. The conclusion: To demoralize a country and destroy its system, make it lose a war. But suppose the army of the country you want to divide and dismantle is capable of victory? The answer is simple: Drag out the theme that armed forces must be brought under civilian control. Our armed forces have always been under civilian control, but this time carry it to the point where generals would be stripped of even the right to make decisions on the battlefield.

No one saw through the long-range campaign waged in the New York Times in the late forties, as congressmen made headlines by harping on civilian control of armies that had never known any other. Nor did anyone remember the "civilian control" campaign when Cyrus Sulzberger wrote in the New York Times of January 4, 1971, while boys were dying in Vietnam: "There has been a steady, if occasionally interrupted, growth of the idea that the purpose of U. S. military preparation is either deterrence of war or, if need be, war in which there is no winner. That is to say neither victory nor defeat. This concept can be traced back as far as Woodrow Wilson who, in January of 1917, urged the belligerents of World War I to 'accept peace without victory.'"

WORLD WAR I BROUGHT ANOTHER LESSON. On May 11, 1931, Austria's great banking house, Credit Anstalt, went to the wall. The lesson it taught was that countries geared to empire status fall into decline when stripped of their colonies and areas of expansion. Austria staged off disaster for ten years by long-term loans from foreign banks which raised the money through low interest borrowing at home. When Credit Anstalt could not pay off, it shook governments and banks around the world. A tidal wave to the left was set in motion as unemployment mounted. England went off the gold standard on

September 21, 1931, and managed paper currency was in. Scandinavian countries, tied to the pound sterling, saw their money depreciate against countries still on the gold standard. Other countries had to devalue or lose their exports. With no fixed medium of exchange, trade slumped and capital fled from country to country in search of constant assets.

The lesson: Make citizens desperate and they will forget national interests. Scramble the world map as though it were a jigsaw puzzle, separate mother countries from their colonies and both will accept anything that promises survival. Destroy the catalyst of patriotism and the stage is set for the "new world order."

ROOSEVELT AND HIS UTOPIANS were ready when the propitious moment of history arrived. Professor Louis A. Fanning, in his excellent book, "Betrayal in Vietnam," observed that "the original American involvement in Vietnam took place in the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt during World War II. Roosevelt's intervention in Vietnamese matters was based on the President's virulent dislike of Western colonialism." Roosevelt's first important declaration concerning his Allies' colonies came during his secret meeting with Stalin, in Teheran, in late November 1943. With Charles Bohlen acting as interpreter, FDR and Stalin planned the ousting of the French from Indo-China and the British from India, as a starter. Roosevelt saw the empires he intended to break up as sources of land and people for the United Nations. Stalin saw the whole Roosevelt dream as a ground-clearing for communism.

THE SAME PREMATURE SPLINTERING OF NATIONS WAS UNDERWAY IN NORTH AFRICA. Here Robert Murphy, FDR's personal representative, and Colonel William Eddy with his mysterious twelve "vice consuls" dined with their French allies at mealtime and, after dark, urged natives to strike out for self-government. Few historians recalled that Jean Monnet, the so-called father of the Common Market, was in North Africa with Robert Murphy when William Eddy's "vice consuls" from the Coordination of Information Office (the fore-runner of OSS) were selecting and training natives who would use labor unions as armies when the time was ripe. Or that Murphy would help Monnet's European Movement get started in 1947 and eight years later bring a letter from Eisenhower to Paris which would topple the IVth Republic and give Algerian terrorists a veritable blood-transfusion.

It was a utopian dream with wheels within wheels from the start. Roosevelt visualized U.N. as a World Government ruling over mother countries and colonies alike. Monnet and his "Europeans" - René Plevin, Robert Schuman, Joseph Retinger the Pole, Duncan Sandys the Britisher, and a host of others - planned to package Europe's countries in a super-state as their only alternative to going under.

Irving Brown and his American labor organizers had their eyes on our allies' colonies as areas to be colonized for Walter Reuther, through hand-picked native labor leaders who would form a socialist labor union empire loyal to a boss in Detroit. Stalin laughed at all of them because he knew that in the end Moscow would pick up the pieces. French Indo-China was to be the first theater of the anti-colonialist war. It started in early 1945 when Major Paul Helliwell, of OSS, gave to Ho Chi Minh 20,000 cartridges, while French resistance fighters were still helping America in the war against Japan. When World War II ended, proponents of the new order were ready and waiting in key positions. Averell Harriman was America's representative in Europe, under the Economic Cooperation Act, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. Robert Murphy, his work in North Africa accomplished, was ambassador to Belgium, the seat of the Western European and regionalism movements. Paul Henri Spaak, known as "Mr. Socialist" and already planning to depose his king and pit Flemish against Walloon in his native Belgium, was Mr. Murphy's closest collaborator.

Joseph Retinger, the Pole, and Duncan Sandys, the British one-worlder, were undermining Britain and working to advance the supra-national government which would sit in Brussels.

Back in America, Cord Meyer, Jr., was founding his United World Federalists and getting ready to infiltrate CIA. John McCloy, the friend of Harriman and Murphy, was U. S. High Commissioner in West Germany. He gave Retinger and Sandys the money to push their European movement, out of what was called Counterpart Funds, which is to say paper money printed by European governments to pay for goods received through Marshall Plan aid. Shepperd Stone handled the disbursing and Robert Murphy's Socialist friend, Paul-Henri Spaak, played on Europe's fears of the bogey-man, America, even though Americans were financing his European Movement and had every intention of bringing their country into it. While this was going on, the AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON UNITED EUROPE was being organized at 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, under OSS boss, William J. "Wild Bill" Donovan, himself. Its objectives: "To aid groups of private citizens in Europe working for unity," as well as providing financial assistance to groups working for European unity, attending European conferences, and sponsoring a special staff at Harvard in a research program on modern federal systems. Anyone interested in furthering the cause of a united Europe could join and receive a flood of handbooks and pamphlets on the Council of Europe and the Schuman Plan for nothing. And all the time, out in Indo-China the communist war which General Donovan's man, Major Paul Helliwell, had ignited in fulfillment of Roosevelt's promise to Stalin in Teheran, was gaining momentum.

THERE WAS NO REASON TO UNDERWRITE AN ANTI-COLONIALIST WAR, other than the global new order it was meant to further. The world had changed as a new generation of educated Asians, Africans and Indians moved upward in government and administration. Left to themselves mother countries and colonies would have developed a Canada-England relationship. This the one-worlders could not permit. There was another problem. It had been easy to dismantle the Hapsburg Empire and bring on anarchy, because Austria had lost the war. But in World War II our allies, whose empires the new world order men were about to dismantle, had been victorious. The answer was to involve them in colonial wars, while they were weary, and to make no-winism the objective of those not doing the fighting.

THE GROUND PREPARING: There are two ways of making an army accept defeat in a war it is capable of winning. The French army that fought in Indo-China would have rebelled if Robert Schuman and René Pleven and their clique had sent men to die but told them they could not fight for victory. The French way was to give her generals a free hand, then send too little and send it too late. (General Henri Navarre begged his government in 1953 not to mention the word negotiation except after a crushing victory. Requests for negotiations from civilians behind his back played a part in making it a no-win war.) The American insiders' way was to look well at home by giving their fighting men everything an army needed, then hold its leaders in check to ensure a stalemate. This was the story of South Korea and Vietnam. In the latter country the enemy inherited the immense stockpile of arms when the heart-breaking farce was over. Patriots will not surrender sovereignty on nothing but a promise that, because an order is new, it is going to be better. To clear the way for a global new order patriotism and all the old props of tradition and culture have to go.

The first step in Italy entailed the deposing of the king after World War II. U. S. Office of War Information sound trucks and Italian-speaking Americans worked like scurrying ants to set up a stacked plebiscite while the Italian army, which was largely monarchist, was still in uniform and not allowed to vote. With the king removed the way to communism was open and the drive on sovereignty could start. As it got under way, Cord Meyer, Jr., wrote: "Anarchy threatens us in the unbridled growth of nationalism and in insistence upon the sovereignty of nations." When Britain tried to break loose from the Common Market twenty-six years later, Cord Meyer, Jr., was on the spot as CIA station chief in London.

Vertical loyalty, from citizen to government, was denounced and a horizontal class loyalty among workers of all nations was extolled. Walter Reuther put it: "International labor solidarity is a trade union obligation." National solidarity was

replaced by working class solidarity, and everything Roosevelt outlined to Stalin at Teheran proceeded to unfold. (The world is strange: While Roosevelt's war was raging in Indo-China, every city and town in France was naming a street or boulevard after FDR.)

NO-WINISM IN INDO-CHINA was the first of a string of demoralizing setbacks designed to make European nations offer their sovereignty on a platter to a centralized socialist government in Brussels, and here a number of coincidences are worth noting.

Jean Monnet, the father of the Common Market, we have pointed out, was encouraging "independence movements" in North Africa with Robert Murphy and his twelve "vice consuls" in 1943. France's Minister of Finance through the crucial years of 1946 and 1947, Prime Minister in 1948, and Minister of Foreign Affairs from July 1948 until January 1953, when the fate of Indo-China was sealed, was Monnet's associate Robert Schuman. Those were the years when French generals in Indo-China were provided enough materiel to keep the war going but never enough to win it; and the enemy's morale was buoyed up by talk about negotiations.

The European Coal and Steel Authority was the first step toward the political federation Europeans were sold under an economic label. It was known as the Schuman plan, and it is interesting to conjecture what influence Robert Schuman's lectures at St. Paul's School, in New Hampshire, may have had toward making Cord Meyer, Jr., a world federalist. Everything suggests that Monnet and Schuman brought France her first colonial defeat as a step toward making Europe a continent of regions instead of countries, and that communists helped them, knowing that the way was being cleared for them.

Another of the present Common Market leaders who helped make his country's defeat in Indo-China inevitable was René Pleven. As a student Pleven had been vice-president of the University Group for the League of Nations. When Monnet took him up in 1921 he was a temporary employee in the Ministry of Finance at 20 francs a day. Three years later he was secretary to the Administrative Council of the Franco-American Company of Electricity and Industry and on the board of directors of Blair and Company Foreign Corporation, as a protégé of Jean Monnet. When the French army was crying for materiel at the battle of Dien Bien Phu and Vo nguyen Giap, if he had lost, would have been without a single regiment in reserve, René Pleven was France's Minister of Defense. Only 4.5% of the French forces in the theater of operations was involved at Dien Bien Phu, into which Ho chi Minh and Giap had thrown their last reserves. To win a battle the Viet Minh could have lost the war, but they knew victory was not what the European Movement men in Paris wanted.

THE NO-WINISM WAR IN INDO-CHINA ended in July 1955 and the synthetic colonial war which was to divide and demoralize America was about to begin. As we have pointed out, France's generals were permitted to exercise initiative on the field while civilian "new world order" architects strangled and undermined them at home. When it was America's turn to be conditioned for "interdependence," a hodgepodge of Council on Foreign Relations members, Bilderbergers, Atlantic Unionists and World Federalists hoodwinked the public by giving our fighting men everything they needed for victory. Then orders from Washington restricted them as to its use.

The no-win war in South Korea taught our commanders that if they did what military exigencies on the field demanded they would be called home. Suddenly it was clear why the mass media clamored for tighter civilian control over the military after World War II. It was not out of fear that generals might start a war, but they they might win one. Each of the West's setbacks is understandable today.

STEP BY STEP TOWARD THE NEW ORDER. America, Russia and the U. N., not Sukarno, drove the Dutch from Indonesia. Spaak's socialists and labor unions were happy to give premature independence to the Congo. In the crisis that followed, Belgians panicked

in their haste to throw away national identity and become citizens of a thing called BENELUX (Belgium, Netherlands and Luxembourg.)

Another French no-winism war in Algeria brought American labor unions, CIA, Mike Mansfield, Robert Murphy, communists, socialists and all the dismantlers of the West out in support of the Algerians. (The best history of that period and the revolt of French officers who knew the war was winnable and the majority of Algerians with them is to be found in Colonel Antoine Argoud's "La Décadence, L'Imposture et la Tragédie.")

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., explained America's predilection for terrorists against our war-time allies by saying: "To win, we must adopt revolutionary dynamism. We'll do it by taking the communist parties away from Moscow and leading them ourselves through proving to them that America is the real progressive nation." (Spectacle du Monde, Paris, July 1962)

THE THEME THAT SMALL NATIONS CANNOT EXIST. As one nation after another was reduced to where it had started, scare salesmanship was stepped up. Unless they wanted to go the way of Austria and Credit Anstalt, they must forget that they had been great nations and become part of a United States of Europe. Only by banding together could they compete with the giant on the other side of the Atlantic, with its powerful "multinational companies." The day of the small nation is past, professors like Schlesinger and Brzezinski proclaimed.

In America the men and organizations who had financed the European Movement started taking about "interdependence" and the necessity of giving up a "little bit" of America's sovereignty if we were to do business with the super-state being formed in Europe.

Henry Cabot Lodge was sent to Paris in 1961 to head the Atlantic Institute headquarters which would sell Atlanticus - The European Economic Community plus the U. S. - to gullible Americans. Robert Schaetzel was made U. S. ambassador to the E. E. C., to gather material for a Council on Foreign Relations book advocating American entry. A Polish-born retired labor attaché named Joseph Godson and Paul Seabury, a leftist professor from the University of California at Berkeley, opened an "American-European Conference Movement" office at 36 Craven Street, in London, to prepare for America's role in the ever-expanding super-state.

Working with Godson was Sir Frank Roberts' "British Atlantic Community Organization," which meshed gears with the "Movement of the European Left." From the first it was openly proclaimed that, once in this innocent-appearing "economic union," there can be no pulling out. This is nothing but the Brezhnev doctrine in Common Market language. Yet C. L. Sulzberger, the New York Times' man in the Bilderbergers, wrote in the Paris-based International Herald Tribune of April 10, 1971: "This continent's most splendid dream following World War II has been the European Economic Community, or Common Market, which was designed to lead nations that had lost their global influence into a political confederation based on joint trading and financial interests."

The truth was, France, England, Belgium and Holland had been deliberately stripped of their global influence, which is to say colonies, in order to force them to join a political confederation or go under. That the confederation would be a constantly expanding one, moving ever leftward, was understood.

This brings us to the most interesting part of the phenomenon of the "small nations cannot survive" thesis.

NATIONAL PATRIOTISM REFUSED TO DIE. With their outlets amputated and patriotism denounced as selfish nationalism nations still clung to what Spengler described as "standards and tastes mortised in centuries." National and traditional loyalties remained, stubbornly clinging to the borders and landmarks they knew. Nations had to be broken up further. The answer was regionalization.

Belgium had been a sovereign state only since 1830, so the language war between Flemish and Walloons was ideal for dividing the nation. In 1970 Mr. Gaston Eyskens, the Prime Minister, announced that "the unitary state is a thing of the past." This was carrying the attack on small nations a step further. It meant breaking them up altogether.

Eleven years after Belgium lost her colonies a 1971 constitutional revision brought cultural and economic decentralization. Flanders and Wallonia were given their own cultural councils and regional parliaments. In Italy, where provincial loyalties were particularly strong, the country was divided into twenty semi-autonomous regions, which held their first elections in 1970. Adroit politicians played the regions against Rome, and by 1976 every major Italian city was communist-governed and the provinces were wallowing in chaos. Basque separatists, calling their land Euzkadi, were encouraged to ask for far more than what their fathers lost. Now they want their own sovereign socialist country, encompassing the entire Basque area, Spanish and French. On December 26, 1972, the separatist movement in Brittany came out in support of the Basques "and all breakaway national minorities and revolutionary forces being denied cultural and political liberation by the capitalistic system." Catalonia, in the north of Spain, followed the Basques in demanding autonomy.

Propagandists depict dissatisfied regions as colonized countries in the grip of still colonial powers, as Corsica and Brittany demand independence from France. A similar movement could start in any of America's ten regions. In already bankrupt Britain, Mr. Michael Foot is encouraging the formation of separate parliaments for Wales and Scotland. Ulster is in open revolt and America's Dr. Herman Kahn expresses the opinion that all Britain's minorities might split off, since twenty constituent nations instead of ten would not affect the political and economic stability of the European Economic Community.

TO SUM IT UP: Parliamentary elections to the regional super-state in Brussels will be held in late May or early June of 1978. Breakaway movements are being fostered in member countries to strengthen the centralization of power in Brussels and weaken still further the states which make up its part. Each breakaway movement of a region or minority is encouraged in the name of nationalism, while national resistance to centralization of power in the Common Market (EEC) is denounced as nationalism. It must be remembered that the 1957 Treaty of Rome which founded the E.E.C. takes precedence over the constitutions of member states.

All of the phases since World War II have followed a prescribed order: decolonization, no-winism wars, formation of the Common Market as a move toward a marxist United States of Europe, and regionalization as a means of immobilizing national resistance.

The drive to bring America into Atlanticus will move into the open in the last year of the first term of President Carter's administration. America will be a province with ten regions. Unless America wakes up,

To our subscribers: Address domestic business to H. du B. REPORTS, P. O. Box 786 St. George, Utah 84770. Address foreign correspondence to Hilaire du Berrier, 20 Blvd. Princesse Charlotte, Monte Carlo, Principality of MONACO.

Subscription rate \$15 per year.

Extra copies 30¢ each.

Hilaire du Berrier, Correspondent

Leda P. Rutherford, Managing Editor