

# THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 49 No. 19

SATURDAY, 13 DECEMBER, 1969

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

### Amerussia\*

#### MAXIMUM CONGLOMERATE

By MEDFORD EVANS

It is part of the "Liberal" folklore that the common people throughout the world are brothers, while the ruling classes of the several nations vie with each other in pitiless rivalry. Wars are fought—so goes the "Liberal" libretto—because the régime of country X intends to take something from the rulers of country Y, and each governing clique induces its subject people to hate, and compels them to fight, the subject people of the other country—whereas all would spontaneously love each other if they were only better acquainted.

This romantic nonsense—propounded by, among a hundred others, so eminent a "realist" as the late Thomas Hardy—is like supposing that children from different families would never fight unless their parents put them up to it. More often, it is the parents who are the moderating influence. The important thing is to control the children—whether to mobilize or restrain them.

But it needs no analogy to discern that alliances, arrangements for trade, systems for communication of every sort between or among nations, are made by the governing elements of those nations—whether *de jure* agencies like the State Department, or *de facto* powers like the constituent companies of the Arabian American Oil Company (Aramco). Not that governments or great corporations may not be hostile toward one another—indeed they may. But if alliances and mergers do occur—and they are always occurring—they will be initiated and completed by a handful of men who have, or assume, the power to negotiate with their opposite numbers in the other government or the other corporation. The ordinary citizen seldom sees a foreigner, and when he does he seldom discusses anything of consequence. John Smith, U.S.A., normally restrains himself to somewhat artificial social pleasantries in conversation with even his cousin from Britain, not to speak of an encounter with Muscovite Ivan Ivanovitch.

The international set, in contrast—whose women may marry billionaire shipping magnates—has a more sophisticated attitude toward the various nations of the world. It is an attitude not unlike that of a man-about-town toward various restaurants and theatres—places to go, each with its own ambiance, each more or less suited to the entertainment of a moment, but no one of them fit to engross a man's whole life. From such a point of view patriotism must seem more than a bit parochial.

(NOTE: One jet-setter—to give credit where credit is

due, though the lady is capable of paying cash any time—recently demonstrated how to handle a nosy New York news photographer—*i.e.*, with a judo flip—teaching us all two things in the process: (1) when you come out of a dirty movie, keep moving; and, (2) though she may have been curious she is not yellow.)

When societies, nations, or systems merge, it is always first at the top. The ordinary American cannot understand how a rich capitalist can seek to do business with a Communist régime, can even connive at bringing Communists to power in such a country as Cuba. But perhaps your and my inability to understand a thing like that is precisely why we are ordinary Americans instead of rich capitalists.

Just a minute! Being readers of AMERICAN OPINION we are not *ordinary* Americans, but are considerably more literate and thoughtful than the average. Don't you agree? So perhaps we can *sort of* understand what rich capitalists and Communists have in common. Of course the main thing they have in common is a burning desire to possess the rich capitalist's wealth, but there are other things as well. Some capitalists are managers, executives of corporations. Inevitably, any chief executive of a large organization has a certain natural sympathy for, not to say envy of, a dictator. You've got problems with the XYZ Company? Think of the headaches Stalin had with two hundred million Russians!

Looking back and judging from an organizational-growth point of view, these fellows must figure, you have to hand it to old Joe. While Hitler and Mussolini went to the wall in the Second World War, Stalin came out of it as a full partner in the "Big Thrice"—the other two being those long established fat cats, Britain and the United States. Since World War II, Stalin's comparatively new establishment has—under his heirs—elbowed Britain to one side and settled down across the table from the Americans as one of the two "superpowers" of the globe. These two run things, insofar as things are run, and on top of that a lot of people think some of the boys Stalin trained ~~control the American position~~. Quite a success story, and what managerial-type capitalist is going to quarrel with "success"?

What about Communism? Oh, that! It's nothing. A real managerial type is not interested in ideological vapors. Results are what we want and these so-called Communists have been getting results. Maybe we can learn something from the way they do things.

That's pretty much the way your rich on-the-job working capitalist is liable to see the big picture.

(continued on page 3)

\*Reprinted from the advance December issue of *American Opinion* which is published monthly except July by Robert Welch, Inc., Belmont, Massachusetts 02178 U.S.A.

# 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. 19

Saturday, 13 December, 1969

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

It is virtually an article of political faith that the world is divided into the free and the unfree, and that the freedom of the free depends in the last resort on the military might of the U.S.A. to defend them from attack by the unfree. The world thus is in the grip of a military confrontation, paralysed in its progress towards a better world by the threat of war.

But, as Mr. Israel Moses Sieff of the used-to-be anonymous Political and Economic Planning observed, the threat of war, or war itself, was the indispensable prerequisite for British "planning" which, among other things, "must clearly involve drastic inroads upon the rights of individual ownership of land as at present understood". In 1933, when Mr. Sieff disclosed his ideas at a dinner at the Savoy Hotel in London, the threat of war was in preparation; by 1938, war was inevitable. And with the war came the implementation of P.E.P.'s plans.

Apart from a thorough pre-emptive atomic bomb attack on Moscow, it would be physically impossible for the U.S.A. to engage in an 'imperialist' war on Russia. So what are Russia's 'defensive' forces for? The answer is in two parts: (1) To maintain the threat of war, indispensable for revolutionary planning; (2) to suppress counter-revolution, when revolution succeeds (the Stalin-Brezhnev doctrine).

The course of history has always been marked by the endeavour of the few to impose their will on the many; and the fundamental strategy has always been to gain control of access to food, clothing and shelter. Modern industrial productivity, however, has produced such potential abundance of these universal requirements as to endanger the future of coercive government. In other words, if every individual had such sufficient access to his basic needs as to be able, in Douglas's words, to "choose, with increasing freedom and complete independence, whether he will or will not assist in any project which may be placed before him", the prospects of 'strong' government and centralised planning would be increasingly dim. So the 'drain on the economy' represented by 'defence' against the threat obligingly provided by Russia justifies a 'managed' economy until such time as sufficient centralisation of government control has been achieved to enable the application of the Brezhnev doctrine, and 'dis-

armament' can be imposed under the umbrella of World Government.

This cruel and ghastly conspiracy is now so close to its culmination that to suppose that a conventional Tory 'victory' at an election could even give it pause is to inhabit a world of sheer fantasy. It is far from certain that an election will even be held. So unstable is the world political situation that events, chance or otherwise, could at any moment trigger off a crisis calling for the same 'emergency powers' as the Attlee Administration utilised to initiate the final destruction of Britain—the once apparently insuperable barrier to World Dominion and the cradle of the concept and mechanisms of individual freedom. Communist military and naval forces are now deployed on a world strategic scale, and the, largely secret, Communist Party forms a cohesive Fifth Column throughout the world. The U.S.A., the richest and most powerful nation the world has ever seen, is being made to appear inept and incompetent in its foreign policy and to be threatened with economic disaster, and revolution in the streets is being rehearsed.

For all the good the Tories did, the years between Attlee and Wilson might as well never have been. Their 'victory' was but their opportunity to get their own hands on the fascinating controls. It was industrial recovery, not Tory 'management', which slowly ameliorated the Crippsian austerity. But in Germany and Japan 'economic miracles' occurred, while the Tory achievement (the word is Mr. Heath's) was such as to allow Mr. Wilson to turn the 'balance of payments crisis' into a pretext for renewed austerity and to shackle the country with increased international debts whose liquidation will be the inheritance of the Tories, should they come to 'power'. Naturally, they will need even more 'power' to clean up the mess made by the 'incompetence' of the Socialists. Remember that Letter of Intent.

For reasons which have been examined in greater and less detail in these pages since the inception of this journal\*, any escape from Britain's predicament entails a repudiation of Britain's international financial 'obligations' and what amounts to a reversal of orthodox fiscal policy.

As regards the financial 'obligations': Every patriotic Tory—surely, there must be some—should consider carefully President Wilson's comment to Colonel House: "When the war is over we can force them [the British and French] to our way of thinking, because by that time they will, among other things, *be financially in our hands*" (emphasis added). (See *The Moving Storm*, p. 114.)

In 1918, there was virtually universal ignorance concerning the nature and operation of the financial system, so there was some excuse for the post-war British Government adopting the policies it followed; they really did seem to be dictated by 'economic necessity'. Probably not one person in ten million 'educated' people would have had the slightest idea what the term "restriction of credit" meant; but now, under the title "credit squeeze", it is considered a prime instrument of fiscal policy, an essential ingredient of 'economic management'. But in 1918, and again in 1945, restriction of credit was the mechanism by which the power of "our hands" was made manifest.

\*For indicative references, see *The Development of World Dominion*, *The Moving Storm* and *The Trap*.

As to a reversal of orthodox fiscal policy: "We think it was Dr. Tudor Jones who suggested that the key doctrine of Christianity is the supremacy of repentance over the Law—that there is what may without irreverence be called a technique by which the chain of causation can be broken". The chain of causation here is: "The Tories must clean up the mess caused by the incompetence of the Socialists in clearing up the mess made by the Tories in dealing with the balance of payments. . . ." More management.

Proximately (but not ultimately) our troubles are due to a gross excess of Law; and unless the Tories repent of their part in this hideous accumulation, they, and the rest of us, "have had it". At the best, there may be twelve months (assuming another election) for the Tories (as the only visible alternative to the Socialists) to come to grips with the real problem.

A NOTE FOR THE ARABS: Events should by now have made it plain that the Arabs are the victims of one of the cruellest hoaxes in history: The Soviets have armed and 'protected' the Arabs in order to give the Zionists a pretext to annihilate them. Obviously, if Russia did the job, that would be 'aggression'; if the U.S.A. did it, it would be 'Imperialism'. But if the Zionists do it, it is because of 'provocation'.

On the outbreak of war in 1939, Douglas wrote: "It is, I think, quite possible to state the *real* as distinct from the proximate objectives of the *present* war.

"They are:

"(1) The establishment of the International Police State on the Russian model, beginning with Great Britain.

"(2) The restoration of the Gold Standard and the Debt System.

"(3) The elimination of Great Britain in the cultural sense, and the substitution of Jewish-American ideals.

"(4) The establishment of the Zionist State in Palestine as a geographical centre of World Control, with New York as the centre of World Financial Control."

Immediately after the war, through the agency of UNRRA and with the collusion of Soviet Russia, a very large number of Jews began migrating from Eastern Europe (Soviet-controlled) to the American zones in Germany and Austria, with the intention, in most cases, of finally making their way to Palestine. "It is clear that it is a highly organised movement, with ample funds and great influence behind it" (Select Committee of the House of Commons). Soviet Russia pressed for, and granted, recognition to the 'State' of Israel, established by typical Communist terrorism; and it was Soviet Russia which during the 'truce' in the first Arab-Israeli war continued to arm the Israelis with arms from Czechoslovakia.

Obviously, with the aid of 'volunteers', Soviet Russia could wipe out the State of Israel in short order. But by arming and instigating the Arabs, they can provoke them to their own destruction. All of this, and the expulsion of the British from the Middle East through the Suez Crisis (a joint venture by the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.), is merely clearing the site for the establishment of the seat of World Government. For at heart, Zionism and Communism are one, and the Arabs are in the way.

## Amerussia

(continued from page 1)

Now a finance capitalist is different. He sits and thinks more, and gets information from Europe and other strange placés, and figures how to hang onto his inheritance and at the same time parlay it into something still bigger. These people probably know something about Marx. If they don't read Marx (who does?) they read about him. As a matter of fact, they are no doubt somewhat flattered by the Marxist analysis. It may predict their downfall, but at least it says they have been on top in modern times and are a necessary precursor of the revolution.

Mmm. Some argument about that by Maoists, and even Leninists. It must be on the whole more pleasing to a finance capitalist to embrace *pure* Marxism, or maybe the Keynesian modification—if it is a modification. Come to think of it Keynes himself was a (quite successful) capitalist and (quite successful) Marxist all in one, wasn't he? The *beau ideal* of the rich revolutionary, Keynes was first in *How To Pay For The War* (don't), first in *The Economic Consequences Of The Peace* (socialism), and first in the hearts of fair Harvard. True, Keynes is dead, but John Kenneth Galbraith marches on.

You ask how rich men can be Communists? I'll tell you how. They went to college. The best colleges, of course. A jerkwater college won't do. Or wouldn't before the current generation. Now some of them are catching up. (Don't get finicky with me about the grammatical number of those substantives. You know what I mean.)

The outlook of the intelligentsia begins by being totally detached. From regarding the world as their plaything intellectually, however, they move to make it so in a practical sense, and thereupon their detachment is transmogrified into passionate concern. Possibly the best known of these political intellectuals is Walt Rostow, author of the immortal words: ". . . it is . . . an American interest to see an end to nationhood".

If you are tempted to dispose of that as the speculation of an ivory-tower dreamer, reflect on the fact that Walt Rostow was—after McGeorge Bundy, and before Henry Kissinger—the American President's Special Assistant for National Security. In 1968 Rostow was discredited along with Lyndon Johnson, but his successor Kissinger differs from him no more than Nixon differs from Johnson. All these men—politicians and intellectuals alike—represent forces committed to Soviet-American "detente" and arms control through "balance of terror".

Arms control means control of the nations which possess arms. That proposition is perfectly simple, self-evidently true, and almost completely overlooked—except by the promoters of arms control. Since some sort of arms control obviously has been achieved—for both the United States and the Soviet Union have yielded national interests rather than use nuclear weapons—it follows that some sort of supra-national apparatus is already operating.

This is not simply the United Nations. More plausibly, it is the "intellectual" community which devised the United Nations and affiliated bodies, such as U.N.E.S.C.O., such as the International Monetary Fund. (NOTE: That was Keynes, Harry Dexter White, and comrades. Their dream of

an international managed currency seems about to come true with the advent September 29, 1969 of Special Drawing Rights (S.D.R.)—"paper gold"—a key feature of evolving world government.)

But the same intellectual community has come even closer to achieving world power through its highly successful propagation of the doctrine of "nuclear stalemate", of a "balance of terror". By convincing the majority of the world's literate population that the United States and the Soviet Union are two superpowers deadlocked across an abyss into which a false move might plunge them both (together with lesser nations), the international intelligentsia have achieved, as it were, the status of "the parliament of man". And their standing committees, such as the Pugwash conferences of atomic scientists from both sides of the Iron Curtain, come very close to running "the federation of the world".

Since all this, however, is accomplished not through open parliamentary procedures but through private, not to say clandestine, gatherings of a self-perpetuating elite, it seems more appropriate to seek a nonparliamentary nomenclature for whatever it is that for the present controls both the United States and the Soviet Union—at least as far as the power repercussions of widely credited nuclear capability go. And that is pretty far.

I suggest that this supra-national agency may be understood (partially) as a "conglomerate"—as that term is now used in the business world—*i.e.*, a corporation comprising other corporations with a variety of special interests but, at the top, one decision-making authority by which all the rest of the far-flung and vastly complex structure is ultimately controlled. It must be understood that this is a figure of speech—for corporations in the literal sense are themselves legal fictions, creatures of government, while the "conglomerate" which I am suggesting is, if it exists (and I believe it does), above all governments. And, if it does not derive its authority from God, which seems improbable in the extreme, it must have, like Napoleon, simply put the imperial crown on its own head. (Actually, such a monster has numerous heads, but to survive they must be of one mind.)

Because this supra-national conglomerate, though it has many other interests and is indeed concerned with all nations, yet centers its attention so largely on the United States and the Soviet Union, I suggest that it might appropriately be called "Amerussia". You must not expect me to give you the details of its organization chart or a certified copy of its constitution and bylaws, for I have never attended one of its board meetings. Though I often felt, when I was working for the Atomic Energy Commission in Washington in the late 1940s and early 1950s, that I was in an ante-room where I could hear the voices and interpret something of their tone, though I couldn't make out the exact words.

No better illustration could be adduced from the public record as to how the Amerussian conglomerate functions than the "hot line" electronic communication system between the White House and the Kremlin. This is said to have been the brainchild of Walt Rostow (my source here is the now indispensable William J. Gill's *Ordeal Of Otto Otepka*, reviewed hereinafter[\*]). Rostow is also said to have been the first person in the White House (he was *in* the White House, you know, as Kissinger is now) to get a call (but I admit it seems to have been station-to-station) from the Kremlin. You

know executive offices don't have direct intercom systems unless they belong to the same outfit.

Now if you add to the "hot line" the "permissive action link", you've got a real control system over the world's two "superpowers"—which means you've got a little world government right there. The "permissive action link" (see also our book review in this issue of *Men Who Play God*[\*]) is an electronic remote-control device by which someone in the White House can prevent the firing of an American nuclear weapon anywhere in the world. But if the White House with its "permissive action link" is tied to the Kremlin by a "hot line", then the Kremlin might come mighty close to having a veto over the firing of an American nuclear weapon anywhere in the world. I do not know that this is technically the case, but I do know that there are many "Liberals" who sincerely think that it ought to be the case. And some of them are in position to get done what they think ought to be done. They sit, as it were, on the board of directors of "Amerussia", maximum conglomerate.

Each component of a conglomerate must furnish something in which the parent company is interested. In the case of commercial conglomerates the something is simply money. Any company which can continually show a profit is worth taking over. But with countries the situation is a bit different. Countries are directly concerned with power rather than money. Power can use money, but money cannot buy power. It will do you little good to offer the hold-up man who has the drop on you twice what he paid for his gun. He will take all your money and keep the gun too. The greatest mistake of the commercial middle-class is to think that power follows money. Money follows power; no money is any good without power to back it up.

So the maximum conglomerate is not looking for money, it is looking for the ingredients of power. If America and Russia are the two "superpowers" which together form an adequate and unmatchable base for supreme world power, it is because—it can only be so if—each of them has something unique to furnish. What America has to offer is the most successful complex of technological development and mass production in the history of man. Notice that from the point of view of prospective rulers of the whole world it makes no difference whether Russia can match America in this regard or not. If so, fine. If not, America can furnish all the technological virtuosity and productive industry which the aspiring globemasters have any thought of using anyhow. In the case of nuclear weapons, whoever controls the American arsenal could not care less what the other nuclear arsenals of the world may hold—if he controls them all anyhow. A world government would not need more nuclear weapons than America already has.

(To be continued)

[\*] It is hoped to reprint these reviews in *T.S.C.* at a later date.

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

Extra copies of this and recent issues of *T.S.C.* are available to subscribers at 4d. posted.

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

Printed by E. Fish & Co., Ltd. Liverpool.