THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 46 No. 5. SATURDAY, JUNE 4, 1966 1s. 3d. Fortnightly

America

How It Is Being Communized

By MARTIN DIES in *American Opinion*, July-August, 1964.

(*Continued*)

II

But the acquisition of the paper title to property by the federal government does not tell the full story of our Communization "by degrees." In modern economics, *control* is more important than ownership. For example, Socialist Hitler permitted the people to retain the paper title to property and the instruments of production, but he appropriated the *control* of them. Thus the paper owners became the servants of the state. Therefore, in measuring the distance which the United States has travelled down the road of Marxism we must take into consideration federal *control* of industry, agriculture, and finance. And here we find the Communists have made the greatest strides. The truth is that there remains very little business, industry, agriculture, and finance that is *not* controlled directly or indirectly by the federal government.

When I first went to Congress, in 1931, the majority of people in my district owned and lived upon their farms, which averaged a little over one hundred acres to the farmer. Each farmer had his garden, fruit trees, and livestock. He depended upon the cultivation of cotton as his cash crop to pay his taxes and buy the things he did not raise. Then came the Roosevelt farm program. I fought it and warned our farmers that it would liquidate them because it would reduce their cotton allotment, proportionately, as much as it would reduce the allotment of large farmers. This is what happened. Today there are few farmers left in my old district. Their farms have been acquired either by the government or some large paper or pulp company. Farming now is under the control of the federal government. This is what Marx advocated. There are some signs of revolt; but they may subside because many farmers seem to have become accustomed to leaning upon the federal government.

In banking, the Federal Reserve completely controls interest rates; in finance, it completely controls the buying and selling of all securities through the S.E.C.; through the Interstate Commerce Comission it controls transport and trade. Thus, further conditions for Communization of the United States have been met in compliance with the teachings of Marx.

What about industry? An ominous warning was recently expressed by Leslie B. Worthington, President of the U.S. Steel Corporation. He said that some sixty federal agencies make the life of businessmen next to impossible. They not only regulate, he said, "they investigate and sometimes castigate almost every action and activity taken or planned by businesses, big and small, successful and unsuccessful." Mr. Worthington's complaint is made by every segment of business, with the exception only of those who depend upon federal handouts. Does the government really want American business to solve our economic problems, or is the government Communizing American business by degrees and manufacturing an excuse for the eventual advent of state capitalism under some form of Marxist dictatorship? If Communists were making the decisions and formulating the policies, could they do a better job of carrying out the instructions of Marx?

What about organised labor? Under the leadership of Samuel Gompers it was a strong opponent of Marxism. In fact, Mr. Gompers told the Marxists: "Economically you are unsound, socially you are wrong; industrially you are an impossibility." The Dies Committee reported the facts about the infiltration of the labor movement by Communists, the capture of some of the most important and influential International Unions, and their control of the Executive Board of the CIO. Even the unions themselves finally admitted the truth of the Dies Committee Reports on Communism in labor unions. It was during that period of Red control that the strong opposition of union leadership to Marxism was changed to policies which favour the Marxist state. Now the unions too, are passing under the yoke of the all-powerful central government they helped to create. They got a taste of this when the Federal Government compelled the railroad unions to submit to compulsory arbitration, against their wishes—thus making a mockery of the principle of collective bargaining.

In politics, recent Administrations have acquired great power to intimidate the opposition and brainwash the people. Television has become the most powerful medium of propaganda, and one has only to listen to the commentators to be disturbed by nearly blatant efforts at "thought control." After all, the owners of the great national networks hold their invaluable franchises from the federal government, and are subject to the rules and regulations of a commission whose members are appointed by the President.

Recently we saw an example of arbitary government power in Texas politics. Congressman Joe Kilgore announced that he was quitting the House of Representatives, and he was making plans to contest the Senate seat held by that favorite of union labor and the "Liberals," Senator Ralph Yarborough. Yarborough and Lyndon Johnston were political enemies; the Senator had openly attacked Lyndon and refused to ride with him in San Antonio during the late President's tragic visit to our state. When, however, Lyndon decided that it was expedient to enlist the support of the "Liberals" of Texas he made (or forced) a deal with Yar-

(*continued on page 2, column 2*)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

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

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

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

Offices: Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London E.11.
Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London N.W.1. Telephone: EUSton 3893.

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne.
Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, Australia (Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London N.W.1, Telephone EUSton 3893). Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W.

A New Religion?

A correspondent of *The Times*, April 16th, concludes an article entitled "The Christian Commitment to World Order" by stating that the Christian "owes support to every effort of his government to put right action, in the context of the U.N., before immediate national advantage. To do other would be to wash hands more culpable than Pilate's." This outrageous pontification follows some very dubious argument, stemming from Pilate's "surrendering the clear law, for the protection of which he had been installed."

The writer transfers attention to the Security Council chamber, where it was far from clear that the President "was putting first the clear law, for the protection of which he was installed." The correspondent claims that the situation was resolved in favour "of Britain and of law," a dubious assumption. Now the organisation is threatened by the non-major members, as he phrases it, manipulating legal power, while the major powers hesitate to sacrifice their positions of strength.

The bastard theology, by Karl Barth out of U.N.O., makes little sense, but this demand for total commitment to the U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. axis surely demands rejection. I cannot see why "national advantage" in the sense of setting one's house in order should so shock the correspondent. The politician is not elected to play the part of Esau, while the command was to love one's neighbour.

But this "new religion" embodies itself in such organisations as the British Council of Churches, which provides the headlines for the *Church Times* (April 22, 1966), asking "What can the British nation do to help poor countries struggling to develop themselves?" Incidentally the same news paper reports that the income of "the Christian Aid Department of the B.C.C." dropped 12% for the 1964-5 financial year. So they are launching a Refugee Week, and United Nations Day is to be Refugee Day, on October 24.

The inference of it all appears to be a surrender of initiative to U.N.O. and of religious thought to B.C.C. (or perhaps a World Council) to avoid the culpability of Pilate, since the organisations evidently have close links. Yet such a renunciation of responsibility follows closely the feebleness of Pilate.

—H.S.S.

AMERICA (*continued from page* 1)

borough and pressured Kilgore to stay out of the race. I know that Kilgore planned to announce because his chief supporter telephoned Lufkin to find out how the situation looked for Kilgore in East Texas.

I was reliably informed that Lyndon threatened Kilgore that, if he ran, Lyndon would "dry up" all sources of financial assistance. This is what Roosevelt did to me in 1944, and Lyndon was an apt pupil of Roosevelt. Ike did the same thing in 1952, in the special Senatorial race. (Of course, the principal works the other way as we found out in the TFX scandals.) The truth is that, for the most part, industrialists and financiers are afraid of the long and ruthless arm of the federal government.

Even Texas union labor bowed humbly to Lyndon. Its darling, Don Yarborough, came within forty thousand votes of defeating Governor Connally two years ago, with the endorsement of all union labor. This time Lyndon told the union leaders not to endorse Don Yarborough (no relation of Senator Ralph Yarborough). With the Presidentially appointed National Labor Relations Board controlling labor, there was no choice; it was a bitter pill, and it indicated that the inevitable fruit of Labor's support of the federal centralization is beginning to be harvested. Labor will reap the whirlwind.

III

It is no "extreme" statement, nor is it the hallucination of a "lunatic fringe," when anti-Communists warn that we are moving rapidly toward Marxist dictatorship. If the trend is not reversed, we will take our place in the Communist bloc; there will be no real fundamental issue between us and Russia except the struggle for power. Our form of Communism may be, and likely will be, different form Russia's. But, the underlying principle of the tyranny will be the same.

Of course the "Liberals" insist that as long as we have free elections we will not be in danger of dictatorship. What is a free election? In my book, *Martin Dies' Story*, I described how Lyndon Johnson was elected Senator. It is all a matter of court record. It was not a "free election" [See AMERICAN OPINION, April, 1964]. Even the 1960 Presidential election was subject to questions of massive vote fraud.

The American people are influenced by propaganda. Public opinion is largely formed by television, radio, and newspaper commentators, and by fake polls which control the decisive bandwagon voters who are interested only in being on the winning side. The American voter should make his choice on the issues; but the truth scares him. Unfortunately, the average American wants to escape from the ugly realities of our march towards totalitarianism. Anti-Communists irritate and upset him with unpleasant truths.

IV

The process of centralization of political and economic

power is gradual in its first stage. As it proceeds it gains momentum. Having become an addict, a nation requires larger and larger doses until it passes the point of no return. It is debatable whether we have yet reached that point. If we have not, it will not be long.

If you doubt that America is being Communized, look at President Johnson's program to fight poverty, which consists of a massive enlargement of present welfare plans. Who can doubt that it will further centralize the political, social, and economic power of the nation in Washington? His program will include and stress medicare, extension of minimum-wage laws to cover an additional two million workers, creation of a domestic peace corps, an enlarged food-stamp plan, creation of a youth conservation corps, expansion of Area Redevelopment and Urban Renewal, broadening of federal housing, more aid to education, mass transit for urban areas, and accelerated public works. There is one thing certain: If the United States has not yet passed the point of no return in its journey toward totalitarianism, the adoption of the Johnson program will put us far beyond that point.

The tragedy is that these welfare programs will not solve any problems. They but convert more Americans into the wards of the state. Only a program to encourage Free Enterprise would solve our difficulties to the extent that it is humanly possible to solve them, and at the same time preserve our freedoms. But then such a program would not increase the power of politicians, and would not wrest "by degrees" all capital from the bourgeoisie.

While I do not contend that all those who profess patriotism are sincere, is it not possible that the real "extremists" in America are those who are propelling our nation toward Communist totalitarianism, and not those who are sincerely fighting a rear-guard action against the overwhelming odds of the coming collectivism? Is it only a fanatic who becomes alarmed for his country's survival as a free nation when, according to Senator Byrd, the public and private debts now approach one trillion and five hundred billions of dollars—while a recent estimate of our national wealth is placed at only 797 billions of dollars? How close are we to the brink? You answer that one.

When anything is said or written about Communist influences in our government, the "Liberals" are vehement in their denials—yet the Committee on Un-American Activities named not less than five thousand Communists on the federal payroll, and fifteen thousand working in defense industries. Many of them held very sensitive positions. This disclosure aroused deep antagonism from the Administration and the Liberal Front. We did not relax our pressure and finally the Administration fired a few of these people; but according to my last information, *all of them have been rehired.*

At any rate, the Communists in our government have undoubtedly exerted influence in shaping our policies. How else can we explain the Communization of this country "by degrees," which the record shows so clearly?

Through judicial misinterpretations and the Congressional delegation of *power to legislate* to our colossal bureaucracy —by the inclusion in every bill of the right of the bureaucracy to "issue such rules and regulations as they see fit"—our form of government has become overthrown. It is no longer a republic. It is not even a democracy, because public opinion is largely managed. Our voracious and insatiable federal bureaucracy is thus extending its ownership and control in all directions until today every business is threatened and millions of our people are wards of the central state. By the process of cheapening the dollar paid to these millions, and periodically increasing the payments, Americans are manipulated to perpetuate the Liberal Front in power.

No one can say to what extent Communists influence these policies. The point is that this country is being Communized as fast as conditions permit. In another decade or so, or maybe sooner, the process will be complete and we will be forced to throw off the pretense and frankly acknowledge that America is another Marxist nation.

V

The "Liberals" ask what proof we have that Communists have been, and are, influencing the policies of our government? Our answer is: all the proof it was possible to obtain under hostile Administrations which actively smeared and persecuted every Committee of the Congress which has tried to get at the facts.

We have yet to hear a satisfactory answer to what those five thousand Communists we found were doing in the federal government, unless they were stealing invaluable secrets and influencing our policies. No "Liberal" will tell us what the eight hundred security risks named by Scott McLeod in 1956 are doing even now in our State Department, unless they are surrendering us to the Reds. Is it not true that through these same tactics the Communists have been able to seize open control of non-Communist governments throughout the world?

The "Liberals" seem hard put to tell why President Roosevelt related to me that, "There is nothing wrong with the Communists in this country. Several of the best friends I have are Communists."

No "Liberal" has yet answered why President Roosevelt shocked Cardinal Spellman by telling him on September 3, 1943 that he thought that the Russians would get about forty per cent of the world and the capitalist régimes would retain sixty per cent; that Roosevelt believed he was best fitted to come to this understanding with Stalin; that Stalin would certainly receive Finland, the Baltic States, the eastern half of Poland and Bessarabia; that there was no point to opposing Stalin because he had the power and it was better to give them gracefully, and that he was not absolutely sure whether Stalin would be satisfied with these boundaries. How could a President of the United States hold such views unless he was being advised by Communists?

Why is it that, when at an early date the Dies Committee furnished the various government agencies with a list of 1,124 federal employees who were members of subversive organizations, the heads of these agencies refused to investigate them; even though Congress had passed a resolution requiring "every department, agency, and independent establishment of the federal government" to "investigate the employees" who are members of subversive organizations or advocate the overthrow of the federal government, and to report the findings to Congress. The sum of $100,000 was appropriated by Congress for that purpose and we submitted a partial list of the most glaring examples, to see what would happen. Perhaps some glib "Liberal" will explain why it was necessary for the Dies Committee on Un-

American Activities to report with regard to this matter:

> *. . . according to the Attorney General's report, the first procedure adopted by his office in making this investigation was to forward all complaints (including our list of* 1,124 *names) involving the subversive affiliations of a federal employee to the departmental head concerned. If he requested an investigation, the Federal Bureau of Investigation was then authorized to make such an investigation and file its report with the departmental head for whatever action he deemed necessary. The Attorney General, in his report to Congress, however, explained that this procedure proved most ineffective in that out of* 1,597 *complaints forwarded to the departmental heads, only* 193 *requests for investigation were returned . . . Of the* 1,124 *names submitted, according to the Attorney General's report, the Federal Bureau of Investigation actually investigated only* 601 *cases. Of these* 601, *the Attorney General stated that he had received replies from departmental heads on only* 501 *out of* 601, *and that action had been taken in only three cases— 2 dismissals and one disciplinary action.*

Have subsequent Administrations changed? Truman referred to Stalin as "my pal, Joe," even though his buddy had stolen our invaluable secrets, violated arrogantly and openly the agreement under which we recognized the Soviet Union, was known to have slaughtered twenty-five million innocent people, and was in the process of committing murders and atrocities which made Hitler look like a pacifist fakir.

What about Eisenhower? Speaking at a Moscow press conference on August 14, he said:

> *I see nothing in the future that would prevent Russia and the United States from being the closest possible friends . . . Occasionally some portion of that [American] Press gives me the devil. Occasionally they are going to give you the devil. All I suggest is that we all keep our sense of values and not be upset by the lies or propaganda of a few crackpots.*

On November 16, 1945, General Eisenhower's testimony before the House Military Affairs Committee was reported by the *New York Times* as follows: "Nothing guides Russian policy so much as a desire for friendship with the United States." At Denver, Colorado, in a pre-campaign speech as reported in the *Washington Star* on June 17, 1952, he said: "There is no more reason to fear the 190 million backward people living on the Eurasian Continent than there is to fear polliwogs swimming down a muddy creek."

These amazing statements came from a man who was publicized as the leader of American conservatives. They were made after the almost daily exposure of Communist lies, perfidy, treason, and crimes in the United States. They were made after the General knew of the slaughter of twenty-five million innocent people by the Soviet monsters and the illegal seizure of the Balkan States under the General's very nose.

What about our assassinated President whose tragic death impels us to treat him gently? Whatever his virtues, he certainly ignored the internal Communist threat. If he had taken it seriously it might be that he would be living today.

What about Johnson? He, like his predecessors, was a pupil of Roosevelt. In our campaign of 1941, when both of us were defeated in the special election, he ridiculed my warnings of the dangers of Communism at home and abroad and proudly proclaimed that he was one hundred per cent for the President and his program. It was he who gaveled-down Bryton Barron. It was he who directed the exclusion of that portion of my amendment to the Communist Control Act which would have saved President Kennedy's life; because, had it passed, Lee Harvey Oswald would have been in jail for his Communist front activities and not firing a rifle from that window in Dallas.

In view of these indisputable facts, can anyone ignore the grave suspicion that Communists within our government have had a hand in shaping our policies? Can anyone deny that we are being Communized by degrees in accordance with Marx's plan for countries such as ours, where force and violence are not the appropriate measures?

The Menace of Communism

In the wake of the Lagos conference to restore 'peace and order' in Rhodesia, 'black majority' rule in Nigeria has collapsed to the accompaniment of the usual political murders. All over the world Christian civilisation is under attack, and is crumbling. The physical resources on which modern industrial communities depend are being steadily lost to the West, and correspondingly made available to the militant and subversive forces of International Communism. Why does the West pursue in Africa the policies so vigorously advocated by the U.S.S.R. and Communist China? Is it by accident, incompetence or design? When policies perhaps initiated out of idealism have visibly led to disaster to millions of the world's inhabitants, and threaten destruction for millions more, why are they persisted in? In the case of Rhodesia, the attempt to accelerate the form of government which has exploded in Nigeria, as elsewhere, is being pursued with a bitter malignancy which has never before characterised British policies. Britain is loading the gun which is pointed at herself. Is she blind, or is she in the grip of alien forces?

Communism is a world-wide international conspiracy to impose a police-state government over the whole world. Its method is by means of highly organised internal Communist groups, tightly disciplined, to work by subversion and disorder for the breakdown of normal governments and the promotion of revolution, to be backed up by Communist troops.

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd. at 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London E.11.

Printed by E. Fish & Co. Ltd., Liverpool.