

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 49 No. 14

SATURDAY, 4 OCTOBER, 1969

1s 3d Fortnightly

Mr. Kissinger

A Would-Be Usurper

By MEDFORD EVANS in *American Opinion*, June, 1969

(Continued)

III

The intellectuals have seen from the start — indeed, they have seen it since before it was quite true — that who controls nuclear weapons controls the world. As with theoreticians generally, they have anticipated events of the practical world, but as with all correct theoreticians, the practical world eventually catches up with them. The practical man in the street can make no greater mistake than to despise theoreticians in general, for sooner or later he will do just about what some of them predict.

The trouble is that there are so many theoreticians (not a high percentage of the total population, but still a large number absolutely), and they do not by any means agree with each other. Hence the practical man in the street has difficulty in deciding which ones he should look upon with awe, and which ones he can safely continue to regard with the contempt due all impractical dreamers. By making himself the power behind the White House throne, theoretician Henry Kissinger has shown enough practical ability to create a serious demand that his theories be seriously examined. His special field is arms control in the service of a new international order. It would be pointless to summarize his views in this field without some standard to judge them by, and therefore I shall try to set down briefly a few fundamental principles relating to arms control.

All control of great forces depends on a balance of those forces, one against another, with the controller at the pivot or center, where he can tip the scales either way with comparatively slight effort. The purpose may be to manipulate the balanced forces, as in raising and lowering a drawbridge; or it may be to secure the position of the manipulator, as when a tightrope walker carries a pole. The gyroscope may be the ultimate mechanical expression of the use of balanced forces for control. In politics the principle has been referred to for centuries in the aphorism, *Divide and rule*.

"Balance of power" politics was from about 1700 the key to British influence in the world and safety at home. American diplomats who have taken up the phrase seem not to understand (they seem not to, but maybe they do) that Britain in the years of her success never undertook to balance anyone *against herself*, but, of course, to balance potential rivals of, or dangers to, Britain *against each other*. Britain wanted a balance of power on the Continent, later round the world, with Britain *outside the balanced system*, in a

position to maintain its equilibrium and her own independence and safety. Sometimes it seems that the British have successfully continued the game to the present day, for the vaunted balance of terror between the two "super-powers" — the United States and the Soviet Union — has neutralized, has nullified, the nuclear arsenals of both, Britain being the nation more vulnerable than any other to nuclear attack.

Be that as it may (and I do not think it is quite that way), there exists in the world today an international community of intellectuals who specialize in the problem of arms control, who understand perfectly well that whoever controls nuclear weapons controls the world, and who understand also that if nuclear weapons are to be controlled there must be a balance of such weapons. *To control nuclear arms there must be a nuclear stalemate*. And if there is no nuclear stalemate, one must be invented.

Actually, no country has at any time even approximately matched the United States in stockpiled nuclear hardware. Hardware is useless, however, without the will to use it. By simultaneously propagandizing the horrors of nuclear warfare and grossly exaggerating when not outright inventing the development of Soviet capability, the would-be-usurpers of world power have created a psychological nuclear stalemate, which is the equivalent of a balance of nuclear forces, which makes possible a kind of arms control, which amounts to an incipient world government.

It should be noted that in this game, in which the Russians have joyously participated, reaping often delicious rewards of international prestige by which I am sure they must often be greatly puzzled themselves, the Soviet Union is still never allowed to outstrip the United States. It is always touch and go between the two. Now it would not be more difficult to tell the lie that Russia has ten times as many nuclear weapons as we have, than it is to tell the lie that they have a tenth as many, or three-quarters as many, or whatever the current lie is. So if the media were dominated by simply pro-Soviet authors, one would think they would go ahead and talk us into complete surrender, as General Forrest did Colonel Streight. ("Don't feel too bad, Colonel. It's not the first time a bluff has beat a straight.")

That the Conspirators have not done this is probably because they have not tried to do it, and they have not tried probably because, Communists of some sort though they may

(continued on page 4)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

PUBLISHED FORTNIGHTLY

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. Tel: 01-534 7395
Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1. 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 I. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. 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.

Vol. 49 No. 14

Saturday, 4 October, 1969

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

It is just a year since the Soviet 'invasion' of Czechoslovakia on a scale and with a precision out of all proportion to the alleged objective of the exercise. We have always regarded this operation as of the gravest strategic significance which, taken together with the concurrent establishment of a strong Soviet naval presence in the Mediterranean, poses the threat of checkmate to Western Christian civilisation and culture*.

Such is the extent of brain-washing these days that already these events of 1968 seem like ancient history. But in recent weeks there have been renewed reports of a further build-up of Soviet naval strength in the Mediterranean and, more ominously to the point, renewed Soviet logistics moves in Central Europe.

In an article published in *Human Events*, Aug. 16, 1969, the evidently reliable Paul Scott reports that: "Russia is stockpiling large amounts of military equipment and food supplies at strategic points along its borders with Czechoslovakia and East Germany. . . . This massive concentration of military supplies, apparently under way since mid-May, has been placed under heavy Russian security guard."

Under modern conditions of warfare, as Glubb Pasha has pointed out, preparedness is the major consideration. Scott makes the same point: "An important factor in modern war is that; long before it can be carried out in Europe, enormous preliminaries must be undertaken by any aggressor.

"For example, it is necessary to position troops and supplies, install advanced command posts, build temporary air fields, and tank repair facilities, as the Russians are now doing in Czechoslovakia—the invasion route to the heart of Western Europe."

The 1968 'invasion' of Czechoslovakia was rapidly accepted by the world news-commentators at the face value put on it by the Russians. But events of recent weeks have amply demonstrated that whatever may have been the position in 1968, Czechoslovakia is now under firm Communist

control, so that logistic moves on the scale reported by Paul Scott are no longer relevant to the Czech internal situation. He reports that NATO agents "tell of seeing thousands of freight cars loaded with hundreds of tanks, artillery pieces, and unperishable food stored on the rail sidings under heavy Soviet guard".

'Putting down' the Czechoslovak 'liberal' movement has proved, as we anticipated, the best possible cover for these logistic moves—a sure-fire winner with the world's 'liberal' commentators. The original 'invasion', had it not stopped within Czechoslovakia, was full of menace for the West. But it did stop, and the partially aroused West could be put back to sleep. But any further advance by Russian-controlled forces can now be from bases and with supplies which only a year ago were several hundred miles to the East. And if ever Czechoslovakia were a 'buffer' zone, it has ceased to be so: "With 300,000 Soviet troops now positioned in Czechoslovakia and East Germany, the Russians now have the most formidable army poised on the borders of West Germany since the end of World War II" (Scott; emphasis added).

From a military point of view, the position of Europe is probably now irremediable. Any one of a number of possible, and even likely, pretexts may serve as the basis of a threat of a Russian military invasion against which the threat of nuclear retaliation is no longer credible (the credibility depended on the existence of a buffer zone). Consequently, what is left but an 'accommodation' between Washington and Moscow to 'preserve peace' in Europe?

From the British point of view, the question is: to what extent has the Wilson Administration connived at all this—even contributed to it? It must be appreciated that the Wilson Administration is not a self-contained British Government, but an important operational unit of the Fabian Conspiracy*, itself part of the International Finance-Communist Conspiracy to rule the world. It is just possible that a well-prepared debate to expose this total situation in the House of Commons might, by its repercussions throughout the world, and particularly its effect on public opinion in the U.S.A., frustrate the plot, though the prospects are a great deal less encouraging than they were a year ago when this penultimate strategy of conquest first became clearly visible.

But if the Conservatives think that by waiting for an electoral victory they can retrieve the situation, they will probably wake up in a concentration camp.

To judge by their qualifications outside politics, a number of Members of the British House of Commons must be presumed to be of superior intelligence, so that their own alleged inability to understand, for example, 'economics' must spring from a reluctance to recognise the implications of quite obvious facts of observation. It is quite beyond question that all major industrialised countries are growing richer every day, if richness is defined as the ability to produce goods and services with diminishing human effort. This is the inescapable consequence of the continuous harnessing of non-human energy to the purposes of production; it is a fact that the introduction of one horse-power-hour of mechanical energy can, under favourable circumstances, displace ten

*See *The Moving Storm*, pp. 130 ff; *The State of the World*; also Glubb Pasha: *The Middle East Crisis*; T.S.C. Oct. 19, 1968: *Czechoslovakia and the West*.

*See *Fabian Freeway* by Rose L. Martin.

man-hours or, conversely, multiply production proportionately†. A visual demonstration of this fundamental fact is provided, for example, in the conversion of a war-ravaged Germany to a leading industrial power in less than a generation.

Now Great Britain gave birth to the industrial revolution, and since its inception has exported thousands of millions of pounds worth of goods *in excess of imports*; if the production 'given away' in the two world wars is included, the sum amounts to hundreds of thousands of millions. Disregarding the book-keeping of these transactions, they are a physical measure of Britain's innate productivity—a productivity which was enhanced, not diminished, by the wars. Quite evidently, the fact that this immense productivity is not at the service of the *British* people must be due to factors lying outside the sphere of productivity; that is, they are political, not economic, factors.

There are, in the main, two inducements to production, either individual or industrial: the psychological—the expression of the creative impulse—and the financial. The former leads to that continuous improvement of process with its continuous tendency to displace man-power; the latter lies outside the sphere of production altogether—the sphere of book-keeping and law. It is clearly in this latter sphere that the *apparent* failure of British productivity lies.

For a long time now, the British psychological inducement to production has been subordinated to the terms on which the financial inducement is made available which are that exports must continuously *exceed* imports, the difference being represented by the importation of money to buy a proportion of total production for home consumption. And the question which our hypothetically above-average politicians seem reluctant to face is: Who imposes those terms?

In short, industry does not exist *primarily* to make a financial profit; it exists primarily to make goods more readily available—that is to say, with a lesser expenditure of human energy—to the people who make them (not, of course, 'the workers' exclusively, but the community with its heritage of industrial 'know-how'). This basic objective has been overlaid and distorted by *political* objectives, for the most part with internationalist origins. The results are what we see: a prosperous defeated Germany and Japan, and a victorious 'sick' Britain. Mismanagement? Well, *yes*; *deliberate* mismanagement for ulterior purposes. It is not a change of management which is required, but a *reversal of policy*; and this involves something quite literally equivalent to a change of religious conviction: Full Employment and *practical* Christianity are incompatible, which is concisely why the world is given over to Satanism.

†If the ten saved man-hours install another H.P.-hour, the process accelerates.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

A Personal Interpretation
By SIR JOHN GLUBB

Sir John Glubb (Glubb Pasha) reveals his expert knowledge of the Middle East and deals with Russia's role there.

4/- posted

K.R.P. Publications Ltd. 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E11.

UNO'S Political And Security Affairs

A recent Parliamentary answer indirectly confirms again the astonishing—and many think, highly sinister—arrangement (elaborated at length in *P.I.W.* 31/68) whereby the Soviet bloc always provides the UNO Under-Secretary-General in the important field of Political and Security Council affairs.

The title of the job has changed over the years, but the list of those holding it reveals ten Soviet nationals and one Yugoslav thus:

Assistant Secretary-General for the Department of Security Council Affairs

1946 Arkady Sobolev, U.S.S.R.

1949 Constantin Zinchenko, U.S.S.R.

Assistant Secretary-General for the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs

1952 Constantin Zinchenko, U.S.S.R.

1953 Ilya Tchernychev, U.S.S.R.

Under-Secretary for the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs

1955 Dragoslav Protitch, Yugoslavia

1958 Anatoly Dobrynin, U.S.S.R.

1960 George Arkadev, U.S.S.R.

1962 E. D. Kiselev, U.S.S.R.

1963 Vladimir Suslov, U.S.S.R.

1965 Alexei Nesterenko, U.S.S.R.

Under-Secretary-General for the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs

1968 Leonid Kutakov, U.S.S.R.

—*Political Intelligence Weekly* 14/69 (April 10, 1969).

The Pyramid of Power

"If any genuine attempt is made to extract a useful lesson from the history of human development, the conclusion is irresistible that the process is one long and, on the whole, continuously successful struggle to subdue environment to the end that individuality may have the utmost freedom. Now, by the operation, misunderstanding, and misuse of our financial and industrial system in its application to economics, we have created an economic position which is such a formidable threat to the material existence of the individual that he is obliged to subordinate every consideration to an effort to cope with it. Partly by education and partly by what may be called instinct, it is increasingly understood that ~~misdirected effort and unsound distributing arrangements~~, while operating to minister to the will-to-power, are entirely responsible for the position in which we find ourselves.

"The practical issue at this time, therefore, is not at all whether this condition is to continue . . . it is simply one regarding the number of experiments, all very probably involving great general discomfort, which we are to endure until the inevitable rearrangement in alignment with the purpose of evolution is satisfactorily accomplished. And the suppression and perversion of the facts, on which alone sound constructive effort can be based, can have but one

result—to increase the number of these experiments and the discomfort of the process.”

—C. H. Douglas in “The Pyramid of Power”
from *The English Review*, 1919.

Mr. Kissinger

(continued from page 1)

~~be, they do not intend for the existing group in the Kremlin,~~ any more than any particular Administration in Washington, to gain full control of the world. If there is a Henry Kissinger in Washington, and are any number of his counterparts in the Kremlin, all that is part of the balance.

World government is not simply a dream of the future. In its perfected form it is such a dream, but then every perfected form is still unrealized. World government already has some kind of approximation in the United Nations. There are, however, closer approximations either unorganized, formally, or secretly organized, or perhaps just inconspicuously organized.

The Council on Foreign Relations itself is undoubtedly a closer approximation to a world government than is the United Nations. But of course the two do not work at cross purposes. The U.N. itself is *a creature of* the C.F.R. and related groups. And the world intellectual community which generated the U.N., the C.F.R., the World Bank, the various “private” international consortia, and the like has always on its mind a more perfect international order. To quote Professor ~~Presidential Advisor Henry Kissinger himself,~~ in his latest book, *American Foreign Policy*, “We must construct an international order . . .” (Page 49), and again, “The greatest need of the contemporary international system is an agreed concept of order A new concept of international order is essential” (Page 57).

Kissinger assumes that some kind of world order has previously existed, and exists now. But what we have had so far is inadequate. “The international system which produced stability for a century [*the Nineteenth Century*] collapsed under the impact of two world wars. The age of the superpowers [*the United States and Soviet Russia*], which temporarily replaced it, is nearing its end”. (Page 2.) There you have, by the way, a concept that is really IN this spring. Arthur Schlesinger Jr. has an article in *Harper's* and that incredible Marine Corps General, David Shoup, has one like it in the *Atlantic*, on “The End of the Age of the Superpowers”. Schlesinger says, “The United States cannot resign from the task of helping to build a rational world order”.

This is the air these intellectuals breathe. (I don't know what happened to General Shoup.) They have long thought like this. Thirty-five years ago at a small Southern college I had a student who was to enter an oratorical contest against a representative of a much more famous institution, a contest sponsored by the Sons of the American Revolution. “Tell you how to win”, I told him. “Tell your audience that the nations of the world should come together in a world union just as the thirteen original states of our national union came together in 1787”. I knew nothing of any World Federalist organization, had never seriously thought about what I was saying. But I knew by intellectual osmosis what the pervasive concepts of the mid-Twentieth Century were.

My boy, a sophomore, did as I suggested, and easily defeated his opponent, a senior, who delivered an old-fashioned Fourth-of-July oration, which he wrongly guessed the Sons of the American Revolution would want to hear. I give you my word there was not a Leftwinger within earshot of the country club where the contest was held. Neither my student nor I had any motive except to win the contest, and the S.A.R. members had no motive, I'm sure, except a vague desire to ~~do something intelligently virtuous.~~ Call it the *Zeitgeist*, a German word which an English dictionary says means “the general intellectual, moral, and cultural state of an era”.

Now if we who comprised the intelligentsia of Dogpatch U. thought like that in 1935, how do you expect Henry Kissinger to think in 1969, who was born near storied Nuremberg, left Germany at age fifteen under threat from the new world order of Adolf Hitler, was schooled in Manhattan, trained in professional espionage work by the U.S. Army, educated at Harvard, and adopted by the Council on Foreign Relations? You expect a kid like that to walk into the White House singing, “With a Bible on the table and the flag upon the wall”?

Kissinger's concept of “limited war”, which requires worldwide arms control in order to be realized, is inseparable from the idea of “co-existence”, which was a logical extension of the doctrine of “containment” propounded by George Ken-
wan, and which since 1952 has been the main line of world Communist policy. Today co-existence has been escalated to *détente* (relaxation — ~~just relax and inhale deeply, you won't feel a thing~~). “Even the attack on Czechoslovakia”, writes Kissinger, “is likely to restore anxiety about Soviet military aggression only temporarily”. The age of the superpowers could very well be ended by their being merged into a federation of the world administered by the international intelligentsia. In anticipation of that day it might be prudent for Conservatives to regard Henry Kissinger as a minister of the shadow world government, now resident in the United States as a control on the White House.

Yes, I'd call that a “would-be usurper”.

(Concluded)

FABIAN FREEWAY

High Road to Socialism in the U.S.A.
By ROSE L. MARTIN

This most detailed and carefully documented account of the origin, growth and present dimensions of the Fabian Socialist conspiracy, with its now virtually total control of the government administrations of both Britain and the U.S.A., is probably the most important book ever written showing how the present disastrous state of the world has come about. Though long, it is easily read; and no one who reads it could any longer misinterpret the current world situation. Fabian Socialism now has nowhere to go but to Communism.

Paper cover 19/-

K.R.P. Publications Ltd. 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E11.

Printed by E Fish & Co Ltd Liverpool