

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 50. No. 6

SATURDAY, 13 JUNE, 1970

1s. 3d.

Fortnightly

The Bamboo Satellite

AN ANALYSIS FROM *The Review of the News*, MAY 6, 1970

On Saturday, April twenty-fifth, Red China again put the American news media into orbit. But give the Associated Press credit. The wire service's dispatch from Tokyo began, "Communist China announced . . ." and continued, "The official New China News Agency said . . ."

It was a discreet disengagement from responsibility which, interestingly, was not emulated by the North American Air Defense Command (N.O.R.A.D.) of the United States and Canada. From its headquarters in Colorado Springs, N.O.R.A.D. promptly and flatly confirmed the Chinese achievement, declaring that the apogee, perigee, and inclination of the orbiting music box (it plays a hymn to Mao Tse-tung) were just what Peking said they were. Be as skeptical as you like about Washington, but never call in question the credibility of either Moscow or Peking!

All Orientals, but particularly the Chinese, have contempt for Western intelligence. And no wonder, one is tempted to add. But it doesn't really matter whether the subtle Chinese are justified in thinking we are stupid, what matters is that they think it—and inevitably are led to experiment to find out how much we will swallow. So far, there seems to be no limit.

You know the established American reaction: "In Washington," reported A.P.'s Phil Brown from Tokyo, "the Defense Department said the launching came as no surprise." An anonymous A.P. dispatch datelined Washington said, "There was a marked lack of surprise among defense and Air Force scientists at the Communist achievement," and quoted one scientist as saying, "I don't think it adds to the worries we have."

Why do "we" (meaning the national consensus as reported by the mass media) persist in getting everything exactly wrong? We take for granted ("no surprise") that the Chinese have the technological and industrial ability to launch a satellite, and to produce nuclear weapons charged with enriched uranium. And then we assume the attitude that it is nothing much to worry about. Obviously, what we should do is to question seriously whether the Chinese have actually done what they are alleged to have done; and to admit, if they have, that it is worrisome as Hell (the comparison is meant literally, not profanely).

What worries me, independently of whether the Red Chinese do or don't have nuclear weapons and spacecraft, is the kneejerk psychology of our national spokesmen, who may or may not tremble at the thought of Mao Tse-tung, but are in any case timid as mice in the public presence of a Jerome Wiesner, a Eugene Rabinowitch, a Hans Bethe, or even—Heaven help us!—a Ralph Lapp. If you don't know who all those political scientists are, it only emphasizes the absurdity

of the fact that such officials as Richard Nixon and Melvin Laird are (in matters politically scientific) their fearful pawns.

I agree that it is no surprise that we should be at this time bemused with a tale out of Tokyo about a Chinese earth satellite broadcasting revolutionary music—"Tung Fang Hung," it goes, meaning *The East is Red*. Or so we are told. I haven't heard it, couldn't translate it if I had. A guy in Hartford said he heard it on his all-band receiver. Well, the Chinese Reds admit that when *they* got the blessed sound back from the heavens, they recorded and rebroadcast it. So the Hartford man could have picked up the rebroadcast, which may not have been a rebroadcast, but an original.

Yes, it is no surprise that there should at this time be a story on the wire that Red China has launched an earth satellite. But if the story were true, that would be a tremendous surprise. As for me, I don't believe it. I am asked accusingly: You don't believe anything, do you?

I believe what is proved, and what I hold as a matter of religious faith. The Red Chinese satellite is neither. From September 1949, when the first Russian A-bomb was alleged, to October 1957, when the first Sputnik was announced by the *New York Times* to the astonishment (but quick recovery) of at least two Soviet space officials, to October 1964, when Red China reportedly "joined the nuclear club," to the present, no genuine proof has ever been presented of any of the landmark triumphs of pretended nuclear and space accomplishments in any Communist-ruled country. I know that our own highest authorities say there is no question, that *they* have the proof, but they never put it out where anybody can check it.

Oh sure, they say they have to keep their sources of information secret because of security. They are never as security-conscious about anything else. They blab out all sorts of vital secrets, but they never blab where they got the "undoubted" information about Soviet or Red Chinese space and atom feats. My hunch is that the reason why they don't is that those who are not deliberately lying don't know as much as they pretend they do.

This latest Peking announcement is so absurd that you would think even an American "Liberal" would spew it back. Get this: The "great victory for Mao Tse-Tung thought" was achieved by "holding high the banner of unity and victory of the ninth party congress . . . and by grasping revolution . . ." That's how Peking says they did it!

Real science.

(continued on page 2)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free: One year 45/-, Six months 22/6, Three months 11/6.

Offices: Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11.

Telephone: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1

Telephone: 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA —

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001

Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

(Editorial Head Office)

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel — Chairman: Dr. B. W. Moynihan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2603. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q., Secretary, H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

One of the late C. H. Douglas's most important contributions to the understanding of political reality was his recognition that warfare, *including Party political warfare*, is of the nature of a prize-fight, fought not for the benefit of the contestants, but primarily for that of the promoter. A limited tenure of office is the prize awarded to the successful Party in an election, but the gain to the promoter is increased centralisation of power which continues irrespective of Party. The basic agenda of any election is the increase of government power, under the guise, these days, of increased efficiency or greater competence. Society is conceived not as a mutually beneficial association of individuals, but as a semi-military organisation geared for the maximum of production, irrespective of the nature or destination of that production. Production for an export surplus—now being transmuted into production for aid to under-developed countries—is pure economic loss. Accelerated capital development is the sacrifice of present generations for the hypothetical benefit of succeeding generations; or, as Douglas put it, the chief effect of improvement of process is not to shift the burden of work from the backs of men to machines, but to enable the worker to do more work. And as the national capacity for production outstrips the national capacity for consumption, the problem becomes international, calling for World Government. And just as all federations of States lead inexorably to domination of the Federal Government over the States, so the emergence of the organs of World Government will lead to the end of national sovereignty.

In this context, there is now very little hope left for Britain as a cultural entity which in its heyday impressed its pattern on the world. The leaders of the major Parties are self-proclaimed internationalists, appealing, as Douglas said, to "an anonymous, irresponsible, and misinstructed ballot-box democracy . . . if our destinies be submitted to decision by that process, the outcome is a mathematical certainty—our final eclipse". Unless internationalism, however denounced, is denounced in Parliament as the treason it is, that dire prophecy will shortly be fulfilled.

The Bamboo Satellite

(continued from page 1)

Perhaps you have noticed the rather interesting paradox that "Liberals," who ordinarily glorify expensive projects of government agencies, are lukewarm at best about the Apollo series of moonshots; while Conservatives, even at Income Tax time, feel a glow of pride at the cool adventures of our astronauts, and a profound surge of reverent emotion when a Navy Captain on worldwide television offers a prayer of thanks to God for the safe return of the three heroes who survived Apollo 13. The Apollo series is so remarkable an achievement of technology and science—at least the greatest thing since Columbus—that even Leftists have to be careful how they belittle it. But they do the best they can. Such periodicals as the *Bulletin Of The Atomic Scientists* and *Harper's Magazine* raise pettifogging questions or make snide insinuations.

You know the reason why the Left hates the Apollo series? Because no one has yet figured out a way to fake for the Russians or the Chinese what the United States accomplished without the possibility of any reasonable doubt or question.

But the important thing is not whether the Russians and the Chinese Communists have done this, that, or the other thing; the important thing is that the propagandists who control our own news media are committed to immediate blind acceptance of all Russian and Red Chinese claims, and to puffing of nuclear and space achievements in the Communist world.

This contrasts with passing lightly over unmistakable achievements in non-Communist countries of Europe and Asia. How many Americans know that the world's leading nation in production of nuclear power for generation of electricity is Great Britain? Not the United States, not the Soviet Union, but Great Britain.* (See *Bulletin Of The Atomic Scientists* for October 1969, where this fact is admitted.) Something is known by Americans of French nuclear and space accomplishments—possibly because of several historic links between France and Russia. But, in general, readers of the American press would be unaware of important nuclear achievements in West Germany, for example, though these matters can be found in the fine print if you look.

How many Americans are aware of the fact—and this one is a fact—that Japan put an earth satellite into orbit on February eleventh of this year? You don't have to be ashamed if you missed it. You see the Japanese really did that, on their own, and it was not in the script, so it got little publicity. Nothing in *Time*. Nothing in *Newsweek*. No big headlines anywhere. There was a story in the *New York Times* of February eleventh from Reuters, the British news agency. The *Times* put it on Page 9 at the bottom of Column 1, under a much longer story about cultural exchange between the U.S. and Russia. The other seven columns of the page were occupied by an ad for Bonwit Teller.

You had to look to find this story, but if you persisted and your eyesight was good you could finally read that Japan

*My own belief (not, I confess, documentable as is the foregoing statement) is that, next to the United States, Great Britain is the most formidable power in the world, in military nuclear capability as in commercial use of nuclear power.

"became the fourth nation to orbit an artificial satellite on its own after the Soviet Union, The United States and France." (In case you're wondering what that "on its own" means, it is probably an implicit reference to the little known fact that a *West German* satellite was launched last November—sent into orbit from Vandenberg Air Force Base in California—in an unpublicized bit of international cooperation.)

The *Times* of February sixteenth had a modest editorial about the Japanese satellite. Starting at the bottom of Page 36, under two editorials about Nasser and Palestine, one could find this sort of reflective wisdom: "Nowadays a world blasé about manned lunar landings and pictures or scientific data from rockets to Mars and Venus can hardly be expected to flip over the mere launching of a small satellite."

At least a moderate flip, however, is clearly expected of the world when *Communist China* announces, two and a half months later, "the mere launching of a small satellite." (The first A.P. story on this was datelined Tokyo, and in it is the first widely publicized reference to the Japanese satellite. There is an admission that Japan as well as Russia, the U.S., and France were ahead of Red China. Maybe the wily Japanese planted the report—well, I'm not serious about that. But it is ironic that the only way most people would ever know that Japan put up a satellite on February 11, 1970, was to read carefully, right to the end, the prominently featured stories on how Communist China put one up on April 25, 1970.)

Granted, the stated weight of the Chinese satellite—381 pounds—though still "small," is seven times greater than that of the Japanese—51 pounds. The advantage of the Japanese one is that it undoubtedly exists.

Well, the Peking "pretty" might exist too. I'm not dogmatic in my skepticism. Somebody wrote and asked me how I proved the Russian and Chinese marvels don't exist. I don't prove it. Logically, the burden of proof is on the affirmative. And don't think they wouldn't prove it if they could. If they could splash a space vehicle down in the Pacific with world television coverage, they would. They always come down somewhere in Siberia—the hard way, on land—and they never admit free observers. They've got something to hide, and whatever it is it isn't anything that would make them look good.

The biggest thing they could have to hide is the simple fact that they don't really have anything to show.

But let that go, for the time being. Assume that a Chinese lantern with a Viennese music box inside is now orbiting the earth at a 68.5 degree angle to the Equator, making one revolution every 114 minutes, and having an apogee of 1,480 miles and a perigee of 373 (I think that's right, or is it the other way around?). You want to believe that, go ahead and believe it. Maybe you get your kicks that way, like going to a horror movie.

What would start me worrying about you would be if you believed the Red Chinese did that on their own, or with only Russian help. (The "Russian help" theory won't be pushed by the "Liberals" for a while, because they are now stuck with contending that the reason why the Maoists did this thing was to spy on the Russians, whom you know how they hate.)

I suppose what we are really concerned about here is the

state of sophisticated technology in the East and the West. Now there can be no question that Japan and the Soviet Zone of Germany are the two most advanced nations in the "East" (to which Japan belongs by geography, Sovzone by politics). Czecho-Slovakia is presumably next. Russia is thought to depend heavily on both Czecho-Slovakia and Sovietized Germany for technological leadership and support. But such an authority as Jaroslav G. Polach, in the *Bulletin Of The Atomic Scientists* (not exactly a Rightwing organ), wrote recently that "East European countries" had experienced "a dismal failure of the plans for establishing their own independent potential" in the field of nuclear energy. (*B.A.S.*, October 1969, Page 15.) This despite the residence in "East Europe" of Klaus Fuchs.

Again Polach writes: "In East Europe no nation has the resources or technical knowledge even to dream about an enrichment plant [for producing U-235] on its own." (*Ibid.*, Page 20.) Yet just that kind of "enrichment plant" is what the media asked us to believe Red China had at least five years ago.

Once more, Polach speaks of "East Europe's . . . obvious retardation in mastering even the fundamental atomic industrial technology." (*Ibid.*) Polach's argument, understand, is that the European satellites of the Soviet Union are backward in nuclear technology (none has apparently even thought of going into space technology) in part because the Soviet Union won't help them out. He makes it clear enough that they can't help the Soviet Union out.

But considering the Soviet's own limitations, somebody would have had to. Who? Oh, come on!

Let's revert for a moment to Japan. That February eleventh event was the launching from Uchinoura Space Center of a 51-pound satellite named Ohsumi. What put it into orbit was a "Lambda 4S-5 rocket" with no navigational or guidance system. If that sounds primitive, think of the skill required to pitch that thing into orbit without electronic control from earth. Kind of like a golfer's making a hole in one on the fly. Still, the Japanese would like to have electronic controls on their satellites. Why didn't they have such controls on Ohsumi? One Takashi Oka, in a special report to the *New York Times* February thirteenth, tells why: "To develop a fixed satellite by 1973 . . . Japan will have to develop or import guidance and braking systems. If this is done, a number of scientists fear, Japan will no longer have an independent space program, but one relying on the inventions of others, notably of the United States. Better to go slowly and go it alone, they argue."

Now if Japan can't have rocket guidance and braking systems without giving up its independence in its space program, what do you think Red China's chances are? Or the Soviet Union's, for that matter. How many Chinese or Russian Toyotas, Datsuns, Hondas, Yamahas, Suzukis, Kawasakis, etc. have you seen crowding Volkswagens and Mavericks off the road, or putting Harley Davidson virtually out of all but the police business?

Oh, you say, but of course we wouldn't let Russia or Red China export such things to us! Wanna bet? But let that go. Just find me a picture of Moscow or Peking that looks anything at all like Tokyo as far as modernization goes. Find me a Russian or Chinese train that is even reported making its run, safely, at 150 mph. Japan is an industrially and

technologically sophisticated nation. Neither Russia nor China is. Japan still needs help from the United States. Russia and China both, I am convinced, get it.

That Red China cannot build and launch a spacecraft on her own is beyond argument. *But*—neither can the state of Florida. Yet spacecrafts can be, and are regularly, launched from the state of Florida. So one could be launched from Red China if the necessary materials were sent over there, as they are sent to Cape Whatchamacallit. Maybe Red China's got a Cape Conniverall.

We got treason on that scale? Don't call it treason! Call it a world view. Put yourself, just once, in the place of a man or group that feels *responsible* for running the whole world. It's a moral question, don't you see? How do you manage the *whole world*? Only one way: *Divide and rule*. But the division must be balanced. If one side is too powerful, it may turn on *you*. Balance of power, balance of terror, balance—among the nations. You at the center, at the pivot of the balance. In its perfect form this is still a distant dream. Meanwhile, we have approximations. And one great balance may be superseded by another, greater one.

These past twenty years we have had a balance between the two "superpowers," the Soviet Union and the United States. At the start the U.S. was too much for the S.U., so "we" had to be cut down and they had to be built up. People who lived in America but thought in world terms could do that—partly by transferring nuclear and space hardware to Russia, partly by establishing Russian *credit* for having these things, independently of whether they had them or not. Both our scientific world and our media-management world are well populated with people who wanted to create a *balance* between the United States and the Soviet Union.

But now the time may have come for a greater balance. The thesis-antithesis of the 1950s and 1960s may have become a synthesis in 1970 which in turn will be a new thesis, requiring a new antithesis. The United States and the Soviet Union are already in a stage of *détente*, as is shown most graphically by the absolutely no trouble we caused them in connection with the Czecho-Slovakian invasion. (We've come a long way, baby, since we wouldn't intervene in Hungary in 1956—that time, it caused talk.) We are ready, in the S.A.L.T. talks at Vienna, to go at least halfway from *détente* to merger.

But if the United States and Soviet Russia are to be friends, who will be the enemy? For the masses must always have an enemy, against whom *you* as manager of the world in general will defend them. Russia has been our enemy, we have been theirs, and very important persons in both Moscow and Washington have profited from the arrangement. Now both sides—suddenly become, or about to become, *one* side—need an enemy. Whom shall it be? It must be a formidable power. Red China, with the "Third World" allegedly in tow, already appears formidable. And she has had, we are assured, nuclear weapons for five, no six years—well, since October 16, 1964, it says in the book.

But till now, we were told, she had no vehicle to bear the weapon above a terrified world—terrified, that is, unless protected by the joint might of two peacefully united superpowers, Russia and America.

So now the media have labored and brought forth a thought of Chairman Mao's—a Red Chinese earth satellite

certified by N.O.R.A.D. and the Pentagon. In the face of this great menace the superpowers are ready for S.A.L.T.

But as far as some of us secular skeptics are concerned, that salt has lost its savor.

Interestingly enough, the man credited with leading Red China's earth-satellite project can be found in *Who's Who In America*—at least in the volume for 1956-1957. He is Dr. Tsien Hsueh-chen (*Who's Who* spells it without the second h), described as born in Shanghai in 1909, graduated from Chao-Tung University, also from M.I.T. (Masters in aero-engineering) and from Cal Tech with a Ph.D. in 1939. His *Who's Who* entry, which continued to be run for a year or so after Tsien fled the country to return to Communist China, lists him as a professor at Cal Tech.

This man was, and still is, considered an expert in jet propulsion. *Time* magazine of December 12, 1949, reported his reading a paper before the American Society of Mechanical Engineers in which he described a passenger rocket that could go from Los Angeles to New York in one hour.

Beginning in September, 1950, Tsien was for five years a subject of controversy. The immigration service of the Department of Justice conducted hearings pursuant to its responsibilities under the Internal Security Act of 1950, and concluded that Tsien was a deportable alien, since it seemed evident (despite his denials) that he was a member of the Communist Party. At the same time, it was considered adverse to American interests for him to *be* deported, since it was believed that his scientific and technical ability (acquired in the main at U.S. institutions) would render him valuable to the hostile government of Red China. He was therefore denied permission to leave.

Nevertheless, in 1955, Tsien escaped and did return to Red China where he was put to work, and furnished window dressing for a paper satellite if he did not in fact produce a real satellite.

"Liberals" have made certain points regarding Tsien . . . all of which, naturally, are false. It is said that his case shows the evil of McCarthyism—thus implying that he was unjustly accused and that by driving him out of the country we made it possible for Red China to develop a satellite. Actually, Senator Joe McCarthy had nothing to do with the Tsien case, which was handled entirely by the Department of Justice, with advice from the State Department and the Department of Defense. Second, Mr. Tsien was not driven out of the country; the government made efforts (not strenuous enough, to be sure) to keep him here. Third, he obviously was, and is, a Communist—so that no personal injustice to him was involved. He was a Communist spy of considerably more importance than the Rosenbergs.

The Tsien case is at once both explanatory and symbolic: We learn that the chief Red Chinese space expert was trained at the two leading American institutions of technology. Any country in the world can have space and nuclear marvels if we train their men and send them the equipment.

—MEDFORD EVANS.

EXTRA COPIES OF THIS AND ALL RECENT ISSUES ARE AVAILABLE TO SUBSCRIBERS AT 4d. EACH WHILE STOCKS LAST. CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARDS COSTS WILL BE APPRECIATED.
