

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 45 No. 21

SATURDAY, JANUARY 15, 1966.

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

Western Response

On July 20, 1965, the Committee on Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives published a report on its enquiry into the establishment of a Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy. The report stated in part:

Analysis of the extensive testimony and data received by the committee in the Freedom Academy hearings leads to the following conclusions:

Communists have expanded their power more widely and at a more rapid rate than any would-be world conquerors of the past.

They have done so by developing a new form of warfare which has enabled them to render conventional military power ineffective in many situations. The new form of warfare is variously referred to as nonmilitary, political, unconventional, total and fourth-dimensional warfare, protracted conflict, etc.

There is recognition of this new type of warfare, in varying degrees, in the non-Communist world. On the whole, however, the United States and other non-Communist nations have not, to date, made an adequate or full effort to study and analyse it in order to find out how it can be countered and defeated.

Communist capabilities in this new form of warfare are the result of a massive development and training programme which began decades ago, in secret, conspiratorial meetings and has been continued in and through a vast network of so-called political warfare or political training schools established as major institutions in Communist countries and on a smaller, clandestine basis in non-Communist nations.

Courses taught in these political warfare schools include such subjects as Marxist-Leninist doctrine, how to put theory into practice, the history of Communism, the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (or of China and other Communist nations), the structure of the Soviet (or Chinese or other) Communist Party, philosophy, political economy, international relations, languages, the economy of Communist nations, history of the labour movement, history of 'national liberation' movements, organisational techniques, techniques to be employed in organising and manipulating trade unions and in building united 'anti-imperialist' fronts, guerilla warfare, paramilitary activities, clandestine party work, organisational work within various types of mass groups, sabotage techniques, military strategy, weapons training, the use of explosives, youth work, and methods of introducing Communist organisations and influence into rural areas.

TOTAL SUBVERSIVE WARFARE

These Communist conflict managers infiltrate—to weaken, wreck, manipulate, and control—political parties, the civil service, key ministries, the Press and other communications media, schools, colleges, and universities, professional groups, trade unions (particularly those in basic industries), student groups, churches, and mass organisations of all kinds.

They seize upon all available injustices, problems, and conflicts and work to magnify and exacerbate rather than cure them. They promote dissatisfaction with the ruling party or government, create national, class, and religious dissension, and foment strikes, riots, and demonstrations.

At the appropriate time, they resort to military operations—of a guerilla or partisan rather than conventional type. These forces use hit-and-run tactics and avoid pitched battles with the regular forces of the government until the government has been weakened internally and they have built up their own strength to the point where they believe they can achieve a military victory.

While the domestic Communists are carrying on this internal warfare against their native lands, foreign Communist governments, parties, and fronts are assisting by attacking the target country in the international arena. Again, this attack is usually not military in the initial stages, but is waged on the economic, diplomatic, and propaganda fronts.

NO MILITARY ANSWER

Because of the nature of this new type of warfare, military forces alone are not adequate defence for any country. Moreover, when other nations are under attack, mere military assistance and/or technical and dollar aid from the United States are not sufficient. Reliance on these weapons alone will not defeat the Communists. It leaves key fronts undefended.

Communist total warfare attacks a society as a whole, not just that element which wears uniforms and is organised in formal military units. It makes all agencies and institutions, governmental and private, combatants in the global struggle. Adequate defence therefore requires that all institutions and individuals not only understand Communism and its methods of attack, but also how its wrecking efforts can be resisted and defeated. The military must understand this; so must Government officials on all levels and civilians in all walks of life—businessmen and workers, clergymen and professors, peasants and housewives. A nation's defences are only as strong as its people's knowledge of Communism and their will to resist it.

Moreover, because the Communist attack is international as well as national in scope, adequate defence requires co-operative action between nations, mutual assistance in resisting Communist political warfare.

The challenge to the United States and its allies today is not to atomise the military installations and capital cities of world Communism. Rather, it is to meet the Communists on all fields of battle in this new form of warfare and emerge victorious in order that nuclear war may be prevented.

(continued at foot of column 1 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: 5 New Wanstead, Wanstead, London E.11.

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London N.W.1.
Telephone: EUSton 3893.

IN AUSTRALIA—

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

Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, Australia (Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London N.W.1, Telephone EUSton 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.

**TO ALL OUR READERS OUR
GREETINGS AND GOOD WISHES
FOR 1966**

Trigger Happy

We are familiar with pictures of refugees, perhaps a woman and a couple of children, who are the flotsam and jetsam of war; yet the *New Christian* callously complains that the British electorate does not feel strongly enough about "the race issue" to give the Prime Minister the support which will enable him "to give the required directives to the armed forces." This of course means war.

The paper also complains of the reluctance of the Conservative Party to approve the application of powerful sanctions and blames (for this reluctance) partly "the remains of nineteenth century colonial attitudes", partly "a desire to placate certain business interests in Rhodesia", but chiefly the knowledge that the British electorate will reject a policy leading to "inconvenience, whether this be measured in the loss of British lives or simply in an increase in the price of cigarettes." I do not know whether the writer of the article contemplates losing his life, but the bland assumption that the motives of those who oppose violence are squalid while those who advocate it are above criticism gives the impression of adolescent arrogance.

He finally contrasts "expediency" with "principle", which enables him to avoid the real issues of order and subversion and of the advances which have been made in Rhodesia itself.

The Archbishop (*Church Times*, Nov. 19, 1965) said in the House of Lords debate that sanctions were "an effective moral instrument to achieve a result" if they brought about the end of the illegal régime in Rhodesia.

The Daily Telegraph (Nov. 22, 1965) entitles its leader, "Oil Sanctions Folly". The article points out that "it follows now that we shape our actions to those of the United Nations", adding that "talk of oil sanctions threatens to weaken the strongest sanction so far brought to bear on Mr. Smith, the unity of all British political parties in condemning his illegal seizure of independence."

Yet the Rhodesian attitude to Queen Elizabeth II differs fundamentally from that of America to George III in the Declaration of Independence and Mr. Smith can hardly be solely to blame for failure to reach agreement. The word "illegal" appears prominently in all discussions, but the Rhodesian affection for the Queen suggests that the letter rather than the spirit is involved.

The Bishop of Mashonaland wrote to the *Church Times* (Nov. 26, 1965) saying "the wounds of 1965 . . . in State and Church will bleed for decades, and perhaps much longer, like the wounds of the Anglo-Boer War, unless the healing, forgiving, understanding, renewing grace of Christ . . . is applied to them by his Church." The *Church Times* contrasts the Bishop's "deeply Christian approach" with the irresponsible language used about treason and war in Africa, and says that the best Christian objective is to try by all means to ensure that "renewed negotiation shall be begun." The Bishop had suggested the previous week, on the subject of oaths, that "perhaps Church and Government together could issue a statement that all such new oaths are provisional to the hoped-for day when the Queen will recognise it again as the *de jure* Government of Rhodesia."

The Bishop, who opposed U.D.I., wrote wisely and pastorally, but unfortunately those who speak of "armed forces" would not wish the *de facto* Government ever to be recognised, whatever the cost in human misery. Foreign subversives eagerly await the breakdown of law and order and need little encouragement from this country: they are totally indifferent to human life and suffering, and I regret that this spirit has infected some in Britain. The Bishop of Southwark suggested in the House of Lords that "the British Government must remove the finger of the White Rhodesians from the trigger"—whatever this elaborate phrase might mean—but concluded that "efforts should be made to re-open negotiations in the hope that our divisions may be healed." H.S.

"A Meeting with Salazar—The Wise Man of the West"

Dr. Salazar, President of the Portuguese Council of Ministers, recently gave an interview to the French magazine *Jours de France*, which was published under the above heading. Dr. Salazar answered questions put to him by the editor, General de Bénouville, to whom he granted the interview. The text of the questions and Dr. Salazar's answers are set out below:

QUESTION: "Portugal has refused to accept the principle of self-determination for her overseas territories. What is Portugal's position today regarding this question and how do you envisage its outcome?"

ANSWER: "We could only accept self-determination for the overseas territories—in the sense nowadays understood by that word—if these territories had to choose their destiny as a nation, or their form of State. But we find that, as a result of the policy of integration followed over the centuries by the Portuguese overseas, these territories in their entirety already constitute a national and a sovereign state. To concede at each political moment that a fraction of a territory has a right to self-determination, in the above sense, is to create a factor of instability and national disassociation. If this formula has any meaning for dependent territories or colonies to which it is desired to grant independence and to define their relations with the State that exercised rights over them, it has none in the case of the Por-

tuguese. In their case, the only thing that matters is to know whether the citizens of the territories have the same political rights under the law, that is, those rights by which the individual is enabled to influence the constitution of State bodies.

"If these rights are the same in all the territories, we do not have citizens and subjects, but only citizens, even though these may only take part in certain elections according to their various capacities.

"But this is a question of electoral rights, not a question of politics.

"The instigators of the African revolution seek to evade the issue with the primary condition of 'one man, one vote'. No one with any sense of responsibility will accept this argument, which is only upheld to achieve certain results, and not because of its truth or justice.

"Recently the election of the Head of State took place, which is carried out by a restricted body of electors. But, albeit restricted, this electoral body is recruited from the overseas provinces as well as from the European part of Portugal. Where can you find a more authentic form of self-determination than this, within a framework where it can be said that a people practise self-determination through the workings of its own institutions?"

QUESTION: "What could be the evolution of the African States born out of colonisation, and what influence would such evolution have on their relations with Portugal?"

ANSWER: "In Africa, where the problem can be viewed more precisely, the States we call revolutionary will continue to practise their political campaign against Portugal, in the United Nations, in the latter's subsidiary organisations, and in the Organisation for African Unity. This is a verbal and discriminatory attack of no great consequence, since these countries are far from being able to provide armies capable of launching attacks in continental Africa. And it will become increasingly difficult for them to do so, as certain other countries abandon their demagogic attitudes in order to seek what is most useful for their life as a recently-independent people. These countries are beginning to understand the idea of interdependence and to realise the necessity for co-operation, and how these are incompatible with the dissemination of a revolutionary and anti-European spirit. Since our policy is to maintain the friendliest relations with every State, in Europe as well as in Africa, these States know that they can rely on us for as much support and help as it is possible for us to give, and for the collaboration our geographical position can bring to their economy. And, of course, although from time to time observance will be made to the cult of African 'fraternity' and to the fight against Portuguese 'colonialism' (which they know does not exist), existing relations will be maintained and cemented and others will be established for the common benefit. The countries of Africa cannot evolve without Western collaboration.

"Why did they submit to contradictory pressures, of which they are the object, in order to turn against Portugal, who neither shows any animosity towards them nor exploits them, but only desires to live in peace with them?"

QUESTION: "The press in all Western countries sporadically announces a revival of internal opposition in Portugal. Demonstrations, in some cases violent, although purely local, have broken out here and there in your country. Who is behind them?"

ANSWER: "To my knowledge, no violent demonstrations have occurred in any part of the country: if there had been any, I would have known.

"The chief centres of information are today linked to powerful agencies, and these to certain interests and ideologies; these interests and ideologies have lately redoubled their activities against Portugal and Portuguese policy, and I think they have good reasons for this.

"The revival of oppositionist activity, mostly noticeable in the publication of manifestos, starts abroad, and it is imported into this country like any other merchandise. Everything crosses the frontier, the radio more easily than anything else, and certain sectors are more susceptible to this propaganda.

"The origins are of two sorts: the interests it is desired to achieve in Africa; the communist and progressive ideologies it is desired to implant here. If we realise that there are people in Africa with deep-rooted revolutionary tendencies, and, in many cases, the workings of outside policy in their favour, given the impossibility of overcoming our resistance in the Overseas Provinces, would seem to many to be easier to achieve here than over there.

"We are not dealing with anything that is genuine or basically national—discordance of ideas or government methods, even if these existed—legitimate ambitions, vital necessities for the Portuguese, pressing questions to which we are unable to provide solutions. No; this concerns important economical, political and strategic interests in Africa, but which must be tackled here.

"With regard to the ideologies which certain opposition groups assume, only ingenious people imagine that the evolution of communism in its countries of origin could result in a lessening of its virulence abroad. That is not the case at all. Communism still makes use of its powers of expansion, independently of what it can do in relation to economic and social structures, since the emergence of new states with communist ideologies carries with it the possibility of greater influence from the Centre of Communism.

"If it were possible for International Communism to become entrenched in the Iberian Peninsula (and it was attempted in Spain from 1936 to 1939), Christian Europe would disappear, for the simple reason that she would become indefensible.

"With regard to Catholic progressiveness, one may say that it seems today to be working in connivance with Communism, in the vague hope that the latter will help bring about the revolution of which the former will cull the fruits by reason of the ascendancy it still holds over Western societies. Man's ingenuity appears to have no limits, and the experiments of others are valueless in this life, since each wishes to make his own.

"Even if governments lose interest in the matter, I remember that I have already seen 'modernism' solemnly condemned, and, in a few years' time, when the new mistakes are sufficiently remote, there is no reason why the same thing should not happen to 'progressiveness'. *Caveant consules . . .*"

QUESTION: "Would you like to tell me about the Portuguese corporative system? Do you see in it a means of associating capital and labour?"

ANSWER: "The Portuguese corporative system is, by reason of its tender years, so far only an experiment: it would be difficult to say that it has provided a solution for the economic and social problem. What we have seen is pure liberalism develop into a fight between capital and labour. What we are faced with is the fact that Communism has absorbed capital and left the worker confronted by a force he cannot measure and which is far more tyrannical than the old capitalism. The corporative system endeavours to respect capital as well as labour and places itself on a level of collaboration, which is that of reality.

"The spirit born of the corporative system is not that of a conflict between the classes, as in liberalism: it is not that of state despotism, as in Communism but that of mutual respect, of friendly co-operation as a safeguard for reciprocal interests, and of compromise with a view to the realisation of the aims towards which are directed the production of goods or of services.

"It has not, up to now, been shown that this system can be maintained without deviation, in the absence of the authority of the State. The latter must intervene if necessary, in the name of the public interest, where the interests confronting each other are unable to agree of their own accord. All that is needed, however, is the atmosphere of peace and complete understanding existing in (Portuguese) economic and social life, in order to be able to state that the corporative system is more satisfactory than any other. This spirit infuriates Communism, which cannot exist without hate and clashes of interest in order to progress and implant itself in contemporary society. We have here another explanation of the attempts to revive activity in certain quarters of the opposition where the latter predominates."

QUESTION: "Does it seem normal to you that Catholics organise themselves politically under any designation, and does it seem to you that they can thus set up a vast international party surmounting all frontiers?"

ANSWER: "No. It does not seem normal to me, nor right, nor advantageous. The unity of Catholics throughout the world does not lie in the federation of organisations or national parties, but in the very existence of the Church to which they belong. It is through her that Catholics are everywhere, and spiritually equal to each other. . . .

"Besides, we are dealing here with the problem in a purely abstract sense, since the Portuguese system does not allow the formation of parties—even Catholic political parties. The question, therefore, does not apply to us."

WESTERN RESPONSE

(continued from page 1)

In total war, military defence is only partial defence. Today, the major gap in world resistance to Communism, the largely undefended front, is the front of nonmilitary or political warfare. The United States has led the organisation and development of the free world's military defence in the global struggle. It is imperative that it now takes the lead in developing its total defence by closing the serious gap that exists on the front which, in the long run, could be as decisive as the military front.

THE PRESENT NEED

If this country and other non-Communist nations are to realise their full capacity to engage in this type of global struggle which has been forced upon them, it is essential that a thorough-going programme of research, education, and training in the area of Communist political warfare be established. The requirements of such a programme are as follows:

(1) Policymakers and Government personnel at many levels must understand Communism in depth, with special emphasis on Communist conflict techniques.

(2) At the upper levels of Government we must have, in addition, officials who understand the full range of methods and means by which this Nation and its allies can meet the Comm-

unist attack and work towards global objectives systematically. This means that they will have to master a broad range of non-military measures which have yet to be developed and systematised.

(3) Below this level, agency personnel must be trained to understand and implement this integrated strategy in all of its dimensions.

(4) The public must have greater understanding of Communism, its objectives, tactics, and methods, especially Communist conflict techniques and the nature of the global struggle, to ensure public support of the Nation's efforts to counter Communist aggression. More thorough public knowledge of Communism will help prevent the extremism which, frequently arising from misunderstanding or lack of information, creates national discussion and impairs the country's efforts in the global struggle.

(5) The private sector must also be helped in understanding how it can participate in the global struggle in a sustained and systematic manner.

(6) It is necessary to assist, and to enlist the support of, other non-Communist countries by training selected foreign nationals.

A SERIOUS GAP

The evidence amply sustains the conclusion that there is a serious gap in the defences of the United States, and the non-Communist world generally, on the political warfare front; that there is a vital and pressing need for an extensive and thorough-going programme of education, research, and training in this area to close the gap; that the required programme is of such size and scope that it can be adequately organised and financed only by the Federal Government; and that a completely independent agency established for this special purpose, functioning in close contact with appropriate operational agencies, would be best suited to accomplish this objective.

The Freedom Academy would fulfil a most urgent and critical need of our time.

[We are indebted to *East West Digest*, the Journal of the Foreign Affairs Circle, Petersham, Surrey, from which the above article is reprinted—Ed. T.S.C.]

THE ROLE OF SUBVERSION IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Price 3/6 including postage

This paper was first published in June 1965 by the Foreign Affairs Study Group of The Monday Club and was prepared specifically for submission to the Foreign Policy Committee of the Conservative Party. It states that it is concerned with one particular external threat to Britain and the Commonwealth—a threat contained in several major policy statements made by the leaders of those Communist Parties which are now in power, and rather imperfectly described in one word as 'subversion'.

The pamphlet gives examples of subversion in such spheres as diplomacy, trade, cultural exchanges and international organisations to name but a few, and concludes with case studies of the Communist take-overs of Czechoslovakia and of Zanzibar, achieved by these methods.

Although the authors do not mention (or recognise?) the subversion within Britain herself and British organisations of all kinds, they do declare the vital need for informing British people at large as to the nature of the Communist subversive threat.

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 5 New Wanstead, London, E.11.

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd. at 5 New Wanstead, Wanstead, London E.11.

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