ITEM: From a full-page Advertisement of Macy's department store, in the New York Times, January 4, 1965:

Take just one example: the United Nations Special Fund, which is helping hundreds of millions of people help themselves. How? It provides the means to survey natural resources, apply modern know-how, train people. Why? These projects help developing countries attract and effectively use the investment capital needed to build "stand-on-their-own-feet" economies. No politics, no partisanship... just good sound business for everybody.

CORRECTION: The United Nations Special Fund was created and began its operations on January 1, 1959. The UNSF was first suggested by Paul G. Hoffman, then a U.S. delegate to the UN, and, since its origin, the only Managing Director which the Fund has had.

In May 1961, Paul Hoffman and the Governing Council of the UNSF approved a grant to finance expansion of the Central Agricultural Experimental station in Santiago de las Vegas, Cuba. The total cost of the project was estimated at $3,000,000-$1,157,600 to be given by the UNSF, the remainder to be raised by Castro's government. The UN's Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) was selected as the "administering agency".

It was late in 1962 before Castro would allow the FAO's agents to enter Cuba to sign agreements that were necessary before aid could be given. On February 13, 1963, Paul G. Hoffman announced that UNSF would make the grant to Communist Cuba, despite formal objections made in the UN by the U.S. delegation. (See "United Nations: UNSF", The Don Smoot Report, April 1, 1963.)

Representative Durwood G. Hall (R-Mo.), disturbed at the UN grants to Communist Cuba, addressed the House of Representatives and reviewed the history of UNSF. Contrary to Macy's contention that UNSF has been "just sound business for everybody", Mr. Hall produced facts to prove that the Communist-bloc nations were the profiteers:

... I call your attention to the fact that [since 1959] while the total contribution of the Communist bloc has increased less than 3 per cent, and the contribution of Soviet Russia has remained constant over a 5-year period, the U.S. contribution to the U.N. Special Fund has increased 300 per cent in that same period.

Not a single year has gone by since 1959 that we have failed to increase the U.S. contribution by a substantial amount. None of the funds are spent on projects in the United States which contributes 40 per cent of the Special Fund, while the Communist-bloc countries are sure that almost all of their funds will be spent in Communist nations because they do not permit conversion of their moneys, except to a very restricted degree.

Here is what one finds when one traces the history of contributions:

In 1959, the United States contributed $10,300,000 while the U.S.S.R. contributed $1 million and the total Communist-bloc contribution was $1,593,000.

In 1960, the United States contributed $15,900,000—a 50 per cent increase. The U.S.S.R. contribution remained steadfast at $1 million and the total Communist-bloc contribution was only $1,625,425.

In 1961, the United States increased its contribution again, this time to $19,900,000. The U.S.S.R. contribution remained at $1 million and the total Communist-bloc contribution was $1,637,425.

In 1962, the United States again increased its contribution to $25,300,000. The U.S.S.R. contribution once more remained steadfast at $1 million, and the total Communist-bloc contribution also remained relatively static at $1,685,000.

In 1963, the U.S. contribution jumped to $29 million. The U.S.S.R. contribution remained at $1 million and the total Communist-bloc contribution remained at $1,685,000.

Now, even these astounding ratios do not tell the full story. The Communist-bloc figures include a $30,000 pledge from Cuba which as of November 1962 had not been paid. Presumably, now that Cuba has been given a large grant she will not mind keeping her word. After all, who would not give a nickel to get a dollar?

Furthermore, contributions from the Communist nations are made in the currency of the donor with only a very insignificant provision of conversion. Yugoslavia allows 20 per cent convertibility. The three Russian members of the U.N. limit convertibility to 25 per cent and then only to cover travel expenses, salary payments to experts—usually their own—and freight and transportation charges on equipment shipped from the U.S.S.R.

In other words, the Communist-bloc nations make sure that any money they contribute to the fund will be expended in Communist countries or countries which can only spend their assistance in rubles.

How have the Communists fared under this arrangement?

Yugoslavia, which has contributed a total of $957,000 over the 5 years, is on the receiving end of three projects totalling $2,627,000.

Poland, which has contributed the meagre sum of $625,000 over a 5-year period, is on the receiving end of two projects totalling $1,837,000.

Mr. Speaker, even the tiny country of Switzerland contributes more to the U.N. fund than Soviet Russia.

The Members will be interested to know that only one identified nuclear research project is being carried out under the auspices of the U.N. Special Fund. It is going on in Yugoslavia—a Communist-bloc nation—and is labelled "Nuclear Research and Training in Agriculture"; and is a 3-year project approved only last May—1962. (Congressional Record, unbound edition, February 21, 1963, pages 2552-2553.)
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FROM WEEK TO WEEK

U.S. News and World Report, March 1, 1965, headlines one of its articles WORLD TROUBLES CLOSING IN ON U.S.
It lists troubles in NATO, with France, London . . . world-wide troubles, with mobs storming American embassies, tearing down the American flag, shouting “Yankee go home”, etc., etc. David Lawrence, the editor of U.S. News, in the previous issue commented on the “strange” complacency of the Administration, an apparent loss of interest in foreign policy. All things considered, a more appropriate headline would seem to be: WORLD COMMUNISM CLOSING IN ON U.S.
After all, the Communist Conspiracy never predicated on a war with the U.S. America was to be outflanked and encircled, until finally that last bastion of capitalism would fall “like an overripe fruit”, but rotten with the Communist maggot within: The Great Society.

Mr. X

Mr. George Kennan, one-time U.S. Ambassador to Moscow and later to Yugoslavia, and who once under the name of Mr. X wrote an article suggesting a partial drawing back of U.S. forces in Europe, is reported in the Daily Telegraph (February 20, 1965) as addressing a New York gathering of statesmen and scholars. “Western policy towards the Soviet bloc, he contended, was riddled with outdated assumptions, yielding sterile results.

. . . He also suggested cutting back on the rearmament of Germany, the promotion of closer contacts with East Germany, and giving greater reassurance to Poland, and other Eastern European countries on the question of Germany’s Eastern border.”

He spoke of “serious elements of misinterpretation” which “impute to Soviet leaders a total inhumanity not plausible even in nature”.

Those Soviet leaders recently visited Peking and North Vietnam with a large entourage of top service personnel, and promised North Vietnam support and supplies in its involvement in the war by the Communist Viet Cong in South Vietnam.

U.S. News and World Report in its issue of February 15, 1965, publishes a verbatim interview with Henry Cabot Lodge, until recently U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, in which he describes the Communist methods, supported by the Soviet leaders, used by the Viet Cong. “What you have in Vietnam is a new kind of fighting man who is as distinct as the infantryman or the aviator. He dresses just like every other man in Vietnam. It is a hot country and they wear sort of pyjama-like clothes, with a pair of trousers and a top. But the terrorist is highly trained, he is very carefully directed, he is very much protected in everything he does. He will be given the order to go in and terrorise a certain village. So Monday morning there will be a dozen bodies on the street.

“The bodies will be those of old men, women and children—not people who have done anything in particular. It’s just killing at random to create terror.

“Then they will kidnap the village chief, cut off his head, put it on a pole, and walk it around.

“So by 3 o’clock that afternoon they do not have too much trouble getting 16- and 17-year-old boys to join the Viet Cong.”

Mr. Lodge further reports that the Viet Cong have so far killed 16,000 village chiefs.

Asked: “Do you mean we have a right to be there in the interest of world peace”, Mr. Lodge replied: “I would say that the Communist seizure of Vietnam would not only have a very disruptive effect in Southeast Asia, but would have world-wide consequence and would certainly shake our position in Berlin”.

And that, no doubt, is the last thing Mr. Kennan’s friends, the not totally inhumane Soviet leaders, would wish to see happen.

But happen it will. The signs are all there. Certain now of the collapse of the South Vietnam government (“political instability”), the U.S. administration is making a minor show of force in Vietnam, which will allow their withdrawal after having “done our best in a hopeless situation”. As usual in such a situation, the State Department has denied that there are any “meaningful” discussions going on concerning an American withdrawal. Just watch. Your turn is coming.

R.I.P.

We learn with regret of the death of E. C. Parker, the Treasurer of the Auckland (N.Z.) District Council of the Douglas Social Credit Movement, and responsible for the distribution of T.S.C. and our literature, whose influence was strong in New Zealand, and who kept in touch with this country.

U. N. O.

The list of United Nations Organisation personnel originally published in The Social Crediter of 18th July, 1964, has been reprinted as a single sheet. Price 25. 6d. a dozen including postage.

A PROPHECY?
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From

Plain Murder

Professor James Burnham has written a book* which describes what he calls "the contraction of the West". He points to the immense loss of territory which has been either geographically a part of the West, or part of what is recognised as Western Civilisation—this civilisation whose origin is in Greece, Rome and Christianity. And where the West has contracted, what he calls "the Communist enterprise" has expanded. "Where the Communist enterprise takes over fully, it inflicts an outright defeat on the West and destroys or drives out the representatives of Western power. It then consolidates the territories, resources and peoples inside the counter-system of its own embryonic civilisation." A note on the dust-cover summarises Professor Burnham's explanation of the process: "The cause of this contraction is neither any external power nor any lack of material strength, but simply failure—a collapse of the will to survive, in short a suicidal tendency."

How has all this come about? If "The Bolsheviks, in 1903, set themselves the objective of world conquest when their total armament was half a dozen revolvers", how is it possible that Communist enterprise (as opposed to our 'suicide') is sixty years later replacing Western civilisation by its own 'embryonic' civilisation? The answer to Burnham is that the West is committing suicide; and, he says, "Liberalism is the ideology of Western suicide". Most of his book is a critical examination of this liberalism, usefully and sometimes brilliantly perceptive of liberalism's nature. But he sees liberalism not as a cause of the downfall of the West, but as an accompaniment, a soothing philosophy by which we reconcile ourselves to our almost inevitable fate—extinction.

And that is what is wrong with this book. Burnham gives the impression that liberalism has arisen amongst us by spontaneous generation, whereas the fact is that liberalism is a carefully and cunningly manufactured poison, administered to us by our deadly enemy, an external and internal power, with full murderous intent, to the end that this enemy, the International Communist Conspiracy, may seize our heritage and potential. It is a poison compounded of some humanitarian reforms to give it a flavour which we are delighted to swallow, and subversive ideas which are destructive of our morals and the institutions of our survival. Liberalism is a poison of the mind, which at once distorts our vision of reality, and paralyses, as it is intended to do, our resistance to the Communist enterprise.†

Seen from this point of view, practically all that Professor Burnham has to say is true. But from any other point of view his descriptions and conclusions could do more harm than good, for his detached and descriptive attitude, his very use of the word "suicide", conveys some feeling of inevitability and hopelessness, as of affliction by a mysterious and fatal condition, arising sui generis, like a cancer. And he ends his book: "But of course the final collapse of the West is not yet inevitable; the report of its death would be premature. If a decisive change comes...?" Whence? We are not told. A pious, useless hope.

This passive view of liberalism renders Suicide of the West vulnerable to active liberal criticism, because the liberals see in Professor Burnham simply a failure to be "progressive". The mere fact that most liberals have become liberal passively gives their beliefs a self-evident quality in the light of which Burnham's descriptions appear naturally absurd. He lists 39 propositions, most of which he says would be agreed with by a liberal; but this list would appear funny to a liberal—that is to say, the compilation of such a list as a basis of analysis. It needs more than that to make silly students see through freedom rides and other disorders of our defeat.

A National Law Service?

The letter which follows was in the British Medical Journal, November 14, 1964:

Sir,—What a lark it would be if law were to be administered in the same way as we administer medicine in this country. Everyone discommoded by the slightest grievance, which nowadays they have to put out of their minds or endure (because it costs the price of about six pints of bitter to consult a solicitor, and it probably wouldn't end there either), would be knocking at their family solicitor's door at all hours, seven days a week. "Couldn't I sue my boy's maths master for not pushing him through the 'A' levels?" "I bought these shoes only six months ago, and just look at 'em now," "Since those people moved in next door we've had nothing but beat music from dawn to midnight." "This inkpot had the cap screwed on so tightly that when I did manage to dislodge it, it flew off and ink went everywhere: tablecloth, my trousers, the carpet, all ruined." You know the sort of thing.

Very soon the family solicitors would be much too harassed to think, and in more and more cases would say, "This needs counsel's opinion", and give the client a note so that he could go and sit on a bench outside counsel's chambers. Experienced litigants would make no bones about wanting counsel's opinion at the very outset—"And make it one with a distinction award. Q.C.s don't you call 'em?". Counsel too would get weary and wary, and growl, "Judgment deferred. Come back in a month's time," forgetting that by then they would be away on holiday and their clueless juniors would only dare to say, "Yes. We must all be patient. Come back in another month's time."

Whenever cases reached trial there would be free board and lodging for all concerned, together with away-from-work benefit, for it would be intolerable that the slightest hardship should befall any litigant pursuing (if not invariably overtaking) Justice. The local friends of the court would arrange flowers, distribute reading matter, and subscribe for easy chairs and television sets in the court corridors, bless their hearts.

Within less than a year it would be noticed that there weren't enough lawyers to go round. Questions would be asked in the House about the shortage, and phased five-year plans promulgated to quadruplicate the number of law schools and their teaching staffs, with the added suggestion that the course of study should be shortened for family solicitors. Headmasters and dons would be besieged to scrape the barrel for possible trainees.

I rather fancy that whoever won or lost a case in court, it would not cost either side a penny. Both costs and damages would be met by Treasury (e.g. by the taxpayers). The only ones to cop it good and hard would be those solicitors who refused immediate legal attention to clients coming to them in doubt or distress of mind, or who made boobs in conducting cases. The Law Society would see to that.

---

To be “involved in litigation” would supplant “being under the doctor” as a status-symbol; and conversations overhead in pubs and public transport would be concerned with experiences while under cross-examination, grisly obiter dicta, and appeals against judgments. A National Legal Service would change our whole culture. Fewer hospitals would have to be built and doctors might be able to get on with the fascinating job for which they were trained, as it would provide the populace with an alternative and, one might almost say, a healthier preoccupation.

After all, a doctor’s surgery attendance is lowest on bingo nights at the village hall.

But it might, I fear, be tough on the lawyers.—I am, etc.

Mundesley Hospital, George Day.
Mundesley, Norfolk.

CORRECTION, PLEASE! (continued from page 1)

Some of us are too young to recall that tremendous day 20 years ago when the UN was formed, but most of us remember. And know what that day meant. And know our world is safer, happier and more prosperous because of the United Nations.

Correction: Exceptions to the “safer, happier and more prosperous” world would include the Congo, South Vietnam, Yemen, Berlin, Cuba, the mainland of China, Korea, and—according to Administration officials—Appalachia and Harlem.

ITEM: From a Book Review by Rory McCormick in America magazine, January 23, 1965:

... the so-called world Communist conspiracy ...

Correction: Mr. McCormick’s skepticism as to the reality of a world Communist conspiracy might be dispelled if he studied the five-volume The Communist Conspiracy: Strategy and Tactics of World Communism. This work was prepared and released by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and ordered to be printed by the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, May 29, 1956.

Within the past year the present Chairman of HCUA, Edwin E. Willis (D., La.), in his preface to World Communist Movement, said:

Today a world Communist dictatorship is a possibility that is far more than theoretical. How long a global dictatorship could maintain its grip over several billion humans in whose hearts the light of freedom burned is highly speculative. But the threat and the suffering and the collapse of all fundamental freedoms to every nation on the earth—s a real possibility.

We must face the fact that many more people dream of world conquest today than did in the days of Caesar, Genghis Khan, Napoleon—even Stalin. These people are organised in the World Communist Movement, with affiliated Communist parties in over 90 nations. Khrushchev claims a formal membership of 40 million persons in this international conspiratorial organisation. Many, many more millions are fellow travellers, sympathisers and collaborators with the movement.

These are the people who are today trying to destroy all free governments and impose on the entire world a so-called dictatorship of the proletariat. Backed by the political, economic, military, diplomatic, cultural, scientific—they are employing their power against us in South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos; in Cuba and Venezuela; in Algeria; here in the United States; in every corner of the earth where there is a Communist.