

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 53. No. 4

JULY, 1973

In Memoriam Joe McCarthy*

By MEDFORD EVANS

MAY 2, 1973 — Sixteen years ago today, Senator Joseph Raymond McCarthy of Wisconsin died at Bethesda Naval Hospital in Metropolitan Washington. His actually mysterious death is now less often commemorated with sorrow by his friends than with triumph by his enemies. So the lie lives and the truth is buried.

The historian J. L. Gaddis, in his recent book *Cold War*, refers casually to "the domestic onslaught of McCarthyism". Charles Lam Markmann, in *The Buckleys*, calls McCarthy *canaille*, a blackguard who "mercifully for his country, died in 1957." The live dog snarls at the dead lion. If the present age, where cold war yields to hot cease-fire, and free schooling to forced busing, is an example of mercy, we shudder to conjecture what we could possibly have been spared.

The few voices raised in McCarthy's behalf confine themselves largely to protesting that he loved his little adopted daughter Tierney, and was loyal to his friends, which is true and shows the most basic of human virtues, but bypasses, and thus concedes to the enemy the historic, and continuing, political significance of McCarthyism. The probability that the man was physically assassinated is timorously avoided or suppressed; the certainty that the Senator was politically assassinated is shrugged off by friends as well as enemies as an accomplished and no doubt inevitable fact which he largely brought upon himself by his anti-Communism.

Yet the friends who forget and the enemies who exult over McCarthy's death are both making the same mistake. They assume that he was hounded to his eventually fatal defeat because he was so outspokenly anti-Communist. *Anti-Communism* and *McCarthyism* are almost by way of becoming synonyms. Historically, this is an absurd prevarication which only a Communist could invent and only a "Liberal" could believe, but which too many Conservatives let pass. No doubt, McCarthy was an Anti-Communist. He even deserved popular recognition as "Mr. Anti-Communist". But he did not create anti-Communism in America, nor was he driven to earth, as he was, simply because he expressed anti-Communist sentiments and attacked Communist individuals. Much less was he hated and finally exterminated (except from history and heaven) because of any alleged smearing of innocent people.

Instances of the latter have not been proved (and since smearing is an evil thing, one must be presumed innocent of it until proved guilty), but if such instances occurred they had nothing to do with the persecution of McCarthy. The Left does not care how many non-Communists you accuse of being Communists. But the Left swarms angrily out

of the hive if you happen to accuse a *Communist* of being a Communist. Annie Lee Moss was a Communist; that was why it was so evil of Roy Cohn on McCarthy's behalf to say she was a Communist. Had she been the harmless Aunt Jemima patronized by Stuart Symington, the Left would doubtless have left her to the mercies of the Committee, happy to know that McCarthy was for once on the wrong track. McCarthy was killed politically, and probably physically, because he was *serious* in his anti-Communism.

Today the objection made to McCarthy — and almost universally accepted since his enemies remember to make it and his friends neglect to refute it — is that he represents an anti-Communist phase in American history, which like the Palmer raids of 1920 is best forgotten except to serve as admonitions for the future. The difference between Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer of the second Wilson Administration and Senator Joseph R. McCarthy of the late Truman and early Eisenhower years, is that Palmer's "Red Scare" was attributed to "hysteria", while McCarthy's anti-Communism is represented as a deadly malignancy of the national body politic.

A few years ago it was only "Liberal Intellectuals" (who are seldom liberal, seldom intellectual, and never both at the same time) who excoriated McCarthy simply because of his anti-Communism. Even they attacked only the *way* in which he expressed his anti-Communism, or what they said was his way. For a decade their charge backfired against them, since the average American took for granted, and leading "Liberals" themselves declared, that Communism was evil. If McCarthy was against it he must have been a well-meaning fellow, even if he sometimes used rough methods. Many thought that rough methods might be just what the country needed. The average American until a few years ago was himself an anti-Communist, and was not always himself too squeamish about methods. The now obsolete slogan, *I like what Senator McCarthy is trying to do, but I don't like his methods*, never succeeded in turning the majority against him, and possibly was not intended to affect the majority directly. It was aimed, rather, at more sensitive types — at teachers, preachers, writers — at sophisticated verbalizers, who would in turn condition the popular mind, à la Pavlov's dog, to react negatively to the name *Joe McCarthy*.

Yet for years the formula never quite worked. By conceding that "what McCarthy was trying to do" (*i.e.*, fight

*From *The Review Of The News*, May 9, 1973. *The Review Of The News* is published weekly from Belmont, Massachusetts, U.S.A. 02178.

Communism) was a worthy objective, the "Liberals" were left cavilling, splitting hairs over methods — and since it was well advertised and hardly contested that the Communists themselves used any methods available, the man in the street rather felt that if McCarthy wanted to fight fire with fire, let him do it.

Today the situation has changed radically. "Liberals" no longer charge McCarthy with using wrong methods in fighting Communism; they now damn him for fighting Communism at all. The country has not yet gone Communist, but it has gone anti-anti-Communist. The change was due to, or signaled by, Richard Nixon's trip to Red China. (The trip to Moscow, which substantively was no doubt by far the more important of the two, had nothing like the propaganda impact of the trip to Peking.) The generation of the Seventies does not seem to know that there is anything wrong with Communism. (Even Rightwingers now say the real enemy is not the Communists. — The hell it ain't.*) The generation of the Sixties learned, or thought it learned, that a war in Asia against Communism (which is all anybody ever told us was the purpose of the Vietnam War) was not good; from which the conclusion began to be drawn that peaceful co-existence with Communism must not be bad. All of this is in marked contrast to the fact that the generation of the Fifties had been told repeatedly by the enemies of McCarthy that Communism must be opposed, but that it must not be opposed by "improper" methods.

Running that back through, the Fifties prepared the country to oppose Communism by carefully limited methods. The Sixties demonstrated that carefully limited methods could not successfully oppose Communism in Vietnam. The Seventies have drawn the conclusion that Communism should not be opposed at all. Even people (probably the majority) who did not "buy" the allegedly ethical argument of the Fifties were convinced by the practical demonstration of the Sixties, and have drawn the fallacious conclusion of the Seventies that it is a mistake to be anti-Communist.

But the molders of public opinion still had a problem. Anti-Communism is now bad by common consent, and that is all to the good as far as the opinion-molders go. But someone might recall that those same opinion-molders were themselves vociferous anti-Communists only a few years ago. Indeed, the technique of making America anti-anti-Communist had involved leading America into a war against Communism in circumstances, and employing methods, where the American military and psychological effort was certain to be frustrated. To lead America into such a war, however, the opinion-molders had had to be, as of the late 1950s and early 1960s, great anti-Communists themselves. Now they must change. But it would be well if few people noticed that they had changed. It would be better, as George Orwell spelled out in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, if the masses forgot that the leaders had ever said anything different from what they were saying now.

To this end the whole burden (as it had come to be thought) of American anti-Communism would be placed, as on a scapegoat, on the already "Liberal"-accursed memory of

Senator Joe McCarthy. McCarthy was now wicked, not because he had used wrong methods in opposing Communism, but because he had opposed Communism at all. And he was the one who led America into the wicked ways of anti-Communism. Moscow and Peking can never forgive us if we do not convince them that we would never have done so foolish a thing as oppose Communism if that wicked Senator from Wisconsin back in the benighted Fifties had not led us astray. *Nostra culpa!* but he, "mercifully," is dead, and now we can return home to the Kremlin. Or the Chase Manhattan bank right across the street.

It may well be that the enduring historic significance of Joe McCarthy is the fact that — even if posthumously — he has finally smoked out the Communist adherents in America. His case demonstrated that you cannot adequately promote Communism while pretending to be yourself an anti-Communist. At some point you have to show your true colours if you hope to make formal peace with open Communists. When a Henry Kissinger — or a Richard Nixon — goes to see a Chou En-lai or a Leonid Brezhnev, he cannot say, *Our late Senator McCarthy was right in trying to destroy your power; he just used the wrong methods.* Doctor Kissinger, President Nixon — whoever seeks a peaceful accommodation with Peking or Moscow — must say, in one way or another: *America is not opposed to Communism, Americans are no longer — if indeed they ever were — anti-Communist. Some Americans were led astray by the late Senator McCarthy, and became for a time hysterical anti-Communists. But the Senator is mercifully dead, and anti-Communism died with him. Please, Sir, be nice to us, and we will be nice to you. No more McCarthyism!*

How else would you approach the Kremlin or the Forbidden City? Would you say, in case you were asked about McCarthy — as you surely would be, in one way or another — would you say, *Oh, we were opposed to Senator McCarthy, because he smeared innocent people — people who were not really Communists?* Would you tell Brezhnev or Mai Tse-tung that *innocent* means *not* being a Communist? Mao Tse-tung and Brezhnev affirm with all the strength they have that *only* Communists are truly innocent. If you want to get along with Brezhnev and Chou En-lai, you had better say something like: *Oh, that poor dear Owen Lattimore! He was worth so much to the glorious Communist cause! it was so wicked of that dreadful Senator McCarthy to persecute this splendid professor. But then what can you expect of an actual ANTI-COMMUNIST, as McCarthy confessed himself to be? Thank the dialectic, there are no longer any anti-Communists in America — except those Birchers, and we hope to take care of them!*

Something like that is what you have to say, whether you mean it or not — even if you are a practised liar, as you surely must be or you would never have had a chance in the first place to go to Peking or Moscow as a representative of the American people, who used to be anti-Communist.

Insofar as they accept the end of the Cold War, the American people are no longer anti-Communist. For whatever may be the case with hot war, open Communists cannot negotiate a compromise in the Cold War. No official Communist can say that anti-Communism is admissible. A crypto-Communist can attack Communism — within limits — but an open Communist, such as the Russian and Red

*The editors regret that they have been unable to find a satisfactory euphemism to replace with precision Professor Evans' expletive. We beg your indulgence in the interest of accuracy.

Chinese officials, must always affirm the correctness of Communism and demand the rejection of anti-Communism. Or turn that around. The rejection of anti-Communism is even more basic. A Communist may deal with a *non*-Communist (confident that the latter will eventually come around), but he can never deal with an *anti*-Communist unless he knows that the latter is lying — and then the deal will (for political reasons on both sides) have to be secret.

Joe McCarthy was not the originator of political anti-Communism in America. Nor was Richard Nixon, though Nixon preceded McCarthy in making political hay out of anti-Communist sentiment which had been thoroughly aroused before either Nixon or McCarthy ever came to public notice. (There is nothing wrong with making political hay out of anti-Communism, if you don't later turn around and feed it to the Communists for their nourishment.) The revelations of Elizabeth Bentley, Whittaker Chambers, Julian Wadleigh, and other repentant Communists had already (1948) confirmed suspicions that the U.S. Government had been seriously infiltrated by Soviet agents — suspicions logically aroused by the still earlier disclosures of Soviet espionage in Canada.

It was February 16, 1946, that the Canadian Government announced the arrest of twenty-two members of one or more Communist spy rings, specifically charged with attempting to steal information on the atomic bomb for the Soviet Union. An advance hint of this had been given February third by, of all people, the late Drew Pearson. (Ten years later, when Igor Gouzenko, whose defection from the Soviet apparatus broke the Canadian spy case, was living incognito in the United States, he appeared, his head covered with a hood to conceal his identity, on Pearson's television programme. Pearson was close to this bit of pre-McCarthy, and post-McCarthy, anti-Communist through-out).

Two official speeches of February 1946 signalled the opening of what was soon to be called the Cold War. One, by Joseph Stalin on February ninth in Moscow, the other by then Secretary of State James Byrnes on February twenty-eighth, to the Overseas Press Club in New York. Each official made plain his doubt that his country could continue peaceful co-existence unless the other country drastically modified its policies.

As heralds of the Cold War, however, Stalin and Byrnes were mere curtain-raisers to Winston Churchill, whose speech of March 5, 1946, at Fulton, Missouri, where President Harry Truman was his host, aroused the "Free World" against Moscow. Said the British wartime Prime Minister, in 1946, a private citizen:

From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of central and eastern Europe, Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest, and Sofia — all these famous cities and the populations around them lie in the Soviet sphere and all are subject in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and increasing measure of control from Moscow.

As the degree of control from Moscow escalated during the next few ensuing years, notably by the "bloodless" Com-

munist *coup* of February 1948 in Czecho-Slovakia, anti-Communism became the accepted American attitude.

And in the interval between Churchill's "Iron Curtain" speech and the fall of Czecho-Slovakia, the U.S. Government for the first time took an official anti-Communist position, not merely against internal subversion, but in the international arena. The "Truman Doctrine" was announced March 12, 1947, and President Truman's request that Congress provide \$400 million to help Greece and Turkey fight Communism was approved March fifteenth. That seems like a small amount nowadays, but the purchasing power of the dollar was double then what it is now, and most important, here was merely the first olive out of the bottle.

It is interesting to realize that this initial announcement of active anti-Communism as the principal foreign policy plank of every Administration from Truman through Johnson was instigated *not* by Joseph McCarthy, who was not known as an anti-Communist until February 1950; nor by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which was that same year (1947) to investigate crypto-Communism in Hollywood; nor by The John Birch Society, which was not to come into existence for another eleven years (1958) — but by General George Marshall, then Secretary of State, and Dean Acheson, then Under Secretary — both to become in due course implacable enemies of McCarthy.

A fascinating account of the origin of the Truman Doctrine is given by Professor Gaddis in his book *Cold War*, reading in part as follows:

On February 27, [1947] President Truman invited a bipartisan group of congressional leaders to the White House for a briefing on the Greek crisis. Secretary of State Marshall described the reasons why the British had withdrawn aid from Greece and Turkey, the danger that these areas might fall under Soviet domination, and the decision which the executive branch had reached on the necessity for American assistance. Marshall's dry, laconic presentation failed to impress the suspicious congressmen

At this point, Dean Acheson asked for permission to speak. The Undersecretary of State painted a vivid picture of a world divided between irreconcilable ideologies, a situation unparalleled since the days of Rome and Carthage. The Soviet Union, he asserted, was trying to impose its ideology on as much of the world as possible. A victory for communism in Greece, Turkey, Iran, or any of the other countries of the Near East Mediterranean region could lead rapidly to the collapse of pro-Western governments throughout Europe. Russian control over two-thirds of the world's surface and three-fourths of its populations [Acheson was evidently already giving them China, though this was two and a half years before the fall of mainland China to Mao Tse-tung's Communists] would make American security precarious indeed. Therefore, aid to Greece and Turkey was not simply a matter of rescuing British chestnuts, it was a sober and realistic effort to protect the security of the United States by strengthening the ability of free people to resist communist aggression and subversion.

(continued on page 7)

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: One year \$6.00; Six months \$3.00; Three months \$1.50. Offices: Business: Tidal Publications, Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001.

Editorial, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

English edition published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11.

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. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q. General Deputy Chairman and Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

Vol. 53. No. 4

July, 1973

Evil Purpose

"There is higher authority than ours for the observation that though one rose from the dead, yet would they not believe. Yet, to take only the period of history covered by the three hundred years since Cromwell, the evidence for the existence of a conscious organised, Evil Purpose in the world appears so overwhelming that it would seem axiomatic that mankind could have no prior interest than to root out its Incarnations wherever found. Yet, so far as we can judge there is general though not universal apathy on the subject, and where there is not, the concern lacks focus. . . ."

—C. H. Douglas in *The Social Crediter*, Oct. 2, 1948.

The BCC and Two Masters

I congratulate the Roman Catholic Bishops of Scotland for refusing to join the British Council of Churches. The decision of their counterparts in England and Wales "is expected to be announced today". (*The Times*, May 5, 1973.)

The arrogance of the BCC appears from a statement of Bishop Sansbury, the General Secretary, that ordinary churchgoers—who finance the organisation—are "the thoughtless and reactionary in the pews". An article in the *East-West Digest*, May 1973, calls it an "unbalanced propaganda agency" and reveals that ten of the thirty Anglican members are *personally nominated* by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York.

The political postures of the BCC are modelled on those of the World Council of Churches and have the same "leftish bias". The author, G. Stewart-Smith M.P., recalls that when Rhodesia declared her independence, the Archbishop, BCC's president, was "all for fighting a holy war". In fact he embarrassed Mr. Wilson by his promise of "a great body of Christian opinion" in using force. I saw no evidence of such support for war in a largish country parish at the time but heard several expressions of horror at the prelate's blood-thirstiness. Mr. Wilson stated in the Commons that the problem was not one "that can be settled by the use of force".

The Bishop of Mashonaland, unfortunately dead, warned against the "undying hatred" that the use of force would provoke, and was good enough to send me a line to say that he believed in a just solution in good time. At this

period I also heard from a BCC sympathiser who commended a "limited war" in which of course he did not intend to participate.

The article shows how the BCC opposed a settlement at the time of the Pearce Commission's visit to Rhodesia in 1972 by rushing out a pamphlet which advised Africans against entering "an inequitable compromise". It had 16,000 copies printed but Bishop Sansbury claimed that it sent no more than 150 to Rhodesia. The WCC had three months earlier granted the Rhodesian terrorist movements 10,000 dollars, and the article asks whether it was not their views that the presumptuous BCC was representing.

Finally, the day after Peter Niesewand's sentence, the Rev. Paul Oestreicher appeared on a platform with Judith Todd in a protest meeting. Mr. Oestreicher "co-author with Communist James Klugman of a book on revolution" has been closely associated with the International Department of BCC for ten years and his special responsibility is East-West relations. Yet he turns a blind eye to any injustice in Communist countries: another article in the *Digest* reviews Prof. Peter Reddaway's *Report* on forced labour camps in USSR which hold some million prisoners in 1,000 camps. But Mr. Oestreicher concentrates on "dialogues" between the Marxist and Christian, an attempt of course to blend opposites. "He will hold to the one and despise the other".

The Editorial opens with an article on "the politics of inciting sexual anarchy" and notes that the object is to destroy the family so that the way to communist revolution may be open. Corruption was a method suggested in an early handbook of power, the *Protocols of the Learned Elders* . . .

But a new leader has emerged who incites the churches to "revolutionary change", the Right Rev. Kenneth Slack, Moderator of the United Reformed Church. In his address to the first general assembly of this body at the City Temple, Dr. Slack quoted the Bolivian Camilo Torres as saying, "The Catholic who is not a revolutionary is living in mortal sin". Dr. Slack added, "He was right". (*The Times*, May 8, 1973).

Revolution in Bolivia or in Ulster means terrorism and savagery and at best leads to the emergence of a more brutal and absolute power, but perhaps Dr. Slack wishes to lead the mob. I do not know how far these incitements violate the law on keeping the peace, but talk of "social justice" with complete disregard of the built-in inflation of our financial system indicates naivety or complicity. —H.S.

Notice

Supplies of *The Selling of America* by Rose L. Martin, which is reviewed on page 5, are in transit from the U.S.A. and should arrive in August, but they are subject to delay in the mails. This book will be available from K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11 3NL, at £2.50p posted.

K.R.P. Publications also has on order *One Hundred and One Things You Should Know About Marijuana* by Robert Pelton and *Blueprint For Tyranny*, giving the complete text of U.S. Executive Order 11490 which permits the United States Federal Government to assume virtual dictatorial controls over the United States in "an emergency type situation". Both books are Western Islands publications and are priced at 50p. each posted.

The Selling of America*

One of the consolations of living in a dangerously threatened world is the pleasure of reading well written books about the crisis. This is the second book of Rose L. Martin's which I have reviewed (the other was *Fabian Freeway*—see AMERICAN OPINION for December 1966), and I find again that her style is engagingly elegant, while her information seems virtually inexhaustible. Most consequentially, her judgment is poised, perspicacious, and precise. There is no royal road to learning for princes, and neither is there any painless path to knowledge for the population at large, but the nearest and least grueling way is through the pages of a well organized, lucid, and gracefully composed work (there are not many) like *The Selling Of America*.

At first I was not taken by the title. I thought the mercantile connotations too placid for a world in crisis. Is the *Gotterdammerung* a time for business as usual? Then I started thinking, which shows what will happen to you when you read books by Rose Martin. America is not in danger of nuclear devastation.† Our putative antagonists in an atomic Armageddon are too dependent on us to launch any large-scale military attack against us, or to provoke us into attacking them.

And our own Establishment, if not so moral as it pretends, is indeed business-minded. It doubtless has every intention of turning the dependence of Russian and Chinese Communism on us to "our" advantage. Those intentions may very well be frustrated, but hardly through the deliberate instigation by either "side" of nuclear war. Not that I accept the balance-of-terror theory. The advantage in nuclear weapons is undoubtedly all ours, if there is any advantage. But as Doctor Oppenheimer sagely observed, "An atomic bomb which you do not use is of no use to you," and we are plainly not going to use ours unless somebody uses one against us first. And neither Moscow nor Peking is going to be so foolish as to alter the American psychology in this regard. (If Moscow and Peking are somehow puppets of *Insiders* in New York and Washington, then *a fortiori* they are not going to bomb either our capital or our metropolis.)

Yet despite the reasons for reassurance that no nuclear holocaust is imminent, no patriotic American can study the position of the United States in the world arena today without feelings of enormous anxiety. Why is this? The reason is that we are being sold out. Our national independence is not yet gone, but our managers have put it in layaway for some customers they know. It's not doing us any good now, and if we don't reverse the transaction U.S. sovereignty will be picked up any day.

"Selling" America doesn't sound so dramatic, nor at first blush so bad, as *betraying* America. It may be recalled, however, that the arch traitor Judas Iscariot "sold" his Master for thirty pieces of silver. (Interestingly enough, Judas was a bit puritanical, and filled with social conscience. When Mary anointed Jesus' feet with "ointment of spikenard, very

costly," it was Judas who objected: "Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor?" He would have made a good Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.)

A traitor is not a legitimate seller, for what he sells is not really his own. He defrauds both the rightful owner and the buyer, for he alienates the property of the former without giving the latter a legitimate title. The selling of America is treason, for no one is authorized by the true owners (who are not only the present people of the United States, but also their forebears and their posterity) to convey the property.

It is a special excellence of Rose L. Martin's book that she has recognized the conspiratorial treason at work in America today as essentially a fraudulently commercial process. True, that treason co-opts (or is co-opted by) other diabolic forces. Taking Milton as our guide we can recognize nihilistic Moloch, dissolute Belial, canny Beelzebub, and (obscurely) the grand strategist—Satan himself. But in charge—or apparently in charge—of daily operations is Mammon, "the least erected spirit that fell/ From heaven." The money-changers are not only in the temple, they have given Caesar an option on the place. (Did you know that Moscow loves to be called "The Third Rome"?)

Speaking, however, of Caesar, you know the story of how he demanded the keys to the Treasury from the custodian, and how on that worthy's reply that under Roman law he could not turn them over thus, Caesar said: *You do not seem to understand the situation. The only question is whether you give me the keys, or I kill you and take them.* (Quoted from memory; so I am prepared to be corrected by people who were there just as I was.) All questions of political power are at some crucial point questions of force. Meanwhile, the terms under which opposing forces shall eventually decide the issue are arranged by parleys and negotiations. Sooner or later the gunmen have a showdown, but too often after the wheeler-dealers have arranged the terms of the shoot out.

Since *The Selling Of America* is itself a (very helpful) simplification of a complex congeries of conspiracies, I'm not sure how helpful it may be for me to simplify the matter further. If you are interested in world affairs, you ought to read the book. If you are not interested in world affairs, why are you reading AMERICAN OPINION? But without attempting to adumbrate anything like the full substance of Rose L. Martin's work, I will retail one or two of her principal themes, confident that you will want to pursue them further in her pages.

Underlying all is her thesis, advanced previously in *Fabian Freeway*, and not altered because there is no reason to alter it, that there are two main aspects of the conspiratorial world revolution. To quote from her earlier book:

The Socialist and Communist world movements are like the two faces of a coin—not identical, yet inseparable It is, of course, to the interest of every man, woman and child in America, desiring personal liberty in a free and sovereign nation, that the fraudulent nature of this coin be recognized

In *The Selling Of America* she adds striking documentation of the increasing currency of the Socialist face of this counterfeit coin. After all, it was between publication dates of her two books that there occurred what was at once the

*A book review, from *American Opinion*, May 1973, of *The Selling Of America* by Rose L. Martin, Fidelis Publishers Inc., Post Office Box 1338, Santa Monica, California 90406; 298 pages (paperback plus jacket), US\$5.00.

†Not before the establishment of the World Government anyhow. After the "sale" is consummated and the universal conglomerate put into working order, Americans might learn what a Carthaginian peace can mean in the nuclear age.

most complete vindication of her thesis, and at the same time the most ominous individual accession to mandated power since the Second World War, not excepting the elevation of Charles de Gaulle to power in France in 1959. I refer to the October 21, 1969, election of Willy Brandt as Chancellor of West Germany. Brandt promptly signed friendship treaties with Soviet Russia and her satellite, Communist Poland. For two years there was some show of reluctance by the West German parliament to ratify such a treaty, but by 1972 they ratified, and West Germany recognized Communist East Germany as a nation. As Rose L. Martin points out, "An earlier German chancellor, Walter Rathenau, was assassinated for less in the 1920s." (Rapallo Pact between Germany and Soviet Russia, 1922.)

Considering that West Germany has been since 1945 virtually an American protectorate, while East Germany has been, and is, plainly an integral part of the Communist bloc against which we have been ostensibly aligned since 1946 (when the "Iron Curtain" became fully visible), there can be no argument but that Willy Brandt has sold out to Moscow not only his own country, but American interests as well. At the same time it should be clear that Brandt neither would nor could ever have done what he did without prior consultation with Washington.

Many Americans are confused by what Brandt has done (as they are confused by what Nixon has done in approaching both Moscow and Peking). Most Rightwingers (me among them) take for granted that Brandt is semisecretly a Communist. What Rose L. Martin points out is that he is openly Vice-Chairman of the Socialist International, and has been since 1966. But since Socialism and Communism are two faces of one coin, then being openly a Socialist is a way of being semisecretly a Communist. *Nicht wahr?*

Too many good Conservatives are not even aware of the formal existence of the Socialist International. One of the great values of Rose L. Martin's book is to wake us up to this tremendously important reality. One picture is worth a thousand words. She includes well chosen, highly instructive pictures. You should sit and stare for some time at a photograph of Willy Brandt with Golda Meir and Harold Wilson at the 1969 Socialist International Eastbourne Congress. It will do you good (intellectually if not emotionally) to see Willy grinning, Golda guffawing, and Harold looking (but not necessarily *being*) somewhat quizzically bewildered. The photo was not taken for this book, you may be sure, but appears on the cover of *The International 1969 to 1971: General Secretary's Report to the Helsinki Council Conference of the Socialist International 25-27 May, 1971*, said cover being sharply reproduced (and it was sharp of Mrs. Martin to reproduce it) in *The Selling Of America*, preceding Page 236. What *did* Israel's Golda and West Germany's Willy find so mutually hilarious in 1969? American stupidity?

The United States is not formally represented in the Socialist International, of which Britain and West Germany are leaders, nor in the Communist world enterprise, which interestingly enough calls itself the "Socialist" camp, and of which Russia and Red China are leaders. We may be sure, however, that Americans are not unrepresented in those interlocking aggregations. The sellers of America keep in constant touch with the prospective buyers. Oddly enough—but

not unexpectedly to readers of AMERICAN OPINION—liaison between our own country and the socialist camp (let the ambiguity stand) is maintained by our best organized capitalists. "The Heart Of The Matter"—that's a chapter title in *The Selling Of America*—is our old (false) friend, the Council on Foreign Relations. I like the way Rose L. Martin handles this one. Beating "Liberal" sophisticates (a rotten bunch, as you know) to the punch, she expresses amazement that *anyone* should ever be so naive as to *question* that the C.F.R. is the *de facto* U.S. government as far as foreign policy is concerned. Like so:

Over the years Foreign Affairs [the C.F.R.'s gray-paper quarterly] has contained so many advance tips on United States foreign policy and graced so many reception room tables in United States embassies around the globe that many "informed" Americans at home and abroad mistakenly assume it to be an official State Department publication. [As many assume the Federal Reserve Board to be part of the Treasury Department.] At any rate, it has become "must" reading for every aspiring young man in the career foreign service, as well as for the captive audiences in schools and colleges to whom reprints of special articles are distributed. [And in whose libraries Foreign Affairs is inevitably found.] Only the oddball would dare to doubt its authoritative character.

Don't look at me! I'm no oddball. I don't doubt it, not for one minute! And haven't for these many years.

But what, really, is the Council on Foreign Relations? It is an institutionalized coalition of New York banks, Ivy League universities, and the major tax-exempt foundations. All these are precisely the most conspicuous institutional products, and undoubtedly the chief beneficiaries, of historic capitalism. Yet through this, perhaps their proudest derivative organization, the Council on Foreign Relations, these capitalists work in concert with the socialist camp to bring about a kind of unified world which can only be dominated by Communist-style terror police. (I once heard a State Department man lecture and say that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. were gradually getting more and more alike—that they were getting more capitalistic, while we were getting more socialistic—and that as a result the two would finally merge. The only real difference, he said, was that *they* have terror police, and *we* don't. In a question-and-answer period I asked him what would happen about the one difference when the final merger came. Would *they* get rid of—or would *we* acquire—the terror police? He had no answer, except that it was a good question (which I already knew.)

I can't begin to tell you here all the data and cogent analysis which Rose L. Martin brings to illuminate the conspiratorial scene. She delves into the financial, political, intellectual, and religious aspects of the remorseless struggle for world power. Besides the C.F.R., she treats of the Committee for Economic Development; the Bilderbergers; the World Council of Churches; the Rhodes Scholarship fraternity (she does *not* think Cecil Rhodes and Lord Milner were intentional betrayers of the English-speaking world—on the contrary; but she observes what Rhodes' academic beneficiaries have done and are doing); and, of course, of the British Fabian Society; and of the aforesaid Socialist International. She deals also with the New Left and Black militants. If she neglects anything, it is the military aspect,

which in one sense must be final. Yet I must allow that if the "selling" process which she describes is successfully consummated, there won't be any international military problem—only a police problem.

The Selling Of America is a challenge to serious thought. What are the relationships between the various conspiracies? It reminds you what a good life it must be to read *National Review* and not believe in any conspiracies, much less a whole snakepit full of them—which is what anybody who opens his eyes must see, though he cannot make out the exact shape of the individual snakes or predict the outcome of their intricate convolutions. Just think, there is William F. Buckley who is working with James Burnham, who was once a Trotskyist, and used to work with Frank Meyer, who was once a Stalinist, and so Bill knows that there just can't be any conspiracies—because, I suppose, when Jim and Frank quit, the whole conspiracy business just sort of fell apart.

Rose L. Martin cannot answer all our questions, but she provides an abundance of information, a rare gift of insight, and above all, heuristic quickening of our own minds. I remain amazed at the scope and clarity of Rose L. Martin's panoramic analysis of the contemporary world. How does she see so much so clearly? How does a woman (male chauvinist pig that I am, I ask) understand so well the men who manage national and international affairs? But then I recall what kind of men those so often are. Perhaps it takes a real woman to discern and reveal the fraudulent nature of an *ersatz* woman like John Maynard Keynes.

—MEDFORD EVANS.

In Memoriam Joe McCarthy (Continued from page 3)

Acheson's oratory carried the day. Senator Arthur Vandenberg, once an "isolationist," declared he would support aid to Greece and Turkey if President Truman would say publicly what Under Secretary Acheson had just said to the Congressmen. The next day an interdepartmental meeting agreed on a working paper, on the basis of which the "Truman Doctrine" was established. "When Truman came before Congress on March 12, 1947," writes Gaddis, "... he made the ideological confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States the central focus of his remarks." Officially, the United States remained anti-Communist from that time until President Nixon decided to go to Peking. Obviously, our Government has not been anti-Communist since that decision, was not even then, and is daily becoming more *pro*-Communist.

Professor Gaddis makes clear that the Truman Doctrine was not meant to be taken too seriously. An information officer present at the aforesaid interdepartmental meeting is quoted as saying that "the only way we can sell the public on our new policy is by emphasizing the necessity of holding the line: communism vs. democracy should be the major theme." The pitch, from the *Insiders'* point of view, was all too successful. Gaddis writes:

Trapped in their own rhetoric, leaders of the United States found it difficult to respond to the conciliatory gestures which emanated from the Kremlin following Stalin's death and, through their inflexibility, may well have contributed to the perpetuation of the Cold War.

Stalin died March 5, 1953. Gaddis is not explicit as to what those "conciliatory gestures" from the Kremlin were.

His book covers detail only through 1947. Yet here he affirms the conclusion that the continuation of the Cold War through the Fifties was not due primarily to Senator McCarthy, though he does at this point make his one previously quoted reference to "the domestic onslaught of McCarthyism" (the only reference to McCarthy is in his book), but was due to the "rhetoric" of the leaders of both the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations. And the only way they could have been "trapped" by such rhetoric was that the American public was *sincerely* anti-Communist, while the Administration leaders were not.

And Joe McCarthy, like the American majority, was sincere in his anti-Communism. That was why he had to go. Joe McCarthy was much too honest, kind, and personally brave a man to last in a Washington where the real foreign policy for twenty-five years was to speak as an anti-Communist and act as protector of established Communist gains. The United States in those days was the champ. In the match with the Soviet Union the trick was to show enough form and power of our own to make the challenger look good, but to pull punches enough to minimize punishment, and at all hazards to avoid a knockout. Joe McCarthy threatened the whole mutual understanding.

Yet McCarthy could not be attacked during his lifetime, much less during his heyday (1950-1953), for anti-Communism. On the record, everybody was anti-Communist. Gaddis cites a *New York Times* editorial of February 11, 1946, saying that Stalin's then recent address would "disappoint those who assumed that communism and capitalism could coexist peacefully in the postwar period." Gaddis continues: "Even liberals like Eric Sevareid and William O. Douglas saw ominous overtones in Stalin's speech. . . . Douglas told Forrestal simply that Stalin's speech constituted 'the Declaration of World War III.'" That's not Joe McCarthy at Wheeling, West Virginia, in 1950; that's Supreme Court Justice Douglas four years earlier. *Everybody* was anti-Communist.

Just so, everybody in the Soviet Union, including of course Nikita Khrushchev, was pro-Stalin. Yet three years after Stalin's death, at the Twentieth Communist Congress, Khrushchev made a seven-hour speech repudiating Stalin's cruelties and indicating that the Soviet Union could coexist peacefully with the non-Communist West. (Actually, Stalin himself had prescribed co-existence as a policy as early as October 1952.)

Clearly the parallel cannot be pressed too far between what surviving Soviet Communists did to Stalin after his death, and what American "Liberals" are doing to McCarthy now that there is a friendly Chase Manhattan bank in Moscow. Khrushchev and company had been servile lackeys to Stalin while he lived, and criticized him only after he was safely dead. Our "Liberals," despite their silly cries of "reign of terror" (had there been one they would have kept quiet), never had any reason to fear McCarthy personally—unless, to be sure, they really did have a blood-Red record which he might any day run across. Even then, McCarthy himself could not have done anything about it, except publicize it. Which would not have hurt them if the public had not been solidly anti-Communist, and if the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations had not, as Professor Gaddis says, trapped themselves in their own rhetoric.

No, for their safety the "Liberals" had to be anti-McCarthy from the start, but they had to be careful *how* they were anti-McCarthy. They could not then denounce him for anti-Communism. Everybody was anti-Communist. They had to say that they too were anti-Communist, and that the Communists whom McCarthy was exposing were not Communists. This was a burden and a strain.

But now that Nixon has gone to Peking, and Henry Kissinger is a power behind the throne,* protocol requires that Americans no longer be anti-Communist. Anti-McCarthyites, then, can use the ghost of McCarthy to be the scapegoat for their own former anti-Communism, as the surviving gang in the Kremlin in 1956 used the ghost of Stalin as a scapegoat for all the cruelties of which they as well as Stalin were guilty. Say this for the Russian Comrades in the comparison with our own "Liberals" — at least the cruelties of Stalin deserved all possible denunciation. But anti-Communism is a virtue, not as our "Liberals" now imply, a sin.

See the serpentine reasoning: "McCarthyism was first defined as "smearing" — actionable slander or libel if provable and not protected by Senatorial immunity. The definition was a lie insofar as it purported to be based on the record of the man McCarthy; but, by endless repetition during his life and after his death, it gained some currency. *Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary* defines "McCarthyism" as "Involving personal attacks on individuals by means of widely publicized indiscriminate allegations, especially on the basis of unsubstantiated charges." This is a wicked thing to do. What is a college student (a good one, who uses the dictionary) to think? This student has no recollection of Joe McCarthy. The student can only suppose that McCarthyism is a wicked thing, and presumably Joe McCarthy was a wicked man.

But now the definition changes. The idea that McCarthyism is wicked is firmly fixed in many minds, but the details of the definition are more elusive. Now we hear that McCarthyism *means anti-Communism*. So anti-Communism must be wicked! Especially since our President has made peace with the Communists. To be sure, some people remember when our President was as notorious as an anti-Communist as Joe McCarthy, but our President has outlived those wicked ways, and like a king's mistress who has entered a convent, no longer thinks in the same terms. Let anti-Communism be consigned to the grave with the late Senator from Wisconsin. Peace!

America must reawaken from the dream of hope that it can peacefully coexist with nations under Communist control. The nations themselves are not the enemy; the Communist controllers are; but such nations as Russia and China are prize pieces on the international chessboard. To approach them unwarily is to invite checkmate. National independence cannot long survive cessation of anti-Communism in America.

But to forfeit American independence would not only be a national disaster; it would also be a betrayal of Christian

(and Jewish and Mohammedan and . . . you name it) faith and common humanity. Communism is openly hostile to God, and secretly hostile to humanity — above all to the *lumpenproletariat* whose misery it enjoys and evidently contemplates increasing. More fortunate under a Communist regime are the previously privileged classes who promptly get killed. It is said that Hitler killed six million Jews. How many he killed is of less importance than the fact that it is in any case a small fraction of the number of assorted Slavs, Chinese, East and West Indians, and Southeast Asians whom the Communists have butchered.

To abandon anti-Communism is to abandon moral decency. It is ironic that Joe McCarthy was attacked on moral grounds, for his chosen enemy is the outstanding earthly instigator of evil — Satan's vicar, as it were. McCarthy was charged with cruelty, but he murdered no one, while his enemy murdered millions. He was charged with "smearing" the innocent — in other words, with lying; yet among his leading personal enemies were Drew Pearson, J. Robert Oppenheimer, and Owen Lattimore, the three most conspicuous liars of contemporary history. (Pearson by common consent, Oppenheimer by self-confession, Lattimore by unrefuted accusation from a U.S. Senate Committee.)

It would not be a light thing, should America forget Joe McCarthy. It is even worse that as of 1973 he is forgotten or blotted from memory by his friends, while he continues to be lied about and vilified by his enemies. This is the worse case because it not only is unjust in itself, but indicates that McCarthy's enemies, who are independent America's enemies, have more pertinacity of fighting spirit and better understanding of history than do his friends. It does not take much courage for a "Liberal" like Charles Lam Markmann to call McCarthy *canaille* at this time, but it takes some; it certainly takes more than for Conservatives to let the accusation lie (as it does), and to support the pro-Communist foreign policy of a President who once, falsely, pretended to be Joe McCarthy's friend.

Yet that President personally was not responsible for the betrayal of McCarthy in which he took part (see Roy Cohn, *McCarthy*, Pp. 62-64), and probably even now does not have primary responsibility for the betrayal of America in which he is taking part. The financial center in New York, the intellectual center in New England, and the political center in Washington are the *troika* responsible for our betrayal to a Communist world government in the making. That this *troika* is never too busy with its other treasonable acts to keep alive the lies about McCarthy and McCarthyism should be reason enough (though truth and justice are greater reasons) to rehabilitate the memory of a great American who certainly did not invent anti-Communism in this country, but whom we may accept as symbolic of it because he was so sincere.

The "Liberal" Establishment now implies that McCarthyism and anti-Communism are one and the same thing. If so, it is because the "Liberal" Establishment from 1946 to 1971 was lying in its teeth.

Which is quite possible. But if McCarthyism and anti-Communism are one and the same thing, the right response is not to reject anti-Communism, but to restore the good name of the man, and renew the good fight for America for which he stood.

*Professor Kissinger was quoted in *Parade* Sunday magazine of April 15, 1973, as saying: "If the North Vietnamese are willing to compete peacefully, . . . then we don't object to their objectives." Their openly declared chief objective, of course, is the Communization of the world according to Marxist-Leninist principles.