

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 48 No. 20

SATURDAY, 28 DECEMBER, 1968

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

The Usurpers

A Review on the Men who Rule America

(From *American Opinion*, November, 1968)

For a sometime contributor to this magazine to accept an assignment to review the latest book by AMERICAN OPINION'S premier book review editor may seem presumptuous. It certainly presents some special considerations: If the book is mediocre, how could one dare to say so; and, if it should turn out to be any good, how could one do it justice without appearing to fawn? Worse, what does one do when he discovers that *The Usurpers*, by Medford Evans*, is not merely good but simply superb?

Ah well, what else would you expect of Medford Evans? Anyone who has read his articles and reviews in AMERICAN OPINION needs only to be told that Dr. Evans has written a new book to be certain that they're due for a trip to the bookstore.

This is fortunate, because no reviewer could hope to summarize in less than a hundred pages the wealth of information which Professor Evans has packed into *The Usurpers*. What he has done, in fact, is to succeed in an attempt to answer the most significant and perplexing political questions of our era:

Is there an identifiable purpose, a basic goal, underlying the foreign and domestic policies of the government in Washington? What is it? Who are the individuals responsible for it? Where do their loyalties belong? How close are they to achieving their goals? And finally, how can responsible Americans once again become masters of their destiny and not merely servants of their rulers?

Conservatives have long recognized that, unless we are to credit our leaders with being paragons of stupidity, it is reasonable to assume that they know what they are doing. It is true, as Tom Anderson has suggested, that there are men in Washington who have never made a mistake—in our favour—just as it is equally true that very few men in positions of authority in Washington make nothing but mistakes. It is certainly apparent to the merest tyro that if the consequences of the policies of our "leaders" were the opposite of their real intentions they would not in fact be our real leaders and not in authority. Moreover, if the purpose of the policies which they institute is consistent, and if careful analysis reveals but one identifiable pattern, moving the nation unmistakably in a single radical direction, then regardless of any explanations, apologies, or excuses, it is unreasonable to think that what is happening has not been

carefully planned by powerful persons for a specific purpose. Concerning their motive and objective, Dr. Evans says:

I do not think . . . that many, if any, of those top men are traitors in the classical sense of simply betraying their own country, the U.S.A., to another country, say the U.S.S.R. I think that many of our top leaders in government and business have participated in a usurpation of power through which they hope to manage rather than represent the American people. I think further that they hope to participate in the management of the world, and that they do not envisage this as possible without ultimately merging with the Communist bloc.

And, Dr. Evans proves his case.

He begins *The Usurpers* powerfully, with details about the deliberate sellout of the U.S.S. Pueblo, and escalates for 249 pages—covering events as separate and important as the nomination of Abe Fortas for Chief Justice, Lyndon B. Johnson's 1948 election to the Senate, the controlled (and carefully planned) expansion of the War in Vietnam, the murders of John and Robert Kennedy, the T.F.X. scandal, the 1964 Presidential election (was it manslaughter or suicide?), the move at the top to disarm America, the motivation of the Warren Commission, and dozens of other crucial and illuminating issues.

Medford Evans describes *how* this country is being conquered and he shows *who* the would-be conquerors are. Clark Clifford, Abe Fortas, L. B. Johnson, Walt Rostow, Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, Robert McNamara, Dean Rusk, and a score of other Usurpers come under his careful scrutiny.

What makes *The Usurpers* unique, of course, is not that Dr. Evans has collected an amazing amount of evidence, but that he has assembled his evidence into an indictment that explains *who* and *why* and *how*. *The Usurpers* proves that the policies of our leaders have been wrong—which is fairly easy to do—but, far more important, it exposes *who* the policy makers are and where they are leading us.

And, in plain language.

It is a stunning book, because the truth stuns people today. Consider, as Evans does, the implications that the Warren Commission published as fact a theory it knew to be false:

It would, of course, be absurd to say that the Warren Commission participated in the assassination of
(continued on page 3)

*Published by Western Islands, Boston and Los Angeles; 249 pages (paperback); available from K.R.P. Publications at 9/6 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 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 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

A Happy Christmas To All Our Readers

NATO's stunning ultimatum that Russian moves in the Eastern Mediterranean or against say Yugoslavia or Rumania would "create an international crisis with grave consequences" is followed, according to the World Service of the B.B.C. (Nov. 28), by a statement by Mr. Stewart that "British withdrawal from the Middle East, including the Persian Gulf, does not mean that she has lost interest in the area; and it would be wrong", he added, "for any other Power to try to take over Britain's former role there". What on Earth, or in Hell, is this supposed to mean?

There has been hardly a word related to reality appearing in the British press since the Russian Czechoslovak manoeuvre. The *Daily Telegraph* editorial of Nov. 18, 1968—"NATO's Late Awakening"—for the first time spells out the situation already analysed in an article written in early September, and published in *The Social Crediter*, Sept. 21, 1968 ("Instant Danger"). The *Telegraph* says: "But public opinion in the NATO countries should know, as it is to be hoped that the culpable NATO Governments know, and as both the Russians and the countries they are threatening certainly know, that NATO is powerless to give any effective aid. It is an illusion to think that NATO's great but dwindling air and naval superiority in the Mediterranean might somehow be brought to bear. Russia's strength on land, and in land-based aircraft, would be overwhelming at the crucial points. Furthermore, along the whole line of confrontation with NATO, from Norway to Turkey, Russian conventional preponderance is so great that she could in retaliation smash through to the West's vitals in a few days in many places simultaneously.

"Would America then risk nuclear war, in which she and the West would be devastated as much as Russia, for Yugoslavia and the others? . . . The answer is clearly, no. It is, in fact, no more than a possibility that America would use nuclear weapons in retaliation for a clear-cut aggression against Berlin or West Germany.

" . . . Now, if there were war, it would probably all be over in a few days. So what is to be done? Bring NATO forces up to maximum efficiency within the severe limits of their inadequate size . . ."

The *culpable* NATO Governments . . . "Culpable" means criminally responsible. Perhaps it could be said of the succession of Conservative British Governments that they were merely criminally *irresponsible*; Mr. Macmillan's "winds of change" speech certainly signalled the unleashing of chaos in Africa. But they did try to stop the rot in the Suez crisis of 1956, and were virtually disarmed in the 1962 Nassau agreement following U.S. abandonment of the Skybolt project. But both the Socialist Administrations have consciously and deliberately pursued policies designed to subordinate Britain in an internationalist order which, as has now become quite clear, is to be policed and maintained by the armed forces of Communism: yesterday Czechoslovakia, tomorrow Britain.

The fatal deterioration in the strategic situation is further highlighted by a speech by President Tito, reported in the World Service of the B.B.C. on Nov. 30, 1968. Tito said that Yugoslavia needed no assistance from the U.S.A. in defence, and did not recognise 'spheres of influence'. This is clearly enough a warning that the Eastern Mediterranean is being closed to the West, and makes nonsense of the idea that Yugoslavia is 'next on the list' for Russian invasion, and under the protection of the U.S.

There is probably a vague feeling in Britain that if the electorate can survive the Wilson Administration's policies for another two years they will be able to throw the Government out of office, and all will be well. Nothing could be further from the truth. The fact is that *no* Government can, by better management of a now patently unworkable economic system, rectify the present situation. Criticism of the Government's 'incompetence' misses the point completely. What Britain can 'afford' under the Wilson régime or any visible alternative has nothing to do with Britain's real productive capacity, which is much greater now than it was when Britain colonised a large part of the world and subsequently fought two world wars. Her present alleged relative poverty is purely a matter of book-keeping; unless that is rectified, economic collapse followed by Communism is certain—unless the Communists get there first. Economic collapse means the break-down of law and order; and Communism is simply the maintenance of law and order by force in place of economic inducement.

It is simply amazing that no one seems to see that Britain's position is exactly as if she had lost the war. Restraint of home production in favour of unrequited exports (which is what a balance of payments surplus is) is merely paying tribute to the victor. The victor, of course is World Government, hitherto exercised through financial power but in the imminent future to be maintained by naked force.

Wisdom

"It is to this day difficult to admit to what extent we were manipulated, how far generous emotions were fed with lies, how brazenly we were used . . . the best one can say is that it may have been the beginning of some degree of wisdom."

This is Stuart Hood, reviewing a new book about the Spanish Civil War in the *Spectator* and recalling his own involvement in the Leftist "student protest" of those days.

—Peter Simple, *Daily Telegraph*, July 23, 1968.

Portugal Stands Firm

A recent United Nations vote against Rhodesia was carried by about ninety votes with two against, these being South Africa and Portugal, and yet we can read John Bulloch, for instance, whose contribution to the *Daily Telegraph* (Nov. 7, 1968) is called: "How Rhodesia Prevents the Reign of Terror". The tribesmen evidently co-operate readily with the forces of order in arresting the terrorists and "the loss of freedom for the few has meant peace for the many", as not more than 500 are detained who would mostly have been convicted "if witnesses were free to speak"

And the rest of the middle of Africa recalls Conan Doyle's story, *The Last of the Legions*, which tells of the chaos which followed the Roman withdrawal from Britain, with many of those who had demanded it being soon dead.

The Portuguese Foreign Minister, Franco Nogueira, throws light on the situation in *The Third World* (Johnson, London) where he describes the General Assembly of UNO as an auction room and predicts a future of instability and suffering for the part of Africa between Northern Arabic Africa and the Southern polycultural zone which includes the unique Portuguese Africa. He calls Nigeria "the artificial political structure which the British left to its fate", notes the harsher type of neo-colonialism which drives hard bargains for raw materials, and shows that the new Westernised African leaders no longer understand their peoples.

The West has in fact transferred its legitimate positions not to the Third World but to the socialist bloc who are working "to encircle Europe", seconded by the anti-Western O.A.U. Meanwhile Europe has abandoned responsibility and displays numerous myths, which contrast with Portuguese reality: such myths include that of the rapid development of the third world, and those of democratic and liberal development and of land reform.

The volume also contains his address at Luanda in which he shows that the Portuguese have no alternative. "Things do not work like this", he comments in rejecting the U.N. solution of independence, while communist determination is of "the most calculated and coldest sort". One man one vote and UNO "legality" are further myths, while they attack Portugal for its success and want her presence withdrawn.

The African Provinces, he shows in his Lourenço Marques speech, are more developed than any recent independent territory South of the Sahara, while the attacks on Mozambique are subsidised—through private companies for imperial reasons, he alleges. The League was European and moderate regarding Africa but UNO has no ideological unity, while its process destroys what previously existed and creates the framework for a new form of power.

Few works shed as much light on these problems and disasters, and Mr. Johnson deserves our gratitude for printing the book.

—H.S.

Race

"No man will treat with indifference the principle of race. It is the key to history, and why history is so often confused is that it has been written by men who are ignorant of this principle, and all the knowledge it involves."

—Benjamin D'Israeli: *Endymion*.

The Usurpers

(continued from page 1)

President Kennedy. Unfortunately, it is not at all absurd to say that the Commission, and President Johnson, whose Commission it was, are accessories after the fact in the murder of John F. Kennedy. The reason that shocking statement is not absurd is simply that we now know for a reasonable certainty—the book Six Seconds in Dallas, by Josiah Thompson, has possibly the most succinctly shattering proof—that more than one marksman fired at the President and Governor Connally. If we know this, if Professor Thompson knows it, if Edward Jay Epstein knows it, we may also be reasonably sure that the Commission knew it.

But if the Commission knew that Oswald could not have been a lone assassin, and yet published the conclusion that he was, then the Commission was aiding the others—whoever they were—to escape. And this, I believe, is what is meant by the term: accessory after the fact. The charge, implicit here and in numerous other books, that the Warren Commission was lying, is so shocking that many good citizens are reluctant to think about it.

Earlier in this chapter, called "The Operators", Dr. Evans demonstrates that the Warren Commission and those who guided it (most notably, Abe Fortas and Nicholas de B. Katzenbach) never tried to "solve" the Kennedy assassination. On the contrary, the Commission began with a conclusion—that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone—and set out deliberately to establish that theory as fact.

Nor did the Commission fail. *It gained the time the Usurpers needed.* As Evans remarks, "even if the essential facts of the *coup d'état* come to be known and accepted, and all the falsehoods of the Warren Commission mercilessly exposed—yet still it will remain true that planning, principally in the Justice Department under Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach, delayed speculation about a conspiracy long enough to ensure Johnson's landslide election in November 1964."

But is it possible for basically decent and trustful Americans to believe that the President, the Chief Justice, and a score of other top-ranking officials would knowingly and deliberately assist in the escape of those who killed President Kennedy? How would your friends and neighbours react to the suggestion that Johnson and Warren, Katzenbach and Fortas—yes, and even Robert F. Kennedy—were accessories after the fact in the murder of President John F. Kennedy?

No wonder "many good citizens are reluctant to think about it".

Yet, how much more difficult is it to believe that these same men have conspired in the deaths of thirty-thousand young Americans in Vietnam? That they have reconciled themselves to the possibility that millions more may die—may, in fact, need to be sacrificed—before their empire is consolidated and its rule secure?

The evidence in *The Usurpers* is overwhelming that this is the case. And, the evidence cannot be ignored. The premise that there are "conspiratorial Usurpers (who) apparently aim at nothing less than an oligarchic government of the world" may be uncomfortable, may even seem incredible, but that premise alone satisfies all

of the known facts and fits all of the known evidence. Until such a premise is accepted, nothing the United States is doing in Vietnam makes sense. Once it is, all of our actions (and inactions) become understandable. They point in one unmistakable direction. And Medford Evans has noted every signpost:

What are we doing in Vietnam? We are given various answers at various times by various people: It is that we are there: (1) To fight Communism; (2) to help the Vietnamese people; (3) to serve legitimate American interests in the Far East; (4) to please our allies; (5) to keep our pledged word; (6) to do nothing at all, really, that is just positive; (7) to prevent economic depression in the United States; (8) to carry on imperialist conquest—United States replacing France in Indochina; (9) to wage a world-wide race war.

All of these have some truth in them for someone—depending on who you are and what you're after. But there is a tenth answer. There are powerful men—Usurpers—for whom we are there:

To promote a new unified world order through constructive conflict, in which the object is not to destroy the enemy, but to build him up, not to win over him but to win him over . . . Vietnam is not a beachhead for the American conquest of Asia. It is a depot and transfer point for American supplies to Asia. Why make war to do it? How else would you cover the transfer of strictly military supplies?

If this is indeed the purpose of what is happening in Vietnam (and the Vietnam War must have a purpose; it has taken so much time and attention and trouble to get us involved in it), then spending billions of dollars to keep us there, while violating every maxim of war to prevent our troops from winning, makes sense—to someone.

"War between a rich country and a poor one often enriches the latter regardless of who wins the military decision." That is not a maxim from Mao Tse-tung's little red book—at least I don't think it is. I got it from *The Usurpers*, along with this next one: "We can expect the United States' war against Communists in Asia to enrich the Communists in Asia".

The truth of this is driven home especially hard when you realize that a substantial portion of our expenditures in Vietnam—perhaps as much as half—are for construction, development, and expansion of non-military projects. The multi-million dollar effort to build "another TVA" in the Mekong Delta is but one example.

Four years ago, there appeared to be neither rhyme nor reason to U.S. strategy in Vietnam. Even today, the war makes absolutely no sense—when examined from the bias of American interests. But remember that Usurper Walt Rostow claims that "it is, therefore, an American interest

Antecedents of Communism

Tracing the writings of Marx to their original source, this booklet gives some important history of the International Conspiracy.

2/6 posted

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

to see an end to nationhood as it has been historically defined". In that context, Vietnam does make sense, as Dr. Evans says:

The Vietnamese, the Viet Cong, the Communist bloc, our "allies"—all—become collaborators with us in paving the way for World Government.

. . . Here is the horrifying truth: The Vietnamese War is the economic lifeblood, not just of South Vietnam, but also of North Vietnam. It may be vital to Red China's emerging role as a nuclear power, and more of a source than a drain for Soviet Russia.

There is much more in the chapter on Vietnam, of course, than a few brief quotes can reveal. The activities in Vietnam of nuclear expert David Lilienthal and his Development and Resources Corporation, for example, are especially fascinating. The most important theme of this book, however, as the author explains in his introduction, "is that legitimate government in the United States has been usurped by deceit and violence, and that the power of a captive United States Government is being exploited to establish a totalitarian World Government".

If the government of these United States has, in fact, been captured; if it is now fully under the control of the Usurpers intent on enslaving us; if our chief threat comes not from the jungles of Asia, the mountains of Cuba, the offices of the Kremlin, or even the streets of America, but from our own government, then obviously a huge number of Americans had better reconsider their strategy for preserving our heritage. Because, if the Usurpers exist, if they are in control, and if they know what they are doing, then opposing their policies will not defeat them. Campaigning for "law and order" will not stop them. And, certainly, partisan rallies and slogans and political chat won't disturb them in the least.

There is only one way to defeat such a conspiracy, and that way is by exposure. Exposure of the participants and their objective, not merely their programs and their progress.

The Usurpers does just that. It names names. You may not like it, you may even have trouble believing it, but you had better read it.—WALLIS W. WOOD.

Extra copies of this and other recent issues are available to subscribers at a nominal charge of 4d. each posted. Any additional contributions towards the costs would be appreciated.

An Introductory Package on the International Conspiracy Finance, Socialism (Fabianism) & Communism

Finance and Communism & Grass-Roots Economics	4/-
The State of the World	3/-
No Co-Existence	1/6
Destalinisation	1/6
What We Face	1/6
A Treatise on Treason	1/6
The Art of the Possible	3/-
Social Credit and Suez	1/6
Step by Step	9d.
More Truth About Vietnam	2/3
None Dare Call It Treason	7/6
Three back numbers of The Social Crediter	5/3

Total Retail Value 33/3

The whole package for £1.0.0 posted

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

Printed by E Fish & Co Ltd Liverpool