

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 51. No. 22.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 22, 1972

7p (1s. 5d.) Fortnightly

### Get US Out!\*

#### THE U.N. THREATENS THE UNITED STATES

By GARY ALLEN

On October 25, 1971, the United States of America suffered a severe kick in the teeth when the United Nations General Assembly voted 76 to 35 to oust the legal Government of China and replace it with representatives of Mao Tse-tung. The *New York Times* reported that after the voting, "For long minutes the packed hall rang with applause and cheers for the winners. There was rhythmic clapping". The word "gleeful" was generally used to describe those who had voted to oust the peaceful government of America's staunchest ally, Chiang Kai-shek, and seat in his place the world's premier warmongers. Symbolically and appropriately the delegate from Communist Tanzania danced the Watusi when the results of the vote were announced.

Our Ambassador to the United Nations, George Bush, maintained that we had seen the "hatred" of America as it really exists in the United Nations. "The mood of the General Assembly that night was ugly. It was something harsh," said Bush, noting that he had been roundly hissed as he rose to speak. Walter Trohan of the *Chicago Tribune* observed:

*... the expulsion of Nationalist China demonstrated clearly, if further demonstration were necessary, that we have few, if any friends, anywhere. Those nations we saved in World War II and those nations we helped on their feet after the war voted against the retention of Nationalist China in the U.N.*

Even "nations" whose very creation we supported and financed joined in the chorus of anti-Americanism. Four of the six Common Market nations voted against us: Belgium, France, The Netherlands, and Italy. (Of the other two, West Germany is not a U.N. member, and Luxembourg bravely abstained.) Also voting against us in this important test were our N.A.T.O. "allies" Britain, Canada, Iceland, Portugal, Turkey, Norway, and Denmark.

As high officials in the Nixon Administration have maneuvered to blame the defeat on assorted Ethiopians in the fuel supply, it has become more and more obvious that the vote was fixed from the start. One remembers that according to *Human Events* for September 25, 1971:

*President Nixon handed Peking a handsome gift last week, making his offering only five days prior to the opening of the General Assembly of the United Nations. In his extemporaneous press conference, the President, announcing a fresh "Sell-out Taiwan" doctrine, stressed that the United States would not only welcome Peking into the U.N., but that we also wanted it to sit on the all-important Security Council. He further demonstrated that the U.S. favored the eviction of*

*Taiwan from the Security Council—this without Red China having relinquished a single concession to the U.S.*

Mr. Nixon had already greased the skids with his announcement that he would journey to Peking to pay homage to the oriental despot, Mao Tse-tung. But, for the sake of appearances, Ambassador Bush made a clumsy effort to resist the Albanian resolution to oust the Nationalist Government. And while Mr. Bush was pushing one policy for the television cameras, the real Nixon policy was being spelled out privately. As the *New York Times* reported October 26, 1971, the President was "flashing one political signal while the United States seemed to be pursuing another in the United Nations".

The next day, in the *Los Angeles Times*, the syndicated "Liberal" columnist Robert Elegant observed:

*The long arm of coincidence can stretch only so far. It was hardly coincidence that placed Dr. Henry Kissinger, the President's guru for foreign affairs, in Peking at the precise moment the United Nations was voting to admit Communist China and expe[el] Taiwan . . . .*

*The adroit orchestration of Kissinger's visit, American maneuvering at the United Nations, and Peking's ritual denunciation of that maneuvering, revealed a high level of practical cooperation . . . . Such understanding is the necessary basis of joint action to attain common purposes . . . .*

*The United States appeared to be striving to save Taiwan's seat in the General Assembly, while admitting Peking to the Security Council. That appearance was almost—but not quite—believable. After all, Washington knew Peking would not accept half a loaf . . . .*

*Once the President announced his intentions of visiting China, it was a foregone conclusion that Peking would get in and Taiwan be expelled. The Administration simply could not imperil the visit and the burgeoning Sino-American relationship by excluding Peking . . . .*

*Actually, Washington's ostentatiously warmer attitude toward Communist China insured her admission. Wavering nations knew that voting for Peking would not really offend the United States.*

(continued on page 4)

\*From *American Opinion*, January, 1972.

# 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 £2.60 (52/-), Six months £1.30 (26/-).

Offices—

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

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. 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 L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougement, P.Q., General Deputy Chairman and Secretary, H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Very early in the elaboration of the ideas subsequently known as Social Credit, their originator, the late C. H. Douglas, recognised that underlying economic phenomena were political phenomena; and that underlying policy, was philosophy. This approach was manifest in his first book on the subject, *Economic Democracy*, and in fact is enunciated in a quite general form in the second Chapter: “. . . the marshalling of effort in conformity with well-defined principles. . . . They may be summarised as a claim for the complete subjection of the individual to an objective which is externally imposed on him; which it is not necessary or even desirable that he should understand in full; and the forging of a social, industrial and political organisation which will concentrate control of policy while making effective revolt completely impossible, and leaving its originators in possession of supreme power”. Remember, this was in the days before the ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’ had been established.

And in Chapter III: “The danger which at the moment threatens individual liberty far more than any extension of individual enterprise is the Servile State [i.e., the Welfare State]; the erection of an irresistible and impersonal organisation through which the ambition of able men, animated consciously or unconsciously by the lust of domination, may operate to the enslavement of their fellows . . . .

“In attacking capitalism, collective Socialism has largely failed to recognise that the real enemy is the will-to-power, the positive complement of servility, of which Prussianism, with its theories of the supreme State and the unimportance of individuals (both of which are the absolute negation of private enterprise) is only the fine flower; and that the nationalisation of all the means of livelihood, without the provision of much more effective safeguards than have so far been publicly evolved, leaves the individual without any appeal from its only possible employer and so substitutes a worse, because more powerful, tyranny for that which it would destroy”.

This is about as abstract an analysis of the situation as is reasonably possible. But it does include a non-material factor—the will-to-power. The economic ‘system’, as a system, has

certain mechanical features—cause and effect factors—; but apart from mechanical energy, whether man-power or machine-power, it is *energised* also by a psychological force, the force of human *intention*.

Looked at, as they say, ‘objectively’, as Douglas largely did in *Economic Democracy*, the outstanding feature of the system is *centralisation*. But the human factor cannot be evaded or ignored: at the centre of centralisation are to be found centralisers. In *Economic Democracy* Douglas gives an ‘objective’ description: “. . . Pyramidal organisation is a structure designed to concentrate power, and success in such an organisation sooner or later becomes a question of the subordination of all other considerations to its attainment and retention. For this reason the very qualities which made for personal success in central control are those which make it most unlikely that success and the attainment of a position of authority will result in any strong effort to change the operations of the organisation in any external interest, and the progress to power of an individual under such conditions must result either in complete acceptance of the situation as he finds it, or a conscious or unconscious sycophancy quite deadly to the preservation of any originality of thought and action.

“. . . .  
“. . . When it is further considered that these positions of power fall to men whose very habit of mind, however kindly and broad in view it may be and often is in other directions, must quite inevitably force them to consider the individual as mere material for a policy—cannon-fodder whether of politics or industry—the gravity of the issue should be apparent”.

In retrospect, *Economic Democracy* can be seen as an impersonal attempt as possible to nip the “grave issue” in the bud, with the minimum of disturbance to society and custom. At that time, relatively simple modifications in finance and accountancy would have enabled a smooth passage from the turmoil of rapid industrialisation into the new age of Plenty and Leisure, which after all are the only sane objectives of industrialisation. But the publication of Douglas’s proposals resulted, in a very short period of time, in their virtual boycott in all the important media of communication—a boycott which has been maintained to this day. All sorts of tripe concerning large economic and political issues is permitted unlimited expression; but any attempt to intervene in such discussion from a Social Credit point of view is met with “The Editor regrets”; or silence.

It thus became apparent that the question as to the conscious complicity of the centralisers in the policy of complete international centralisation of power was not an open one; there was manifest opposition to a policy of progressive decentralisation of initiative which the progress of the industrial arts made increasingly possible. The official adoption of the policy of Full Employment set the seal on the endeavour to proceed to World Government, “through war, or under threat of war”.

With the benefit of hind-sight, it is now clear that the First World War—which at the time appeared to be chiefly economic in origin (the struggle for world markets to dispose of relative over-production)—was in fact a large step towards World Government, hopefully to be embodied in the League of Nations. The attempt failed, because United States public opinion revolted. On the other hand, it was immediately apparent that the Great Depression of 1929 was

another such step; and Douglas foresaw that a Second World War, with the same ultimate objective, was being prepared. Even in 1931, Professor Arnold Toynbee disclosed that if nations did not surrender their local national sovereignties voluntarily, they would be forced to do so through war; and in 1939 Anthony Eden remarked that: "It seems that our New Order must be built through war. But it will be built, just the same". When Mr. Heath proclaimed "I am an internationalist", he meant the same thing—the system over the individual.

The fundamental fact is that where industrialisation ('development') is successful within an area of 'local' national sovereignty, it is increasingly incompatible with a policy of Full Employment. To maintain the system, it is necessary to break down the boundary of local sovereignty, so that 'local' productivity can be dissipated over 'under'-developed areas of the world. The Big Idea can perhaps be more easily grasped by realising that what the Internationalists have in view is some form of graduated International Income Tax, which, imposed by an International Government, would mulct the 'rich' nations for the (alleged) benefit of the 'poor'—in fact, however, to maintain Full Employment as a means of government when technological progress is obviating more than a minimum of necessary human employment.

A leading article in the *Sunday Telegraph*, Dec. 19, 1971, professes ignorance as to what is going on: "But what is urgently needed first is a great deal more information than we now possess on the precise origins of the stubbornly high unemployment level. How much of it can be ascribed to short-term factors which may soon be remedied? And how much, in fact, is due to these profounder changes which are likely to be beyond the reach of traditional cures?"

"At present nobody can answer these questions [we can], since existing statistics do not supply the information. Only a fresh and thorough investigation of the problem can provide the answers. . . ."

*Mutatis mutandis*, the "fresh and thorough" examination of the problem was made in *Economic Democracy*. It really was a fresh examination, and exposed some essential fallacies of economic theory which, however, have never been corrected, and which Douglas predicted would lead to precisely the situation which faces us today, and about which the *Telegraph* apparently is now concerned. The problem is technological advance *versus* Full Employment, and the only change since Douglas wrote is that due to the exponential advance in technology. If a "fresh" investigation is to be held, it will only be to furnish a smoke-screen for authoritarian measures to redistribute the world's wealth: not for the benefit of the Indians, Pakistanis, etc., who represent the "over-population" of the world, and are therefore billed for mutual extermination through grass-roots wars and anarchy, as advocated by Chairman Mao, but to maintain the supremacy of a system of government over the interests of individuals as such. And that is what the Common Market is really all about, as a careful examination of the White Paper, Command 4715, and the *Times* leading article Nov. 20, 1971, make plain for those with eyes to see.

At fairly frequent intervals, some natural disaster—an earthquake, an eruption of a volcano, the striking of a city by a cyclone—afflicts mankind. At other times, political

disasters strike—the Russian Revolution, the Cuban Revolution, the slaughter and devastation in Pakistan. Large-scale wars are usually seen coming; but lesser disasters mostly seem to come suddenly on people who have lived in the feeling that "it can't happen here". But disaster is predictably and quite imminently looming over Britain. If the real danger were recognised, there remains some slight possibility that catastrophe could be avoided, by exposure in the House of Commons of the machinations behind the scheme to subject Britain to the Treaty of Rome. The hope inheres in the fact that it is very unlikely that the Conspirators could survive a thorough-going exposure *under the right auspices*. In this connection, it is important to recognise the work of exposure, carried out at ground-roots level, but systematically and thoroughly, by the John Birch Society in the U.S.A. For the time being—but probably not for much longer—Congress is still potentially more powerful than the Executive. Probably by now hundreds of thousands of Americans "know the score" in a way that not one in ten thousand British do. Those hundreds of thousands could snow-ball very rapidly given the right stimulus; and that is the one thing the Conspirators fear—not only for the success of their Conspiracy, but for the sake of their skins. And as they and their Plans would be as much in danger as everyone else, there will be no large-scale war involving the major industrial powers, much less an atomic one, and the "threat of war" is less operative than it once was.

## Violence and Reconciliation

International finance drives people to international communism, while communism uses finance to spread its power. However, the Mexican poet Octavio Paz calls communism "not scientific" and he enjoyed England as a country "where society was more important than the state". He says that Mexicans are not pre-Columbians. Nor are they Europeans either. "We have adopted the language, religion and political system of the western world, but in other ways we are not part of it. Our God is not Quetzalcoatl, it is Christ. But it is a very different Christ from that of Europe." (*The Times*, Oct. 30, 1971.) Internationalism, as mentioned above, finds that this kind of local pride and definition sticks in its throat.

The churches generally deal with the problem less happily, often failing to desecrate the complementary powers. Fr. Torres of Colombia helped a guerilla band dispose of four soldiers and was himself killed, in 1966, when more soldiers counter-attacked. The next year, Archbishop Camara of Recife and a group of "Left-wing bishops" issued a Pastoral Letter from the Third World. *The Church Times* (Oct. 29, 1971) describes the archbishop as "that courageously prophetic and non-violent man who is the Martin Luther King of Latin America". But such men can soon arouse violence.

Moreover the Council of the British Council of Churches found itself divided on the question of the WCC "anti-racist grants", although it finally commended the WCC appeal for its fund to "combat racism". The Bishop of Winchester called the WCC action "divisive", and the secretary of the Methodist Conference hoped for "a clear word of direction" from the WCC and pronounced violence "the last resort". Canon Paton however said that the action was taken "to line up" with victims and those fighting for the victims.

(The news has just come through of two more policemen murdered in Ulster.)

The Very Rev. C. H. Dixon, Dean of Umtata, calls apartheid "a relatively minor issue that was dividing Anglicans from other Christians". Many he says are joining other denominations, while "the vast majority of English-speaking peoples have little or no contact" with the Anglican Church. People like T. Huddleston and C. Desmond exposed injustices but have "engendered so much bitterness, misunderstanding and frustration" that the work of the Church and its philanthropic efforts has been seriously hindered. (*South African News*, Oct., 1971.)

Meanwhile Dr. Marais of the Trust Bank predicts that South Africa will within 30 years constitute a trading bloc equal to the EEC due to "the growing friendly atmosphere between South Africa and a number of Black States". We may note the advance of Zululand under Chief Buthelezi to "the same kind of interim self-rule as the Transkei". President Amin of Uganda has offered to send a "fact-finding" delegation to South Africa, and the Ivory Coast President has suggested sending a delegation. Chief Jonathan of Lesotho said at his country's fifth anniversary celebrations, "We must engage in dialogue now". The leaders of Zululand, Transkei and Tswanaland visited Britain and were received by the Duke of Edinburgh at Buckingham Palace on October 7th.

—H.S.

### Get US Out!

(continued from page 1)

Mr. Elegant cheered this sellout of our best ally in favor of our worst enemy, describing it as "creative hypocrisy". He said it was necessary to obtain "the created purpose of gaining the U.N. seats for the Peoples Republic, which actually administers the vast mainland and some 750 million Chinese".\* And Robert Elegant assures us, as have so many others, that "Peking's admission will not only strengthen the U.N. peacekeeping capacity, but will, at the least, open the door to U.N. activities like arms-limitation and nuclear-test ban talks". Meanwhile, according to Elegant, Mr. Nixon's "creative hypocrisy" will validate his credentials as a statesman.

The Ambassador from Pakistan, who voted to admit Red China and expel Free China, saluted our President's "creative hypocrisy" by declaring: "I would like to acknowledge that President Nixon's new policy contributed to the victory". Ambassador James Shen of Nationalist China praised Mr. Bush's efforts in behalf of free China, but added sardonically, "there seems to be a lack of coordination with the White House". Columnist Willard Edwards wrote that Shen "hoped it wasn't deliberate".

Anybody has the right to hope.

Part of the charade called for Mr. Nixon to be outraged appropriately with the consequences of his own acts. After all, millions of Americans had watched via television as the U.N. humbled our country and cheered the defeat. But the Presidential press secretary, Ronald Ziegler, assured news-

men that the "defeat" in the General Assembly "will not affect our policy", and that Mr. Nixon has "no intention to retaliate". And Ambassador Bush vouched for the fact that the Nixon Administration, which even refused to use its veto in the Security Council to block the seating of the Maoists, will continue to support the virulently anti-American U.N. no matter what. As Ambassador Bush put it on November 1, 1971:

*We are prepared to face this reality and act in accordance with it . . . even though it may cause us some grief, some arguments, some criticism . . . Quite obviously it is going to take on what some have said is a bipolar institution and triangulate the power. Certainly with Peking coming into the Security Council seat we are going to have at a minimum a triangulation of power. I think you'll see Peking doing what many have predicted—championing the Third World developing nations or attempting to . . . President Nixon has always supported the U.N. and will continue. We have no plans to do anything else.*

When Ambassador Bush was running for the Senate from Texas in 1964, he took quite a different attitude. At that time he maintained: "**If Red China should be admitted to the United Nations, then the United Nations is hopeless, and we should withdraw**". And of course, Mr. Nixon built much of his political reputation on his own fervent opposition to the admission of Red China to the U.N. Richard Nixon was even a member of the Committee of One Million, the largest organization devoted exclusively to fighting the admission of the Maoist Government to the United Nations.\*

During his 1968 quest for the Presidency, on the nineteenth of April, Mr. Nixon proclaimed:

*I would not recognize Red China now, and I would not agree to admitting it to the United Nations, and I wouldn't go along with those well-intentioned people that said, "Trade with them, because that may change them". Because doing it now would only encourage them, the hardliners in Peking and the hardline policy they're following. And it would have an immense effect in discouraging great numbers of non-Communist elements in Free Asia that are now just beginning to develop their own confidence.*

Richard Nixon no longer even refers to Communist China as Red China, but by Mao's ludicrous title: The People's Republic of China. After all, only ten days after taking office he had directed Henry Kissinger, his national security assistant, to lay plans for embracing Peking. One result was the orgy of anti-Americanism which accompanied the expulsion of Nationalist China from the United Nations.

In the wake of what has been described as a diplomatic Pearl Harbour, many Americans are for the first time willing to take a second look at the United Nations. In order to understand the U.N. and the threat it poses to American liberty, one must go back to its dusty antecedents and examine the plan and the planners.

(to be continued)

\*The admission of Red China to the U.N. carried such a high priority with the Establishment that three major television networks, and nine Washington and New York stations, refused to sell time to the Committee of One Million for screening of a film warning against a U.S. detente with Peking.

\*To his credit, Mr. Elegant uses the word "administers" rather than resorting to the creative hypocrisy used by "Liberals" who claim that the Peking Government represents 750 million people. The Government of Red China represents only a small clique of top communists.