

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 55 No. 10

JANUARY, 1976.

20p Monthly

### The Rockefeller File\*

A BOOK REVIEW REPRINTED FROM *AMERICAN OPINION*, JANUARY, 1976.

SUPPOSE we begin by qualifying the witness. Since Gary Allen has long been one of the contributing editors of *AMERICAN OPINION*, and is perhaps first among them not simply because of accidental alphabetic position, it may be instructive to compare him with some of the rest of us. (Comparisons are odious, but revealing — or should we say, *because* they are revealing?)

Alan Stang is more belletristic — a coruscating writer of fiction and non-fiction (and you can tell which is which). Sue Huck is witty and scholarly — Exhibit A in support of H.L. Mencken's contention that intelligence is a specifically feminine trait. Robert Welch, who occasionally comes down from his command post as Editor to contribute to *AMERICAN OPINION*, is the most broadly learned and deeply reflective of us all. (I speak not of the third dimension — length.) In myself I recognize unequaled impudence, a necessary quality in a book-reviewer. Scott Stanley, as incomparable coach of the team, must obviously know more than any of his players; and it has been noticed, nervously in some quarters, that he has recruited new talent which may yet outstrip us all. But good wine needs no bush, and the best wine is sometimes the oldest; pass the palm to veteran contributing editors such as Tom Anderson, Hilaire du Berrier, George Schuyler, Harold Lord Varney, and Dave Woodbury.

Yet as of this date recapitulation shows that Gary Allen has had more lead articles in *AMERICAN OPINION* than anyone else, and in view of the sagacity of the Editor and the Managing Editor there has to be a reason. The reason is that Gary grabs complicated issues vigorously and straightens them out like a householder shaking dust and creases out of a rumpled

rug. Gary's expertise in exposition — his excellence in exposés — consists in the rational order of his analytical presentation and the simplicity and clarity of his verbiage. To borrow an expression from former Governor of Georgia Marvin Griffin, Gary Allen doesn't just tell it like it is, he puts it down where the cats can get to it.

Particularly is he skilled in the wrap-up; he operates at the summit of summarization. As the hippies would say, he is Numero Uno at getting it all together. In baseball terms he is in the clean-up position. Assuming the rest of us are on base, he is most likely to blast out a grand-slam home run.

That's about what we have in *The Rockefeller File*.

This is not Gary Allen's first demolition of an out-front Establishment figure. It should be remembered that it was in 1971 that Western Islands published Gary's *Richard Nixon: The Man Behind The Mask*. Two years before the revelations of the Watergate Hearings, Allen correctly identified Nixon as a two-faced politician who voiced Conservative rhetoric while all the time being in action a cat's-paw for Nelson Rockefeller, who was to furnish him Henry Kissinger, described accurately by Allen as "the most important man in the Nixon Administration, bar none." In retrospect there can be little doubt that Gary Allen hit the nail on the head when he wrote concerning the 1968 contest for the Republican nomination: "The Rockefeller campaign suggested from the beginning that the New York governor was acting as a stalking-horse for his ostensible opponent." To be a stalking-horse for your own cat's-paw is a neat trick, *n'est-ce pas?*

There can be little doubt, either, that Kissinger has acted for seven

years now not only as advisor to the President (whoever that President may be) and as Secretary of State, but also as control on the Presidency for the House of Rockefeller. (At least the Rockefellers must have so regarded him.)

When Gary Allen wrote *Richard Nixon: The Man Behind The Mask* his conclusions may have been regarded as "extreme" by many, perhaps by most, Conservatives; today, Allen may seem to have understated his case, but as a measure of his perspicacity it may be noted that he wrote *before* the Nixonian obeisance to the Red Terror in Peking in February 1972, *before* the catastrophic capitulation to the Soviets in the SALT I agreement which Nixon signed in Moscow in May 1972, and *before* the disclosures of Presidential perfidy which made possible the forcing of Nixon's resignation on August 9, 1974, by parties perhaps as perfidious as himself, whose cat's-paw he had (selfwise) so unprofitably been.

In view of all the foresight shown by Gary Allen five years ago regarding Richard Nixon's role as a minion of the House of Rockefeller, it may behoove us to listen to what the same author has to say about the House itself. Keep remembering that Allen was right about Nixon. We'd better pay attention to what he says about the Rockefellers. (The plural is important. Gary makes plain that he is not talking just — or even primarily, for that matter — about the posturing Nelson.)

Before we run out of space here — and because we do not in any case want to try to summarize a book which is itself a compact summary,

\* *The Rockefeller File* by Gary Allen. '76 Press, Post Office Box 2686, Seal Beach, California 90740; 200 pages (paperback).

and which you should obtain and read *in toto* for yourself — let's come to the nub of the matter in *The Rockefeller File*. It is found at the end of Chapter Six, the beginning of Chapter Seven, and in the titles of Chapters Seven and Eight, which are, respectively, "Surrender By Consent" and "Surrender By Conquest." Following is a sampling from Allen's presentation of his momentous thesis:

*... there can be absolutely no doubt that the major Rockefeller goal today is the creation of a "New World Order" — a one-world government that would control all of mankind. But, wanting a Global Superstate and getting one are two different things. How do the Rockefellers expect to round up all of us cows and herd us into their World Government corral?*

Prior to asking that question Allen has already given part of the answer:

*With money the Rockefellers gained control of the media. With the media the [Rockefeller] family gained control over public opinion. With control over public opinion they gained control of politics. And with control of politics, they are taking control of the nation.*

That system works well enough (or ill enough) for the United States. In the international arena, however, the situation is a bit more complicated. Other nations, whether in the "Free World," the "Third World," or the Communist bloc, refrain from submission to America — refrain in manner and degree, from hesitance to defiance to settled hostility. Yet if there is to be One World — and all Rockefeller-endowed intellectuals agree that there must be — all nations, or perhaps all except one, are going to have to submit either to a newly formed sovereign world power or else to an existing sovereign power — *i.e.*, the one nation which does not submit, and thus *becomes* the world power.

Since among existing nations the United States and the Soviet Union are by common consent accorded the status of "superpowers," it is obvious

that one of the two would be the only existing power which might with consent of the remaining nations be transmogrified into a world government. It is equally obvious, however, that so long as the two superpowers remain separate from each other, the remaining nations will hardly agree as to which of the superpowers to join, or indeed whether to join with either. On the other hand, were the two superpowers to be themselves united, the result of the merger would be so colossal that all lesser powers would hasten to attach themselves to such a keeper of the "peace."

No one doubts, however, the adamant resolve of the Soviet Union never to yield sovereignty to any other political entity. It follows ineluctably that if the Soviet Union will never yield sovereignty to the United Nations (the veto was put in the U.N. Charter to satisfy the Soviets), much less to the United States, then — *if there is to be One World* — the United States will simply have to yield to the Soviet Union. That is the kind of simple, practical logic which the Rockefellers understand. If the mountain will not come to Mohammed, Mohammed will go to the mountain; and if the Soviet Union will not surrender to the United Nations or anyone else, the Rockefellers, who control or almost control the United States, will certainly undertake, and have undertaken, to get the United States to surrender to the Soviet Union. (The Rockefellers are great undertakers.)

American surrender to the Soviets is essential to world peace. That is the meaning of *détente*. Better Red than Dead is a form of the same basic idea, but the Rockefellers have refined it further, so that the revised form reads simply, *Better Red*. In order to have one truly peaceful world, you see, we must not only surrender, we must like it. (All that is why my favorite Biblical text is from *Luke 22:36*, the words of Jesus: "He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one.")

I have been not so much paraphrasing as improvising upon a theme from Gary Allen — the theme that the Rockefellers are taking control of our nation, and are planning to

use that nation as a down payment to take control of the world. Let me return to illustrative direct and indirect quotations from *The Rockefeller File*. Allen's provocative chapter titles, "Surrender By Consent" and "Surrender By Conquest," are adapted from a statement of James Warburg, son of Paul M. Warburg, who was father of the Federal Reserve System. The younger Warburg told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 17, 1950: "We shall have world government whether or not you like it — by conquest or consent." Which translates roughly, *Up against the wall, M\*\*\*f\*\*\*, this is a stick-up.* (M\*\*\*f\*\*\* stands for *My friends.*)

Surrender by consent involves generating public support for U.S. participation, and U.S. citizen participation, in every kind of international organization looking toward supranational control. Allen writes:

*The Rockefellers know that the roads to World Government can be as varied as human hopes, fears, ambitions, ignorance and greed. And since the Rockefellers never put all of their financial or political eggs into one basket, . . . they are involved in promoting every conceivable route to a World Superstate . . .*

*A complete listing of all organizations, movements, publications, and programs supporting World Government, which in turn are managed behind the scenes by the Rockefeller-CFR axis [Allen has previously established the solidarity between the Rockefeller family and the notorious Council on Foreign Relations], would fill a book the size of the Los Angeles area telephone directory. Obviously, we can mention only a few of the more important trails along the Rockefellers' drive toward World Government.*

What Allen means by "only a few" is rather striking. He gives the following list as "just a few of the organizations in the United States which are financed and/or directed by the Rockefeller-CFR combine that is actively promoting the voluntary demise of American independence": American Assembly; American Asso-

ciation For The United Nations; American Friends Service Committee; Arden House Group; Atlantic Union; Business Council; Center For Advanced Study In Behavioral Sciences; Center Of Diplomacy And Foreign Policy; Chatham House; Citizens Committee For International Development; Committees On Foreign Relations; Committee For Economic Development; Council On Foreign Relations; Federation Of World Governments; Foreign Policy Association; Institute Of International Education; Institute For World Order; National Planning Association; The Trilateral Commission; United World Federalists; U.S. National Commission; and, World Affairs Council.

It will be noted that well over half of those organizations reveal in their names that they are concerned with international affairs, and as a matter of fact the others are similarly concerned. Basic to the Rockefeller-C.F.R. mentality is the assumption that social and economic issues must be analyzed and judged from a global point of view, not a national point of view. Such an attitude gets particularly sticky when the matter at stake is national defense.

But the Rockefeller-C.F.R. mentality flinches not at throwing U.S. national defense into the pot of the international game where the winner will take all and convert it to World Government. The name of the game (and it changes from time to time) is today *détente*, which, as Allen points out, in its original French means either a lessening of tension — or a trigger. The finger on the trigger is currently Henry Kissinger's; the order to fire doubtless depends on decisions to be reached at board meetings of the Rockefeller family and their *Insider* associates.

The novelty of *détente* to many Americans conceals the fact that the groundwork was laid long ago in considerable detail — and never more ominously than in a document issued in September 1961, known as Department of State Publication 7277, entitled *Freedom From War: The United States Program For General And Complete Disarmament In A Peaceful World*. Gary Allen points out that said "program," which was presented to the United Nations the month it

was published, was a "carbon copy" of a similar plan for "total and complete disarmament" presented to the U.N. one year earlier by the Soviet Union.

The end point of both plans was indeed the "disarmament" of the United States, but it involved the complete *armament* of a United Nations "Peace Force." The idea was (and is) to do to the United States essentially the same thing that gun-control would do to individual citizens of the United States — *i.e.*, deprive each of the means of self-defense. Under the plan no nation would have the capability of making war against another nation, but the United Nations Peace Force would have the capability of irresistible war against any nation. Today it is rather more evident than it was in 1961 that the United Nations, through domination of the General Assembly by the "Third World," and through Soviet veto power in the Security Council, is already an anti-American instrument.

The plan set forth in Publication 7277 has not yet been implemented, but the SALT agreements are giant steps in the direction of such implementation, which when finalized means the "Surrender By Conquest" that Gary Allen — having picked up the unintended tip from James Warburg — now vigorously warns us against. Even more decisive is the accomplished fact which Gary Allen documents, that the United States, without waiting for any kind of agreement, has for fifteen years been undergoing unilateral strategic disarmament, chiefly at the hands of former Secretary of Defense (and present head of the World Bank) Robert S.

McNamara. Citing Phyllis Schlafly and Chester Ward's check list of McNamara's administrative aggressions against the very national defense forces he was supposed to optimize, Allen writes: "In fact, McNamara destroyed more operational U.S. strategic weapons than the Soviets could have destroyed in a full-scale nuclear attack!"

Again, Gary Allen has crafted a potent polemic against the Establishment, showing its conspiratorial nature, its linkage with the very Communism which is supposed to be its antithesis, and its boundless ambition to achieve totalitarian world power. He has shown again that the Council on Foreign Relations is America's central intelligence agency (when you decapitalize those words you make them *more* important), and that the Rockefellers are the ranking family of our national plutoligarchy.

Allen concludes his survey of the menace of Rockefellerism (of which I have treated only the threat to American independence) with a stirring appeal to demand "Truth In Politics" from candidates, particularly those for the House of Representatives, in which must originate all money bills. *The Rockefeller File*, says its author, "was not written simply to entertain . . . , merely to inform . . . , or even to frighten . . . . It was intended to be a razor-sharp sword which can sever the hangman's rope before it strangles us." I have no doubt that it will assist immeasurably in that vital service, and thus help gain for the nation an indispensable reprieve. — MEDFORD EVANS

(The Rockefeller File was due for release in the U.S.A. in mid-January and should be available from K. R. P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London E11 3NL by the end of March, 1976, at £1.50, posted—Ed. T.S.C.).

## 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 Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11 3NL. Tel. 01-534 7295

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. General Deputy Chairman and Secretary, H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

## The Insurrection of Hell

J. Edgar Hoover described in "The Case of the Atom Bomb Spies" (*Readers Digest*, 1951) how a foreign power, "espousing a doctrine of hate, frightfulness and slavery", could turn free people into traitors. He added that the tragic horror of Communism was that "it blights the moral strength of man, leaving him only a puppet to be manipulated at will."

Twenty four year later, Solzhenitsyn complained in New York City, on July 9th, 1975 (*Mindszenty Report*, September 1975) that Communism "has infected the whole world with the belief in the relativity of good and evil." He continued, "But if we are to be deprived of the concepts of good and evil, what will be left? Nothing but the manipulation of one another. We will decline to the status of animals."

Both views, in remarkably similar language, ascribe to Communism the perversion of anyone who might be useful to it. In fact they reflect the view that Pius XI expressed in *Divini Redemptoris* in 1937 that "Communism is intrinsically evil." The testimony extends over nearly forty years, yet such as Dr. Kissinger, Canon Collins, the Rev. P. Oestreicher and some of the present Pope's entourage would not accept this view.

Marcel Clement, Director of the Centre Français de Sociologie, shows conclusively in "The Communist Challenge to God" which view is correct. For he demonstrates clearly enough that Marxian materialism and Christianity hold diametrically opposed views on God, man and history. For Communism teaches that matter, as Pius XI put it, "with its blind and hidden forces, is the only reality which exists." This leaves no room for God, while man is thinking matter.

M. Clement summarises Dialectical Materialism and concludes that, according to Marx, the creative principle of the world is matter in evolution. "And the essence of matter is conflict—the rejection of what is opposed to it—that is, Hatred." The essence of the Christian Creator is Love.

In his chapter on Historical Materialism, the author points out that in the Marxian view, conflict is the condition of progress, so that those who work towards reconciliation and love, instead of fomenting conflicts, "are reactionaries and liars who must be 'liquidated.'" Religion in Marx's view results from the gullibility of the exploited or the cynicism of the exploiters, in fact it interferes with hatred.

Marx wrote the theory and Lenin was its "practical strategist and tactician." M. Clement points out that he corrupted the meaning of such words as peace and democracy which have different meanings for a Marxian and a Christian and calls Marxian-Leninism "an insurrection of the forces of Hell in history."

He concludes with a section on the Victory of Charity, saying that "charity cannot be disassociated from truth" and he notes the saying of Pius XI that "another powerful ally of the agents of Communism is undoubtedly the conspiracy of silence concerning the movement which is observed by the greater part of the non-Catholic Press of the world." I fear the Pope would have to include the Catholic Press to a large extent today.

The Conspiracy has also maintained in full force its fifty-seven year suppression of Major Douglas's elucidation of the mechanism of inflation—a mechanism indispensable for the imposition of Communism—and of the correct and anti-inflationary technique of financial accountancy in a developed industrial economy, which is all that can save us now. The Church does not consider

the unearned Increment of Association—"Consider the lilies of the field, how they do grow"—nor the Cultural Inheritance, our legacy in common from all our ancestors. And so Marxian theory and Leninist practice are being used, almost unopposed, by power-hungry financial manipulators not to free the "workers" or anyone else, but to embrace all in such a slavery as tyrants have always envisaged, but only now have acquired the technology to enforce and perpetuate it.

—H.S.

(The final paragraph has been amended by the Chairman of the Social Credit Secretariat in the light of the advancing situation and embodies the point made by the contributor. — Ed. T.S.C.)

## The International Financial-Communist Conspiracy

There is no reason to change the following editorial comments made in these pages ten years ago:

Our difficulties do not arise from a lack of information. There is an abundance of it. In fact there is a surfeit. But the information available through the usual channels, on international affairs, is either incomplete or falsified. It is slanted.

Surely, there must be differences of opinion somewhere along the line? There are! One commentator on the A.B.C.'s "News Commentary" broadcasts, when asked why most of the views expressed by the various speakers were along the same line, remarked that perhaps it was because information came from the same source. Another commentator who stepped out of line was gradually eased out. There is a hidden censorship.

So with books. And there is an avalanche of them. Those that threaten the covert censorship, when publishers can be found, are suppressed one way or another, usually by the silent treatment.

In the past twenty years, a number of books on various aspects of the International Communist Conspiracy, written by experts in their fields, have been published in the U.S.A. They were given the silent treatment there and were unnoticed in England and Australia. The John Birch Society has re-issued twelve of the titles in cheap reprints.

Also in the U.S.A., Press, radio and television made *The Politician* (Belmont Publishing Company, Belmont, Massachusetts) one of the most controversial books of the Twentieth Century, *before publication*. After its publication—when anybody could now read the whole book and form his own opinion—these same media did their utmost to smother it. Eighty thousand copies have been sold outside of regular channels probably, not one thousand copies have been sold through the sixty-eight hundred commercial book stores. Nor did these 6,800 stores sell we believe, more than twenty thousand of John Stormer's *None Dare Call It Treason* (Liberty Bell Press, Florissant, Missouri), while the total sales of that paper-back book was close to five million copies.

The American writer, Charles Ferguson, said "Control of credit and control of the news are concentric." Are there any doubts about the control of Communism?

(*The Politician* is available from K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London E11 3NL, at £1.50 posted.)