

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 48 No. 1

SATURDAY, 6 APRIL, 1968

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

### Dean Rusk

#### IS HE THE INSIDERS' QUARTERBACK?

By MEDFORD EVANS in *American Opinion*, March, 1968

*It is Rusk's veiled strength that most impresses the handful of men who deal with him regularly . . .*

—MAX FRANKEL

*New York Times Magazine*

In April 1962 attorney Clyde Watts and I accompanied Major General Edwin A. Walker (Resigned) as he testified before the Stennis Committee of the United States Senate on "Muzzling of the Military". It was a year after Walker had been relieved of his command in Germany of the Army's 24th ("Victory") Division—an action taken April 17, 1961 the same day as the Bay of Pigs (and, like that bloody fiasco, still cloaked in a certain mystery). President Kennedy, Defense Secretary McNamara, and Assistant Defense Secretary Arthur ("Right to Lie") Sylvester had jumped channels to make sure that Walker was got out of Bavaria, though his operational record there had been distinguished. Oddly involved in the hatchet job on one of America's finest soldiers was an obscure journalist named John Dornberg, and a well known radio commentator, Daniel Schorr, of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Before the Stennis Committee (Special Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate) General Walker, in a prepared statement, alluded to a "real control apparatus", a "real decision-making apparatus", which "through the media of mass communication, the U.S. Department of State, and the information offices of the services" runs the American military.

Explicitly, Walker told the Committee: "There are few more vital questions than: (a) Who controls the Defense Establishment of the United States? (b) How is the control exercised? (c) Toward what end is it directed? The Walker case shows that the apparent controls and the real controls are not the same. (The record reveals that General Walker had received words of praise and admiration for his performance in Germany from every echelon from the Secretary of the Army to enlisted men.) It is evident that the real control apparatus will not tolerate militant anti-Communist leadership by a division commander."

Senator E. L. Bartlett, Democrat of Alaska, seemed shaken by the foregoing, as well he might have been, and ought to be. All of us ought to be. The Senator slept on it, and next day, Thursday, April 5, 1962, when the Hearing resumed, addressed Walker: "General, may I quote from one sentence of your prepared statement yesterday on page 3. I will quote the entire sentence. You said: 'It is evident that the real control apparatus will not tolerate militant anti-Communist leadership in a division commander.' Will

you tell us just what you mean by the words 'real control apparatus'?"

Walker: "The 'real control apparatus' can be indentified by its effects and what it is doing, what it did in Cuba, what it is doing in the Congo, what it did in Korea . . . the apparatus is those who wanted to see these things happen . . ."

Bartlett: ". . . there exists in this country in positions of ultimate leadership a group of sinister men, anti-American, willing and wanting even to sell this country out. It that the correct inference . . . ?"

Walker: "That is correct; yes, sir."

To the members of the Senate Committee, sheltered as they were by preconceptions, this thing was beginning to seem uncomfortably incredible. But the man from Juneau mused doggedly on. "General, I think that the Nation is entitled to know the names of these men, because, according to this statement, they are traitors and ready to let this country go over to our enemies."

Bartlett asked for it, Walker let him have it. The unmuzzled, "Pro-Blue" General named as men whom he would "question . . . with respect to our constitutional system, our sovereignty, our security, our independence" (ready?) Walt Whitman Rostow and Dean Rusk. There followed a moment of Senatorial consternation. Or perhaps, sitting there at Walker's side, I only imagined an inward perturbation of the Senators. For they are good men at saving the surface. And perhaps that is really about all there is to save. But think of the implications! A general officer with thirty years' service in the United States Army, an outstanding if controversial figure in the news for a year, under oath before a Senate Committee identifies as, in effect, enemies of the United States the U.S. Secretary of State and the Chief of the State Department's Policy Planning Council!\*

(continued on page 3)

\*Perhaps the general officer is mad. This possibility, as fate would have it, was to be explored some six months later. General Walker was arrested at Oxford, Mississippi, in the early fall of 1962 at the time of the military occupation of the University of Mississippi. Flown to Springfield, Missouri, under authority of a virtual *lettre de cachet* issued by Federal Judge Claude Clayton, Walker was held in a maximum security cell from which he would most likely never have emerged if he had not had friends and family of considerable wealth and influence, and from which he would have emerged only with the stigma of madness if he had not enjoyed such extraordinarily good mental health—one might say such anti-paranoia—that even the actual persecution to which he had been subjected did not disturb his equanimity, did not prevent a liberally qualified Dallas psychiatrist from finding on examination that Walker's mind was functioning at a "superior level". The General is not mad. He could well say to anxious adherents of the Establishment what Hamlet said to his mother: "Lay not that flattering unction to your soul, That not your trespass but my madness speaks."

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

### FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

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

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

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

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

Telephone: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1

Telephone: 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 2600. 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, Rougemont, P.Q. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

### FROM WEEK TO WEEK

The report on rioting in the U.S.A., delivered to President Johnson some months earlier than anticipated, can best be characterised as a document of incitement, as will be immediately apparent to anyone who has read Alan Stang's *It's Very Simple*. The rioting which had been 'escalated' over the past few summers has conformed exactly to Communist plans published in the 1920's. The report ascribes the causes of the riots to 'injustices' to Negroes, which, so far as they exist, cannot possibly be rectified in anything under several years; and to police methods of dealing with incipient riots. The report virtually suggests that the outcome of coming riots will be the division of the U.S.A. into two groups—the very objective of Communist strategy as exposed by Alan Stang. But to state such an outcome as a probability is to exalt it into an objective which can be achieved.

The way to prevent riots (if it is not now too late) is by nipping them in the bud by law enforcement at the local level—a matter where the first hour or even first few minutes are critical. But such local and swift law enforcement has been made progressively more and more difficult by decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court and various edicts from Washington, so that the *idea* of riots has got off to a flying start—that is to say, the probability of a relatively minor incident exploding into a major riot has increased so disastrously that preparations to deal with the expected riots of the coming summer amount to preparations to fight a civil war—a situation which would end in martial law which, in this context, would be Communist dictatorship. For it must be remembered that Communism is a system of government imposed *from the top*, and that some of the top men are in Washington.

The world situation is now catastrophic, and it becomes ever less possible to regard it as the result of a series of mistakes. For one thing, the steps by which it has come about were laid down many years ago in Communist literature with even more precision than Germany's strategy was laid down

in *Mein Kampf*. And the U.S. administration has been detected in too many lies—the latest revelation, currently causing consternation in Congress, being the Gulf of Tonkin incident which led to the Congressional Resolution which forms the basis of the U.S. military intervention in Vietnam without a declaration of war, a decision which is reserved to Congress. And of the *conduct* of the war in Vietnam it can truly be said that it serves Communist purposes.

All in all, it appears that the American summer of this year 1968 could very well be the period scheduled for the culmination of the plan for a Communist take-over of the globe, with the only shots fired being for the murder of 'counter-revolutionaries'.

Sir John Glubb spent thirty-six years living among the Arabs. From 1939 to 1956 he was in command of the Arab Legion, the little army of the State of Trans-Jordan. By reason of this, he knew at first hand and with military perception the realities military, strategic and political of the Israeli war on the Arabs with its typical Communist atrocities and propaganda. He writes of all this in his book *A Soldier With the Arabs*\*

As early as 1939 the late C. H. Douglas recognised that the creation of the State of Israel was one of the real as opposed to the ostensible aims of the second world war, and that this aim was a strategic objective of what we now recognise as the International Communist Conspiracy. Glubb Pasha, as Sir John is more widely known, recalls that within hours of the ending of the British mandate in Palestine, the U.S. and Russia recognised the State of Israel, and that during the U.N. 'truce' in the Israeli-Arab war "an aerial ferry was working constantly between Czecho-Slovakia and Israel, bringing in more arms from behind the Iron Curtain". When Israel's victory was assured, Russia consoled the Arabs with (unfortunately, well-based) propaganda that their defeat was due to England and the U.S.A., who under the U.N. truce embargoed arms supplies to the Arabs.

This lucrative strategy was repeated with swift precision in the Israeli-Arab war of June, 1967. The USSR egged the Arabs on to certain defeat, and then supported the U.N. cease-fire. Under the guise of replacing Arab losses, the USSR moved in fresh military equipment, and technicians. It is reported that the Arabs are given instruction *in Russian*.

In the light of all this, what Sir John had to say concerning the effect of the first Israeli-Arab war is particularly instructive: "In former times, when armies moved overseas, they did so accompanied by their weapons and administrative requirements. Today, the transport of personnel and the transport of material are widely different problems. The men of whole armies can be flown over seas and continents in a matter of days, if not hours. But the material which they need has never before been so difficult to move. The problem of transporting tanks, guns, vehicles and heavy ammunition is immense. Not only so, but the maintenance of these weapons in the field requires an extensive organisation of workshops and stores. If, therefore, either side can pre-position its material in peace-time, in the theatre of possible operations, so that only the personnel need be flown out, then that army will be the first in action when the war begins."

\*Hodder and Stoughton: London, 1957

The USSR and its 'satellites', the State of Israel, and the U.S.A. *Administration*—not the citizens of the U.S.A.—are all aspects of the International Communist Conspiracy. The strategic problem of the Conspiracy is to confront the citizens of the U.S.A. with a situation where it would be *evidently* impracticable for the U.S.A. to oppose military action by the USSR firstly in the Middle and Far East, and then in Europe.

In short, no alternative but nuclear war by push-button. Following the crash of the U.S. hydrogen bomb armed aircraft in Greenland, the rest of these strategic bombers have been grounded. It is *said* that they can be airborne in fifteen minutes—but airborne where? If the continuous flights were originally deemed essential for the security of Europe—the nuclear 'umbrella'—has the necessity vanished?

Politics is the art of the possible. But what we are witnessing is the narrowing of alternative possibilities to vanishing point. In the 1920's reform of the defective financial system could have saved Christian civilisation. That possibility has been eliminated in the existing context. In the 1950's Britain, by consolidating the English-speaking Commonwealth to an economically viable unit, might have disrupted the Conspiracy's strategy. But Britain is now disarmed and thus deprived of any power of independent initiative. Nuclear war by the U.S.A. . . ?

### Petty Britain

The Romans could appreciate size even in falsehood and used to call an outrageous liar *splendide mendax*, a vintage storyteller, but they considered rudeness an unpleasing quality of barbarians. The Christian admired politeness, not only in France, and the ancient phrase "manners maketh man" expressed the outlook of a civilization.

By contrast, *The New Christian*, whose editor is not unknown to the B.B.C., gives prominence to unmannerly attacks on the governments of South Africa and Rhodesia (Jan. 25, 1968). Readers, it says, "will not need to be reminded of the foul legal devices employed by the racist government of South Africa", and the writer describes the position of thirty-six South West Africans now being tried in Pretoria "on charges of terrorism". The British Government should call upon Prime Minister Vorster to declare that the case is outside the jurisdiction of the courts of his country, it adds.

I should suggest, with discourtesy, that the Rev. Trevor Beeson has no experience of terrorists inside his parish, or threatening it from outside and that if he heard of some he would call a policeman, whatever the United Nations had decreed in New York, and would be the last to insult the forces of law and order.

The same issue prints a contribution from Frank Clements, "a former Mayor of Salisbury", who presumably no longer lives in Rhodesia, for his article alleges that "Press censorship, hanging, torture, flogging and imprisonment without trial" are the methods of the Rhodesian government. If Mr. Clements still lives in Rhodesia, his article suggests a tolerant kind of censorship, while it omits any reference to the good old pre-Smith days when burning, maiming, intimidation of witnesses, and terrorism proceeded without much interference.

Philippa Berlyn, in *Rhodesia, Beleaguered Country* (The Mitre Press, 15/- Stg.) gives a much more realistic account

of her country when she describes how the cant of Mr. Wilson has turned her into a rebel. She notes how he turns his outraged attention on Rhodesia without a word but recognition for the hurly-burly of Nigeria. Indeed she leaves the impression that the presence of the white man in Africa has signified a lull between one tribal outburst of violence and another. Miss Berlyn incidentally has a great affection for the black Rhodesians and is a leading expert in their language, but she resents the misrepresentation of Mr. Stewart, for instance, about the voting system, while being amused at the ignorance of Mr. Bottomley, and fully aware of the Rhodesian distrust of all British politicians.

Miss Berlyn, the wife of a Professor of Law of the University College, Rhodesia, fully explains the great educational effort being made in Rhodesia, which is also misrepresented, and her attitude towards distant politicians who threaten Africa with another Viet Nam (or further Viet Nams) may be imagined. Her discrimination evidently amounts to that of an admirable woman. Those who are distinguished neither by manners nor even 'splendid' untruth can hardly fill the role of Man. Like the people who stop our competitors from taking part in the ploughing match in Rhodesia, they represent not Great Britain but Petty Britain.

—H.S.

Dean Rusk

(continued from page 1)

For the horrified Press there was no recourse but pretense of amused disdain. What's a reporter to do? Nowadays, attacks on Rusk and Rostow *from the Left* are treated with respect, but in 1962 an attack from the Right was to be disposed of in the shortest way possible. And the shortest way is laughter. For a time it seemed that supercilious ridicule would do the trick. Rusk himself greeted a staff meeting: "Good morning, comrades!"—a gasser, as Frank Sinatra might say. Yet Rusk didn't like it a bit when an aide told this to the Press as an example of his boss's urbane wit. (See Roger Hilsman's *To Move a Nation*, Page 42.)

But if it was, and is, after all a matter of opinion as to whether Rusk and Rostow were, and are, enemies of U.S. Constitutional independence (and, among the intelligentsia a matter of opinion as to whether they *should be*—for the view is widespread in intellectual circles that national sovereignty is an evil thing), there was one issue of simple fact raised in this same connection by General Walker. In naming Rostow he identified that eminent M.I.T. Professor as one who had "been in control of the operating arm of the CIA . . . since 1954". As the *Richmond News Leader* observed later, "Few of Mr. Walker's statements excited higher indignation". Yet, as the journal from Virginia also pointed out, Walker was right, and testimony, largely ignored by the Press, was subsequently published to the effect that the Center for International Studies at M.I.T. was a C.I.A. operation. At the table with Walker in the Caucus Room of the Old Senate Office Building that morning in April 1962, I knew that the General knew what he was talking about. I knew the source inside the C.I.A. where he got the information.

Intellectual fads change as sharply and as irrationally, as skirt lengths and hairdo's. In 1967 Mary McCarthy would write of "the sinister Walt Rostow, said to be the closest to the cupped Presidential ear"; would speak matter-of-factly of "the ties that have come to light between the C.I.A. and the

intellectual community", would observe that "the C.I.A. has a special rapport with the traitor (who, if he is not bought, is usually an intellectual) . . ." You understand, this last concerns C.I.A. operations in *Vietnam*. But philosophical Mary makes a generalization about it. What Mary McCarthy writes in 1967 is sophisticated. When Edwin Walker (correctly) anticipated her by five years he was derided by the sophisticated. No fool like a sophisticated fool.

If General Walker was right about Rostow's C.I.A. connection, was he also right about Rostow's underlying hostility to the continued independence of a Constitutional United States? Actually, Rostow has been rather open about this, having written that it is "an American interest to see an end to nationhood as it has been historically defined". Fair warning, you might say. He is now at Lyndon's right hand. (That being so, who in *Hell* is at Lyndon's left hand?)

Even so, Walt Rostow is not nearly so important a man as Dean Rusk. Rusk was the *first* man Walker named, though the General disclaimed detailed knowledge: "I cannot identify those that are in complete control of the apparatus. I have identified individuals who appear to think on the same lines as the apparatus, which has been a 'no win' policy." In an epicene age General Walker's rhetoric is seldom *a la mode*. As a rule, however, he knows what he is talking about. Now, six years after he pinpointed the Secretary of State as "very influential" in achieving objectives of the "real control apparatus"—now, when we have a different President, but the same Secretary of State—perhaps we are in a better position to judge how close the General was to the mark that day in April 1962.

### I

Is Dean Rusk the most powerful man in Washington? A tricky question, since no one can be sure that Rusk will even be in Washington by the time these words appear in print. Yet, it is still a question worth asking. One preliminary matter must be dealt with first. What do we mean by *power* in an individual? Not physical strength, obviously. Almost as obviously, not intelligence as such. Neither the circus strong man nor the brilliant mathematician is powerful (unless by accident) in the sense we intend.

Money gets us a little closer to the meaning. The rich man has influence. Yet in Washington individual wealth alone is not of great importance. To be sure, there are enough leeches and to spare, from the Capitol to the Pentagon, to take from the man of wealth all he has, but few to give him what he wants. A billionaire is an exceptional Croesus in our time, but his entire fortune is less than one percent of an annual Federal Budget. What *is* power?

It is rather self-evident that in an organized society the man of power is an organization man. What confers, or implies, power within an organization? Position, to be sure, but not necessarily the top position. The visible summit may be for show. On the other hand, the indispensable base will be composed of too many individuals for any one of them to be thought powerful. There is no Atlas on whose personal shoulders the world of Washington rests. We should remember, by the way, that dictatorship has not been achieved in the United States, and that even our most powerful man—whoever he may be—is not all-powerful, nor by himself, preponderantly powerful. He will have, as it were, a plurality, not a majority, of the atoms of power. Men vary in the degrees of influence they wield, and it is natural to con-

jecture that there is one who is more influential—not more than all the others combined, but more than any other one. Who is the Monsieur X?

Whoever he is, he will be what he is in part as a result of his position, while to be sure he may have attained the position as a result of his earlier power to influence. The key position will not always be the same one, for the man makes the position as well as the position makes the man. It will not necessarily, as we have said, be the theoretically highest position, for in practice the grand vizier may be more powerful than the sultan. It will, however, be as a rule a relatively high position. A powerful man alters the position he holds, but he must hold an intrinsically powerful position in the first place if his personal power is to have a fulcrum.

The positions of power in Washington are the executive command posts of the great agencies—the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General. If these positions are filled by strong men, then among them we may well find the most powerful man in Washington. Yet they are Presidential appointments. How shall we compare them with the President himself? Or, if the President be personally weak, then what of the White House advisors who are closest to the Presidency, which is undoubtedly the *position* of greatest power? Clearly there are several variables in the question—too many, indeed, for a fully demonstrable answer to our question, Who is the most powerful man in Washington? Most specifically, is it Dean Rusk?

Despite the difficulties, if we identify the factors of power we may guess better at our answer. One factor is simple endurance, the ability to do what Talleyrand said he did in the French Revolution—to survive. Many things contribute to survival, most of them inexplicable, but one contributing factor seems to be freedom from ultimate responsibility. Talleyrand was not a charismatic leader, was hardly regarded as a man of principle. It was only in the long run that he got his way, got it because he did not prematurely insist upon it, got it through patience and the violent actions of others. He might in 1815 have been fairly regarded as the most powerful man in Europe, though he was, of course, never a Head of State, never a leader of a Party.

(To be continued)

### Communist Revolution in the Streets

by Gary Allen 45/- posted

A book of 112 pictures and 128 pages, 8½" x 11" which SAMPLES rather than SURVEYS the drive toward Revolution in the streets of the U.S.A. The author sees the development of a familiar pattern in the United States of America—the classic Communist design for a Revolution of an American "proletariat"—and as much as possible has let the Revolutionaries convict themselves with their own words.

### Conquest with Words

How the Communist Lingo promotes World Revolution  
by Roy Colby 17/3d.

"Literate humans maintain contact with reality largely through words and word symbols . . . Suppose, however, that the word symbols . . . are distorted, inaccurate, or untrue? . . . Worse yet, what if some words which are accepted as having very clear and specific connotations and meanings, do in fact 'mean' the VERY OPPOSITE?" (From Foreword).

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

Printed by E Fish & Co Ltd Liverpool