

MR. NIXON

The Candidate Versus The President

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of *Communist Revolution In The Streets*, and of the explosive best-seller, *Richard Nixon: The Man Behind The Mask*, just released by Western Islands. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN OPINION. Gary Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.

■ THE *London Sunday Times* for January 16, 1972, featured a story by its Washington correspondent, Harlow Ungar, headlined "How Nixon Came To Love The Soviets." Despite that whimsical title, the article is wholly serious. The *London Times* is a counterpart to our own *New York Times* and is very, very Establishment. Mr. Ungar begins:

In one of the most far-reaching trade agreements since the end of the Second World War, America and Russia tomorrow will announce plans to expand trade and work towards normalisation of trade between the two nations. The agreement could lead to a free flow of goods between the US and all the Iron Curtain countries by 1973.

According to the *London Times*, this agreement grew out of complaints to Mr. Nixon by the chief executives of Mack Truck and the Ford Motor Company that "Pentagon paranoia was interfering with

development of highly profitable American trade." It seems that despite the fact that hundreds of items had been removed by President Johnson from the list of those declared strategic and therefore not exportable to the Communists, there were still some items on that list which were badly needed by the Soviet war industry and not otherwise obtainable. The *London Times* continues:

Besides the anger such policies were producing among the business leaders Nixon needs to finance his next election campaign, the Pentagon policies were also blocking trade expansion at a time when America desperately needed to increase exports . . .

Now, however, he [Nixon] is faced with the problem of getting reelected — and the "Commies" may be the very people to help him. According to his political advisers, he must wipe out the trade deficit and end the recession if he is to retain the backing of big business. With a little help from his new Communist friends, who are as eager as he is to trade, Nixon could well fight this year's election with the slogan: "The man who brought the cold war to an end — at a profit."

Yes, and F.D.R. might have run in 1940 as "The man who kept us out of war with Japan — at a profit."

There is an ugly name for this sort of thing, and it is certainly not what voters had in mind when they put their X's

beside the name of Richard Nixon in 1968. Mr. Nixon had built his political career on his oft-declared awareness that the Communists are bent on world domination, and that the survival of our nation depends upon resisting them by every means at our disposal. In 1968, few would have dreamed that Richard Nixon would engage in building the armed might of the Soviet Union in order to procure funds for his reelection campaign. Little wonder that millions of Americans have become cynical about their political leaders.

During the Johnson Administration, the term "credibility gap" was widely used, but the truth is that we have had a credibility gap with every President since Calvin Coolidge — who craftily avoided it by refusing to say anything at all. During the 1968 campaign, Candidate Nixon made a major issue of the failure of credibility of the Democrat Administration, proclaiming: "I believe a tide of discontent is running deep and strong within the people, a powerful current which will sweep away falsehood and duplicity, and carry our country again to the firm and high ground of principle." That was nice talk, but a recent Harris poll shows that after four years of Richard Nixon the public is more leery than ever about the integrity of America's political leaders. And for good reason.

While "Liberal" columnists are congratulating Mr. Nixon on abandoning his Conservative campaign promises, dumfounded voters are asking themselves why they should bother participating in politics if party platforms and the pledged word of candidates are to have no meaning.

A major thrust of Mr. Nixon's 1968 campaign was the rising rate of crime in America. Over and over again Candidate Nixon pointed to the statistics which showed that crime had increased by a staggering eighty-eight percent during the Sixties. In declaring his "War on Crime," the Candidate told the Republican National Convention:

During the decade of the 1960's, the peace forces of our society surrendered critical ground to the criminal forces. The first right of every American, the right to be free from domestic violence, has become the forgotten civil right of the American people. . . .

We must re-establish again the principle that men are accountable for their crimes — that while the boy's environment can help to explain the man's crime, it does not excuse that crime. . . . We cannot accept a wave of crime as the wave of the future.

Nonetheless, the wave of crime has continued to grow, and Americans are even less secure today than they were in 1968. Before he left to run the Nixon reelection campaign, Attorney General John Mitchell "explained" that "fear is being swept from the streets of some — though not all — American cities." You are apparently supposed to think that your town is just one of the unlucky exceptions not yet reached by the Nixon crime warriors. The facts are that crime in America jumped 12 percent in 1969 and an additional 11.3 percent in 1970. The latest available statistics show crime rising at the rate of 11 percent during the first half of 1971. After three years of the Nixon war on crime, criminal activity will be up more than one-third. There were, for example, 566,700 more crimes committed in 1970 than 1969, and approximately 570,000 more crimes in 1969 than 1968. Unless criminals took a vacation during the second half of 1971, there will have been a 1.5 million increase in the incidence of crime since the election of Richard Nixon.

While stumping the hustings, Candidate Nixon identified the cause of spiraling criminality as the weakness of the Johnson Justice Department, headed by the pathetic lambsy-Ramsey Clark. As The Candidate said: "Is it any wonder

that criminals in America are not losing much sleep over the efforts of the Department of Justice? Is it any wonder that the old saying, 'Crime does not pay,' is being laughed at by criminals?" Nice rhetoric. Privately, however, Nixon's opinion of Clark was quite different. Ramsey Clark deserved every brickbat and more, but as Richard Harris observed in the *New Yorker*:

Apparently Nixon himself did not enjoy his attacks on the Attorney General. "Ramsey Clark is really a fine fellow," he said to his closest associates during the campaign. "And he's done a good job." In the view of one of the candidate's top advisers, the candidate had felt compelled to use this "simplistic approach" to stir up the voters.

Time of January 3, 1972, comments that Nixon had campaigned hard on a "pledge" to reduce crime, "and gave the impression that merely replacing Attorney General Ramsey Clark with a man like John Mitchell would work wonders. It did not; crime is still rising." The problem was that substituting Mitchell for Clark was about the only change made. As the nationally syndicated columnists Evans and Novak put it: "In Atty. Gen. John Mitchell's huge Justice Department, for example, most first and second level assistants to the new assistant attorneys general are being retained. This means that scores of government lawyers hired by John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson are staying on..." As a result, the John Mitchells and Richard Kleindienst have been little more than figureheads, and Mr. Nixon's "War on Crime" has been another no-win war.

While campaigning in 1968, Candidate Nixon also took a firm stand against forced busing, maintaining: "I oppose any action by the Office of Education that goes beyond a mandate of Congress; a case in point is the busing of students to

achieve racial balance in schools..." Once elected President, however, Mr. Nixon appointed James E. Allen to be Commissioner of Education. In New York, Allen had earned the nickname "Mr. Busing" because he had bused students all over the state in an attempt to achieve "racial balance." The *Manchester Union Leader*, which supported Nixon in 1968, editorialized:

Commissioner Allen has ruthlessly destroyed the neighborhood school concept in New York State and forced the busing of Negro students into white schools and white students into Negro areas. All the people in the United States who voted for Dick Nixon, thinking there was going to be an end to this type of destruction of the neighborhood school concept, must feel terribly double-crossed by this incredible appointment....

The President also appointed the "Liberal" Robert Finch to head the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and later replaced him with the even more "Liberal" Elliot Richardson. Both of these men are also strong advocates of busing and have instituted scores of suits to require local school districts to bus children for racist purposes. These suits led to the greatest busing of students in history... and all during the Nixon Administration. The President has continued to denounce busing while permitting the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to go right on filing suits against local communities which have refused to bus their children.

Now that another election is approaching, Mr. Nixon is once again making very strong statements in opposition to busing — but without being specific about what he will do about it. In his last State of the Union message the President told the nation: "All of my recommendations, however, will be rooted in one fundamen-

tal principle with which there can be no compromise: Local school boards must have control over local schools."

Don't you believe it! The President is even now preparing to institute a Value-Added Tax (which amounts to a national sales tax) to replace the local funding of our schools with federal funding. The whole course of our nation's history has shown that federal controls follow federal funds as the little lamb followed Mary. And the Supreme Court has already ruled that what the federal government finances it may control. Once again, the Conservatives get the rhetoric while "Liberals" get the action.

Again and again the President has reflected the cavalier mentality of the perfume company that advertises: "Promise her anything, but give her Arpege." You will remember, for instance, that some of Mr. Nixon's most popular and well perfumed campaign promises concerned the national welfare mess. In accepting the nomination in Miami, Candidate Nixon explained the effects of welfare on its recipients: "As we look through the ages, and welfare is not new, we have found that inevitably when such programs continue and escalate in any society, welfare tends to destroy those who have received it and to corrupt those who dispense it." While seeking votes around the nation The Candidate proposed that the Free Enterprise system be permitted to solve the problems of poverty, suggesting: "Instead of Government jobs, housing and welfare, let government . . . enlist . . . the greatest engine of progress ever developed . . . American private enterprise."

Mr. Nixon also made it clear that the greedy and not the needy were receiving our welfare expenditures, and promised that would be stopped. He told an audience in Concord, California: "The best way to protect welfare is to see that the fakers and chisellers come off the rolls." And he cautioned a Dallas audience: "One candidate stands for putting mil-

lions more on welfare rolls. I say, we need to put more millions on payrolls." Candidate Nixon voiced his strongest opposition to a guaranteed annual income, declaring unequivocally:

One of the reasons that I do not accept . . . a guaranteed annual income or a negative income tax is because of my conviction that doing so, first, would not end poverty, and second . . . it would have a very detrimental effect on the productive capacity of the American people . . . I am against any system which would destroy or reduce that incentive, that determination, that self-respect and that pride. That is why I take a dim view of these programs.

Within a year of his election, however, the President introduced what he called a Family Assistance Plan — a guaranteed annual income which would put up to 23 million on permanent welfare, the equivalent population of eleven American states. Dr. Roger Freeman of Stanford's Hoover Institution, an ex-Nixon aide, recently testified before the Senate Finance Committee that the Nixon program would not only double the welfare rolls but would wreak havoc with the economy. He revealed that virtually all of the gimmicks in the scheme have been tried in various other welfare measures in the past, with the result that the welfare rolls have mushroomed.

But "Liberals" cheered Mr. Nixon. The *New Republic* actually hailed the President's program as "creeping socialism." Nicholas von Hoffman, the *Washington Post's* house radical, chirped happily that it "embodies and makes official one of the wildest dreams of the 1950's." Daniel Schorr of C.B.S. praised the new Nixon proposal for massive welfare because, he said, it abolishes the "old fashioned" connection between working and earning a living. According to Schorr:



"HO-HO-HO."

Candidate Nixon campaigned against welfare; President Nixon proposes to expand welfare to put 23 million on the dole. Candidate Nixon demanded frugality; President Nixon increased the federal deficit three-fold while running a Budget almost \$100 billion above the Johnson "spendthrift" Budget. Candidate Nixon promised never to institute wage-price controls; President Nixon imposed such controls. Candidate Nixon promised to seek victory against the Communists; President Nixon renounced victory, offered North Vietnam reparations, and traveled to Peking to kowtow before murderers.



"SURPRISE, TRA LA LA LA"



This is an effort to federalize the patchwork welfare system. It would expand coverage from 10 million to 22 million Americans. It would help to erase the invidious line between working Americans and welfare Americans. It does contain the implied commitment to income maintenance for Americans in need. And all this from a President elected by the welfare-hating "forgotten" middle-class American.

Quite so. And elected, by the way, on the firm promise that he would reduce welfare spending. Mr. Nixon's Family Assistance Plan, now referred to euphemistically as "welfare reform," will of course be fantastically expensive. As economist Henry Hazlitt discloses:

If the government paid such a guarantee of, say, \$3,720 (the present officially estimated "poverty level") to a family of four, or an average of \$930 to every person, this would come to a total of about \$186 billion a year. That any effort to pay such a sum would lead to crushing taxation, wild inflation, wholesale destruction of incentives and economic chaos is unlikely to deter those social reformers who have the courage of their logic It is because it has accepted the Socialistic guaranteed income principle that the Nixon welfare program is certain to be expanded every election year.

Some Conservatives, engaging in wishful thinking, permitted themselves to be convinced that the President abandoned his plan for a guaranteed annual income after it failed to pass Congress last year, but the Washington weekly, *Human Events*, reported February 12, 1972, that it is still priority Nixon legislation for the election year. And the ruse goes on.

You will recall also that Candidate

Nixon's prescription for America's ills was "new leadership," and that he emphatically declared during the campaign: "We can't be led into the '70s by the men who stumbled and bumbled and fumbled their way through the '60s." Speaking in Dallas, The Candidate promised:

I want a Secretary of State that will join me in cleaning out the State Department It has never been done We are going to clean house up there. We are going to bring in new men with a fresh approach. It is going to be a Nixon-oriented State Department.

After the election, as with every one of the Nixon promises, the song of "new leadership" was drowned by "Hail, hail, the gang's all here!" The *Wall Street Journal* of January 6, 1969, described the President-elect's visit to the State Department, where Mr. Nixon told the assembled "architects of the past" whom he had so vociferously denounced during his campaign: "When we talk about the new leadership, that does not mean that all of those who have served in career positions in the old leadership should leave that service Under no circumstances would I say to men who have rendered such distinguished [!] service 'step aside' and put in completely inexperienced men in their places."

The *Chicago Tribune* of March 4, 1969, admitted that the "architects of the past" seemed secure. *Tribune* columnist Walter Trohan observed of the State Department: "President Nixon was elected in 1968 because many Americans devoutly desired a change. Now, after 18 months, these same Americans are generally saddened because he has failed to throw the rascals out After 18 months it is business as usual for the so-called liberals, even in the Nixon Administration."

This, despite the fact that the State Department is so packed with security

risks that for many months *The Review Of The News* has each week exposed one or more of their number who have been officially identified as security risks by the State Department's own intelligence officers . . . but are still employed by the Nixon Administration in key posts. And, beside the significance of Mr. Nixon's failure to keep his promise, consider the implications of the following from the *Washington Star* of February 1, 1964:

A list of potential security risks in the State Department, kept secret since it was prepared in 1956 by a now-deceased Department security chief, has been turned up by congressional investigators. Dated June 27, 1956, and signed by Scott McLeod, administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs [in the State Department], the memorandum states: "On the Department rolls are some 800 individuals concerning whom the Office of Security has information which raises questions in major or minor degree with respect to the criteria [of Executive Order 10450], namely questions as to possible past associations, false statements, immoral conduct, homosexuality, intoxication, mental defects, etc. All have been cleared as qualified for access to classified information.

"Of the 800-odd listed, there were approximately 250 on whom the questions are, in my opinion, serious in relation to the broad Security responsibilities of the Department. Sixty percent are incumbents in high level assignments in the Department or in the field. About one-half are assigned to what can be categorized as critical intelligence slots in the Department or to top level boards and committees. The situation described is obviously serious and deserves urgent attention."

Yet Mr. Nixon has done *nothing* to remove from the State Department even those officially identified as security risks by the Department's own intelligence section. The one man who tried, chief security evaluator Otto F. Otepka, was himself driven from the Department and refused reinstatement by Mr. Nixon's Secretary of State.

Meanwhile, Henry Kissinger helped President Nixon keep his promise to bring "new leadership" to America by picking twenty-three holdovers from the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations for the National Security Council, a fact almost totally ignored by the Establishment media. Syndicated columnist Anthony Harrigan, who did comment, remarked:

Nixon Administration supporters who closely observe the defense establishment and who count themselves as realists in military and foreign policy issues were shocked recently when they saw the full list of new National Security Council members. Dr. Kissinger has assembled a staff made up of people identified with the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations and with such individuals as McNamara, Rusk, Rostow and Katzenbach. To many people, the list will appear to be nothing less than incredible . . . The Kissinger selections would fit in nicely with a Hubert Humphrey or Edward Kennedy Administration.

The *New York Times* quoted a "knowledgeable Johnson Administration official" as admitting Kissinger's staff was comprised of "virtually all in-house people." Another of L.B.J.'s boys observed that holdovers from the Kennedy-Johnson Era outnumber newcomers from the academic world and from Nixon's campaign organization. The disgusted American Conservative Union, a predominantly Republican organization, declared

in its *Battle Line* for February-March 1969: "Whatever policies in foreign affairs President Nixon may choose to follow, the apparatus he has established to execute those policies is controlled by the very liberals who have weakened American power and prestige for two decades."

This is incredible, for no man in history has come to the Presidency with so thorough a knowledge of Communism as Richard Nixon. He has met the Communists face-to-face at home and abroad. His many statements on the subject indicated that he well understood the techniques and goals of the International Communist Conspiracy. Mr. Nixon's political career was in fact built on a pyramid of invective aimed at "Liberal" appeasement of Communism and the "no win" strategy. Typical of the "old" Nixon were statements such as the following:

We are in a race tonight, my fellow Americans, a race for survival in which our lives, our fortunes, our liberties are at stake We have already paid a terrible price in lives and resources to learn that appeasement leads not to peace but to war

The Communists proclaim over and over again that their aim is the victory of Communism throughout the world. It is not enough for us to reply that our aim is to contain Communism, to defend the free world against Communism, to hold the line against Communism. The only answer to a strategy of victory for the Communist world is a strategy of victory for the free world.

By 1968, Mr. Nixon had somewhat toned down his anti-Communist statements, but he still made it clear that the Comrades had not renounced their goal of world conquest. Over the C.B.S. Radio Network, The Candidate warned: "Any sign of Western weakness or Western

irresolution would only tempt the Soviets to new adventures and strengthen the hand of the hardline faction within the Kremlin." A week later, in denouncing the "architects of the past" who read a change of Communist intentions into every Red propaganda release, Mr. Nixon declared: "I intend to do away with wishful thinking either as to the capability or the intent of potential enemies."

There is no doubt about it. Millions of Americans voted for Richard Nixon in the belief that, at last, we would have a President who would stand up to the Communists with courage and honor. It was not to be. As early as his Inaugural Address, President Nixon let it be known that it was going to be "business as usual" in appeasing the Communists. He declared: "After a period of confrontation, we are entering an era of negotiation." And, the President continued: "The peace we seek is not victory"

"Era of negotiation," indeed! As Mr. Nixon well knows, we haven't had a confrontation with the Russians since the carefully staged "Cuban missile crisis" in the early Sixties. The intervening years have brought a constant flow and flush of meetings. In fact, since the end of World War II, we have sat down with the Soviets over five thousand times to discuss limitations on armaments. We have been in an "era of negotiation" with these same Soviets since the Cairo Conference of 1943. It is far too obvious, as Mr. Nixon admits, that "The peace we seek is not victory"

Anyone at all familiar with what the Communists call treaty warfare could have predicted the shabby results. As V.I. Lenin postulated long ago: "It is ridiculous not to know . . . that a treaty is the means of gaining strength." In another dictum, Lenin is said to have phrased it even more colorfully: "Promises are like pie crusts, made to be broken." Stalin was equally blunt: "A diplomat's words must have no relation to action — otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words

are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood."

The Soviets are ideologues — and they practice what Lenin and Stalin preached. As the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has reported:

The staff studied nearly a thousand treaties and agreements of the kinds described above, both bilateral and multi-lateral, which the Soviets have entered into not only with the United States, but with countries all over the world. The staff found that in the 38 short years since the Soviet Union came into existence, its Government had broken its word to virtually every country to which it ever gave a signed promise.

In the light of fifty years of Communist duplicity in negotiations, the Soviets deceive only those who wish to be deceived. If the Communists had not already broken the treaties previously signed, there would be no excuse for negotiating with them to acquire their signature to promises they have already made and broken! But, soon after taking office, Mr. Nixon entered into disarmament talks with the Soviet Union — despite the fact that his books and articles and speeches reveal that he understands perfectly well how the Communists use treaties and negotiations as instruments of political warfare.

Every would-be aggressor from the dawn of time has tried to disarm the enemy. Disarmament agreements have been made and broken since Cain rocked his brother Abel into a deep sleep. None have been kept. Of course, the mere lesson of all recorded history did not daunt Richard Nixon. He elected to ignore the fact that, just as with treaties in general, the Communists look upon disarmament as a means of conquering

the "bourgeois" states. He knows very well that on November 30, 1927, Maxim Litvinov introduced Soviet proposals before the League of Nations calling for "Immediate, Complete and General Disarmament." Yet that exact phrase is today used in the propaganda of both the Communists and the Nixon Administration.

Establishment "Liberals," those "architects of the past" with their nearly three decades of uninterrupted disasters in dealing with the Communists, were of course ecstatic over President Nixon's "new" attitude towards the Communists. James Reston of the *New York Times* rhapsodized:

It is true that Nixon rose to power as an anti-Communist, a hawk on Vietnam, and an opponent of the New Deal, but once he assumed the responsibilities of the Presidency, he began moving toward peace in Vietnam, co-existence with the Communist world of Moscow and Peking, and despite all his political reservations, even toward advocacy of the welfare state at home.

Nixon's policies toward Social Security, welfare payments, arms control and coexistence with the Communist world are quite different from the policies he supported when he was a congressman, a senator and vice president under Eisenhower. He has been struggling between his political prejudices of the past and his responsibilities as President, and he has moved in the last two years toward an accommodation with his old adversaries both at home and abroad.

This has not been easy. He is still torn between his old anti-Communist cold war instincts and his new Presidential duties. He has been arguing for arms control, he has been supporting the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, he has

been supporting the reconciliation of the West Germans and the Soviets, he has been approving more trade between the Western and the Communist world — most of the time against the prejudices of most of the conservative Republicans who supported his bid for the Presidency in the first place.

The likelihood is that Nixon is going to be President for the next six years. He is at a critical point in his career. He has been trying to liberate himself from his conservative and anti-Communist past, and work toward a progressive policy at home and a policy of reconciliation with the Communists abroad . . .

Many Nixon watchers, both "Liberal" and Conservative, are predicting that some form of disarmament agreement will be reached with the Soviets before the November election as a result of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks which have now been running for two years. The Establishment media will ballyhoo any type of disarmament agreement as bringing "peace in our time," and such a coup will greatly enhance the President's chances of reelection. But there are many, including the normally "Liberal" columnists Evans and Novak, who are plenty worried about the consequences of this election ploy. As Evans and Novak put it:

Deepening dependence by Richard M. Nixon on his role as Peace President to give him a second term in the White House is now causing well-concealed anxiety among some of his own top-level foreign policy experts that he may unwittingly make himself a hostage in Moscow's hands.

Their apprehension stems from the fact that success or failure of President Nixon's ambitious peace plans hinge upon the mood of the Soviet government. If the Kremlin

decides to up the ante, Nixon would have the bitter choice of either dropping a policy increasingly vital to his reelection or agreeing to Soviet demands not in the best interests of the United States.

What really worries these officials is the possibility that Nixon, whose career was built on a hard base of iron anti-Communism, might become so entranced with the Peace President role that he would agree to Communist demands which just a year ago would not have been seriously entertained . . .

Equally concerned, columnist John Chamberlain observes: "President Nixon seems to be following Franklin Roosevelt's ill-advised theory that, if you give the Soviets something without asking questions, they will respond in the future in a similar manner. This is the only explanation for Mr. Nixon's apparent conviction that a concession now on limitation of the antiballistic missile will be followed a year later by an agreement with the Soviets on halting the further development of offensive nuclear weapons."

This is hardly the cautious strategy of anti-Communism upon which Richard Nixon was elected President of the United States. What is happening is that Mr. Nixon is unilaterally terminating the Cold War by giving up. In return he is receiving the election-year plaudits of media pundits who would have you believe that it was all a misunderstanding anyway. Unfortunately, most Americans have forgotten that it does not take two to make a fight when one is prepared to stand flat-footed and take a beating. Certainly Russian Premier Leonid Brezhnev isn't telling the Russian people that we will have an "era of peace." In the *Chicago Tribune* of April 18, 1970, Frank Starr, Chief of the Moscow Bureau for the Tribune Press Service, reported:

The Russian people are entrusted with a historical mission to lead all humanity to communism, the highest civilization, Leonid Brezhnev said today. They are fully resolved to fulfill that mission to the end, he asserted . . .

In a short speech, his third in four days, he assured his listeners and the nation that communism will eventually win "a full and final victory" thruout the world.

"That mission was entrusted to us by history itself, bequeathed to us by Lenin. And our people, our party, is resolved to fulfill it to the end," Brezhnev said.

So brazen are the Communist leaders, and so confident are they that our leaders and the moguls of our mass media will pay no attention, that they brag on our own soil that their goal remains world conquest. In 1967, in New York City, Kossygin was asked: "With all the talk about friendship, peace and 'building bridges,' does the Soviet Union still have as its primary objective the overthrow of capitalism?" Without a moment's pause, the Soviet dictator shot back: "Of course!"

Meanwhile, some of the advances made by the Communists while our "Liberals" have been cooing over Nixon's moves to accommodate the Reds include the following:

West Germany has, with the encouragement of the Nixon Administration, come to terms with Russia, Poland, and East Germany. The Soviet section of Berlin now becomes officially a part of East Germany, thus legitimizing the Berlin Wall.

Iceland has moved so far into the Marxist camp that it has ordered the United States to leave our great Keflavik base there.

Libya has forced American withdrawal from our giant Wheelus Air Base and has invited in Russia.

India, a recipient of over \$7 billion in American aid, has formed a treaty of alliance with the Soviets.

Japan, ignored in Mr. Nixon's decision to seek accommodation with Red China, is moving Leftward and considering neutrality.

South Korea, stunned by the President's Red China operations, is being pushed toward accommodation with Communist North Korea.

The Mediterranean is afloat with the Soviet Navy and dotted with bases granted by former "colonies" which we helped to liberate into Communist hands.

The Red Sea is taking on the ideological color of its name as the Communists are fanning out from Yemen. Red China is meanwhile forging links with Ethiopia, The Sudan, and others in the region.

Panama, according to Undersecretary of State Charles Meyer, will not be defended by the United States even in the event of a direct Communist invasion. This, despite the fact that the Panama Canal was ceded to the United States by treaty and is as much a part of our country as is beautiful downtown Burbank.

Chile has become a full-fledged Communist nation, has nationalized American industries, and has invited the U.S.S.R. to use its naval bases — all without the Nixon Administration's once mentioning the Monroe Doctrine.

Peru has nationalized American property with impunity and become a hardened enemy of the United States.

Ecuador, which captures American fishing vessels at will and holds them for tribute, has followed Peru's example through a pro-Communist military coup.

Argentina, once a keystone for our interests in South America, has seen the handwriting on the wall and is turning toward neutralism.

Canada, under pro-Communist Premier Pierre-Elliott Trudeau, has separated itself from American foreign policy and is seeking to outdo the United States in appeasing the Communists.

In fact, America's makers of foreign policy have yet to win a single battle against the Communists since Richard Nixon took his oath of office.

In the past, Mr. Nixon treated Cuba as a dagger held at the throat of America. "We must no longer postpone making a command decision to do whatever is necessary to force the removal of the Soviet beachhead. The United States cannot tolerate the continued existence of a Soviet military and subversive base ninety miles from our shore," he maintained. According to Candidate Nixon, "The United States must make a decision that Castro must go, and then do what is necessary to bring him down." Such Nixon promises, like all the others, have disappeared into the memory hole.

The distinguished journalist Paul Scott, in his column of May 30, 1969, revealed that "President Nixon is continuing the Johnson Administration's policy of not disturbing Communist Cuba." And, says Scott, "All moves within the Nixon Administration to tighten up the quarantine of Cuba have been blocked by Henry Kissinger, Nixon's foreign policy advisor in the White House." Kissinger has even ordered a detailed study to prepare for reestablishing formal diplomatic relations with Castro! The effect on anti-Communist resistance within a bleeding Cuba has been disastrous.

President Nixon has also done much to kill hope for liberty among the Captive Nations of Europe and Asia by making it clear that he recognizes the legitimacy of their slavemasters. And the abandoning of these millions of people is part of the accommodation Mr. Nixon is now pursuing with the Communist dictators. As Paul Scott observes:

A new "Nixon Doctrine," now emerging into public view, had a lot to do with those unexpected invitations from Moscow and Peking for President Nixon to visit those countries.... The highly questionable

doctrine is based on a Presidential decision to support the legalization of communist control over all the people and nations seized during and since World War II.

Although never announced by the President, this policy of writing off the Captive Nations of Europe and Asia was secretly made known to Soviet and Chinese leaders several months ago and shortly after the Presidential decision was made.... The new Nixon policy, which Moscow and Peking have been trying to get the U.S. to adopt for more than 20 years, already has begun to show its face in several ways. Most dramatic of these is the President's unexpected support of Communist China's membership in the United Nations and seat on the UN Security Council.

Richard Nixon has come a long way since that 1968 campaign, in which he promised us victory over Communism. Naturally the Far Left is delighted. The *New York Times* of December 4, 1971, proclaims that "a noticeable improvement in the political climate between the Soviet Union and the United States, appears to have given rise to a mood of euphoria." Euphoria is defined as an unreal feeling of wellbeing. Much of the current euphoria, of course, stems from the promise of increased "trade" with the Soviets. And it is unreal! Especially when one remembers that, during his 1968 campaign, Richard Nixon said of the Soviet Union, Red China, and the Communist nations of Eastern Europe:

I believe, as far as those countries are concerned, the United States should not provide any credits or anything that could be treated as, or classified as, aid to those nations if they persist in trading with or aiding the enemy in North Vietnam.

On October 24, 1968, Candidate Nixon told a nationwide radio audience that "as all Americans bitterly know, the Soviets have been and still are the arsenal and the trainers of the North Vietnamese and have escalated this jungle battle into a major war." He acknowledged that eighty-five percent of all war materials entering North Vietnam emanate from Soviet bloc nations. You see, Mr. Nixon said of the Communists, "They use trade as a weapon. We must recognize that trade is one of our greatest assets in this game, and we must use it in the same way."

So you see it was with full knowledge of the perfidy of his act that this same Richard Nixon sent his Secretary of Commerce to Moscow in November of 1971, to arrange for \$2 billion in strategic trade with the Soviet Union. According to Stans, "we have eliminated some 1,800 items from the restrictions against sale to the Soviet Union, and that process is still continuing." Mr. Nixon is openly providing the Communists with priceless computers, machinery, tooling, electronics equipment, and other items necessary for war production. In addition, American companies are making plans to build for the Russians the world's largest truck factory.* The fact that trucks form the backbone of a modern army, and that truck factories are readily converted into tank factories, is no longer discussed in high Republican circles.

And what concession have we received for increasing the ability of the Soviet Union to make war? None.

With what will they pay us? Who knows? Rubles have no value outside of the Soviet Union. Premier Aleksei Kosygin made it plain to Stans that East-West trade cannot expand unless the United States is willing to provide the Communists with easier *credit terms*, running up to ten years. Late last year President Nixon ordered the Export-Import Bank (under authority of the Export Expansion Finance Act of 1971) to grant

credits to Communist Romania so that Bucharest can more quickly acquire American industrial innovations. Stans indicated that the White House will soon allow other Communist regimes to borrow from the Bank. You see, a number of West European and Japanese industries are presently in financial difficulty because they extended credit to the Soviet bloc and have had trouble collecting. But if the Communists should default on their loans from the Export-Import Bank, the American public — *which guarantees such loans through taxes* — would get stuck with the loss.

In other words, the great boost to our economy and the profits to Mr. Nixon's backers referred to by the *London Times* will be paid for by the long-suffering American taxpayer.†

The President's about-face may be explained by the fact that much of the trade with the Communists is controlled by the Rockefeller-Eaton-Rothschild axis represented by the International Basic Economy Corporation — which, according to the *New York Times* of January 16, 1967, has contracts to build war production factories behind the Iron Curtain. (The English Rothschilds joined the Eaton-Rockefeller combine two years later.) Senator Frank Church has revealed that David Rockefeller has been the chief principal in convincing the Administration to make this about-face on "trade"

*The *Indianapolis News* of March 29, 1971, reports that American pilots reveal the trucks on the Ho Chi Minh Trail resemble old Fords. The reason they do is that Henry Ford built the Gorki truck factory for the Bolsheviks in the 1930s. Then, as now, Americans were told that if we helped Russia to industrialize, it would produce an era of peace. Fifty thousand dead Americans in Vietnam found that increasing the war-making potential of the Soviets produces mainly dead Americans.

†If you doubt that there is anything so cynical as fund-raising for the Presidential campaign in back of this move, please explain why Maurice Stans has just resigned as Secretary of Commerce to become Mr. Nixon's chief fund-raiser for that campaign.

with the Communists. Rockefeller actually flew to Moscow and met personally with Kosygin to clear the deal before Nixon moved!

And while the Nixon Administration is deliberately building up the Soviet war-making capacity, it is deliberately tearing down our own.

You will remember that Candidate Nixon vowed: "The U.S. must maintain a strategic superiority to enable it to deal from a position of strength in maintaining peace. Research and development of new weaponry must be aggressively pursued and an anti-ballistic missile system must be built at all costs." The *Los Angeles Times* of September 27, 1968, quoted Candidate Nixon as follows: "I do not believe that the United States can afford to accept the concept of parity with the Soviet Union." Later he added: "... in recent years our country has followed policies which now threaten to make America second best both in numbers and quality of major weapons. That is why I charge the opposition with creating a security gap for America . . . I intend to restore our objective of clear-cut military superiority . . ."

Yet, in his first press conference as President, Mr. Nixon repudiated the very concept of "superiority" as the aim of his policy. "Superiority" was to be replaced by "sufficiency." As he phrased it:

I would say that in regard to Dr. Kissinger's suggestion as to "sufficiency," that that would meet certainly my guideline . . . when you talk about "superiority," that may have the detrimental effect on the other side in putting it in an inferior position and therefore giving great impetus to its own arms race. . . . I think "sufficiency" is a better term, actually than either "superiority" or "parity."

As a result of this breach of yet another campaign promise, there has been

virtually no development of new weapons under the Nixon Administration. In 1967, Robert McNamara and his radical "Whiz Kids" froze both our Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (I.C.B.M.) force and our Polaris nuclear submarine force. Today, after three years of President Nixon's defense management, we find that we have exactly the same number of I.C.B.M.s as we had in 1967; exactly the same number of ballistic missile nuclear submarines as we had in 1967; and, the number of U.S. strategic bombers continues to dwindle. Worse, Assistant Secretary of Defense David Packard, who subsequently resigned, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

The small size of the MIRVed warheads resulted in a lower capability in our forces to destroy Soviet retaliation forces than could otherwise have been the case . . . this administration made a deliberate decision not to improve the accuracy of our MIRV . . .

President Nixon even reduced L.B.J.'s anti-ballistic missile (A.B.M.) system, so that instead of protecting twelve cities it is designed to protect only two. The cutback was made on the grounds that such a defensive system was too "provocative" to the Soviets! Clearly, the Nixon strategy is to *disarm* the United States. Joseph Alsop, in a column titled "Nixon Firm But Continues To Disarm," emphasizes what he calls "the rather major matter of the Nixon-Melvin Laird disarmament, which is beginning to make the Truman-Louis Johnson disarmament look pretty trivial." Alsop tells of our massive unilateral disarmament after World War II and Korea, then continues:

But soon after our engagement in Vietnam, still another U.S. disarmament began, this time behind the deceptive facade of the war itself. The nuclear-strategic balance

was allowed to deteriorate in a shocking manner. All expenditures on real strength were skimped to pay for the war within a limited defense budget. This had started already when President Nixon took office and made Melvin Laird secretary of defense. Under their aegis, however, the new American disarmament has gone much further and much faster . . .

Writing in the "Liberal" *Los Angeles Times*, Chalmers Roberts says, "Laird has shelved all sorts of new weapons and equipment, much of it already postponed because of Vietnam war costs . . ." On June 10, 1969, in fact, the Pentagon announced that in order to "cut spending" it was dropping the only military man-in-space project, the \$3 billion Manned Orbiting Laboratory (M.O.L.). Some \$1.3 billion had been spent on M.O.L. since 1963, and our Air Force leadership has long been of the opinion that in order to be secure from attack the United States must have military craft in space to inspect and, if necessary, destroy hostile satellites. But the Nixon Administration "can't afford" the relatively small expenditure necessary to finish the job and help protect this nation from our Communist enemy by providing America with the one military application of our enormously expensive manned space ventures!

Richard Nixon's policy is to walk softly and throw away the sticks.

Even with the war in Vietnam the Nixon Administration has made the most drastic cuts in defense since the end of World War II. The defense budget submitted in January of this year is a 23-year low as a percentage of the total federal Budget. In terms of 1972 dollars, the Nixon Administration is spending only half as much today on strategic defense as was spent in the relatively peaceful year of 1962. The Administration now brags that it spends more on the Department of Health, Education and Welfare than it

does on defense, even though the only legitimate function of government is defending its citizens from predators, foreign and domestic.

Whether or not the Russians have developed the tremendous nuclear arsenal they claim is a moot point. It is hard for many of us to believe that a nation which cannot build its own trucks is capable of building super-sophisticated weapons. But this is not a field in which a prudent nation can take chances. As a matter of common sense, the United States should have the best weapons systems that our technology can develop. But at the rate of deterioration of our armed forces under Richard Nixon, the Russians may be able to invade us with clubs and rocks by rowing across the Bering Strait.

Whatever the truth of Soviet military might, two facts are inescapable. First, through his massive new trade program President Nixon is doing everything feasible to increase it. Second, Mr. Nixon, himself, now claims the Communists are stronger, militarily, than we are. In an interview with C.L. Sulzberger of the *New York Times* on March 9, 1971, the President stated: "The Soviets now have three times the missile strength (I.C.B.M.) of ourselves. By 1974, they will pass us in submarines carrying nuclear missiles." If this is indeed the case, why has Mr. Nixon refused to increase our military capability, and why is he making our sophisticated technology and strategic goods available to the Soviet Union?

For eight years, Robert McNamara and his "Whiz Kids" were the favorite target of concerned Republicans. During the campaign, Richard Nixon declared: "I intend to restore ready access of our top military professionals to the President of the United States, as contemplated by the National Security Act. I intend to root out the 'whiz kids' approach which for years in the Defense Department has led our policies and programs down the wrong roads."

Robert McNamara and his whizzers

almost destroyed America's defense system, but those same architects of disaster continue to dominate the Pentagon and the National Security Council even though McNamara is away running the World Bank. You begin to realize how completely true this is when you understand that the McNamara Pentagon reorganization was based on a plan prepared by Henry A. Kissinger, now Mr. Nixon's top security advisor.

And the President's switcheroo on Vietnam has been even more dramatic than his reversal of position on the need to keep America militarily strong. In August of 1964, *Reader's Digest* published an article by Richard Nixon entitled "Needed In Vietnam: The Will To Win," in which he laid the situation out straight and true. He began by stating: "One more surrender or retreat, and creeping communism will become galloping communism" throughout Asia and the Pacific. Mr. Nixon proclaimed that our goal must be victory: "What we must do is to instill a determination to win this crucial war — and to win it decisively. Victory is essential to the survival of freedom." And Nixon put the blame for not winning squarely on President Johnson, saying he had "no real intention of winning this war. Instead we are trying to achieve a precarious balance." Mr. Nixon castigated the Johnson Administration for repeating Truman's mistakes in Korea. Citizen Nixon wrote:

We are again fighting under self-imposed handicaps. Certainly we should bomb the roads, bridges and supply routes into South Vietnam. We must make up our mind to win this war by whatever means short of nuclear attack seem most effective.

On March 5, 1965, Nixon delivered a speech titled "The Choice In Vietnam," which once more outlined the stakes in the Vietnam War. He declared:

The battle for Vietnam is then not just about Vietnam. It is about all of Southeast Asia. It is not about just fifteen million people but about two hundred million people and an area which produces over half the world's tin, half the world's rubber and untapped natural resources of immense value to a hungry, developing power like Communist China . . .

But the stakes are even higher. The greatest prize in Asia is Japan, a miracle of economic recovery since World War II and the greatest industrial power in Asia. Japan is the only country with a possible chance to counter-balance China once China develops its industrial might. Southeast Asia, next to the United States, constitutes Japan's biggest trading area. If this area comes under Communist domination Japan will inevitably be pulled toward neutralism and even toward a pro-Communist position in order to survive economically . . .

The battle for Vietnam is the battle for Asia. If the United States gives up on Vietnam, Asia will give up on the United States and the Pacific will become a Red Sea.

Next, Candidate Nixon discussed our options:

But why don't we negotiate now? This is the question which is being increasingly raised by critics of the present policy.

The best answer to this question is to pose another question — what do we negotiate at this time?

Vietnam has already been negotiated once. In 1954 the country was partitioned and the Communists took the north half of it. Do we now negotiate it again and give the Communists half of what is left of Free Vietnam?

Why not then negotiate the neutralization of Vietnam? Laos proved the stupidity of this course of action. An agreement with the Communists to neutralize a country is simply surrender on the installment plan. It means just three things. We get out. They stay in. They take over.

When we negotiate with the Communists we must recognize that our motives are different from theirs. We go to the conference table to promote peace. They go there to win victory. Communist tactics in negotiation can be summed up in four sentences.

First, they demand something to which they are not entitled.

Second, they threaten war if they are not given what they demand.

Third, they insist we negotiate to avoid war.

Fourth, if we do negotiate, their price for peace is half of what they were not entitled to in the first place....

We can never negotiate surrender, retreat, neutralization or partition of Vietnam.

Even after the Paris Peace Conferences began, Candidate Nixon was warning that negotiations were merely a Communist tactic. On February 12, 1968, he issued this statement: "Where the Communists are concerned — as we learned in Korea — when we talk, they fight. We must never forget that after truce talks started in Korea, there were 18,000 American deaths — more than died before the truce talks began. We must never let that happen in Vietnam."

Of course, that is exactly what President Nixon has permitted to happen. During the Nixon Administration, nearly 20,000 American soldiers have been killed by the Communists while Richard Nixon has continued to negotiate. That is

far more casualties than would have been suffered had the President done what he promised, again and again, and moved to win the war. Once again, Richard Nixon has not only broken his word, but done exactly the opposite of what he pledged to do!

President Nixon's "new" dove policies were lifted right out of the dove platform of the radical "Liberals" at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in 1968. But the Democrats did not dare adopt such a platform for fear it would mean political suicide. Only a Republican could get away with it. Speaking of the minority Vietnam plank in the Democratic platform, Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond proclaimed in their column of October 21, 1969:

Today Nixon is carrying out every provision of that plank and — at points — more. The dove-supported Democratic plank advocated "phased withdrawal" of all foreign troops from Vietnam. Richard Nixon has gone further. He has begun phased withdrawal of U.S. troops without the withdrawal of North Vietnamese troops. The dove-supported Democratic plank opposed "unilateral withdrawal." The President has gone beyond it with a beginning unilateral withdrawal.

Had Hubert Humphrey tried to continue the "no-win" policies in Vietnam while instituting piecemeal surrender, Republican Congressmen and Senators would have raised a national uproar. But Nixon is a political artist. He disguised his surrender in what Stewart Alsop has called "Churchillian rhetoric," all the while proclaiming that he will not be a party to "disguised surrender."

In January 1972, President Nixon took to nationwide television to tell the American people that he had in secret talks with the North Vietnamese offered the Communists almost everything but

the Brooklyn Bridge to let us off the hook in Southeast Asia. Contrary to prior promises, the President made it clear that he *would* accept a Coalition Government in South Vietnam. Despite the fact that he had often counselled against the folly of rewarding aggressors, Mr. Nixon even went so far as to offer the North Vietnamese billions of dollars in what amounts to war reparations. But the North Vietnamese are unmoved even by this offer of surrender. With the supplies they are receiving from the Communist bloc (some actually transshipments of American trade goods), the North Vietnamese can keep the war going indefinitely . . . just so long as our planes are forbidden to attack such strategic targets as their supply ports. The Communists know that the longer the war continues, the higher the ransom they can demand. And *their* goal, at least, is victory.

The Nixon vs. Nixon dialogue on Red China is yet another case in point. While campaigning for the Presidency in 1960, Richard Nixon said of Red China's leaders:

Their aim is the world and we must constantly keep this in mind . . . The Chinese Communists at the present time are international criminals. They're threatening us in Formosa. They're threatening free people in Korea . . . we have got to tell all of those who are international criminals, and that is those who use force to extend their aggression, that crime doesn't pay, because, if it does pay, they're going to use it. It's just as simple as that.

Citizen Nixon long represented himself as a staunch opponent of admitting Red China to the United Nations, even joining the Committee of One Million against admission of Red China to the international organization. In his book *Six Crises* Mr. Nixon wrote:

. . . admitting Red China to the United Nations would be a mockery of the provision of the Charter which limits its membership to "peace-loving nations." And what was most disturbing was that it would give respectability to the Communist regime which would immensely increase its power and prestige in Asia, and probably irreparably weaken the non-Communist governments in that area . . .

I would not recognize Red China now, and I would not agree to admitting it to the United Nations, and I wouldn't go along with those well-intentioned people that said, "trade with them" because that may change them. Because doing it now would only encourage them, the hardliners in Peking and the hardline policy they're following. And it would have an immense effect in discouraging great numbers of non-Communist elements in Free Asia that are now just beginning to develop their own confidence.

But by 1971 President Nixon had relaxed trade restrictions with Red China; endorsed Red China's admission to the United Nations; and announced a visit to Peking without consulting, or even informing, any of our faithfully anti-Communist allies in Asia. Japan, for one, now realizes that it has been left holding the bag. While encouraging our friends to maintain an anti-Communist course, President Nixon has made his deal with Mao. The leaders of the free Asian nations don't wish to be dominated by the Chinese Reds, but they are practical men. They will now move toward Peking or the Soviet Union to try to make the best deal possible.

Repercussions of President Nixon's visit to Red China are also being felt in Latin America. As Ernest Cuneo pointed out in *Human Events*: "The result is a

virtual diplomatic stampede by our former allies, both West and East, to reach understandings with Moscow and Peking similar to those sought by the U.S." Radical columnist Stanley Karnow gloats: "Spokesmen for the current remnant of the once-powerful China Lobby publicly assert, like their forebears, that their efforts are being thwarted by Peking's deliberate or unwitting agents in the United States. But in reality, they concede, their anti-Communist drive has been deflated by one man — Richard Nixon."

President Nixon has claimed that "normalizing" relations with Red China will bring about an era of peace. But Chairman Mao is one of the few world leaders who does not even pretend to be a peace-lover. "Political power grows out of the end of a gun," he has written. "The world can be remolded only with a gun."

Mr. Nixon had long taken the position that there could be no change in our policy towards the Red Chinese — who, according to a recent report by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, have exterminated nearly 64 million of their own people — until Mao and his "international gangsters" mended their ways. But the Chinese have not even bothered to pretend, actually stepping up their shipment of arms to African guerrillas even as Mr. Nixon was taking off to kowtow in Peking.

It now seems fantastic that the cornerstone of Richard Nixon's rise to political power was his apparent opposition to both Communism and Socialism. In fact Nixon often equated the two. As he phrased it back in 1952: "There's one difference between the Reds and the Pinks. The Pinks want to socialize America. The Reds want to socialize the world and make Moscow the world capital. Their paths are similar; they have the same Bible — the teachings of Karl Marx."

The basis of socialism, of course, is Big Government — bureaucracy, controls, deficit spending, and inflation. In a pam-

phlet entitled "The Nixon Stand," Candidate Nixon declared: "If I were to pick one major issue in this 1968 election in which the candidates have a basic disagreement, it is with regard to the role of government. There are some who believe the way to a better society is for government to get bigger and bigger — which means the rights and responsibilities of people will get smaller and smaller."

Candidate Nixon presented himself as the country's last chance to save itself from being thrown to the mercy of Big Government and an omnipotent state. At Williamsburg, Virginia, he declared: "That is why I have been saying that the choice in this election year is perhaps the most important in our lives. If we fail to seize this moment, if we let slip this chance to recapture our personal freedom — the moment may never come again in our lifetime."

Millions of Americans voted for Mr. Nixon in the belief that he would carry out his campaign promises and put the government in a shrinking machine to save personal freedom. It was not to be. Richard Nixon discarded that campaign promise the day after the election.

Some diligent soul who made a count of the number of federal administrative agencies in the Nixon Administration came up with more than 2,400. Congressman William Roth (R-Delaware) assigned to his staff the task of calculating the number of federal aid programs in existence, and the total came to 1,315 as of September 1969 — 225 more than the previous year under Lyndon Johnson. According to Congressman Wright Patman, there are nearly 1,600 advisory committees and commissions in the Executive branch alone. By early in his Administration, Richard Nixon had added forty to that total.

Identifying 5,315 federal programs, bureaus, and commissions, President Nixon announced that he had found fifty-seven that he thought he could get along without. He declared courageously,

for example, that he thought the Republic could survive without a bureau of tea tasters. But, at last report, those fifty-seven bureaus, including the doughty tea tasters, were still running full tilt. After listening to Mr. Nixon's 1972 State of the Union message, a disgusted Congressman John Ashbrook remarked:

On the domestic front, there does not appear to be a single area in which the President sees no role for the Federal Government. In no field does he advocate ending or even cutting back an existing government program, no matter how ineffective. The march of new bureaucracy, new deficits, and new controls continues without a pause. This, apparently, is what the President's New American Revolution is all about. It seems to me more like the New American Regimentation.

Every program advocated by Richard Nixon in the last four years has been designed to increase the power of government — even those, like Revenue Sharing, which were said to have exactly the opposite effect. Mr. Nixon's Revenue Sharing program actually centralizes the power it pretends to decentralize. As soon as the states and local governments become dependent on the federal funding he proposes, controls will be applied as they were in education and agriculture. No political institution of any kind, at any time in history, ever gave away anything with no strings attached. You can't decentralize government by centralizing the tax collections.

The Revenue Sharing plan would not reduce state or local taxes, but add to federal taxes. According to Dr. Arthur Burns, it will probably raise even state and local taxes. As Republican *Battle Line* reports:

Indeed, the revenue-sharing provision of the Nixon Plan might lead

to even higher state taxes, admitted presidential aide Dr. Arthur Burns, because the Federal share paid to each state would be based on the state's matching taxes — the higher the state tax, the more they would get back from Washington.

Mr. Nixon's Revenue Sharing program, which is expected to pass during this election year, does not share revenue but debts. The federal government has no money to share since it is itself running deeply in the red.

Federal spending is an excellent barometer of whether government is getting bigger or smaller. In 1968, Candidate Nixon again and again attacked the profligate spending of the Johnson Administration. Candidate Nixon forecast economic ruin if government spending were not slashed to the marrow. He claimed that every day President Johnson put off the necessary reduction in federal spending "he places in greater jeopardy the entire international monetary structure." Broadcasting over C.B.S. radio on April 25, 1968, The Candidate claimed that "only by cutting the federal Budget can we avert an economic disaster..." Mr. Nixon denounced the "old politics of spend-and-elect" and told his supporters: "We need a government in Washington that will recognize that economics is more than a question of politics..."

An Associated Press dispatch dated October 26, 1968, quoted The Candidate as stating: "My administration will be one in which we are going to do what is necessary but with less money. That policy, directed toward achieving a balanced Budget, will stop the rise in prices and lead to a reduction in taxes." In a formal position paper on the economy, he proclaimed: "The entire Budget needs exhaustive review.... Some programs... must accept less than maximum funding; non-essentials... must await easier times; every major program... must be scoured for economies."

Lyndon Johnson's 1967 Budget — at the height of the Vietnam War — was a bloated \$158 billion, which at the time seemed astronomical. While on the primary trail, Mr. Nixon claimed that if that amount were not sliced by \$10 billion, the country would face fiscal disaster. In 1968, Johnson fattened the Budget to a staggering \$183 billion. For fiscal 1969, however, *Richard Nixon* introduced what was astonishingly described as a "bare bones" Budget of \$192 billion. Before the year was out, the "bare bones" had been fleshed out to \$200 billion. What had been denounced as profligate spending under L.B.J. was now said to be tightfisted frugality. President Nixon's 1972-1973 Budget calls for spending of \$246.5 billion. That is \$96.5 billion more than Mr. Nixon claimed L.B.J. should have been spending at the height of the Vietnam War in 1967.*

Under Richard Nixon, government spending is up over one-third, despite the fact that the cost of the Vietnam War is down two-thirds. Remember when we couldn't afford four years of Hubert Humphrey?

You will remember also that President Johnson's deficit spending was a major target of the Nixon attack in 1968. As the Candidate pointed out: "The total deficit run up in the Budget of the Johnson years will amount to more than \$55 billion. The massive deficit has wracked and dislocated the economy; this massive deficit has plunged the free world monetary system into a profound crisis of credibility." It is obvious from reading Mr. Nixon's 1968 speeches that he thoroughly understands that the relationship between deficits and inflation is the same as that of matches and fire. As a candidate, Richard Nixon explained:

What is inflation? Technically, it is an excess of money over goods in the economy. As a result the value of money goes down, your dollar buys less. In fact today the dollar

has 17 cents less buying power than it had at the end of the Eisenhower Administration. Over the last three years alone inflation has totalled more than ten percent and in recent months has been proceeding at an annual pace of almost six percent.

Where does the new money come from? The Candidate answered correctly:

... There is no mystery about what causes inflation. It springs from the desire of politicians to bestow upon the people more favors than the people are prepared immediately to pay for. In every year since 1961, the federal government has spent more money than it has taken in....

When federal expenditures are enormously more than federal revenues, the politicians pursuing popularity through inflation turn to the Federal Reserve system and create money literally out of thin air. To finance the Treasury, the Federal Reserve system has expanded the money supply at a breathtaking rate. During 1967, the money supply grew at 7 percent, the fastest rate of growth in the entire period since World War II.

This new money which the Federal Reserve system creates "out of thin air" takes on value as it is spent only by taking away from the value of every other dollar already in circulation — the dollars in your wallet, insurance policies, and savings accounts. You will notice that during the campaign Mr. Nixon did not resort to the hypocrisy of blaming inflation (or technically, and more accurately, an increase in the money supply) on businessmen, labor unions, or the "inflationary psychology." None of these can

*A billion dollars in added government spending costs the average family about \$25 in direct and hidden taxes. Calculate your share.

create new money, and it is new money injected into the economy by government which bids up wages and prices. You can't have a wage-price spiral throughout an economy unless the government is creating new money. "Deficit spending," said Candidate Nixon, "is the cause of our present inflation."

Candidate Nixon called inflation "the cruelest tax of all" and noted that Lenin believed inflation to be the surest way to destroy the capitalist system. The Candidate told a C.B.S. radio audience:

Tonight I want to discuss a major cause both of centralization and of frustration in the Great Society, namely, inflation of the currency and the cost of living. John Maynard Keynes once quoted Lenin as saying, "The best way to destroy the capitalist system is to debauch the currency." Keynes explained that: "By a continuing process of inflation, governments can confiscate, secretly and unobserved, an important part of the wealth of their citizens . . ."

This is the danger we face if current policies are pursued . . . The continuing process of dollar debauchery is today robbing our citizens of their wealth and aggrandizing the power of Washington.

His campaign statements reveal that Richard Nixon has a better grasp of economics than any President in decades. He knows exactly what he is doing to us . . . but he does it anyway. Mr. Nixon's 1970 Budget plummeted \$13.1 billion in the red. For fiscal 1971, he promised a balanced Budget. In introducing it to Congress he announced that he was keeping his promise, boasting: "I pledged to the American people that I would submit a balanced Budget for 1971." And he proclaimed: "The surplus for 1971, an estimated \$1.3 billion, will serve both to stem persistent inflationary pressures and

to relieve hard-pressed financial markets." He added: "We must balance our Federal Budget so that American families will have a better chance to balance their family budgets." That year the Nixon deficit reached a crushing \$25.6 billion, an "error in calculation" of almost \$27 billion. Meanwhile the federal deficit has increased *three hundred percent*.

By 1971, continued deficits had the Nixon Administration in deep trouble. With Mr. Nixon refusing to keep his promise to eliminate or cut back on the Great Society programs, all originally opposed by the G.O.P., the federal Budget was out of control. New money resulting from the Nixon red ink was fueling the wage-price spiral faster than ever. Naturally, President Nixon picked this time to admit to newsman Howard K. Smith that he is "now a Keynesian in economics."

While the current batch of economists tries to disguise the late John Maynard Keynes as a "capitalist economist" who only wanted to save the system from itself, Keynes made no bones about what his system was designed to do, openly bragging that its adoption would mean the "euthanasia of capitalism." An ardent Fabian Socialist, he was not only a sex pervert of the worst sort, but boasted as early as February 22, 1918, of "being a bolshevik." Lenin praised him before the Second Congress of the Communist International as being "more striking and more instructive" than any of his homegrown Communist revolutionaries.

Whether Keynes' motive was the hatred for normal society so common in sex perverts, or his devotion to the cause of the Fabian Socialists, is unimportant. What he did was to devise a system in which it is claimed that inflation by deficit spending can produce perpetual prosperity. Keynesian economics is a fraud. It does everything that Candidate Nixon said it does; it distorts the economy, produces inflation, and centralizes political and economic control in the federal government.

In February 1971, Mr. Nixon introduced a \$230 billion Budget, described by the *Wall Street Journal* as a "blockbuster." It called for a planned deficit of \$11.6 billion. In announcing his scheme the President claimed: "The [Keynesian] full employment budget is in the nature of a self-fulfilling prophecy: By operating as if we were at full employment, we will help to bring about that full employment." Even Keynes would have blushed.

Commenting on the "new" Nixon and his Full Employment Budget, James Reston observed in the *New York Times*: "Washington doesn't quite know what to make of all this. He swallowed Lord Keynes in one gulp. He announced the biggest Budget deficit of the century as if it were the first article in the Republican catechism, and he embraced most of the old Democratic economic devils like long-lost buddies." In his column of February 3, 1971, Reston cheered:

The Nixon Budget is so complex, so unlike the Nixon of the past, so un-Republican that it defies rational analysis . . . The Nixon Budget is more planned, has more welfare in it, and has a bigger predicted deficit than any other Budget of this century.

Instead of the "planned" \$11.6 billion deficit for fiscal 1971-1972, the latest estimates calculate the deficit at \$39 billion. For fiscal 1972-1973, the Nixonites are planning a \$26 billion deficit. If the Administration's calculations are as far off as they have been in the past, the National Debt will go up in the next fiscal year by \$50 billion. Senator Harry Byrd informs us:

For the 4 years of his administration, President Nixon will have run a total Budget deficit of \$124 billion - this huge sum is far more than double the \$54 billion total deficit compiled during the last 4

years of the administration of President Johnson.

On June 30, 1969, the debt stood at \$367 billion. As of June 30, 1973, the administration forecasts that the debt will be \$493 billion. That is an increase of \$126 billion in 4 years.

When the total of \$493 billion is reached next year, one-fourth of that enormous total debt will have been incurred during the administration of President Nixon, in only 4 years.

Four years ago anyone who predicted such developments in a Nixon Administration would have been thought mad. I know, I predicted it in this magazine in 1968, and took quite a blistering for it from my friends at such normally Conservative journals as *Human Events*. They didn't want to believe that Richard Nixon, whom they saw as an advocate of anti-Communism and fiscal integrity, was a fraud. I didn't want to believe it either, but when my research showed it was true I said so.

At the rate Mr. Nixon is now increasing spending, we will have a \$300 billion Budget in two years, in comparison with "big spender" L.B.J.'s last Budget of \$183 billion. Under "Conservative" Richard Nixon, we aren't rushing headlong into Socialism, we're travelling by jet. As John Kenneth Galbraith says, under "the Nixon Game Plan . . . socialism is the name of the game." Little wonder that during the first three years of the Nixon Administration, the cost of living went up more than the total for the previous eight years under the Democrat "big spenders."

While on the campaign trail, Candidate Nixon referred to deficit spending as "psychedelic economics" which bring on "un-American controls." On October 23, 1968, he warned that the election of Hubert Humphrey would lead to disastrous wage and price controls. Here are The Candidate's words:

The psychedelic economics of the present Administration can lead to the police economics of wage and price controls, or to a major recession with widespread unemployment, as the economy's way to bring itself back into balance. My opponent already has indicated his probable choice: wage and price controls. . . . Let no one imagine that police economics merely contracts the freedom of a few corporations; in order to control wages and prices, it would be necessary to embark on a road from which it is very hard to escape without major damage to the freedom of all. I do not believe the American people should be forced to choose between unemployment and un-American controls. There is a further choice: the American way of responsible fiscal policy that allows the American people to be both affluent and free. If I am elected, I pledge that I will adopt this approach, redressing the present imbalances without increasing unemployment or controls.

A week earlier, Candidate Richard Nixon had advised:

Even the old leadership is alarmed about the highest rate of increase in the cost of living in almost two decades. Now, belatedly, my opponent is thinking of doing something about it. No, he's not thinking of cutting unnecessary spending programs. He's not thinking of cutting government waste, or reducing your tax burden. He's not thinking of treating the causes of the high cost of living today. The old leadership is thinking of treating the symptoms of inflation by bringing to bear the most harmful tool in the economist's kit: Wage and Price Controls.

As the election drew nearer, Mr. Nixon warned again about "police economics," using much the same language:

Let no one imagine that police economics merely contracts the freedom of a few corporations; in order to control wages and prices, it would be necessary to embark on a road from which it is very hard to escape without major damage to the freedom of all. If wage controls go in, the bargaining table will become a bureaucrat's desk — and there'll be no bargaining at all.

It can happen, unless you do something about it this November.

As President, Richard Nixon promised over and over again that he would never resort to controls on the economy because they never work. On June 17, 1970, he declared:

Now, here is what I will not do. I will not take this nation down the road of wage and price controls, however politically expedient that may seem. Controls and rationing may seem like an easy way out, but they are really an easy way in — to more trouble, to the explosion that follows when you try to clamp a lid on a rising head of steam without turning down the fire. . . .

Wage and price controls only postpone a day of reckoning. And in so doing, they rob every American of a very important part of his freedom. . . .

In a report to Congress in February 1971, the President reiterated what he said was his unalterable opposition to wage and price controls. In language that could not have been plainer, he announced: "I do not intend to impose wage and price controls which would substitute new, growing and more vexatious problems for the problems of inflation."

Yet on August 15, 1971, President Richard Nixon did what he promised he would never do: He instituted wage and price controls. The "Liberal" media had a field day praising the President for "doing something." Just as when he announced that he was traveling to Red China, the media boys worked overtime to create the appearance of popular support, and none so much as mentioned that it was Nixon's own policies of blockbuster Budgets and enormous deficits which were at the core of the problem his New Economic Policy was supposed to solve.

At a meeting on April 24, 1970, economist Milton Friedman emphasized the futility of the freeze mechanism: "We have two thousand years of history on this, aside from the economic analysis, and there is not a documented case in which wage and price controls ever had any significant effect on inflation." But wage and price controls do accomplish one thing. They put economic dictatorship in the hands of the President.

Originally, Mr. Nixon promised the nation that the wage and price controls would last only ninety days. Then came Phase II, lifted straight from Schacht's 1933 economic policy for Adolf Hitler,* and Nixon associates are making it plain that, as the *Wall Street Journal* put it: "Phase II is forever." Economist Murray Weidenbaum, a former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, describes our economic future this way: "After Phase Two, we will have Phases Three, Four and Five. We can never go back." Columnist T.R.B. of the openly socialist *New Republic* gloats at the death of Free Enterprise:

... the point is that the old laissez faire, free enterprise economy of supply-and-demand that Herbert Hoover used to worship now belongs pretty much to American folklore. It is naturally left to a Republican President to quietly accept the fact and to base his policy

upon it, all the while announcing that governmental controls are only temporary. Well, we imagine a lot of the controls will be dropped, sure enough; but we also guess that some will be kept from now on, and that things will never be the same again. This is a new era....

As Democrats ruefully remark, it all goes to prove that Mr. Nixon was wise to adopt a policy they urged. Indeed, he abandoned his aversion to Peking, Moscow, and a managed economy all at about the same time.

Columnist Marianne Means writes in the *Washington Star* for December 1, 1971, that even Lyndon Johnson is delighted with Mr. Nixon's socialist game plan:

Former President Lyndon B. Johnson acknowledges that Richard Nixon, as a Republican President, has been able to accomplish some things that a Democratic President could not have....

"Can't you just see the uproar," he asked during a recent interview, "if I had been responsible for Taiwan getting kicked out of the United Nations? Or if I had imposed sweeping national controls on prices and wages?"

"Nixon has gotten by with it," he observed, in an appreciative tone in his voice, "If I had tried to do it, or Truman, or Humphrey, or any Democrat, we would have been clobbered."

As John Kenneth Galbraith noted, there really isn't a dime's worth of difference. Even the *New York Times* recognizes what Richard Nixon has done:

*Hitler, like Nixon, was a great admirer of John Maynard Keynes — a fact which has long driven "Liberals" up the wall. Now it drives Nixon's defenders up the wall. And it should.

This Administration thus has narrowed the gap between the two major parties as the post-war Tory government narrowed it in Britain. The grand, stark alternatives no longer exist. Any Administration elected this year is going to have a wage-price policy, is going to try to have unbalanced budgets, provide subsidies and manage large social welfare programs. So far has this process gone in three years that many commentators ask: Are there any issues between the parties?

One is reminded of the "old" Nixon who told an audience in New York City on January 20, 1958:

If we have nothing to offer other than a pale carbon copy of the New Deal, if our only purpose is to gain and retain power, the Republican Party no longer has any reason to exist, and it ought to go out of business.

Who, besides George Wallace, is saying that today? Syndicated columnist Ernest Cuneo, for one. As he observes: "The President has practically appropriated the Democratic platform of 1968. There is scarcely an issue which the Democrats have raised which the President hasn't taken as part of his policies . . ." Nicholas von Hoffman, the resident radical of the "ultra-Liberal" *Washington Post*, compliments the President in a December column:

Programmatically, Nixon appears to be far closer to a liberal Democrat than anything but a

Rockefeller Republican . . . there's hardly a comparison between the two men. Kennedy was an inflexible anti-Communist with none of Richard Nixon's talent for moving toward a worldwide accommodation with the other side.

And Max Lerner, the old Marxist, laughs in his column:

Pity the poor conservative, who must swallow his principles and pride and cheer raggedly for a President off in pursuit of strange gods under alien Chinese and Russian skies . . . Had Humphrey been elected in 1968, and had he adopted such policies, the whole Republican Party, headed by Mr. Nixon, would be in full pursuit of him today for having sold American security down the river. If Mr. Nixon should fail in his reelection bid, and someone like Muskie, Kennedy or Lindsay should carry his détente-with-the-East policies further, Mr. Nixon might again reverse his field and take charge of a campaign against them, or if he were no longer credible, Melvin Laird might.

This prospect doesn't console the conservatives. But they have nowhere to go, no one else to support. I think they will settle for Mr. Nixon, betrayal and all.

Frankly, the only answer I know to that is probably a little too earthy for this magazine. But, for the edification of Max Lerner and Mr. Nixon's other new pals, here it is: **The hell we will!! ■ ■**

CRACKER BARREL

- Those who have the new "easy to read" Treasury pamphlets on making out income taxes are now looking for something that will make the tax "easy to pay."
- Granting we do not know the age of the human race, almost everyone agrees it is old enough to know better.
- All that is most worthy in a man, he must work out and conquer for himself.
- To starvation the Reds add chains.