

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 54 No. 9

JANUARY, 1975

15p. Monthly

Conspiracy*

The New World Order Isn't New

By MEDFORD EVANS

It was Immanuel Kant who, in the *Critique Of Pure Reason*, said (roughly) that if you want to know something for sure, you Kant. We mortals judge by appearances, and the phenomenon, alas, is not the noumenon, not the thing-in-itself. A philosopher named Hans Vaihinger bought this package but rewrapped it.

What we must do, said Hans, is accept certain "fictions." (The quotation marks reflect the possibility that they are not really fictions; they might be true; but if so, it would be only a coincidence. Ah, me! This philosophy is tough stuff.) The *Britannica* summarizes as follows:

These fictions are held to be the constituent elements of all human knowledge, whereby the will, in its effort to come to terms with irrational and unknowable reality, constructs rational explanations of phenomena "as if" there really were knowable grounds for believing them to be true in the sense of conforming to reality.

What I suggest is that, as we face the irrational and unknowable world of Watergate and *détente*, we accept the only rational explanation yet constructed of such phenomena as the apparently unnecessary and badly-bungled-by-experts burglaries of the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist and the headquarters of the Democratic National Committee; or of such apparitions on the international scene as the Yom Kippur War of 1973 and the Cyprus War of 1974, in both of which the forces closer to the Soviet Union gained advantage, while clients of the United States were disconcerted by the devious diplomacy of our Secretary of State. It would be a labor of supererogation even to begin to catalogue the domestic and foreign political phenomena, from bussing to the recognition of "East" Germany, of which the only rational explanation is: *Conspiracy*.

We must, however, take special note of the one massive phenomenon which more than any other challenges reason to explain, and that is the promotion from within the United States of trade with the Soviet Union in commodities and under terms which ensure that every advantage, both economic and military, will accrue to the Soviets. Particular firms and individuals within the United States may temporarily profit from the wheat deals, computer sales, and truck-factory commitments that have been made, but the economic cost is a new burden to the American taxpayer, while the effect on the status of the United States is perhaps catastrophically degrading.

Granted that the ordinary rational observer of such phenomena can find no ground for determining with cer-

tainty the reality beneath the appearance, yet practical reason can make sense out of such matters only by assuming that behind them there is a *Conspiracy*. The time would seem to have come when a precious agnosticism regarding the existence of a Conspiracy is a luxury Americans can no longer afford. Much less can we afford flat denials of Conspiracy by those who have themselves been involved in affairs of the Central Intelligence Agency, or the Fourth International, or other such instrumentalities.

Indeed, this is a subject which deserves far more study than it has yet received; one of the numerous disservices of the *no-Conspiracy* affectation is that it has so often prevented serious attempts to analyze available evidence as to the composition, motivation, and grand strategy of the *Conspiracy*—that necessary fiction to which even the most elementary *Realpolitik* accords a pragmatic sanction. Too much of the comparatively scanty literature on the Conspiracy appears to be subjectively colored—even after allowing for the Vaihingerian thesis that *all* judgments are basically subjective. The subjective element may range all the way from the blatant prejudice of the Anti-Defamation League, which suffers an emotional seizure at the very mention of the word *Jew*, and finds a Klansman behind every bush, to the vatic inspiration which led me, for example, a couple of years ago to write the article "Bad Business: Can the C.F.R. Colonize Russia?" (*AMERICAN OPINION*, January, 1973) which was excerpted and reprinted by permission in *Intellectual Digest* of April 1973, under the title "Beware of World Government: Word from John Birch Country that the Liberals and Big Capitalists of our Trotskyist Establishment may Lead us into Slavery."

The tone of that subtitle telegraphs advance notice to the reader that he is going to enjoy something which will surely fall of its own ridiculous weight, but as a matter of fact (we speak *as if* there really were such a thing as a *fact*), the very items in the article which I.D.'s editors chose to highlight as ludicrous have stood up rather well. For instance, consider this bit of I.D.'s sophisticated editorial derision:

The article . . . contains a number of revelations that will open some eyes wider than they have ever been opened before. We note in passing that West German Chancellor Willy Brandt, hitherto seen [by

*From *American Opinion*, December, 1974. *American Opinion* is published by The John Birch Society, Belmont, Massachusetts, U.S.A.02178. The overseas subscription rate is US\$12 per year.

whom?] as a staunch ally of the America of Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon, "surely is a Communist"; that Bolshevism was foisted upon Russia by "the German and Jewish Company of super-Capitalists, whose real schemes were camouflaged under the guise of Communism" (if we read this aright, Communism is a capitalist conspiracy) . . .

Well, I.D. old boy (is there a Freudian explanation for the fact that *Intellectual Digest* regularly chooses to refer to itself by its Freudian acronym?), you read it almost aright. The words about the German and Jewish Company of super-Capitalists which you put in quotation marks are not my words, as they are made to seem, but those of the cultivated Englishwoman Mrs. Nesta Webster, writing for the *London Morning Post* of April 27, 1922, concerning the Treaty of Rapallo, which had been signed eleven days earlier. I am not unhappy to have Mrs. Webster's words taken for my own, but it is a bit imprecise.

The words "surely is a Communist," about former West German Chancellor Willy Brandt, are indeed my own. But, considering that Willy had to resign because his Henry Kissinger, one Guenther Guillaume, was discovered to be a Communist agent, those words of mine don't look very ridiculous after all, now do they?

Nor is it ridiculous to suppose that "Communism is a capitalist conspiracy," though it is most certainly an oversimplification. The works of Robert Welch, Dan Smoot, Gary Allen, Cleon Skousen, Carroll Quigley, and Rose L. Martin, among others, have made familiar to the widely read the idea that there is no Aristotelian contradiction between capitalism and Communism. Merely to leaf through the pages of *Foreign Affairs*, the great quarterly review published by the Council on Foreign Relations, and observe that the preponderance of its quite numerous advertisements comes from America's leading banks, airlines, and university presses—most notably banks—is to raise the question whether financiers and executives who support such an *advanced* journal can be so very conservative after all.

Yet despite the somewhat scattered profusion of material concerning not only the infiltration of the Right by the Left, but also of the Left by what is at least generally thought to be the Right, it must be admitted that the bulk of such material reflects an essentially personal point of view. Pioneers in Conspiracy-analysis are necessarily adventurous, and generally quite conscious of the risk that while some readers will praise them for brilliant insight, others (plus many nonreaders) will dismiss us as a bunch of nuts. Not unnaturally, this adventurous, speculative turn of mind—while its heuristic value is incalculable—is seldom adapted to the production of works which command such universal assent as to leave scepticism no escape hatch.

In recent years, however, a man has appeared whose work so combines brilliance of insight with prudence of method, thoroughness of research, aptness of application, and subtlety of inference, as to leave dissent without a voice. I am referring, of course, to Antony C. Sutton, whose *magnum opus* in three-volumes, *Western Technology And Soviet Economic Development*, was once called (by me) "the most important book since the Bible"—a judgment I have found no reason to reconsider. The reason why that work is so important is that it removes from the realm of controversy the question as to whether the Soviet Union

has, or has ever had, independent industrial capability. Sutton shows, with a vast array of conclusive documentation, that Soviet economic development has from the start been crucially dependent on Western—primarily German and American—technology.

Since it seems virtually as certain as hypothetical matters can be that if the level of Soviet economic development had been significantly lower than in fact it has been, the Soviet system would not have survived these fifty-seven years, it therefore seems logical to conclude that Soviet survival has depended on Western technology, which in turn depends not merely on scientific comprehension (an individual matter in which individual Russians have frequently excelled) but crucially on industrial organization and finance capital (which is a form of organization). Russia's most decisive industrial advance was made in the 1890s, under the leadership of the Czar's Finance Minister Count Witte, who was of Dutch ancestry, and who drew on the West for both methods and materials. Modern Russia has at all times depended as heavily on Western Europe and the United States as the prairie states of America have depended on the industrial regions of the Great Lakes and the Northeast.

Now let us reflect a moment. Is it not practically an inevitable supposition that if the dictatorial rulers of Russia have had to get capital funds and equipment from the West, then they must have had dealings—throughout the past eighty-five years or more—with Western capitalists?

That is indeed, on reflection, practically an inevitable supposition, but it has never been supported systematically enough to be converted from a supposition into a case until the publication of Antony C. Sutton's latest book, *Wall Street And The Bolshevik Revolution* (New Rochelle, New York, Arlington House; 228 pages, \$7.95). Others have told us, correctly and persuasively as far as they went with their facts (not necessarily as far as they went with their theories), that Jacob Schiff and his Kuhn-Loeb investment banking firm "financed the Bolshevik revolution." No one has previously told us such things as the following, primarily based on the U.S. State Department Decimal File:

. . . in the fall of 1922 [five years after the *coup d'état* which inaugurated the Bolshevik revolution], the Soviets formed their first international bank. It was based on a syndicate that involved the former Russian private bankers and some new investment from German, Swedish, American, and British bankers. Known as the Ruskombank (Foreign Commercial Bank or the Bank of Foreign Commerce), it was headed by Olof Aschberg; its board consisted of tsarist private bankers, representatives of German, Swedish, and American banks, and, of course, representatives of the Soviet Union . . .

In early October 1922 Olof Aschberg met in Berlin with Emil Wittenberg, director of the Nationalbank fur Deutschland, and Scheinmann, head of the Russian State Bank. After discussions concerning German involvement in the Ruskombank, the three bankers went to Stockholm and there met with Max May, vice president of the Guaranty Trust Company. Max May was then designated director of the Foreign Division of the Ruskombank . . .

We need to know who Max May was. He was vice president in charge of foreign operations for Guaranty Trust of New York. And what was Guaranty Trust? It was "the largest trust company in the United States and controlled by the J.P. Morgan firm." Sutton continues:

Guaranty Trust used Olof Aschberg, the Bolshevik banker, as its intermediary in Russia before and after the revolution. Guaranty was a backer of Ludwig Martens and his Soviet Bureau, the first Soviet representatives in the United States. And in mid-1920 Guaranty was the Soviet fiscal agent in the U.S.; the first shipments of Soviet gold to the United States also traced back to Guaranty Trust.

Antony Sutton's new book is replete with citations of action by Morgan and Rockefeller interests that could only be viewed as pro-Bolshevik, pro-Communist, and it will be necessary for us here to note further instances of this kind. Before proceeding to do so, we might first consider the following disclaimer:

Let the reader should deduce—too hastily—from these assertions that Wall Street was indeed tinged with Red, . . . we also in a later chapter present evidence that the J.P. Morgan firm financed Admiral Kolchak in Siberia. Aleksandr Kolchak was fighting the Bolsheviks, to install his own brand of authoritarian rule. The firm also contributed to the anti-Communist United Americans organization.

Observers of the domestic political scene in the United States may understand that sort of thing—or at least find an analogy in experience on the home front. How many well-heeled businessmen have contributed to both the opposing candidates in a run-off election, or perhaps to three or four leading contenders in a primary? Such businessmen intend to have a claim on the winner, whoever he may be. Similarly, in World War I, captains of finance in Western Europe, Britain, and especially the United States, hoped to cover every eventuality for the postwar situation; *i.e.*, whether the Allies won or Germany and the other Central Powers won (Sutton shows that American banking firms financed German wartime espionage in the United States), and whether Russia, one of the Allies through most of the war, was to emerge still under Czarist control, or, as it did, under Bolshevik control.

Sutton's thesis, however, goes further than saying that the financiers were simply hedging their bets, and hoping to have a stake in surviving governments, whatever kind they might be. He sees the top international bankers as primarily *monopolists* at heart who hoped and believed that "through political influence they could manipulate the police power of the state to achieve what they had been unable, or what was too costly, to achieve under private enterprise."

Financiers and industrialists who will back, say, both the Democratic and the Republican parties in an American election, though there is little chance that either of those parties could ever itself wield or confer upon anyone else total control of the economy, might naturally look with special interest on the Russian Bolshevik—*i.e.*, Communist Party—since it clearly aimed from the start at total power. Capitalist interest in the Russian Communists, serious from the start, can only have increased as the "Soviet Union" has (with required capitalistic aid) not only maintained its grip on the necks of the Russian people, but also developed

for itself a reputation as a "superpower" on the international scene.

As a Rockefeller or a Morgan heir views a meeting at the summit between an American President and the Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, may he not take satisfaction in the feeling that he controls both parties to such a conference? Yet he may be mistaken. It has yet to be demonstrated that Brezhnev can be deposed as readily as Nixon was. Some say that Khrushchev was fired by David Rockefeller, and it may be so, but evidence is lacking.

On the other hand, Sutton has abundant evidence for statements he makes regarding the union—whatever its motivation—between Wall Street and the Bolshevik revolution. To illustrate the explicit detail with which this painstaking scholar documents the existence of *les liaisons dangereuses* between the *apaches* of the Kremlin and the prostitutes of Wall Street, let us adumbrate briefly what he reports about certain individuals and institutions belonging to or employed by the American plutocracy.

Perhaps the best known, and certainly the least business-minded, of individuals here noted is one whom Sutton calls an "Establishment Revolutionary," John Reed (1887-1920) was author of *Ten Days That Shook The World*, an eyewitness account of the Bolshevik seizure of power in St. Petersburg in November 1917. (October 1917 by the old calendar then still in use in Russia; hence the term "October Revolution.") Reed was a native of Portland, Oregon, who graduated from Harvard in 1910, and made a name in journalism by reporting from the field the border war between the Mexican "cattle thief, bandit, and revolutionary leader"* known as Pancho Villa and U.S. forces under General John J. Pershing. Reed's reports were (naturally) sympathetic to Villa. The significant information that Sutton adds is that a German espionage agent "had an account with the Guaranty Trust Company and from this payments were made to Western Cartridge Co. of Alton, Illinois, for ammunition that was shipped to El Paso for use in Mexico by Pancho Villa's bandits."

But Reed was to go on to greater things. Continuing as a correspondent for *Metropolitan*, a magazine owned by Morgan partner Harry Payne Whitney, as well as for the radical *Masses*, Reed in 1917 went to Russia, where he not only observed events which he wrote up in the aforementioned *Ten Days That Shook The World*, but became so intimate with the Bolshevik inner circle that Lenin himself wrote the introduction for Reed's book. Said Lenin: "Here is a book I should like to see published in millions of copies and translated into all languages," and indeed the book sold widely. Reed's financial means of subsistence came not only from *Metropolitan's* Whitney (a director of Guaranty Trust), but also from the more Bohemian banker Eugen Boissevain, "who channeled funds to Reed both directly and through the pro-Bolshevik *Masses*." Boissevain was Edna St. Vincent Millay's husband. I feel pretty bad about that, but facts are facts.

Summing up, John Reed was, in words of his biographer Granville Hicks, "the spokesman of the Bolsheviks in the United States." He was also a leading Bolshevik in Russia, where he became a member of the Third International

*The quoted characterization is from the entry for Pancho Villa in *Webster's Biographical Dictionary*.

(Comintern) executive committee. Even sooner, he "possessed a Military Revolutionary Committee pass (Number 955, issued November 16, 1917) giving him entry into the Smolny Institute (the revolutionary headquarters) at any time." He died of typhus in Moscow in 1920, and lies buried in the Kremlin. A Harvard man financed by Wall Street. That's the story of our lives—dumb Middle Americans that we are.

Not the whole story. There are some good parts, too. But first there are some more bad parts. The one about William Boyce Thompson is real bad. William Boyce Thompson (1869-1930) is described in part as follows by *Webster's Biographical Dictionary*: "American mining operator, b. Virginia City, Mont. Accompanied American Red Cross mission to Russia (1917-18); tried to get American aid for Kerenski regime, and after Kerenski's fall urged recognition of Soviet government." Sutton adds much more. Thompson, a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, personally paid the entire expense of the Red Cross Mission to Russia, and in addition, shortly after his return to the United States, gave the Bolshevik Party one million dollars. Sutton reprints the following from the *Washington Post* of February 2, 1918:

New York, Feb. 2.—William B. Thompson, who was in Petrograd from July until November last [actually until December 1917], has made a personal contribution of \$1,000,000 to the Bolsheviks for the purpose of spreading their doctrine in Germany and Austria.

Mr. Thompson . . . believes that the Bolsheviks constitute the greatest power against Pro-Germanism in Russia and that their propaganda has been undermining the militarist regimes of the General Empires [sic! Central Powers, perhaps?].

Mr. Thompson deprecates American criticism of the Bolsheviks. He believes they have been misrepresented and has made the financial contribution to the cause in the belief that it will be money well spent for the future of Russia as well as for the Allied cause.

It was already evident that Lenin had been sent to Russia by the German General Staff, in order that he might seize power from the Kerensky regime and take Russia out of the war against Germany, as he did. Edgar Sisson, who arrived in Russia at the time Thompson left and remained for over three months, reported that Lenin was actually a German agent, but it is not necessary to accept this in full in order to know that the Germans wanted him in Russia, and saw to it that he got there. Thompson returned from Russia to the United States via London, "where in company with Thomas Lamont of the J.P. Morgan firm, he visited Prime Minister Lloyd George." Sutton reprints passages from once secret papers of the British War Cabinet regarding this visit:

The Prime Minister reported a conversation he had had with a Mr. Thompson—an American traveller and a man of considerable means—who had just returned from Russia, and who had given a somewhat different impression of affairs in that country from what was generally believed. The gist of his remarks was to the effect that the Revolution had come to stay [Thompson

was right about that, and he and other Wall Street operators were one of the main reasons why it has stayed.]; that the Allies had not shown themselves sufficiently sympathetic with the Revolution; and that MM. Trotzki [sic] and Lenin were not in German pay [no, in American pay, except for Germany's furnishing Lenin's transportation from Switzerland to Sweden, en route to Russia], the latter being a fairly distinguished Professor . . . In Mr. Thompson's opinion, it was necessary for the Allies to realise that the Russian army and people were out of the war, and that the Allies would have to choose between Russia as the friendly or a hostile neutral.

Note that Thompson, despite his contention that Lenin and Trotsky were not pro-German, laid it on the line that the Bolsheviks *would* take Russia out of the war against Germany; he merely contended further that this was the Allies own fault. (They had not been "sufficiently friendly with the Revolution.") We should note, too, that Thompson, no doubt strengthened by the company of Lamont, made such an impression on Lloyd George that the latter persuaded the Cabinet to (in Sutton's words) "go along with Thompson and the Bolsheviks." In consequence Bruce Lockhart, a protégé of Lord Milner's, was sent to Russia "to work informally with the Soviets."

At this point a quotation from Lockhart seems in order. (He wrote a rather famous book called *British Agent*, published in 1933 in New York and London by G.P. Putnam's Sons.)—When Thompson departed from Russia, which was, of course, before Lockhart got there (that is, on this trip; he had previously been a British consul in Moscow), he had left in command of the American Red Cross Mission one Raymond Robins, of whom Sutton tells much, but whose description here we shall leave to Lockhart, who came to know him well. After describing Robins in general—including in the description the statement, "Although a rich man himself, he was an anti-capitalist"—Lockhart continues:

In a less official sense Robins had a similar mission to my own. He was the intermediary between the Bolsheviks and the American Government and had set himself the task of persuading President Wilson to recognise the Soviet regime. He knew no Russian and very little about Russia. But in Gumberg, a Russo-American Jew, who for years had been in close touch with the Bolshevik movement, he had an assistant who supplied him with the necessary knowledge and arguments. And Gumberg's arguments in Robins' mouth made a most convincing case for recognition. I liked Robins. For the next four months we were to be in daily and almost hourly contact.

Isn't that a pretty picture? The anti-capitalist rich man, deputized by a pro-Bolshevik Federal Reserve Bank director to head a Red Cross mission (Sutton says aptly, it should be called a Wall Street mission) to Russia, taking his lines from a script prepared by a Russo-American Bolshevik Jew (Sutton has much to say about "Gumberg," whose real name was Michael Gruzenberg), in daily, almost hourly contact with a Scottish adventurer (and gifted writer) selected for this post by Alfred Viscount Milner, eminent British Imperial statesman and financier, whom Sutton quotes as saying, "Marx's great book *Das*

Kapital is at once a monument of reasoning and a storehouse of facts." Imagine these two pleading with their own governments to recognize the Bolshevik regime whose terrorist methods were already evident in the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly by armed force in January 1918. What shall we make of it? Is it simply a case of "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad?" (Lockhart, by the way, was jailed by the Bolsheviks before he got out of Russia, and vilified by them after he got out.) How do our captains of finance and industry think? Better or worse than you and I? Different, that's for sure.

I have drawn perhaps too heavily on Sutton already; I urge that you consult his work for yourself to get a more adequate idea of how deeply our financial and industrial leaders have been involved from the start in support of the Communist dictatorship in the Soviet Union. You will want to learn something about the American International Corporation, organized by Morgan interests "with major participation by Stillman's National City Bank and the Rockefeller interests." Together with Kuhn, Loeb & Company and Guaranty Trust, A.I.C. rescued the Bolsheviks from terminal disaster fifteen years before the Roosevelt Administration extended formal recognition to the Soviet Union. Sutton points out that the Bolsheviks could not have survived without trade, and that Wall Street had the muscle in America "to obtain the export licenses needed to ship goods to Russia." H. G. Wells writes in *Russia In The Shadows* (George H. Doran Company, 1921) how on a visit to Russia in 1920 he ran into Frank A. Vanderlip (a director of American International Corporation, among other activities) at the Moscow Guest House. Wells is a bit supercilious about the American capitalist:

Mr Vanderlip had been staying here, I gathered, for some weeks, and proposed to stay some weeks more. He was without valet, secretary, or interpreter. [An interesting thing to be without—an interpreter.] He did not discuss his business with me beyond telling me rather carefully once or twice that it was strictly financial and commercial and in no sense political I did not even ask how it could be possible to conduct business or financial operations in a Communist State with anyone but the Government, nor how it was possible to deal with a Government upon strictly nonpolitical lines. These were, I admitted, mysteries beyond my understanding.

In a subsequent conversation, Lenin himself let Wells know what Vanderlip had been selling. "What do you think of this new Republican Imperialism that comes to us from America?" the Bolshevik leader asked the British Socialist. Wells writes:

Lenin proceeded to explain the projects with which one American at least was seeking to dazzle the imagination of Moscow. There was to be economic assistance for Russia and recognition of the Bolshevik Government. There was to be a defensive alliance against Japanese aggression in Siberia. There was to be an American naval station on the coast of Asia, and leases for long terms of sixty or fifty years of the natural resources of Kamchatka and possibly of other large regions of Russian Asia. Well, did I think that made for peace? Was it anything more than the beginning of a new world scramble? How would the British Imperialists like this sort of thing?

But some industrial power had to come in and help Russia, I said. She cannot reconstruct now without such help

Curious how little some things change in fifty-four years. Capitalists (some capitalists) still think that with their "shrewd know-how" they can exploit the Communists. In an attempt to resolve something here, let's first quote Sutton one more time. His own wrap-up section is titled, "The Explanation for the Unholy Alliance." I should like to quote it in full, but will only hit the high spots:

What motive explains this coalition of capitalists and Bolsheviks? . . . the simplest explanation of our evidence is that a syndicate of Wall Street financiers enlarged their monopoly ambitions and broadened horizons on a global scale. The gigantic Russian market was to be converted into a captive market and a technical colony to be exploited by a few high-powered American financiers and the corporations under their control. [Emphasis in the original.] . . .

. . . were these bankers also secret Bolsheviks? No, of course not. The financiers were without ideology. [Compare Vanderlip's insistence to H. G. Wells that he was nonpolitical; and compare, too, Wells' sarcastic demolition of the idea that one who deals with a Communist state can be nonpolitical, whatever he may imagine himself to be.] The financiers were power-motivated and therefore assisted any political vehicle that would give them an entree to power: Trotsky, Lenin, the tsar, Kolchak, Denikin—all received aid, more or less

[Fascists, too, received aid from Wall Street.]

[Thomas W.] Lamont secured \$100 million loan for Mussolini in 1926

Sutton does not use the word *Conspiracy*, but in the following he supplies a pretty good semantic equivalent:

The Marburg Plan, financed by Andrew Carnegie's ample heritage, . . . suggests premeditation for this kind of superficial schizophrenia, which in fact masks an integrated program of power acquisition

The governments of the world, according to the Marburg Plan, were to be socialized while the ultimate power would remain in the hands of international financiers

This idea was knit with other elements with similar objectives. Lord Milner in England provides the transatlantic example of banking interests recognizing the virtues and possibilities of Marxism

. . . Woodrow Wilson came under the powerful influence of—and indeed was financially indebted to—this group of internationalists. As Jennings C. Wise has written, "Historians must never forget that Woodrow Wilson . . . made it possible for Leon Trotsky to enter Russia with an American passport."

But Leon Trotsky also declared himself an internationalist Bolsheviks and bankers have then this significant common ground—internationalism

Wall Street did indeed achieve its goal. American firms controlled by this syndicate were later to go on and build the Soviet Union [Sutton has three volumes documenting that] and today are well on their way to bringing the Soviet military-industrial complex into the age of the computer.

Well, is there A Conspiracy or not? I suggest that such

a concept is at least a Vaihingerian "fiction." We must act as if there were A Conspiracy if we are going to be effective in this world. Sutton has established that Wall Street regularly employs conspiratorial methods, and that major capitalists have regularly dealt with Communists. It needs no establishing that Bolsheviks—Communists—use conspiratorial methods. Nor does it require elaborate proof to show that Wall Street-Communist relationships exist to this day. David Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank, for example, in May 1973 opened its office in Moscow at One Karl Marx Square. Yet given the undoubted existence of conspiracies, both "capitalist" and Communist, are we justified in speaking of A Conspiracy?

Not only are we justified; it is the only logical and prudent thing to do. One wishes Antony Sutton, for one, would do it. The concept of a New World Order not only inspires our American Secretary of State and his Wall Street patrons, it is also integral to the Soviet system, and central in the thinking of the British Prime Minister and other members of the Socialist International who with the Communists are the leaders of Western as well as Eastern Europe. Granted that in such a bucket of eels there is much individual competitive striving, yet all these parties are united in the common objective of bringing mankind under unified control. No conspiracy of worldwide importance has any other goal, and this unity of objective makes all such conspiratorial groups teleologically *one conspiracy*. Professor Sutton's new book would be much more important, and a lot less confusing to those ignorant of the way the world is run, had he not turned somersaults to avoid saying so.

When Sutton asks himself whether the bankers were secret Bolsheviks, his answer that they were not, because "the financiers were without ideology," is not so much wrong as irrelevant. The Bolsheviks (those who survived) were also without ideology, as Lenin in effect made clear with his treatise on "Leftwing Communism, An Infantile Disorder." No conspirator is a Marxist, no conspirator is a capitalist, or a socialist, or any kind of -ist, except, given the opportunity, a recidivist. They are all criminals. They are indeed "power-motivated"; they are also lust-motivated, hate-motivated—above all, pride-motivated. It is this dedication to the sin of Lucifer which makes the whole conspiratorial world kin.

The enormous political and economic problems created by the existence of The Conspiracy are of course exacerbated by the fact that we can barely begin to identify the individual Conspirators. We deduce their existence, as we generally do that of salamanders and moles, from their effect on the earth. Sometimes, however, they surface. Consider the case of the "Club of Rome," described in *Time* of October 21, 1974, as:

an informal group of 85 leading international businessmen, scientists and thinkers devoted to developing ways of dealing with an ever more complicated world.

Developing ways of dealing with the world indeed! One must ask these eighty-five, the Club of Rome: "Who made thee a prince and a judge over us?" (Exodus 2:14.) They might be more embarrassed to answer that question than was Moses. And they seem hardly the sort to reply, as Moses could have done later: "Almighty God."

Dissent*

A REVIEW OF A REVIEW

The pages immediately preceding contain a brilliant review, by Medford Evans, of a scholarly and important new book—*Wall Street And The Bolshevik Revolution*—by Antony C. Sutton.

We were happy to publish the review, and we intend to sell a lot of the book. We have a very high regard for both Professor Sutton and Dr. Evans. The great research scholar has, as always, done a phenomenal job of disclosure and documentation with regard to the facts under his investigation. The reviewer has brought to bear on those facts his tremendous understanding of the ideological and political background involved.

The only fly in all of this ointment is "your editor's" disagreement with some conclusions in the book. And my conscience requires that the nature of this basic disagreement be made as clear as possible in the space that is available.

1. Professor Sutton proves beyond all doubt the tremendous aid that was given to Lenin, Trotsky, and the whole Bolshevik revolution in Russia by partners of J. P. Morgan and Company, by the Rockefeller interests, by Frank A. Vanderlip, and by many more of the most prominent members of the American banking and industrial hierarchy. Then he asks himself why there should have been such an alliance between the capitalists of Wall Street and the Communist revolutionaries whose ultimate objective was the destruction of capitalism everywhere on earth.

The answer Professor Sutton comes up with is that these monopoly-minded capitalists were seeking to put themselves in the most favorable position to exploit the great Russian business boom which would develop under the new regime! Please note that we are talking about some of the very smartest businessmen, in what had become the most productive and prosperous nation in history through the operation of individual initiative in a free market. On the other side was a body of Communist usurpers, determined from the very beginning to destroy every vestige of free enterprise—even at the cost of murdering at least ten million shopkeepers, independent farmers, landlords, and other thrifty members of society.

Yet these capitalists were supplying huge measures of their money and influence and prestige to the Conspiracy, supposedly for the sake of the great new market they would thus win over from competition. Of course we do not believe a word of it. And we are very sorry that Professor Sutton accepted at face value today a typically Communist line of deception which was being used so extensively over fifty years ago.

2. We believe that the real reason why many American capitalists were giving such strong support to the Communists in Russia is very simple: *They were both playing on the same team!* During the ten years preceding the events put on record by Professor Sutton, a very sizable number of American *Insiders*—of whom those we have indicated were outstanding examples—had taken con-

*From *American Opinion*, December, 1974.

certed action to carry out many vital designs of an International Master Conspiracy. Permit us to remind you of just a few.

(a) They imposed on the American people, through many lies and great cunning, an embryonic formation of the second plank in the ten-point Communist program for the destruction of capitalist nations; namely, in Karl Marx's exact words, "a heavy progressive or graduated income tax."

(b) By great labor and studious deception they created the Federal Reserve System, which fulfilled Marx's fifth requirement; namely "centralization of credit in the hands of the state."

(c) They inaugurated plans for gradually putting into effect every one of the other eight planks in Marx's platform of destruction, some of which by today have already been carried out in full, and the rest of which are fast approaching complete fulfilment.

(d) Most *Insiders* of the Conspiracy, from such fields as Education, Religion, and Politics, posed as "Liberal" Democrats. While most *Insiders* from the ranks of Banking and Big Business claimed to be Conservative Republicans. But it was the money of the latter group, and their manoeuvring behind the scenes, which got Woodrow Wilson elected President in 1912, and then re-elected in 1916. And he proved to be a marvellously useful tool in connection with all of their schemes.

Wilson won the second election largely through the appeal of a slogan that "he kept us out of war." This was despite the fact that all during the campaign he and Winston Churchill were blueprinting America's course to be followed as soon as they could pull us into the war. And despite the further fact that, as early as the spring of 1915, Wilson and Churchill had contrived one of the most infamous pieces of treason to their respective countries in all human history—the sinking of the *Lusitania*, with a loss of some twelve hundred British and American lives—as the *cause célèbre* and the basis for their lies which finally brought us into World War I two years later.

(e) The *Insiders* of America, England, France, and other countries planned and timed everything about this war with brilliant cunning to have it serve three vital purposes of the Conspiracy. The first was to destroy Germany as a powerful anti-Communist industrial nation. Second, the war was to be used as a means of preparing Russia for a revolution that would give the Communists a huge and suitable physical base for the subversion and subjugation of other countries. And, most-important of all, the effect of American participation in this war would be to destroy (forever, they hoped) our proud and productive independence—which the *Insiders* smeared incessantly and effectively as *isolationism*.

All of the above courses of action had been consummated, or undertaken, and a dozen more like them, in accordance with plans of the Conspiracy—and largely through the designs and support of the very *Insiders* we are talking about—before their further aid to the Communists, as described by Professor Sutton, was even started. The real purpose of all of these un-American actions and plots was to advance the Communist movement. And we see no reason why Professor Sutton should labor so hard to find some other motivation for the later pro-Communist activities of the same *Insiders* than the one which prompted

their earlier acts of treason or subversion.

3. Our whole educational program is based on historical facts which we believe fully support the following synopsis. For approximately two hundred years there has been in existence an International Master Conspiracy with a self-perpetuating Inner Circle of control. All the actions of that Conspiracy, which include every amoral crime, massive deception, and ruthless cruelty known to man, have been aimed at making a top circle of *Insiders* the absolute and tyrannical rulers of the whole human race. The intermediate aim of these *Insiders* consists of gradually gaining more and more power until they have brutally enslaved the total population of the earth. Their unchanging strategy for this satanic accomplishment calls for the destruction of all religion, of all previously existing governments, and of all traditional human institutions. This is so that their "new world order" (originally referred to in the Latin phrase *novus ordo seclorum*) can be imposed on the resulting chaos, misery, and despair. The three major means for carrying out this strategy have been wars, deliberately fomented for this purpose, and of which they could control both sides; money, which was to be replaced eventually, after serving its temporary purpose, by a more brutal and direct form of power; and hatred, to be created and intensified on the basis of every conceivable division of mankind, over differences of religion, race, color, language, customs, age, sex, and economic status.

In the 1840's, after two generations of steadily increasing power, especially in Europe and the United States, the Inner Circle of this Conspiracy established an activist arm, known as the Communist Party. That arm proved so useful and was subsidized into becoming so large and so powerful, that it is now frequently confused with the Master Conspiracy which controls it. This is despite the fact that most of the *Insiders* of that Master Conspiracy—such as Nelson Rockefeller or Henry Cabot Lodge, for example—have always been recruited, since the very beginning, from the top social, financial, educational, and political echelons of their respective countries. This vast but tightly coordinated international body of *Insiders*, with their subordinates and Communist agents, already exercise an absolute and formal tyranny over Russia, China, and some forty other nations. There is only one great task which they now have left, before establishing that same tyranny over all the rest of the world through their Communist instrumentality, the United Nations. It is the formal and complete subjugation and enslavement of the American people with all of the chains that our own government is now helping them to forge and fasten around us. The only chance we have of saving ourselves—and thereby helping to save so many other countries—from so horrible a fate, is to create enough understanding of, and opposition to, what is taking place, before it is too late.

Hence, as useful as Professor Sutton's book will be in proving the support given by Wall Street to the Bolshevik Revolution, we could not do our part in giving it wide distribution without expressing our disagreement with the reasons he has offered to account for that support. While our only quarrel with the review by Dr. Evans is that we did not think even its last page has been explicit and forceful enough about the nature and the *oneness* of the Conspiracy that we face.—ROBERT WELCH

GUARDING THE GUARDIANS

The old question as to who will guard the guardians, *quis custodiet custodes*, needs asking about the pastors of the Church, perhaps in the form who will shepherd the shepherds? For they are feeding their flocks with some peculiar provender in response to the Lord's command, feed my sheep.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, replying to questions at a press conference on his return from Chile, claimed that he "spoke out strongly about human rights" when he met the head of the Chilean military junta, but complained that the tiny Anglican Church in Chile almost unanimously "shared the general middle-class view there that it was a good thing to have got rid of the Allende regime." The implication being that human rights were universally respected under Marxist Allende. He added that there were other countries in Latin America "where torture and other horrible things" were happening to people, but apparently did not mention the atrocities committed by communist guerillas.

The Bishop of Southwark makes what appears as a vicious and unchristian attack on Pastor Wurmbrand (also in *Church Times*, Oct. 11, 1974) when he says that Rumanian priests "do not tour the Western world making vast profits from books and lectures and winning personal acclaim", and he adds that Mr. Wurmbrand "is as credible a guide to the affairs in Rumania as is Dr. Paisley to the affairs of Northern Ireland." Richard Wurmbrand, who lived in Rumania and suffered in gaol, contributes a short letter in which he reports that Pastor Visky "has been arrested for his faith" because he distributed Bibles and other Christian books from abroad, punishable under the new press law with two years imprisonment.

The Archbishop of York has expressed sympathy with the World Council of Churches distribution of funds to "liberation" organisations. But Peter Simple quotes from a letter from the Secretary of the Christian Affirmation Campaign which appeared in the *Catholic Herald*. This reveals that the WCC has recently distributed three and a half million dollars to the Indo-China Reconstruction Fund in the following proportions: North Vietnam, two million; Provisional Revolutionary Government areas of South Vietnam, one million; Laos, \$350,000; South Vietnam \$150,000. (*Daily Telegraph*, 15 Oct., 1974.)

I would suggest that these prelates read a book by Henry R. Pike of the Christian Mission to Europe and the Communist World. It is reviewed in *East West Digest* of September, 1974, under the heading, "A Broadside at the World Council of Churches" and is entitled *Religion, Red and Rotten*. The author suggests that the WCC rewrite its constitution as follows: "We support leftists, socialists, communists, heresy, heathen and pagan religions, airline hijackers, black panthers, Marx, Lenin, revolution, anti-Western programmes. . . ."

I take to heart the advice that one should clean one's own backyard before telling others how dirty theirs' are; but other communions use similar tactics. Father Arthur Lewis of Rhodesia, dealing in his *September Newsletter* with the allegations of Church leaders of brutality by security forces, points out that the alleged episodes are all con-

cerned with methods of interrogation and that the circulation of the dossier "has played right into the hands of the enemies of our country everywhere." The Bishop of Mashonaland, with whom Fr. Lewis spoke about it is unhappily associated "with the notorious Roman Catholic Bishop of Umtali, Donal Lamont, who has whipped up hostility to every attempt at a settlement and has lost few opportunities to damage this country outside its borders."

The employment of religion to damage not only African countries but the Western world and the chipping away at the foundations of Christianity resulted in a gathering of many Christian leaders from different European churches and indeed from all over the world at Berlin on Ascension Day, 1974. The declaration which the members signed dealt with the dangers of the World Council of Churches "religion" and was called Freedom and Fellowship in Christ, reasserting the full Christian belief. The final statement seems particularly applicable to our violent and abusive pastors: "He will come as the true Shepherd to gather together His one flock out of the dispersion. To Him be praise and glory—forever! Amen." —H.S.

The Alternative to Disaster

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

The purpose of this little book is to exorcise a set of misconceptions by showing their relation to our present troubles and discontents, and to indicate that a re-formulation of current problems from a realistic rather than an axiomatic position points quite clearly the way to the solution.

Not the details of, but the approach to these problems is of vital concern to everyone as we head for apparently unavoidable disaster. Inflation is the jet-propellant of this Gaderene rush. To know, in the sense that we know now that the earth revolves on its own axis, that inflation is simply the technique of a policy of deliberate totalitarianism, wonderfully clarifies our view of what can and must be done if we are simply to survive in our present way of life, and achieve a higher civilisation in the future for our children.

Posted prices:

25p. each—3 copies 65p., 10 copies £1.80, 25 copies £4.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,

245 Cann Hall Road, London E11 3NL.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

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. Six months £1.30, Airmail one year £3.50.

Offices—
Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11 3NL.
Tel. 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London, NW1 7PX.
Tel. 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA—
Business: Box 3218V, 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, 2 Park Village East, London, NW1 7PX. Telephone: 01-387 3893. General Deputy Chairman and Secretary, H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

Printed by Circular Press Limited, Colwyn Bay