

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 48 No. 14

SATURDAY, 5 OCTOBER, 1968

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

### Instant Danger

A generation has passed since the Munich Crisis, so it is worth recalling that period.

For several years prior to Munich, Germany had been re-arming. Adolf Hitler had published *Mein Kampf*, a blue-print of his designs if ever there was one. On the other hand, the Bank "of England" financed German re-armament, and the Socialists were pacifists. Foreign Correspondents, notably Douglas Reed, sent home warning dispatches; but they were played down by the Press, especially by the *Times*, from which Mr. Reed resigned in disgust.

Hitler pursued his plans to a point where it became obvious that he was close to a position where he could conquer the whole of Europe, although he denounced Communism, as entrenched in Russia, as the real enemy. So his claim to Sudeten Germany, in the possession of Czechoslovakia, was made an issue of general war. But Britain, thanks to the Socialists, who could have used the re-armament of Great Britain to overcome the great depression (in the best Keynesian manner), but didn't, was totally unprepared for war; and Mr. Chamberlain made a deal with Hitler—the Munich Agreement—which postponed war for a year. It was evident enough then, but is quite certain in retrospect, that had Great Britain with or without allies, declared war on Germany in 1938, Europe would have been overrun and Great Britain defeated—for ever.

However, despite the profound relief of the nation it was clear that our Wall St. masters were displeased—or pretended to be. At all events, the pacifist Socialists began screaming for war, and a campaign of vilification of Chamberlain unprecedented in British history took rapid shape. The political commentary industry worked overtime to build up a war psychology, and Hitler and the Germans were described in terms that have never been applied to Stalin and the Communists. War became certain.

It is a cardinal article of faith among honest-to-God-is-dead Socialists that 'Hitler' was bent on world conquest. Very likely he was, although he disclaimed the intention. The Communists, however, continuously and emphatically have proclaimed exactly the same intention, only to be met by polite disbelief by the Socialists and Liberals (those who believe it, of course, think it a good thing). The Russian version of *Mein Kampf* is *Foundations of Leninism*, by J. Stalin; and there are hundreds, if not thousands, of other texts. The Liberals disbelieved Hitler—that Communism is the enemy—and disbelieved the Communists—that *they* are the enemy. Who *is* the enemy? The British?

If the situation was menacing in 1938, it is a hundred times more dangerous now.

Communist strategy has been, and is, to achieve 'peacefully' such a change in the military balance of power as to

achieve the conquest of Europe 'by surprise'.

According to some Defence Correspondents, the Russian move 'against' Czechoslovakia must have taken six months to plan, and even they seem surprised by the precision of the operation. Does it take 600,000 troops and 20,000 tanks to 'subdue' Czechoslovakia? Suppose that in March, 1968, the Kremlin had proclaimed its intention of moving these forces closer to West Germany in August, with the intention of 're-uniting' Germany. The NATO forces *might* have responded. Has NATO now six months to prepare logistically for a conventional war? Can NATO use tactical nuclear weapons without slaughtering Czechoslovaks and our 'friends' the Yugoslavs? Can we save the West Germans without killing the West Germans? Will U.S. public opinion risk nuclear missiles on their cities to 'save' West Germany, or even Europe? If not, can Britain, which defied Hitler, deter Russia?

Those who understand the true operation of the financial system will realise that an economic 'crisis' can be precipitated overnight when the time is ripe—the ground is being prepared by the 'danger' to sterling and the 'doubts' about the dollar. When Mr. Wilson has demonstrated (as he was put in power to demonstrate) that socialist technological miracles cannot save Britain, the mysterious consortium of European financiers will 'decide' not to go on making loans to 'support sterling'. Unsupported, sterling, "one of the world's reserve currencies", collapses, disrupting international trade and creating financial havoc—all very 'accidental'. And then the strikes begin. And the oil is cut off.

For more than fifty years Communism has maintained in Russia and elsewhere training establishments, the equivalent of universities, to turn out men as highly qualified in theoretical and practical Communism as a system of seizing and maintaining World Government as are engineers or medical practitioners in their disciplines. These experts, distributed throughout the world, but as articulated by the Kremlin as is the structure of an army, comprise at the same time a Fifth Column such as Hitler never dreamed of, and an intelligence network so secure (because composed of nationals dedicated to internationalism) that it is certain that there are no government secrets anywhere in the world which are not known almost instantly to the Kremlin. One agent in any department of government, or industry, is sufficient\*.

In the light of all this, it ought to be plain that Europe hasn't a dog's chance. Lenin himself described the "war for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie" as "a hundred times more difficult, prolonged and complicated than the  
(continued on page 2)

\*See *Theory of Subversive Action*, R. Cosyns-Verhaegen, K.R.P. Publications, 7/9 posted.

## 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 40/-; Six months 20/-; Three months 10/-.

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

Telephone: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1

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

### FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Mr. H. Wilson's equivalent rank in the hierarchy of World Government, in which he is pleased to play his revolting role, is about that of Sergeant, his immediate superior being a Master Sergeant in Washington. As it is not for him to reason why, it hardly matters what he thinks of the fraudulent financial system, under which the international financiers grant one loan after another to 'bolster sterling'. He probably knows that Britain's indebtedness can never be repaid in kind—to attempt it would be to hypothecate the export of Britain's total production for years ahead. The indebtedness is simply an instrument of coercion to enforce a tyranny over the British people until such time as the military sanctions of the World Government are overtly established, and Britain can be regarded as merely a territorial Province of One World. With the Financier in ultimate control, debts will no longer signify, and money can become a pure rationing system, with the consumer having no say (he has little now) over the programme of production. Apart from the proletariat's rations, it will all be for export—to underdeveloped countries—of course. Ask Mrs. Castle of Uppsala.

In the meantime, Sergeant Wilson can drill the O.Rs. in 'Britain', and lead his Section in the War against Rhodesia.

Douglas once whimsically remarked to the effect that if, in the prevailing high winds, a chimney-pot were blown off and fell on Mr. Emanuel Shinwell, he could regard the occurrence with some equanimity. At least the previous Socialist Government had the pretext of post-war 'difficulties' to justify its programmes of austerity and regimentation; but Mr. Wilson has behind him a period of over twenty years of 'recovery', in which our unconditionally defeated 'enemies', Germany and Japan, have achieved the economic miracles which Sergeant Wilson periodically and unavailingly promises us.

So, "fight the good fight" (against the British and the Rhodesians); insult the South Africans, and arm the Nigerians—sparrows all.

No doubt, one of the high attractions of ballot-box democracy for Sergeant Wilson and his ilk is that the worst that can happen to them is defeat at an election. Unless the Russians come, that is. And the Russians are closer than they were a month or two ago.

It is too much to suppose that, with very few exceptions, all political commentators are Communists, secret or otherwise. But they behave as if they were. The 'line' on the Russian 'invasion of Czechoslovakia' was established and stabilised within a few days: Russia has made an enormous 'blunder', has risked losing the good-will of the West, has threatened trade, hardened America's attitude, and jeopardised the prospects of peace in Vietnam; and increased the prospects of a disastrous Republican victory in the U.S. How stupid can they be?

Indeed, according to these commentators, Russia is more to be pitied than blamed; so it is vital to maintain the dialogue with them, and continue cultural exchanges. Perhaps this time Russia has learned her lesson—from the wonderfully restrained Czechs (and Slovaks). If not, Sergeant Wilson may not speak to her any more. So there!

Further supplies of this issue are available at a nominal charge of 4d. per copy posted, but additional contributions towards costs would be appreciated.

#### Instant Danger

(continued from page 1)

most stubborn of ordinary wars between states". But Lenin, like his successors, believed it could be done; and, with International Finance behind the effort, he seems to have been right. You, dear reader, if a property-owning citizen, are one of the international bourgeoisie. If you are merely an international financier, have no worries. You are Socialism's bread and butter.

Whether, as Dimitri Manuilski claimed it would, the U.S.A. will fall into their hands "like an over-ripe fruit", remains to be seen.

#### Theory of Subversive Action

Beyond legality and this side of violence

Translated from the French of

ROGER COSYNS-VERHAEGEN

"The aim of this study is limited to the following:

"To explain subversive action, to describe its methods, to demonstrate its possible aims and then to provide sufficient rudiments to enable one to expose it and form an opinion in each specific case."

7/9 posted.

Will be available from K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.,  
245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11. shortly.

#### Insurrection

Is America sleeping through civil war?

by Susan L. M. Huck

2/9 posted

#### The Unelected

How do you move left from here?

by Gary Allen

5/- posted

## Laos

FROM THE SCOREBOARD EDITION\* OF *American Opinion* (JULY-AUGUST, 1968) WE REPRINT THE SECTION ON LAOS IN MR. HILAIRE DU BERRIER'S NATION BY NATION ANALYSIS ON ASIA:

It is at this time a grave responsibility to write about Laos, the lovely little "land of a million elephants" now struggling to survive. Here King Sri Savang Vatthana reigns in Luang Prabang (the royal and spiritual seat of power), while in the capital city of Vientiane Prince Souvanna Phouma, the Prime Minister, works to save his storm-tossed country.

American responsibility for what is happening here is great. First there was our senseless backing of Ho Chi Minh in the post-War years when we conjured the monster from the vase. Then came December of 1959 when pro-Western officers seized power in Laos in what was called the *Christmas Coup d'Etat*. Washington forced them to step down. Perhaps the *coup d'etat* was an error. If so, providing the Communists with ammunition by high-handedly giving the impression that Laos was a puppet State which America would not defend was certainly a greater one.

Through the years one man has repeatedly come to the fore in moments of Laotian crisis. That man is His Royal Highness, Prince Souvanna Phouma. In January of 1958 he even tried an experiment to see if he could bring the Communist Pathet Lao back into the fold—a sad attempt to see if good apples could cure bad apples—and was accused of selling out his country. The experiment failed, but the Laotian ship of state is still afloat. And, through all the shoals—Communist plots, rebellious captains, ambitious warlords, and the meddling of the C.I.A.—the calm, pipe-smoking Prince has somehow managed to continue to preserve Laos and its 3 million people.

Today Laos is going through a more critical period than anything the little kingdom has endured to date: There is, of course, the Hanoi offensive against Laos, more vicious with every day; and, there is the threat of an American-imposed Coalition Government in Saigon that would remain a "Coalition" just long enough for our troops to withdraw. Prince Souvanna Phouma knows only too well what is happening. On October 23, 1964 he declared: "When the Communists take over Saigon there will be nothing for us to do but pack our baggage." When the Prince and his Laotian Government pack their baggage, free Thailand will go under also.

It is so important that Americans have at hand a frank report on the situation in this part of the world, a report from someone whose authority will not be readily disputed, that your correspondent wrote to Prince Souvanna Phouma, who is a personal friend, and urged him to set down on paper the message he would put before the American people if he could address them directly. We told His Highness that his report on the state of Laotian affairs would be printed as he wrote it. On April fifth, from his palace in Vientiane, Prince Souvanna Phouma wrote us a letter under filing number 407, in which he said:

*I thank you warmly for your letter of March 7, 1967 and the pleasant memories which it brings back to me. I shall be happy to get together with you again and I hope*

*we can do so in the near future. As regards the situation in our country, I am sending you a report, affixed to this letter, which you can publish in any magazine you wish, under my signature. It is a résumé of the Lao question, which is now very complex and becoming more so as the war continues. Whatever happens, I shall be happy if American public opinion can have a chance to become acquainted with these problems.*

With a note of thanks and recognition, and a kind request for a copy of your correspondent's book on Vietnam, the Prince closed with his signature and the Great Seal of the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Laos. The personal report of His Highness follows, unchanged save that it is translated from French into English:

*To understand the situation in Laos one must recall the words of Napoleon: "The policies of a State depend first of all on its geography."*

*And so it is. With the Kingdom of Laos surrounded by some 600 million Chinese, 30 million Thais, 20 million North Vietnamese, 15 million South Vietnamese, and 6 million Cambodians, it is easy to understand what sort of policy Laos with her 3 million inhabitants has to follow as regards her immediate neighbors if she wishes to survive.*

*One also has to take into account other permanent considerations of the problem: (A) That of history. The history of the kingdom has been a story of slow, peaceful expansion: Chinese moving towards the south; the T'ai Kingdom towards the Lane Xang. There was no bloodbath, no wild gallop such as Attila made. It was a conquest, without clashes, of fertile territory that was almost uninhabited. We are peaceful laborers.*

*(B) The matter of Buddhism. It came to us from India. Since then we have practiced that admirable religion with full respect for its principles. Ours is Buddhism of the Small Vehicle—non-violence and moderation. As in India, our people bathe in the religion that teaches the uselessness of force.*

*(C) Furthermore, we have always been a monarchy. Not a sumptuous monarchy avidly gathering vast domains, nor a dictatorial one. Rather our monarchy has been austere, preoccupied with religion and moral force (which are the same thing), careful to remain close to the people. Such have been our Kings.*

*These fundamental elements of our physical geography and permanent traits of our psychology explain much of our national reactions before the problems that confront us today.*

*These problems were born the day the former French Indo-China became independent. Under the pressure of events France was forced to abandon her colonial position. This disengagement permitted a Marxist-Leninist Party to easily seize power in North Vietnam. Since then events have unfolded according to their terrible internal logic, aided, without doubt, by the mistakes of men here and there, not only local politicians but those of the great powers.*

*In Laos also a Marxist-Leninist Party, the Neo-Lao-haksat, which used to be called the Pathet-Lao, played its own game in the same fashion, boasting that it was*

\*Available from K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, Ltd: 9/3 posted.

the sole depositary of the national will. In reality, Souphanouvong (the Prince who leads Laos' Reds) and his partisans, which are not numerous, were at sides during the independence struggle. Once we acquired independence—we are members of the U.N., we have a Parliament, free elections, deputies and diplomatic representatives—the Neo-Laohaksat pretended that Laos was not truly independent and launched a campaign of anti-National subversion in an attempt to impose the Communist system on the country. Civil war started at that moment. Yet, this war would not have gone on so long had Communist North Vietnam not brought massive aid to the Neo-Laohaksat. In reality, the Vietminh and the Neo-Laohaksat performed the usual dragging-out operation of the "war of national liberation," englobing in that cover-all any imaginable situation in such a way that even those who were not the least bit Marxist were given a mortal and even a legitimate excuse for these revolts and all the internal subversion against the legal government which went with them.

However, since these problems exist one must try to resolve them in the best interests of our country. Those who have charge of public affairs in Laos must analyze the situation as objectively as possible. In my case, I decided that a policy of the Right, which is to say a total show-down with the Lao and North Vietnamese Communists, was not reasonable. Our country did not have the means. Our army is still young. Our national budget is weak. Our population is politically uneducated. These facts, along with those I described at the beginning of this article, guided me in my decision. Only a neutral policy was realistic, and I have had a hard fight getting this admitted, not only in my own country but abroad. It was not easy. In Laos many political groups reasoned as follows: The Neo-Laohaksat have only a few badly-armed battalions. They have no money. Their political organization is only starting. The population is not Marxist. We have an army of 18,000 men (at that time), foreign support, legal authority, and sufficient means. We must not hesitate. Let's fight the Neo-Laohaksat. Let's crush that mosquito.

This was also the point of view of the United States, but events proved me right. For it is now 1968 and we have still not been able to vanquish the Neo-Laohaksat, and the North Vietnamese are in Laos. The latter have increased their aid to the Pathet-Lao. They have brought forty thousand troops into our country, they have enlarged the Ho chi Minh Trail and built up their combat potential. In sum, the situation is much more dangerous today than it has been for some years, not only because of the intrinsic force of the Neo-Laohaksat but because North Vietnam is completely committed to support of the war for "national liberation" which the Neo-Laohaksat is waging. This is the fundamental point. North Vietnam bears principal responsibility for the war in Laos, because, in violation of international rules and the Geneva Accords of 1962, she aids a party in revolt and herself commits an armed aggression against an independent nation (with her armed presence on the Ho chi Minh Trail). The Neo-Laohaksat forces, I repeat with insistence, would be nothing without the support of the Hanoi government.

This is the situation in Laos in 1968. Our small country

devoutly wishes neutrality. To have that, she has given up much. Read the articles of the 1962 accords. Laos is forbidden to belong to any military pact, to practice an aggressive policy, to permit the installation of military bases, to make propaganda against my country, etc. In brief, she is bound by an impressive list of things she is forbidden to do. No one can believe that the great powers are really afraid of a little country of 3 million people, isolated among monsters who surpass her a hundred times over in power.

Whatever one might say as to the sincerity of those Accords, we signed them in good faith, except for the Neo-Laohaksat. It is our misfortune that we are in a region where the ideological struggle between Marxism and the liberal system has taken on the proportion of a war to the death. The Lao problem has become bound up with the problem of Vietnam. Our fate thus depends on the struggle between the forces facing each other in Vietnam, and some of these (the Vietcong and North Vietnam), by ideological messianism, do not want the neutral experiment in Laos to be successful. Therefore the die is cast.

(Signed)

Prince SOUVANNA PHOUMA.  
(Chao Krommana (Prime Minister)).

Affixed is the Great Seal of the Kingdom of Laos.

We are very grateful to His Highness for having taken time to write in such detail of the problems he faces, surrounded as he is by such powerful and often unconscionable neighbors. He has not, as the Venetians advised, embraced "the hand he cannot cut off." With the fate of 3 million helpless people in his hands, he has played for time. What happens to them will depend on what we do in South Vietnam. It appears that our President, to win a national election, may yet try to force Vietcong participation in the Government of South Vietnam—the effect of which will be fatal in Vientiane as in Saigon.

If there are some who criticize the Prince for his decision to try to follow a neutral path instead of throwing his country into a pragmatically hopeless fight, bear in mind that he was warned by *Time* magazine after the Rightwing *coup d'état* of December 1959 that "U.S. policy sees little profit in trying to make a free world bastion out of an isolated jungle nation whose borders are contiguous with a Communist power."

In the ultimate reckoning it is only on America's will to stop the Communists that the will to resist of the small nations of the world can depend. In the light of this there is something ineffably sad in the way this harassed Prince and Prime Minister takes time in the midst of our President's search for a peace that will be a death sentence for Laos, to lay his cards on the table before the American people.

Finance and Communism  
and

Grass-Roots Economics

4/- posted

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

Printed by E Fish & Co Ltd Liverpool