

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 53. No. 8

NOVEMBER, 1973

15p Monthly

### Ecomaniacs\*

#### YOUR CAR IS DRIVING THEM CRAZY

By RICHARD E. BAND

Give me a breath of dirty air! I would prefer it, I really would—at least if laundering the air means that the ecology charlatans are going to hustle us into dictatorship. Which is exactly what it means. At the moment, they want to bury the private automobile in exchange for air as fresh as was ever drawn by the gods on Olympus. And, if they bring it off, these con artists of a past that never was (and a future that never can be) will in the process destroy the nation's economy and cut our liberties to the bone.

Like so many tales of woe nowadays, this one begins with a Congress asleep at the throttle. Railroaded in the rising hysteria over the environment that overwhelmed our colleges in the spring of 1970, Congress nodded a foggyheaded approval to the Clean Air Act during the "lame duck" session that fall. Hardly a soul on Capitol Hill foresaw the strong-arm tactics that the Environmental Protection Agency would use to enforce it. Objections here and there, mostly raised by automotive engineers, were everywhere written off as so much rasping self-interest.

Yet in the course of succeeding months the mandate of the Act became harrowingly clear: ninety percent of the three major pollutants given off by auto engines would have to be done away with by 1976, come hell or high prices. The high prices, alas, have arrived all too soon; and the hell is on its way.

The fancy anti-pollution gadgetry required under the Clean Air Act of 1970 has already bid up new car prices by a hundred dollars or more. This is in addition, of course, to the fat sum added to the sticker on the window by inflation resulting from deficit spending. And there are more surprises to come: In eighteen metropolitan areas around the country, according to an E.P.A. ukase of June 15, 1973, owners of *used cars* will also have a chance to pay and pay. They too will soon have to purchase additional equipment—catalytic converters, at a cost which General Motors President Edward Cole fixes at \$150. The E.P.A. says the required converters may cost as much as \$185.

Already the attorneys general of the states involved have mounted a counter-attack in the courts. As their first line of argument they rightly claim that the new ruling will impose an unbearable hardship on owners of used cars—especially on the thrifty poor whose vehicles might not sell for much more than the cost of the anti-pollution equipment.

Yet, in recent weeks, it has developed that the very metals that serve as catalysts in the converter, platinum and palladium, may themselves be dangerous to public health. "Within days," *Business Week* reported in June, "the E.P.A. will launch

a \$1.5 million crash research programme to find out." And isn't *that* kind of them? First your bureaucratic masters decide to install a converter on your car at your expense, and then they discover that the fine particles it releases into the air could lodge in human lungs, creating "a very significant health hazard."

Whether installed at the factory or at a local garage under orders from the Environmental Protection Agency, the substantial price of every piece of clean-air equipment must come out of your pocket. And the hidden long-range expenses, in terms of poor engine efficiency and higher fuel bills, will cost you even more. There are the little irritants, of course, like the rough idling and dangerous stalling in traffic. But these fade into obscurity when set against the massive and wasteful increase in gasoline consumption fostered by the clear-air devices. Existing paraphernalia have boosted gas consumption by about ten percent, and when all the Rube Goldberg provisions of the Clean Air Act go into effect, that figure is expected to leap to forty percent. In concrete numbers, the Clean Air Act has already cost the country 12.5 million gallons of gasoline per day over and above what would otherwise have been burned.

This situation, moreover, is bound to grow worse as the older, more economical autos wear out and the sluggish E.P.A. gas-hogs take their place. According to the Office of Emergency Preparedness, 1972 cars were already burning up an additional 300,000 barrels of oil per day merely to cover the same mileage as the vehicles they replaced! Thus the heaviest blame for the energy shortage must rest upon the federal government—which has used the E.P.A. to force us to squander our national resources in the name of saving the environment.

Of course, the bureaucracy has long been busy creating this fuel crisis. Since 1959, for example, the federal government, while squealing about free trade, has imposed import quotas on petroleum in the vain hope that it could thereby encourage domestic exploration and refining. As it turned out, nothing of the sort happened; until early 1973, not one new refinery was built on the entire East Coast of the United States. The big oil companies went abroad, drilled and refined, and sold to whoever offered the right price. Meanwhile the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, which will usually "loan" your money to foreign governments at the drop of a hat, cooperated by refusing credit to under-developed countries for their own oil operations, leaving them to do

\* From *American Opinion*, October 1973. *American Opinion* is published monthly from Belmont, Massachusetts, U.S.A. 02178, subscription rate U.S. 12 dollars per year. Subscriptions can be arranged through K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London E11 3NL, at £5.75p.

business with the Rockefellers and their oily comrades or to do no business at all.

From hindsight it is obvious that the import quota system has lent even greater strength to the titans of the oil industry. Under it, refiners have been able to bring in foreign crude only in proportion to their domestic output, which means that independent producers, who buy their American oil as surplus from the giants, have no chance to catch up with the big companies by importing. And the giants have lobbied long and hard to scotch any plans for independent refineries to handle imported oil—the great battle to stop the Machiasport, Maine, project in 1968 being an outstanding case in point. Moreover, the government's so-called "Western Hemisphere rule," by giving special import preference to the vast Exxon holdings which happen to be located in Venezuela, has discriminated against independent refiners who would in a free market buy their crude oil elsewhere more cheaply.

Even more significant than the import quotas, perhaps, has been the government's campaign against coal, which is available in great abundance in the United States. As it has clamped down on economical strip mining and forced power companies to abandon the burning of coal, the Bureaucracy has progressively sapped and strained our oil resources.

Frank Ikard, the former Congressman from Texas who is president of the American Petroleum Institute, points out that in just six years the demand for petroleum distillates in generating electricity has soared from 8,000 barrels a day to 200,000. This huge drain on our oil supply can be traced directly to the stiff regulatory posture of the federal government, which refuses to recognize that in a modern economy the desire for an Eden-like purity of the environment must be tempered by reason if we are to meet the nation's staggering needs for energy.

By throttling the railroads, for instance, the federal government has thrown a third burden upon the national oil supply. Far more efficient than trucks for long-haul freight carrying, trains could save millions of barrels of oil now devoured every year by the trucking industry. Nonetheless, the Interstate Commerce Commission has virtually regulated the railroads into bankruptcy through a long string of spectacular rulings which have regularly forbidden *reductions* in freight rates which the railroads need to attract new business. And since the railroads and the coal companies depend so heavily upon each other, the federal crusade against both industries has boded doubly ill for the nation's energy supply.

While import quotas have limited our supply of oil, government restrictions on coal and on the railroads have encouraged us to consume it ravenously. Add the Clean Air Act, unbalance everything with price controls, and you have created a full-scale energy shortage.

And the blame doesn't stop with the federal bureaucracy. Radicals outside of government have carried on endless litigation against a number of projects vital to developing America's energy-resources. For over four years they have staved off construction of the Alaska pipeline and have halted off-shore drilling along the oil-rich California coast. These two operations alone could deliver five to six million barrels of oil a day. Repeatedly they have prevented the oil companies from building new refineries. Worse, their delaying tactics have thrown America a decade behind the advanced countries of Western Europe in the commercial development of nuclear plants that would greatly relieve our overtaxed oil supply.

Many good folk labor under the illusion that the ecology crusade has arisen from the altruism of the people, rather like a latter-day Pilgrimage of Grace, with the innocent masses sweeping in from the hinterlands to protest against craven old King Henry. Some very powerful people would like you to believe such nonsense. But the fact is that no major public campaign, involving billions of dollars in private and public expenditures, springs up of its own accord. Some arm of the "Liberal" Establishment gets the show under way by announcing a "need"; then the grants begin to flow from the great foundations into the think-tanks and the Ivy League universities. At this point, prominent citizens speak out and the mass media burn the issue into the public conscience. In the end, the masses "awaken" and step in line.

The environmental movement was as carefully scripted as a Gilbert and Sullivan operetta. Joseph L. Fisher, president of Resources for the Future, Incorporated, introduced the chorus in 1964, when he observed in his annual report that "the wide variety of threats to the quality of the environment may well embrace the gravest U.S. resources problem for the next generation." Over the years, Resources for the Future has been the top "conservation" front for the "Liberal" Establishment. The prime mover in its founding was William S. Paley, Leftist board chairman of C.B.S. Time and again it has received millions of dollars from the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation. Today the leading figure in its operations is Robert O. Anderson, chairman of Atlantic Richfield (the oil company), who also serves as a director of the United Nations Association of the United States, as chairman of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies (which tries to convince businessmen that, like God, capitalism is dead), and as chairman of the board of the John Muir Institute, organized by environmental fanatic David Brower to hold conferences on such radical themes as (1970), "Is survival economically feasible?"

In 1965, Resources for the Future opened up a special research/educational programme on the environment, financed to the tune of \$1.1 million by the Ford Foundation. Soon huge wads of money began to fall on the heads of willing university researchers. The Establishment campaign was in gear. In 1966, the Ford Foundation set up a "Resources and Environment Division" through which it fed such diverse groups as the Open Space Action Committee, the Save-the-Redwoods League, the Massachusetts Audubon Society, Nature Conservancy, and the militant Environmental Defense Fund.

Ford money, as a matter of fact, virtually created the "environmental law" fad, making certain that there would be a great body of radical lawyers to support the ecology campaign. By 1971, the Ford Foundation had fattened the purses of the Environmental Law Institute by \$152,000; given \$37,775 to the University of Michigan "to study the role of the courts in reviewing decisions affecting the environment"; provided \$20,500 so that the Association of American Law Schools and the far-out American Association for the Advancement of Science might hold a symposium on the relation of the law to environmental problems; and, given \$10,000 to the University of California to support the *Ecology Law Quarterly*.

As the RAND corporation, the Brookings Institution, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Academy of Science cranked out streams of erudite studies, a demand was also created for scholarly colloquia to bring the greatest wits together in the interests of radical ecology. Major forums were

held in 1965 and 1966 on "The Quality of the Environment" and "Future Environments of North America." The Rockefeller Foundation channeled hundreds of thousands of dollars into the think-tanks and the speciality groups like Resources for the Future. It also began to pour cash into the Conservation Foundation, founded and bankrolled by that resolute warrior against the oil interests, Laurance Rockefeller. It is no accident that Russell Train, who headed Laurance Rockefeller's Conservation Foundation, took charge of the Nixon Task Force on Resources and Environment, afterwards moving up to Undersecretary of the Interior, Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, and now Acting Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

By 1967 the time had come for "distinguished citizens" to speak out on behalf of saving the environment. At President Johnson's request, Laurance Rockefeller chaired the White House Conference on Natural Beauty, and later the "Citizens' Advisory Commission on Recreation and Natural Beauty, which President Nixon renamed the Citizen's Advisory Commission on Environmental Quality.

As the barons of big business joined the chorus, the mass media supplied the counterpoint. It was "an easy task," notes *Ramparts* in its study of *The Eco-Establishment*, "for men who have their hands in the direction of C.B.S., National Educational Television, Time-Life-Fortune, the *Christian Science Monitor*, the *New York Times* and Cowles publications, as well as many of the trade journals and conservation magazines.

In a moment of disarming frankness, *Fortune* magazine pointed out that "the elite of business leadership strongly desire the federal government to step in, set the standards, regulate all activities pertaining to the environment, and help finance the job with tax incentives." As he had done in the past, trusty old Joseph Fisher of Resources for the Future set down the programme in more useful detail: "There will have to be a will to provide funds to train the specialists, do the research and experimentation, build the laws through which more rapid progress (in pollution control) can be made, and of course, build the facilities and equipment."

In other words, "the elite of business leadership" will supply the funds for lobbying and promote the eco-freaks while the taxpayer foots the bill for environment control—which is *people control*.\* For those in on the game, the profits would be enormous. In the decade after E.P.A.'s "standards" take full effect, beginning in 1976, anti-pollution equipment for automobiles alone will siphon off *ninety-five billion dollars* from the pockets of American consumers. That stunning figure easily exceeds the total annual output of goods and services in Canada, and outstrips Mexico's output by three times. Furthermore, the clean air gadgetry will cost about \$63 billion *more than it will save* in terms of pollution damages. Yes, the Establishment *Insiders* had a good thing going.

In the next stage of the ecology craze the much-touted "grass-roots activism" began to appear. Senator Gaylord Nelson and Representative Paul McCloskey drummed up support for their National Teach-In on the environment during the spring of 1970, taking to Washington leading campus radicals from throughout the country. The funding for the National Teach-In came from the Rockefellers' Conservation Foundation, the Ford-backed Audubon Society, and the tax-free American Conservation Association. James Ridgeway

\*Italics added—Ed. T.S.C. 'Controls' mediated by 'laws' operate on persons, not on physical facts. The more 'law', the tighter the control, leading ultimately to total control.

observes in *The Politics Of Ecology* that "the top staff was imported from the Kennedy Institute at Harvard and paid for by foundations." Labelling the Teach-In a "planned event," Ridgeway says that "the big business conservationists didn't buy off the movement; they built it."

Those who doubt Mr. Ridgeway's assertion can check the statistics in *Advertising Age*, which reported shortly afterward that the biggest advertisers supporting the Teach-In's Earth Day (which was celebrated on Lenin's hundredth birthday, April 22, 1970) were Proctor and Gamble, General Electric, B.F. Goodrich, Du Pont, Standard Oil of New Jersey (Exxon), International Paper, Phillips Petroleum, Coca-Cola, Chevron Oil, General Motors, and Atlantic Richfield—a list which includes most of the accused polluters!

Ridgeway's argument, which makes good sense and certainly merits broader exposure than it has thus far received, is that "the ecologists, ideologues for the ecology crusade, ironically function as a cover for the energy game. They talk in radical terms about reorganizing society, about population control, but they merely serve to distract attention from the central issue." By the "central issue" Ridgeway means the near-total control of America's fuel supply by a few major corporations. The corporations gladly pour money into the most radical causes, like David Brower's Friends of the Earth, to expand the power of government through the ruling "Liberal" Establishment even as they manipulate the kooks for their own advantage. And the strategy works, just as it worked for J. P. Morgan when he underwrote the radicalism of the fledgling *New Republic*.

Now you can see why Mr. Brower's powerful backers sat by while the Friends of the Earth published *The Environmental Handbook*. Drenched with anti-capitalist propaganda, the *Handbook* was supposed to become "the Bible of the new movement"; what it really did was to present an extreme alternative to what the *Insiders* of the Establishment were advocating, making the *Insiders'* game plan seem by comparison eminently reasonable and just. This, of course, is the use to which the Establishment has long put the Far Left.

Laurance Rockefeller's man Russell Train, who now runs the Environmental Protection Agency, has admitted as much with regard to David Brower and the radicals of the Friends of the Earth. *Environmental Quality* for April of 1973, quotes Train as having exclaimed, "Thank God for Dave Brower. He makes it so easy for the rest of us to be reasonable. *Somebody has to be a little extreme*. Dave is a little hairy at times, but you do need somebody riding out there in front." In short: Radical David Brower and his frenetic collaborators, with all their ranting and incredible claims in court, are being financed by the Establishment to make total state control over our living space sound "reasonable."

You will hear more from Brower and the Friends of the Earth. Although the group was reported to have slipped \$250,000 into debt by January 1972, the usual financial angels bailed it out of trouble. With backers like Atlantic Richfield's Robert O. Anderson, who shunted \$200,000 into the organization to get it started, Friends of the Earth isn't about to go under. Mr. Brower's advisory council is a regular Who's Who of the Left: Norman Cousins sits on it, along with Paul Ehrlich (author of *The Population Bomb*), super-radical Barry Commoner, Harriet van Horne, Mrs. Merlie Evers, George Wald, Communist folksinger Pete Seeger, and professional degenerate Arlo Guthrie.

Friends of the Earth is not unaware of the energy shortages

that its high-powered lobbying and litigation have fostered. Its battle against construction of badly needed atomic power plants is notorious. To block the Alaska pipeline it called in swarms of radical attorneys from Arthur Goldberg's Centre for Law and Social Policy, established in 1968 as a breeder for ecomaniac lawyers. The Centre has received lavish grants from the Ford Foundation, the pro-Communist Stern Fund, the Meyer Fund, and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, of which Laurance Rockefeller is chairman. Isn't it peculiar that the Rockefellers turn up in all of these schemes to limit the nation's energy supply—schemes which will inevitably lead to higher fuel prices and fatter profits for Standard Oil (Exxon)?

The consumer is caught between two mighty pincers. Above are the regulators of the federal government, constantly seeking more authority over the quality of our lives, and on the street below is the environmental lobby, financed by the great foundations and the Establishment *Insiders* of the giant corporations. Already the vice is being tightened. Under a court order obtained by environmentalists on the West Coast last November, for example, the Environmental Protection Agency has been "obliged" to draw up plans for stringent gasoline rationing in the Los Angeles Basin. When E.P.A. unveiled the scheme, even Senator John V. Tunney, the playboy "Liberal", branded it as "nonsensical" and "impossible to enforce without a bayonet at the back of every motorist." And that was only a preview of coming attractions.

In January of 1973, the National Resources Defense Council, founded by Laurance Rockefeller at Princeton in 1970, haled E.P.A. Administrator William Ruckelshaus into court for granting a grace period to eighteen cities for putting together their own anti-pollution proposals under the Clean Air Act. Ruckelshaus saw that the cities could not possibly have plans ready without a grace period, and fearing massive public outrage he was prepared to offer a bureaucrat's mercy. But the militants wanted immediate action, and persuaded the federal Appeals Court for the District of Columbia to compel the E.P.A. to come up with its own plans for the eighteen metropolitan areas. On June fifteenth, in response to the court ruling, the E.P.A. proposed "transportation controls" for the eighteen cities "to reduce air pollution," as the *Washington Post* bluntly put it, "by forcing an end to reliance on the automobile."

Among the proposals were the poisonous mandatory catalytic converters for used cars that we mentioned earlier. Bad as this might be, some of the other proposals were enough to have brought a blush to the cheek of Big Brother himself. According to E.P.A.'s latest edict, *all sales of gasoline and all automobile traffic could be banned from Los Angeles by 1977*. If the federal government attempts to institute such incredible ordinances, it will destroy America's second largest urban area.

For northern New Jersey, the bureaucrats have somewhat "milder" guidelines: three cars in five may be forced off the road, and the amount of gasoline available in the area would be frozen at the 1972-1973 level. And developers of shopping centres would have to show that the cars attracted by new parking lots will not push pollution levels above E.P.A. standards, or the Great White Father in Washington won't give them permission to build.

San Francisco is slated to take the same drubbing from E.P.A. as northern New Jersey, although the Agency satrap there takes a more cheerful tack, suggesting that "parking

lots could be turned into parks if that's what people want." One wonders whether the "people" will ever be consulted.

In New York, where Mayor Lindsay has gone after polluters with the zeal of Mohammed driving out pigs, the City concocted a plan on its own that pacified E.P.A. It includes restrictions on taxicab cruising, an end to all on-street parking in Manhattan, and crippling regulations on daytime deliveries to stores, factories, and businesses. Mayor Lindsay, you see, wants to make it easier for New Yorkers to sleep at night by asking the truckers to wait for sundown before they start their deliveries.

Boston, under a recent plan, would be required to outlaw twenty percent of its auto traffic during the summer months, and to stiffen the requirements later if the limited ban doesn't prove sufficient to slake the lusts of the ecomaniacs. Concerned citizens quickly pointed out that the new regulations would ruin salesmen and others who require their cars to make a living, but the E.P.A. shrugged off these objections with promises to grant waivers by and by.

The criminal absurdity of such directives is far less frightening than the self-righteous arrogance with which Washington has issued them. Robert W. Fri, who served as Acting Administrator of E.P.A. after Mr. Ruckelshaus stepped down, has admitted with a sheepish smile, "I'm not sure these are the results that Congress intended." Which is bureaucratic doubletalk for: "I know perfectly well that Congress never intended to shackle the American people like this, but they were foolish enough to give us the power, so we're going to enjoy it." Regional Administrator John A. S. McGlennon was more candid when he told the Boston City Council that the federal government would institute its crippling controls "regardless of whether the city approves." The city, of course, would have to pay the armies of police necessary to enforce the complicated driving restrictions. The mind boggles at the titanic burden that the Environmental Protection Agency is planning to load onto state and local budgets around the country without so much as a by-your-leave to the harassed taxpayer.

Nonetheless, the ancient cry of *Deus le vult*, which launched the Crusades, is once more crackling through the air. And the white knights of E.P.A. are convinced that they hold a high commission from God Almighty to bludgeon American civil liberties in the name of mountain-fresh air. Their squires have already written forty-four pages of clean-air dictates—all with the force of law—on the basis of some vague "mandate" from a "higher power" than the people. An E.P.A. spokesman in Boston, for instance, recently declared that "there is no questioning the standards or that we have to meet the standards," much as if these wild fiats of bureaucracy stood with the force of Holy Writ.

There is a higher mandate, however, and that is the ancient constitutional principle, deeply rooted in English and American law, that the state shall not limit the citizen's freedom of movement. Yet, if the E.P.A. bureaucrats have their way, American citizens in good standing will be unable to convey themselves freely to their place of employment even as Communists (thanks to the Supreme Court) travel freely abroad on American passports.

In *American Jurisprudence*, that plodding but authoritative encyclopedia of the law, we read that "the right of a citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, by horse-drawn carriage, wagon, or automobile, is not a mere privilege which may be permitted or

prohibited at will, but a common right which he has under his right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." (Second edition, Volume sixteen, Page 686.) To set bounds to that right the government may act only through due process of law—due process which the recent despotic rulings of the Environmental Protection Agency have thus far disregarded with impunity.

Will the courts uphold the basic freedom of Americans to travel in liberty within our own country? Past experience raises grave doubts. In what could turn out to be a momentous "sleeper" decision, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia ruled, and was sustained by a four to four vote of the Supreme Court in June, that the E.P.A. could not permit any "significant" deterioration in air quality even in regions where the air meets the strictest federal standards. That means the federal government may soon be prohibiting nearly all industrial and residential development in rural America. Given such an incredible precedent, it seems most unlikely that the courts will long defend a man's right to drive his own car on the roads of the United States of America.

Our only real recourse is to fill the halls and chambers of Congress with our complaints. The Clean Air Act must be repealed. If Congress wants to control pollution in the air, let Congress spell out the means to do it rather than turning the matter over to armies of faceless bureaucrats who make their own rules as they go along without recourse to the people. The present arrangement is delivering us into the hands of collectivists who would strangle suburban America for lack of transport, bringing to its knees the vast middle-class that is the backbone of Conservatism in the United States. As Professor G. W. Pierson recently warned: "A society without movement is like a man without breath; soon dead." Mobility is basic to every definition of freedom. Without it, no man is free. And it is our mobility which is now under attack by those who seek to control our every move. They *must* be stopped.

---

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

A binding has been made, in one volume, of issues of *The Social Crediter* (Australian Edition — almost identical to the English Edition) from May, 1970 to December, 1971, inclusive. A limited number will be available at £1 posted early in the New Year, but orders may be accepted now.

The September issue of *The Social Crediter*, containing the address "Douglas — The Man and the Vision" by J. W. D. Lee is still available at 18p. posted, with discounts for quantities as follows:

3 copies, 45p; 6 copies, 60p; 12 copies, £1; 30 copies, £2

Orders for the above should be placed with K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London E11 3NL. Book list free on request.

---

## Style of Type

Problems faced by our printers have made it necessary to change the type face used in *The Social Crediter*. This change should be a temporary one.

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

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

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

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

Offices—

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

IN AUSTRALIA—

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

## THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

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

## Contretemps

The following letter, published in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* in its issue of July 23, 1973, has come to the notice of the Social Credit Secretariat, and is republished here at the request of Miss C. M. Douglas.

Re the French translation of C. H. Douglas's Social Credit (Quebec Socreds Get the Word in French by Richard Clerous June 2) based upon an interview with Louis Tardivel, in which the names of both the under-signed were mentioned.

The proposal originally suggested to us, and agreed to, was for a series of translations of the works of C. H. Douglas of the standard of university texts, and it was insisted on our side that: "Publication must be by a respectable commercial publisher, or a group unconnected with any political movement or party . . ." (Extract from letter to Mr. Tardivel May 27, 1972).

This was agreed to by Mr. Tardivel, who replied (June 21): "Our publishing firm will be completely free from all political influence."

We have yet to receive his explanation of the public association of himself, and the book, with the Creditiste Party; and we have not seen the translation at any stage, but have received from a Canadian correspondent a long list of errors and mistranslations which suggest that it does not approach the standard required.

If this proves to be so, we are concerned that the quality of thought of the late C. H. Douglas shall not be judged by this translation; but even more, that the name of Douglas shall not be associated with any political party.

The aim of Social Credit, as a political philosophy, is the decentralization of power to individual people—*not* power over others, *not* participation in collective decision-making, but power over their own lives and their own choices. A political party, on the other hand, is a group of people seeking the concentration in their own hands of political power over others. A Social Credit Party is therefore a contradiction in terms. It would save a great deal of confusion in politics, and particularly in Canadian politics, if they were more clearly understood.

C. M. Douglas

C. G. Dobbs

## A Diamond-studded Watergate

By ROSE L. MARTIN

After eight weeks of suspense, revelations and contradictions, unrivalled by any mass-entertainment spectacular in our day, the first phase of the Watergate hearings has ended. Apparently, it was only a beginning, with more to come when the Congress returns to Washington.

Varied and confused as the public's reactions may be, there is one point on which almost everyone seems to agree. Namely, that there has never been anything like it before. Frankly speaking, however, this is not quite true, and to suppose so implies some misunderstanding of human nature past and present. While the Watergate affair may be politically unprecedented in the United States, viewed in the perspective of history it is not unique.

There is a parallel to Watergate more exact than most of us would care to believe. To find it, one must cross the Atlantic and go back nearly two centuries in time to an equally celebrated scandal which preceded by just a few years the fall of the monarchy in France. It was known as the Affair of the Diamond Necklace, and it involved the highest personages in the land, along with a prize assortment of bunglers, stumblers, opportunists, publicity seekers and more or less accomplished liars.

Conducted in a blaze of prominence by the French Parliament (*sans* TV), the case of the Diamond Necklace had definite features in common with Watergate—allowing, of course, for differences in time and place. It lasted nine months, during which the attention of all the civilized world was riveted upon it and the government of France was paralyzed. Irrespective of anyone's guilt or innocence, it wrecked the reputation of every individual touched by it, many of whom later died on the guillotine.

Fifty years and as many volumes were eventually needed to establish the facts of the case. In its day, however, it created a climate of cynicism and irreverence that led the French people to doubt the credibility of their rulers, thus indirectly promoting the cause of revolution. No matter how much the Queen of France protested she had known nothing about the affair, the sad fact was that few believed her. President Nixon, in denying he had any foreknowledge of Watergate or its cover-up, finds similar difficulty today in convincing his critics.

The scenario of the Diamond Necklace Affair, which had criminal aspects, was equally as fantastic as Watergate. It included charges that the Austrian-born Queen of France, Marie Antoinette, had conspired with the Grand Almoner of France, Cardinal Rohan, to defraud a jeweller of a costly diamond necklace. Besides impugning the veracity of the Queen herself, the affair brought into high relief both her alleged extravagance and the bankruptcy of the French Treasury. It destroyed the popularity of the royal family, notably that of the unfortunate queen.

One of the chief figures in the whole elaborate intrigue was a mischievous lady who lived by her wits and claimed descent from the ancient house of Valois. She called herself the Countess de Lamotte, and she had previously succeeded in extracting many thousand francs from Cardinal

Rohan on the strength of her supposed friendship with the Queen. Her activities included a forged correspondence from the Queen to the Cardinal, and a fraudulent meeting at night in the park of Versailles between the Cardinal, disguised as a soldier of the guard, and a young prostitute who bore a startling physical resemblance to the Queen. The interview was brief; but in fleeing the counterfeit "Queen" threw a rose to the Cardinal in token of her sentiments.

Thus, the Cardinal was duped into believing he was an object of the Queen's special favour, and was rendering a service in helping to procure the diamond necklace for her. Actually, the Queen, who loved jewels, had several times refused to buy that particular necklace because she considered it monstrously ugly. Moreover, she had a strong personal distaste for the Cardinal, instilled by her mother, Empress Maria Theresa of Austria.

The motives of the self-styled Countess de Lamotte were pecuniary and strictly self-serving. Likewise enmeshed in the scandal and consigned to the Bastille along with the Countess and the Cardinal was another protege of Rohan: a mysterious and flamboyant character known as Count Cagliostro. He was one of those strange combinations of occultist, alchemist, adventurer and secret revolutionary peculiar to eighteenth-century Europe.

Presumably an agent of Phillippe, Duke of Orleans — the French King's cousin who did so much to provoke the onset of the French Revolution in 1789 — Cagliostro is further presumed today to have been a double agent of Frederick the Great of Prussia. At all events, he was a master of the arts of entrapment, and is believed to have set in motion the whole sensational Diamond Necklace Affair. That Cagliostro was finally acquitted, despite the best efforts of the French Secret Service, is attributed to the fact that a leading and very vocal member of the French Parliament was his attorney.

Although France of the *ancien regime* might seem a very far cry from the twentieth-century United States, the situation of these two nations is not dissimilar. Before 1789, France was the leading country in Europe, the most advanced, the most affluent, the most envied, as the United States of America has been in the modern world. France's alliance with Austria, sealed by the marriage of Louis XVI to an Austrian princess, also made it the foremost military power on the Continent.

That alliance was an obstacle to the ambitions of King Frederick of Prussia, who connived ceaselessly through his agents to undermine it together with the stability of the French throne. For a short while at least, he proved to be the major beneficiary of the French Revolution, for which the Diamond Necklace Affair had helped set the stage.

Contrary to general belief, the French Revolution did *not* originate as a spontaneous movement of the populace; but was promoted by a complex of secret societies and foreign intrigue, in a permissive atmosphere fostered by liberal intellectuals of the so-called Enlightenment. Only a very small fraction of the French people desired and planned the Revolution, never the people as a whole who were taken by surprise.

It is well known that history tends to repeat itself, not verbatim perhaps, but with variations. Sometimes this occurs

by accident, and sometimes as the result of deliberate research and intent. In the introduction to a new book, *The Selling of America*, the writer of this article has already pointed out a number of striking similarities between happenings of recent years in America and those leading up to the French Revolution of 1789. The Affair of the Diamond Necklace is one more case in point, and should be recalled in connection with Watergate before the parallel becomes irreversible.

For despite its moments of comedy, spiced with gossip about highly placed officials, Watergate represents a genuine threat to the greatness and freedom of the United States. It raises doubt as to the integrity of the Government and casts a shadow over the office of the Presidency that words alone cannot dispel. And, unbelievable as it might seem, there are some in this country—not many, but not without power and urged by ambitious elements abroad!—who would take advantage of the decline in public confidence to merge our country into a federal World State, for which modern blueprints exist but whose idea dates from the French Revolution.

Detailed plans for such a World State are already on file in the United Nations. They include an international monetary system, an international tax system, an international parliament, an international police force to replace our armed services, and other novelties, all foreign to the U.S. Constitution. These things are to be accomplished with or without revolutionary violence. If carried out, they would reduce the mighty United States of America to the status of a captive giant on the very eve of the two hundredth anniversary of its Independence.

(Rose L. Martin, veteran newspaper woman and writer, is the author of two best-selling books, *Fabian Freeway* and *The Selling of America*. These can be obtained from K.R.P. Publications and Tidal Publications. *The Selling of America* can be ordered from Fidelis Publishers, Inc., Santa Monica, California, 90406)

### Correction, please!\*

ITEM: From an article in *National Review* magazine for September 14, 1973:

*Henry Kissinger is brilliant, learned, intellectually bold, and a virtuoso of the public media. His achievements as the President's National Security Assistant have been, and have been globally recognized as being, spectacular . . . We wish the new Secretary well.*

CORRECTION: *National Review* editor William F. Buckley is woefully out of step with responsible Conservatives in his maudlin admiration for Kissinger.

Dan Smoot, in his "Report" for May 26, 1969, discussed Kissinger's career to that date, pointing out that "he has worked for the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, has served as Research Secretary of the Council on Foreign Relations, and, for 10 years, was Nelson Rockefeller's chief foreign policy advisor. He was a special consultant to Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson. He became a full professor at Harvard in 1962, in the Centre for International Affairs.

"At a seminar of the International Association for Cultural Freedom, held at Princeton in December, 1968 (after Kissinger's appointment had been announced), Kissinger told

those present, 'The doors of the White House will always be open to your ideas.' Those present included representatives from Communist countries, American black-power advocates, known pro-communist leaders from foreign nations, and the usual assortment (at gatherings like this) of the most influential and dangerous of American Liberal-radicals: Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., McGeorge Bundy, George Ball. The seminar was financed by the Ford Foundation . . .

"Kissinger, a one-world socialist, urges arms control and eventual disarmament. Most people would like to live in a world where national war machines are not necessary; but any effort to make such a world by negotiating arms-control with communists (or any other totalitarians) is suicidal folly."

In January of 1972 the Conservative newsletter *Life Lines* reported: "In January 1969, Kissinger made his foreign policy views crystal clear in an issue of the CFR publication *Foreign Affairs*, wherein he advocated that South Vietnam form a coalition government with Communist Vietcong participation. In the months that followed he arranged for the Rand Corporation to draw up a study for the purpose of outlining plans to restore political, economic and cultural relations with Cuba. He then played a major role in inducing the National Council of Churches to call for dropping the U.S. quarantine of Cuba and re-establishing diplomatic relations with Fidel Castro. Kissinger even went so far as to order a feasibility study to be drawn up to see how the anti-Communist government of Brazil might be overthrown!"

On September 4, 1973, Mr. M. Stanton Evans, the distinguished Conservative editor, author, and commentator, also criticized Kissinger's performance. Evans noted that Kissinger claimed the truce in Vietnam was "a workable compact which would bring about a reduction of North Vietnamese forces in South Vietnam. Today that agreement lies in shambles as the Communists press their aggression all over Indochina and the flow of Hanoi's forces to the South continues, as Kissinger argued it would not." Regarding the rapprochement with Red China engineered by Kissinger, Mr. Evans observed: "On the negative side of the ledger there is a policy of studied negligence toward the question of Peking's heroin trade, a diplomatic freeze toward our allies on Taiwan and the ouster of Free China from the United Nations—another outcome directly contrary to Kissinger's assurances." And, Evans warned, "even more important to the question of American security, Kissinger was the godfather of the SALT agreements which embrace and institutionalize the peculiar theories of the disarmament lobby. Mr. Nixon was supposedly going to dislodge, explicitly disowning the idea of defending America's civilian population from enemy attack."

Conservative political scientist Henry Paolucci wrote a monograph in 1972 called *Who is Kissinger?* that ought to be in the library of every Kissinger watcher. Professor Paolucci included this observation: "The record of the Kissinger-Nixon years is now plain enough for all to read. Abroad, the world communist leaders have piled one spectacular victory upon another, while our former allies are abandoned to a destiny which leaves them ashen-eyed. At home, the Democratic liberal internationalists, relieved of direct responsibility for American policy, are literally jumping for joy over the 'miracle' that their Harvard colleague has single-handedly wrought for them, while the old conservatives labor in vain to conceal their obvious nakedness from the sight of their fellow Americans." That the emperor Buckley is among the naked is now obvious to the merest child!

\*From *The Review of The News*, September 19, 1972. *The Review Of The News* is published weekly from Belmont, Massachusetts, U.S.A. 02178.

Dr. Kissinger made special preparations for his appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which has been considering his nomination as Secretary of State. Naturally, he spent time with numerous American Ambassadors and State Department personnel. But he also sought the counsel of top Establishment *Insiders*. The *New York Times* for August 31, 1973, carried an illuminating report from which we quote:

"In addition to Mr. [George W.] Ball, Mr. Kissinger has arranged interviews with the following establishment figures, from both political parties:

"Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, an Under Secretary of State in the Johnson Administration, and now an executive with International Business Machines; McGeorge Bundy, national security advisor to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson and now head of the Ford Foundation; William P. Bundy, former Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs, now editor of Foreign Affairs quarterly; John J. McCloy, former High Commissioner for Germany; Richard E. Neustadt of Harvard, a former official in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations.

"Also, David Rockefeller, chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank; Robert D. Murphy, a former diplomat and an executive of Corning Glass International; and Benjamin Read, executive secretary of the State Department during the tenure of Secretary Dean Rusk, and now head of the Marshall Plan Fund."

Every one of the gentlemen listed by the *Times* is an active member of the secretive, elitist, Council on Foreign Relations—as is Henry A. Kissinger himself. This comes as no surprise to careful students of American foreign policy. In fact, even syndicated columnist Bob Considine indicated what is going on in his column for November 28, 1972, where he observed: "We haven't had anybody on stage resembling Kissinger since Col. Ed House, who ran a lot of important errands overseas for Woodrow Wilson. But Wilson's faith in House was not nearly as constant as Nixon's in Kissinger." It was Colonel Edward M. House who played the key role in the founding of the Council on Foreign Relations immediately after World War I. And what House hoped to accomplish with the aid of the C.F.R. was, as he revealed in his book *Philip Dru: Administrator*, "Socialism as dreamed of by Karl Marx."

Creation of a One World dictatorship is to this day the goal of the C.F.R., although the tactics and terminology are now far more sophisticated than those of Marx. For example, in 1959 the C.F.R. prepared what it labelled *Study No. 7: Basic Aims of U.S. Foreign Policy*, in which the following appears: "The U.S. must strive to: A. BUILD A NEW INTERNATIONAL ORDER . . . including states labelling themselves as 'socialist.'" *Study No. 7* also urges that the United States "Maintain and gradually increase the authority of the U.N.", and "Make more effective use of the International Court of Justice, jurisdiction of which should be increased by withdrawal of reservations by member nations on matters judged to be domestic." The Study additionally called for secret negotiations with Communist Russia about a disarmament programme and about Germany, as well as opening up contacts with Red China. Kissinger has advanced all of these schemes.

Few knowledgeable authorities now doubt that the objective is a Communist-style dictatorship involving a Great Merger of the United States of America and the Soviet Union. In his best-selling book *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, Gary Allen points out that Communist Russia "was almost literally manufactured by the U.S.A.", being maintained by the constant technological help this country has pumped into the U.S.S.R.

even as our ruling "Liberals" have for the last half-century pretended they consider Communism our enemy. Thus, notes Allen, "For fifty years the Federal Reserve-CFR-Rockefeller-Insider crowd has advocated policies aimed at increasing the power of their satellite, the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, America spends \$75 billion a year on defense to protect itself from the enemy the *Insiders* are building up. What has been true in the past is even more valid today. The leader in promoting the transfer of technology and increasing aid and trade with the Communists is the Council on Foreign Relations." It's all part of the plan to "build a new international order."

But one does not have to take the word of Conservatives on this subject. Dr. Carroll Quigley, a "Liberal" history professor at Georgetown University, is one who has long admired the plans outlined above. In 1966 he wrote a long book, entitled *Tragedy and Hope*, to defend the conspiracy about which we are concerned. On Page 950 he declared: "There does exist, and has existed for a generation, an international Anglophile network which operates, to some extent, in the way the radical Right believes the Communists act. In fact, this network, which we may identify as the Round Table Groups, has no aversion to cooperating with the Communists, or any other group, and frequently does so." Quigley spends the next several pages elaborating on the fact that the New York arm of this operation is "known as the Council on Foreign Relations, and was a front for J.P. Morgan and Co. in association with the very small American Round Table Group."

Professor Cleon Skousen is correct when he states in his book *The Naked Capitalist*: "It may seem somewhat contradictory that the very people whom Marx identified as the epitome of 'Capitalism' should be conspiring with the followers of Marx to overthrow traditional Capitalism and replace it with Socialism. But the record supports the Quigley contention that this is precisely what has been happening." And, as we have demonstrated, Henry Kissinger has long been an important figure in this conspiracy.

Why then does the editor of *National Review* praise Kissinger and wish him well? For an answer, let us go back to Professor Paolucci's monograph, where he points out that as far back as December 17, 1968, William F. Buckley Jr. described Kissinger as "a realist, a patriot", and expressed his confidence that Kissinger will "render great service". Paolucci concludes: "Kissinger knows that there is a powder-keg of latent popular resentment in this country, which may suddenly blow up, sending him and his anti-nationalist colleagues to a much merited hell . . . Having conned the editors of *National Review*, he must count on their intellectual vanity, at least, to hold back the wrath of the American right-wing." Is that really what Mr. Buckley is doing? If it is, and he persists, it may well cost him whatever respectability he has managed to retain in Conservative circles. — W. E. D.

## THE SELLING OF AMERICA

By ROSE L. MARTIN

£2.25 posted

K.R.P. Publications Ltd.

245 Cann Hall Road, London E11 3NL