

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 49 No. 26

SATURDAY, 21 MARCH, 1970

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

The Pentagon

KREMLIN ON THE POTOMAC

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

To call the Pentagon the Kremlin on the Potomac is not thereby to state that the U.S. Defense Department headquarters is the control center of the Communist conspiracy in our country, though it does not exclude such a possibility. *Kremlin* is a Russian word meaning citadel, and every Russian city of the Middle Ages had its kremlin, the one in Moscow being now uniquely famous and having acquired a special meaning as the symbol of Soviet power. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* says:

KREMLIN . . . the central fortress in medieval Russian cities, usually situated on the high bank of a river or in the angle formed by the confluence of two rivers. . . . the walls were usually built with slight angular breaks, so the kremlin had the form of an irregular polygon in plan.

Well, our Pentagon, which is situated near the confluence of the Potomac and Anacostia rivers, is not an irregular polygon, its five sides having all the same length, but it is an unusual polygon—much more unusual than the sort of isosceles triangle formed by the Kremlin in Moscow, and if possible even more of “a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma”.

I

Mr. Nixon's journalist Clark Mollenhoff wrote a book called *The Pentagon* a couple of years ago. It began: “If ‘power tends to corrupt’, we should be filled with the greatest apprehension about the power of the Pentagon . . . Viewed in its totality, the power centralized in the Office of Defense Secretary could be used to impose a dictatorship on the nation”. An even more expert observer, General Nathan F. Twining, wrote about a year earlier:

. . . America's citizenry should candidly recognize that, while this nation has no military “man on horseback”, and no Prussian-type Armed Forces General Staff, a system has evolved in which the nation now has a single civilian Chief of Staff in the Secretary of Defense. This single civilian today exercises the total power which our democracy has historically been so reluctant to see fall under any one individual's control. Whether this is good or bad is a matter for historians. (Neither Liberty Nor Safety, Page 188.)

Well, General, you are too polite. The Pentagon, as you surely know, hires its own historians, and unless we make and act on some kind of judgment now, the historians of the future will be less, not more, likely to render a true and fair verdict. Every man his own historian, I always say, and as for me I say down with the Pentagon and bring back the American fighting man. It is a popular fallacy that the

Pentagon represents the military—top echelon, to be sure, “the big brass”, as the more or less amiable pejorative has it—but still the military establishment of the United States. Nothing could be further from the truth, as General Twining, General Curtis LeMay, General Edwin A. Walker, and any number of other generals and admirals know very well. The Pentagon represents the American military the same way a leash and muzzle represent a police dog. And in this case the leash and muzzle have been locked in place by those who intend to open the premises of the nation to unprecedented intrusion.

It is a commonplace that there are two schools of thought in the top layers of the American power structure—the One Worlders and the Military-Industrial Complex. What may be hard to realize, but is ever more evidently true, is that these two groups are now one and the same. American Big Business has global interests, and thus no interest in any kind of parochial patriotism. There was a time, now viewed with scorn by the intelligentsia, when American investments abroad were protected by American arms—the Marines in Nicaragua or China, as you recall. During the Depression there were fewer foreign interests of Americans to protect, and less to protect them with; there was, however, at home a great development of the governmental structure, which seemed at first to be hostile to Big Business, but which during World War II, through cost-reimbursable contracts, achieved an amalgam of business and government.

After World War II it seemed for a time that American enterprise would expand unchecked throughout the globe, protected by the residual prestige of the U.S. military establishment, which though promptly disbanded as a fighting force was felt to be on tap at all times, as proven by the readiness (so it seemed in retrospect, though it certainly did not seem so at the time) of the conversion to a war footing after Pearl Harbor. Besides, there was the post-War monopoly of the atomic bomb. It was going to be an “American Century”.

During this era of the afterglow of victory—from V.J. Day in August 1945 to the Korean debacle beginning in June 1950—the internal relationships of the government-Big Business amalgam were revolutionized. Whereas, during the War, business and industry had felt that they were the quite willing servants of the armed forces—and the quite unwilling servants of the bureaucracy—after the War they came to realize that the armed forces could very well serve *them*, while the bureaucracy could be reduced to something between an annoyance and a protective screen.

(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

It has been quite clear, at least to us, for the last twenty years that the likelihood of another world war has been growing increasingly remote; but the *threat* of such a war, assiduously played up by the mass media and political commentators, has formed the best possible smoke-screen for the strategic dispositions essential to police the World State under the World Government, so long foreshadowed and now so imminent. Mr. Healey, British 'Defence' Minister, has made it more or less official that NATO is done for: Europe's security is absolutely predicated on America's H-bombs. The coming about of this situation has been visible for a long time; but the point of no return has now been passed. The strategic assets of the world are now in the hands of international cartels, and Russian forces are deployed to ensure the strategic security of the territorial basis of world government—the Middle East and Mediterranean. If the Tories imagine they have any options left in this situation, let them recall the Suez Crisis when the active collusion of Moscow and Washington was first publicly displayed.

What happens next? "In the first year of the new [U.S.] Administration we have seen Government artificially [i.e., purposefully] drive the cost of money up to its highest level in 100 years of American history. The move intended to reduce inflation has seriously disrupted many sectors of the economy.

"We have seen a new Tax Bill which will increase the capital gains tax, curtail the tax advantages of depreciation in real estate investment, has already eliminated tax credits, and has essentially stripped fiscal policy of many of its built-in devices to stimulate the economy." (Bernard Cornfield, president and chairman of Investors Overseas Services.)

We have repeatedly warned that when the crash comes, it will be contrived to look like an accident. We do not for one moment imagine that the 'new' Administration does not know what it is doing, or is making 'mistakes'. Quite obviously the stage is being set for a financial crash in which millions will lose their life-savings, and even their homes, paving the way for the open coalescence of World Finance, International Cartels, World Communism, the United

Nations, and World Government. A well-integrated and industrially developed nation commanding its own raw materials could easily survive an American financial disaster; but independent nations, or Empires such as the British (economically self-sufficient) have been eliminated. South Africa could survive, but should she attempt it, she will be destroyed under the pretext of eliminating racialism.

Short of an upsurge of American public opinion against the instigators of this coming crime—and the upsurge of anything except anarchy in the chaos of a financial catastrophe is difficult to imagine—there would now seem little hope. The British Conservative Party in Opposition had an unparalleled opportunity to expose the situation before the enemy was ready to strike. Now what can they do? If they will not discover and proclaim that the financial system is completely fraudulent, they will indeed be hanged with the rope of their obstinate disbelief. The industrial system does *not* exist to provide employment; the purpose of trade is *not* to provide a financial surplus, except to repay money which need never have been borrowed. The British Empire has been dismantled by the timid and the traitors at the instigation of our implacable enemies, to whom Christian national culture and individual prosperity were until now insuperable obstacles to a mechanistic World Government. But the insuperable has been overcome, at the cost of untold millions of lives and appalling suffering. No wonder that Jesus, who saw it coming, wept.

But no; the Conservatives merely hope to win the electoral race to Power, and they are encouraged by the commentators who, like race-course touts, sell their 'tips' for a living. Aspirants for government do not want to see less power for Governments; they probably, even if unconsciously, hope for crises to sustain emergency powers. To proclaim their rivals for power 'incompetent' is to imply their own superior competence, and what they want is a difficult situation in which to demonstrate that superiority, even if the difficulty lies on the edge of disaster, as it does now. Mr. Heath finds it more expedient to disavow Mr. Powell than to denounce traitors; an increasingly ungovernable situation provides a "challenge to leadership"; the problem, as Mr. Heath seems to see it, is to convert the stampede of the Gadarene swine into an orderly march to destruction. A lawless society calls for more Law. This, of course, is just what the Communists believe; but they are more strongly fortified in their belief because they also believe that Communists, not *petit bourgeoisie*, have a historic mission to 'lead' the fully-employed proletariat out of disorder into the orderly production of goods to raise the standard of living of the capitalistically down-trodden people of the underdeveloped 'nations'.

We would *pray* that even just a handful of patriotic Conservative Parliamentarians would get together and give full and careful consideration to the article, *Culture and Ritual*, written by C. H. Douglas 25 years ago and republished in our previous issue. "The greatest war of all is still to be fought—to a conclusion, this time". The only place where this war *can* be fought now, in Britain, is in Parliament. The Socialist Government, quite avowedly, represents Internationalism, the enemy of patriotic nationhood. Its purpose, like Mr. Heath's, is to 'lead' the British into 'Europe'—half way to World Government. But the Conservatives must face the actual consequences of what they have allowed to hap-

pen, or contributed to themselves either through misguided idealism ("Winds of Change") or invincible and wishful ignorance of the real forces confronting them. "The Conservative Party has been guilty of the unforgivable sin, and must suffer for it." Recognition of this, and true repentance, might still lead to redemption. But public opinion, no matter how well informed, can now achieve nothing except through dedicated *British* patriotic leadership based on political and economic reality. To this, a response arising from British character and culture might save the world, just as the Spirit of Dunkirk saved the world, and as economic "management" for One World objectives will destroy it. We need a second coming of Christianity, fully understood as being "something inherent in the very warp and woof of the Universe".

This *present* Parliament is the last chance for the Conservatives. Win or lose the next election, they face obliteration thereafter. The forces they face are precisely the forces which were *behind* Hitler, those which financed and promoted him for the destruction of the then existing world order (largely based on the Pax Britannica) which, win or lose the war, he was certain to bring about. The Conservatives can speak now, *in Parliament*, a platform to the world; but in due course, and probably before long, they will be silenced for ever as "criminal reactionaries". Do they really, in the light of Suez, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Camp David . . . believe "it can't happen here"? If they do, they will perish for that belief, not voluntarily as heroes, but in derision at the hands of their enemies, like American prisoners in Vietnam. Let them not forget that "their" Government trades with Russia, which sustains the Communists and the atrocities in Vietnam—all in the cause of One World Government.

Drift from Reality

A hundred "Church executives and economists" as well as representatives of "international agencies" attended a consultation at Montreux at the end of January and came to the conclusion that they should allocate funds to finance "programmes and projects that stress social justice, self-reliance and economic growth". (*Church Times*, 6 Feb., 1970). "Social justice," incidentally, usually means socialism, the antithesis of self-reliance, and as the World Council of Churches sponsored the consultation, and as a portion of the fund raised is to be spent on "educational and political action in the affluent world", the cause of international socialism is unlikely to suffer from these activities. One feels that few of the delegates understand what is really happening in the world they wish to benefit.

An indication of the kind of future in store appears in an account of the proposed division of the diocese of Oxford. One of those concerned in the division, we read (also in *The Church Times*) "is in favour of a southern diocese—largely the area defined in the Redcliffe-Maud report as Unitary Authority No. 52 . . .". But I do not know whether the proposed diocese will be called "No. 52".

Nor does this issue of the paper seem to understand the position in its description of Bertrand Russell as "one of the outstanding intellectual giants of this or any period in English history". I prefer Peter Simple's description of him as doyen of the protest industry.

The question, "Is the Soviet Navy ahead of ours?" forms the title of an article in, naturally, an American paper, (*Human Events*, Jan. 17, 1970) in which Col. R. D. Heinl Jr. points out that "The Russian navy can outshoot ours, and their ships go faster. They are 10 years or more ahead of us in surface-warfare missiles. . . . Other than that, the Russians have a second-best navy". Moreover their warships are much newer, and Col. Heinl deplores the "decade of indifference". But the article shows awareness of what is actually happening, despite all diversions supplied by protestors, etc. And by contrast, M. Barsley (*The Times*, Jan. 13, 1970) quite rightly refused to take seriously Dr. Robinson's words, "the Christian revelation gave the last word to the left". For of course the left in action means a world full of puppets under monolithic rule, which is precisely the position rejected by Jesus Christ at His Temptation.

Refreshing indeed to read the views of Dr. William S. Snow, father of John Snow the cricketer. "Writing in his parish magazine, Dr. Snow of Bognor Regis says, 'I was appalled to see Bishop Sheppard in company with my lords of Stepney and Southwark leading anti-apartheid demonstrations at Twickenham. Why are demonstrations calculated to stop sporting events confined to the Springboks? There is a horrible political apartheid in Russia.'" (*Daily Express*, Jan. 31, 1970.)

John Braine the author and former left-winger points out that there is no atrocity in people defending themselves. Indeed (*Catholic Herald*, Jan. 16, 1970), "I and the majority of people in the West will resist to the death" against the threat of World Communism to destroy the West. For Communism rejects Christianity, "the rule of law . . . and everything that we mean by freedom. . . . free speech does not exist in North Vietnam, any more than it exists in Red China or the USSR. . . . We are fully justified as Christians to resist Communism by all means within our power". He does not seem to think that the Christian revelation "gave the last word" to the left, and shows a far more realistic approach to the world in which we live than the parading bishops or the former Bishop of Woolwich.

—H.S.

The Rising Toll in Vietnam

Saigon, January 22—Officials of the U.S. Command report that 84 Americans were killed in Vietnam last week and 706 wounded. These figures bring total U.S. combat casualties since 1961 to 40,226 killed, 264,429 wounded and more than 1,400 listed as missing or captured. Another 7,200 Americans have died from so-called non-hostile causes such as accidents and illness. South Vietnamese losses for the week are put at 197 men killed and 839 wounded, bringing their death toll for the war to 100,842. An estimated 592,952 Communists have been killed during the same period. (Since the war talks began in Paris more than 20 months ago, 17,612 Americans have died in South Vietnam's battlefields.)

THE DEVELOPMENT OF WORLD DOMINION	13/- posted
THE MOVING STORM	13/- posted
THE TRAP	2/6 posted

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.
245 CANN HALL ROAD, LONDON, E.11

The Pentagon

(continued from page 1)

It was during this era that the organization now known as the Department of Defense was planned, together with major spin-offs such as the Atomic Energy Commission and the Central Intelligence Agency. Other "historians" will catch me up on calling A.E.C. a spin-off of the Defense Department, since the atomic agency was set up with much fanfare in 1946, a year before the armed services were first "unified". Thus it would be more precise to say that A.E.C. was a spin-off of the War Department, which a year later was merged into what was first called the National Military Establishment, and two years later, in 1949, was tightened up and given its present name, Department of Defense. The Central Intelligence Agency was originally under the Secretary of Defense, but in the reorganization of 1949 was made an independent agency. (Boy, was it ever!)

The simple, but possibly elusive and yet vitally important fact is that the Department of Defense—for which "the Pentagon" is the popular synonym—did not "just grow", it was created.

II

For what purpose was the Department of Defense created? To control the American armed services. The Atomic Energy Commission and the Central Intelligence Agency were created for the same purpose.

After World War II it was felt in the bones of the Brahminical caste that the U.S. Army (which then included the Air Corps) and Navy were embarrassing white elephants. Basically, the world had been conquered as of the time of the Yalta conference, and there was simply nobody to fight. There was a rather open assumption that the "Big Three"—the United States, Soviet Russia, and Great Britain—formed a very real global condominium, with France and what is now called Nationalist China having nominal membership in this world directorate. Among the Big Three themselves—as always happens in troikas—there was an observable tendency for pairs to form against the remaining one, sometimes with one line-up, sometimes another, but most often the United States and Britain against Russia. Or so it seemed.

Later, at the time of Korea, Great Britain appeared to give at least indirect or negative support to Russia (as the principal back of North Korea), while in 1956 at Suez the United States openly sided with Russia against Britain (and France and Israel). Yet despite these pairings and jostlings, no two of the Big Three ever seriously fell out with one another. In spite of N.A.T.O. and the Warsaw Pact, in spite of the nuclear arms race and the rise of two of the Three to the status of "superpowers"—despite all these things, or some would say because of them, war between any two of the great nations of the earth (define "great nations" how you will) has remained since 1950 "unthinkable".

Some people thought they were thinking about it during the so-called "missile crisis" of October 1962, but many of us denied then the possibility of a real clash, and it turned out we were right, whether necessarily or accidentally we won't now argue. But it is now known (though it was not known at the time) that Kennedy and Khrushchev made a deal about the Cuban situation, and for the quarter of a century from 1945 to 1970 Russia, Britain, and the United

States have always made deals—*have never been genuinely close to a direct armed confrontation.*

Dwight Eisenhower wrote in *Crusade In Europe* (or perhaps Joe Barnes wrote for him) that after the conquest of Germany, when he was in Berlin, "Overshadowing all goals for us Americans was the contribution we locally might make toward establishing a *working partnership between the United States and Russia*". (Paperback edition, Page 486, italics added.) In some sense, it appears that the partnership was established and has endured to the present, when it is no doubt being immeasurably strengthened at Helsinki and wherever they take the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (S.A.L.T.) from there.

Some such analysis as the foregoing will explain two things: (1) the rapid demobilization of U.S. armed forces after World War II, (2) the interminable series of disarmament conferences, of which S.A.L.T. is simply the current example. But how account, in such an analysis, for the fact that between 1950 and 1969, through all or parts of the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon Administrations, the United States has so enormously escalated its defense budget, and has so provocatively seemed to arm itself to fight its working partner the Soviet Union, while actually involving itself in wars in Korea and Vietnam which would be absurd if they were not so hideous—wars which seem to be deliberately prolonged (the Korean War is not actually over) by U.S. refusal either to yield or to win? It is as if we wanted to keep some sideline war going for an ulterior purpose—not dependent on the outcome of the fighting. The very purpose of these conflicts is so vaguely defined that our Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, is quoted in *U.S. News & World Report* for December 1, 1969 as saying, "So it is entirely possible that historians will not be able to say that on such-and-such a day in such-and-such a year the war in Vietnam ended".

Why, since we have made it plain that we will not fight a major war, do we insist on fighting minor wars? The reason we give for not winning the minor wars is that we dare not provoke the major war. But to fight the minor war at all could provoke a major war, and inability (if that is what it is) to win a minor war might even encourage a major enemy to attack us. It appears virtually certain that we *know* there will be no major war, and that the minor wars are conducted, in effect, by joint agreement with the Soviet Union—which says to us, as it were, *You can destroy and kill to such and such an extent in Korea and Vietnam, but no further, if you value our partnership.* And we have said the corresponding thing to them as regards, for example, Hungary and Czecho-Slovakia.

Yet on the surface our wars in East Asia seem to be far more pointless than Russia's operations in Central Europe. It seems as if we had since 1950 not built up our armed services in order to fight these wars, but fought these wars in order to build up our armed services.

(To be continued)

EXTRA COPIES OF THIS AND RECENT ISSUES OF "THE SOCIAL CREDITER" ARE OFFERED TO SUBSCRIBERS AT 4d. EACH TO ENCOURAGE WIDER DISTRIBUTION.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., 245 CANNON HALL ROAD, LONDON, E.11, FOR BOOKS ON SOCIAL CREDIT AND THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL-COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY.

Circular Press Ltd., Colwyn Bay.