

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 52. No. 24

SATURDAY, 17 FEBRUARY, 1973

7p. (1s. 5d.) Fortnightly

### The Reith Lectures for 1972

#### Delivered by Andrew Shonfield

The first paragraph of the first of these lectures, headed "Melting-pot or a Bag of Marbles?" makes one wonder how reliable Mr. Shonfield is as a witness concerning Common Market affairs. He started off by saying: "At the climax of the great debate on British entry into the European Community the argument sometimes sounded something like this. One side was saying that the whole operation was a disgraceful and unnecessary surrender of national power to conduct our own affairs: unnecessary because the European Community was essentially a feeble thing which would, if we only let it be, go away. And the other side, while urging us to brace ourselves for a great historic occasion, told us authoritatively not to worry because the Community really had remarkably little power, in practice, to change the way in which its member states run their national affairs." "Well, which is it?" he asks, "Feeble or powerful? Historic or a dead bore?"

To anyone who has followed the "great debate" at all, a more inadequate and frivolous description of it could hardly be imagined. Yet Shonfield does not seem ashamed to say: "There are occasions when I find myself oscillating between these two views." In fact he has nothing much to say about the concrete advantages or disadvantages to the ordinary citizen of joining. His title for the whole series of lectures is *Journey to an Unknown Destination*. "We don't know", he says, "what the final answer will look like—or even should look like". In other words, "We don't know where we are going and we shan't know whether we have arrived"—all of which leaves infinite scope for misdirection and deception.

Under these circumstances we may well ask: "Why start at all?" However Shonfield takes it (Nov.- Dec. 1972) that we shall start although he admits that "it was inconceivable that Britain would have entered into an effective partnership with western Europe until it had first lost its empire and then become finally disabused of the idea of the Commonwealth as the fulcrum of an independent British policy": thus the matter has had to wait until the stage was properly set. True, the empire has gone but we still wonder how Shonfield knows that the people of this country are "disabused" about the Commonwealth, a community under the same Crown and with vast untapped resources. Although Commonwealth relations have deteriorated since the war many of us believe that mutually beneficial arrangements could still have been made with Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Rhodesia and other remains of the empire and with the former member, South Africa, which would have satisfied all our essential requirements for food and raw materials. We also had other valuable connections.

But Shonfield dismisses the subject without argument and

proceeds to indicate how the European Community should be organized and administered now that it has nine members instead of six. He thinks that Britain's entry will fundamentally change its structure and that performance will be improved although there may be "more overt conflict and friction". In fact, he foresees headaches all around: difficulties with America, Japan and the Soviet Union and endless internal pitfalls due to different interests and outlooks. And, several times, there is a suggestion that satisfactory integration will not be achieved, or will be very slow, without the threat or even the occurrence of a crisis. He says for instance: "No doubt a manifest crisis requiring a joint policy in a hurry would be a good help: a military threat or the prospect of a world slump or perhaps some critical shortage of a commodity like oil, putting our whole economic system at risk". He even advises the Community to prepare for something of this kind by forming transnational links between the officials working in the foreign offices of the nine member countries. He does not say so but, from what we know of recent history, we may feel fairly sure that appropriate exercises for these officials will be arranged.

Shonfield is "in the fashion" when he suggests that the E.E.C. should concentrate as much as possible on trade with and aid for backward countries: it is, he says, the biggest market for their produce and supplies them with more development aid than the U.S.A. He is not in favour of over-centralisation: he wants to see a Community which does not depend "on the establishment of a single supreme power standing above national governments but on the organisation of many bits and varieties of power exercised by transnational groups which operate with a large measure of autonomous initiative, even when their members are themselves ultimately subject to the behests of governments". He hopes that the Commission in Brussels will not "condemn itself to concentrate on the exercise of detailed regulatory functions—looking after agricultural regulations, seeing that the anti-trust rules are observed and that there is no cheating on European customs arrangements and on indirect taxes—instead of providing the long-term thinking and the technical skills that are needed to keep pushing the process of European integration forward". In other words it looks as if he wants it to be a kind of glorified "think-tank". He sees the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers as safeguards for democracy as opposed to technocracy: there should be intimate and sensitive liaisons between the institutions of E.E.C. and the national Parliaments.

Shonfield condemns the present plan for Monetary union  
(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 £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.

Vol. 52. No. 24

Saturday, 17 February, 1973

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Just how frightful—and imminent—is the threat to civilisation presented by the Finance-Communist Conspiracy (*Marxian* Communism by itself would never have got anywhere without international financial backing and organisation at the highest levels) is revealed—perhaps deliberately—in a news commentary given by a Dr. Peter Russo and broadcast by the Australian Broadcasting Commission on Jan. 22, 1973. He said:

“Mr. Nixon delivered his Inaugural Address from behind a bullet-proof glass shield, guarded by thousands of police and secret-service men strategically deployed throughout the areas of celebration. And once again, while the echoes of the recent blanket-bombing of Vietnam, the most vicious and devastating aerial bombardment in history are still being heard around the world, Richard Nixon repeats that it all has been done—is being done—to promote the era of peace which he has ushered in, and what’s more, he has done it with honour.

“In the world’s capital cities, even those normally sympathetic to American policies, officials, as well as ordinary citizens, have expressed their revulsion and horror. But this time, you may have noted that many of these overseas comments on Nixon’s actions do not refer so much to American policies as they did in the days of President Johnson. Today it is not Nixon’s policies which are being analysed; they are, by normal standards of political behaviour, too irrational to bear analysis. Professionals are now actually questioning Nixon’s sanity; and it is in this context that the comparison with Hitler’s deceptive ambiguities and unpredictable acts of savagery, come up in Europe as well as in the United States itself.

“Admittedly, there are some distinguished commentators who did their best to interpret Nixon’s blanket-bombing of Vietnam in purely political terms. One of these, Professor Max Lerner of Brandeis University, leans over in various directions to try to provide Nixon’s destructive tantrums with a political *rationale*. Professor Lerner insists that Nixon’s actions have been disciplined, cold-blooded actions, not the results of mental imbalance or fits of pique. But Lerner goes on to show that if Nixon did act only after careful reflection, then it becomes a comparatively simple matter to

tear Nixon’s arguments apart and expose their dangerous fallacies. ‘Let us assume’ says Lerner, ‘that President Nixon wanted to show his resoluteness, ignoring the opinion of writers and politicians who never had a good opinion of him anyway. Nixon has also said that those who accuse America of the callous use of power would despise it for powerlessness if it had not responded to Hanoi’s provocations. This’, says Lerner, ‘is too casual a way to dismiss world opinion’. It is not only President Olaf Plamer in Stockholm who linked Nixon with Hitler. The comparison was made in other non-Communist capitals as well. ‘A nation’s role in history’, says Lerner, ‘is largely shaped not only by reason of its power, but by the power of its image. Each of them, power and image, has to carry credibility’. In the view of Lerner, the American historian, President Nixon seems concerned only about the credibility of American power. He omits what happens to the image if that power is abused, as Nixon has been doing. Nixon has set a precedent in the naked use of power which other nations will remember, and which they may someday decide to follow. When they do, adds Lerner, and America decides to protest, its protest will seem a wry mockery.

“Lerner and his colleagues, and I am quoting here only the milder critics of Nixon’s act, feel that the American people, as a country and nation, will be involved historically in what’s happened. It was their President, whom they returned with a landslide election victory who ordered, on their behalf, the heartless, cold-blooded bombing of a small country to achieve an end which was dubious at best. There the conclusions of the various commentators are unanimous, and Professor Lerner sums up: ‘Never’, he says, ‘has the need for some explicit limitation on the President’s use of his war-power been clearer. The bombing of Hanoi will not easily slip from the memory of hundreds of millions of people. When they think of American power’ asks Lerner, ‘are they not likely to remember that an American President used it whether in a hot rage or with cold calculation to enforce his policy of terror? This is why even more important than the proposals to cut off war spending, a new War-powers Bill or Amendment is a crucial priority.’

“So far, these milder protests on the home American front coming usually from conservative academics and former administration officials add up to little more than counsels of perfection. President Nixon has given no accounting of what he has done or why he did it—apart, that is, from his sickening regurgitation of his peace-with-honour platitudes. Furthermore, he knows that, as of now, there is little in the domestic power-complex, including the Press and other communications media, which he cannot terrorise into subjection in the same way [?blanket-bombing] he has tried to terrorise the people of Vietnam.

“If there has been another and immeasurably worth-while precedent set in relation to Nixon’s blanket-bombing of Vietnam it has been set outside America. I refer to the unequivocal world-wide protest which let Nixon know there were limits of barbarity beyond which even he could not go with impunity; and America is, fortunately, no longer capable, as it once was, of indulging its every whim with a dollar here and a hand-out there and fatuous one-way Treaties to wrap up the deals. It was also gratifying to learn that at last we have senior Ministers who know the formula. When someone like Nixon professes to be your friend, it’s

high time to start loving your enemies."

Of course, Dr. Russo needs to be *heard*, not so much to be believed, as to be understood.

This picture of an isolated and insane President, disregarding, presumably, the advice of Dr. Henry Kissinger and the horde of advisers drawn predominantly from the Council on Foreign Relations, may be convincing to those who have not read *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*.

Dr. Russo does not tell us that the Russian-born Professor Lerner has been affiliated with about twenty-five Communist or Communist-front organisations in the United States; nor that Lerner wrote in a syndicated column in the American Press: "The American problem is not to end the [Vietnamese] war but to end it so that Russia, rather than [Communist] China, emerges as the force in North Vietnam and the surrounding area. That is complex but war is complex because life is."<sup>\*</sup>

The key to Dr. Russo's commentary lies in the words: "Nixon has set a precedent in the naked use of power which other nations will remember, and which they may someday decide to follow. When they do, adds Lerner, and America decides to protest, its protest will seem a wry mockery". But of course Communist Russia and Communist China—and Hanoi—have already set precedents in the naked use of power. So what Messrs. Russo and Lerner are getting at is that the blanket-bombing of Vietnam is to demonstrate to Americans that they should not be surprised, or hurt, when naked power is used against *them*. After all, "It was *their* President, whom they returned with a landslide victory who ordered, *on their behalf*, the heartless, cold-blooded bombing of a small country. . . ." In short, they asked for it, and they'll get it back for themselves. It may look like an insane scheme, but it looks like one that is going to work. Otherwise, why spend all that money? And don't forget that it is the U.S.A. which keeps the USSR going, and the USSR which keeps the North Vietnamese going. Crazy; or something else—like starting to love our enemies.

<sup>\*</sup>*Biographical Dictionary of the Left* by Francis X. Gannon: American Opinion, Belmont, Mass.

### NONE DARE CALL IT CONSPIRACY

By GARY ALLEN

"After reading this book you will never look at national and world events in the same way again"

—John G. Schmitz, United States Congressman

1 copy, 50p.    3 copies, £1    10 copies, £3    25 copies, £6

### ALTERNATIVE TO DISASTER

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

Examines the economic foundations of the Conspiracy

1 copy, 30p.    3 copies, 75p.    10 copies, £2    25 copies, £4. 25p.

Prices include postage

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

## Who They Are\*

### THE CONSPIRACY TO DESTROY AMERICA

By GARY ALLEN

(Continued)

#### COMMON CAUSE

Most of the organizations we have discussed deal directly with the government, or with the academy and the mass media. The *Insiders* of the Establishment are also organizing radicals at the grass-roots level. The operation is called Common Cause, and its job is to mobilize suburban "Liberals," the poor, minorities, and students to lobby among both the Republicans and Democrats for the passage of socialist legislation.

Although less than two years old, Common Cause might well become one of the most important and influential groups in American history. Already it claims a membership of a quarter of a million and is spending more money than any other pressure group in the nation's capitol. The official high potentate at Common Cause is an aristocratic Republican named John Gardner (C.F.R.), who came to his post as President Johnson's Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare by way of the Carnegie Corporation.

Common Cause is promoted as the "little people's lobby," but the *Washington Post* of August 23, 1971, tells who is bankrolling it:

*Common Cause, the national lobby attempting to change political structures and priorities, has a list of major contributors that reads like a Who's Who in the Establishment.*

*Rockefellers, Ford Motor Co., Carnegie foundation leaders, corporate directors, investment bankers and key people in the publishing industry, including Time, Inc., are among the donors of \$500 or more to Common Cause . . . .*

*Several members of the Council on Foreign Relations, made up of many of the Eastern intellectual and corporate leaders, were among the contributors. Frank Altschul, vice president and secretary of the Council, donated \$500 to Common Cause.*

My, my, isn't that surprising! Among the limousine "Liberals" who have provided the money behind this organization to "organize the proletariat" are David Rockefeller (C.F.R.); John D. Rockefeller III; Caryl Haskins (C.F.R. and Haskins & Sells); J. Richardson Dilworth (C.F.R. and Chase Manhattan Bank); William T. Golden (C.F.R. and formerly with Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades Company); Roy Larson (C.F.R. and *Time* magazine); Sol Linowitz (C.F.R. and Xerox); Andrew Heiskell (C.F.R. and Time Incorporated); John Hay Whitney (C.F.R. and International Herald Tribune); William Benton (C.F.R. and Encyclopaedia Britannica); Gardner Cowles (C.F.R. and Cowles Publications); William Paley (C.F.R. and C.B.S.); and, Thomas Watson (C.F.R. and I.B.M.). Other key benefactors have included Iphigene Ochs Sulzberger, heir to the *New York Times* fortune; the late Agnes Meyer, publisher of the *Washington Post*; Time Incorporated; the Ford Motor Company; and, Walter Haas Jr., president of Levi Strauss &

<sup>\*</sup>From *American Opinion*, October, 1972.

Company and a trustee of the Ford Foundation.

These are the people who are financing Common Cause "to shake up the Establishment." One more proof that it is the super-rich *Insiders* who are behind the radical movements and growing collectivism in America. The poor are but pawns in a game of super-chess which they do not understand. You see, it is really very simple. The man who writes the checks is always the employer. Those who receive the money are the employees. Employees are hired to do what employers want them to. That is what they get paid for.

#### SO WHO ARE THEY?

It must now be wearily obvious to the merest tyro that we could go on and on with this discussion of *Insider* operations. We could go into groups like the Pilgrims Society, the Foreign Policy Association, the Twentieth Century Fund, Atlantic Union Committee, United World Federalists, the Commonwealth Fund, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the Advertising Council, American Assembly, the Rand Corporation, American Association for the United Nations, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Institute for International Government, World Peace Foundation, the Pugwash Conferences, World Rule of Law Center, the Bohemian Grove operations, and the Brookings Institution.

These organizations have one thing in common: They are all financed by a handful of men with enormous wealth. These groups promote central control of our national economy and/or the surrender of America's sovereignty to a World Government. And the hierarchies of all of these groups are studded with members of the Council on Foreign Relations—important *Insiders* of the Establishment—the "they" about whom Congressman John Schmitz is talking in his American Party campaign for President of the United States. More power to him!

(Concluded)

### Double Talk

The holding of contradictory opinions has been called the mark of a savage mind. But we are also told that you cannot serve God and Mammon which shows that if a person preaches two contradictory opinions, he will hold to the one and despise the other, even while he uses it as a mask.

Two of these cases make recent history. The first is the decision of the World Council of Churches to double its grant to African terrorist organisations "who this year can count on a handout of a million dollars." (*Human Events*, November 11, 1972). Dr. Philip A. Potter, the new Secretary-General of the WCC admits that "it is quite probable that some African liberation movements do buy arms from the Communist countries".

Geoffrey Stewart-Smith, M.P., editor of the *East-West Digest* investigates this problem in the December, 1972, issue in his editorial entitled "Selective Moral Indignation: the World Council of Churches". He has little difficulty in showing that the WCC looks away from such events in Russia as the sentence of Vladimir Bukovsky to seven years' hard labour and five years exile, or from the state of Lithuania which prompted two Catholic youths to burn themselves to death in public. Nor has this Council anything to say about the brutal invasion of South Vietnam.

He asks, "Why is the WCC so determinedly anti-Western?" And he can only explain it by the "infatuation of the WCC with radical politics". It has developed a hybrid of Marxism and Christianity, called "secular ecumenism". The retiring secretary Dr. Blake proclaimed, "Reflection on Marxism is now a common necessity for all churches." Or to put the matter simply, the WCC has become the tool of Marxism, and under the label of Christianity, it aims to deprive the individual person of such liberty as he has attained and, under cover of benefiting the Third World, to transfer all power to a central tyranny.

*Plus ca change*: for exactly the same game is being played inside Britain, which serves as the second example of flagrant dishonesty. For in this case Christianity ("Blessed are the peacemakers") is not in question but the sovereignty of Great Britain. As *The Spectator* puts it on December 30, 1972, in an article headed "Unacceptable Surrender", "The Welsh, the Scots and above all the English are being forced into a supranational system which spits contemptuously upon their histories and traditions. . . . The Prime Minister has demonstrated . . . his ignorance of and contempt for the people he rules . . . the people, if they are to keep their national identity, sooner or later will vomit out the foreign matter of the policy with which Mr. Heath has force-fed them." —H.S.

### The Reith Lectures for 1972 (Continued from page 1)

"as a scheme for European integration by central bankers instead of by politicians". "It is worth making the point", he says, "that to surrender control to a group of European bankers, acting independently of individual governments would be a retrograde step" (Are the bankers and the politicians really out of step?). Integration rather than merging is, he says, in keeping "with the mood underlying the construction of Europe". We must "maintain vigorously the individual character and separate identities of the national groups taking part . . . the nation will remain for many people—for the overwhelming majority of those involved—the primary centre of group loyalty".

But, as Mr. Shonfield has said: It is a "Journey to an unknown destination". What he would like to see and what he will see if he lives long enough may be very different things. There is no suggestion in Mr. Shonfield's lectures for any change in the political and economic thinking or in the rules of finance and accountancy that have brought us to our present pass. Hence, although enlarging the field of operations may or may not afford temporary relief, the same problems will inevitably reappear with additional complications. With big business growing bigger and overflowing national boundaries and with merger following merger the end must be world-government, probably as Dr. Monahan has forecast recently in these columns\*, of a very unpleasant totalitarian kind. In the same article Dr. Monahan has also indicated how such an end could have been avoided, to the great advantage of mankind. Whether this is still possible or whether we are entering another dark age only time can tell.

—T.N.M.

\* (1) "Social Credit and the British Crisis", *The Social Crediter*, April 15, 1972 — English Edition, April 29, 1972.

(2) "Alternative to Disaster", *ibid.* Dec. 9, 1972. English Edition, Dec. 23, 1972. (Also published as a booklet.)