

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 49 No. 12

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1969

1s.3d Eortnightly

Mr. Kissinger

A Would-Be Usurper

By MEDFORD EVANS in *American Opinion*, June, 1969

Spake *Time* of February 14, 1969: "Henry Kissinger is already suspected in Washington of being a would-be usurper of the powers traditionally delegated to the State and Defense Departments." Recently in a book called by odd coincidence *The Usurpers* (and containing by further odd coincidence the observation, "The Secretaries of State and Defense are the obvious V.I.P.'s of the Cabinet) your correspondent argued that:

... many of our top leaders in government . . . have participated in a usurpation of power through which they hope to manage rather than represent the American people By no means are all the Usurpers in the Johnson Administration Former Vice President Nixon — now a protégé of his former putative political rival Nelson Rockefeller — has taken no position basically at issue with the Johnson Administration At some time after November 5, 1968, we shall know whether the Usurpers . . . are (1) to continue in power, or (2) to be replaced by Establishment substitutes, or (3) be replaced by more representative Americans.

As of mid-April 1969, we know that the ball was under shell Number (2). The Establishment has sent in a new platoon, but it's the same team. While it may appear extreme to speak of Nixon as Rockefeller's *protégé*, it is simply a fact that promptly after the election Nixon appointed as his closest foreign-policy advisor the man who had been Nelson Rockefeller's foreign-policy advisor in the campaign — Henry A. Kissinger. Heretofore obscure to the public, Kissinger has had influence in every Administration since Truman's. Now under Nixon his position is possibly the most powerful in our government, next to the Presidency itself — or perhaps not excepting that, for he may be the main channel between the President and the higher echelons of the Establishment.

The king who reigns but does not govern is in effect a servant to his chancellor, his *éminence grise*, who in turn characteristically belongs to an order.

I

Henry Kissinger's job under Nixon — "Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs" — is the same one Walt Whitman Rostow had under Johnson. Both the similarities and the differences between Rostow and Kissinger are of considerable importance.

Both are academic intellectuals, both are Jewish, both had experience in military intelligence in World War II, both

have worked since the war in Cambridge, Massachusetts (Rostow at M.I.T., Kissinger at Harvard), on projects financed by the Central Intelligence Agency. Both are brilliant, both have written numerous books, each having one book of marked influence — Rostow's *The Stages Of Economic Growth*, Kissinger's *Nuclear Weapons And Foreign Policy*. This is not at all to belittle the importance of their other writings, which is great.

Each has also experienced life in both Europe and America, but here a difference appears. Rostow was born in the United States (New York City) and, besides going to Yale, received an important part of his education in Europe, at Balliol College, Oxford, where he was a Rhodes Scholar. Kissinger, all of whose higher formal education was obtained in America, at Harvard, was born in Furth, a German city of about 100,000 population near Nuremberg, and lived there until he was fifteen years old. Both men, as indicated above, were in intelligence during World War II, and both served in Germany. But, Rostow was a Major in the Office of Strategic Services, while Kissinger was an Army enlisted man who rose to sergeant. Rostow, who was already a Yale Ph.D. in 1940, is seven years older than Kissinger, who did not enter Harvard till after the war, and did not get his Ph.D. until 1954.

Yet in 1946, when he was only twenty-three years old and had never been to college, Henry A. Kissinger was discharged from his N.C.O. status and given a civilian job with the Army at a salary of \$10,000 a year. Everyone who worked for the Government in those days knows that \$10,000 was the salary of a "CAF-15" or a "P-8" — the highest grades in the civil service at that time. Men fifty years old considered themselves highly successful if they made P-8 or CAF-15. Of course, civil service or not, everybody who remembers 1946 can recall that \$10,000 a year was good money for anybody but movie stars and General Motors executives. And for a kid twenty-three years old? He had to know somebody. It isn't that one needs to question his merit. Kissinger is, as we said above and will have occasion to say again, brilliant. But merit and brilliance are not enough for a deal like that.

Despite the fact that Rostow was, on the record, academically the more precocious of the two, Kissinger probably has the more subtle intelligence. Certainly he is the better writer. Rostow's books are almost unreadable. In the *Usurpers I* suggest that Doctor Rostow doesn't actually intend

(continued on page 3)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

PUBLISHED FORTNIGHTLY

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. Tel: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1. Tel: 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 I. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. 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.

Vol. 49 No. 12

Saturday, September 6, 1969

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Socialism appears to have three levels of recruitment. The lowest and, today, the least important and relevant is the misconception that the poor are poor because the rich are rich. Historically, with the rise of industrialisation, this view appeared to be justified. There was grinding poverty, and immense fortunes were made. But even then, the *personal* consumption of all of even the moderately rich relatively did not amount to much. The spending of fortunes went into the construction of capital goods, useless to the population as food, clothes and shelter. This is the typical war economy: guns before butter. And, leaving aside death through malnutrition and insanitary environment, early industrialism was a war economy—battles for export markets and the competitive development (then called exploitation) of undeveloped countries. Eventually, the benefits of industrialisation became available (though even now not to anything like the extent potentially available) to the home consumer*.

The second level of recruitment is the intellectual. Here a good deal of misguided idealism (most Socialist intellectuals probably could not construct a box, let alone develop and run a factory; they are characterised by a passion for giving orders to those who can, and confiscating the product) is compounded with an undue proportion of envy, malice and spite. They are the Non-Commissioned Officers in the army of Socialism, whose position is maintained by having troops ("workers") below them. Their concern is to promote the importance of Employment: what is the use of being a Labour Boss if the troops are vanishing? A modern Social Conscience of course requires that the troops should be comfortable and well-fed in their barracks, and kept fit for working; but the important thing is that they should be *there*. To this end, *some* 'unemployment' is exemplary—a requirement of discipline.

The third level is the Financier-Capitalist level—in fact, the apex of the pyramid, where the primary, and perhaps only, objective is Power, on an international scale.

The point to be kept in mind in all this is that *the standard of living for the individual is governed by the ratio of consumer-production to capital-production*. (Capital here

refers to physical production, not finance-capital.) Capital production is in fact the 'profits' against which traditional Socialism has been accustomed to inveigh. Now if this is grasped, it should be apparent that the Socialists are the best organised profiteers in history; their objective is to restrict consumption, and expand production by means of forced 'development', production for export, and the pursuit of technology. Education in its proper sense (the flowering of the potential individual human personality) is subordinated to producing workers and technologists in the proportion demanded by the requirements of industry.

It is against this total background that the 'achievement' of putting men on the moon must be seen—the larger lunacy. If this had been done by 'private' Capitalists out of profits 'wrung' out of the worker by exploitation, what an outcry there would have been! Yet the economic reality underlying the enterprise is one and the same thing. Socialist taxation is, economically, precisely the same thing as private Capitalist profit, except that it is very much more extortionate.

Modern astronomy and astro-physics have made gigantic strides in our understanding of the universe; it is hardly too much to say that all the major problems have been solved in principle at least. Even so, it makes no real difference to any particular generation what the age of the Universe actually is and whether or not it is expanding; nobody can do anything about it. The idea of colonising the moon, let alone one of the planets of our system, is probably pure moonshine, though few scientists have the nerve to say so. Professor Fred Hoyle, however, does say*: "I find it ironic that doubts are being cast as to whether sums of the order of 100 million dollars can be afforded for the construction of new accelerators because sums of *tens of billions* are being afforded to set a man afoot on the ruined slag-heap we call the moon". It is, of course, the information gained by the use of particle accelerators which has solved so many fundamental problems.

So far as ordinary human needs are concerned, the space-programme is a gigantic swindle; the fascination of seeing "the first" man on the moon is not likely to be repeated with the second or any others. As a spectacle, man's activities on earth, his proper habitat to which he is attached by incredibly delicate physico-chemical and psychic mechanisms, are of infinitely greater interest than anything anyone is ever likely to see televised from space. Even if, for some remote future, this forecast is too pessimistic, it is certainly true that the resources and energies of these present generations are being squandered and gambled for the extremely doubtful benefit of our indefinitely remote progeny.

But it may well be that there is something more behind the spectacular nonsense. The programme has 'justified' the construction of an exceedingly complex global communications network; and this may well be a sort of electronic brain to serve the undisclosed purposes of World Government. It is quite beyond all reasonable doubt, now, that there is in existence a World Government, still largely occult, but discernible in its manifestations: "a compact organisation, almost impossible to identify completely, possibly controlled at the top by something the Churches call Satan" (C. H. Douglas). This is a matter which those theologians who have

*See *The Development of World Dominion*, Notes 123, 126.

**Galaxies, Nuclei and Quasars*.

not substituted social 'science' for Christian theology might well take seriously. The Gospels bear witness as much to the existence of Satan as to the divinity of Christ; by their fruits shall ye know them.

The point is that the forces which inflicted on Græco-Roman Christian civilisation the physical *and cultural* destruction of two World Wars and the Great Depression are active in the world today. The First World War effectively eliminated a generation, inflicting an almost mortal blow on cultural continuity. This attack has been continued in the perversion of education into a system of mental conditioning by which technological values have been substituted for cultural, and the amoral standards of the 'permissive' society insinuated, reaching its apotheosis in the U.S.A. with systematised sex instruction of infants in schools.

In short, the means employed are a strong indication of the end intended. We are, in effect, going through the Orwellian (1984) phase, leading to the Huxleyan *Brave New World*. But in practical terms *internationalism* is the enemy, and national promoters of internationalism are traitors and will have to be dealt with as such—an objective which transcends Party Politics. Thoroughgoing patriotism, combined with defiance of the World Bank even at the risk of military sanctions is, so far as we can see, the one alternative to perpetual enslavement. The ultimate power of the Enemy is based on deception, and an informed challenge to that power would end it.

Return to Sense

I have not previously heard of the Dean of Salisbury, Rhodesia, the Very Rev. S. M. Wood, and evidently he does not support Mr. Smith wholeheartedly for he says that economic growth would enable the Africans to "find their strength and demand and achieve their rights". Yet in the same sermon at Wareham, Dorset, the Dean urged that sanctions should be abandoned as they were not hurting the Whites but were hurting the Africans "increasingly and alarmingly". (*Church Times*, July 25, 1969.) And he told the congregation to face the "unpalatable" fact that Mr. Smith and his colleagues have won the UDI stage of the constitutional struggle, while sanctions were bringing "hopeless despair" to African school-leavers, whose numbers will be doubled this December. The Dean's solution is to leave the problem to "the inevitable process of history" which will redress the balance of power. Ninety-five per cent of the population are Africans and over half of them are under sixteen. I think the Dean might have given credit to the rulers and their services which have produced such an increase in the young population, and which have protected them from the disasters which have decimated Africans in the central parts of Africa.

In the same issue, Canon Edward D. K. Wood of Lavant, Chichester, points out that terrorists are the very people who in Rhodesia "attacked (black) Africans, burnt Africans' houses and churches and schools and terrorise the Africans on the borders of Rhodesia and Mozambique". The canon would suppose Bishop Huddleston to be aware of the apostolic warning against doing evil that good may come and that as a man of peace he would hate violence and warfare.

Further, the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship has "rebuked

the eight Liverpool clergymen who recently called for armed intervention by the British Government", and the editor of *Challenge* has pointed out that a "holy war" in Africa could lead to another Biafra or Viet-nam. The call for a holy war should be resisted "as holy folly".

Sympathisers with Mr. Smith have used most of these arguments already, but they may claim some advance when his critics or the indifferent use the same arguments. I cannot see why a disastrous British Government should presume to give quite different countries advice on how to run their affairs or why political arrangements that are supposed to suit Great Britain should apply to a totally different population, some of whom are at varying stages of development, and half of whom are under sixteen. No one would now take the Liverpool clergymen seriously and the ostensible advocates of the black Africans are bound to reconsider a situation that gravely damages these very people.

At the same time those who are steering clear, if precariously, of the communist web need constant vigilance against their enemies, for if anything is certain, the enemy will not rest.

—H.S.

Mr. Kissinger

(continued from page 1)

his books to be read. They are intended to influence opinion by just being there. Someone can say, *you know we have to do thus and so in Southeast Asia because*, as Rostow has shown, *the nations there have reached such and such a stage of economic growth*. And Rostow's prose is so impenetrable that nobody is going to read it to find out whether he actually demonstrated any such thing or not.

As a writer, Kissinger is in another category. While Rostow is almost intolerably verbose, Kissinger is generally perspicuous. Here is a sentence taken almost at random from Rostow's *The Dynamics Of Soviet Society*:

The shapeliness of the story [Soviet history] which emerges is, thus, not the consequence of full control and forethought by the men who have dominated the Soviet system, but rather of the continuity of priorities in their minds in confronting issues thrown at them for decision by the course of world history and the continuity of certain fixed or slowly changing forces operating within the society they have sought to control. (Mentor paperback edition, page 18.)

You like that? You must be some kind of a nut if you do.

In contrast, consider a passage — not, I admit, taken quite at random — from Henry Kissinger's *The Necessity For Choice*. He quotes Dr. Hans Bethe as having said it was embarrassing to have had to stand at Geneva and discuss technical possibilities in the realm of nuclear testing which "implied that we considered the Russians capable of cheating on a massive scale". Kissinger comments:

. . . it is difficult to understand why the chief American negotiator should have been quite so defensive about presenting our case. After all, if arms control is to have any meaning, negotiations about inspection must assume the possibility that the other side may cheat. The absence of trust is precisely what makes arms control so important. When the survival of society is involved, it does not seem unreasonable to strive for

safeguards other than the word of men who arrested the leaders of the Hungarian revolution while negotiating an armistice with them and who executed them despite a promise of safe-conduct. (Page 276.)

Kissinger does not sustain this kind of eloquence, but Rostow never reaches it, apparently never strives for it, possibly does not know what it is. You will observe that in the passage above Kissinger not only flashes a bit of Ciceronian invective, but does so in the service of justice. Also, he manages quite a successful apothegm in, "The absence of trust is precisely what makes arms control so important". I wish I did not have to add that it is precisely Kissinger's skill in lucid articulation which not only distinguishes him from Rostow and other "Liberals" but also, by attracting the often unwary admiration of Conservatives and especially of the ideologically uncommitted, makes him a particularly dangerous minister of the Establishment.

Kissinger's aura is not that of the typical "Liberals" against whom so many of us have by now developed antibodies. He moves among us with a certain mystery, but inevitably we are tempted to think, *Well, if he is not a "Liberal" he must be some kind of Conservative.* We are reluctant to condemn a man who frequently says good things, who — as in the passage quoted above — does not hesitate to criticize even a scientific Brahmin like Hans Bethe, and that for softness toward the Soviet Union.

The uncertainty in the ambience of Kissinger's image creates confusion in the minds of some of our best Conservatives, if — as is just possible — *Time* may be believed. The cover story of the issue for February fourteenth began with an anecdote about General Curtis LeMay's allegedly saying when Kissinger's name was mentioned: "I remember him. He was a crypto-left-winger when he was teaching at Harvard and a dangerous pinko when he was serving John Kennedy". Whereupon "another former general" allegedly replied, "Curt, I can forgive you occasionally for not knowing *what* you're talking about. But in this case it's obvious you don't know *who* you're talking about. You've mixed up Henry Kissinger with Arthur Schlesinger." *Time* adds: "LeMay nodded sheepishly and sat down."

If General LeMay did that he was far too modest, for what he reportedly said about Henry Kissinger is true, or at least as true as it would have been about Arthur Schlesinger. It happens to be Schlesinger himself who in his book *A Thousand Days* tells something of how close he and Kissinger worked together in serving John Kennedy. The time was July 1961, the issue was the Berlin crisis of that summer, the problem of the Kennedy *entourage* was to refute some tough-sounding anti-Communist sentiments which had come quite surprisingly, and to "Liberals" somewhat embarrassingly, from former Secretary of State Dean Acheson. On short notice Kennedy asked Schlesinger "to prepare an unsigned memorandum about the unexplored issues in the Berlin problem." Arthur went into action as follows:

I immediately sent out calls for [Abram] Chayes and Kissinger, both of whom had left their offices for luncheon. It was not till after three that I finally got them over to the East Wing, and the President's helicopter was due to depart from the White House lawn at five. We quickly worked up an outline. Then, as

Chayes and Kissinger talked, I typed. By furious effort, we got the paper to Hyannis Port in time. (Page 325.)

Abram Chayes was Legal Advisor to the State Department, and a friend of Chester Bowles. It is somehow kind of touching to think of Arthur's sitting there taking dictation from Chayes and Kissinger. It was evidently the advice of such stalwarts as these which led to our pusillanimous tolerance that summer of the shameful obscenity of the Berlin Wall. I should say that General LeMay had every right to call such counselors dangerous pinkos.

As for Kissinger's being "a crypto-left-winger when he was teaching at Harvard", the evidence is overwhelming. It was indeed during the last years of the Eisenhower Administration that Kissinger at Harvard played an historic catalytic role in reassuring the Russians that they had nothing to fear from America's highly vaunted nuclear weapons. Schlesinger again treats of this matter. Speaking of "a new approach to the arms race under the banner of 'arms control,'" he says: "The thinking was particularly hard along the banks of the Charles River, where Jerome Wiesner, Thomas C. Schelling, Henry Kissinger and others worked out the strategy of equilibrium in the nuclear age."

The establishment of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in 1961, the simultaneous issuance of State Department Publication 7277, the signing of the Test Ban Treaty of 1963, the conclusion of the Nonproliferation Treaty in the last year of the Johnson Administration and the first months of the Nixon Administration — all these steps in the "Politics of Surrender" were promoted and guided by numerous "crypto-left-wingers" and "dangerous pinkos", to be sure. But, by none more effectively than by President Nixon's new Assistant for National Security Affairs, Henry A. Kissinger. The enormous implications of these "arms control" activities require the most careful and thoughtful unfolding. Before attempting such an analysis, let's say one or two words more about the kind of man Kissinger seems to be.

(To be continued)

THE TRAP

"We see Heads of State, Heads of Departments, and droves of lesser commanders flying to confer all over the globe, visibly evolving the machinery of International Government—government of nations from outside nations, and ending in World Government without nations. We are in a trap, not so much 'struggling to survive' as being prevented by the traitors in our midst from dismantling the trap."

The trap closed on Britain with the signing of the ignominious Letter of Intent from the British Government to the International Monetary Fund. What is left of British sovereignty? This booklet briefly reviews the situation.

1 copy 2/6 posted 3 copies 5/9
6 copies 10/3 12 copies 17/6
K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11.

For the purpose of interesting potential new subscribers additional copies of this issue of *The Social Crediter* are available, at 4d. each posted.