

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 50. No. 1

SATURDAY, APRIL 4, 1970

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

The Pentagon KREMLIN ON THE POTOMAC

By MEDFORD EVANS in *American Opinion*, February, 1970

(Continued)

III

The Pentagon physically and with its operating staff is a megafacility for war-making, without control of which no power structure can operate in America, if indeed anywhere in the world. The revolutionists who staged their demonstration of October 1967 on the steps of the Pentagon were homing accurately on what they wished to seize or destroy. Impersonally (and the activities of most of the 35,000 personnel who work in the vast structure are quite impersonal), the Pentagon is a master instrument panel through which are controlled the fleets of the air and of the sea, the missiles of every range, and the fighting units of every size and every kind of specialization which the United States with the expenditure of incalculable billions has deployed throughout the world. Compared to the Pentagon, the Smolny Institute, the Tauride Palace, the Winter Palace, the island of Kronstadt, and all the other facilities which Lenin and Trotsky seized in the Bolshevik Revolution of November 1917 were nothing. Nor is there, credibly, anything else like the Pentagon anywhere in the world today.

But the Pentagon, at the level of operations, has no policy. It is a bus—better, of course, a tank—without a driver. So thoroughly have generals, admirals, and civil service employees been indoctrinated with the principle of “theirs not to reason why” that like the boy on the burning deck they would just stand there to the holocaust if they received no order to the contrary through channels. Bulkwise they are the Department of Defense (D.O.D.) . . . , but mindwise the Department of Defense is *the Office of the Secretary of Defense*. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force may be and often are important individuals, but they are under the line authority of the Secretary of Defense and do what he wishes—usually because they want to, but anyhow do it.

Yet the Secretary of Defense himself is far from autonomous, despite General Twining's fears about this “single civilian Chief of Staff”. True, the Secretary *could* seize enormous power, but only if the White House were weak or negligent. This the White House will not be while the President has such Special Assistants for National Security Affairs as McGeorge Bundy, Walt Rostow, and Henry Kissinger. Actually, no Secretary of Defense has been at any kind of odds with the White House since James V. Forrestal fell from that sixteenth-story window at Bethesda. The burdensome and generally unattractive Office of Secretary of Defense is a vital organ of the shadow world government which, as was suggested above, the international Brahmins have

operated, however precariously, since the Yalta, if not since the Tehran Conference.

The D.O.D. in the Pentagon is necessary to the shadow world government for three salient reasons: (1) to control the American soldier, (2) to preserve the facade of the world “balance of terror”, (3) to control the U.S. economy and population. A note on each of these reasons:

(1) Obviously, the first reason is the most immediate, and the cashiering of Douglas MacArthur was the biggest single job the Pentagon ever had. General George C. Marshall was called out of retirement and appointed Secretary of Defense (contrary to the provisions of the law at the time), allegedly to guide us through the Korean War. But, once MacArthur had been ousted, Marshall was no longer needed to *prevent victory*, and he resigned in September 1951, having been appointed in September 1950. Since MacArthur, the automation of general officers has been almost complete, with the notable exception of General Edwin A. Walker, who—though a two-star in comparison with MacArthur's five—caused almost as much of a flap in the Pentagon and the White House.

(2) This is not the place to go into my special convictions about the nature of the “balance of terror” on which world diplomacy has been based for twenty years. I think the Soviet prestige is essentially as phony as a Potemkin village. But be that as it may, our own military establishment has to be formidable and enormous in order that people may conceive what is meant when it is said that the Soviet establishment is formidable and enormous. Every advance of our own is cited as a reason to fear Russia.

The theory that Russia is on our heels if not leading in the arms race resists every bit of repeated documentation that all the so-called gaps are either non-existent or in our favor. Thus the most zealous pro-Soviet propagandist can join heartily in promoting magnification and progress at the Pentagon, since these will be taken as infallible proof that even greater magnification and progress have occurred in the Soviet Union.

(3) Control of the U.S. economy and population is obviously not wholly distinct from control of the American soldier. The essential problem of those whom the Secretary of Defense represents is to convert the United States from its traditional individualism and national independence to collectivism and interdependence of nations in a unified world order. Solution of this problem requires both a positive program and repressive action to keep impulsive Americans (whether in or out of uniform) in line.

(continued on page 4)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free: One year 45/-, Six months 22/6, Three months 11/6.

Offices: Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11. Telephone: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1 Telephone: 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA —

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001

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

(Editorial Head Office)

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel — Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2603. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q., Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

The idea underlying the Common Market is the idea that underlay Hitler. Hitler, to use the popular saying, was no more than the tip of the iceberg, the great reality being an immense totalitarian bureaucracy. If that happened to be a German, or even a Prussian, bureaucracy, it might be distinguishable as an oppressor; but a multi-national bureaucracy which would have enormous powers would in the end be just as oppressive, but less distinguishable because more anonymous and hence, virtually impossible to overthrow. Nuclear war being 'unthinkable', armed forces would become police forces. The idea that elected 'representatives' would have any control over this apparatus is absurd. Furthermore, if Britain, for example, did not like the results (and it must be assumed that Britain fought 'Hitler' in anticipation of such results) any attempt to contract-out would be illegal—an act of 'rebellion'. The overriding objective of the organisation would be "greater industrial efficiency" and, of course, the development of the under-developed countries, meaning a redistribution of wealth on a world scale; so long as workers with coloured skins were getting less than those with white, a need for equalisation of incomes would be apparent. Greater industrial efficiency might well require the re-location of workers having 'special skills'; any objection by nationals to being relocated among foreigners no doubt would attract the attention of the Race Relations Board. And so, by easy stages, to 'desegregation' of employment, and an "end of nationhood".

Despite the virtual conspiracy of collusion between the Party leaderships to keep decisions about joining the Common Market and abrogating British national sovereignty beyond the jurisdiction of the electorate, it is evident that the electorate is deeply uneasy to a degree where something has had to be done about it. The technique is an old and proved one: *organise* the dissidents, and then lead them up the garden path. Hence the Safeguards Campaign to gather in all those "who believe that Britain should not join the Common Market without stringent and effective safeguards". This of course means "should join the Common Market (with safeguards which can be dropped once the Treaty of Rome is signed)". The fundamental idea is to get the cattle into the pens first; while they roam around loose they may

disrupt carefully made plans for their future. The Directorate of the Safeguards Campaign includes some well-known One Worlders, and no doubt many not so well-known; and the Secretariat, which does the work, is certain to be carefully infiltrated.

The answer to all this is individual initiative exercised through small groups, along the lines of the Now or Never Campaign, which may well have been the real reason for de Gaulle's celebrated "Non". This represented merely a tactical postponement, until more water should have swept under the bridge, bringing Social Democrat (Fabian) Governments to power.

The issue is being made to look mainly economic, but in fact is political, for, as Douglas said, "if you can control economics, you can keep the business of getting a living the dominant factor of life, and so keep your control of politics—just that long, and no longer". This, of course, is precisely what the Wilson régime has achieved. The Conservatives call this achievement 'incompetence', but we call it treason.

The Now or Never campaign offered an economic alternative, but too much water has flowed under the bridge for that issue to be effective now. Canada is governed by a Prime Minister with Communist affiliations, and Australia is being welded into the Asian complex.

Mr. Heath has announced baldly in Parliament: "I am an internationalist". To be an internationalist means *not* to be a patriot; it means to look forward to the abridgement and ultimate abrogation of national sovereignty; AND THAT IS THE ISSUE. Every Member of Parliament should be asked to declare himself on that issue. The only Safeguard now is to turn traitors out of Parliament. *Get cross.*

It is vital to realise that if the British electorate is tricked into surrendering its sovereignty as a nation, the surrender will be irrevocable unless the whole scheme—plot—for One World Government collapses. The nearer One World Government comes to achievement, the more catastrophic that collapse will be. Hitler's was an attempt at such Government, and its collapse nearly destroyed Europe, and in any case paved the way for the present attempt, or was part of it.

The date of the next British election—if any—is not yet known; but it probably marks the end of the remaining (and diminished) opportunity to preserve national sovereignty.

For remember: If treason is *allowed* to prosper (higher parliamentary salaries?) none *dare* call it treason. Once supreme international power is achieved, it will be used against those who have surrendered to it. And it is that surrender that Messrs. Wilson and Heath contemplate, step by "pragmatic" step under 'competent' leadership.

COMMUNISM, CONSPIRACY AND TREASON

A brochure with an introduction and a list of books on Fabian Socialism, International Communism and International Finance which are concentric and form an International Conspiracy.

Free on request

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11.

Conception of the Possible

The Sunday Times, Jan. 25, 1970, gives a profile of Lord Hunt by "Spectrum" which it calls, "Lord Hunt: the man who sold it soft". His most pronounced characteristic as a political animal, says "Spectrum" in a penetrating phrase, is "a very narrow conception of the art of the possible". Some readers may remember that Group Captain Cheshire had the wider conception that enough good will existed on both sides in Nigeria for the making of peace in November.

The same narrowness marks some of the critics of South Africa. A group of South African churchpeople, including the Archbishop of Capetown, issued "what amounted to a manifesto for voters in the coming General Election". (*Church Times*, Jan. 23, 1970.) In this they said, "No Christian can support a political policy which, being demonstrably impracticable, bases its appeal to the electorate on false claims and promises. Such an essentially dishonest policy cannot be reconciled with the Christian's commitment to truth". I do not see how it is altogether *impracticable*. The standard of non-white education is higher than anywhere else in Africa, internal peace survives (in marked contrast to the disorder in many other African states) and there have been notable housing efforts. These cannot be the false claims and promises to which the manifesto refers. Nor do I believe the South African rulers to be notably *dishonest* men. They have tried, after all, to build on African foundations and doubtless they honestly believe that a Westminster type of democracy would not serve the interests of any section of their difficult but prosperous country.

Curiously enough, Dan Van der Vat wrote an article in *The Times* dated Jan. 23 called, "African Priests up in Arms". The priests, he says, "humbly invite" their bishops to learn more about African parishes and call for more responsibility for African priests in administering the Church. Their manifesto, printed in the *Rand Daily Mail*, remarks: "The Government is Africanizing its civil institutions. Why must the Church lag behind this progress?" These words suggest that, in practice, the Government has a wider conception of the possible than the Church. Peregrine Worsthorne's view in the *Sunday Telegraph*, Jan. 18, 1970, was that the imposed "solution" reached in Nigeria conformed to a European, not an African, pattern; for Europeans originally put Nigeria together.

By contrast, an article called "Rhodesia Policy vs U.S. Security" (*Human Events*, Nov. 29, 1969) shows the great ingenuity of the Russians towards their "enemies". Through Rhodesian sanctions they have forced the U.S.A. to buy all their chrome from Russia. The deputy director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness remarked: "If the USSR were to decide to discontinue sales of Chromium ore to the United States for one year, we would use up the entire uncommitted stockpile excess in that year . . . there is no way to see the chromium needs of the United States being met without chromium ore from Rhodesia". Senator Thurmond also points out that "Rhodesia is also the sole source of petalite . . . and present stockpiles are practically exhausted". It is used for making high temperature glass and ceramics.

However, the Russian monopolists need not tremble, for we read, (*Daily Telegraph*, Jan. 29, 1970) "Mr. Stewart, during his talks with Mr. Rogers, raised the question of America's retention of a consulate general in Salisbury,

Rhodesia". He urged America to show its disapproval by withdrawing its representative. The question is, Whom does Mr. Stewart represent?

—H.S.

Analysis of Communist Aims

Taken from the United States *Congressional Record* (Senate), Appendix, January 10, 1963, the following selection of those immediately relevant to student demonstrations, subversion, and corruption are taken from 45 points in an analysis, produced in 1962, by Mr. Skousen, Field Director, American Security Council:

11. Promote the U.N. as the only hope for mankind. If its charter is rewritten, demand that it be set up as a one-world government with its own independent armed forces. (Some Communist leaders believe the world can be taken over as easily by the U.N. as by Moscow. Sometimes these two centres compete with each other as they are now doing in the Congo.)
13. Do away with all loyalty oaths.
16. Use technical decisions of the courts to weaken basic American institutions by claiming their activities violate civil rights.
17. Get control of the schools. Use them as transmission belts for socialist and current Communist propaganda. Soften the curriculum. Get control of teachers' associations. Put the party line in textbooks.
18. Gain control of all student newspapers.
19. Use student riots to foment public protests against programmes or organisations which are under Communist attack.
20. Infiltrate the press. Get control of book review assignments, editorial writing, policy making positions.
21. Gain control of key positions in radio, T.V., and motion pictures.
22. Continue discrediting American culture by degrading all forms of artistic expression. An American Communist cell was told to "eliminate all good sculpture from parks and buildings, substitute shapeless, awkward and meaningless forms".
23. Control art critics and directors of art museums. "Our plan is to promote ugliness, repulsive, meaningless art".
24. Eliminate all laws governing obscenity by calling them "censorship" and violation of free speech and free press.
25. Break down cultural standards of morality by promoting pornography and obscenity in books, magazines, motion pictures, radio and T.V.
26. Present homosexuality, degeneracy and promiscuity, as "normal, natural and healthy".
27. Infiltrate the churches and replace revealed religion with "Social" religion. Discredit the Bible and emphasise the need for intellectual maturity which does not need a "religious crutch".
28. Eliminate prayer or any phase of religious expression in the schools on the ground that it violates the principles of "separation of church and state".
32. Support any socialist movement to give centralised control over any part of the culture-education, social agencies, welfare programmes, mental health clinics, etc.
38. Transfer some of the powers of arrest from the police to social agencies. Treat all behavioral problems as psychiat-

ric disorders which no-one but psychiatrists can understand or treat.

39. Dominate the psychiatric profession and use mental health laws as a means of gaining coercive control over those who oppose Communist goals.

40. Discredit the family as an institution. Encourage promiscuity and easy divorce.

41. Emphasise the need to raise children away from negative influence of parents. Attribute prejudices, mental blocks and retarding of children to suppressive influence of parents.

The Pentagon

(continued from page 1)

After MacArthur, the biggest job of repression the Pentagon (and its bosses) had was getting rid of Senator Joe McCarthy. Here the role of the Department of Defense was not quite so singular as in the MacArthur case, but it was still crucial, the misnamed Army-McCarthy Hearings* being no doubt a necessary prerequisite to the Senate's condemnation proceedings against McCarthy in the fall of 1954. The reason why both MacArthur and McCarthy had to be destroyed was that both represented the "archaic" concept of national victory and independence. Both, however, were so popular and so skillful in office that neither could have been disposed of without the unparalleled resources of the Pentagon.

IV

Today, Big Business and the intellectual Brahmins whom it simultaneously fears and supports do not need military protection against the Soviet Union (with which there is an arrangement of coexistence) or against any other foreign power. What is required is protection against potentially unruly groups in any country, especially the United States itself. This requirement explains the so-called disarmament program, which is not really a disarmament program at all but a redistribution of arms. Since there will be no more wars between the great nations, weapons suitable only for such wars are to be immobilized and, as soon as possible, concentrated under control of a world agency. Yet the armed services of the great nations will not be disbanded. On the contrary, they may even be enlarged, for they will have the more tedious assignment of maintaining law and order in their own countries, where the traditional police are daily being shown to be inadequate.

Details cannot be anticipated, but the trend in weapons distribution is: all weapons up one echelon. Private citizens will be totally disarmed; local police may have sidearms, but no riot-control equipment; states may have riot-control equipment, but no weapons adequate for pitched battle against armed opponents. National forces may have every kind of weapon short of those needed to defend the nation. In general, state and national forces will be integrated, but there will be the sharpest of lines between, on the one hand state forces versus the citizen, and on the other hand national forces versus the world agency. *The world agency will have a monopoly of nuclear and all other "ultimate" weapons.*

The Pentagon will be at once a command post for the national police, and a service center to be used as desired by the world agency. The corresponding citadel in Moscow—

the Kremlin—will serve a similar purpose in the Heartland of Eurasia.

In Russia they say there are three principal organizations—the Army, the Secret Police, and the Party. By placement of key personnel, however, the Party effectively controls the other two. In the United States today, only the Army—or rather, the Armed Services as a whole—can be clearly seen. Yet it is obvious enough that the Armed Services are controlled, and controlled in a way that has revolutionized our traditional policies of (1) no "standing armies" in peace, and (2) victory in war. The commissars who exercise this revolutionary control sit of necessity in the office of the President of the United States, who is titular Commander-in-Chief, and in the office of his next-in-command, the Secretary of Defense.

It is not necessary that the President and the Secretary should themselves understand this system, but it is vital that they do not buck it. For we too have our Secret Police, which one supposes must emanate from the Central Intelligence Agency, and there are quite evidently ways of dealing with Secretaries of Defense or with Presidents who buck the system. James V. Forrestal was taken to Bethesda Naval Hospital and died; John F. Kennedy died and was taken to Bethesda Naval Hospital.

In each case there is, or was, someone in the Pentagon who knew what happened. That hospital at Bethesda is, after all, a Defense Department installation.

(Concluded)

AN INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL CREDIT

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

A New Revised Edition

10/6 posted

SOCIAL CREDIT IN 1967

A Review for New Readers

3/- posted

THE STATE OF THE WORLD

The state of the world has grown steadily worse since 1945, and appears now to be on the brink of explosion. And the evidence of conspiracy, once in the main largely conjectural, is now abundant, clear and readily available. But not through the usual channels.

This review of world affairs was originally published in 1946. It was reprinted in 1967 with some added notes. The essential thesis remains unimpaired; and fore-sight is more convincing than hind-sight.

3/- posted

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11.

*McCarthy was undoubtedly right in saying that his opponents in this case were not the Army, but "Pentagon politicians".