

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 53. No. 5

AUGUST, 1973

"The International Idea"

B. C. H. DOUGLAS

(Notes of an Address delivered in London and published in *The New Age*, January 14, 1932)

I should like to impress upon you that in bringing forward the subject which is covered by the title for discussion, I have no intention of merely initiating an interesting discussion upon a philosophical abstraction. As you are aware, I regard society at the present time as being the battle ground of two fundamentally opposed ideas, at any rate, as they are put forward, and the future of society as likely to be determined by which of those ideas shall prevail. So far as I can see, those of us who are in this room constitute the general staff of one of the armies. We are the general staff, not perhaps because of any outstanding qualifications for the task, but because there does not seem to be any other on our side with a clear conception of what it is trying to do. Now one of these ideas, the one which we oppose and which has many forms, has one of its embodiments in the idea that the logical and almost inevitable form that social progress must take, is the breaking down of all differences, social and national, and the setting up of a world state.

But the first doubt which I should like to assist you in casting upon this superficially attractive idea is to direct your attention to the fact that, like all the other analogous ideas of which it forms one exhibit, it is impervious to the assault of fact. The fact that the Irish Free State has split itself off from Great Britain, and that India and Egypt seem likely to go the same way, that there is a strong and growing Home Rule movement in Scotland, that certain States of Australia are contemplating secession from the Australian Commonwealth, that there is quite a strong, if not articulate, division growing up between the Eastern and Western States of the American Union, and between the Eastern and Western Provinces of the Dominion of Canada, that Spain seems likely to split into two separate republics, that of Catalonia and that of Northern Spain, and many other instances of the same type, offers no evidence or argument to the Internationalist.

Now, of course, there is a perfectly straightforward and practical explanation of this propaganda for internationalism, and for practical purposes one does not really need to look further. Hardly a day passes without a leading article in *The Times*, or other papers of the same type of interest, remarking, as though it were axiomatic, that the world is one economic unit, and that no adjustment of the present discontents can be expected which does not proceed from international agreement. These journals are ably seconded by High Clerics. This opinion, you will notice, is never argued; it is always stated as though it were obvious to the meanest intellect, which is, in fact, just about what it is.

Now, as I have just said, the simplest explanation of this is that if you only make a subject large enough and involve a sufficiently large number of people in the solution of it, you can rest assured that you will never get a solution. A democracy of a thousand voters can be personally approached and convinced on any subject within a reasonable period of time, but if you enlarge the franchise to include everyone over twenty-one in a population of 45,000,000 you can be reasonably sure that any general conclusion at which it will arrive, it will arrive at twenty-five years after that conclusion ceases to be true. If you can super-impose upon that by means of a controlled Press, Broadcasting, and other devices of a similar nature, something that you call "public opinion" (because it is the only opinion which is articulate) you have a perfect mechanism for a continuous dictatorship, and moreover, it is the form of dictatorship which is fundamentally desired by the collectivist mentality—a dictatorship which has power without responsibility.

There is, however, another explanation almost equally obvious, and probably equally true, and that is that local sovereignty, particularly as it extends to finance, is a barrier to the supremacy of international finance.

A Jewish financier, expressing his contempt for Gentile mentality, once remarked that the secret of the inability of the Gentile to shake himself free from the dominance of finance resided in the fact that the Gentile was incapable of distinguishing between numbers and things. I should be inclined to go further than that, and say that the mentality which is attracted by the Internationalist idea is incapable of distinguishing between numbers, things, and individuals. It is a type of mentality which is fostered and ultimately becomes inseparable from people who deal with nothing but figures, and is, in my opinion, the reason why the banker in particular is fundamentally unsuited for the position of reorganiser of the world. No banker, as such, has any knowledge of large undertakings. He thinks he has, because he deals with large figures, and he mistakes the dealing with large figures as being equivalent to dealing with large numbers of things and people. Mr. Brenton has dropped upon a letter from a correspondent, Sir E. O. Williams (incidentally, an engineer) to *The Times* of December 8, and referred to it in *The New Age* of December 17. It calls attention in a hesitating way to one of the most important ideas I have ever seen in that newspaper, which idea I feel sure must have crept in by mistake. It is contained in the enquiry: "Can like be equated to unlike, by any necromancy of gold?" You might put the matter another way by enquiring whether there was any similarity between a

Beethoven Sonata and a bottle of wood alcohol in New York, because you can buy either of them for 5s.

Now this is the idea which is at the root of the International idea, where it is held sincerely. It is that you can obtain an elaborate series of statistics regarding the populations of the world and put a committee down at Geneva, or elsewhere, to legislate for them on the basis of statistics. It is an idea which would never be accepted by anyone who had ever run or organised a small business, and its most vocal exponents, such as, for instance, Mr. H. G. Wells, or Sir Norman Angell, have never, I think, been responsible for the organising of a business of any kind. Their qualifications for organising the whole world have never, as one might say, been checked by any kind of laboratory experiment. They are, in fact, in exactly the position of a would-be bridge builder who is ignorant both of the Theory of Structures and the Strength of Materials.

The danger to the world of this idea is instant and practical. There is a world movement definitely conscious of its aims, counting amongst its adherents many persons placed by social position, prestige, and other conditions, in what would seem to be a most impressive relation to politics and organisation, which is consciously working for just exactly this purpose. With it, or behind it, however you like to regard the matter, are all those forces whose ends are best served by the subjection of the individual to the group. While it will certainly fail, its backing makes a conflict certain.

I should like to direct your attention, as a more than usually illuminating instance of what I mean, to an article which appears in the November issue of *International Affairs*, which is the journal of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, commonly known as Chatham House, an organisation which possesses a Royal Charter, and which (as viewed from Chatham House) brings together the best brains on all subjects connected with High politics. The article is entitled, "The Trend of International Affairs Since the War," and the following extracts are indicative of its nature:—

"Either our modern economic internationalism has to be sacrificed, or else we must learn to live our political and our cultural life on the modern world-wide scale, which we have achieved in our economic life already.

"The other alternative, of course, is that we should bring our political and our cultural life into harmony with our economic life; that we should preserve our economic internationalism by internationalising our social life through and through, in all its layers.

"You remember, perhaps, that one of the most famous generals in history once remarked that his opponents were invincible because they never knew when they were beaten. It is my hope that this same kind of invincible ignorance—a really heroic form of ignorance, may carry our generation to victory in our spiritual war for the establishment of universal and enduring peace [!!!].

"If we are frank with ourselves we shall admit that we are engaged on a deliberate and sustained and concentrated effort to impose limitations upon the sovereignty and the independence of the fifty or sixty local sovereign independent States.

"The surest sign, to my mind, that this fetish of local national sovereignty is our intended victim is the emphasis

with which all our statesmen and our publicists protest with one accord, and over and over again, at every step forward which we take, that, whatever changes we may make in the international situation, the sacred principle of local sovereignty will be maintained inviolable. This, I repeat, is a sure sign that, at each of those steps forward, the principle of local sovereignty is really being encroached upon, and its sphere of action reduced and its power for evil restricted. It is just because we are really attacking the principle of local sovereignty that we keep up protesting our loyalty to it so loudly. The harder we press our attack upon the idol, the more pains we take to keep its priests and devotees in a fool's paradise, lapped in a false sense of security which will inhibit them from taking up arms in their idol's defence.

"In plain terms, we have to re-transfer the prestige and the prerogatives of sovereignty from the fifty or sixty fragments of contemporary society to the whole of contemporary society.

"In the world as it is to-day, this institution can hardly be a universal Church. It is more likely to be something like a League of Nations. I will not prophesy. I will merely repeat that we are at present working, discreetly, but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national states of our world. And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands.

"But supposing this does not happen? Supposing that the present generation of mankind is defeated in the end, after all, in the strenuous effort which we are making to centralise the force of sovereignty.

"But Prussia has not ceased to be one of the great States of the modern world. She is still great, because her public organisation . . . is still second to none. I suggest to you that history is likely to repeat itself here, and that, once again, what Prussia is to-day, France and Great Britain and Italy, yes, and even the United States, are likely to become to-morrow. For the sake of the peace and prosperity of the world, I devoutly hope that my prophecy will prove correct."

Now if the address from which these extracts are taken had been given at some local Socialist or Communist Forum, and had appeared in, let us say, *The Worker*, or some other organ of those sections of society which are more obviously suffering from the present state of affairs, one would, if one had felt obliged to notice it at all, have remarked that it was rather poisonous nonsense, and left it at that. Communists, in their periodical appearances in the police-court, might well refer to it. But the speaker was Professor Arnold Toynbee, who was one of the British representatives at the Peace Conference, and, I believe amongst other things, is, or has been, the occupant of the Chair of Greek at London University, and the occasion was the Conference of Institutions for the Scientific Study of International Relations held at Copenhagen on June 8th, 1931, at which twelve countries were represented, and, in addition, delegates attended from four international organisations, the nature of which was not stated. These Conferences were initiated by the League of Nations Institute of Intellectual Co-operation. The address, therefore, from the auspices under which it was given, is a matter for

serious attention. The first point in it to which I should like to draw your attention, is the emphasis that it places on the fact that the work of which the speaker is so proud has been persistently pursued for the last twelve years with all possible energy and in every country, and yet it does not appear to occur to the speaker to question whether there is anything in the state of the world at the present time which would suggest that the results could be regarded as a subject for congratulation to anyone outside the confines of a criminal lunatic asylum. In Europe, the national sovereignty which has, perhaps, been most wholly delivered over to the tender mercies of the League of Nations in the period under review is Austria, and if the state of Austria at the present time is an exhibit as to the state that the whole world will be in when it, too, has been brought under the League of Nations, then I think we can say in all seriousness, "God help the world." You will notice that this peculiar blindness to facts which seems to be characteristic of all persons afflicted with the collectivist mentality is strongly in evidence, together with the peculiar determination to regard the populations of the world as only salvable through a continuous course of deception, by being made to vote, and to think, and to call for things of which they do not know the meaning or the result.

You will also note that there is not a single reference in this article, and in general there rarely is, in proposals of this nature, any reference to the remote possibility that so far from nationality being the cause of the world-wide unrest, it is sovereignty, whether national or international, which is resented, and that to replace national sovereignty by international sovereignty is to still further complicate and exaggerate the evil against which the whole world is rebelling. Or to put the matter another way, Professor Toynbee, and others who think like him, are not really interested in removing the cause of complaint at all, they are merely interested in making it impossible for complaints to become effective.

I think it is significant that what one might call "good-class" propaganda for internationalism has for many years been a passport to political success, particularly in Great Britain. It has been clearly allied with political Liberalism, and the support which political Liberalism has always received from International finance is well-known. Strictly speaking, the orthodox tenets of British Trades Unionism are strongly national and anti-international, a fact which anyone can prove for themselves by talking to the average working Trades Unionist on the subject of Protection. Yet, the British Labour movement, which has also received considerable covert support from international finance, has officially presented a policy of internationalism as a part of its platform, and those Labour and Trades Union officials and politicians who have in the past been most conspicuously successful have taken care to render, at any rate, lip service to the international idea.

It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to point out to an instructed audience that the conflicts between nations, at any rate, in modern times, are not due to the existence of nations so much as to the existence of conditions which cause friction between nations. To argue that the best way to stop war is to abolish nationality is exactly the same thing as to say that the best way to stop fighting between individuals is to abolish individuals.

How to Use a Church—Soviet Style

People use churches in various ways: some for prayer, worship and sacraments, while others it must be admitted have used those bodies for self-advancement. In Albania, we read (*Daily Telegraph*, May 3, 1973) religion was abolished in 1967 and the country was proclaimed "the first atheist state in the world." A priest, Father Kurti, was shot there recently. The Church itself has stood for the Law of God in temporal as well as spiritual affairs, and could still act as *the authority on the mills of God*. (C. H. Douglas).

The Russians, however, have tried to use the status of the hierarchs for foreign policy purposes, according to an article in the *East-West Digest* of April, 1973, entitled, "The Russian Church as an Instrument of Soviet Policy". We must of course recall that the Russian church has never known the freedom which Magna Carta guaranteed to the Anglican Church of the time. Yet the cynical Soviet use and abuse of the Church deserves particular study, and William C. Fletcher has written a book, *Religion and Soviet Policy 1945-70*, devoted to "the activities of the official church leaders in the service of Soviet foreign policy".

It means that the Soviet Government cannot completely eradicate the Church, as the Albanians are trying to do, for then the status of the useful hierarchs would be robbed of any credibility. They so decimated Buddhism that the Government has had to step in and help its representatives, and the Russian centre of the World Fellowship of Buddhists is now run in the Asian People's Institute of the Academy of Sciences in Moscow.

Four phases, broadly speaking, have occurred in Russia's use of the Church as an instrument of foreign policy. Stalin turned to the church in the war to arouse Russian patriotism, and then in the Cold War the church was "harnessed to Soviet 'peace' propaganda". But the Metropolitan Nicholas overacted—calling America the "rabid fornicatress of resurrected Babylon"—and strained the credulity of all but the most naive.

But, thirdly, under Khrushchev's expansionism, the church played a useful role with the "third world" nations, and the Soviet authorities used the Czechoslovakian churches and held Assemblies in Prague. These disseminated the idea of "peaceful co-existence", yet violent revolution against "reactionary forces" was encouraged. The World Council of Churches forwarded this policy when, at Uppsala, they voted funds to fight "racism", and increased the amount in 1970. The Russian Church used the WCC as a platform to attack USA and to divert attention from persecution in Russia. For during this highly successful phase of cooperation with the WCC, the number of churches in the Soviet Union was cut by half "as a result of persecution".

This phase collapsed with the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, and the USSR government has returned to "a more vigorous—and virulent—policy". The writer suggests that Western Christians should no longer tacitly acquiesce "in the propagation of what they know to be lies". I should like to go a little further than the article and suggest that the activities and attitudes of the WCC and of the BCC need closer scrutiny.

We might call the abuse of the Church which the article reveals a sin against the Holy Spirit. —H.S.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

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

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free: One year £2.60 (52/-), Six months £1.30 (26/-).

Offices—

Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11. Tel. 01-534 7395
Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Tel. 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001
Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001 (Editorial Head Office)

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2603. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougement, P.Q., General Deputy Chairman and Secretary, H. A. Scouler, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

Vol. 53. No. 5

August, 1973

The R.I.F. and the C.F.R.

The following are extracts from our "Week to Week" notes for July 12, 1969:

Despite the present convenience of the expression "International Marxist Conspiracy", Marx is anything but convincing as the author of the present situation. *Das Kapital*, taken so seriously by liberal Intellectuals, is a mere compilation, and a recruiting device for the scum of the underworld—recruited to first undermine, then destroy the culture and order of Western Civilisation. As an economic system, Marxian Communism would never have got anywhere. That the (according to Marx) increasingly impoverished and downtrodden proletariat could have subscribed the billions of money which has organised Communism as a destructive force throughout the world does not stand a moment's examination. The Big Money has come from the Big Bankers, sometimes privately and directly, but more importantly through the tax-exempt Foundations—whose main contribution, however, has been to financing subversion on the highest Intellectual planes, where the strategy of establishing World Government by bringing "an end to nationhood" has been directed through the Royal Institute of International Affairs and the Council on Foreign Relations (U.S.A.).

... Britain did not have race problems until a subversively directed immigration policy imported foreign races. In a letter signed by Lord Walston and others, published in *The Times* of June 10, 1969, the following appears: "The Institute of Race Relations came into existence some 11 years ago, *having previously been part of the Royal Institute of International Affairs*. . . . It was helped in its early days by generous gifts from industry, private individuals, the Ford Foundation and the Nuffield Trust. . . . The Ford Foundation has once more generously given us \$350,000. . . ." (Emphasis added). Clearly the work of the Institute began before it became independent, in the days when the Royal Institute and its activities, like those of the C.F.R., were somewhat clandestine and esoteric.

The Taming Of The President*

By MEDFORD EVANS

For months the Watergate affair seemed utterly mystifying—less in itself than because of the journalistic commotion over it that was sustained from the strangely clumsy burglary of June 17, 1972, to the temblor (about 6.5 on the political Richter scale) that shook the White House April 30, 1973. What had kept the newshounds so restless throughout that ten-month interval?

Suddenly it seemed absurdly simple. Haldeman and Ehrlichman and Kleindienst were Out; Elliot Richardson and General Alexander Haig were In. None of the Outs belonged to the Council on Foreign Relations; both the Ins did. Technically, I believe Alexander Haig is not on the Council's rolls, but as the triple-tested faithful Achates of its superfactotum Henry Kissinger, the General in any case belongs to the C.F.R.

Elliot L. Richardson is, of course, a certified guilt-edged [*sic!*] C.F.R. member. Richard Kleindienst, whom he replaces as Attorney General (Mike Mansfield's Senate majority permitting), is not. It is said that Kleindienst, a wheel in the Goldwater '64 campaign, kept Birchers at arm's length because their views about conspiracy, Communism, and the C.F.R. are so extreme. Now that Richardson has superseded him as Grand Inquisitor, Kleindienst is doubtless devoting his sudden leisure to study of the works of Gary Allen, Dan Smoot, and Robert Welch to find out what happened.

Yet he might have known the Brahmins of the Back Bay would eventually blackball him. True, he was of New England ancestry on his mother's side, and attended Harvard, where he took his A.B. *magna cum laude* and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. Elliot Richardson, in comparison, had graduated a few years earlier merely *cum laude*, and had missed Phi Beta Kappa. Yet Richardson is the one presently hailed in the media as the intellectual. This is not necessarily simple prejudice. The older man took his Harvard law degree as well as his bachelor's *cum laude*, while Kleindienst finished Harvard Law School three years later with a degree but no honorific Latin addition. Perhaps because he had to work his way through. (You begin to sense the problem?) This he accomplished as a law clerk for Ropes, Grey, Best, Coolidge & Rugg, a firm of which Elliot Richardson became an associate (after a term as clerk, first to Judge Learned Hand, and then to Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter) during Kleindienst's last year there. It's a small world, especially in Boston.†

But the social distance between Elliot Richardson and Richard Kleindienst is not to be measured by the fact that the latter was once, as it were, an employee of the former. The simple and ineradicable fact is that Richard Kleindienst

*From *The Review Of The News*, May 30, 1973. *The Review Of The News* is published weekly from Belmont, Massachusetts, U.S.A. 02178.

†Should we or should we not be surprised that Archibald Cox, Harvard Law professor named by Richardson as special prosecutor for Watergate, was also after graduation from Harvard Law School a clerk for Judge Learned Hand and subsequently an associate of the Boston firm of Ropes, Grey, Best, Coolidge & Rugg.

was born in Arizona. Now anyone may live in Arizona, but nobody except Barry Goldwater was born in Arizona. (I'm trying to look at this thing from a properly Bostonian point of view.) If the Massachusetts opponents of the Mexican War had had their way, Arizona, like Texas, California, and other such places would not even be in the United States. However, once we are all in One World, none of that will matter any more.

The personal drama implicit in Elliot Richardson's takeover of the Attorney General's office from Richard Kleindienst is a tantalizing topic, but must not detain us further from examination of the national existence of which Watergate is so serious a symptom. What partially surfaced at Watergate is a struggle not so much as to who shall run the country as to how the country shall be run—whether as a Constitutional Republic or as part of a fascistic world empire. And it is not so much the Nixonites as the anti-Nixonites who prefer the latter. Or, if the two factions be equally fascistic in intent it is the anti-Nixon faction which is far more likely to win. Both factions have served the purposes of that master conspiracy which it is useful to recognize as objectively Communist—for as other groups serve the Conspiracy, whether willfully or no, so the Conspiracy serves Communism. Yet the anti-Nixon faction, as is shown by the quantum increase in the already significant C.F.R. influence, is much the closer to the revolutionary vertex—or, if you prefer, vortex.

The shrewdest comment on Watergate so far (and so far as said comment goes) is that of Stewart Alsop in *Newsweek* of May fourteenth: "Politicians have played tricks on each other since politics was invented. But this is no politics; this is war". Analyzing not only the Watergate break-in, but also other activities of the Committee to re-Elect the President (CREEP), Alsop finds that the methods are those of World War II's Office of Strategic Services, in which he served. "OSS was patterned," he says, "on the British Secret Services, and the Central Intelligence Agency has in turn been patterned on OSS."

Of course, all the operatives in the Watergate fiasco were, apparently, "former" C.I.A. agents except G. Gordon Liddy, who was (sorry about this) an ex-F.B.I. agent. (Should the *ex* also be in quotes? I don't press the point.) Mr. E. Howard Hunt, according to *Facts On File*, was in 1961 the C.I.A. official in charge of the Bay of Pigs fiasco. When the Watergate case came to trial in January 1973, Hunt led the pack who pleaded guilty. Following him in this apparent failure of nerve (but you can't be sure about things like that) were Bernard L. Barker and three associates, all four coming from Miami, Florida, to burglarize and bug Democratic headquarters in Washington, D.C., and all four having previously come to Miami from Cuba as "fugitives" from the Castro revolution. (It seems worth noting in passing that Hunt, Barker, and the other three, objectively speaking, had by participating in the Bay of Pigs fiasco helped consolidate the revolutionary gains of the Castro regime.)

James McCord, who like G. Gordon Liddy pleaded *not* guilty, but was convicted, had "retired" from the C.I.A. after nineteen years with that agency. Following their conviction McCord and Liddy turned out to be very unlike each other, or at any rate played very different roles. McCord's

decision in March to tell all (more or less, one imagines) is what opened the sluice at Watergate, with the resulting flood of information which finally convinced us all that the newshounds had not been yapping nine months over nothing. In contrast with McCord, Liddy refused to talk even when offered immunity against further charges, and incurred an additional prison sentence for contempt of court. As an old operative himself, Stewart Alsop was stirred to admiration by Liddy's "closed mouth and sardonic salute when he was condemned to a long jail term." No question Liddy is of tough fibre, but don't be too sure the others are not also.

Alsop's point is well taken that Watergate represents not politics but war. (If, as Clausewitz said and Lenin believed, war is the continuation of politics by other means, the difference in the means is great enough to be qualitative.) But there are corollary conclusions which Alsop ignores, and we should not. War involves two sides, unless indeed a strong aggressor ruthlessly subjugates a victim at one fell swoop, and that certainly did not happen at Watergate, since the forces allegedly acting for President Nixon were the aggressors in this particular encounter, and were also the losers. Did the Democrats and journalists who defeated Liddy, Hunt, McCord and company at Watergate—and afterwards defeated Mitchell, Stans, Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Dean, Gray, Kleindienst, *et al.* (but not Alexander Haig)—do so by political means only, or did they also employ the weapons and methods of covert warfare? To illustrate by reference to a companion case, did Hunt and Liddy use more or less warlike methods in rifling the files of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist than Ellsberg used in plundering government files for the Pentagon Papers? And was the *New York Times* more (or less) an accessory, or accomplice, of Ellsberg's than the White House staff was of Liddy and Hunt?

The reason why we do not know whether the press used precisely the same methods against the Nixon entourage that the latter used against the Democrats at Watergate is that the press, as it exultantly proclaims, won the battle. Losers, not winners, get cross-examined. In this kind of warfare, more than in any other, there is no substitute for victory. Francis I after the Battle of Pavia could say, "All is lost save honor." At Watergate there was no honor to lose.

Except in the eyes of an old pro like Stewart Alsop, who as we noted above admired "the stubbornly silent G. Gordon Liddy," with his "closed mouth and sardonic salute." At this point one would like to ask O.S.S. veteran Alsop a question or two. In his own phrase, the Watergate break-in was "ludicrously bungled." Considering, then, that the men in charge—Hunt, Liddy, and McCord—are apparently among the top experts in the field, how shall we account for such bungling? Is it not true that covert warfare almost invariably involves what are called "double agents"—*i.e.*, men who work simultaneously for both sides? Is it not possible that among the operatives at Watergate were some who were *not* bunglers loyal to Nixon, but experts on the take from Nixon's adversaries? Who picked up the blue chips after Watergate? If G. Gordon Liddy, for hypothetical example, had not failed but succeeded in what he was trying to do at Watergate, he would have had reason to give somebody a "sardonic salute," would he not?

At the same time, more obviously turncoat types such as John Dean III and James McCord might not really have been weaker than Liddy; they might simply have had different roles to play. After all, if Watergate was going to hurt Nixon, somebody on the working level had to act the rat. Maybe that was simply McCord's and/or Dean's job. (Dean especially did it awfully well.) War is war, Stewart. You know that. To vary a theme from Ibsen*: *No knight-at-arms sacrifices his honor even for victory in war.* Answer: *Thousands of secret agents have done so.*

Yet what happened at Watergate June 17, 1972, is of small intrinsic importance compared to what it represents; and the men arrested there are, as everyone knows, small fry compared to whoever it may be that sent them there. The press could hardly get the public interested in Watergate (George McGovern tried and tried to get us stirred up about it last fall, but everybody just yawned) until, after McCord's and Dean's intimations, the President made what may have been a disastrous appearance on TV, and by accepting or forcing the resignations of men so close to him as H. R. Haldeman, John D. Ehrlichman, Richard Kleindienst, and John Dean III, startled the country into the realization that the White House was under an attack which could no longer be ignored. The drawn visage and shaken demeanor of Richard Nixon the night of April thirtieth were a shock to millions who had thought he was secure with the mandate they had given him less than six months earlier. And had thought *they* were secure. The American people in some way identify with their President. If he is all right, they are all right. Richard Nixon was plainly not all right.

The shake-up in his White House staff and the Cabinet was important in the first place because it indicated the President was shaken. But it was also important in itself; in itself much more important than the melodramatic dumb show at Watergate. To understand what it may mean to have Haldeman and Ehrlichman superseded by General Haig, and Richard Kleindienst superseded by Elliot Richardson, we have to assess the jobs as well as the men in question. Profiling Haldeman and Ehrlichman, *Newsweek* of July 28, 1969, headed the story: "The Praetorians." As a vexillary of the *Washington Post* (now widely hailed as the victor of Watergate, which by synecdoche may have a good deal of truth), *Newsweek* would have zeroed in early on such targets as Ehrlichman and Haldeman, and would have understood the implications of labeling them Praetorians.

The Praetorians were the bodyguard of the Roman emperors. Their commanders, called prefects, came from the rank below the Senatorial, but in practice exercised great power. We seldom reflect how completely men in high office are in effect imprisoned by those who protect them. How would you feel to wake up in the White House every morning knowing that you couldn't get out on Pennsylvania Avenue, or anywhere else, without the permission of armed guards who keep you under constant surveillance? The situation was similar in ancient Rome. In A.D. 193 the Praetorians murdered the emperor Pertinax and auctioned the empire to the highest bidder. Didius Julianus bought it. Septimius Severus, however, bribed the Praetorians to

murder Didius, made himself Emperor, and reorganized the Praetorians so successfully that they didn't murder another emperor for twenty-nine years.

This power business is a tough racket. Always has been. Still is. Ask those recent White House Praetorians, H. R. Haldeman and John Ehrlichman. Or ask the Kennedy family. You can see why *Insiders*, merchants of power who deal behind the scenes, would be in the market for "Praetorians," as *Newsweek* so aptly calls them.

The new Praetorian prefect in the White House is Alexander M. Haig, four-star general and, as I write, still Vice-Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. Curiously, *Newsweek* has not called *him* a Praetorian, nor is there any outcry from "Liberals" about "take-over by the military." The Left is no doubt confident that what you have here is a take-over of the military.

General Haig's most conspicuous military virtue is that he will do as told by the chain of command above him. For three and a half years now his orders have come from Henry Kissinger, whose aide and deputy he has been. At West Point in 1947, Alexander M. Haig ranked in 214th place among 310 graduates. That should suggest to you how much arguing he is likely to do with Henry Kissinger, who would (rightly or wrongly) hardly deign to argue with a cadet who had graduated in *first* place. Heretofore, Professor Kissinger has had to deal with "Praetorians" so "abrasive," so "Prussian" (all those terms derived from *Newsweek*) that *Parade* of May thirteenth referred to them as "White House hatchetmen Hans and Fritz" who "have gotten" Herb Klein, but "will probably not get Kissinger." Obviously *Parade* of May thirteenth went to press before April thirtieth—which is a trouble weekly magazines have—but just as obviously *Parade* was confident that Kissinger would take Haldeman and Ehrlichman the way Moche Dayan took the Gaza Strip.

And he did. It is Kissinger's man Alexander Haig who now commands the White House palace guard.

But potent as such a Praetorian prefect may prove on catastrophic occasions, yet short of anarchic breakdown Elliot Richardson's new post of Attorney General is far more pivotal. Indeed, of all Cabinet positions it is, in proportion to its real importance, the most neglected by the populace, though not (you may be sure) by the Establishment *Insiders*.

To find the most illuminating comparison, one goes not to ancient Rome, but to modern totalitarian regimes. The key office, under the dictator himself, is that of whoever controls the secret police. Russia's Lavrenti Beria was Minister of Internal Affairs, Germany's Heinrich Himmler was Minister of the Interior. The U.S. Department of the Interior has no such potential role, but the U.S. Department of Justice, under the Attorney General, does. The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is immediately under the Attorney General, and while the popularity of the late J. Edgar Hoover blinded most Americans to the fact, it remains true that the F.B.I. is the nucleus of any national terror police which may develop.

"Liberals" understand this well enough. The only way the "Liberals" could thrive so well and so long with Mr. Hoover in office was to keep over him such Attorney Generals as Herbert Brownell, William P. Rogers, Robert Kennedy,

*In *A Doll's House* Torvald Helmer tells his wife, Nora: "No man sacrifices his honor, even for one he loves." She replies, devastatingly: "Millions of women have done so."

Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, and Ramsey Clark. Thus was the F.B.I. prevented from moving effectively against Leftwing subversion; but if power continues to shift further Left, and should pass the tilting point, be sure the Attorney General will see to it that the F.B.I. *does* move against residual Rightwing countersubversion. It should be noted that the Attorney General would probably remain in charge of any agency which might in the future combine the F.B.I. with the C.I.A., or with state and local police. We observed above a fortuitous omen of this in the fact that ex-F.B.I. man G. Gordon Liddy headed a task force otherwise composed of "former" C.I.A. operatives.

Yet the Attorney General of the United States is not merely the head of our potential terror police. He is the top lawyer of the nation, which means, *inter alia*, two things of vital importance: (1) As chief counselor at law of the Executive Branch he has great influence in determining, with the Supreme Court, how the Constitution and other laws shall be determined in practice. (2) As chief prosecutor for the federal government, he has power to say who is brought to trial and who is not.

The protocol pecking order of the Cabinet is State, Treasury, Defense, Attorney General. The rest are lesser lights. Of eleven Cabinet positions, H.E.W. is ninth. Thus it might appear that Elliot Richardson, by moving from ninth (H.E.W.) to third (Defense) to fourth (Attorney General) had arched over a peak and started to descend. But State and Defense obviously derive their prestige from foreign relations in peace or war. In an era of One World, where war is unthinkable, where national sovereignty is (the intellectual establishment assures us) obsolete, these slightly anachronistic departments lose lustre. Even Treasury becomes something of a field office, somewhat parochial, in an age of Special Drawing Rights.

The Attorney General's position is rather different. In it there is, compared to State and Defense, perhaps little lustre to lose, but there is a world of power to develop. State and Defense look outward to foreign countries with which in peace or war they have to deal. When, under World Government, no nations are regarded as "foreign," State and Defense will forfeit relevance and begin to atrophy from disuse. But the chief law-enforcement officer, the Attorney General, looks inward, to secure obedience from the inhabitants of his own country. As State and Defense wither on the vine, the Justice Department will be busier than ever, since management of the American people will be the most important, and most difficult, task of the New World Order. The Attorney General will, of course, be dependent on his superiors at the supranational level, but they will also be dependent on him. Obviously, the *Insiders* don't want to depend on a former Goldwater man who was born in Arizona, and who has never joined the Council on Foreign Relations. Elliot Richardson, on the other hand, is clearly one of theirs.

Also is right. Watergate is not politics; it is war. But it is not a one-sided war. And it is not war between Democrats and Republicans. Under cover of party politics a bipartisan conspiracy wages war for subjugation of the United States to the New World Order. I agree with Dr. Boris Sokoloff, writing in the *Manchester Union Leader* of May 11, 1973, that Watergate on its face is so incredible, such

a "poor scenario," that it had to be actually part of "a plot against Nixon, cleverly executed by a double-agent." I disagree, however, that the purpose of the plot was to prevent Nixon's election in November 1972. If that was its purpose, it was almost as stupid as if it had been an honest burglary.

We all know that McGovern worked Watergate to death during the campaign, and we all know that it did him no good. Any political analyst could have foreseen as much, just as any trained secret agent could have seen that the game was not worth the candle in the Watergate break-in. On the other hand, a "clever double-agent," or a group of them extending into the highest levels of government and the Establishment, might well have planned Watergate so as to accomplish pretty much what has been accomplished.

The purpose of Watergate, I submit, was to tame and harness completely the President of the United States. The U.S. President is automatically and simultaneously the greatest hindrance and the greatest help imaginable to World Government conspirators. If he does their will, he is their greatest help; if he keeps his oath of office to uphold the Constitution, he is their greatest obstacle. From the conspirators' point of view the office of the President must be powerful enough to control the nation, but the President himself must be weak enough for the conspirators to control him.

Possibly Harry Truman was the last President to be more or less his own man. Not that he was not subject to influence. Everybody is. Truman was evidently subject in particular to the influence of Dean Acheson, who flattered the Kansas City roughneck with his Eastern Establishment elegance. (A roughneck hates all snobs except those who flatter *him*.) Yet no one could be sure what Harry Truman would do next. Perhaps it was the example of Hairbreadth Harry that made the *Insiders* realise how dangerous a President could be who took his own authority seriously. Possibly Truman slipped up on them, since he might well have seemed to be the last person they could not outwit. And that may be just what he was—the last person, in the Presidency, whom they did not always outwit—or outbludgeon.

I waive analysis of the cases of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower. If they were not *Insiders* themselves, they were in any case incapable of thinking in terms other than the drive for world power which sustains the *esprit de corps* of the *Insiders*. They were, if you will, warrant officers.

Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon, I submit, were never running the show on the Inside. Each had—one of them no doubt still has—a kind of personal ambition which must be surrendered by all who are to be admitted to the ultimate arcana of the cabal. I think none of our last three Presidents was ever considered (whatever any one of them may have considered himself) as more than an acolyte of the inner hierarchy.

Yet each, once in office, eventually assumed, or attempted to assume, authority on his own, and each (in the judgment of the *Insiders*) had to be checked—and was checked: Kennedy by assassination, Johnson by forced abdication, Nixon now by threat of impeachment. Who can foretell whether Nixon will actually be impeached? I suspect the top *Insiders* themselves do not know—and do not greatly

care, though possibly they would slightly prefer that he not be. I think that they would prefer rather that the threat of impeachment, like the sword of Damocles, hang over his head to keep him modest.

In all these cases a patriot's feelings must be mixed. Settled hostility toward the *Insiders* is inseparable from patriotism, and since our last three Presidents have all in one degree or another been victims of the *Insiders*, all must challenge the sympathy of the patriotic. Yet it seems prudent to recall that all three invited their punishment by working with and for the *Insiders* in the first place. If John Kennedy didn't mean it when he proposed interdependence instead of independence, if Lyndon Johnson didn't mean it when he exhorted Congress with the slogans of revolution, if Richard Nixon didn't mean it when he took steps to unite the U.S. with the "People's Republic of China" and the U.S.S.R., then they should never have thus committed themselves to the *Insiders'* program of World Government.

Now let's rough out from the *Insiders'* point of view a hypothetical scenario for the last few years and the next one or two. Waive the question whether the *Insiders* caused the election of Nixon in 1968. Considering how close it was, it is at least possible that they did not. Yet they surely staged his landslide of 1972, as is now practically admitted, since both *Time* and *Newsweek* of May 14, 1973, report the Republicans' helping McGovern get the 1972 Democratic nomination in order to guarantee Nixon's election, as was charged at the time by *The Review Of The News* (July 5, 1972). The *Insiders'* newsmagazines do not yet admit the rest of the story, which is that leading Democrats *knew* McGovern could only help Nixon, and thus must have intended to help Nixon. It had to be a bipartisan plot, not one hatched unilaterally by H. R. Haldeman and John D. Ehrlichman. But why? Try this:

A President with a Conservative image was needed (and was by the 1968 election provided) in order to effect the link-up with Red China and Soviet Russia. A "Liberal" President's doing so would have provoked too much protest from the American people. That is a familiar thought, and not untrue for being familiar. But there was more. The President who effected the link-up must be given widespread endorsement by the American people after the link-up. Thus the people would seem to be endorsing the link-up itself. Here is the logical reason for the evident bipartisan connivance in 1972 to elect Nixon on the Republican ticket by nominating McGovern on the Democratic ticket. Let voters explain as they would that they voted for Nixon only because they felt McGovern was *even worse*, it would still be in the record that Nixon won by a landslide after going—in the very year he went—to Peking and Moscow. "Liberals" of both parties would support such a ruse to weld tighter the Red link-up.

Yet on the Left there were two objections to the scheme. One was that it would be painfully humiliating to George McGovern, who had (so an Outsider gathers) been a faithful servant of the *Insiders* for a long time. The other was that it would be enormously gratifying to Richard Nixon, who (as the *Insiders* would never forget) had a quarter of a century earlier betrayed Alger Hiss—the very symbol of One World—to rednecked American chauvinist pigs. For revolutionaries it is never desirable to perpetuate in power,

or in even the simulacrum of power, anyone ever known as a counterrevolutionary. Richard Nixon could well be useful, and might well be given his moment at the summit. But he could not be permitted to establish his position there as a permanent fact of history. Once the purpose for which he was elevated had been achieved, he must be cast down.

Even the accord with Brezhnev could never erase the infamy (as the *Insiders* would see it) of his ancient anti-Communism, whatever the nature of its origin. It must not be recorded in history that what Nixon helped to do to Hiss was ever forgiven or forgotten. It could be temporarily overlooked to achieve compensatory advancement for the revolution; yet in itself the apparent counterrevolutionary action of Richard Nixon in 1948-1950 must still be punished. Moses was allowed to lead the children of Israel for years after his sin of self-exaltation, but he was not allowed at last to enter the promised land.

All this was steadily borne in mind (one conjectures) even during the season when the strategy of electing Nixon by nominating McGovern was being put into effect. Nor was it enough for the *Insiders* to say among themselves, We'll take care of him somehow, later. The means of Nixon's destruction—Watergate—was fed into the computer of history three weeks after he had served his purpose by signing the accords with Brezhnev in Moscow, and three weeks before the Democratic Convention in Miami Beach. Thus McGovern's vindication in history was in effect put in escrow for him before he undertook the temporarily humiliating ordeal of being politically pulverized by Nixon in November 1972. And thus was the timebomb planted which would shake the White House to its foundations the next April. ("The cruelest month.") There seems to be no authority for the report (but it summarizes much) that a C.I.A. agent wrote on his desk calendar after Nixon's victory in November 1968: *This Administration will self-destruct in five years.*

The Nixon gang is bad—no doubt of that—but it is no worse than the *Washington Post* gang, and apparently less powerful. The danger of the Watergate *expose'* now going on in Congress, in grand jury sessions, and in the major media, is that too many Americans will believe that Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Mitchell, Stans—perhaps even Nixon himself—are the conspiracy. They are obviously involved in it, but so are their most implacable adversaries.

Mercutio's line serves in this instance: A plague on both their houses!

THE DEVELOPMENT OF WORLD DOMINION

By C. H. DOUGLAS

The selection of commentaries comprising this very important book make it unique among Douglas's works, and highly relevant to the current situation.

Paper cover 68p.

Hard cover £1 . 35p.

Prices include postage

Book list free on request

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11 3NL