

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 54 No. 5

AUGUST, 1974

15p. MONTHLY

The Unelected*

A CONSPIRACY BEHIND THE SCENES

By SUSAN L. M. HUCK

The vast majority of Americans go about their productive business increasingly burdened and bedevilled by what is termed "social change." We are supposed to believe that these difficulties—written into legislation by the Congress and escalated by the bureaucracy—are natural and normal, necessary or desirable, and in any case inevitable. When the Socialist trend becomes as obvious as it is you are supposed to believe that your Congressmen are delivering what the people want and that Socialism is inevitable.

You are not supposed to believe that the pattern of social change is planned and fostered. It is assumed that you will not read books like *The Active Society*, published in 1968, by high-powered sociologist Amitai Etzioni. From such books you would get a very good idea of how revolutionary social change is actually engineered. Etzioni's specialty is what the Conspiracy calls "societal change." A graduate of Hebrew university, he did graduate work at Berkeley. Later at Columbia University as a faculty member he was up to his ears in the intrigues accompanying the violence there in 1968. When the chairman of the sociology department was forced out, guess who stepped into his shoes? Small wonder that Professor Etzioni's book is dedicated to the activist students of Columbia and Berkeley.

But it is not Amitai Etzioni in whom we are interested here. Rather it is what he represents as an engineer for the Conspiracy. This 1974 *Scoreboard* has, after all, been devoted thus far to a hard look at our *elected* representatives and the power they wield. Now it is time, before proceeding at last to our concluding foreign analysis, to remind ourselves of how completely the power game in our own country is really controlled by *unelected* conspirators behind the scenes. Now we enter, for a few pages, the shadow world for which there can be no photographic illustrations. Now it is time to talk briefly about the nature of power by which the Conspiracy manipulates the people who select the Congress. And for this purpose we have chosen as our guide to how it is done a top technician in the field of conspiracy, the aforementioned Amitai Etzioni, chairman of the department of sociology at Columbia.

Professor Etzioni's specialty is nothing less than manipulation of the entire human race. When he speaks as a socialist and internationalist of controlling society, he is speaking of nothing less than controlling the people of the entire world. Unfortunately, such priesthoods as that to which he belongs have always felt the need to use a language which can only be understood by the initiated. If the masses could understand what they were saying to each other the magic would

be gone and they would be run out of town. Thus, writing an entire book about how to cause constant turmoil and "permanent revolution," Professor Etzioni wants to ensure that the average person can't read it. Which is why he invents his own language and then provides a *very* incomplete private dictionary at the back of the book.

His title, *The Active Society*, is easily enough explained. The "active society" which he wants, says Etzioni, is one constantly agitated by "social movements." The "movements" are never discussed in terms of their objectives, because the objectives are selected for them by conspirators at the top. In many cases, they don't matter—the supposed goals are nonsense. The real purpose is the process of what Etzioni calls "mobilization."

Thus we have, for instance, marching in lock-step over the bewildered Silenced Majority, such mobilizers as Women's Lib, Gay Lib, Kiddie Lib, and Grey Lib. The first two are well underway, and the last two, well, we'll be hearing more of them. You have no doubt noticed how these "movements" seem to have turned on and off like a faucet? You're right, they are. "Mobilization is viewed as a drive which is . . . deliberately initiated, directed, and terminated." Etzioni adds, "The societal change involved . . . is intended."

One can imagine the Establishment giggles and guffaws when feedback through the newspapers and television tells them how their "movements" are doing. During the recent uproar caused by Gay Lib demands in New York, some of the goals involved forcing department stores to allow transvestites to try on clothes like anybody else (see those hairy legs in the next booth, girls?), or to make it official that "sexual orientation" shall not be grounds for keeping the freaks out of any sort of job, no matter how many customers they repel, or how many children they may, ah, influence.

All of this goes so against the grain that the entire proposition ought to have been laughed into oblivion. But it was a cliff-hanger in the New York City Council. The vote was twenty-one to nineteen to reject the Gay Lib law, yet no matter what you may think of New York, there are millions of "straights," and only perhaps fifty thousand homosexuals and others whose sexual orientations are not generally appreciated. Where did they get all that clout?

That's what "movements" are all about, says our guide. Small numbers are to be offset by money, organization,

*From the annual *Scoreboard* Edition of *American Opinion*, July-August, 1974.

leadership, favorable publicity, and full-time effort. In theory, these factors can be assembled by any group trying to make a point. But, in fact, "movements" which might deprive the "Liberal" Establishment of its own goals don't have much chance. Have you ever seen Establishment moneybags handing over big donations to a group fighting forced bussing? Not likely!

But let us return to the fact that, whatever the goals, "movements" represent "mobilization," and *that* represents collectivization. Etzioni explains:

The transformation that mobilization entails is collectivization—not necessarily of ownership, but of effective control. The assets themselves may remain in their original locations and need not necessarily be directly transferred to or used by the controlling elite or organizations. It is, rather, the capacity to control the use of the assets . . . that is increased. To the degree that corporations can be instructed to follow government-set "guidelines," a gain in the national level of mobilization is achieved.

This is, of course, fascism. Mobilization is the method, collectivization is the goal, and never mind the intermediate eyewash about "integration" or "gay rights" or the rest of it.

As has been pointed out before by Dr. Medford Evans and others, for instance, the goal of forced bussing is not really integration. It is the establishment of the "right" of the government to haul away your child against your wishes. Your child is being collectivized, just like your property. In both cases, you are left with the responsibility and expense, the headaches and the heartaches, the taxes, the insurance, the bills, while control is transferred from you to the "controlling elite." It's planned that way by Establishment theoreticians like Amitai Etzioni, chairman of the department of sociology at Columbia.

When Kiddie Lib gets properly cranked up, we will see a handful of children and "child advocates," as the adult operatives of the "movement" call themselves, create a completely phony demand that children be "liberated" from their parents. "Liberated," that is, into the bear-hug of Big Brother. This demand will in turn be heard by the Congress and legislated into new fetters for the people, new programs on which to spend even more billions in inflationary deficit dollars.

When it comes to liberating more of your money into the control of the elite, Professor Etzioni (since he is talking to them, not you) can lay it on the line:

More indirectly, by issuing large sums of money (i.e., by generating inflation), a state can gain control of the assets of [those] whose assets are in the form of savings and whose incomes are fairly fixed without orders being issued or requests being made.

Did we have a fifteen percent inflation last year? (It felt like more.) Whatever it was, it was in effect a raise in taxes, fifteen percent or whatever—with never a law passed, never a new regulation, no "guidance" except in the *highest* circles of the financial elite. It's all quite deliberate. The middle class, the working poor, pensioners, people dependent upon their savings—they are the ones cleaned out. They represent far larger numbers of people than do those involved in the tedious procession of "movements," but there is no leadership for them, no organizations, no sympathetic

TV "documentaries," no aggressive attorneys filing "class-action suits" on their behalf. The reason is obvious. They are the *victims*.

One of the interesting points Professor Etzioni brings out is how *few* people are even involved in the Establishment *Insiders'* movements. The elite he likens to a cybernetic control device. It is small and weak, but it gives orders to large and powerful units. By causing inflation, our financial elite makes you work harder and receive less, while more of what you earn is siphoned away to be used against you.

As for these "movements," there is only the clever illusion of "mass" about them.* To Etzioni, Columbia and Berkeley were beautiful, in precisely the sense that Comrade Herbert Aptheker said Watts was beautiful. Etzioni dedicates his book to the "active ones," many of them students of his who had learned his lessons well, and who behaved so appallingly at those institutions. Yet he tells you how extraordinarily few people created the mess. On the most radicalized campus, the top figure would be four percent of the student body! This means that, even at Berkeley, ninety-six percent stayed away. But, by giving the Free (Filthy) Speech Movement every encouragement, nationwide publicity, recognition *and* success, while suppressing both law enforcement and the natural reactions of the California taxpayers who were picking up the bills for every aspect of it, the illusion of a successful mass movement was created. Thus, says our guide:

Of the approximately 2,000 colleges and universities in the United States, the student bodies of only a few followed . . . Berkeley . . . another few engaged in smaller projects, a somewhat larger sub-set actively re-examined student-administration relations.

And so on. The picture is one of "gradual and uneven mobilization," which is one of the problems Etzioni is working on, as he says: "It follows from the above discussion that we expect mobilization to be an elitist process." (Italics his.)

Probably you hadn't thought of Mario Savio and Mark Rudd (remember them?) as any kind of an elite. Those conspirators operating the system of pressure-from-above, pressure-from-below, are of course "above" and might not care to have the rabble-rousers placed in the same elite classification. According to Etzioni, both Grayson Kirk, head of Columbia University (and once head of the Council on Foreign Relations), and Mark Rudd, who did so much to wreck Kirk's office, are of the elite.

Between the two of them, though, higher education in the United States was dealt a staggering blow—and *that* was the idea!

The pattern was brazenly similar at Berkeley, at Cornell, at Harvard, and a dozen more. Each of these institutions was (and remains) under the complete control of "Liberals," members of the C.F.R., people who supply the Etzionis of Academia with everything they need. As they were "attacked" by these "movements," they were careful to protect the radicals from taxpayers, alumni, other students, law

*Etzioni says that 10,000 men converted Palestine to Israel, that 80,000 brought about the French Revolution, that 35,000 hardcore Vietcong were "transforming" fourteen million South Vietnamese before Hanoi poured in troops to lend a hand in 1964. How many did it take to enslave Russia, China, Cuba? How many would it take to free them?

enforcement, flunking grades, everything. The elitist C.F.R. members in charge of the media gave the "movements" maximum publicity, all very sympathetic, playing them up as fine, noble, dedicated, sensitive youths, brilliant, the cream of their generation. And all the while they were mouthing the sort of language which drill sergeants are no longer permitted to employ (or, in some cases, were never permitted to employ)!

Much of their behavior was not only aggressive but patently regressive—some of them were regressed clear back to the feces-smearing stage—but this was never mentioned in public. In private, Professor Etzioni reveals that this, too, is just one of the techniques. As in "sensitivity training" (particularly of the Esalen brand), the theory seems to be that you regress the person being manipulated, and then he, she, or it get transformed into a beautiful butterfly or something. People who use this technique know there's a danger that the victim will stay regressed.* As a matter of fact, Professor Etzioni is irked no end by the wastage of activists who, having discovered drugs, promiscuous sex, the joys of arson, vandalism, shoplifting, and other good things in "the movement," decide to forget about the political end of it and just concentrate on the fun part.

Not just people, but societies too, can and should be regressed, he says, in preparation for a "transformation" which may just misfire. One of the techniques for at least trying to regress a whole society is for the Establishment to encourage non-productive activities and emphasize the collective (*nothing* individual) contemplation of navels, or the thinking of allegedly beautiful thoughts (a virtue they have no difficulty in attributing to the most foul-mouthed and foul-minded of their *apparatchiks*).

To mobilize, you see, is to collectivize. "Mobilization makes the societal unit as a whole *less private, more public, and hence more politically intensive.*" (Italics his.) "The level of political intensity refers to the ratio of societal activities which are politically controlled to those which are not."

We see this in action in Communist societies where the ruling elite tries to monopolize every waking hour of every citizen. When people are not working, the elite wants them to be attending lectures in Marxism-Leninism, watching propaganda films or TV shows, *etc.* Barring that, they can be kept out of mischief by having to stand in line for hours in order to buy anything, by having to wait their turn at the collective kitchen and bathroom, and on and on. Since all the waiting time is the result of shortages imposed by the heavy hand of the Communist Party, waiting in line is also a "politically controlled" activity.†

Trying to illuminate his notions on "the relations between personal and societal activation," our Establishment people-engineer stumbles into a light moment. If you ask "workers" whether they want more in the way of "material goods," they say yes. This is a most discouraging fact for the social-guidance group, since they would prefer a different sort of

*Of course, to take the theory from whence it comes, Etzioni derived it from Marxist guru Herbert Marcuse and the Freudian radicals.

†As I wrote that I had Russia in mind, Russia is a holiday resort compared to Red China. No regime in the history of the world has ever "mobilized" for control of many people, so rigidly.

answer. Oh, how to get around it! He tells us how it is done:

When a person is asked about the desirability of material goods, the question captures one side of his ambivalence. If the same man were asked, for instance, if he favored the use of one-half of one percent of his tax money for raising the cultural niveau of his country, he may well also assent (especially after some explanation of the issue and if no campaign is conducted by opposing interest groups).

That emphasis below is mine. What Etzioni is trying to say is that if you ask the average worker what he would do with twenty dollars more, he will likely choose to spend it on some goodie or other—much to the disgust of the social planners. "If the same man were asked" if he minds having twenty dollars lifted from him (since the poor fellow is probably paying four thousand dollars in taxes, twenty dollars is half of one percent) to raise "the cultural *niveau* of his country," he might go along—but only if Etzioni has a chance to work on him, and if there is no one to contradict such nonsense.

Personally, I love the choice of words: *raise* and *cultural* and *the country* are "good" words. A person might be inclined to uplift the anything of his country. But *niveau*? That would take some explaining, although it's a dandy way to put on airs (I know how to say "level" in French and you don't, clod, so gimme your twenty dollars).

Others of the Conspiracy's theorists, less sanguine than Etzioni as to the outcome, would just go ahead and impose the tax bite. If the worker knew that raising the cultural *niveau* meant being taxed to pay some wise guy thousands of dollars to scribble a poem consisting of the one word "Lighth" (which really happened), said worker might become sufficiently "activated" to leave Dr. Etzioni lying on the pavement, much the worse for wear. One can savor the thought!

The professor says ". . . the struggle that is most significant . . . occurs between the mobilizers and the unmobilized." Does he mean between mobilizers (collectivizers) and the unmobilized members of the group they are trying to use, or between them and the *other* groups they are trying to clobber, which they would therefore like to see remain unmobilized for a while longer? It's hard to tell, but I believe he means the first. Etzioni does recognize the difficulty if *all* groups are completely mobilized, but he relieves the difficulty by observing that this heartwarming state is never reached. Besides, it's not really the objective. His purpose is not to achieve something and then relax. The objective of the Conspiracy is *continual* agitation, "movements," struggles, "transformations" aimed at ever-changing goals, because it is the *process* of social manipulation which these people consider to be such fun. Goals, shmoals! Ever watch a sheep-dog in action? He likes his work, too.

It reminds me of another difference between Russia and Red China. The leaders of the Soviet Communist Party always prod their flocks onward *toward* Communism. According to the official line, the Soviet Union is not a Communist State, but is merely "on the road to socialism," with the destination, Communism, still out there where the sun rises or whatever. More than fifty years along this *very* road, they have not yet "achieved Communism." Is this a failure of leadership?

Hold on a minute. A Chinese friend told me that the worst mistake Mao Tse-tung ever made was to announce, in the wake of the incredible misery and turmoil resulting from the imposition of communes and the Great Flop Forward, that China had achieved Communism. The entire nation was aghast! This *mess* is Communism?!

Now you understand why the Soviet leadership is quite content to remain short of the alleged goal indefinitely. The people can be flogged down the rocky path and berated for their lack of enthusiasm, while their self-appointed Communist Party (a controlling elite) will never have to deliver on that dream world it keeps promising. It can't deliver, and never intended to. The Party's dream world is doing what it is doing now.

The Communist goal is (almost) complete mobilization. That is (surprise!) also Establishment theorist Etzioni's projected ideal situation:

The main questions for the transformation toward an active society [a society which is one continuing series of social "movements"] are whether or not societies can mobilize themselves and their member-collectivities [sub-groups] to high, crisis-like if not higher levels in non-crisis situations and whether or not they can generate power for internal self-transformations instead of [for] exerting their wills on other societies.

The "mobilization" which most Americans think they understand is wartime mobilization, which generally either is, or is alleged to be, for defensive purposes. That is, for survival. Of course an elite can disguise aggression in these terms, but it is rather unusual to have an elite deliberately *not* mobilize for a war. It was one of the many unusual things about the Vietnam War. Since it was not intended to be won, and since the disparity of military strength between the United States and North Vietnam was so enormous that, without rigid control, we might have won it in a thoughtless moment, so to speak, we can see why the only "mobilization," during the Vietnam War, was the mobilization of *opposition!*

The reason for the digression is to point up Etzioni's rhetorical question: Can societies generate power for internal self-transformation—mobilize for war against themselves? His answer is of course "yes." As an avatar of the wreckers of Columbia and Berkeley, and doubtless as an admirer of the mobilization against any successful American effort in Vietnam, he *knows* the answer is yes.

So long as the present elite is running the United States, we can look forward to more and more of our strength being mobilized against us. The employment of crisis as a pretext for doing one thing or another, usually radical, is a well-known tactic among both practitioners of politics and students of the subject. And why wait for a crisis, when it can be created—either actually or as an illusion. Etzioni recognizes the concept's peerless usefulness when he sets forth his next question: Can we be agitated to higher-than-crisis levels in non-crisis situations?

The obvious answer, which he does not give, is yes, *provided that those being mobilized do not know it is NOT a crisis situation.* The best example is the "ecology crisis," a whole "movement," with big green "E" banners and Earth Day (Lenin's birthday, probably a glorious "in" joke). Con-

vince the innocent that the world will end in (x) years* if we don't take unprecedented steps which simply amount to a Great Leap Forward in collectivization. The "ecology movement" pays dividends along the lines of regression, too. Anti-productivity is cited as specifically regressive, and according to the theory we must be regressed before we can be transformed. (Or converted into serfs on the goat-pasture, in the more likely event that the promised transformation slips a gear somewhere.)

The bias against productivity, in the classic sense, is evident in most of these Establishment-created movements, more openly so since the "flower children" period. Turning people off the notion of doing the sort of work which keeps the water running and the lights lit and food in the stores seems to go along with it all. Etzioni and others of the *Insiders'* engineers who like to wrap their thoughts in the magician's cape of "science" lose few opportunities to compare their con games to laws of thermodynamics and what-not. What about "the law of conservation of energy"? If the energy of the society is ever more thoroughly drawn into these phony mobilizations, won't it be at the cost of other activities? Certainly anyone can understand that the time and energy of our professional revolutionaries and their misled followers would normally have been spent doing something else. (And the rest of us could have done something more pleasant with the time we have had to spend resisting them.) But that is exactly the point.

Remember *Doctor Zhivago*? Remember the conditions depicted during and *after* the Bolshevik Revolution—years and years of total collapse? No bread, no fuel, no real money, no employment except what you are ordered to do, no freedom, no security. The energies of the people of Russia and other lands brought under Red control were either diverted into the cruelest activities, or paralyzed by disorganization, shortages, starvation, and terror. Thus the *Insiders'* current problem:

Can this level of [higher-than-crisis] mobilization be attained without generating so many counter-currents and so much alienation that the consensual base of society and the values related to it will be undermined as the realization of the values expressed in the goals is advanced?

In short, is a "permanent revolution," a continual and authentic [sic!] social-movement society, possible?

Not to keep you breathless any longer, Professor Etzioni thinks so, or he wouldn't have bothered to write this handbook for Establishment conspirators on how to do it. However, the rest of us may be relieved to learn that there are *very* many problems, the "state of the art" not yet being what *Insider* enthusiasts of "societal guidance" would like it to be, and there are an almost infinite number of points at which they can blow the game.

One of the toughest problems they face is changing the values of an entire society. The frontal-assault method preferred by the Communists (ideologically and militarily, when they have the bodies to squander) strikes our own social-planners as needlessly alienating, unsophisticated, lacking in style, and icky. (Blood is icky.) But subtler

*"You *have* to tell them the world will end in five years, or nothing gets done," Etzioni's assistant protested when we asked.

methods face the problem that if you aren't awfully careful the people will find out what you're doing to them, and could get icky, too. At least, it could queer the game, and you'd have to start over with another subterfuge. It is here that the whole scheme depends upon command of the high ground in mass media, government, and education.

With command of the media, government, and education, our elite is enabled to mount and maintain, with continual pressure, a variety of attacks on inconvenient popular beliefs, moral standards, and value systems. Patriotism is a perfect example. They have tried to reduce the natural feeling of love of country by hammering at us that it is crude, unsophisticated, unintelligent, outmoded, a disguise for all sorts of unpleasantness, primitive, and emotional.* It's a long, tough struggle, and in fact it may never succeed, because I believe that patriotism is always latent in normal people. It may be suppressed, but it can flare up quite without any hokey "movement," like a fire not quite extinguished. For controlling elites trying to phase out the United States in favor of a worldwide elite-and-masses type of society, patriotism is a source of nagging anxiety. It could catch them by surprise just when they think they have everything in the bag.

They sense this. Professor Etzioni doesn't talk about it, but concern about latent patriotism and a few other possible sources of uncontrollable visceral reaction are the real reasons behind the "gun-control" drive. Lest the thing blow up in their faces, they want to feel that they have all the weapons. You can be certain that, like their Communist counterparts, our elite would not hesitate to mow down (literally) any "movement" which threatened their dominance—if they could. Coercive power has been used in Little Rock, at Ole Miss, and against troublesome individuals. Through control of the media, these uses of coercion are praised. In contrast, we have spectacles like the March on the Pentagon, where troops were sent out to serve as "heavies" and as a scenic backdrop for a "movement" performance. They'd have been court-martialed if they had hurt anyone. The same thing can be said of the riots in Washington in 1968. There were police and troops everywhere, yet they were forbidden to do what they are trained to do. "Liberal" elitists like Ramsey Clark demanded a full report for every one of fifteen shots that were fired, while the capital was a burn for nearly a week!

Etzioni is quite interesting on the subject of power. He just says that society isn't going to be guided without the use of power, and gets into it, declaring that there are three types of power: persuasive, utilitarian, and coercive. The use of any kind of power engenders resentment; one of the great problems of social manipulation is to forestall, reduce, or render impotent the inevitable resentment.

"An application of power changes an actor's [*a person's*] situation or his concept of his situation." (Italics mine.) Illusions are very important in this game. Heavy applications of the elite's persuasive power, through the media, government, and education, are used to make Americans think that their values are no longer widely shared by other Americans, that they are "outmoded," that American society

is a blot upon humanity and must struggle humbly to reform and redeem itself in the eyes of the world, and on and on. None of these things are true; that is not our situation—but all the stops have been pulled in an effort to convince us that it is.

"Persuasive power . . . is exercised through the manipulation of symbols . . . in order to mobilize support and penalize those who deviate." Penalizing those who deviate, by means of "persuasive power," means (in a nutshell) smearing them. There are variants, one of which is the un-person treatment. The victim doesn't exist. An amusing example of this method can be drawn from the excesses of Soviet Communism. Remember Lavrenti Beria? Probably not, unless you were one of his victims. He was Stalin's last secret-police chief and he was both "liquidated" and converted into an un-person after Stalin left the stage. What to do about the spread on him in the Great Soviet Encyclopedia? Hmm!

The result was a perfectly exhaustive article on the explorer, Vitus Bering, to fill the yawning hole.

Personally, I have characterized the treatment as 1) Ignore, 2) Smear, and 3) Destroy. Step 1 probably eliminates ninety percent of your problems, since it is usually fatal to the development of opposition leadership. Should (1) fail, Step 2 may eliminate most of the remaining difficulty. Sometimes people like Governor Wallace require the full treatment.

The persuasive power of mass-media propaganda is now augmented by selectively aimed campaigns directed at groups chosen for mobilization. So-called "consciousness-raising" is nothing but a concentrated attempt to convince the target-population that it is abused and aggrieved. The amount of money available is indicated by the launching of the Women's-lib magazine *Ms.* Financing and distributing a new magazine on a national scale is not done without very heavy Establishment support.

Then there is what Etzioni calls in other volumes "normative power." This is the power which lies in what people believe to be right and proper. It too is available for exploitation by the Conspiracy, since respect for "the law" puts a lot of muscle behind that "right and proper" business.

Many years ago, Columbia's Professor Paul Lazarsfeld (now retired) wrote a paper pointing out that, since Americans were so law-abiding, the way to make them accept unpalatable revolutionary changes was to change the law (with as little fuss as possible) and then, besides requiring obedience to the change, you could appeal to "reverence for the law" and all that. There was nothing new in the concept, but it was specifically related to the sort of laws which bring us all this racial toil and trouble. You know, the unconstitutional dictates of the Supreme Court being the Law of the Land, and that sort of thing. A later example would be the attempt to sneak through the "Equal Rights" Amendment, under which we might wake up one morning to the news that women had been liberated into the infantry and relieved of discriminatory rest rooms, and you would have to go along because it's not only the law, but the Constitution!

These conspirators are not big, themselves, on reverence for law and Constitution, but when pressure-group legislation, backed by any five radicals on the Extreme Court, can turn both against the people, then it is very useful to prey upon such pieties. They do not propose to abide by our

*Etzioni's assistant told me, "In the intellectual community, you don't find people who are patriotic because they view themselves as world citizens." Or maybe it's because those who decide who gets called an intellectual simply consider patriotism disqualifying.

norms, but they expect—nay, demand—that we abide by theirs. If you have noticed a program debasing, destroying, and eliminating old values to make room for the new—you're right.

Then there is "utilitarian power." This is the power to make it literally worth your while to go along, or to make it hurt, in terms of income, property, job status, career, pension, *etc.*, NOT to go along. Fines, lawsuits, and costly legal harassment requiring you to fork over a lot of money to prove innocence are some examples related to the law. But the bureaucracy offers much scope for creativity along those lines. The Conspiracy forces its ways upon police officers, members of the Armed Forces, teachers, and many others by "requiring" self-criticism, sensitivity training, the teaching of blatant propaganda, permissiveness toward Establishment-approved, destructive, and criminal elements . . . on and on. Knowing that many such employees feel locked into their careers, our Establishment elite makes it very clear that promotion depends *not* upon how well you teach, police, put out fires, or run your ship or battalion, but on how well you conform to the "social changes" being forced upon you. If revolutionaries in the crew of an aircraft carrier run riot and engage in sabotage and mutiny, it is possible to have a Chief of Naval Operations like Admiral Zumwalt (terribly with-it, you know) who publicly tongue-lashes his lesser admirals for not finding out what the darlings wanted and giving it to them right away.

Books could be written about the carrot-and-stick methods used to "transform" the American educational system from a locally supported and controlled institution into a federally controlled system serving Big Government (which is itself subservient to the *Insiders* of the Establishment). Federal "aid," or whatever it's called, is nothing but your own money, removed forcibly through taxation, and used to bribe you into what they love to call "voluntary compliance." That's the carrot. The stick isn't far behind.

Finally, "coercive power" includes the ultimate sanction, death, and lesser unpleasantnesses such as various forms of imprisonment, forced labor, and torture. Unless coercive power is being employed by psychopaths (which happens often enough), it is a means, not an end, and a little of it goes a long way. Coercive power is "the offer you can't refuse," although you may still have a choice—you may choose to die. Etzioni points out, "It is a fact, though, that coercive controls are typically used to foreclose this option, too—to force the subjects to live in jail." (Jail is rather mild. The real McCoy is prison or a slave-labor camp.) Those who employ "coercive power" are generally infuriated should the victim choose to die on his own terms instead of theirs.

What Professor Etzioni really considers the ultimate is "thought reform." One of the flaws of normal "totalitarian persuasion," he says, is that "the members of such a society have a considerable residue of 'internal' and behavioral resistance." You see, says the Establishment's people-engineer:

In terms of personality theory, we need a better conceptualization of deep versus superficial acceptance. [Do you really really love Chairman Mao?] One indicator of this difference may be the readiness with which the acceptance "washes out" when the social pressure ceases; another may be the extent to which it is encompassing (e.g., is it operative in the private sectors?).

Also, we expect that studies using depth methods will find signs of latent rejection and suppressed resistance, even while persuasion seems to "work" on the manifest level.

We expect that our returned, surviving P.O.W.s who have sampled the People's Democracy could tell Etzioni and the Conspiracy a thing or two about that. Meanwhile, we are referred to a study of forty Chinese intellectuals who had undergone "thought reform." Even though all forty were unreformed enough to escape later on, investigator Robert Lifton concluded that "the great majority . . . are partially convinced" that their tormentors are right and they are wrong, and "a small minority undergo complete personality change." The Red Chinese thought-reform process takes place under conditions our P.O.W.s would recognize; it is a process which "harnesses the most powerful emotions in the total manipulation of the individual."

A reliable and effective method of "thought reform" still eludes those who want to serve at the top of the Conspiracy's societal guidance business. They still seek the techniques of 1984. You will remember that once the fellow-travelling English intellectual George Orwell recognized the totalitarian goal of Communism to be complete domination over the world, by whatever means necessary, he had the decency and integrity to turn upon them and try to warn us through books like *Nineteen-Eighty Four*.^{*} The book, you may recall, focuses upon a low-level bureaucrat whose job involves the constant rewriting of history to conform to the current Party Line—the sort of person who, in Russia in 1953, was detailed to replace the Lavrenti Beria article with one on Vitus Bering. When the fellow's thoughts begin slipping their bonds, it comes to the attention of the "compliance structure." Its goal is not simply to make the errant fellow shut up and behave. The goal is to make him *love* Big Brother, "using depth methods . . . to find latent rejection and suppressed resistance."

The goal of the societal-guidance people roosting in American academic circles is no different from the goal of the men in the Kremlin. It is *control of everybody and everything*. Megalomania? Sure! Extraordinarily difficult to achieve? Indeed!

These "intellectuals" who are trying to optimize the compliance structure are technicians, still tinkering with the machinery to be used by their protectors and employers, the *Insiders* of the present World Establishment. Whatever their protestations about rejection of repression, the fact is that they know very well what compliance structures are for. They also know all about these phony "movements" which, in their own words, are nothing but mobilization for collectivization. Sorry, but we recognize the mentality. The nature of the game is that of a boot stamping forever on the human face.

^{*}Orwell's papers, collected in three volumes, provide much insight into a remarkable man, and also tell us a not unexpected tale of how rejection of Communism, active resistance to Communism, cost him dearly. Orwell had a difficult time ever after in the field of journalism, and it took years for him to find a publisher for his anti-Communist books.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., 245 CANN HALL ROAD
LONDON E11 3NL FOR BOOKS ON SOCIAL CREDIT
AND THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL-COMMUNIST
CONSPIRACY. FREE BOOK LIST ON REQUEST.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

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

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free: One year £2.60. Six months £1.30, Airmail one year £3.50.

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

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

IN AUSTRALIA—
Business: Box 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, 2 Park Village East, London, NW1 7PX. 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.

Perspective

Very many of us, no doubt, when we first became Social Crediters, envisaged the rapid translation of the world to a condition of uniform and comfortable prosperity. We are wiser now. The world will never be like that. Social Credit means that the world, for any man, may be what he makes it for himself. Social Credit is designed only to bring about the *conditions* of freedom; for only the man himself can *be* free.

From this point of view it can be seen that Social Crediters have Social Credit now. What, then, more do we seek?

We recognise in the world an attempt to enslave men without their knowledge; we seek to expose that attempt, that those with the will-to-freedom may attain to freedom.

There is a lesson for all of us in a letter from T. S. Mann to the *Catholic Herald*. He is discussing the philosophical or theological grounds for the objection to atom-bombing. On one matter he quotes Abbot Vonier: "We live with men who are tossed about by every wind of doctrine in the things of the spirit . . . they consider that God who has made them what they are will make it all right . . . they have lost the old Christian idea of the importance of the moral state of the soul. The life of every human being, the disadvantages of birth, of mind, of body, are not made good by any extra-providence. The simple expectation of any gratuitous action of God that would come in and mend matters when needed, is not moral perfection . . . is not a defensible attitude." Discounting some arguments against the atom bomb, based, as he remarks, on time and number factors, T. S. Mann says: "We have sufficient warrant for knowing that death might come in the night like a thief, in whatever shape . . ."; and he finishes his letter: "We do know that were Russia to march and to conquer, then every attempt would be made to pervert the minds of Christian people; to destroy in our souls every vestige of our Catholic Faith. What I, personally, am not convinced of is that it matters very much whether I end my days comfortably in a bed or as a radio-active cinder."

—*The Australian Social Crediter*, Nov. 6, 1948.

Mr. Oestreicher's East

The *Catholic Herald* (June 14, 1974) displays a picture of the bearded Paul Oestreicher beside a bewildered looking elderly prelate, Dr. Ramsey, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and devotes an article called "Christians in the East" to an interview with Mr. Oestreicher conducted by Peter Nolan. As Secretary of the British Council of Churches East-West Relations Committee and as the companion of the Archbishop, Mr. Oestreicher's views of the East doubtless carry considerable weight in the counsels of affiliated churches.

In his view, "Anti-communism is just as dangerous as Communism itself." And in communist countries he said that a decent minimum standard had been achieved for all, without the "pockets of poverty" visible in all Western countries. He added that the B.C.C. arranges "scholarships for Communist students to study in the West, financed through the World Council of Churches." His own approach was to "encourage Communists to live up to their high ideals."

Yet Mr. Oestreicher who is "well-known for his public opposition to Apartheid and championing of other civil rights issues" has nothing to say to Mr. Nolan about the treatment of minorities like Baptists or Jews nor does he appear unhappy about communist "ideals" or "education." By anti-communism he said he meant "Western self-righteousness."

An entirely different East appears from the writings of Pastor Wurmbrand and Alexander Solzhenitsyn who have *lived inside* the system, and in their view a "good communist" would be ready to betray or torture without scruple for the sake of the Party.

Mr. Solzhenitsyn, in his first major television interview since his expulsion from Russia, revealed that all royalties from *Gulag* and his television fee were being placed into a new Russian Social Fund. "The money is to be used for helping the families of political prisoners behind the iron curtain." (*Daily Telegraph*, June 25, 1974). These must be some of those who fail to receive the "decent minimum standard of living" which Mr. Oestreicher claims to have been "achieved for all."

Solzhenitsyn (according to the same report) also "voiced doubts" about the value of East-West *détente* and criticised the Western Press for their "lack of courage" in seeking the truth in Communist countries. Western public opinion, in his view, devoted too much attention to helping would-be emigrants from Russia "and too little to helping those who remained in Russia and tried to change the political system. Political repression in Russia was 'a danger to the whole world.'" And it sounds from the interview as if numerous Russians would like to change the system.

Détente on the theological plane is usually called dialogue, and such a dialogue was first held in Germany in October, 1964. The Italian delegate, Gruppi, said afterwards, "As Marxists, we are fighting for a socialist society. The Marxists can never achieve this aim single-handed. A Christian element, as well as others, must help." He said at Prague that the dialogue "allows us to find an audience", and the Soviet review *Voprosy Filosofii* commented two years later that dialogue is not an end in itself "but a way of spreading the Marxist-Leninist view of the world." (*Conflict*, June 1974).

During the Catholic conference at Nemi in 1971, the Jesuit de Rosa pointed out that communist parties use dia-

logue to expand their audience "and make the conquest of power easier". The journal reminds its readers that Marxism rests on the belief in philosophical materialism and that Marxism and Christianity are "like fire and water" a mixture of which "can only leave the one or the other unrecognisable." Communism it adds is not searching so much for believers as "for those who will further its ends."

Mr. Oestreicher, who arrived in this country from East Prussia in the thirties, uses his talents unconsciously to further such ends. His thesis that much of the social protest against Communism "came from the former middle classes in Communist countries who had lost their privileged position" takes no account of the millions and millions who have suffered in prison camps or been eliminated, for according to communism the privileged form a tiny class. Nor can one accept his idea that "the rising level of education"—often known as indoctrination—will of itself "lead to changes." Mr. Oestreicher in fact is hardly the man to stand at the elbow of a bewildered but influential prelate.—H.S.

Socialism

"Socialism is a disease of a state of society in which a true science of society scarcely exists, in which false notions of life, of the relation of the individual to society and the state, are widespread, and in which all ranks are honeycombed by sentimental notions of what ought to be, and can be, in this world. Since Rousseau, a certain set of doctrines has been permeating modern society which have no truth in history or fact at all, but which flatter human nature and are sure to be popular, because they make light of education, culture, capital, breeding, and all the excellencies which, *being very hard to get*, raise him who has them above him that has them not. The same doctrines teach, *per contra*, that the untrained man is the *norm*, and type, and standard, so that men, instead of being urged to seek the excellencies, are encouraged to believe themselves superior, without them, to those who have them. Such is the outcome of the doctrine of equality, and, as it has spread, it has only grown more popular, has propagated more and more fallacies, and shifted more and more distinctly into a thirst and demand for (equal) enjoyment of material luxury. Socialism is an effort to gratify the thirst in some other way than by using it as an incentive to industry and economy. Obviously, there is no other way, unless it consists in taking away the means of material enjoyment from those who have produced and saved them, and giving them to those who have not produced and saved them. Every step in that direction, is a step towards universal impoverishment and barbarism, and every step will have to be won by war. The socialists assume that their victory in that war is certain, but it is certain that they are entirely mistaken." —*Scribners*, New York, March, 1880.

NEW TITLE

AMERICAN OPINION "SCOREBOARD '74"

50p. POSTED

by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London E11 3NL.

The Dead Level

"Democracy is not all clear gain. For one thing, its methods of reaching decisions by voting creates the general impression that the majority is right. From a ladies sewing circle to the assembly of the League of Nations we count heads when we wish a matter settled. The result is that we modern democrats, who would scorn to truckle to an autocrat, truckle to the majority with all the obsequiousness of a courtier before his sovereign. Once the fashions were set by a monarch—the king could do no wrong. If he wore a beard, beards were fashionable; if he wore a ruff to cover a scar, ruffs were the order of the day. Democracy, however, which has largely abolished this mimicry of kings, has for many folk only substituted mimicry of the mob. We do not go through the outward ritual of kneeling to *their Majesties*, but in fact we continually bow before two great sovereigns of the democratic state—The General Average and the Majority Vote.

"In political procedure it doubtless is true that the best way yet discovered to run a government is to elect public servants by popular suffrage. But to grant the wisdom of political democracy is a very different thing from saying that in any decision which calls for spiritual fineness the majority is likely to be right. Upon the contrary, the majority is almost certain to be wrong. Put to popular vote the query, which they enjoy the better, ragtime and jazz on the one side, or Chopin's Nocturnes on the other, and where would the majority be? Put to popular vote the query, which interests them more, the movies or *Hamlet* and *King Lear*, and where would the majority be? Which are more popular, novels written by animated fountain pens that turn out love stories by the gross, or the great classics of our English speech? The idea that the voice of the people is the voice of God is mostly nonsense . . .

"The fact is that in any realm where judgment calls for spiritual fineness, only the minority who are above the average are ever right. And because a man is always tempted to live down to the average of his social group, a searching test of character is involved in one's relationship with this dead level of public opinion and practice. . . ."

—*Twelve Tests of Character* (1923) by Harry Emerson Fosdick.

ALTERNATIVE TO DISASTER

BY BRYAN W. MONAHAN

A realistic approach to inflation which points the way to an alternative to Communist slavery. It gives in more detail the financial aspects of the International Conspiracy outlined in *None Dare Call It Conspiracy* by Gary Allen.

1 copy 25p, 3 copies 65p, 10 copies £1.80, 25 copies £4.

SERVITUDE—OR FREEDOM

A leaflet surveying *Alternative to Disaster*

Free on request

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Rd., London E11 3NL