THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 45 No. 26 SATURDAY, MARCH 26, 1966 1s. 3d. Fortnightly

Mac-the-Knife*

Mr. Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, is indeed one of the cleverest con men to have appeared on the Washington scene. After deciding to scrap our Strategic Air Command defense system, supposedly for reasons of "economy" and the "reduced Soviet bomber threat," he then went off to the N.A.T.O. conference in Paris where he proceeded to scare the living daylights out of our Western European allies by telling them about the great potential nuclear threat from Red China. We quote the *New York Times* of December 16, 1965:

Mr. McNamara said that the Chinese Communists, having already detonated two test nuclear devices, would produce enough fissionable material in the next two years to start a small stockpile of atomic weapons . . .

He said that Peking's new military prospects included the following:

The development of a medium-range ballistic missile that could become operational, carrying a nuclear warhead, as early as 1967.

The deployment of several launchers for medium-range missiles by 1969, *with possibly "several dozen" by* 1976.

The initial deployment of intercontinental ballistic missiles, which could hit Europe or the United States, in 1975.

One would assume from the above that Mr. McNamara is concerned about Red China's capabilities to harm us. All of which makes one wonder why Mr. McNamara has decided to scrap S.A.C. now. If S.A.C. is no longer of any use against the Soviet bomber threat, why can't it be used to protect us from the Red Chinese threat? Strategic bombers, it is known, can fly in any direction, even in circles if necessary. If Peking has the capability of developing a medium-range ballistic missile with a nuclear warhead by 1967, why are we now reducing our nuclear deterrent by two-thirds?

Another interesting question: If McNamara is concerned about Red China's nuclear *potential*, why isn't he concerned about the Soviet Union's present nuclear capabilities? The Soviets boasted in early November about having developed an "orbital missile" capable of delivering a surprise blow from space. Yet Mr. McNamara has remained strangely silent about this "orbital missile" which the Russians say they have *now*, but he is having conniptions over a Red Chinese I.C.B.M. which won't be operational for at least ten years, long after Mr. McNamara has left Washington.

Of course the Russians have assured us that they would never, never use their orbital missile against us. We quote the *New York Times* of December 11, 1965, to put your minds at ease:

The Soviet Union has given diplomatic assurances to the United States that it has no intention of placing nuclear weapons in orbit, the State Department disclosed today. [Gromyko also assured us that they would never place missiles in Cuba.]

The United States has raised the question whether the Soviet Union was violating the 1963 *arms control resolution after the Russians boasted in early November about the development of an "orbital missile" capable of delivering a surprise blow from space.*

Mr. McNamara was reassured.

After announcing that he was dismantling S.A.C., the Secretary of "Defense" then announced that he was ordering the construction of 210 new FB-111 jet bombers to replace the 345 B-52's and 80 B-58's to be scrapped. The public's fears were thus momentarily allayed. What McNamara didn't tell the public was that the 210 FB-111's would not have the range nor the bomb-load capacity of the giant B-52's. In fact, with McNamara now closing down our bases close to the Soviet Union the FB-111 would hardly have the range necessary to penetrate the industrial redoubt of the Communist empire in Siberia. Nor did McNamara tell the public that the FB-111's were just airplanes, they were not an air-defense system. S.A.C. is based on an overall deterrent concept. By dismantling S.A.C., McNamara is destroying an entire system of defense. He is not simply replacing old planes with new planes.

As General Curtis LeMay said: "We may be caught and have to use this aircraft [the FB-111] as a poor substitute, for we are long past the time when we should have started production of a new and advanced system." (*Boston Herald*, December 12, 1965.) The General knows what he is talking about for he was Commander in Chief of the Strategic Air Command—while McNamara was building Edsels—and later was Air Force Chief of Staff.

Another important point seemingly overlooked by McNamara, but obviously carefully calculated in his plans, is the time element. We are told that the scrapping of S.A.C. will be *completed* by 1971. However, if we follow Mr. McNamara's schedule of base closings, S.A.C. will be rendered ineffective much earlier than that, probably in two years at the most.

On the other hand, the first FB-111's will only begin coming off the production line in 1968, which at best is a very optimistic target date considering that it took seven years to develop the B-58 from drawing board to prototype. All 210 of the FB-111's are supposed to be ready by 1971. Which means that we shall virtually be deprived of any effective manned-aircraft defense for a period or two to three years. It should be noted that no new bombers have come off the assembly line since 1962. If the first

(continued on page 3)

*Reprinted from **The Review of the News** (Dec. 23-29, 1965) which is published by Correction, Please!, Inc. Belmont, Massachusetts, 02178, U.S.A.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free: One year 40/-; Six months 20/-; Three months 10/-.

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

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

The only uncompromisingly anti-Communist countries now left are Portugal, Spain, South Africa, and Rhodesia. Communist or, if the term is preferred, Internationalist control over the rest of the world is so advanced that no other real nationalist initiative remains possible. With every week that passes, the stranglehold of the Washington-Moscow axis is intensified.

This situation has been brought about, in the main, by Fabianism—the steady, consistent, but gradual application of the policy of centralisation, proceeding in the first place through financial policy and in the second through the growth of power and monopoly of 'federal' governments. At the present time we are witnessing the culminating phase in the frenzied rounds of international consultations to 'integrate' defenses, not-win the war in Vietnam, contain China, and disarm in favour of the United Nations. All that remains now is to mop up the remaining pockets of resistance, and the beginning has been made with Rhodesia by provoking the Smith government into an overt act of resistance, which in due course can be put down by force. This vile act of the Wilson régime demonstrates with fearful clarity how firmly once-Great Britain is in the grip of the internationalists.

It is true that for a long time there has been little to choose between the Tories and the Socialists—so far as the common man is concerned. But the grim campaign to get rid of Macmillan and destroy the morale of the Tories shows that the hidden government at this stage requires the vindictive ruthlessness of a Wilson and the naked hatreds of his left-wing extremists who are waiting for the day when bombs will fall on Salisbury. For that is what public 'opinion' is being prepared for, with the co-operation of the Press, the B.B.C., the Bank "of England", and the American establishment. We are to learn that effective resistance to internationalism is a crime punishable by death. And the second lesson to be learned is that "one man one vote" has pretty well accomplished its mission in Britain by installing a dictatorship—not of, but through Mr. Wilson. And at the rate things are now going, it looks to be not long before "rebellion" at home will be an act punishable by death. If this seeems far-fetched, remember Cuba. Everywhere the prelude to disaster has been the attitude "it can't happen here". So thought, in recent times, the Algerians, the Katangese (slaughtered by the U.N.), and the Cubans.

Political Intelligence Weekly (London), Feb. 18, 1966, finds it incredible "that any individual with such a Communist-front background [as Arthur Goldberg] could successively become a Justice of the US Supreme Court and an American Ambassador to the UN, especially when the US Government is taking on Communism in Vietnam."

We do not find it incredible. It is in fact a brazen display of the power of the Conspiracy. The picture of the world now is one of the steady emergence into openly exercised power of a World Government which, for decades past, has secretly pulled the strings attached to nations from concealed positions of power—mainly financial power. The international control of credit and exchange has meant the control of national governments, which have thus been constrained to follow economic and trade policies which have led to wars and centralisation of power in institutions at the cost of the liberty of individuals.

The late C. H. Douglas once wrote of the Financier-Communist Conspiracy as one which cared no more for the immolation of the peoples of a continent than for the death of a sparrow. Whether he had Africa specifically in mind we do not know: he wrote before the winds of change were unleashed by Macmillan. But that the Africans are in for immolation has been evident for some time.

For thousands of years the black Africans lived in a complex tribal society which had evolved to suit a temperament adjusted to tropical living. By *our* standards their condition was no doubt appalling; but not by theirs. Perhaps the best way to gain an appreciation of the native outlook and way of life is to read Joyce Carey's novel *The African Witch.* The endemic diseases and hazards of life which restrained the teeming population growth were taken by the natives as part of the natural order.

To replace all this with a modern agricultural and industrial, urban, civilisation is a matter of the gravest delicacy, requiring, perhaps, centuries. It is essentially an organic process, growing outwards from a number of centres and leaving as undisturbed as possible the complex tribal life until growth and change is able gradually to extend. Even the controlling of endemic diseases creates dangerous problems for the natives, since it increases the rate of population growth beyond the ability of the natives to increase food production. And education, by eroding the tribal structure which is the foundation of the native natural order, opens the way to demagoguery; and this in turn leads to incitement, to discontent and disruption of otherwise stable societies which however they appear in our eyes, have sufficed the needs of the natives for untold generations.

Now whatever the original motives, and even methods, of the deliberately maligned 'colonialism' which appeared in Africa it was in essence an organic growth. Its methods evolved by adaption to the problems presented by the stages of development. And one thing that is quite certain is that as the replacement of tribalism by organised agriculture, communication, and industrialisation proceeded, integration of the native into the complex was inevitable — for merely mathematical reasons.

'Government' in these delicately difficult circumstances, must necessarily be government of ability; and as complexity extends, so the field of recruitment must extend, as perhaps is best demonstrated in the Portuguese overseas territory of Angola.

There are really only two practicable alternatives in Africa: to leave the continent alone (which has not been done); and *benevolent* colonialism—that is to say, a slow organic change proceeding by adaptation and evolution according to the emerging possibilities.

Colonialism, whatever its beginnings, was indeed becoming increasingly benevolent. And anti-colonialism was in its inception an openly declared Communist strategy to bring down European civilisation everywhere.

All this, of course, was and is known to the power, the invisible world government, which operates through international finance and Communism. Self-government at this time for the 'nations' of Africa is impossible; what appears to have been achieved so far in that regard, has been the result of the momentum generated by the colonisers. That momentum is visibly going down and every successive disruption of government brakes the momentum the more.

Thus the destruction of the native Africans, according to the satanic plan to exploit the wealth of Africa in the service of a World Government, is now inevitable unless that World Government is exposed, challenged and defeated in the little time left before "none dare call it treason". If the Rhodesia Front government is destroyed, one of the few last bastions from which challenge is possible will be gone.

The Wreckers

Subscribers to Christian Action have been led to believe that they are feeding the hungry and educating the ignorant: but the organisation has now set up a committee to arouse public opinion against Mr. Smith and to sponsor the use of force. Canon Collins explained that Britain "should offer to the world, through the Security Council of the United Nations, such force as it has available to be applied to make sure that the Smith régime should cease." (*Church Times,* Feb. 4, 1966.) The committee, including three M.P.'s and clergy of several denominations, intended to inform the public of the "moral principles" involved, adding that U.D.I. was "a grave threat to international peace."

The Bishop of Southwark also sounded a war trumpet in his sermon at Southwark Cathedral, saying that Mr. Smith's attitude "makes nonsense of everything Jesus taught" and that it was the duty of the church to support the Prime Minister in resisting Mr. Smith's "evil policies." (*The Times,* Feb. 7, 1966)

The Church Times also included without comment a report of alleged brutality in Rhodesia, where information is "being currently collected by the Bishop of Matabeleland," the Right Rev. K. Skelton who incidentally, is expected to meet Mr. Selwyn Lloyd. Beatings have taken place but the informant "was not himself beaten up, he was ordered to expose his film."

The Bishop's dossier will not make pleasant reading, one might have wished that Mr. Lloyd was to meet the Bishop of Mashonaland, yet the background to the incidents is not Cheltenham Spa or a Cathedral Close. The Rhodesians cannot ignore the massacres to the North of them and in three months we have heard of only one fatality. Outsiders, a few of them possibly well intentioned, incite the inhabitants to commit diabolical crimes and others threaten the country with war.

Mr. Smith, further, has maintained law and order which surely may be classed as "moral" work and the country threatens no one. Nor have I yet heard of an alternative to the *de facto* government which, unlike many recognised régimes, did not shed any blood to attain power and may even have increased its support. Perhaps the adversaries of the régime are becoming worried lest the "world" front against it proves less solid than announced and that no incidents of the Sharpville kind have yet occurred. The Bishop of Matabeleland could not expect such tolerance in many other countries, particularly in Africa.

One can hardly hope that British Guiana, where the Queen has recently faced considerable danger and which is torn by racial hatred (perhaps fomented), will enjoy independence without some violence. Yet the "morality" of independence never arouses discussion any more than the abandoning of responsibility causes any qualms. From the Christian point of view we remember the parable of the Wise Virgins who remembered the oil, and of the ten talents, as well as the recognition that the civil power acted as a divine agent. I cannot see that Mr. Smith "makes nonsense" of this, or that his refusal to allow the wreckers free reign in his country amounts to "evil policy".

"If bullying and military blackmail produce the changes necessary . . . . they will be well worth while. The alternatives are to let Mr. Smith win or to use force in Rhodesia. Both are hideously bleak." So writes David Adamson(*Daily Telegraph,* Feb. 10, 1966) suggesting that sanctions are not going to cause a surrender. Perhaps the public is to be softened up for these further moves to satisfy the extremists or to save Mr. Wilson's face. I do not know what Mr. Selwyn Lloyd is trying to save. I should have thought that there were worse rulers than Mr. Smith.

—H.S.S.

Mac-the-Knife (continued from page 1)

FB-111 is scheduled to appear in 1968, that means that we shall not have produced any new bombers for a period of *six years*! During these six years, the Soviets will not have been twiddling their thumbs. They will have been producing without interruption, four new types of strategic bombers. The much-heralded "reduced Soviet bomber threat" will have been increased to a somewhat nightmarish degree. We wonder if this is not Mr. McNamara's calculated intention. He is supposed to be a whiz-kid with a slide-rule and we know, based on rumours, that he can count to ten.

But let us not be unfair to Mr. McNamara by speculating about the future. From McNamara's present words and actions we can conclude the following: that the Soviet Union is no longer a threat to us, and therefore we can revise our concept of national defense which heretofore has been based on the ridiculous notion that Communist Russia posed the greatest threat to our security; that Red China is a threat to us but we do not need S.A.C. to protect us from this threat, nor do we need to develop any new bomber deterrent system, similar to S.A.C., to counter this threat. What we do need to counter the Red Chinese threat is more human flesh. Hence McNamara has ordered a manpower increase of 340,000 in the armed forces.

Congress and the Air Force have been pressing McNamara to develop a new advanced manned strategic aircraft (A.M.S.A.) to take over S.A.C.'s deterrent role. But this means developing a defense system based on the idea that the Communist world—notably the Soviet Union—is the enemy. As yet Mr. McNamara has resisted all pressures to build an A.M.S.A.

What about our antimissile missile? Now that the Soviets have an intercontinental ballistic missile (I.C.B.M.) and the Red Chinese will have one in ten years, you would think that the United States would lose no time in developing an antimissile missile defense system. Well, our antimissile missile—the Nike X—is still in the research and development stage. It is not yet in production. But time is going fast, and Lyndon Johnson will have to decide very soon whether or not this country is to have an anti-missile missile.

Already the disarmament advocates, in the guise of a "special citizens' committee", headed by Pugwasher and member of the Council on Foreign Relations Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, have urged Johnson to delay production of the Nike X. Their peculiar reasoning was explained in *Business Week* of December 4, 1965 as follows: "People who work toward international arms control argue that putting Nike X into production might well increase tension with Russia, wreck any possibility of an East-West arms control agreement and set off a new arms race by inducing the Russians to perfect more offensive weapons to counterbalance the U.S. defense."

In other words, the insane members of S.A.N.E. would have you believe that if you develop an adequate defense to deter a bully, you will only force the poor frustrated bully to develop another technique of getting around your defense. In other words, there can never be any real defense against the bully.

What's the solution to the problem? Dr. Wiesner advocates "disarmament." But this doesn't solve the problem of the bully. If the bully, according to Dr. Wiesner, will overcome your defenses at any cost, what makes the wise doctor think that the bully is really interested in "peaceful coexistence"? Maybe the bully is really interested in attacking you.

Another objection to the Nike X which Mr. McNamara will no doubt raise is the cost. It will cost us $20 billion to produce an effective antimissile missile system.This will be thoroughly rubbed into the noses of Congress which has been persuaded to dispense billions to fight "poverty" and other such mortal enemies, but which will now be told that an adequate defense against nuclear attack is beyond our meagre resources.

From all of Mr. McNamara's contradictory thoughts and actions you would imagine that the Defense Department was in a complete state of confusion and disarray: escalation and bomber phase outs; Red Chinese missile threat and a U.S. anti-missile missile delay ; the Joint Chiefs of Staff think that Russia is the enemy (after all, they were pointing missiles at us from Cuba only three years ago—eyeball to eyeball!) but Mac-the-knife implies that Russia is not the enemy.

Indeed, what is McNamara up to? That's not too difficult to figure out if you notice how quietly he has been going about building an entirely different "defense" system. Apparently, we are in a sort of transitional stage—moving, according to plan, from the obsolete concept of national defense to one embracing a new world order. The Defense Department has obviously adopted the attitude that national defense is a thing of the past. It must now think in terms of defending a world order, whose enemies will be entirely different from those we have faced as a free, sovereign nation. We know that this is so, because Mr. McNamara is already developing the military force which will fight these new enemies.

He has ordered the construction of 58 giant jet transport planes, the C-5A, which will carry 600 armed troops or 250,000 pounds of cargo. Along with these planes he is developing a fleet of new Navy cargo ships, to be designated as Fast Deployment Logistic (F.D.L.) ships. This represents a new concept in defense. According to the *Boston Traveller* of December 13, 1965:

> *The planes capable of spanning oceans with the speed of commercial jetliners, will zoom troops, tanks, helicopters and small arms to makeshift landing strips close to battlefronts.*
>
> *The FDL ships, meanwhile, will serve as floating depots at sea near potential trouble spots with instantly available weapons and equipment—including helicopters, tanks and amphibious craft . . .*
>
> *The C-5A and FDL combination reportedly would give the U.S. the mobility to move entire divisions of troops and their supplies anywhere in the world within a matter of days.*
>
> *An ideal combination, according to military experts, for quick U.S. intervention and decisive action in today's brushfire warfare.*

The key phrases in that report are "potential trouble spots." "quick U.S. intervention," and "today's brushfire warfare." Certainly, the Soviet Union is no "trouble spot." Nor is Red China exactly a "trouble spot." The new enemy, in other words, is "trouble spots like Katanga and Rhodesia, where a revolt against the established world order will have to be put down quickly and decisively by Fast Deployment Logistics. Any anti-Communist revolt, such as the overthrow of Juan Bosch in the Dominican Republic, will be designated a "trouble spot," and the World Government's future peace force, supplied gratis by Mr. McNamara, will be on hand to crush it.

This is undoubtedly what the new defence concept is all about, and this is why S.A.C. is being phased out and the Nike X will never see the light of day. Perhaps one of these days our military men will snap out of their confusion and realise that con-man McNamara is, after all, none other than the man from U.N.C.L.E.

The powers vested in the undersecretary-general of the United Nations may well constitute the ultimate power of life and death over every human being on the face of the earth. There have been eight holders of the office. They have been communists without exception, seven from the USSR. That the United Nations Organisation is world communism under construction is revealed in

THE FEARFUL MASTER

by G. Edward Griffin

8/6d.

NONE DARE CALL IT TREASON

by JOHN A. STORMER

A careful compilation of facts from hundreds of Congressional investigations of the Communist conspiracy to enslave America.

6/2d.

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

To enable wider distribution, additional copies of this and other issues of **The Social Crediter** are availible at the following prices which include postage:

6 copies 6/6	25 copies 18/6
12 copies 10/6	50 copies 32/6

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd. at 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London E.11.

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