

THE ISSUES, 1972

The Phony Quixote And The Windmill

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University, is author of *Communist Revolution In The Streets*; Richard Nixon: *The Man Behind The Mask*; Nixon's Palace Guard; and, *None Dare Call It Conspiracy* — a sensational new best-seller with 6 million copies already in print. 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.

■ Now that radical Democrats have completed making a fool of the Party of Jefferson and Jackson in front of 50 million or so television viewers, the people in Keokuk, Peoria, and Paducah are waiting with anxiety to see the championship jousting match between Senator Quixote of South Dakota and the national windmill. Poor Quixote! He doesn't know the match is fixed, and that he is about to get clonked on the cabeza by the real pros. Or, to change the metaphor, McGovern is about to discover that in the N.F.L. of politics the referees often look the other way while the defense holds and you get clipped from behind by those you thought to be on your side.

Of course the real victims of this business are not the incredible Mr. McGovern and his pride of puberty-stricken zealots, but the millions of ordinary Americans who watched the Great Freak Show that was the Democrat National Convention. George McGovern frightens them more than the Two-Headed Man.

And, in this election year, fear is the name of the game.

Time for July 10, 1972, carried a caption entitled "Why Is Richard Nixon Smiling?" Under those words one read: "Of all the possible Democratic nominees, the Republicans regard George McGovern as the most vulnerable." After all, six months ago you could get larger odds on George McGovern capturing the Democrat nomination than on Phyllis Diller being chosen Miss America. True, true. And you may have seen the bumper sticker which proclaims: "Listen to McGovern — He'll Scare Hell Out Of You." If you do, he will. That is what the game is all about.

To understand what is happening you must remember that in 1968 Hubert Humphrey stumped the country promising deficit spending, wage and price controls, a deal with Red China, disarmament treaties with the Soviets, bussing children for racial purposes, a guaranteed annual income, and a federal spending program for every conceivable notion known to man or beast. Richard Nixon, of course, denounced the radicalism of Humphrey's programs in the most somber and convincing tones. Then, after the election, Mr. Nixon implemented what the radical Humphrey could only promise.

This year the *Insiders* of the Establishment could not again trot out poor old Humphrey, for Nixon had pre-empted all his programs. It was necessary to up the ante; to escalate to the Left so as to justify further collectivism after Mr. Nixon is reelected. Arthur Schlesinger Jr. suggested the nature of the game in the

New Republic for February 26, 1972. According to the junior Schlesinger:

This is a perplexing presidential year for the Democrats. It is perplexing first because President Nixon and his razzle-dazzle, hidden-ball strategy have made it so. There was a comforting predictability about the Nixon of our youth. While not giving him credit for depth of conviction, students of the old Nixon did suppose that, if he believed in anything, he believed in two ultimate propositions: the sanctity of the free market and the wickedness of Communism. Then . . . last summer, without a backward look or apologetic word, he dumped both beliefs and embraced J.K. Galbraith and Mao Tse-tung. It shakes one's faith in human nature . . .

Does anyone really suppose, for example, that if the Democratic candidate had won in 1968, an American President would now be on his way to Peking?

And this suggests the fourth essential quality for the Democratic nominee: he must be bold and forthright on policy. Otherwise President Nixon may well move out ahead of him. In China and, to a degree, in price control, the President did succeed in outflanking the Democrats. Given the political impact of these moves, he will doubtless be tempted by further moves of the same sort. If the Democrats choose a cautious nominee, reluctant to expose himself, to express commitments or to go out on limbs, this will make it easy for the President to move out in front. Here again the argument points to McGovern. More than the others, he has addressed himself lucidly and courageously to the large issues; he would be the hardest man for Nixon to outflank [on the Left].

True enough. But McGovern's radicalism has already produced in Middle America a powerful response that can only be characterized as fear. The real flanking will begin after the election when, in the name of "unifying the country" or some such drivel, Mr. Nixon will begin co-opting the McGovern program just as he did that of Hubert Humphrey.

At present, the media abound with discussion of the "issues" of the upcoming campaign. These issues will turn out to be more apparent than real, but on the surface there now appears to be much more than a dime's worth of difference between contestants McGovern and Nixon. Let us see how much of that difference is genuine.

McGOVERNOMICS

THE economic proposals of George McGovern are genuine mind-bogglers — strictly Tinker to Evers to Marx. Or, more appropriately, Galbraith to Keynes to Marx. Robert Sam Anson, McGovern's official biographer, admits:

The economy is another field where McGovern has found it difficult to develop any interest or expertise. Generally his friends, not to mention his critics, cite economics as McGovern's weakest point, both politically and intellectually. Once again the reason seems boredom, an unwillingness or inability to cope with the technical details of a complex subject.

Still, the fact that federal spending has only doubled in the last decade does concern McGovern. He has shaken himself from boredom long enough to devise schemes for doubling government spending once again. The Senator's pink pipe dreams include a \$10 billion plan aimed at producing 2.6 million new "public service" jobs; an eight-fold increase, to \$24 billion, in federal aid to schools; a

\$43 billion family-allowance program; a \$33 billion socialized-medicine plan; the spending of \$25 billion to assure millions of new government-owned homes . . . and the list goes on and on. As columnist Ralph de Toledano gasps:

If Senator George McGovern is elected President of the United States — and if he implements but some of his campaign promises — the federal budget will be doubled and the federal bureaucracy tripled.

Every one of these programs, the good and the bad, will not only reach into the Treasury but will also create its separate bureaucracy, riveted eternally to the public trough. And, it should be noted, what has been presented in these two columns is but part of the McGovern largesse. Those economists who estimate that George McGovern's programs will add another \$200 billion to the present federal budget may be too modest in their prognostications.

And how does the Democrat candidate propose to pay for his psychedelic spending program? Why, by tax reform. As Congressman John Schmitz points out, "tax reform" is a euphemism which politicians use when what they want is a tax increase. George McGovern is making such "tax reform" a central theme of his campaign in spite of the fact that according to *U.S. News & World Report* for June 26, 1972: "Mr. McGovern has voted for most of the federal taxes now on the books." Of course the object of McGovern's "tax reform" is to put an even bigger bite on the taxpayer — especially corporations. *Time* of June 26, 1972, reveals that under the McGovern scheme:

Business taxes would be raised by anywhere from \$13 billion to \$17 billion, depending on what

McGovern statements one reads, but even at minimum this would be a whopping 39% raise. This would be accomplished by knocking out breaks for corporations that have been written into law since 1960. The two chief benefits to be removed are accelerated depreciation and the 7% tax credit on investments in new or modernized plants and machinery.

That is, with America's plants and machinery already falling behind those of Western Europe and Japan, McGovern would make things worse by encouraging obsolescence. This can only mean an unfavorable balance of trade and massive unemployment.

Much of the Senator's appeal to the New Left is rooted in his promise to "soak the rich." According to the candidate:

I propose a minimum income tax so that the rich could not avoid their share of the tax burden no matter what loopholes they used. One possible formula would be a minimum income tax to apply to all those with total incomes in excess of \$50,000. The entire income of any person in this range would be subject to payment of taxes of 75 percent of the current statutory rates at the rate they would have to pay if there were no loopholes If this minimum income tax were now in effect it would bring in approximately \$5 billion during the present fiscal year and \$6 billion in fiscal 1973.

Anybody who thinks that a measly \$6 billion in increased tax collections is going to float George McGovern's astronomical spending programs would believe that you could cover Pike's Peak with a Band-Aid.

In an Iowa speech last January, Mc-

Government talked of inheritance taxes and advocated "a ceiling on the amount that might be received and place a 100 percent tax on all gifts and inheritances above that amount." When the flak hit the fan, the Senator soon backed off this plan and proposed to reduce the rate of confiscation to a mere 77 percent. He explained his reason in *Business Week* of May 27, 1972:

This is one thing that amazed me. We got more criticism from working people on anything approaching a 100% tax than we did from business people. I've had a lot of businessmen tell me: "Look, I don't want to leave my kid more than half a million; it'll ruin him." But a lot of these workers say it's un-American to tax anyone at 100% on anything. So I decided the thing was unworkable.

Of course, "workers" know very well that the great fortunes are already protected from inheritance taxes in tax-free foundations. They reasoned, correctly, that McGovern's proposal is just another Marxist program aimed at confiscating their accumulated capital. Even so, this proposed "reform" would net only about \$5 billion to throw on the fires of federal spending — an amount which would fuel the McGovern spending program for about four days.

Senator McGovern means to redistribute the wealth, and that means massive taxation. Under his plan every one of us — man, woman, and child — would receive an annual "grant" from the government, regardless of income or assets. The figure usually used for this "grant" is \$1,000 per head. But, "it might be \$900 or \$1,007.64," McGovern equivocates. Assuming this range, the McGovern plan would mean that we would receive \$1,000 per person, which would be added to our taxable income. Thus a family of four would be ahead only if its total

income (including the \$4,000) came to less than \$12,000; anyone earning more than that figure would face a sharp tax increase. After all, the \$1,000 "grants" have to come from somewhere! Above \$20,000 the tax rate would bound into the stratosphere.

Even "Liberal" columnist Sylvia Porter is shocked at this plan. She writes that if you are a member of the middle class:

... the redistribution of wealth would mean it's YOUR wealth that is being redistributed. A huge portion of the money could come from nowhere else but you — and the higher your earnings, the bigger the bite on you.

The productive and creative middle class would bear the brunt of McGovern's Marxist program. Economist Henry Hazlitt has calculated that if the top tax rate were reduced to 50 percent, the government would lose less money than it spends in *one day!* *Business Week* quotes George McGovern's economic advisor, Dr. James Tobin, as maintaining: "We simply cannot do the job for the poor in this country entirely by taking money from the rich." Paraphrasing Karl Marx, Senator McGovern says he believes: "Each American should pay his fair share, and each American should receive his fair share." *Time* explains the significance of this as follows:

To him that means... incomes would be leveled. Corporate taxes would rise sharply. The Government would take over more of the planning of investment. The American economy would come to resemble Western Europe's, with high social spending, low defense spending and more central direction....

But one thing is clear; in tone and direction, his program is a design for the most basic change in

the nation's economy, and indeed its whole society, since the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt.

That leveling of incomes is the key. As the great family fortunes are protected in tax-free foundations, the middle class would be destroyed — condemned to the eternal slavery of supporting (in the manner to which they intend to become accustomed) those who won't or can't work. One can see why welfare Brood Mothers, professional students, hippies, and the lazy in general are enthralled with the idea of a McGovernment. Why work when you can vote yourself a living?

The McGovern economic program is obvious insanity. When McGovern's proposed spending programs are added up and compared with his proposed cuts in Defense spending and tax increases, one still comes up with a deficit in the federal Budget of something like \$150 billion a year. The monetizing of this kind of deficit would produce absolute runaway inflation in a very short time. Compounding the problem would be the fact that increased corporation taxes would also be passed on to the consumer in the form of higher prices.

NIXONOMICS

ONLY among the insane does madness seem normal. If it were not for the absolutely insane proposals of George McGovern, the economic madness of the Nixon Administration would be a major issue in this election year.

During the 1968 campaign, profligate spending by the Johnson Administration was a major object of Candidate Nixon's oratorical fire bombs. Lyndon Johnson's 1968 Budget was a staggering \$183 billion. But, despite campaign promises about bringing federal spending back to reality, the 1972-1973 Nixon Budget calls for spending at the rate of \$246 billion — an increase of \$63 billion in just four years. This means that, under Richard Nixon, government spending

has skyrocketed an unbelievable 33 percent.

Before departing for less harried climes, Professor Paul McCracken, former chairman of Mr. Nixon's Council of Economic Advisors, proclaimed that the federal Budget was "in a quite literal sense out of control." According to Congressman Daniel J. Flood, Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare, spending by those Departments is now in excess of \$100 billion per year. As Congressman Flood observed:

I was here in 1962 — only 10 years ago — when the budget for the operation of the entire federal government was \$100 billion. Today, in one appropriation bill, just two of the many departments of government — Labor and Health, Education and Welfare — will be handed that much or more to spend in one year

A recent Brookings Institution study reported that "in the space of ten short years, Federal civilian expenditures as a percentage of G.N.P. almost doubled." And, thanks to Richard Nixon, there is no end in sight. At the rate that the Nixon Administration has been escalating spending, a \$300 billion Budget may be only a few years away.

Closely attuned to this spending is the corresponding rise in the national debt. During 1968, one of Candidate Nixon's pet themes (and a valid one) was that the huge deficits run up by Lyndon Johnson were the real cause of inflation, because these debts are monetized (turned into fiat money) through the banking system. This new money takes on value only by taking away from the value of all other money already in circulation. The money resulting from the government deficits then percolates through the economy, bidding up wages and prices. Candidate

Nixon told us in 1968, quite accurately, that the wage-price spiral was not in itself inflation, but was the result of inflating the money supply. After the election, however, Mr. Nixon refused to cut federal spending and escalated the federal deficits. 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 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, 1972, 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.

Instead of cutting government spending to ease inflation, Mr. Nixon did what Hubert Humphrey said he would do — and what Mr. Nixon had sworn over and over that he would not do. He applied wage and price controls to the economy. Temporary ones, of course. About as temporary as the Rock of Gibraltar. Now the "temporary" ninety-day controls have turned into Phase II, and as the *Wall Street Journal* noted: "Phase II is forever." Milton Friedman, a former Nixon economic advisor, 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 and spell the end of the Free Enterprise system. Columnist T.R.B. of the openly Socialist *New Republic* gloats:

... 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 denouncing that governmental controls are only temporary. Well, we imagine a lot of the controls will be dropped; but we also guess that some will be kept from now on, and that things will never be the same again . . .

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.

Meanwhile, as inflation booms and Mr. Nixon chides George McGovern for his frightening rhetoric about raising taxes, a tax increase is being planned by the Nixon Administration. Columnist Sylvia Porter reports:

Another massive tax reform law is now a certainty. It could be passed as early as 1973. It well may outrival the historic Tax Reform Act of 1969. It easily could be the most revolutionary tax law in modern times.

It doesn't matter who wins in November — whether a Republican or a Democrat occupies the White House and what newcomers sit in the Senate and the House. It doesn't matter whether the legisla-

tion originates with the President or with leaders of Congress, nor does it matter who pushes the hardest for action. And it doesn't matter who you are or what your income bracket is — you'll be affected.

Miss Porter claims that the game plan calls for Mr. Nixon to *surrender to the pressure* of George McGovern for "tax reform." She writes:

Meanwhile, it's no secret that President Nixon has been pushed into a position where he must announce some of his own tax reform proposals during the campaign. In the words of one highly placed official, "He will." Nixon well might back the revolutionary proposal to limit tax exemption of state and municipal securities.

George Shultz, the President's new Secretary of the Treasury, has already announced that a "tax increase may be the only means of undertaking large new social programs" — like the President's plan for a guaranteed annual income to support the indolent. Only something as mad as McGovern's wild-eyed scheme to provide every American with a \$1,000 grant could make Richard Nixon's Family Assistance Program look Conservative by comparison. You see, the Nixon F.A.P. would put *only* 24 million Americans on a permanent federal dole. What a bargain! As the Eternal Playwright might have said, "The tax man cometh."

Mr. Nixon, you see, is only surrendering to the inevitable. Presidential economist Pierre Rinfret has it all figured out. After describing McGovern as "an economic Socialist" who "represents the socialist economic trends in the U.S.," he explained the situation for the *Los Angeles Times* of July 18, 1972:

Rinfret said he thought McGovern's proposals would have a strong

effect on Congress, even if he lost the election, because they reflect a basic trend. "We're fighting a rear-guard action," he said, referring to advocates of free capitalism. "The trend is as immutable as the sands of time."

The President's economic advisor is saying that Socialism is inevitable no matter who wins the election. So why fight it? Whether Rinfret knows it or not, this has been a major theme of Communists of all stripes since Karl Marx codified the Conspiracy's economic program in the *Communist Manifesto* of 1848.

And the fact is that Richard Nixon has been pursuing Socialist strategies ever since he was elected. McGovern's chief economic advisor, John Kenneth Galbraith, wrote in *New York* magazine for September of 1971 that under "the Nixon Game Plan... Socialism is the name of the game." And even Michael Harrington, National Chairman of the Socialist Party, admits that Nixon is taking us into Socialism. In a communication dated February 11, 1972, and sent to all members of the Socialist Party, Harrington coined the phrase "Conservative Collectivism" to describe the Big Business Socialism of Richard Nixon and his fellow *Insiders*. He pointed to "pervasive federal regulation, planning, and spending," and noted cheerily that the Nixon Administration has drifted to the Left of John Maynard Keynes, the queer British advocate of massive deficit spending.

Price and wage controls and the largest deficits since Franklin Roosevelt, Chairman Harrington contends, are "collectivist techniques to enhance corporate wealth" and to perpetuate an "outrageous maldistribution of income." You see, says the Chairman of the Socialist Party, "there is no longer any question whether the future is going to be collectivist; the present is becoming so more every day at the urging of sophisticated

conservatives"... by which he means Richard Nixon.

Speaking of Nixon, Harrington actually declares that "the democratic Left cannot afford to be less radical than the sophisticated Right." And, he concludes: "The issue, these developments indicate, is no longer whether we are going to be collectivist, but how.... I suppose that, as a longtime democratic Socialist, I should be enthusiastic about this belated Republican recognition of one of the most fundamental of Marxian truths — that the essentially social means of production constituted by our interdependent technology requires a social mode of production; i.e., conscious planning and control. In part, I am. But I am also concerned because this Marxist truth is being championed by businessmen who hardly have Socialist goals in mind...."

Which is exactly the point. Richard Nixon and his *Insider* friends are using Socialism, as it has always been used by a handful of *Insiders*, to establish their own dictatorial control.

THE CONSERVATIVE POSITION

A Conservative candidate would inform the public that the only honest tax reform must include a serious cut in government spending. He would promise to balance the Budget to control inflation and would eliminate the dictatorial wage and price controls. He would make a move to get government out of the Health, Education and Welfare business. He would demand an end to the Welfare State which is impoverishing the American middle class, and promise to get government off our backs.

McGOVERN ON DEFENSE

IF McGovernomics is calculated (we use the word carefully) to frighten most Americans, his Defense policies are designed to create blind terror. Writing in *The Humanist* for November-December 1971, Senator McGovern declared:

I see a \$31 billion slice of pie that we can carve out of the federal budget today and reapportion tomorrow. A billion dollars could be cut from allocations for the SST and things like the ABM. Another \$8 billion need not be spent in Vietnam.... Seven billion dollars would be released if we cut our forces in Western Europe by one-half, or at least asked the Europeans to pay half the cost of support. Fifteen billion dollars might be added... by making an across-the-board cut in that monstrosity called the military appropriations budget.

The military, you see, is a monster. The *New York Times* for April 25, 1972, quotes the *Prairie Populist* as warning: "That military monster, now capable of blowing up the entire world a hundred times over, is devouring two out of three of our tax dollars. It inflates our economy, picks our pockets and starves other areas of our national life."

Of course this is purest bunkum. The "military monster" is *not* devouring two out of three tax dollars. The *San Diego Union* of March 27, 1972, notes: "In the new budget, defense accounts for only 32 percent of total federal spending [as compared with 65.8 percent in 1952] — the lowest percentage in 23 years — while spending for welfare, education, the environment and other 'human resources' programs accounts for fully 45 percent. The defense outlay also would represent a 22-year low in the portion of our gross national product devoted to national security — 6.4 percent."

So, you see, Senator McGovern is simply not telling the truth. It is, of course, perfectly all right to lie if one is a genuine, certified idealist and humanitarian. But this particular "humanitarian" not only lies but openly threatens our men in uniform. *Life* of July 7, 1972, quotes McGovern as follows:

The guys who are supposed to be the toughest of all — the Pentagon brass — they're going to find out I'm tough if I get to be President. I think that is going to be the chief test of the next President — whether he can stand up to the military — and I don't mean the Russians or the Chinese — I mean our own.

McGovern's biographer Robert Anson quotes him as saying of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: "I've been watching those guys make mistakes for the last twenty-five years. I can't wait to have a crack at them." According to *Time* of June twenty-sixth, "If McGovern had his way, more generals than rockets might be fired."

How, then, would we defend ourselves? We wouldn't. In an interview in the July 1971 *Playboy*, McGovern declared: "We ought to unilaterally halt any further missile development and then press for agreements with the Soviets on the A.B.M." Which, by the way, is just what Richard Nixon has done!

But McGovern proposes to save \$31 billion on the Defense budget to pour into Socialist programs by emasculating U.S. defenses. *Time* of June 26, 1972, summarizes these proposals:

McGovern's savings in strategic nuclear weapons would come mainly from phasing out the less versatile liquid-fueled Titan ICBM and reducing the strategic bombing force — on the grounds that the U.S.S.R. is cutting back its bombers and the U.S. needs only enough of them to complicate Soviet defensive planning.

McGovern thus sees no need to continue the program of placing more warheads within single missiles, for example in converting the Polaris submarines into the MIRVed Poseidon system or in

MIRVing the Minuteman ICBMs. The fact that the U.S. has been doing this, he argues, only ensures that the Russians will not stop until they deploy MIRVed missiles too

The candidate argues that the U.S. nuclear-submarine fleet alone is all that is really essential to deter an enemy from attacking, since there is no way to simultaneously locate, much less destroy, enough of these vessels. He sees the future of land ICBMs and bombers as limited, but considers their added deterrent value worth maintaining at their relatively low cost. He would modernize existing B-52 bombers rather than develop the new B-1 bomber. He applauds the SALT limitations on anti-ballistic-missile systems on the grounds that they are essentially ineffective.

Columnist Robert Allen summarizes McGovern's Defense proposals this way: "His broadaxed defense budget would drastically dismember the armed forces and literally reduce the U.S. militarily to a third-rate power. In effect, his extremist policy would disarm the U.S. unilaterally — at the very time the Soviet is intensifying the expansion of its military strength, particularly naval, air and space."

NIXON ON DEFENSE

DURING the 1968 campaign Mr. Nixon stressed that the United States must maintain unquestioned military superiority over the Soviets; a superiority, he said, which we are rapidly losing due to the dangerous policies of Robert Strange McNamara. Twelve days after taking the oath of office, Richard Nixon changed his tune and began humming a song about "sufficiency." The concept of "sufficiency" is the same as McGovern's prattle about "overkill." It is argued by both McGovern and Nixon that, if we have sufficient power to destroy the Soviet

Union, it makes no difference how much capability the Soviets possess. This tantalizing theory ignores the fact that we have foresworn a first strike, and that our capability must be measured in terms of our ability to absorb a Communist strike and then retaliate. Common sense infers that true nuclear "sufficiency" requires missiles and megatonnage far superior to that with which the Soviets are credited.

In his inaugural address, however, Mr. Nixon said that he would substitute an era of negotiation for the era of confrontation. Soon we were sitting down with the Soviets at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). This was used as an excuse for not developing any new weapons systems which might prove "provocative" or "de-stabilizing" — despite the fact that McNamara had scrapped three-fourths of our multi-megaton missiles; all our intermediate and medium-range missiles based in Europe and Turkey; three-fourths of our strategic bombers; the 24-megaton bomb, our largest weapon; our airborne alert; 23 anti-bomber missile batteries; and, our missile and bomber bases near the Soviet borders in Turkey, Italy, and North Africa.

Here are the Class A nuclear weapon systems which the disarmers abandoned or refuse to build: the second thousand Minutemen missiles which had originally been scheduled; an advanced supersonic strategic bomber which was actually built and successfully flown as early as 1965; an advanced bomber interceptor; the Skybolt air-to-surface long-range missile; space weapons such as the Pluto, Dynasoar, and Orion; and, all plans to make our missiles mobile by putting them on surface ships and freight trains.

If Mr. Nixon had really wanted to deal with the Russians from strength at the SALT talks, he would have begun a major effort to produce new strategic weapons. What kind of bargaining position are you in if you keep your deuces and throw away your aces? But, despite all the campaign promises and the formal com-

mitments of the Republican Party Platform, the Nixon Administration refused to push *production* of a single new weapons system.

The Nixon Administration has done nothing to alter the disastrous course of nuclear disarmament carried out for seven years by McNamara and his band of Whiz Kids. The Nixon Administration made no move to *build* new weapons, more missiles, more nuclear-armed submarines, any surface-to-surface missile ships, or to support *production* of an advanced strategic bomber.

Now President Nixon has signed the SALT treaty and it is awaiting approval by Congress. Columnist Robert Allen summarizes testimony against the SALT treaty already heard by Congress:

... under these treaties, Russia can build up its land and sea-based missile armaments as it had planned to do. That is, the Soviet is not prevented from doing what it had contemplated anyway. All the pacts do is to legitimize their strategic weapons build-up.

On the other hand, the agreements signed in Moscow put the U.S. in a strait-jacket that explicitly prevents it from further development of its strategic arms. Under this freeze, the U.S. is definitely put at a serious numerical inferiority in both ICBMs and submarines, while Russia is allowed to continue expanding its already huge arsenal of these cataclysmic weapons.

As a consequence, it is being argued, at the conclusion of the five-year duration of these accords, the U.S. will be perilously inferior and highly vulnerable in both land and sea-based missiles . . .

This key issue was sharply and forcefully spelled out by Senator Henry Jackson at a Hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee, as follows:

Within the five-year life of these agreements, that is by mid-1977, we will be in the position of having to ask the Soviet for parity. In other words, we will be asking them to give up in SALT II what they have gained in SALT I. Yet what possible reason is there to expect that the Soviet will be willing to do that? Or more to the point, what political and diplomatic concessions will we be forced to make so that the Soviet will not further widen their margin of superiority?

There was no answer from Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, to whom this penetrating question was addressed. Yet the SALT treaty is the basis for Mr. Nixon's 1972 campaign slogan: "Generation Of Peace."

In short, Richard Nixon has already dealt the devastating blow to America's defenses about which George McGovern is only talking.* And, Nixon has gone him one step further — actually proposing the surrender of America's arms to a World Authority. For details, see Dr. Medford Evans' analysis beginning on Page 37 of this issue of AMERICAN OPINION.

THE CONSERVATIVE POSITION

THE United States should have unquestioned military superiority over the Communists. Any disarmament treaty must provide for On-The-Spot inspection — an agreement which any sincere participant would readily make. The Communists, needless to say, have never been willing to agree to such inspection.

Cuts in our Defense budget probably would be practical. Some of what is included there has little if anything to do

*Current haggling is over the fact that the Nixon Administration has asked Congress for funds for developing (but not producing) the B-1 bomber and a new submarine — solely on the basis that these can be used as bargaining chips for the next round of SALT.

with defense. But a strong Conservative case must be made for basing our defense on technology instead of masses of marching men.

Under the proper circumstances it would be possible to withdraw many of our forces from Europe, maintaining a relatively small but well-equipped defense force there. But the prerequisite for any such move is election of a genuinely anti-Communist President in whom our European allies can have sufficient faith to maintain their own anti-Communist commitment in the face of Soviet power. Our troops are now in Europe for no other reason than to assure our allies that if the Soviets move against them America will respond. With a tough anti-Communist in the White House, the presence of such troops as *hostages to our commitment* would not be necessary.

Thus, if it were carefully done under the right circumstances, we might find it possible to cut as much from the Defense budget as George McGovern proposes. But the Democrat candidate is not advocating eliminating fat; he means to dismember our entire defense network.

What Conservatives must emphasize, however, is that while everyone is quaking at McGovern's mad-dog proposals, Mr. Nixon is actually in the process of accomplishing what McGovern is only talking about. Richard Nixon has already signed disarmament plans which formally assure the Soviets superior power. What Conservatives want is unquestioned military superiority. A vote for either Richard Nixon or George McGovern guarantees that we won't get it.

McGOVERN'S FOREIGN POLICY

THE *Wall Street Journal* of June 29, 1972, observed: "Perhaps the first point that should be made about George McGovern's foreign policy is that, in a fundamental way, he hasn't yet got one . . . Instead, his aides say he has the 'right instincts' about how America should conduct itself abroad . . ."

McGovern's "instincts" relative to Communism provide a clue to what his foreign policy would be like. His pro-Communist commitment goes back at least to the Henry Wallace campaign of 1948. At that time McGovern wrote a letter to the Mitchell, South Dakota, *Daily Republic* accusing it of joining "the anti-Russian, smear Wallace bandwagon." Young McGovern, arguing that the paper should favor both Russia and Henry Wallace, declared:

Millions of intelligent Americans who have made no effort to understand Communist Russia are now clamoring for dollars, battleships and bombs as a means of containing communism. . . . Under the blinding light of the current Red Scare, we are going all-out for nationalism, militarism, suspicion and power politics. Do we realize that we only show our loss of faith in the American dream when we foolishly hope to stop communism with dollars and bombs? . . .

A second popular illusion which has at least colored the Daily Republic, is that Russia is all wrong and the U.S. is virtually blameless. Russia has been pictured in the popular mind as a vile, imperialistic gangster. Uncle Sam, on the other hand, like mother's little boy, can do no wrong. Perhaps it is time to remind ourselves that it was Russia alone who saw the terrible danger of the Axis aggressors, and who pled for collective action to stop them as early as 1933. . . .

[Yes, Dr. McGovern, and who in 1939 signed the Ribbentrop alliance with Adolf Hitler!]

I take my hat off to this much-smearred man [Henry Wallace] who has had the fortitude to take his stand against those powerful forces of fear, militarism, nationalism and greed. I'm tired of listening to

the thoughtless jeers and charges of "crackpot" and "Communist" being thrown his way.

Well, maybe that was just youthful exuberance, unmoved by the fact that tens of millions of human beings had just disappeared behind the Iron Curtain into slavery. Some men would have grown up, but McGovern didn't. *Time* of May 8, 1972, quotes the South Dakota Senator as maintaining: "I liked what [Henry] Wallace had to say about foreign policy. I still think he was essentially right." And Senator McGovern added in an interview with *Life* of July 7, 1972:

. . . I supported Henry Wallace for a while in '48 — that was really hopeless — because he foresaw the revolutionary movements around the world, and felt as I did — that our foreign policy was becoming too militarized, too "get tough," and we were being identified with an order that was passing.

George McGovern, the former history professor, has learned nothing from history. He told *Playboy* of July 1971: "... we're going to have to abandon our paranoia about Russia's ambition to dominate the world." McGovern apparently did not read the *Chicago Tribune* for April 18, 1970, when Frank Starr, Chief of the Moscow Bureau for the Tribune News 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.

Even in the face of this, McGovern euphemized his rather incredible beliefs about Communism to *Playboy* as follows:

Speaking for myself. . . I'm willing to live in a world of diversity and I think we can get along with the Communists. If people want to be organized under a Communist system, we've got to accept the fact that this is their judgment to make. The Soviets may be in competition with us, but that doesn't mean we can't coexist peacefully with them. And I think the same thing is true of the [Red] Chinese. We have had the view too long that because they are Communists, they are our mortal enemies.

And, McGovern continued by expressing his glee that President Nixon has come around to his way of thinking about Communism:

I think even Nixon is beginning to see that. I mean, he seemed to enjoy being wined and dined in Romania by the Communist government. And he doesn't seem to be particularly disturbed about Communism in Yugoslavia. He even talks of being concerned about Czechoslovakia because of the difficulties with the Soviet Union. So I think even he is beginning to see that you can survive in the same world with Communists, that we don't have to get involved in any more holy crusades to "stem the Red Tide."

Since President Nixon's trip to Red China, and his signing of the SALT

agreements, the Senator must be even more excited about the Nixon conversion. After all, for over twenty years McGovern advocated that Red China be admitted to the United Nations and be recognized by the United States. He was certain that we had badly misjudged the kindly Mao. We formed S.E.A.T.O., he claimed, because of "mistaken beliefs . . . those holding that China seeks to, or can, conquer and dominate her Asian neighbors." He calls allegations that Mao is hostile to America a "pure myth." Red China's support for "wars of liberation" demonstrates that she, not unlike the Soviet Union, desires "to be the ideological center of the world revolution, but she seems to cherish with equal fervor her role as non-combatant."

On this subject, George McGovern sounds exactly like Richard Nixon in Peking. And, he is equally "progressive" in his attitude towards Castro. As early as 1963, McGovern was criticizing "our Castro-fixation." The South Dakotan told *Playboy*:

I don't know why we ever broke relations with Cuba. It was a mistake for the Eisenhower Administration to do it and to set up the invasion that John Kennedy later attempted to carry out. That's not the way to deal with a government whose ideology we happen to oppose. It was — and is — a mistake for the United States to be in a counter-revolutionary position in Latin America . . .

McGovern has even called for the surrender of our Guantanamo Naval Base, maintaining: "I don't think it really contributes much to the security of the country, and it's a kind of aggravation and a reminder of Yankee imperialism." The presence of a Russian naval base in Cuba, however, does not strike the Senator as "Communist imperialism." To his way of thinking, there is no such thing.

The Soviets and Red Chinese are simply trying to share their good life with the downtrodden masses of the world.

Late last year when McGovern advocated "normalizing" relations with Cuba, the *Daily World*, official organ of the Communist Party, U.S.A., declared:

The spirit of the real United States is reflected in the demands of Senator George McGovern... for the establishment of normal economic and cultural relations with Cuba.

Henry Kissinger also favors such a course, and has already run the idea through one of the Establishment think-tanks. Look for Nixon to recognize Castro shortly after the election.

The heroic McGovern not only welcomes Communism in Cuba, but in any of the other South American nations as well. In fact he would assist it. When *Playboy* asked the Senator how we should deal with Communist Salvador Allende in Chile, McGovern replied: "If that government moves to address itself to fundamental economic and social problems, it will justify American assistance." Commenting on George McGovern's promotion of Communist expansion, *Time* of June 26, 1972, observed:

McGovern says that he would prefer that nations like Brazil or India not turn Communist, but that if they did, it would not "fundamentally affect our interests." McGovern thus applauds Nixon's overtures to Peking and Moscow. He would pull all U.S. forces out of Taiwan, abandoning that government. He also argues that South Korea is so much stronger than its foes in the North that U.S. troops can also be withdrawn from there.

To McGovern all anti-Communist leaders are dictators who must be de-

posed. Communists and Socialists, however, are loyal democrats deserving of our "assistance." He would not only cut off aid to Free China and South Korea, but to Greece, South Africa, Spain, South Vietnam, and other anti-Communist nations. He would support Communism in Russia, Red China, Chile, India... or wherever else it "moves to address itself to fundamental economic and social problems."

NIXON'S FOREIGN POLICY

AMERICA has never had a President who came to office with so strong a reputation as an anti-Communist as Richard Nixon. You are well aware that we could fill pages with quotations from the Richard Nixon of the past, warning of the Communist objective to dominate the world. Virtually his entire political career had been built on the premise that the only way to deal with Communists is through strength, never relying on Communist promises as did Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam.

Yet, as soon as he took his oath of office, Richard Nixon did one of the most amazing presto-chango acts in the history of American politics. It was the greatest reversal of campaign promises since F.D.R.'s switcheroo in 1932. Conservatives were stunned and confused; "Liberals" were surprised and delighted. Max Lerner, the antique Socialist, was typical of those radicals who expressed glee at Richard Nixon's abandonment of his oft-repeated anti-Communist commitment:

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....

This applies to the conservatives who supported Richard Nixon in 1960, helped elect him in 1968,

rejoiced in his victory, believed in his medicine — only to find themselves now unconsulted, unloved, unheeded.

For myself, I have a very different and more positive view of the Berlin agreement, the *ostpolitik*, the China trip, the Russian summit, the SALT negotiations. For once it is the conservatives who wear hair shirts traditionally worn by liberals. It was they who picked and praised Mr. Nixon: How did it happen that he betrayed their faith in him?

... 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 . . .

James Reston of the *New York Times*, the unofficial spokesman for the Eastern "Liberal" Establishment, has long been a tub thumper for "Liberal" Democrats. But he, too, has now become a Nixon cheerleader. When Reston is cheering in public, you know the *Insiders* of the Establishment are cheering in private. And it is primarily Nixon's reversal of his former anti-Communist pose which has made Reston shake his pom-poms. As he has recently written:

President Nixon has now completed the most dramatic experience of his long career, and while it will be a long time before the practical results of his trips to China and the Soviet Union are known, his efforts to reach an accommodation with the Communist world have to be recognized as the bravest diplomatic initiative of the post-war generation.

According to "Liberal" mythology, the Cold War has all been an unnecessary

happenstance, a gigantic mistake, engendered by mutual suspicion and mistrust. Reston continues:

The major problem of the post-war world has been the danger of nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union, and the heart of this problem has been the mutual distrust of the leaders of these two nations. Both have been living under the dominion of fear.

What President Nixon has tried to do by compromising with China and the Soviet Union is to get rid of this fear. You can argue that he has given too much on Taiwan in Peking and too much of strategic arms in Helsinki and Moscow . . . But in his missions to China and the Soviet Union, he was at least trying to ease the mistrust, which is at the root of the major world conflict.

Hundreds of millions of human beings enslaved by the Communists have nothing to do with "mistrust," of course. Neither has the oft-repeated Communist commitment to destroy capitalism and conquer the world.

Like the stroke of an axe, Richard Nixon's trip to China convinced the Asian world that the United States would no longer stand in the way of Mao Tse-tung's ambitions to establish hegemony over the Orient. Leaders of the Pacific nations — in Japan, South Korea, and elsewhere — saw the Red Chinese handwriting on the wall and moved to make the best deal they could. They know that if we will abandon our most loyal ally, Chiang Kai-shek, we will sell out anybody. Once again, Richard Nixon has quietly accomplished what a George McGovern and his hairy friends can only scream about.

One of the President's most important reversals in policy concerns aid and trade with the Communist bloc. While seeking votes in 1968, Mr. Nixon was vehemently against such trade as amounting to trea-

son. Now, trade with the enemy is one of the cornerstones of his "Generation Of Peace" strategy.

On August 17, 1971, President Nixon signed into law a bill raising the lending power of the Export-Import Bank to \$20 billion and permitting Exim loans to Communist countries including the Soviet Union, all its satellites, and Red China. The money for these loans comes from the U.S. taxpayers. This bill represented a reversal of the previous law which had barred loans to Communist nations supplying materials or aid to North Vietnam.

On August 9, 1971, the Nixon Administration granted licenses for the shipment of \$162 million in machinery for a new truck-manufacturing complex in the Soviet Union, a move generally considered as a prelude to approval of the giant deal to build a \$1.4 billion Mack Truck plant in the U.S.S.R. The Nixon Administration also approved shipment to the Soviets of millions of dollars' worth of machine tools and sophisticated computers, and during 1970 removed more than 1,300 strategic items from the U.S. list of banned exports to the Communist bloc. The Nixon Administration has already authorized shipment of many important manufacturing materials to Red China, and even jet aircraft.

On July 8, 1972, the Nixon Administration announced that the United States would send the Soviets \$750 million worth of foodstuffs on top of the \$150 million ordered in 1971. And, as this is being written, an American trade delegation is on its way to the Soviet Union to negotiate a trade agreement which will run into billions of dollars. The Soviets are seeking ten-year credits on purchases at interest rates of 2 to 3 percent, in spite of a prevailing average U.S. rate of 6 percent. Also, they will undoubtedly receive Most Favored Nation trading status, which would cut tariffs by 50 percent or more on many exports. Almost every day the newspapers carry a new announcement of some major agreement between a

U.S. corporation and the Soviets — involving airplanes, oil, computers, and sophisticated machine tools. The United States is also going to build the world's largest truck factory for the Communists — even as the Russians are providing the North Vietnamese with virtually their entire supply of trucks.

Little wonder that the boys in the Kremlin are clinking their vodka glasses to toast the reelection of Richard Nixon. *Los Angeles Times* columnist Ernest Conine, a militant "Liberal," comments at length on this phenomenon:

In the Republican corner we have Richard M. Nixon, the demon Red-baiter of the 1940's and 50's, a man who has spent most of his political life as a bitter critic of the Soviet Union and all its works.

As President, Mr. Nixon has taken to making journeys of peace to Peking and Moscow. But he remains convinced that the only way to deal with the Communists is from a position of strength.

In the Democratic corner there is George McGovern, who in 1948 supported Henry Wallace's third-party bid for the Presidency. The McGovern of 1972, like the [Henry] Wallace of 24 years ago, takes a benign view of Soviet intentions — and, to prove it, is willing to cut the defense budget by 40% with or without Russian reciprocity.

This means the Russians must be hoping for a McGovern victory, right? Not according to Egyptian leaders who have been in touch with the Kremlin. They say the Soviet leaders are anxious to avoid stirring up trouble, in the Middle East or elsewhere, which could jeopardize Mr. Nixon's chances for reelection.

Then take the Chinese. They should be enchanted, one might think, by McGovern's promise to

get out of Vietnam immediately, if not sooner, and to preside over a major withdrawal of U.S. forces from Asia as a whole.

But lo and behold, the Democratic and Republican leaders of the House of Representatives came out of China the other day with the impression that Premier Chou En-lai and other leaders of the Peking regime are worried about the kind of foreign policies espoused by McGovern.

To quote Rep. Hale Boggs of Louisiana, the Democratic leader, "There was specific concern, rather emphatically, with regard to the possibility of continued Soviet armament and American disarmament."

Rep. Gerald Ford of Michigan, the GOP leader, added that "Among high Chinese officials there was a great deal of interest shown in many questions about the sufficiency of our military capability . . . They don't want the United States to withdraw from the Pacific or the world at any point.

Columnist Conine comments that it is "mind-boggling" and "surrealistic" to picture "Mao and Leonid Brezhnev sporting Nixon buttons." But Mao and Brezhnev know what Richard Nixon really means by a "Generation Of Peace."

THE CONSERVATIVE POSITION

ONE CAN find the Conservative position on foreign policy and Communism simply by referring to old Nixon speeches. There you will read that the Communists mean what they say about world conquest. And they do! One remembers that in 1967, in New York City, Soviet Premier Kosygin 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 mo-

ment's pause, the Soviet dictator shot back: "Of course!"

If the Communists want trade and peaceful coexistence, in the sense that Americans understand that term, let them demonstrate their good will by disbanding their worldwide network of espionage and subversion. Let them tear down the Berlin Wall and ring up the Iron Curtain. Let them order their vassals in North Vietnam to pull their troops back behind their own borders. Let them hold free elections in Cuba, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, North Korea, China, and the U.S.S.R. Let them show "good faith." Then, and only then, should we treat them as anything but our sworn enemy.

McGOVERN ON VIETNAM

IT IS his stand on Vietnam which originally rallied the New Left to McGovern's cause and compelled him to seek the Presidency. To George McGovern, those Vietnamese who opposed Ho Chi Minh were "French puppets." The Senator called former Vice President Ky "a Benedict Arnold who sold out to the French." He told "Meet The Press" in February of 1971 that North Vietnam's Communist troops are more representative of the hopes and aspirations of the people of Indochina than the American forces in Southeast Asia. While constantly condemning the Government of South Vietnam, McGovern has never had so much as a harsh word to say about the Communists in the North, even after their recent invasion.

Certainly Senator McGovern makes no bones about his plans to end the Vietnam War by abandoning the area to the Communists. He says repeatedly:

I would halt the bombing the moment I was sworn in as president.

Secondly, I would notify Saigon, Hanoi and the Provisional Revolutionary Government [the Commu-

nist name for the Vietcong], and other interested parties, that I was setting a definite date for withdrawal of all American forces within 90 days' time of the inaugural.

Simultaneously I would announce the termination of all military aid to the governments of Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam....

Even Vietnik propagandist Jane Fonda, fresh from entertaining North Vietnamese troops, admits that McGovern's peace plan "is identical to the Communist Seven Point Program of the Provisional Revolutionary Government in South Vietnam."

In a meeting with South Carolina delegates to the Democrat National Convention, Senator McGovern told a questioner: "I would go to Hanoi and beg if I thought that would release the boys one day earlier." You see, he minced: "Begging is better than bombing." This kind of crawling is repugnant to most Americans and has given rise to the coined word: *McGroveling*.

Another McGovern stand guaranteed to alienate Middle America is his call for amnesty for an estimated 70,000 draft-dodgers who fled the country to avoid military service. McGovern told his supporters that "a man who had gone to Canada or to prison might have suffered more than a man who lost his leg in the war." He has even proposed an amnesty for *deserters* on a case-by-case basis.

It is certainly difficult to believe that a man who takes such positions is a *genuine* candidate for President of the United States. Can it be that McGovern is Nixon's fall guy — Nixon's Mortimer Snerd?

NIXON ON VIETNAM

RIGHT up to the day he was elected in 1968, Richard Nixon made very strong statements concerning the need to win the war in Vietnam. He said that the

alternative was Communist domination of Asia. But, after taking office, he made another 180-degree reversal. The President's dove policies were lifted right out of the dove platform proposed by radicals at the Democrat National Convention at Chicago in 1968 — and were so radical that even the Democrats did not dare adopt them 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 for 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 Johnson "no-win" policies in Vietnam while instituting piecemeal surrender, Republican Congressmen and Senators would have raised a national uproar. But Richard 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 of 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 now accept a Coalition Govern-

ment in South Vietnam. Despite the fact that he had often counseled 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.

The Communists have killed nearly 50,000 young Americans, and Mr. Nixon offers them reparations traditionally paid by a nation defeated on the battlefield. The President's reelection slogan should be "Billions For Blackmail, But Not One Cent For Victory."

Contrary to his every campaign promise, Mr. Nixon let the Vietnam War slide for forty-two months while he increased trade with the Soviet Union and Red China, the arsenals of the Vietcong. Then, as the election approached, the President announced that he would mine Haiphong Harbor to cut off the war matériel he had helped to supply in the first place. If blockading the harbor is the quick route to victory, and it may be, why didn't Mr. Nixon do it in 1969?

Well, it was a matter of political timing. By making it appear that he has acted "decisively," Mr. Nixon can now pull off his thinly disguised surrender and claim it as a victory.

Who is going to challenge him? McGovern? Vietnam surrender is the heart of the McGovern campaign.

THE CONSERVATIVE POSITION

MILITARY men have contended for years that the war in Vietnam would be over two months after the White House agreed to permit them to seek victory. Closing Haiphong was a step in the right direction, but a call to Hanoi informing the Communists that if they do not call off the war and withdraw behind their borders they will not be there next week might produce far more important results! It is high time we told Hanoi to

*After Clark was retired from the Senate by the voters of the Keystone State, the multi-millionaire "Liberal" became the Grand Kleegle of the United World Federalists.

return our prisoners or we will use the full force of American military might and come and get them.

McGOVERN ON WORLD GOVERNMENT

THE ancient albatross of "isolationism" has been hung around George McGovern's neck by the same pundits who, for over three decades, have made that term synonymous with the ways of the troglodyte. But since the Prairie Populist is willing to abandon to the Communists virtually any country in the world, the charge appears to have some validity. And since his "isolationist" rhetoric about bringing home our soldiers and minding our own business appeals to many Conservatives, the polls show that some Americans actually believe the South Dakotan to be a Conservative. The truth of the matter is that, while McGovern opposes resistance to Soviet and Chinese aggression, he is a full-blown internationalist who would surrender America's sovereignty at the drop of a muijik.

George McGovern is a founder, and has served as vice chairman, of the World Government front known as Members of Congress for Peace Through Law (M.C.P.L.), a name adopted from the United World Federalists' slogan, "World Peace Through World Law." *Congressional Quarterly* of July 31, 1970, reports:

In the summer of 1966, Joan McKinney [of the staff of United World Federalists], who became MCPL's executive director, came to Washington to discuss the world federalist movement with [Pennsylvania Senator Joseph] Clark. During their conversation, the idea of forming a joint action group in Congress to coordinate interest in world peace and law was suggested. On August 30, Clark had lunch with... Sen. George McGovern (D.-S.D.) and Miss McKinney, and they agreed to start up a formal organization.*

It is difficult to find a screwball in the House or the Senate who does not belong to M.C.P.L., including McGovern's "friend" Tom Eagleton. Members of this World Government group include Edward Brooke, Philip Hart, Frank Church, Alan Cranston, Mark Hatfield, Jacob Javits, Eugene McCarthy, Edmund Muskie, William Proxmire, Phillip Burton, Shirley Chisholm, John Conyers, Michael Harrington, Paul McCloskey, Clark MacGregor (now running the Nixon campaign), and Louis Stokes.

According to *Congressional Quarterly*, M.C.P.L. devotes its energies to promoting "disarmament, closer scrutiny of military spending, strengthening the United Nations and reappraising U.S. Vietnam policy." It is, in fact, the Congressional front for the United World Federalists, who openly advocate the scrapping of the U.S. Constitution and the merging of our country into a world super-state with the Soviets and Red Chinese. Doing his best to keep this matter from becoming a campaign issue, McGovern's official biographer, Robert Sam Anson, writes:

For a brief time as a freshman Congressman, McGovern was a member of the United World Federalists. Even today, although his membership has lapsed, McGovern says: "I still go along with a lot of what they say. They have a lot of good ideas."

Anson openly emphasizes what he calls "McGovern's advocacy of world government as the only hope for peace."

NIXON ON WORLD GOVERNMENT

RICHARD Nixon has made himself a partner of the *Insiders* of the monetary-industrial complex who have used America's foreign aid money to build vast multi-national operations in the West and are now preparing to open up the East. They want monopolistic control over

international finance, business, manufacturing, transportation, and natural resources. To do this they must control a World Government from behind the scenes. Addled "Liberals" like McGovern must do much of the selling, however, because the World Government must be made to appear to be a humanitarian enterprise devoted to "peace."

If you will listen closely to the foreign policy statements of Richard Nixon, you will note that the code phrase he has been using for all of this is "new world order." It pops up over and over again, and means nothing to 99 percent of the American people. Yet it has been used as a euphemism for World Government over a period of nearly two centuries. Richard Nixon used the phrase in both Peking and Moscow.

The promotion of World Government is not new to Nixon. In the October 1948 issue of the United World Federalist publication, *World Government News*, the following announcement appears on Page 14: "Richard Nixon: Introduced world government resolution (HCR 68) 1947, and ABC (World Government) resolution 1948." While Nixon is far too clever actually to join the United World Federalists, he has formally endorsed it.* And since, in order to enforce its totalitarian edicts a World Government requires a world army and a world court, Richard Nixon is on record as favoring both. According to Associated Press of September 7, 1971, he now openly claims that borders are obsolete.

The move to convert the United Nations into a World Government is tied to the disarmament movement. Most Americans are not aware that disarmament involves not merely doing away with nuclear weapons in the hands of sovereign nations, but turning them over to a World

*For details on Nixon's active promotion of World Government see Chapter Twelve, "President Of The Universe," in the author's book, *Richard Nixon: The Man Behind The Mask*; Western Islands, 1972.

Authority under the United Nations — which would then possess a monopoly on military might. And one of those treaties which Richard Nixon recently signed in Moscow obligates the United States and the Soviets to “the achievement of an effective system of international security in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.”

THE CONSERVATIVE POSITION

THE Conservative position on World Government is very simple: Decisions affecting the well-being and survival of the United States of America must be made by Americans, and Americans alone, not citizens of foreign nations or *Insiders* of a world super-state.

THE GREAT STALKING HORSE

THE mass media are presenting the McGovern vs. Nixon race as a man espousing dangerous radicalism pitted against a representative of traditional Americanism. The very same mass media which created McGovern virtually out of whole cloth have now turned around to plant the kiss of death on his campaign. *Newsweek* for July 24, 1972, rated Nixon's lead in “solid” electoral votes as 236 to 7.

McGovern has other problems besides the media. He has the wildly enthusiastic support of radical youth, the welfare poor, and black militants. And, as Democratic strategists Richard Scammon and Benjamin Watterburg have noted, the vast majority of Americans are still “unyoung, un-black and un-poor.” Labor is mostly unsympathetic. Blue-collar workers are repelled by McGovern's pro-Communist policies. The Silent Majority is not going to be attracted by the Senator's stands on what Senator Hugh Scott calls “McGovern's Triple-A Platform: amnesty, acid, and abortion.” And certainly Americans who work for a living could not have been too thrilled about 300-pound Brood Mare welfare mothers claiming over national television from

Miami that they were “starving” to death, and demanding lifetime incomes from the pockets of taxpayers. Nor are they very thrilled about the pro-McGovern Gay Liberation Front demanding freedom for sex perverts. Middle America is also well aware that almost every van full of hippie-freaks one sees these days sports a McGovern bumper sticker. With friends like that . . .

If the Senator from South Dakota tries to move into the center, he will alienate McGovern's Marauders, the New Left ideologists who procured his candidacy. Already, too, Israeli Premier Golda Meir has let it be known that she favors the reelection of Richard Nixon, urging traditionally Democratic Jews to go G.O.P. in 1972. And, after what McGovern did to Mayor Daley of Chicago, Richard Nixon need hardly worry about losing *this* election by a late-hour “steal” in Cook County.

McGovern is a very unrepresentative candidate selected by a very unrepresentative Convention. He did not even receive a majority of votes cast in the primaries, winning only one (California) where there was a substantial turnout of registered Democrats. The rank and file Democrat, if he owns a TV set, knows that his Party has been stolen from him, and that the kidnappers convened in Miami to nominate a man who is no more a Democrat than Gus Hall.

But if George McGovern represents the Crazy Left, Richard Nixon represents the Sophisticated Left. In *Newsweek* of January 11, 1971, “Liberal” columnist Stewart Alsop discussed Mr. Nixon's betrayal of the millions of Conservatives who voted for him in 1968 by pointing out that the President's “basic program, leaving aside frill and rhetoric, is really the liberal Democratic program.” Ten days later, “Liberal” columnist David Broder of the *Washington Post* observed that “since the 1970 election, everyone agrees, President Nixon has been moving to the left.” Even the *New York Times*

glories in the President's abandonment of traditional Republican Party principles, declaring in an editorial:

In its abandonment of outmoded conservative doctrine, the Nixon Administration has moved much more swiftly and thoroughly than did the Eisenhower Administration

But in three years, Mr. Nixon has transformed the political and ideological landscape.

He has imposed wage and price controls which until very recently had been seriously advocated only by the most liberal Democrats. He has espoused the Keynesian doctrine of government spending and has had successive budget deficits totaling nearly \$100 billion. He has requested another increase of \$50 billion in the national debt ceiling. He has devalued the dollar.

He has proposed welfare reform to establish a minimum guaranteed income for every family. The Federal Government has taken over the passenger side of the railroad business, heavily subsidized the merchant marine and tried to subsidize supersonic airplanes.

In foreign affairs, old shibboleths have also fallen. Nationalist China is no longer in the United Nations. President Nixon is about to journey to Peking to meet with Chinese Communist leaders. Disarmament negotiations with Russia are far advanced, and the President hopes to sign an agreement when he visits Moscow in May

The damage is to the preconceptions of traditional conservatives and to the wilder notions of reactionaries. After the Nixon Adminis-

tration's record, Republican candidates can no longer inveigh against big government, budget deficits, government subsidies or Federal regulation of the economy.

The only way to keep the Republican Party from an open revolt against Richard Nixon was for the Establishment to come up with a Democrat candidate from among the crazies — someone so far out as to frighten everybody but Gus Hall and Angela Davis. Nixon needed a critic on the Far Left to provide balance against possible serious attack from the Right — thus making him appear to be the candidate of moderation. McGovern filled that bill to a tee. Of course he cannot be elected. And even if by some freak accident he were elected, he could not put his programs into effect — a fact which he admitted, himself, in a recent advertisement in the *Wall Street Journal*. Even George McGovern knows he would be faced with the same coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats which so effectively hamstrung the radical advisors of President Kennedy.

No, the only man who can legislate McGovern's program is Richard Nixon. And he is in the process of doing it, even as he covers himself with the rhetoric of moderation. In the next four years Richard Nixon, if he is not stopped, will co-opt the McGovern platform just as he did that of Hubert Humphrey. As Mary McCarthy noted in *Newsweek* for July 10, 1972: "Had Nixon in 1968 run on a platform of admitting [Communist] China to the U.N., cooperation with the Soviets, wage and price controls, devaluation of the dollar, God knows who would now be in the White House — very likely Governor Wallace. And what policies would he be pursuing?" ■ ■

Reprints of this copyrighted article are available at the following prices: One to 99 copies, five for one dollar; 100-999 copies, sixteen cents each; 1,000 or more copies, fourteen cents each. Order from *American Opinion*, Belmont, Massachusetts 02178.