

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 52. No. 10

SATURDAY, 5 AUGUST, 1972

7p. (1s. 5d.) Fortnightly

### Pentagon Papers\* MAKE A NOISE IN THE EAST

By MEDFORD EVANS

Publication by the *New York Times* and other newspapers of classified documents relating to the Vietnam War produced an alleged crisis of freedom of the press versus national security, in which we were urged in effect to choose between the interests of the common defense and Constitutional rights of free speech. I suggest that the whole affair was a stage-managed illusion to divert attention from the attempted American surrenders to Red Russia and Red China for which the summer of 1971 will be unhappily remembered in future history. I say attempted surrenders, for fortunately it is not now wholly within the power of any Administration or other conspiracy to deliver the American people to complete serfdom in a New One World (N.O.W.).

What is supposed to have happened in the case of the so-called Pentagon Papers? What, indeed, are the Pentagon Papers? They consist, we are told (I for one have not seen them in their official form), of forty-seven volumes—a total of 7,000 pages—containing basic documents and a narrative account concerning U.S. involvement in Vietnam—all classified "Top Secret" and given heretofore only the most strictly limited distribution.

Included on the distribution list, however, was the Rand Corporation of Santa Monica, California—a project theoretically not of the government, but wholly owned by the government (by the U.S. Air Force, to be more specific) and intended to serve the purpose of research, analysis, and advice to the government by a staff of experts of superior intellectual capacity and peculiarly dispassionate judgment. The Rand Corporation is devoted not to research in the physical sciences, nor in the social sciences as ordinarily defined in the academic community, but to what has sometimes been called operational research and analysis. They study problems of war, peace, and government.

Since the experts at Rand are financed by the Air Force it might be presumed, however impartial their fact-finding, they would make recommendations in the interest of the Air Force in particular, the Defense Department generally, and the security and independence of the United States basically. Such a presumption is not necessarily warranted.

As long ago as the late 1950s the economist Kenneth Boulding suggested rather enthusiastically that the Rand Corporation might end up doing what so many colleges founded by churches have done—destroying the basic beliefs on which the parent institution itself depended. As these colleges have in general eroded Christian faith and ridiculed Christian doctrine, so the Rand Corporation (and presumably other government-financed "think tanks" as well)

might in due course subvert traditional national loyalty and discredit established procedures of military security.

Judged from that point of view, the Rand Corporation has done rather well. Whether the achievements of Daniel Ellsberg represent its finest hour remains to be seen. According to *Time* magazine, Ellsberg and other Randy intellectuals had already enjoyed some pretty fine hours. During one chapter of his employment at Rand, Ellsberg

... turned to a livelier life: a succession of dazzling girls, a red sports car and a share in a ramshackle Malibu Beach house. He flooded the place with psychedelic lighting to the point where police raided what they thought was a noisy pot party, only to find a number of tipsy Rand analysts dancing to rock music. (Time, July 5, 1971.)

To me the most interesting word in that quotation is *only*. We are supposed to be relieved to find out that nothing was happening except that experts employed (at fabulous salaries) to explore the subtleties of our survival in a world of nuclear weapons and conspiratorial intrigue were drunkenly dancing to mind-blowing sound.

But why must our thinkers get tanked? Because they are so morally sensitive. Ellsberg finally decided that he could no longer be responsible for the sins of his country. (When anybody starts worrying about the morals of "America", you can be pretty sure he has no morals of his own.) He made up his mind to strike a blow for truth and righteousness by violating the confidence of his employer, and acting as a visible portion of a massive organization for espionage within the national defense establishment. On the receiving end of the espionage line were, of course, the *New York Times* and other newspapers which could make the information available to Moscow and Peking without endangering a single Russian or Chinese agent.

To pretend that a newspaper which enjoys the protection of the armed forces of a sovereign nation has a right to publish documents which that nation has, by due process of duly enacted law, classified as militarily secret is too patently absurd for serious consideration. Nor, oddly enough in view of the immense spate of spurious publicity surrounding the matter, have the courts considered any such preposterous issue. What they have considered is whether they should in advance enjoin the papers from publishing what may, in the sequel, turn out to have been documents which it is illegal

(continued on page 3)

\*From *American Opinion*, Sept., 1971.

# 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.

Vol. 52. No. 10

Saturday, 5 August, 1972

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Beyond any shadow of doubt, the twin problems of Inflation and Unemployment are quite easily soluble in economic terms. The real trouble is that these 'problems' are not primarily economic, but political. That is to say, they are *maintained* as problems to further the policy of those who *prevent* their economic solution. What is that policy?

The policy in question is embedded in the problem of the relationship of the individual to the group. In human sociological terms, a group is a number of persons classed together by virtue of what they have *in common*—the Lowest Common Denominator. Thus practically everybody possesses hair; but some have light hair and others dark. Perhaps the very lowest common denominator is that people can be numbered irrespective of any distinguishing characteristics other than that they are 'people'. On the other hand, an individual is distinguished precisely by what he possesses which is not common to others—enrichment. The fundamental political problem concerns the endeavour to *institutionalise* one or other of these characteristics of a population. It is seemingly a contradiction of terms to speak of institutionalising individuality, but what is implied is illustrated very simply by, say, an automatic cigarette-vending machine which offers a variety of brands of cigarettes for individual choice.

So far as we are aware, it has never been suggested that a group is *self-conscious*. There are metaphysical theories which postulate a super-group consciousness; but in practical terms this comes down to a small inner group claiming to be the agents of this super-consciousness—the basis of certain theologies—or else to *be* that consciousness; to incarnate in themselves the "wave of the future" or "will of the people" or "Nature". This is the concept that lies behind the drive for One World, with its corollary, World Government. Quite logically, since World Government in an *overt* way does not exist as yet, its proponents must sustain and extend *government as such*. Unemployment and Inflation require, or appear to require, more and more government control: it is as simple as that. A genuine solution to those problems would steadily diminish the importance of

government.

When the late C. H. Douglas began his analysis of this situation (*Economic Democracy*, 1919), he deduced from the organisation of society and the operation of the economic system the existence of a group of people endeavouring to impose on the world a rigid pyramidal form of government. This was a tentative deduction, in that he was not then convinced that it was a *self-conscious* attempt: it might have been that the ordinary operation of the financial-economic system had thrown certain people into positions of great power, and that they took steps to preserve that power without recognising its source. (It must be remembered that in 1919 the operation of the financial system was shrouded in mystery, and was supposed to follow "inexorable economic laws", and that economic disasters were of the order of acts of Nature. Professor Toynbee is perpetuating this myth when he writes "Nature is going to compel posterity to revert to a stable state on the material plane", though no doubt he knows very well this is Communist *intent*). Events, however, convinced Douglas that there *was* in fact a conscious policy aimed at extending and perpetuating international pyramidal Government. More important, particularly since the end of the Second World War, overwhelming evidence in support of that conviction has been brought to light. In short, the mainspring of world politics is *conspiracy*.

Now German National Socialism, as expounded by Hitler, included various economic and political 'theories', which could be—and were—discussed indefinitely—up to a certain point. At that point, it became clear that Nazism was a conspiracy for World Government, and that the only way to deal with it was militarily.

It is quite certain now that, whatever Hitler may have thought, Nazism was part of a far more embracing conspiracy which was immeasurably furthered by the war and its aftermaths. This means that we are not up against the problems of Unemployment and Inflation as such, but are up against the Conspirators who are using these artificial conditions as weapons to impose World Government to 'solve' them.

In these circumstances, participation in the make-believe of ordinary Party Politics is worse than futile: it is the broad road to destruction. What good did it do for the British to have dismissed the Socialist Labour Government and instal the internationalist Tory Government? The British situation has deteriorated just as rapidly under Heath as under Wilson, and now the Government is openly contemptuous of Parliament and people, and Professor Toynbee, representing the views of the Royal Institute of International Affairs ("the Chatham House gang" for whom Mr. Heath is the political agent) contentedly forecasts a "fearful ordeal of reversion" for our posterity. Far better to abstain from voting or, where voting is compulsory, to vote informally—unless there is a candidate who recognises that we are the victims of a conspiracy and is prepared to denounce it publicly, and work for a genuine solution of economic problems which, although it would invite military sanctions, would do so *while these are too dangerous to the Conspirators to be undertaken*.

Journalistic comment of the order which compares the relative 'competence' of such as Wilson and Heath is now completely beside the point. The threat posed to Britain in

particular and in the first place is essentially the same as in 1939—loss of national sovereignty for which, as Professor Toynbee revealed in 1931, the Chatham House gang and its international associates (notably the Council on Foreign Relations, the effective Government of the United States of America) have been “working secretly, but with all [their] might”. Only undertaking the risk of war is likely to avert this threat.

What is to the point is an attempt to achieve a widespread understanding of the true situation. We strongly recommend a study of Gary Allen's *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, and the implementation, *mutatis mutandis*, of the course of action advocated therein. This book clearly recognises, and documents, the linkage of International Finance and International Communism, and is short and easily read; and a full grasp of its contents and implications, amongst enough people (it is proposed to circulate thirty million copies in the U.S.A.) is the surest road to our survival. Douglas long ago recognised that the economic ‘problems’ could not be dealt with until the Conspiracy was exposed and destroyed. Obviously the main battle is within the U.S.A.; but exposure anywhere, and perhaps particularly in Britain, helps forward that ultimate victory which is now at least in sight.

#### Pentagon Papers

(continued from page 1)

to publish. The courts said to the Press, in effect: *We will not tell you not to proceed. We tell you to proceed at your own risk.* The doctrine of “no prior restraint” is not a doctrine of unlimited license. As observed in *U.S. News & World Report* (July 12, 1971), “the decision set up no block to subsequent criminal prosecution of all involved in publication of the secret material”. Ellsberg, of course, knows this.

The courts' decision, then, did not automatically destroy the nation's system of security of information. In view, however, of the kind and quantity of publicity attendant on the decision, it went a long way toward weakening that system, which has been under the most vicious attack (to my personal knowledge for twenty-five years) by scientists, journalists, and government officials themselves, many of great eminence. Practically all of these have appeared at once overscrupulous and unscrupulous—perfect through practice in the art of straining at gnats and swallowing camels.

In the present case, as William E. Dunham, Clark Mollenhoff, and others promptly pointed out (see, for example, *The Review Of The News*, July 7, 1971, Page 21), the *New York Times* had hunted with the hounds a few years ago, when it condemned security officer Otto Otepka for having shown a State Department classified document (“Confidential” only, not “Top Secret”) to a Senate Committee lawyer (cleared for access to confidential information)—all in the line of duty.

Not that the *Times* ever endorsed a strict security system, but it was willing to attempt to use technicalities of the system to try to discredit a man who represented the legitimate antisubversive thrust of the system. William J. Gill, in *The Ordeal Of Otto Otepka* (Page 455), tells how Otepka and his wife, leaving the Senate hearing room in April 1969, when his appointment to the Subversive Activities Control Board (S.A.C.B.) was under consideration, were accosted by men of the media. “The two reporters who pressed him most

severely,” says Gill, “were Neil Sheehan of the *New York Times* and Tim Wheeler of the *Daily World*, official organ of the Communist Party, U.S.A.” It is a small world, isn't it? And I don't mean the *Daily*. Neil Sheehan, of course, is the *New York Times*-man whose “investigative reporting” brought the illegally obtained Pentagon Papers into possession of the *Times*.

It is important to remember that Daniel Ellsberg was not a lone operator, though as of this writing he is the only one to have been charged with a crime. It is important to remember, too, that “investigative reporting” such as that with which the *Times* credits Sheehan involves the receiving of stolen goods—knowingly receiving stolen goods, since the news value of the documents accepted by the *Times* reporter for publication depended precisely on the fact that they had been stolen from the government. In the Soviet Union and other Communist countries, any such theft would automatically mean the death penalty.

It could mean that in this country, too, if Congress had done formally what it did informally by the Tonkin Resolution—that is, if it had declared war against North Vietnam, or Red China, or the Soviet Union itself, with all of whom we *are*, of course, at war in Southeast Asia. The papers which Ethel Rosenberg allegedly typed out for her husband Julius Rosenberg after the latter had received information from her brother David Greenglass were not more illegally produced than the Sunday *New York Times* of June 13, 1971.

If one wished to press the matter (I wouldn't mind seeing it pressed) a case could probably be made that the Rosenberg and Sheehan-*Times* cases are exactly on a footing. In each case the information was apparently intended for a power with which we were theoretically *not* at war (we have never been theoretically at war with Soviet Russia), but in each case the information was evidently intended to benefit a foreign power, and was obtained *in war time*. Since World War II has still never been concluded by a treaty, one could argue . . . you see what one could argue.

The chief obvious differences between the two cases are: (1) that the proof is much better that the Ellsberg-Sheehan-*Times* spy ring did steal secret documents from the U.S. than that the Greenglass-Rosenberg-Harry Gold-Yakovlev ring ever did what was charged against them; (2) that the putative ultimate recipient of the Rosenberg's information was the Soviet Union, while that of the Ellsberg-Sheehan-*Times* apparatus is the total Conspiracy of which the administrators of the Soviet Union are only a part—which Conspiracy has a far better chance of destroying the United States than the Soviet Union on its own could ever have; (3) that the information furnished by the *Times* was more nearly complete and more surely reached its destination, since the *New York Times* is certainly delivered and read not only in Moscow, but also in Peking, Hanoi, Paris, London, New York, and Washington.

The last-named city brings me up against the fact that for all my certitude of the criminal responsibility of Ellsberg, Sheehan, and the publishers of the *Times*, I am in no tizzy to have them successfully prosecuted to the hilt by the present Administration. For the present Administration is itself involved in the general crime for which the *Times*, *et al.*, could logically be prosecuted. It is probably involved in the very person of Daniel Ellsberg, who not only was formerly employed by the quasi-governmental agency the Rand

Corporation, and again by the Department of Defense itself, but also was employed at the time of his espionage activities (and still is, presumably) by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology—specifically, according to the reliable W.E. Dunham, by M.I.T.'s Center for International Studies, the best known cover operation for the Central Intelligence Agency in Cambridge. Ellsberg was probably acting according to C.I.A. instructions when he began Xeroxing all those Top Secret documents for eventual publication in the *Times*.

The number of important people involved in this whole affair—criminally involved if a hostile Administration wanted to look at it that way—means that there had to be some kind of general assurance that the Administration would take the kindest possible attitude. There would, to be sure, have to be a scapegoat, a fall guy or two, but not too many people would get hurt. Daniel Ellsberg is now in custody, but Walter Cronkite has not been charged with harboring a fugitive from justice, though he interviewed Ellsberg on national television at a time when the F.B.I. was said to be searching for the man.

The Press, of course, claims the privilege of protecting its sources of information. So let's talk some about secrecy. Nothing is bruted more loudly by the Press barons than "the right to know". *Time's* cover of July 5, 1971, bearing Ellsberg's curiously unlikelike picture, carried also the slogan: "Battle Over the Right to Know". *U.S. News* of the same date began its article on the "Pentagon Papers": "A showdown over the ages-old issue of national security vs. 'the people's right to know'"—and so on.

But the Press refuses to let the public know where it gets its information! When the federal court ordered the *Times* to show cause why it should not turn over its copies of the Pentagon Papers to the Government, the newspaper's reply was that it feared its sources would be disclosed. Quoting now from the *Times* itself (June 17, 1971, Page 1, Column 8) under byline of Fred P. Graham:

*Arguing that the First Amendment shields newspapers from being forced to disclose their confidential sources, The Times' lawyer asserted that the Constitution thus protects the newspaper from having to surrender the documents.*

That lawyer, by the way, was Alexander M. Bickel of the Yale Law School. This eminent legal scholar, then, is contending that "the right to know" justifies the Press in violating the law, but that when it comes to telling how the Press got the forbidden knowledge in the first place, the public has no right to know.

Nothing is more curious than the implicit assumption in the whole controversy over publication of the Pentagon Papers than the apparently prevalent assumption that the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* somehow represent the American people, while the Government of the United States does not. The second half of that assumption might, alas, be true, but the first half certainly is not. *U.S. News* (*loc. cit.*) asks the question: "Does the Government have a right to withhold from public knowledge the information it considers vital to defense and foreign policy?" The plain answer is, of course, that it is the public which expects the Government to withhold information it considers vital to defense (the public unfortunately may not think a lot about foreign policy).

The public would have demanded somebody's impeach-

ment if the government had broadcast in advance MacArthur's plans for the Inchon Landing, or Eisenhower's decision as to D-Day, the date of the Normandy Invasion. Only public sentiment has kept whatever atomic secrecy we have left. Only fear of public reaction prevents most of the Press from publishing every military secret we've got.

The *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* do not represent the American public. The former is owned by Arthur Hays ("Punch") Sulzberger, the latter by Katharine Meyer Graham. They are not America. Their and their employees' talk of freedom of the Press is poppycock. If you imagine that their papers are free, just try to get something published in either one which is seriously hostile to the personal interests of the owners. Interview space is restricted; letters to the editor are screened, censored, and edited; even advertising is rejected if it is counter to the paper's policy, and of course if it is accepted it is far from free, running to thousands of dollars a page. A big newspaper is a privileged monopolistic money-maker, and the only thing more important to it than making money is political power.

The *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Los Angeles Times*, and other such corporate entities play important roles in running the government now; they aspire to even more important roles. The contest over publication of the Pentagon Papers is, among other things, a struggle for the perquisites and insignia of power. If the *New York Times* can obtain purloined secret documents from the government and publish them without retribution, then the *Times* is to that extent more powerful than the government. If, in addition, it can deny the government the right to secret information held by the *New York Times*, such as the identity of persons involved in stealing the government's documents—and do this not merely as an accessory after the fact (and perhaps also before and during the fact) but as a matter of claimed Constitutional privilege—then indeed is the *Times* at a higher echelon of power than the government in Washington.

I admit my argument is better theoretically than it is practically. Theoretically, there is no question that the government should have the right to keep military information secret, and that newspapers should have no right to protect criminals. In practice at present, however, the government and the big newspapers are fully in cahoots, and a flap like the one over publication of the Pentagon Papers is essentially a diversion by the Conspiracy to take public attention away from something more important.

Like what? I'll tell you what.

Sun Tzu, the reputed wizard of war in ancient China, is supposed to have laid down various military maxims which have not been entirely displaced even by the thoughts of Chairman Mao or the lucubrations of Karl von Clausewitz. Bill Benton's *Britannica*, in the article on Camouflage, quotes old Sun as saying in *The Art Of War*, circa 500 B.C., "All warfare is based on deception. . . . when we are near, we must make the enemy believe that we are away; when far away, we must make him believe we are near. Hold out baits to entice the enemy. Feign disorder, and crush him". Sun is also credited with the aphorism: *Make a noise in the East; strike in the West*. The Chinese are a subtle people. It will not do for us to neglect what their sages have to teach.

(To be continued)