

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 55 No. 1

APRIL, 1975

15p. Monthly

The Ends And Means Of Subversion*

by MEDFORD EVANS

What is subversion? I propose to give here a definition, analysis, and history of subversion—all very sketchy, indeed fragmentary in proportion to the inherent magnitude of such topics, but all treated with a view to interpreting the significance of the current attack in the media, and in the government itself, on governmental agencies originally established to prevent, counteract, or stop subversion. I shall comment on fallacies regarding subversion, especially fallacies arising from judging subversion as if it were an end in itself, and I shall suggest the importance of subversion in an age of "superpowers" and "strategic" weapons. Finally, I shall leave on the docket the question whether a systematic attempt to counter countersubversion is not in itself a form of subversion.

Webster's Seventh Collegiate defines *subversion* as "the act of subverting" or the "state of being subverted," or simply as "overthrow." The verb *subvert* is more graphically defined: "1: to overturn or overthrow from the foundation; RUIN 2: to pervert or corrupt by an undermining of morals, allegiance, or faith." The unabridged *Webster's* gives *destruction* as a further synonym of *subversion*, and offers as an example of possible use, "subversion of a government." There is no reason here to quarrel with these definitions.

While national governments are most often thought of as the targets of subversion, any person or institution may be such a target, and the *Manifesto* of Marx and Engels openly proclaimed that the objective of Communism is "the overthrow of all existing institutions." Indeed, the reason why subversive activity is so generally aimed at governments is that the purpose of government is the common defense and security of the territory governed, and if other institutions within that territory are not defended and secured they will predictably fall apart or be readily overthrown. Few have contradicted the assertion of Thomas Hobbes that, without some kind of government, the life of man is "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short." Hobbes himself, by the way, lived to be ninety-one.

Hobbes' successor John Locke observed that government is in essence the authority to kill people, and from that and other considerations Thomas Jefferson concluded that government is a necessary evil—at once evil and necessary. The Birchean goal of "less government" has a fungible relationship with "more responsibility," but the substitution of individual responsibility for government is not expected to be complete. There *can* be a better world under God here, but the best of worlds, directly under God, with *no* human government, seems to be reserved for heaven.

*From *The Review of the News*, February 12, 1975. This review is published weekly by The John Birch Society, Belmont, Massachusetts, U.S.A.—overseas subscription rate US\$12.00 per year.

Paradoxically, those of us who seek to minimize earthly government, but recognize that its total elimination can be approached only asymptotically, are not the ones who try to subvert governments, except enemy governments in time of war. The principal agents of subversion of the American government are persons who make clear their belief that government in general should assume more and more of the responsibilities formerly left to individuals.

From this it follows that such persons have in mind, not the overthrow of U.S. Constitutional Government in order to leave the population in a state of anarchic nature, but the replacement of the U.S. Constitutional Government by one more totalitarian. Put another way, governments are generally subverted, if at all, in the interest of some other government. But in the interest of tolerance let me admit that subversives in America today really are like us patriots in one respect. *We* authorize, condone, or (like Nathan Hale) participate in subversion of an enemy force in time of war; *they* consider themselves to be *at war against America*; America is their enemy. A number of these people are *in* the American government, which is why that government is doing so poorly in domestic and foreign affairs. From their own point of view these persons are *not* doing poorly, they are doing very well, and their prospects must look good to them for replacing the present U.S. Government with a New World Order. They should, however, be reminded that the traditional fate of subversives caught in the act in wartime is death.

Subversion is clandestine warfare. The forms it may take are various in the extreme; in fact, devising new forms of clandestine warfare is one of the more ambitious activities of subversive agencies; but among the more important forms of subversion are "black" propaganda (the term is not racial, but technical; it means false propaganda, or "disinformation," such as false reports concerning nuclear or other capability), spying, theft, sabotage, and calculated depression of morale, as through rumours, drug-pushing, or moral and cultural degradation. The most dramatic forms of subversion involve violence, as assassinations or *coups d'état*.

Two recent acts of violent subversion in the United States are the bombing of the State Department building in Washington on January 29th, synchronized with an unsuccessful attempt to bomb a federal building in Oakland, California—both efforts claimed by the New Left's "Weather Underground"; and the forcible occupation by American Indians of a Catholic abbey in Wisconsin. As I write, the latter action is nearing success. State Governor Patrick J. Lucey has refused to take decisive action of his own against the insurgent Indians, but on February 1st moved promptly against white citizens of Wisconsin who threatened to oust the Red men holed up in the captured monastery. At last word, the Catholic owners had capitulated. This is a comparatively minor example of the way command posts in

America today protect subversive forces *against* the rank and file of the American people.

Let us note in passing, by the way, that activities of the American Indian Movement which are open, and thus able to claim they are not subversive because not clandestine, are still in fact subversive in character because while the actions are boldly open, the reasons for them are not. No one can seriously believe that American Indians now want national independence, but it is easy enough to believe that *some* American Indians have been hired to put on a show at Wounded Knee (for example) intended by its producers to weaken America—not *vis-a-vis* her indigenous Indians, but *vis-a-vis* the only other "superpower," the Soviet Union. What is a bit bewildering is how to determine on which side the governor of Wisconsin is serving.

VIOLENCE AND INTIMIDATION

As for the January 29th incident in the State Department building, and its corollary in Oakland, they are of the utmost seriousness. In Washington the Smithsonian Institution and the Departments of Treasury, Interior, and Agriculture were also threatened by anonymous phone callers, and those three Departments evacuated their respective buildings of a total of 6,000 employees, though unlike State they experienced no explosion. In the State Department building, in a ladies' restroom on the third floor, near the offices of the Agency for International Development, the Bureau for East Asia, and the Bureau for African Affairs, a device exploded at 1.17 a.m. which damaged twenty rooms on three floors—not a nuclear blast, but no fire-cracker either. The fastidious *New York Times* reported:

Water from broken pipes flooded the third, second and first floors. There were still large smelly pools of water in the corridors at noon. Two elevators and a lighting system were knocked out. There was also extensive damage to the second floor office of Joe H. Morton, chief of the department's Security and Investigations Division.

One is tempted to speculate that if Otto Otepka had not been feloniously removed from State as head of Security, the distressing inundation would never have occurred, but there is no use crying over spilled water from the ladies' restroom. Besides, the attack on Otepka (a bureaucratic action at the highest level) and the attack on the building (a physical action at the third-floor level) were part of the same war, which is the war against America. The reason for the bombing on January 29th was given in letters from Weather Underground (or "purporting to be from the group," as the *New York Times* has it—from whom does the *Times* think such letters came, the C.I.A.?) The letters said the bombs (one in Washington, one in Oakland) were intended to retaliate against the Ford Administration's proposal to send \$522 million in military supplies to South Vietnam and Cambodia. Such action, said the letters, was "deliberate and outright sabotage of the Paris agreement" of January 27, 1973 (for which Henry Kissinger shared a Nobel Peace Prize with Vietnam's Le Duc Tho). In other words, this bombing of a major U.S. Government building in the nation's capital was a warlike act by covert guerrillas operating on behalf of Communist North Vietnam and the Communist Vietcong, both Soviet clients.

Secretary of State Kissinger, according to the *Times*, characterized the bombing as a "totally senseless act." Whether he meant by this that his State Department was

already on the side of the Communists anyhow, and thus Weather Underground was expending explosives uselessly, who can say? In any case, the labelling of acts of violence as "senseless" has become a cliché second in inanity only to the customary prompt declaration following the assassination or attempted assassination of a major public figure that there is "no evidence of conspiracy." In view of the anonymous phone calls and letters associated with the January 29th bombing of the State Department, Secretary Kissinger could hardly contend there was no evidence of conspiracy, but was reduced to the *pis aller* of saying the deed was "senseless."

Of course the bombing was not senseless at all, but a no doubt highly successful warning to our ministry of foreign affairs that it had better not even skirt around the edges of anti-Communism. The Communist Weather Underground will get you if you don't watch out!

The rejection of reason in official U.S. intelligence agencies was even more egregious in the case of the F.B.I., if indeed the Bureau did say what the *Times* of January 30th attributed to it, that the bomb threats in Washington the day before "were apparently without specific political motives." To savour the full fatuity of that you must understand that later in the same article is found the information given above, that letters from Weather Underground said the bombs were to retaliate against the proposal by the Ford Administration (which would mean by Kissinger's State Department) to give South Vietnam and Cambodia half a billion dollars' worth of military supplies. How politically motivated can a violent action be?

Yet surely Secretary Kissinger could have quietly suppressed any design within his own department to endorse an international loan or gift which might be construed, no matter how tortuously, as "deliberate and outright sabotage" of the Paris agreement which he and Le Duc Tho had consummated. Thus the bombing which either was unnecessary to prevent, or else could not prevent, the \$522-million transfer made for reasons too subtle for Weather Underground, evidently had a further political purpose—which was, in short, to terrorize bureaucratic Washington.

If "They" can bomb twenty rooms on three floors of the State Department building, who will say that "They" cannot go anywhere in Metropolitan Washington "They" want to go? But "They" are plainly Communists. So if you, Mr. GS-14 or Ms. GS-12 have any *anti*-Communist impulses, you'd better suppress them now. This government—the U.S. Government, the one you're working for and the rest of us are paying for—is in process of being hijacked by Communist subversives.

I have dwelt disproportionately upon one form of subversion—sabotage—in part because it has been recently in the news, and in part because it is a kind of threat easily understood. Books could be written—and have been—on every one of the forms of subversion mentioned heretofore: black propaganda (disinformation), spying, theft, sabotage, depression of morale, assassination, and *coups d'état*. All these forms have been used throughout history—and prehistory.

The Trojan Horse represents the most famous triumph of disinformation. The practiced Greek liar Sinon convinced the Trojans, in spite of true warnings from Cassandra and Laocoon, that the hollow wooden monster should be dragged into the besieged city in order to appease the gods. (By the way, the Trojan Horse was not made by the

Trojans, they were its victims.) At night (perhaps about 1.17 a.m.) the Greeks in the horse came out and opened the gates of Troy to the Grecian armies, which poured in and sacked the city utterly. The main thing to remember now is that the whole strategy depended on the Greeks pretending to have given up the struggle. They sailed away from Troy, ostensibly to go home, but actually to take cover at the island of Tenedos (modern Turkish Bozcaada), whence they returned for the kill on signal from the wily Ulysses.

The story is an excellent lesson concerning the consequences of a false *détente*. Which is why Herman Dinsmore's new book, *The Bleeding Of America*, has on its front cover a picture of the famous statue of Laocoon and his two sons in their death struggle against giant serpents—in the posture, says Dinsmore, of the United States today.

An even more famous, and authentic, account of subversion—this time by espionage—is given in the books of *Numbers* and *Joshua* in the Bible. The point (one point) to be drawn from the report of the twelve spies of Israel who reconnoitred the land of Canaan is that military intelligence is properly to be judged by its accuracy, not by the methods of those who collect it; for all twelve spies used the same methods, but Joshua and Caleb gave a true account of the relative abilities of the Israelites and the Canaanites, while the other ten grossly exaggerated the capabilities of the Canaanites, and thus postponed the entry of the Chosen People into the Promised Land. (Compare varying reports regarding Soviet capability since 1945.) Later, when Joshua took Jericho, he not only used espionage in his preparations, but also his spies were saved by the harlot Rahab, who said to the clandestine invaders, "I know that the Lord hath given you the land, and that your terror is fallen upon us, and that all the inhabitants of the land faint because of you." (*Joshua* 2:9.) So she hid them from the security guards of Jericho, and was forever after honoured in Israel.

In war, you can't just dismiss situation ethics out of hand. A more modern instance is the case of Yaleman (Class of 1773) Nathan Hale, who was not a "dirty spy," but a patriotic hero. Depends on your loyalty to your own side. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* points out (article on "Espionage") that international law "recognizes the well-established right of belligerents to employ spies," and observes: "Spies are punished not because they have violated international law, but only to render such methods of obtaining information as dangerous, difficult and ineffectual as possible."

ENEMY INFILTRATION

The most efficacious means of subversion, I have not listed above. It is infiltration of your own agents into the highest command posts of your enemy's organization. Or if not into the command post itself, then into a position where you have decisive influence over the enemy's commander. But this seems to be what our enemy has done to us. Phyllis Schlafly and Admiral Chester Ward argue persuasively in their new book *Kissinger On The Couch* that no Russian could have done for the Soviet Union what our Presidents Nixon and Ford have done in concluding, as they have done under the unique influence of Henry Kissinger, the SALT agreements. Denial to the American people of any defense against nuclear-missile attack is the ultimate in subversion. (Not that Kissinger has done this

by himself; Walt Rostow, Jerome Wiesner, and the Pugwash scientists in general were way ahead of him. But they never quite rang the bell at the top; mighty Henry rang it twice.) Subversion on this scale was not possible before the development of "superpowers" and "strategic" weapons.

Yet a deeper subversion exists than military betrayal—a kind of subversion which neither the White House, nor any other Executive agency, nor even a self-idolizing judiciary can attain. It is the subversion of the representatives of the people in Congress assembled. On Monday, January 27th the Senate voted 82 to 4 to create a Special Committee to investigate the C.I.A., the F.B.I., and other agencies concerned with countersubversion—*i.e.*, intelligence, counterintelligence, and law-enforcement in related areas. Meanwhile, the House Internal Security Committee has been abolished by a parliamentary manoeuvre, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has been downgraded and subjected to scurrilous attack by Jack Anderson, with obvious cooperation from the Senate Office Building.

What we are likely to witness in the wake of Watergate is exploitation of the Congress to effect the total subversion of the American Constitution. The 94th Congress appears destined to re-enact the role of the Long Parliament of the Puritan Revolution, which led to the dictatorship of Oliver Cromwell. And the most immediate task of the revolutionary Congress is to purge the Government of all persons in any agency who have previously tried to purge Communists. The House Internal Security Committee, as successor to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, was the obvious initial target. The C.I.A. also came under immediate fire because of its recent anti-Communist activities (comparatively slight though they were) in Chile, where the Communist Allende was overthrown, and also because within the C.I.A., more evidently than in any other such agency, are persons who can help the Congress ferret out and dispose of the anti-Communists.

The power which this anti-anti-Communist investigation of security agencies packs is indicated by its leader. So is the way that power is likely to be used. Nelson Rockefeller is Chairman of the Commission to investigate the C.I.A.; he is also, as Vice President, presiding officer of the United States Senate, where only four men (Jesse Helms, William Scott, Strom Thurmond, and Herman Talmadge—all Southerners, by the way) had the courage and patriotism to vote against the coming purge of anti-Communists from Government. The Chairman of the Senate Committee itself is Frank Church of Idaho, who in 1973 led the wolf-pack in the attack on I.T.T. and C.I.A. for involvement in anti-Communist activity in Chile.

Asking Rockefeller and Church to investigate agencies originally set up to combat Communist subversion is like asking the Godfather and son to investigate the New York Police Department. They may very well purge anybody *except* members of the family. The mood of these investigations is indicated by *Newsweek's* comment (January 6th) on the forced resignation from the C.I.A. of the formerly powerful chief of Counterintelligence, James Angleton, that "in the end, it was Angleton's total distrust of Communism and *détente* that became burdensome to the C.I.A." Or consider the following from *U.S. News & World Report* of January 27th:

While the Central Intelligence Agency is being sub-

jected to intensive investigation for allegedly exceeding its legal powers, private reports from Moscow indicate that Russia's secret intelligence organization—the KGB—is increasing its influence in the Kremlin. This is reflected in the tougher stand taken by the Soviet leadership in relations with the U.S. and Egypt.

Some have feared that the C.I.A. and the F.B.I. will be destroyed by these investigations. That is not the idea. The idea is to strengthen them by another step toward the New World Order. That step involves a major purge to make possible their merger with the K.G.B.

Portugal

From the English *On Target*, February 1, 1975, we reprint the following extract from the *H. du B Reports*, Volume XII—Letter 7—November-December, 1974:

"When Spínola was putting over the coup, Otelo Sarava de Carvalho's 'Committee for Liaison and Revolutionary Vigilance' bided its time. The minute Caetano fell, de Carvalho took charge of watching over the 'revolutionary orthodoxy' of Spínola.

"Moscow estimated that Portugal would be the last country in Europe to fall. The Kremlin figured that Yugoslavia would be theirs when Tito dies and Spain with the passing of Franco. Italy could be taken any time but Portugal not before 1981 at the earliest. No one was more surprised than Moscow when Spínola, the national hero, did their work for them. Brezhnev's first move was to transfer Ambassador Kalinine from Cuba to Lisbon. The Central Bank of Portugal reported that Moscow had transferred \$55 million to the Portuguese Communist Party between May and September. Russian arms were reaching red cells in the provinces. Trainloads of Portuguese workers indoctrinated by French reds began pouring home. Soviet labour boss, Alexander Chelepine, drew up a programme for Labour Minister Pacheco Goncalves, a communist, and 800 red shop organizers were soon regimenting Portugal's 1,200,000 workers for political action. Before April 25 the weekly Moscow-Stockholm-Lisbon flight arrived nearly empty. After the coup three flights a week reached Lisbon loaded with Russians.

"By July Spínola realized he was being used and ordered his Prime Minister, Mr. Palma Carlos, to try to move up the elections planned for late 1975. 'Traitors who have nothing to do with Portugal are trying to set the nation on fire and create a country that will no longer be Portuguese,' Spínola declared as he manoeuvred to gain six years in which to bolster the country against the reds by holding elections at once. Seeing which way the tide was running, Palma Carlos not only failed to push the election issue but left Spínola defenceless before his enemies by resigning and taking four non-communist ministers from the 15-man Cabinet with him. The field was cleared for the reds and Vasco Goncalves, Moscow's man, became Prime Minister, beating Spínola's friend, Lieutenant Colonel Mario Miguel.

"Spínola still hoped his prestige would enable him to get the monster back in the vase. He tried again in August, by having General Costa Gomes, the number two man of the junta and head of the Armed Forces, propose limiting the powers of the Co-ordinating Committee of the Armed Forces, which Vasco Goncalves and three pro-red ministers controlled. Gomes joined the appeal but assured the committee, on the side, that he was with them.

FROM:

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,

"The airforce was with Spínola, but Admiral Pinheiro de Azevedo, the Chief of Staff of the navy, was with the reds. On September 10 Spínola, in desperation, called on 'the silent majority' to take a stand against totalitarian extremism and set Saturday, September 28, for a demonstration of support in Lisbon. Though a watch was put over Vasco Goncalves the game was already lost. Red unions tied up buses and trains to prevent Spínola supporters from reaching the capital. Teenage militants with red arm-bands went down bumper-to-bumper jams of cars at roadblocks on roads leading into Lisbon. Occupants were searched, questioned and handed a list of 'fascists' marked for arrest, with a hint that their names would be added if they did not turn around and go home. There was no organized defence of liberty. The communist Minister of State, Alvaro Cunhal, phoned General Vasco Goncalves and asked, 'What should I do about the barricades?' The Prime Minister answered, 'Hold them. I'll send the army to help you.'

"The reds justified their takeover by cooking up a story that the right was planning to seize power. A few guns were confiscated from the pigeon-shooting club, to back their charges, and whisky bottles from a political club were offered as proof that Molotov-cocktails were being prepared. Once more *Grandola, Vila Morena*, went over the air as a signal that the reds had won, followed this time by *Vincemos*, the revolutionary song Allende's followers adopted in Chile.

"Communist units occupied the Ministries of Information and Defence and the office of telecommunications, and the country was theirs. To avoid civil war Spínola resigned on September 30. The three right-wingers of the junta who supported him were summarily sacked and General Costa Gomes made himself President, with the aid of the two members of the junta who remained. General Vasco Goncalves continued as Prime Minister and announced, 'In the coming elections fascist reactionaries will not be permitted to vote.' When leaders of the Christian Democratic Party begged for protection, he refused to receive them. In his resignation speech General Spínola declared, 'My sense of loyalty prevents me from betraying my people, for whom new forms of slavery are being prepared under the false flag of freedom.'

"On November 19, two days after the new government had started purging anti-red officers and retiring generals over 62, which included Spínola, to make them ineligible for any active role, the *Washington Post* reported that U.S. Ambassador Stuart Nash Scott felt there was no danger of Portugal going communist. By then the campaign denouncing Spínola as a hidden reactionary and friend of capitalism was in full swing, and General Otelo Sarava de Carvalho was arresting anyone who got in his way.

"Spínola himself was reported to be far from Lisbon, working on a new book. No one knew where Irving Brown was, but his ICFTU was locked in fraternal embrace with the communist 'World Federation of Trade Unions', opposition to which was supposed to be ICFTU's reason for existence.

"That same November 19th Teddy Kennedy was in Lisbon, singing *Grandola* with the victors, accompanied on the guitar by Minister of the Interior Colonel Manuel da Costa Braz, the head of Vasco Goncalves' police machine, which, when the truth is known, will make Caetano's look permissive."