

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 48 No. 2

SATURDAY, 20 APRIL, 1968

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

Dean Rusk

IS HE THE INSIDERS' QUARTERBACK?

By MEDFORD EVANS in *American Opinion*, March, 1968

(Continued)

Often found in pivotal positions in the legal power structure are men who, so far from being original sources of decision, actually have no will of their own, but are instruments of another, are channels through which power from outside the government is brought to bear upon the government, and so upon the nation. For this immorality there is a moral reason. Any man is stronger when he fights for someone else. To suppose that self-preservation is the strongest impulse of man is as fallacious as it is commonplace. If it were so, then no man would fight to the death when by flight or surrender he could live. Yet many men in all ages have done just this. The Spartans at Thermopylae, the Americans at the Alamo, are examples. But we are not concerned simply with heroism. It is often possible to do for another what one cannot do for oneself, easier to do various things for another than for oneself. The division of labor is not only a matter of using special skills, it is also a matter of dividing the burden of decisive action—of dividing the decision from the action.

I learned this principle in a modest way when I was a personnel officer at Oak Ridge. I had no command authority in my department. I was staff assistant to my department superintendent. Occasionally someone had to be fired. I did not have even an opinion of my own in any such matter. The decision to fire X would be made by the superintendent, perhaps on advice from operating supervisors under him. Once the decision was made, I was the one who had to tell the victim. I will not say that this was never unpleasant, but I will say that it never unduly disturbed me. I could in all sincerity be sympathetic with the careless or incompetent technician who had to go, but I was completely implacable in the face of suggestions that the matter be reconsidered, for I had simply no authority to reconsider it. My boss, the superintendent, had told me what to do. If the decision was wrong I was not to blame. The boss himself might have suffered pangs of doubt—perhaps even so great that if he had had to face the doomed employee he would have wavered and changed his mind. But I could not change his mind, and I never wavered. Such is the cruel power of organization. The judge is not the hangman.

I think of this when I see men in public life adhering to policies which they would inevitably question themselves if they had the power to do so. But their very lack of power to change their instructions increases their power to dispose of the fate of others. No man could live with the responsibility for the Vietnam War if he had the option of calling it off. No man could both decide on and carry out our policy in Vietnam. Whoever is carrying it out must be the most

powerful man in the government, for it takes great power to maintain such a frightful course. At the same time he must be subordinate somehow to someone else somewhere. From which it follows that he is subordinate to someone outside the government while he is superior to everyone inside the government—insofar as the government is a unit, and it has to be some kind of unit to operate.

The most powerful man in an organization is the man who gives the word. On a ship it is the captain, on a football team it is the quarterback. But the captain seldom owns the ship or selects its destination. The quarterback, whom the team on the field must obey, gets his instructions from the coach. Notice that a quarterback without a coach on the bench is at a disadvantage. Tactical power is greatest when free from strategic responsibility. Whoever is quarterback in Washington probably gets his instructions from outside Washington.

I think it likely that Dean Rusk is the most powerful man in Washington. He has shown survival value, and he is undoubtedly an organization man whose organizational ties extend outside the government. His only rival for the quarterback position has been McNamara (we shall see in a moment why L.B.J. himself is not), and McNamara, for all his success in humiliating Generals and Admirals, has never demonstrated as has Dean Rusk the ability to express contempt for the American people as a whole, for the whole American way of life, and get by with it. We shall recur to this point.

But why do I credit Rusk and McNamara (now moving on to head the *very* important World Bank) with being more powerful than L.B.J.? First, I suppose that all three of them are creatures of the Establishment, but that Rusk and McNamara are more completely so. Lyndon is President because somebody did something about Kennedy. He is, as Robert Sherrill has called him, the "accidental President". But there is nothing accidental about Rusk and McNamara. Both have remained in key positions throughout *both* the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. This is actually quite extraordinary.

Nothing is more obvious than that L.B.J. personally would not want the same kind of advisors that J.F.K. had. We are familiar with the differences in "style" between the two Presidents, and it is a matter of record that in spite of talk about continuity—intended no doubt to still suspicions concerning the *coup d'état*—L.B.J. has replaced Kennedy's choices whenever he could. He would not be able to replace either McNamara or Rusk unless he got the word from New York. But it is almost surely Rusk who gets the word, and gives it.

It should be recalled, by the way, that McNamara and Rusk, especially Rusk, were *not* Kennedy's personal choices.
(continued on page 3)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

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

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free: One year 40/-; Six months 20/-; Three months 10/-.

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

Telephone: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1

Telephone: 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA—

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

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

(Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2600. 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 Reuter news item, published, but not prominently, in the *Daily Telegraph* of March 3, 1968, reports that the Indian Navy will be in "complete charge" of the Indian Ocean when the British Navy withdraws. The Indian Navy is to be enlarged, most of the equipment to come from Russia. These arrangements follow talks between Mr. Kosygin and Mrs. Gandhi in February. "The move apparently paves the way towards the formation of a mobile fleet to operate in the Indian Ocean."

As Russian supplies imply Russian operatives, it is not difficult to see what sort of mobility the Indian Navy will exercise. As *U.S. News & World Report*, Jan. 29, 1968 observes: "Indian Ocean area is vast, the back door to Southeast Asia and the strategic key to India, East Africa, much of the oil-rich Middle East."

If the Tories got back to power, do they really believe they could put the clock back? There is no power vacuum: British power is being replaced, day by day, by Communist power—the military basis of One World Government, the objective of the Wilson régime.

An A.B.C. broadcast feature "News Review" on Mar. 11, 1968, disclosed that the Kerner Commission Report on racial disorders has *already* been issued as a paper-back book, achieving in a few days best-seller status.

The Kerner Commission "declared that it had uncovered no evidence that any of the disorders or incidents that led to the riots 'were planned or directed by any organisation or group, international, national or local'" (*The Times*, March 4, 1968). What leads to a riot is one thing; the systematic exploitation and escalation of an 'incident' is something else.

According to an article by Paul Scott published in *Human Events* of Feb. 24, 1968, the Commission studied "battle plans" of black militants. "These documents, now being circulated openly among black militant and Communist groups in the country, call for the creation of conditions of revolution and guerilla warfare in major U.S. cities this year by the disruption of all types of public services."

Scott quotes from a document prepared by Robert F. Williams, "a fugitive from North Carolina now living in Red China": "The American economy and its delicate and automated society cannot withstand any sustained and violent dislocation. Massive violent disruption would set off a chain reaction which would fragment the entire nation and usher in an all-consuming state of anarchy. Out of the ashes of anarchy and chaos, a new order would be constructed."

Included in the programme is the organisation of clandestine fire teams, which would work in complete secrecy and would be totally divorced in the organisational sense, enjoying complete autonomy, and consist of teams of three or four persons known only to each other—the Communists 'cell' technique. The task of these teams is to set strategic fires, both in the cities and in the rural countryside, in rich timber resources and among crops and rural factories.

Note that this is planned for *this year*, and that President Johnson has stated that trouble cannot be avoided. If it comes off, what becomes of the "nuclear umbrella" which is supposed to maintain the peace in Europe and allow the building of "bridges to the East"?

The tragedy of opposition to Communism lies in a failure fully to understand what Communism actually is. Communism is the power-structure of a system of world government designed to replace the world government which hitherto has been exercised through centralised international control of the financial system—a control which, since 1914, has largely been directed to the destruction of the British Empire, and latterly to destruction of Britain as a nation; and to the building up of the Communist Empire as a means of rule by force. The last target is the American *public*, and the gold 'crisis' is a warning that that universal economic crisis, so long foretold, is nearly upon us. When the dollar 'falls', as inevitably it must under the operation of the gold 'standard', the way will be open to overt world government. At this late stage, only the *demonstration* (such as was thwarted in Alberta) that an alternative financial system could reverse the forces which have brought about the present world crisis offers a remaining hope.

With a Satanically perverted logic, the *Guardian* (March 13, 1968) suggests that the hanging of some condemned murderers in Rhodesia constitutes a "breakdown of law and order", and argues that Britain should undertake a direct military invasion. How many lives would be lost in such an operation it is impossible to estimate, but it is unlikely that the editorialist of the *Guardian* would be among them.

And if such an invasion succeeded, the competitive passions and ambitions of the banned black nationalist parties would be released, and would result in a renewal of murders, tortures, burnings and intimidation. Would the British remain to govern the country, and maintain law and order? *The Guardian* says it is time to "restore" British *physical* control.

Elsbeth Huxley, writing from Salisbury, says "peace unquestionably reigns" (*Daily Telegraph*, March 13, 1968). And this is the testimony of all visitors to Rhodesia. It is a peace which succeeds "widespread, violent and bloody intimidation. The petrol bomb, the flaming roofthatch, the burnt family and the beating-up were nightly hazards".

The *Guardian* foresees an "extended form of civil war covering all Southern Africa". What is more probable is civil war covering Britain, in which the fate of 'petit-bourgeois' editorialists will be fairly predictable. Incitement to war and violence is a form of living by the sword, and thus of incurring the penalty of perishing by the sword.

The Spectator, March 15, 1968 remarks: "The Chancellor of the Exchequer sits down this week-end to put the finishing touches to his Budget against the backcloth of the biggest convulsion the international monetary system has known since the war. If this does not concentrate Mr. Jenkin's mind and strengthen his resolve, then nothing will." Well—of course. 'Mr. Jenkin's' budget is the culmination of the wrecking economic policies which the Wilson régime was installed to accomplish, so that it is only natural that a suitable backcloth should be provided. It is now evident that the final collapse of sterling has been engineered to trigger the collapse of the dollar, thus precipitating the universal economic crisis planned to usher in the Communist take-over.

The barrage of economic 'analyses' (which all follow the same line) to which the populations of the industrialised countries are being subjected are irrelevant. The international financiers know exactly what they are doing. Crisis is their *policy*—to prevent reform of a system which concentrates world power in their hands, until such time as a policed World Government is achieved.

Facts of Death

It has not taken Soviet Russia long after the departure of the British to establish contact with the new Arab rulers of Aden. Meanwhile in the neighbouring Yemen, the Republican Government has thrown compromise with the Royalists to the winds and installed a war Cabinet . . .

Since Soviet ships in 1955 first breached the then existing arms control in the area, without Western opposition, Russia has become arms supplier to Egypt, Iraq, Syria, the Yemen and the Sudan. Since Britain left the Near East bases of Alexandria and Port Said, Russian warships have moved into both and have an additional base at Latakia in the rear of Turkey. The Committee on Defense has reported to the Western European Union on a serious shift of naval power in the Mediterranean. France, the Committee noted with concern, is about to give up the base at Mers el Kebir*, and there is a permanent Mediterranean presence of 50 Russian warships . . .

—*Daily Telegraph* (London) Dec. 28, 1967.

* This has now been done.

They Still Have Their Uses

Despite their decline, Church and State still have most unexpected uses. The Prime Minister, for instance, serves as the mouthpiece of President Johnson, for *The Church Times* (Feb. 16, 1968) suggested that Mr. Wilson's pronouncements on Vietnam at the end of his Washington visit indicated "the probable next moves of American policy", for his speech was checked with the President. It warned against escalation and renewed the request for peace talks "with self-determination for the Vietnamese as part of the settlement, even though elections might result in a Communist majority".

The same newspaper gives a report of the British Council for Peace in Vietnam, of which Lord Brockway is chairman. This council has sponsored a declaration calling on the Government to take a new initiative to prevent the escalation of the war, and ten bishops—including of course those of Southwark and Woolwich—are among the signatories, which also include Canon Collins "and leaders of other Churches and of the Jewish community". The declaration asks the Government to disassociate itself from "the United States intervention in Vietnam", demands unconditional ending of United States bombing, and a settlement based on the 1954 Geneva agreements "which include the withdrawal of all foreign troops". The Chinese and Albanians must regret that they did not keep this sort of religious body in being.

If we turn to the longer prospect, some might complain that the Pope was a mediaeval anachronism and a reactionary bar to progress, but they could not make a greater mistake. For according to Frank Giles in *The Sunday Times* of Sept. 24, 1967, if the Pope lives, "I think that we can look for an extension of his diplomatic activities, to the point where Christ, in the person of his Vicar on earth, and anti-Christ, in the shape of applied Marxist-Leninism, learn to live, if not work, together . . . it will certainly do no harm and may do much good for the future of mankind". Millions who have experienced the bitterness of communism will wonder if the Pope intends to abandon his mission of overcoming evil with good and falsehood with truth.

For the problem of the recalcitrants remains and they include not only a few inconvenient individuals like Pastor Wurmbrand, but the bulk of believers for whom the World Council and the British Council do not speak—although they contribute towards them. And a suggestion comes from Rhodesia that this matter has not been neglected, for Archdeacon Lewis complains of the *persecuting* zeal of the official British Church. The new religious body will, it seems, "take care" of the new type of heretic.

—H.S.

Dean Rusk

(continued from page 1)

Both were choices of Establishmentarian Robert A. Lovett. It is widely thought that Kennedy wanted to get rid of Rusk. Then, Kennedy was got rid of. Rusk and McNamara themselves are not sources of power. Both are career employees. But both are such trusted employees that L.B.J. could no more rid himself of their influence than he could fire J. Edgar Hoover, who is also a trusted employee. The difference is that J. Edgar Hoover is trusted by the American people, while we do not know for sure who it is that trusts McNamara and Rusk.

We do know that it is extraordinary for any Secretary of State to endure, as Dean Rusk has done, through the terms of two such very different Presidents as John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson. Only a few Secretaries of State in U.S. history have served for any length of time under two Presidents. Among the few are Timothy Pickering, who served under Washington and John Adams; John Forsyth, under Jackson and Martin Van Buren; William H. Seward, under Lincoln and Andrew Johnson; John Hay, under McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt. In none of these cases was the contrast between Presidents so sharp as with

Kennedy and Johnson—except, perhaps, in the case of Lincoln and Andrew Johnson (another of the curious parallels between the two Johnsons). In every case the Secretary of State was an outstanding man. And I think we can say that of Dean Rusk.

Andrew Johnson could not in practice do what any President can do in theory—simply fire one of his Cabinet members. He had no reason to want to fire Seward, who alone stood with him against a hostile Congress. He certainly did, however, want to fire Edwin M. Stanton, his Secretary of War. But Stanton's support in Congress was so strong that the "Tenure of Office" act was passed, which formalized Congressional pressure to uphold the Cabinet Officer against the Chief Executive. When Johnson proceeded to try to force Stanton's removal anyhow, he was promptly impeached. Only the Constitutional provision that a two-thirds vote of the Senate is required to convict on impeachment saved Andrew Johnson from being himself removed from office instead of his Secretary of War. Thirty-five Senators voted against the President, nineteen for him. Had it been thirty-six and eighteen, Stanton would have stayed and Johnson would have gone. As it was, the President of the United States in 1868 was demonstrably one of the less powerful figures in Washington—not to be compared with Charles Sumner or Thaddeus Stevens.

There is today no Tenure-of-Office Act, but as a practical matter it seems doubtful that the President of the United States in 1968 could, if he wanted to, fire either "his" Secretary of State or Secretary of Defense. (I should be delighted to be proved wrong.) One of these two, I should say, either Dean Rusk or Robert McNamara, is for the historical moment the most powerful man in Washington. It may be wrong to separate them. Perhaps, like ancient Rome, the Establishment chooses two consuls. But Rusk is clearly more intelligent and better educated than McNamara, far better educated than Lyndon. Is this enough to give him that edge which in any triumvirate, or troika, one man is bound to hold? Of itself, probably not. If Rusk is soft, or if his connections are anywhere weak, then, superior intelligence or not, he could be cut down by a computer (an adder?) like McNamara or a Texas diamondback like Lyndon. On the record, Rusk is not soft, but of an enduring toughness. To appreciate that fact, do this instant replay:

The Korean War and the Vietnam War represent a tremendous turn in the history of nations. They represent, quite possibly, the beginning of the end of nationhood—most notably for the United States, but ultimately for all other nations as well. Since nations must be ended to make way for world government (with its World Bank, and its World everything else) these strange wars represent obscurely the first serious attempts to establish a world order not centering—as did the age of British imperialism—around any national sovereignty. For the nation most heavily committed to both the Korean and Vietnam wars—*i.e.*, the United States—has refused as a major point of policy to make its own national interest the measure of its conduct of either war.

The United States fought in Korea under the banner of the United Nations. The United States in Vietnam, though now under its own flag, has an even less clearly defined objective than it had in Korea. In both wars the United States government not only refused to make victory its objective, but took punitive measures against those who sought victory

—against General Douglas MacArthur, against General Edwin A. Walker. Since MacArthur was cashiered, no U.S. commander in any field of combat (except Oxford, Mississippi) has been allowed to seek victory. Since the series of persecutions of General Walker, no officer has even spoken in recognizable terms of national victory.

The enormous historical importance of Korea and Vietnam is reflected in the fact that these are the first wars of the nuclear age involving a nuclear power—and *in them nuclear weapons have not been used*. The United States refused to employ atomic bombs in Korea although by so doing it could quickly and easily have won a victory. Let me confess that I am not sure—and my uncertainty is based on interior glimpses of the atomic energy project in the years around 1950—I am not sure that it would have been technically feasible to use atomic weapons in 1950. We were supposed to be manufacturing them, and we were supposed to have them stockpiled. We did have something stockpiled, and in 1951 we started a big testing program in Nevada as well as at Eniwetok. But key men in the whole business were typically opposed to any use of the bomb. Some of these men were philosophical pacifists. Would a pacifist consider himself a traitor if he—as he would see it—spared mankind from nuclear devastation by making sure that any bombs the stupid military tried to use in combat would be duds? Of course it never came to that. Political authority in Washington saw to it that the military never had a chance to find out whether atomic weapons used in battle would go bang or not. In spite of General MacArthur, Washington found a substitute for victory. It was "nuclear stalemate"—which did not require any actual nuclear weapons in a Russian stockpile, but just a flat policy of not using any (in combat) from the American stockpile.

Whatever might have been done in Korea, it is less clear that victory could be won in Vietnam by use of nuclear weapons, for it is not at all clear what would constitute victory in Vietnam. After World War II the United States retreated from victory; in Korea the United States refrained from victory; in Vietnam the United States cannot even define victory. Thus one progresses toward an end of nationhood and—presumably—toward a one-world establishment.

Note, however, that the personal common denominator of the Korean War and the Vietnam War is Dean Rusk.

(To be continued)

St. George's Day

In a letter to this English Edition of The Social Crediter, the St. George's Day Association has asked to remind all readers that Tuesday, 23 April, is St. George's Day, and appeals to them to attend their own church or chapel to pray for Divine Assistance for our country, and to wear a rose throughout the day.

Judaism and the Vatican An Attempt at Spiritual Subversion

Translated from the French of Le Vicomte Léon de Poncins "Drawing on original documents, many not previously available to the English reader, this book unfolds the essential texts without which it would be impossible to comprehend the tortuous history of the relationship of the two great religious systems of the world". 31/6 posted.

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

Printed by E Fish & Co Ltd Liverpool