

# THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 47 No. 20

SATURDAY, 30 DECEMBER, 1967

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

### Escalation

Under the Heading "When the Administration discusses Viet Nam" the following Statements were published in *Human Events*, Washington, October 7, 1967:

"Actions taken (in Viet Nam) have proved effective and will prove more effective as time goes on."

—Secretary Robert McNamara, Jan. 17, 1962

"By every quantitative measure we are winning the war in Viet Nam."

—McNamara, February, 1962

"... there is no plan for introducing Americans in combat in South Viet Nam."

—McNamara, March 22, 1962

"Progress in the last eight to 10 weeks has been great... The government has asked only for logistical support... Nothing but progress and hopeful indications of further progress in the future."

—McNamara, May 12, 1962

"Our military assistance to Viet Nam is paying off. I continue to be encouraged. There are many signs indicating progress."

—McNamara, July 25, 1962

"There is a new feeling of confidence that victory is possible in South Viet Nam... The corner has been turned."

—McNamara, Jan. 31, 1963

"There are some definitely encouraging elements. The ratio of casualties between government and Viet Cong forces, the ratio of arms captured or lost between the two sides, the steady extension of the strategic hamlet program, the increasingly effective work of the Montagnards along the border areas—all those indicate some turning in the situation."

—Secretary Dean Rusk, Feb. 1, 1963

"The momentum of the Communist drive has been stopped."

—Rusk, Feb. 13, 1963

"The South Vietnamese themselves are fighting their own battle, fighting well."

—Rusk, April 18, 1963

"There is a good basis for encouragement. The Vietnamese are on their way to success and need our help; not just our material help—they need that—but our sympathetic understanding and comradeship."

—Rusk, April 22, 1963

"Secretary McNamara and Gen. (Maxwell) Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S.-trained personnel."

—President Johnson, Oct. 2, 1963

"We believe that the present (Saigon) régime has moved promptly to consolidated public effort, that they will be able to resolve some of the internal difficulties that grew up, and that there will be a possibility that the people of that country will move in greater unity on behalf of the total effort."

—Rusk, Nov. 8, 1963

"... Small numbers of the U.S. personnel will be able to return by the end of this year."

—McNamara, Nov. 19, 1963

"We have every reason to believe that (U.S. military) plans will be successful in 1964."

—McNamara, Dec. 12, 1963

"With these further measures, we felt that a start could be made in reducing the number of U.S. military personnel in Viet Nam as their training missions were completed. Accordingly, we announced that about 1,000 men were to be withdrawn by the end of 1963, and expressed the hope that the major part of the U.S. military task could be completed by the end of 1965, although we recognized that there might be a continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. advisory personnel."

—McNamara, Jan. 30, 1964

"I am hopeful we can bring back additional numbers of men. I say this because I personally believe this is a war the Vietnamese must fight... I don't believe we can take on that combat task for them."

—McNamara, Feb. 3, 1964

"I don't believe that we as a nation should assume the primary responsibility for the war in South Viet Nam. It is a counter-guerrilla war, it is a war that can only be won by the Vietnamese themselves. Our responsibility is not to substitute ourselves for the Vietnamese, but to train them to carry on the operations that they themselves are capable of... I don't believe that pouring in hundreds of thousands of troops is the solution."

—McNamara, Feb. 19, 1964

"I think the resources and capabilities are there to get this job done on the present basis of assistance to the Vietnamese so that they themselves can handle this problem primarily with their own effort."

—Rusk, Feb. 24, 1964

"... the situation can be significantly improved in coming months."

—McNamara, March 17, 1964

(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 40/-; Six months 20/-; Three months 10/-.

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

Telephone: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1

Telephone: 01-387 3893

#### IN AUSTRALIA—

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

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

(Editorial Head Office).

#### THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2600. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr.

Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1.

Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur

Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q. Secretary:

H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

A Happy New Year  
To All Our Readers

#### FROM WEEK TO WEEK

There is now so much writing on the wall that even those who run should be able to read the message. By all appearances, the *strategic* conquest of Europe has been accomplished, while its occupation remains a matter of convenience. Once-Great Britain, protected from overt invasion by water—for the present—is being reduced from within to economic ruin, while her physical assets are being taken over by international financial interests. Even the possibility of biological warfare in the form of foot-and-mouth disease cannot be ruled out. The possibility of a real nuclear confrontation between the 'two' 'Super' Powers is being made progressively less acceptable to public opinion in the U.S.A., thus paving the way for a nuclear-armed 'peace'-keeping role for the U.N. and victory for World Government. And then counter-revolution can be put down by practised Communist techniques.

An extraordinary report by the Assistant Editor appeared in *The Sunday Telegraph* on November 5, 1967. Headlined "Russian Troops Are Training In France", it states that Red Army troops are *already* (our emphasis) training with French forces on French soil as part of a Franco-Soviet military exchange programme, while the two Governments are reported to be discussing joint staff talks and even the exchange of staff officers at each other's headquarters. A visit by Marshal Zakharov, the Soviet Chief of General Staff, coincided with the biggest French air manoeuvres held since the war—an exercise which had as its working hypothesis disturbances in Berlin and East Germany leading to the encircling of Berlin by Red Army forces.

De Gaulle is constantly depicted as an egocentric super-patriot but his total record is one of consistently pursuing Communist objectives.

Prime Minister Wilson who early in his administration received the adulation of the mass media, is now receiving

an increasingly bad press, which makes it appear that his real role as the Kerensky of the British Revolution is about to be made apparent. As Lenin laid down, the time for the Communist take-over is when the proletariat becomes convinced that even Social Democracy cannot save them from the oppression of the 'Capitalists'. And, of course, the economic policies imposed by Wilson are providing the necessary conviction.

It is several years since we published in these pages articles entitled *Now Or Never*, and *The Last Chance*, suggesting in outline the economic policy which if pursued with faith and courage might have saved Britain. But even at the end of World War II, the late C. H. Douglas was profoundly pessimistic, because he recognised the utter ruthlessness of the Conspirators who, he knew, recognised the Anglo-Saxon *character* as the greatest danger to their plans. There is no sign of danger to those plans now. But the danger to Anglo-Saxons is extreme.

#### "A Subversive Agency"

When the Heir to the Throne recently ascended a church tower in Cambridge and met the bell-ringers, the Vicar was in the party and happened to be Canon Montefiore, whose unpleasing speculations have kept him in the news. The last time I walked by his church, the boards on the church railings were plastered with notices of meetings about family planning, which made the building appear the centre of a cult of infertility.

I do not know whether Canon Montefiore sides with, or would consider himself a rival attraction to, the Rev. Paul Oestreicher who has recently promoted a Christian-Marxist dialogue. This activity found a succinct critic in the Rev. H. S. Goodwin of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, Holborn, who said, "The British Council of Churches and its parent body, the World Council of Churches, have consistently behaved in a manner that would be fitting for a subversive Marxist agency." (*Church Times*, Oct. 13, 1967). The consultations took place in Stepney, East London, and were presided over by the Rev. Alan Ecclestone, Vicar of Darnell, Sheffield, "who, since 1948, has been a member of the British Communist Party."

After reading that religion has been abolished in Albania, we come to the Rev. P. Oestreicher's account of the Co-existence of Christianity and Communism in Eastern Europe. The writer displays his prejudices when he says that Marx "uses the ethical foundations of the Judaeo-Christian tradition . . . to demolish what he saw of religion in the name of righteousness. Such religion as he knew really was the 'opium of the people'". For the Orthodox Church was the "wealthy beneficiary and obedient lackey of a cruel Czarist tyranny." (*Church Times*, Nov. 3, 1967.)

I could not personally lump together the ethics of these two faiths for this would suggest that Christianity, with its emphasis on the person, made no fundamental change of direction. Nor was the last Czar a cruel man, despite the efforts of B.B.C. propaganda in saluting the Soviet fifty years. Abuses had arisen in many parts of Europe—the prince bishops of Bavaria are a random example—but they did not lead to the destruction of the church. Mr. Oestreicher is keen to show that Christians in Russia have no feelings against communism, for "their sufferings seldom had the overtones of anti-communism which are so easily (and cheaply) adopted in the West." One presumes that he sees

nothing incompatible between Christianity and communism! We must be ants at heart.

The Rev. P. Oestreicher then glances at other communist countries, and no blame for friction rests with the communists apparently. In Hungary, Cardinal Mindzenty "stands between a settlement of Church-State tensions", while the suffering of minority churches in Rumania is probably due "to Rumanian history and nationalists rather than Marxism." Incidentally, a book has just appeared by Richard Wurmbrand, a Rumanian pastor, who was imprisoned for eight years—three of them in solitary confinement—and after a short release, for another six years.

The British Council of Churches further welcomed the subversive activity of Mr. Noel Slater who presented for their approval a report called *Christians and the Common Market*. Mr. Slater was formerly executive secretary of B.C.C.'s International Department and now acts as assistant director in the Commonwealth Secretariat with special responsibility for Common Market questions; he said that the goal was "not to unite Europe in order to allow ex-colonial powers to throw their weight about. European unity must pursue justice in terms of East/West and North/South divisions 'or it will come under the judgment of those who misuse God's gift of power'." (*Church Times*, Oct. 27, 1967.) This viper in the bosom of the Commonwealth evidently does not consider that his God is concerned with those who abandon the gift of responsibility.

However, Lord St. Oswald reminded the congregation of an inter-denominational service at the Albert Hall that the main hope of the communists was that we should "comfortably forget their deeds". The service commemorated the 95 million victims of communist persecution and was attended by refugees from 20 countries now under communist rule. (*Catholic Herald*, Nov. 3, 1967).

Until the Church makes clear how and why its faith differs from Marxism, the World and British Councils of Churches cannot dodge the Rev. H. S. Goodwin's indictment, however such as Canon Montefiore and the Rev. P. Oestreicher try to confuse the issue.

—H.S.

### Centralisation

"It is my belief that if we carry into these years (ahead) the present system of concentrated economic powers and practices of both capital and labor, of concentrated populations, of concentrated industries, of concentrated government domination and direction, of heavy taxation with its destructive effects on community and individual initiative and independence, of the steady impairment of our soil and water and the destruction of our forests and of irreplaceable minerals and oils, of the prevailing greed of various privilege-seeking groups, we cannot possibly avoid economic disaster . . . Yet it is a fact that the dominant thinking of the moment simply proposes a continuation, with ever-increasing governmental interference, of this same hopeless system."—*Decentralise for Liberty* by Thomas Hughes.

Mr. Hughes was Assistant-Secretary for Fiscal Affairs, (U.S.A.).

### British Agriculture

The following letter, addressed to the Editor, appeared in the *Daily Telegraph*, November 7, 1967:

Sir—I wonder if your readers know or care what is happening to a large agricultural minority in some of the more rural parts of Britain.

We in Central Wales are hoping, desperately, that our political watchdogs are giving the highest priority attention to one of the most sinister pieces of legislation ever to come onto the statute book. We can only hope, because the view, from our green hills, is bleak. Politics and politicians seem wholly concerned with satisfying the wants and feeding the envy of a terrifying, monolithic, urban proletariat. We feel we are being served, piecemeal, to this jealous Moloch.

What are we so worried about then? In short the Agriculture Act, 1967, the White Paper of August, 1965, and in particular the section authorising the setting up of rural development boards—in Mid-Wales, the Pennines and elsewhere.

Sinister legislation? You can hold these transparent documents up to the light, back-to-front or upside down, if you like, but you will come up with the same answer. Compulsion, dispossession, collectivisation of farms.

Supporters of the measure, including, mysteriously, the National Farmers' Union, admit that these powers exist, indeed are explicit in the Act, but say that they will never be used, that the Act will work through "voluntary" co-operation of the farmers. Voluntary, that is, until a farmer wishes to opt out, when he will be "directed" along lines decided by the board.

The truth is that the powers vested in the board are total, but will never need to be used. The very existence of a rural development board area, with a standstill on all buying and selling of land except by consent of the board, means that the free market in land in Central Wales has ceased to exist—already. Land values will find their own—very low—level.

Let us not be mistaken. This is no remote Welsh domestic issue, but land nationalisation, and not by the back door either. The Ministry's intentions are there for all to see, for those who can and are willing to read.

Is it too late to halt the trend to bitter, penal legislation by an administration secure in its disciplined majority? Regularly we are presented with measures of social revolution and constitutional erosion thinly disguised as moral justice and "national interest". Mrs. Castle's public song of triumph over the incidental (and destructive) social effects of a measure supposedly restricted to making the roads safer shows clearly enough where the true motives lie.

What is to happen to us? To paraphrase another fascist reactionary, "They may not frighten the electors, but, by God, Sir, they frighten me!"

Yours faithfully,

BRUCE OGILVIE

Llanwrada, Carmarthenshire.

## Escalation

*(continued from page 1)*

"The road ahead in Viet Nam is going to be long, difficult and frustrating."

—McNamara, March 26, 1964

"... the training personnel we have assigned there will come back as their training mission is completed—perhaps some can return this year; some next."

—McNamara, March 29, 1964

"We are confident these plans point the way to victory."

—McNamara, March, 1964

"I think on balance the number (of U.S. military personnel needed in Viet Nam) is not likely to increase substantially."

—McNamara, May 14, 1964

"I don't object to it being called 'McNamara's War'. I think it is a very important war and I am pleased to be identified with it."

—McNamara, April 24, 1964

"I think they (the Viet Cong) have very serious problems—not only in fact, in terms of losses, disruptions, but in terms of morale. So I am not pessimistic about the situation."

—Rusk, July 1, 1964

"We don't want our American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys... to get tied down in a land war in Asia."

—President Johnson, Sept. 25, 1964

"The most vital impression I'm bringing back (from Viet Nam) is that we've stopped losing the war... I must say I was surprised by the intensity and scale of their (the Viet Cong) attacks."

—McNamara, Nov. 30, 1965

"It will be a long war."

—McNamara, Dec. 1, 1965

"Approximately 235,000 (U.S. troops in Viet Nam) are needed."

—McNamara, March 2, 1966

"Aw, come on. What does someone in New York care about the war in Viet Nam?"

—Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester, May 12, 1966

"The crisis of credibility has gotten so out of hand that we don't believe our own leaks."

—Press Secretary Bill Moyers, Aug. 21, 1966

"We are beginning to see some signs of success of this strategy. The Viet Cong monsoon offensive, which we know from captured documents it was their intention to carry out during the period of May to October, has not materialized because of (General) Westmoreland's tactics of carrying out spoiling operations based on intelligence he has received as to concentrations of Viet Cong... The number of defections this year has doubled compared to the past year. No doubt this is a sign of erosion of morale."

—Rusk, Aug. 25, 1966

"I know of no plans to increase the forces in Viet Nam after the congressional elections."

—McNamara, Oct. 14, 1966

"I do believe that one basis for optimism is that the other side must surely now understand that they are not going to succeed in seizing South Viet Nam by force."

—Rusk, Jan. 1, 1967

"I think we have seen some very favourable signs that we are making headway on the military side, but that does not mean that the war is just about over... I must say that I have been impressed by the doubling of the rate of defectors from the other side."

—Rusk, April 16, 1967

"During the past year tremendous progress has been made... We have pushed the enemy farther and farther back into the jungles... The (South Viet Nam) troops are fighting much better than they were a year ago... The number of defectors coming into the government has substantially increased. The ratio of enemy personnel killed to those killed by the enemy continues to increase... It has doubled during the past year... We have succeeded in attaining our objectives... The enemy has not won a single, significant victory during the past year, despite the tremendous effort that he has put forth."

—Gen. William Westmoreland, July 13, 1967

"Suffice it for me to say that we are generally pleased with the progress we have made militarily. We are very sure that we are on the right track."

—President Johnson, July 13, 1967

"The other side is hurting, and they are hurting very badly."

—Rusk, July 19, 1967

"(Since last October) substantial progress has been made in the political, economic and military area."

—McNamara, July 21, 1967

And finally—

"The people who sent us here are patient, but they are not docile. Our national spirit and unity are not expendable. The public confidence cannot be taken for granted eternally. I tell you—and I say this carefully—the clamor of public irritation and impatience cannot be brushed aside like a bothersome fly and the flip and snobbish judgment that the public is not informed... The American people have not lost faith in themselves or in their democratic institutions, but the American people are tired of and they are fed up with doubletalk in Washington."

—Sen. Lyndon B. Johnson, Dec. 12, 1950, in a Senate speech on the Korean War

### The Truth about Vietnam by Robert Welch

The purpose of this article is to raise the question: Does the death of Americans in Vietnam constitute deliberate, conscious, and cold-blooded murder on the part of the Johnson Administration?

2/3 posted

### More Truth about Vietnam by Robert Welch

This pamphlet is devoted to the issue, "Why fight 'em in Vietnam and help 'em everywhere else?"

2/3 posted

Supplies of both the above should be available in January, 1968

### The State of the World

The review from T.S.C. 23rd September, 1967, in pamphlet form. Should be available immediately.

3/- posted

### Fabian Freeway by Rose L. Martin

A 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.

57/6 posted

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

Printed by E Fish & Co Ltd Liverpool