

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 49. No. 24

SATURDAY, 21 FEBRUARY, 1970

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

NARCOTICS

THE COMMUNIST DRUG OFFENSIVE

By SUSAN L. M. HUCK in *American Opinion*, May, 1969*(Continued)*

During World War II, when Mao's forces were confined to "Yenan", a rather bleak region around the great bend of the Yellow River, the oh-so-high-minded Communist government began an official policy of *forcing* the farmers under its control to grow poppies rather than food. On pain of having their land confiscated (Mao had not yet dared to do this — he was still posing as a hero "agrarian reformer"), Chinese farmers were required to plant no less than two-thirds of their land in poppies, and perform the tedious job of making incisions in the seed-pod of each flower, then collecting the little beads and dribbles of exudate at regular intervals. Opium is produced by the *drop* you see. The amount of human labour which is represented by ten or fifteen thousand *tons* of opium can scarcely be imagined. Opium is, above all, a cheap-labour product, and the tonnage just mentioned is thought to be Red China's current or very recent actual production of raw opium.

Opium poppies have also been a long-standing cash crop for both minority tribesmen and Chinese farmers in the rugged hill-country of Southwest China and adjoining South-east Asian nations. It can be grown there on unirrigable land, and in rice paddies during the dry winter season. In subtropical southwest China, however, it remained for the Communist regime to convert opium from the equivalent of illegal hillbilly "moonshine" to a modern plantation crop cultivated by slave labour. State-owned plantations, as well as the State-directed acreages on communes in all suitable regions of the Chinese mainland, now produce the immense quantity of opium which China uses *exclusively* for export.

Pravda's man reported on his own trip to the Yunnan area in 1958. There he saw both the hillside patches which had traditionally produced a "cash crop", and the more modern Red Chinese method of production. "I would not have been surprised at the sight of the prisoners, nor the guards, nor the barracks with guardtowers in the distance," wrote Comrade Ovchinnikov, who comes from the Land of the Slave-Labour Camp himself. "What surprised me was the whole extensive tract of opium poppies."

Mao's famous put-on, termed "Let a Hundred Flowers Bloom", which lured into the open most opposition among the "intelligentsia" of China in 1956, must have supplied hordes of workers for the *real* "let a hundred flowers bloom" campaign. One of the occasional escapees from Red China's government opium plantations reported in Japan on his experiences. He had been forced to help tend some 2,700

hectares (over 6,700 acres) of opium poppies in one irrigated valley near Lingyuan. The entire area was enclosed by an electrified barbed-wire fence and both civil and military guards.

Besides the Kansu-Shensi-Shansi-Inner Mongolian region of Communist-fostered poppy cultivation since "Yenan" days, and the southwestern region (Yunnan, Kweichow, Kwangtung, and Szechwan provinces) it would seem that poppy cultivation, under irrigation, is being pressed into remote Sinkiang province. A Red Chinese film director "goofed" in Sinkiang recently and had to be summoned for criticism before Mao's wife, Chiang Ching. In the making of a propaganda movie called *Combat Songs of the Frontier*, he thought all those "flowers" would be the perfect background for the usual "happy liberated peasants" singing and dancing militantly in the foreground. Those "flowers" were opium poppies, and the director was turned over to the Red Guard for "education".

Pravda's man tells us that, in 1952, when Red Chinese opium production was a mere two thousand tons per year, it netted 70 million dollars in cool, hard cash. At that time the Red Chinese government was only beginning to push drugs at Americans directly. Most exports had been toward other Asian nations. But, during the Korean War, Chinese dope-peddlers in Japan began discovering how many American servicemen already had an interest in drugs, or could develop an interest in a fast buck through smuggling dope into the United States. Ever since the Korean War, too, the majority of North Korean agents captured by South Korea has been carrying supplies of narcotics in bulk form, which they were to sell in order to finance their operations in South Korea or beyond*.

In the year 1952, having done so well at dope-peddling, the Reds convened a secret meeting in Peking involving the Ministers of Finance and Foreign Trade, and Red overlords of existing and potential poppy-producing areas. The result was a special bureaucracy, at sub-Cabinet level, to plan, supervise, and co-ordinate all aspects of the production, processing, and export of opium and its derivatives.

(continued on page 4)

* This is a standard Communist tactic. On 27 May, 1968, police at Long Beach, California, arrested six Red Chinese sailors with 26.4 pounds of heroin strapped to their bodies. They were determined by the State Bureau of Narcotics to be residents of Kwangtung province in Red China — on assignment.

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. Monahan, 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. Scouler, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

Vol. 49. No. 24

Saturday, 21 February, 1970

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

The fundamental cause of the Biafran tragedy was One Worldism, which holds that bigger and more powerful governments are better than smaller and more independent governments. This is rather like a game of cards, where the individuals of the world are sorted into suits (nations), ranks (political parties culminating in Court Cards, the Government) and played against each other until only the players are left, and one or a pair of these are the 'winners'. It makes no difference whether individual people are slaughtered in war, or starved, or merely rendered helpless in the face of 'strong' government. Of course, this leaves open the question as to who "the players" are (but see Dr. Medford Evans's *Amerussia*). We don't suppose Mr. J. H. Wilson really imagines he is one of them, but he can sort of act the part for the time being, and is quite prepared to sacrifice other people's lives, even if only as an accessory before the act, in furtherance of the principle involved.

Even before the Biafran leaders formally surrendered, the British Establishment set in motion a huge cover-up operation, designed to convince 'public opinion' that peace and relief were at hand, largely as a result of its efforts to restore law and order by arming the enemies of independence. But the maintenance of law and order in an artificial society of mixed races requires a high degree of common culture, and a quality of discipline in the forces charged with the maintenance of order which is the product of a long tradition and a feeling of essential unity with those under their protection. These conditions do not obtain in Nigeria. Defeat in war has not obliterated the sentiment which gave rise to secession, which could be expected to persist even under *ideal* conditions for at least two generations. After all, there are still strong feelings for secession among the Scots and Welsh — and even the English, as witness the considerable emigration. Actual warfare imposes a discipline of a sort which in the conditions of 'victory' in Nigeria is certain to evaporate. Yet the victors must remain armed if the authority of the Central (it was never a properly Federal) Government is to be maintained.

Whether or not Krushchev really thought he would have to wait to be a great-grandfather to see the whole world

Communist, he illustrates the fundamental idea of the One Worlders: it does not matter what happens to this generation if future generations can be brought under the authority of a World Government. This will be to turn the world of Nations into a world of Tribes under the dominion of the most powerful tribe — the Money-Tribe — whose mission will be to stamp out tribalism under the threat of atomic annihilation. There will be no risk to the bombers, when they have all the bombs.

* * *

Patronage, for which J. H. Wilson and other Heads of Government are becoming notorious, can be considered as inverted blackmail. It is designed to secure the position of the dispenser. It ought to be regarded as a crime; but it passes increasingly without reaction in our modern 'civilised' permissive society, which passively condones mounting crime.

The trouble with this sort of thing is that it is a one-way street, leading to outright totalitarianism. The worse conditions get, the more the Government wants to be 'strong' — any government. And the stronger the government becomes, the more individual discontent grows. Strong government means high taxation, and high taxation promotes crime; and so on.

We remain convinced that virtually the only way out of our troubles is a fairly rapid and progressive reduction of taxation, combined with the elimination of inflation, and its eventual reversal. But we are not convinced — quite the reverse — that there is unlimited time to escape catastrophe, and still less that a change of government will do anything but give a fatal policy a new lease of life.

DANGER SIGNALS

A paragraph headed *Crazy* concludes the editorial of *The Sunday Express* (14 Dec., 1969). It describes how the *Ark Royal* and the *Eagle* have had £60 million spent on them, adding that Mr. Healey has ordered them to be "phased out within the next two years". So they will be scrapped before any replacements appear to carry aircraft and "we shall have no defences whatsoever in the Atlantic". And, the paper asks, "In heaven's name, what is going on? Is Mr. Healey trying to reduce this country to impotence in the world?" The writer does not answer his question but turns to the waste of £60 million. But the answer to his question must be YES, international socialism does intend to reduce Britain to impotence in the world and has largely succeeded — as it has already succeeded with numerous smaller countries.

Judging by Vice-President Spiro T. Agnew, the Americans realise some of the dangers. The Vice-President (*Human Events*, 22 Nov., 1969) attacks the television network commentators because, after the President's speech on Viet Nam, "the majority" of them expressed their hostility to what he said. One network "trotted out Averell Harriman for the occasion". Mr. Agnew points out that this "small group of men" live in New York or Washington, D.C., and that despite their useful work on the pollution of the Great Lakes, etc., "they can make or break by their coverage and commentary" . . . "the networks elevated Stokely Carmichael and George Rockwell", while the nation knows "practically nothing" of these commentators, and the Vice-President asks "whether a form of censorship already exists" through them.

Human Events of 15 Nov. stresses that "The Silent Majority" must speak out.

Mr. E. Powell also felt it "wrong to keep silence simply for fear of misunderstanding or offence." (*Church Times*, 12 Dec., 1969). He was speaking about the "sign-in" on world poverty and deplored the part taken by the clergy, for while many look to the Church for guidance, "all too often what they get is amateur politics and amateur economics, the sort of shallow silliness of which the declaration on world poverty is a quintessential example". And, according to Major-General D. A. B. Clarke (*The Tablet*, 6 Dec., 1969), the Swanwick Conference which agreed on the terms of the "sign-in", "self-proclaimed as representative, was remarkable for its one-sidedness". The British Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Justice and Peace Commission and others jointly sponsored the conference, so one need not be surprised that "the 'left of centre' and the extremists of the 'destroy and rebuild' school were prominent at Swanwick . . . the declaration which people are being asked to sign is a somewhat strange document." People in fact need to use their judgment and not to rush after the Archbishop in signing every document and ringing every bell.

Mr. Stewart, the Foreign Minister, for all his emphasis on sincerity and morality, showed weakness and want of foresight when he discussed Nigeria on television. He encouraged hopes on an African solution of the tragedy, although most observers would have considered the collapse of the talks predictable, and we soon read (*Daily Telegraph*, 19 Dec., 1969) that "peace talks between Nigeria and Biafra were abandoned in Addis Ababa yesterday". Nor did Mr. Stewart examine the ethical point whether the end justifies the means.

Socialist "morality" also contrasts with the words of St. Paul in the Epistle for the Sunday after Christmas (originally to the Galatians): "The heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant . . . thou art no more a servant but a son; and if a son, then an heir". But socialism would rob the heirs, ostensibly to redistribute the takings among others who are kept from their inheritance, and would increasingly treat the population as servants and prevent them from looking after themselves in education, health services, etc. *The Spectator* (27 Dec., 1969) senses a little of this in an article called "Should Charity be Nationalised?" It would, it says, be natural to hope especially over Christmas, that "the essentially personal and nongovernmental nature of morality in general and of charity in particular would be the unequivocal and urgent message of the Churches". Yet the very reverse has appeared: "Pandering to the modern trend, the British Council of Churches are building up to the climax of their national sign-in in favour of overseas aid." Members of Parliament are to be asked to demand that "the Government increases its overseas aid expenditure by £150 million a year. When the Church itself has come to accept — indeed to support — the nationalisation of charity, it is time to sound the alarm".

— H.S.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., 245 CANN HALL ROAD, LONDON, E.11, FOR BOOKS ON SOCIAL CREDIT AND THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL - COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY.

The Monopoly of Credit

The third revised edition of 1951 of *The Monopoly of Credit* by Major C. H. Douglas was re-issued in 1958. The comments we made in 1951 bear repetition.

The Monopoly of Credit is a major work of Social Credit. It was chosen for re-issue from a list of possible works of like calibre by Douglas because it is the work which is, before others, the technical manual of Social Credit and, as such, is the one which should be brought, though not exclusively, to the attention of anyone who may desire to be informed at first hand of Major Douglas's analysis of the present financial-economic system, its effects and the means available to correct them.

It is the standard literary instrument for the correct information of the public concerning the technical aspects of Social Credit and, as such, its availability and continuous distribution is a primary concern of the Social Credit Secretariat. How can this be secured?

In general, it is not a policy of choice that Social Crediters themselves should absorb the total literary output of Social Crediters, or even a great proportion of it. Our objective is to reach those members of the public who are able and willing to profit by Social Credit ideas. But extensive experience has shown that unusual obstacles are placed in the way of our reaching this objective. The organisation of the sale of even the most trivial and evanescent work is highly elaborated, beyond our means to imitate; and, in addition, it is controlled, we are satisfied, at every point: production, distribution, advertising, criticism. Beneath the avalanche of printed matter which effects nothing whatsoever to the true advantage of mankind, but definitely the reverse, it is calculated that any reparative agency will be buried and obliterated.

The ever-continuing attacks on Social Credit, dishonest in form and probably in intention, are proof that incomplete reliance is reposed in this calculation: that all the time Major Douglas's ideas are spreading. Every assistance must be given to an extension of this process. Accessibility of important sources is the key to the achievement of this end. Every reader of *The Social Crediter* should have in his own possession at least one copy of *The Monopoly of Credit*, and it should be his constant practice, as an integral part of his work for Social Credit, to urge the purchase (not the borrowing, though that has its place) of copies by every member of the public who shows any sign of genuinely seeking information on the critical question of our generation. No public library is properly serving the community if it does not possess a copy freely obtainable by its readers. No book list is complete which does not give accurate information of its authorship and place of publication. In all of these directions, our readers can do something to increase the distribution of *The Monopoly of Credit*, and to overcome the psychological resistance to Social Credit ideas.

THE MONOPOLY OF CREDIT

by C. H. DOUGLAS

14/- posted

(Slightly soiled copies, 7/6 posted)

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11

NARCOTICS (continued from page 1)

In common with all bureaucratic structures, precise names of groups and their organisational characteristics change from time to time. Initially, opium production was managed by the Special Trade Bureau, Ministry of Finance, directly responsible to the Political Bureau of the Chinese Communist Party. More recently, production and manufacture within China has been handled by the Administration for the Processing and Sale of Special Products of Local Industry. Significantly, foreign operations — narcotics exports — are under the direction of a special committee of the "Overseas Department" of the Chinese Communist Party. Considerable detail on the apparatus, and names and titles of Red Chinese involved, appeared in the Swiss publication, *Journal de Geneve*, 20 June, 1960.

Neighbouring non-Communist Asian nations have long been a particular target of the Red Chinese dope trade. Japan ruefully estimates that Red Chinese dope-pushing fleeces her of at least 170 million dollars annually, with the number of addicts constantly increasing. Hong Kong, the number-one outlet for Chinese opium products, has seen the local addiction rate soar steadily until, by 1966, it was estimated by Hong Kong authorities that about one-eighth of the entire population of Hong Kong was on drugs.

Thailand is another target nation — on the list for take-over after Vietnam, with guerrilla warfare already under way. There are many routes for the infiltration of opium from Yunnan province through Burma and Thailand to the outside world. South Korea, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Taiwan are similar targets, while Singapore, like Hong Kong, is both a target and a major redistribution point. (Macao appears to be too firmly under Red Chinese influence to be termed a "target" any more, but it is a centre of both heroin manufacture and smuggling).

Outside of Red China, opium, morphine-base, and heroin are sold to any buyers able to handle the drugs on a large enough scale. Very considerable quantities of these drugs enter the United States; not so much along the West Coast, as might be expected, but "the long way around" the world, via the Middle East and Mediterranean. After the 1958 coup in Iraq, the Kassem Government had close relations with Red China and, in consequence, Baghdad became the terminus for bulk shipment of Communist narcotics. Other Middle Eastern countries, such as Comrade Nasser's Egypt, have also served this purpose. More recently, Albania, Red China's miserable little European satellite, has become a major redistribution centre; it is very conveniently located for Mafia hoods.

Thus, although it is quite true that the vast majority of illicit drugs entering the United States comes to the East Coast from the Mediterranean and Middle East, the vast portion of said drugs originates from Red China as a part of Communist political warfare. Transportation charges are insignificant considering that smuggled goods tend to be "stowed away" anyway. At retail, a pound of heroin can be divided into about 45,000 "nickel bags" worth five dollars each, for a total of as much as 225,000 dollars!

Mexico is now beginning to loom large as a redistribution point for heroin (sometimes in fairly crude form) entering

the United States. Chinese poppy-growing experts have also gone to Red Cuba as "agricultural technicians", and have been observed at work in Pinar del Rio and Camaguey provinces, although it may be questioned whether even Cuban slave labour is cheap enough for the tedious, drop-by-drop method of gathering opium. Poppy fields have been spotted from the air — they are rather conspicuous at blossom time — in Mexico itself. And Red Chinese "agricultural technicians" have even introduced poppy cultivation to Tanzania, Mali, and other parts of Africa. Red Chinese drugs, moved via Tanzania or directly into the Congo ports, contributed to the Congo slaughter of 1960-1964, and other Red butchery.

As early as 1961, Dr. Lois Higgins, an Illinois narcotics expert, warned that narcotics addiction, as well as pornography, was "a Communist weapon to destroy the young manhood of the free world". At that time, the *real* push had scarcely begun — only eight years ago, let us keep in mind, our already difficult drug-addiction problem was largely confined to the fringes of city slums. It was still unimaginable that drug-addiction could be successfully promoted among the great masses of American students.

But Step One: Get them on drugs, has been successful beyond anyone's wildest imaginings. Some really incredible percentage of American college and high-school students are now at least playing with marijuana. Step Two: Get them on the needle, is having increasing success. Step Three: Get them on heroin is only beginning.

Though growing rapidly, heroin use is "still small" in the colleges, says the *New York Times*, so don't worry — the same issue of the *Times* carried the New York Liberal Party's plea for "legalised pot". Yet the potential market is so obvious, the coming demand so clear to those familiar with drug-addiction, and at least partially aware of the extra-ordinary "permissiveness" toward drug abuse in "Liberal" ruling-class circles, that even some non-Communist regions are tooling up for opium production.

On 18 March, 1969, the *Washington Post* reported that Iran, which had outlawed poppy cultivation in 1955, was legalising it once more. Why lose out?

Meanwhile, according to narcotics experts attached to the U.N. Narcotics Commission, "more than 5 million acres of land in starving China are now devoted exclusively to intense cultivation of narcotics poppies." The object? As former Chief of the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics Harry J. Anslinger testified before the U.S. Senate: "There is very definite proof that heroin smuggled in from Communist China is responsible for the rise in narcotics addiction among juveniles in the United States".

(Concluded)

Addendum to "Narcotics"

The following footnote, referring to the lines "The *London Weekly Review*, on 6 November, 1964, estimated the value of Red China's opium-products for that year as high as 800 million dollars*" in the last paragraph on page 4 of the last issue of *The Social Crediter*, was omitted:

* In his nationally syndicated column of 21 September, 1964, Victor Riesel gave the figure as 500 million dollars; two years later, writing in the *Philadelphia Enquirer* of 23 January, 1966, Pierre Huss gave it as 800 million dollars.