The Social Crediter, September 18, 1971

ENGLISH EDITION

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 51. No. 13. SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1971 7p (1s. 5d.) Fortnightly

America 1971*

The politics of dollars and sense

By GARY ALLEN

During the past twelve months as the world made its annual trek around the sun, most of the earth-shaking stories in America revolved, directly or indirectly, around the thirty-seventh President of the United States. It was during this year that the reign of Richard I, current champion of the Establishment Roundtable, passed the halfway point of his first elected term.

During the year the electronic varlets of the mass media had King Richard's loyal subjects out checking the air for any taint of toxicity, scouring each stream for polluted perch, and plying the highways and byways of the land spearing every wayward O'Henry wrapper. All of which was not only very nice, but one of the slickest political shell games ever promoted. It must have reminded Mr. Nixon of his youthful days as head barker at the Slippery Gulch Rodeo in Prescott, Arizona.

While the new shell game is an electronic affair with solid-state components, it is dedicated to the ancient principle that a dishonest hand is quicker than the eye. While the public is watching the shell marked *pollution*, the pea is under the one marked *socialism*.

And there has been one lot of peas under that latter shell in recent years. As Walter Trohan, the *Chicago Tribune's* sagacious columnist emeritus, noted in that newspaper for October 5, 1970:

> *It is a known fact that the policies of the government today, whether Republican or Democratic, are closer to the 1932 platform of the Communist Party than they are to either of their own party platforms in that critical year. More than 100 years ago, in 1848, to be exact, Karl Marx promulgated this program for the socialized state in the Communist Manifesto . . . .*

One must remember that Marx, the hireling codifier who wrote the Communist Manifesto for a secret society known as the League of Just Men, used the terms Communism and socialism almost interchangeably. Marx said that we could not have Communism until the entire world had been socialized. All Communists were to work for socialism. Even today, Communist spokesmen and official Communist literature say nothing of Communism, but talk only of socialism.

Few Americans profess to believe that Communism is inevitable, but many now claim to see what they say is "the handwriting on the wall" and proclaim the inevitability of socialism. Socialism is no more inevitable than Pharaohism, but it *will be* inevitable unless more people wake up to how it is being used by a powerful conspiracy out to rule the world.

To many political observers the most shocking development of the past year was the admission by President Richard Nixon to newsman Howard K. Smith that he is "now a Keynesian in economics". The jolted Smith commented later "That's a little like a Christian Crusader saying: all things considered, I think Mohammed was right". Howard K. Smith was well aware that such a statement was tantamount to a declaration by Mr. Nixon that "I am now a Socialist". John Maynard Keynes was an English economist and professional Fabian Socialist who bragged that he was promoting the "euthanasia of capitalism". Keynes was a flagrant homosexual, sometimes referred to as Lord Pansy of Flitdon, who designed a socialist system of economics as a means for venting his hatred of productive and normal society.†

It is generally believed in England among students of this conspiracy that John Maynard Keynes produced his *General Theory Of Money And Credit* at the behest of certain *Insiders* of international finance who both hired and persuaded him to concoct a pseudo-scientific justification for government deficit spending—just as the mysterious League of Just Men had hired Karl Marx to write the Communist Manifesto.‡ Such financial *Insiders* are in the business of acquiring government bonds in countries around the world. The further a government goes into debt, the more interest is paid to the powerful *Insiders* who "create" money to buy such bonds by the simple expedient of bookkeeping entries. Otherwise, you can bet your last farthing that the *Insiders* of international banking would be as violently opposed to inflationary deficits as the most devout followers of Professor Ludwig von Mises.

The Keynes theories, absurd on their face, were heavily promoted by those who saw a system based on artificial control of the economy as a tool to gain political and economic power for themselves. Keynes was brought to America to sell his "system" to F.D.R., who made it the theoretical base

(*continued on page 4*)

*From *American Opinion*, July-August, 1971.

†Lord Keynes' love letters to one of his boy friends have recently been published in *Lytton Strachey, A Critical Biography*, Michael Holyroyd; Holt, Rinehart and Winston, two volumes. Certainly Mr. Nixon has embraced only Keynes' economics, but it might be well if our readers still on good terms with the President were to call Mr. Nixon's attention to the foul perversions of the creature he has selected as his economic guru.

‡The Communist Manifesto did not even bear Marx's name until two decades after it was written.

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.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"Russia's vast military superiority at all essential points of contact with the West is now the dominating factor in the world balance of power." Thus begins a short editorial in the *Daily Telegraph,* Aug. 3, 1971. The article goes on to refer to a book, *Soviet Military Power* by Prof. John Erickson which states that Russian strategy, and the means to conduct it, have moved from deterrence to the offensive, and the *Telegraph* says, "This unprecedented military expansion . . . goes far beyond the maximum requirements of even the most cast-iron defence. For what ultimate purpose . . .?"

However, this situation has been apparent for some years, has often been referred to in these pages, and has been increasing in gravity all the time. According to Erickson, manœuvres are conducted on an enormous scale, rehearsing an attack against Western Europe.

Wars usually occur when both sides consider they can win —they are fought to *prevent* any one Power, or combination of Powers, achieving the degree of strategic superiority which 'Russia' appears to have attained, for this is sufficient to ensure surrender to an ultimatum, so that on this reckoning, war is unlikely. But 'Russia's' objective is the military subjugation of the U.S.A., which could hardly be achieved by direct military invasion.

For this sort of reason, Dr. Medford Evans, writing in the 1971 "Scoreboard" issue of *American Opinion* (July-Aug.), suggests: "I think we need to consider seriously the possibility of very large-scale warfare in Europe and the United States in the near future." The idea is that war in Europe— and once started it would be carried to the logical conclusion —would produce a situation in which "Civil disturbances of both racial and ideological colouring would convulse the United States far more than yet dreamed of", while, of course, the American troops in Europe would be mere hostages. "The national schizophrenia which has developed out of the Vietnamese nightmare would grow worse as voices from the campus, the pulpit, the media, and the United States Senate cried out that we should never have had our troops in Europe in the first place. . ." All this, of course, would amount to a Communist directed revolution in the U.S., with sabotage of key military installations and communications—detailed plans are known to exist for this. With American military power thus paralysed, the way would be open for Russian forces to move in to support the rebel 'Government' and 'police' the revolution.

Dr. Evan's article would have been written some months ago. Since then we have seen President Nixon's unprecedented face-losing offer to visit Peking—an announcement which has already destroyed America's remaining position in Asia, already imperilled by the deliberate misconduct of the war in Vietnam. And on August 16 came the barely concealed announcement of the collapse of the dollar, with other measures which in a few days have already produced a confrontation between the Administration and the unions.

Events of this sort are essentially irreversible—all the more so since they are the outcome of *conspiracy,* not, as they are intended to appear, of sheer ineptitude. When, on March 30 this year, Brezhnev claimed that "The total triumph of socialism the world over is inevitable, and for this triumph we will fight, unsparing of our strength", he spoke from fore-knowledge, and gave the answer to the question with which the *Telegraph* concluded its editorial. What other answer could there be? Can it be imagined that the attempt, from wherever it ultimately proceeds to unite Europe, is anything more than a ruse? Is it really conceivable that a "politically united" Europe will be permitted to build itself into a military power capable of neutralising Russia's "vast military superiority"?

We have several times referred to the malevolent influence of the Royal Institute of International Affairs on the conduct of British policy, as disclosed by its Secretary, Professor Arnold Toynbee—"We are working discreetly, but with all our might, to undermine national sovereignty". *Time and Tide,* Aug. 1971, quotes some recent remarks of Professor Toynbee: "Three interacting habits are carrying mankind towards self-destruction. They are the maximisation of births, *local sovereignty,* and technology"—emphasis added. How much of this sort of thing lies *consciously* behind Mr. Heath's determination to merge Britain's 'inessential' sovereignty in Europe's we do not know, but since the publication of the White Paper it is clear that the real reasons are not economic. Nicholas Kaldor (*New Statesman,* July 16, 1971) wrote of the White Paper ". . . its crudities, disastrous logical contradictions, vaguenesses and deliberate omissions . . ."—a characterisation (fully justified by a reading of the complete Paper) which means that the publication of such a Paper was a deliberate act of deception practised for ulterior motives—such as the abrogation of national sovereignty.

Unless patriotic Americans can defeat the Conspiracy *in America,* it will not at this stage make any significant difference whether or not Britain 'joins' Europe. But to defeat the attempt to have her join—peacefully, as it were—for the *right reasons* and with the maximum publicity—could conceivably influence the outcome in the U.S.A. Opposition to treason is patriotism—the defence of national sovereignty. But if the revolution succeeds, opposition becomes "counter-revolution", and Communism has a well-elaborated and practised technique for dealing with it—or even the suspicion of it.

That sovereignty—or rather the determination to abolish local sovereignty in favour of the sovereignty of international authorities—is the underlying issue is made clear in an

article "Europe As a World Power" by Andrew Schonfield in the *Daily Telegraph* of Aug. 10, 1971: "The curbing of unrestricted national power, of which the European Community is the most dramatic expression *to date,* is, after all, a more general underlying theme of the international organisations that have been developing in the contemporary Western world since the war. The EEC is the latest and most powerful variation on that theme."—Emphasis added: the end is not yet.

Who is to do the curbing? Well, presumably whatever power possesses "vast military superiority" over the countries which still possess "local" sovereignty—*i.e.,* what the White Paper calls "inessential" sovereignty. And then, we are to suppose, the agents of this vast military superiority will, in Douglas's words, "be transformed into ministering angels, and their international police will spend all their time helping international nursemaids to cross the international traffic. Anyone can see that".

At the present time, the international nursemaids are the Vietnamese, the black Africans, the Indians and Pakistanis, the Arabs, and assorted South American nationals, most of whom are engaged in fratricidal endeavours to achieve "local" sovereignty.

♦ ♦ ♦

"It is now settled that the Macclesfield by-election shall fall in late September before the two main party conferences. The date is meant to indicate the party managers' certainty that the seat will be held by the Government and that nothing can go wrong to damage the leadership at the party conference"—David Wood, *Times* Aug. 2, 1971. If this forecast proves correct, it is probably the very last opportunity there will be possibly to frustrate the leadership's determination to abrogate British local sovereignty, and we suggest that our readers in the area obtain and distribute the booklet "Whiteprint For Betrayal" to all the patriots they can identify and reach. If the short bill authorising the Government to accede to the Treaty of Rome is whipped through Parliament, only an improbable miracle can save Britain as an identifiable culture.

A Bishop Speaks

An important letter from the Bishop of Mashonaland to the *Church Times* (Aug. 6, 1971) makes nonsense of the claim that the WCC grants to terrorist "liberators" are "right". The bishop says that of the nineteen organisations assisted, aid in money to two of them, ZANU and ZAPU, appears to him "uninformed and unethical". As for the wives and children who are supposed to benefit, the members of these organisations in Zambia and Tanzania are not allowed to have wives with them. The money sent to Zambia and Tanzania cannot reach their families and so "can only be spent on men preparing for violent attacks upon this country" (Rhodesia) where in fact Christian Care helps their families.

Encouraging these men is "to encourage others to go to exile or death over the Zambesi"; they then are "lost in every sense of the word if encouraged by WCC grants to leave their country". The bishop, an opponent of all that is "unjust and racial" in the Rhodesian Government, nevertheless has in fairness to point out that "because of strife between ZANU and ZAPU", more African Rhodesians are imprisoned in Zambia than are "detained" in Rhodesia, over 200 as against 139.

The bishop has dealt faithfully and accurately with the organisations known to him, and doubtless the other seventeen are open to the same kind of objections. I cannot think that any African wants his hut to be burned over his head.

—H.S.

Terror at the Synod

The Church of England stands in some danger of being swung behind the World Council of Churches' grants to terrorists, for the General Synod's Board for Social Responsibility set up a working party to consider these grants to "freedom fighters". The Rev. Paul Oestreicher, Bishop Skelton and twelve others formed the committee, one of whom, Professor Anderson, acted as chairman. The report, *Civil Strife,* evidently comes down on the side of the terrorists and the General Synod at York will be asked to "take note" of its contents. (*Church Times,* July 2, 1971.)

In fact, the report considers such grants "entirely appropriate", with "certain provisos". Some members of the working party evidently had reservations about organisations "committed to violent means", while others thought that the WCC had been "too selective in identifying tyranny". But as long as the grants were not devoted to "the encouragement of violence", the majority of the working party felt no qualms. Such grants can hardly be held to discourage violence, any more than a present to a known assassin would rank as a peaceful overture.

Sir Dingle Foot Q.C., writing to *The Times* (June 30, 1971) shows the same blindness to terrorism when he deplores the Law and Order Maintenance Act of Rhodesia. For he recalls the "great public meetings" addressed by Mr. Nkomo before 1960 but does not mention the violent disorders of the period. And when he holds that "the great majority of Rhodesians" are denied any means of political consultation or expression, he fails to mention the traditional means.

Meanwhile in Sierra Leone, Mr. Stevens, "self-proclaimed president", has brought in military assistance from Guinea and executed Brigadier John Bangura and three others. Two MPs, P. Whitehead and H. Soref, call this "shocking", for the proceedings against the general "have not been disclosed". (*The Times,* July 2, 1971.)

While these disturbances occur and the WCC and perhaps the Synod encourage others, and while the Portuguese prepare for an attack from Guinea with the concurrence of Sierra Leone, Mr. Vorster gave warning on May 31st that "the greatest threat in Africa at present was the Chinese bridgehead in Tanzania. With the building of the Tan-Zam railway, the Chinese presence was flowing over into Zambia". (*Britain and South Africa Forum,* June, 1971.)

Despite these threats, developments towards "self-government for the Bantu terorities" proceed. The Tswanas will become self-governing this year and the next king of the Zulus will be installed this year as well. Moreover some of the Bantustans "might become independent this decade", although no date can be fixed in advance for the eight Bantustans' independence and membership of UNO. This process, however it differs from Western Democracy or from the notions of the Rev. P. Oestreicher, fails to qualify as intolerable tyranny.

—H.S.

Mr. Oestreicher and the Gunmen

The Rev. Paul Oestreicher adopted the equivocal position on the committee examining the World Council of Churches grants that, faced with tyranny, "he could not take a machine gun into his hands, neither could he condemn his brothers who . . . struggled for justice in the most effective way possible". He was not referring to the vastly increased offensive armaments of the Soviet Union but to "funds for combating racism". (*Church Times*, July 23, 1971.)

The chairman of the committee or working party, Professor Anderson, revealed his bias quite frankly in discussing the conditions of justifiable rebellion which, he said, they considered "in relation, especially, to South America, Eastern Europe and South Africa. In all of these—and especially in South Africa—tyranny is indisputable".

The working party made no reference to the Soviet influence on the WCC described by Russell Kirk in *Human Events* (June 26, 1971) exercised through the Russian Orthodox clergy on the Council. For, said Mr. Kirk, the Russian Orthodox Church "is a mere puppet of the Soviet régime which permitted the Orthodox hierarchy to join the WCC (in 1961) only because this might enable the men in the Kremlin to influence world opinion through the WCC". Mr. Kirk asks how racial justice can be promoted by "enabling bands of fanatic blacks to murder large numbers of other peaceful blacks". Mr. Oestreicher must either approve of these murders or call them something else. Dr. Blake of WCC, says Mr. Kirk, "defers almost servilely" to Russian attitudes, and sees no enemies to the left.

President Houphouet-Boigny of the Ivory Coast disagrees with this complacency, for he says that "the real menace is communist expansion. The real threat is China. And against this danger the best bulwark is South Africa with its military and industrial power". (*RSA World*, fourth issue, 1971.) He adds that African problems should be discussed by Africans "and that includes the Whites of South Africa". Mr. Vorster says much the same: "The basis of our policy here is that we are of Africa, and our main concern is to be of service to Africa."

The report called *Civil Strife* fails—as far as I know—to mention the terrible events of Northern Ireland, where civil strife rampages, and certainly omits the South African contribution to its solution that sovereignty depends "on the simple right of a people to be itself" (e.g. Lesotho) or the development of Bantustans, where the various native nations can live their own lives. Nor does *Civil Strife* mention the Southern Sudan where "the Christian Church is growing more rapidly than anywhere else in Africa" and where the clergy are "hunted men". (*Church Times*, Aug. 6, 1971.)

Instead of any kind of constructive approach, Mr. Oestreicher turns on a country which has treated him rather well, with considerable arrogance. He says (July 23 report), "This country now has the gospel preached to it, whereas it had previously exported it to other parts of the world". He does not make it clear if it is the Gospel according to WCC or P. Oestreicher from which we benefit.

—H.S.

America 1971

(*continued from page 1*)

for the flim-flam economics of his New Deal. Now that he too is a Keynesian, all Richard Nixon needs is a cigarette holder, a dog named Falla, and a wife who resembles a whooping crane.

Of course Presidents Roosevelt and Nixon have not been alone in embracing Lord Keynes. The September, 1970, *Bulletin* of the American Institute for Economic Research notes of the pervasiveness of the Keynesian economics:

> *The Great Delusion of this Twentieth Century is the mistaken belief that inflating can somehow create orderly and sustainable economic growth. The delusion is not new. It has been nurtured through the ages, by Kings, Princes, and Oligarchs, whose coin-clipping defrauded their subjects while enriching the royal coffers.*
>
> *But in the Twentieth Century the Great Inflating Delusion received the blessings of Lord Keynes who, as advisor to governments and teacher to teachers in the universities, became the most persuasive purveyor of monetary illusions since John Law. Lord Keynes' disciples now include many, perhaps by far the most, of the academic economists as well as many others serving central banks, governments and innumerable businesses.*

"Liberals" were naturally gleeful at Mr. Nixon's announcement that he has become a convert to the Keynesian economic perversions. As James Reston of the *New York Times* enthused:

> *Washington doesn't quite know what to make of all this. He swallowed Lord Keynes in one gulp. He announced the biggest budget deficit of the century as if it were the first article in the Republican catechism, and he embraced most of the old Democratic economic devils like long-lost buddies.*

Later in his internationally syndicated column of February 3, 1971, Timesman Reston exclaimed: "The Nixon budget is so complex, so unlike the Nixon of the past, so un-Republican that it defies rational analysis . . . . The Nixon budget is more planned, has more welfare in it, and has a bigger predicted deficit than any other budget of this century."

The day before, on the floor of the House, Democrat Congressman Harold Runnels hailed the new John Maynard Nixon this way:

> *. . . these are historic times. We are witnessing the entry of the Republican Party into the world of 20th century economic practice. It has been a breach birth if there ever was one.*
>
> *In the past few days, a Republican President has announced that he is a converted Keynesian—a Republican administration has submitted what they term an expansionary or full employment budget—and on Monday we received an economic report which indicates that Republicans are at long last conceding that Government must play an active role in the management of the economy.*
>
> *Without detracting from this great leap forward by the Republican Party, I must say that they are three decades late . . . . It is said that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. We Democrats are flattered . . . .*

(to be continued)

Printed by Circular Press Ltd., Colwyn Bay