

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 49 No. 10

SATURDAY, 9 AUGUST, 1969

Registered at the G.P.O., Sydney, for transmission by post as a periodical.

### The C.F.R.

#### Conspiracy To Rule The World

By GARY ALLEN in *American Opinion*, April, 1969.

(Continued)

Having ensured that Eastern Europe would fall into the hands of the Communists, the C.F.R. helped to arrange the sell-out of China to the Communists. The propaganda which convinced Americans that Mao Tse-tung was an innocent agrarian reformer running an Asian branch of the A.D.A. emanated from a C.F.R. front known as the Institute of Pacific Relations. Professor Quigley reveals:

*After 1925, a somewhat similar structure of organizations, known as the Institute of Pacific Relations, was set up in twelve countries . . . on an interlocking basis with the Round Table Group and the Royal Institute of International Affairs.*

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which investigated the American branch, concluded:

*The Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR) has been considered by the American Communist Party and by Soviet officials as an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda, and military intelligence.*

*The IPR disseminated and sought to popularize false information originating from Soviet and Communist sources.*

*Members of the small core of officials and staff members who controlled IPR were either Communist or pro-Communist.*

*The IPR was a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives.*

Quigley, whom you will keep in mind is biased in favor of the Round Table conspiracy, states:

*The influence of the Communists in IPR is well established, but the patronage of Wall Street is less well known.*

*. . . The headquarters of the IPR and of the American Council of IPR were both in New York and were closely associated on an interlocking basis. Each spent about \$2.5 million dollars over the quarter-century from 1925 to 1950, of which about half, in each case, came from the Carnegie Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation (which were themselves interlocking groups controlled by an alliance of Morgan and Rockefeller interests in Wall Street). Much of the rest, especially of the American Council, came from firms closely allied to these two Wall Street interests, such as Standard Oil, International Telephone and Telegraph, International General Electric, the National*

*City Bank, and the Chase National Bank.*

Since the English and American Round Table groups were financed by men who had extensive holdings in China, why would they not be doing everything in their power to make certain that China did not fall to the Communists? This is what Alfred Kohlberg, a patriotic American who had investments in China, could not understand. Kohlberg was an I.P.R. member who, when he discovered its Communist domination, tried to fight the Rockefeller and Carnegie interests and expose the I.P.R. Through his efforts the Institute of Pacific Relations was exposed, by the McCarran Committee of the U.S. Senate—though the role of the C.F.R. was kept out of the scandal. The fact of the matter is that the Communist I.P.R. was run by such C.F.R. stalwarts as Owen Lattimore (the “conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy”), Soviophile Philip Jessup, Dean Rusk, Communist spies Alger Hiss and Lauchlin Currie, and other such C.F.R. notables.\*

#### VI

Whenever one points to the strange affinity between a coterie of finance capitalists and Communism, one is treated as if he is a candidate for the funny farm. In spite of all the evidence in his own book, Professor Quigley, who describes the Eastern Establishment as “internationalist, astonishingly liberal,” and admits the group “has no aversion to cooperating with the Communists,” laughs at the idea that the two are linked. He does, however, admit:

*. . . the relationship between the financial circles of London and those of the eastern United States . . . reflects one of the most powerful influences in twentieth-century American and world history. The two ends of this English-speaking axis have sometimes been called, perhaps facetiously, the English and American Establishments. There is, however, a considerable degree of truth to the joke, a truth which reflects a very real power structure. It is this power structure which the Radical Right in the United States has been attacking for years in the belief that they are attacking the Communists. This is particularly true when these attacks are directed, as they so frequently are, at “Harvard socialism,” or at “Left-wing newspapers” like the New York Times and the Washington Post, or at foundations.*

(continued on page 3)

\*It is less than coincidence that the Council on Foreign Relations now advocates recognition of Red China “to pull China back into the family of nations.” (See Richard Nixon’s “Asia After Vietnam” in the October 1967 issue of the Council on Foreign Relations’ official magazine, *Foreign Affairs*.)

## 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 45/-; Six months 22/6; Three months 11/6.

Offices: Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London E.11.

Telephone: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1

Telephone: 01-387 3893

### IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001

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

(Editorial Head Office).

### THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2603. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q. Secretary: H. A. Scouler, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

Vol. 49 No. 10

Saturday 9 August, 1969

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

It is probably only the continued existence of the British Parliament which saves the Wilson Administration from possibly violent counter-revolution; for what has been happening under Wilson is Communist revolution in its penultimate stages. The ground for this has been prepared throughout this century by the steady but unobtrusive transfer of power from Parliament to the financier-socialist junta (only a fraction of which is in the Cabinet) which controls the socialist bureaucracy. Parliament has been disarmed simply by swamping it with an impossible volume of business; and any real threat of revolt against Cabinet dictatorship has been parried by the threat of dissolution which, for far too many Members, means the loss of an income which they would have no hope of matching elsewhere.

Insofar as by-election, municipal election, and public opinion results are indicative, not by any stretch of the imagination can Parliament any longer—nor for some considerable time past—be considered representative of public opinion. And this is all the more remarkable in that genuine or effective Parliamentary opposition to Government policies should be more than a mere matter of difference of opinion as to whether British disarmament policy is right or wrong. If the Government is wrong, it is irrevocably wrong—irrevocably in the sense that damage done cannot be undone, at any rate in time to avoid disaster. The Conservative Opposition 'disagreed' with the Government's 'East of Suez' policy, the mere announcement of which has profoundly altered the balance of power in the world. But if there is another election, and the Conservative Party forms the next Government, does anyone suppose it could restore the situation to what it was when it left office? Politics is the art of the possible, and the function of the Wilson Administration is to pre-empt the field of the possible. Both the Attlee and the Wilson Administrations have—we would say deliberately—mismanaged the economy so as to intensify international

control of British internal policy—because the Wilson Administration is Fabian-internationalist orientated, and is in collusion with International Finance which has the same orientation. Thus what in fact is treason can plausibly be represented as economic necessity.

It is hard to imagine at this stage that the Conservatives have any convictions other than that they would consummate ultimate surrender of British sovereignty to World Government more sauevly than would the Socialists. In any case they have established no other options.

Coupled with his warning that Parliament was unlikely to survive indefinitely, Douglas advised that so long as it survived, it should be used to call the Executive to account, rather than for mass-producing legislation, mostly of a restrictive nature, and little of it understood in its content or implications by most Members.

A proper consideration of the Wilson Administration's record makes it plain that the only real option open to the Opposition—or to individual Members who put patriotism before livelihood—is in fact to call the Government to account for (a) running down British defences (Wilson: "A defence policy which does not contain within itself the seeds of further progress towards disarmament is one which in the present state of the world we can no longer regard as appropriate". *National* disarmament is a policy objective of internationalists looking to a "world police" force to ensure obedience to a World Government). (b) Attempted surrender of British national sovereignty to the Council of Europe, under guise of economic considerations. (c) Deliberate mismanagement of the British economy, including intensification of a confiscatory and disincentive taxation system. It should be constantly recalled that the graduated income tax was specified in the Communist Manifesto as an essential step towards Socialism.

If a determined group of patriotic Members would get together and study the now readily available materials relating to these items with a view to forcing a properly prepared debate (they should pay as much attention to preparation and organisation as the Communists do) they might achieve much more than they expect. If there is another election, the Socialists appear certain to be defeated. But if they are defeated for 'incompetence' rather than treason, it will be a further and probably final victory for International Socialism, Communism, or World Government, call it what you will. The only thing which can now stop World Government, fully policed along Communist lines (as in Czechoslovakia, etc.) is conscious and informed opposition to World Government. Party political parliamentarianism is now absolutely suicidal.

## The New York - Moscow Axis

"Unaided, the Soviet Union would be utterly incapable of holding together its vast Eurasian empire. So far, however, the Kremlin has never failed to receive timely adequate support from the United States. There is as yet no sign that this situation will change."

—Medford Evans in *American Opinion*, Scoreboard 1969 Edition.

## The Wigan Crusade

Crusading, one would assume, had become a disreputable term (now called a "dirty word") since the Venetians turned aside from a venture of this kind early in the thirteenth century and wrecked Constantinople. Yet eight Liverpool clergymen, like an octet of Peter the Hermits, have proclaimed a "justifiable holy war" against Rhodesia and would try to lure their brethren to death, although in this case they would presumably not emulate the Hermit who personally led on the children like the Pied Piper of Hamelin.

As a holy war is a Mohammedan and not a Christian obligation, Canon Park, one of the signatories, discusses "the crusade" quite seriously and calls for "action now . . . to clean up the muck on your own doorstep" (*The Times*, June 27, 1969). And the Very Reverend Lord Macleod quotes Gandhi that "where there is injustice, it is better to use force than to do nothing" and complains that most Christians are "passivists (note the spelling) who have neither the gumption to be pacifist nor the guts to be participant".

Rhodesia of course lies far from "our own doorstep" and intervention would doubtless only add to the havoc of Africa. For the calamity which the Rector of Wigan, Canon Park, threatens will come about unless he can incite and win his war already engulfs the largest and once most democratic of the old colonies to the North, and millions there have neither "some justice" nor "a chance of freedom", and many of them are dead.

The Marquis of Salisbury replies (*The Times*, July 1, 1969) that Canon Park would declare war because Rhodesia has a minority government, not because the condition of the Africans there is worse than in other African states with "a so-called majority Government" or would necessarily improve if they came under African majority rule at the present time. Lord Salisbury points out that Christ lived in Palestine under foreign occupation but did not advocate the use of force against it, adding that he is "old-fashioned enough to prefer the Christianity of Christ to the Christianity of the Rector of Wigan".

Commander G. H. Peters of Gwelo, Rhodesia, attributes the result of the referendum to four causes: the belief that "the then British Government tricked Sir Edgar Whitehead after a massive 'yes' vote in the 1961 referendum", with consequent mistrust; the belief that communism is at hand in Africa and only strong government can thwart it; the failure of premature power of Africans to the north; and the experience that sanctions are an irritant, not a deterrent. He adds, "I believe that history will record that it was the Macmillan-Macleod era which did the damage in Rhodesia".

The fulminations from Wigan and the new "Liverpool sound" will hardly alarm the Rhodesians, nor I trust will they suggest that all members of the Church of England share this insane craze for starting yet another war. Rhodesia would not prove another Czechoslovakia.

—H.S.

*The C.F.R.* has been reprinted as a booklet by *American Opinion* and is available from K.R.P. Publications at 23 posted.

## The C.F.R.

(continued from page 1)

After describing how cosmopolitan and sophisticated these people are, the Professor actually tries to rationalize Communist activity in this Establishment conspiracy as a product of *naiveté*. Quigley writes:

*It was this group of people, whose wealth and influence so exceeded their experience and understanding [sic], who provided much of the frame-work of influence which the Communist sympathizers and fellow travelers took over in the United States in the 1930's. It must be recognized that the power that these energetic Left-wingers exercised was never their own power or Communist power but was ultimately the power of the international financial coterie, and, once the anger and suspicions of the American people were aroused, as they were by 1950, it was a fairly simple matter to get rid of the Red sympathizers. [Emphasis added.]*

This, of course, raises the question of just who is using whom? It is always assumed that it is the Communists who dupe others into doing their work. In most cases this is undoubtedly true; however, it strains credulity to believe that men who are the worlds' best businessmen and bankers, on the one hand, can be perennial pigeons in dealing with Communists on the other. Clearly there are *Insiders* manipulating both ends of the show.

The Reece Committee attempted to investigate this matter. Norman Dodd, chief investigator for the Committee, was told by the then-President of the Ford Foundation that the purpose of his Foundation "was to so alter American society that it could be comfortably merged with most of the Soviet Union." Dodd was then told that this was being done on "orders from the White House." Quigley says of the Reece Committee's investigation of tax-exempt foundations:

*It soon became clear that people of immense wealth would be unhappy if the investigation went too far and that the "most respected" newspapers in the country, closely allied with these men of wealth, would not get excited enough about any revelations to make the publicity worth while, in terms of votes or campaign contributions. An interesting report showing the Left-wing associations of the interlocking nexus of tax-exempt foundations was issued in 1954 rather quietly.*

Dodd maintains that when the investigation began probing into "the so-called legitimate world" which is the real nerve center of the Communist movement, the investigation was quashed. Rene Wormser, counsel for the Reece Committee, states in his book *Foundations: Their Power And Influence*: "Mr. [Congressman Wayne] Hays [an Ohio Democrat who while serving on the Reece Committee did everything possible to prevent orderly and coherent Hearings] told us one day that 'the White House' had been in touch with him and asked him if he would cooperate to kill the Committee." The man in the White House at that time was Dwight Eisenhower—a member of the C.F.R. who named six members of the C.F.R. to his Cabinet, as well as naming no less than twelve members of the C.F.R. to the rank of Under Secretary.

The answer to the question of who is using whom is at least partially answered by Professor Quigley, who reveals the following amazing information about C.F.R.-Morgan manipulation of the Left:

*More than fifty years ago the Morgan firm decided to infiltrate the Left-wing political movements in the United States. This was relatively easy to do, since these groups were starved for funds and eager for a voice to reach the people. Wall Street supplied both. The purpose was not to destroy, dominate or take over but was really threefold: (1) to keep informed about the thinking of Left-wing or liberal groups; (2) to provide them with a mouthpiece so that they could "blow off steam," and (3) to have a final veto on their publicity, and possibly on their actions, if they ever went "radical."*

What is more likely is that these Wall Streeters financed the Left because it was promoting the world Superstate sought by the Round Table Group. After all, despite the erroneous publicity about "wealthy Rightwing millionaires," there has been no corresponding financing of Constitutional Conservatives by these elements.

Quigley cites the alliance between Wall Street and the Left in creating *New Republic* magazine, which was organized by a Morgan associate and financed by an heiress to the Standard Oil trust. He writes:

*The original purpose for establishing the paper was to provide an outlet for the progressive Left and to guide it quietly in an Anglophile direction. This latter task was entrusted to a young man, only four years out of Harvard [where he helped found the Inter-collegiate Socialist Society], but already a member of the mysterious Round Table Group, which has played a major role in directing England's foreign policy since its formal establishment in 1901.*

The young man was Walter Lippmann, described by Carroll Quigley as the authentic voice of the Eastern Establishment.

The *New Republic* was founded by Morgan agent Willard Straight. Herbert Croly, the first Editor of the magazine and a naive "Liberal" who accidentally stumbled into seventy-two officially cited Communist Fronts or activities, makes perfectly clear in his official biography of Straight that the latter "was in no sense a liberal or a progressive, but was, indeed, a typical international banker and that the *New Republic* was simply a medium for advancing certain designs of such international bankers, notably to blunt the isolationism and anti-British sentiments . . . ."

*Reader's Digest* Senior Editor Eugene Lyons, in his book *The Red Decade*, extensively chronicles the services done for Soviet Russia by the Insider-controlled *New Republic*. Lyons writes:

*The American liberal aberration had its house organ, "The New Republic" which led all the rest in avid and indiscriminating acceptance of the myth of Stalin's Utopia.*

\*Straight subsequently launched the magazine *United Nations World*.

## **SOCIAL CREDIT IN 1967**

A Review for New Readers

3/- posted

from K.R.P. Publications, 9/6 posted.

What did serving as Stalin's press agent have to do with "advancing certain designs of such international bankers?" What indeed, unless it is promoting the interests of the C.F.R.'s goal of World Government?†

The Round Table Group, using Morgan money, has at the same time used both of our political Parties and the Communists for its own purposes. Quigley reveals:

*The associations between Wall Street and the Left . . . are really survivals of the associations between the Morgan Bank and the Left. To Morgan all political parties were simply organizations to be used, and the firm always was careful to keep a foot in all camps. Morgan himself, Dwight Morrow (C.F.R.), and other partners were allied with Republicans; Russell C. Leffingwell (C.F.R.) was allied with the Democrats . . . and Thomas W. Lamont (C.F.R.) was allied with the Left.*

(To be continued)

†The *New Republic* has been enormously influential among American "Liberals" who do not realize they are tools being used for ulterior purposes. William F. Buckley Jr. says he began *National Review* to serve as a Rightwing *New Republic*, but has succeeded only in producing the world's most effective cure for insomnia while attacking anti-Communist activists. In fact, the editors of *New Republic* and *National Review* have arranged a deal whereby one may now receive both magazines at the same time for a reduced package rate.

Mr. Buckley, whose TV program is carried over C.F.R.-controlled stations, and whose column appears in such C.F.R. organs as the *New York Post* (owned by Jacob Schiff's granddaughter, Dorothy), never mentions the C.F.R. In his syndicated column shortly after the election of Richard Nixon, Buckley went so far as to give his seal of approval to the appointment of Nelson Rockefeller (C.F.R.) as Secretary of State—calling the man who along with partner Cyrus Eaton controls American trade with the Red bloc, an "anti-Communist." Mr. Buckley pretends the enemy is simply "Liberal" philosophy and ideology. He has become the Liberal Establishment's "house conservative," a "respectable and responsible" adversary,—one who never ever whispers about conspiracy.

## **The Development of World Dominion**

By C. H. Douglas

The post-war years in Great Britain under the Attlee Socialist Administration were critical, for in those few years Britain, victorious in war, lost the peace. Throughout that period the late C. H. Douglas wrote a series of penetrating commentaries dealing with the politics, economics and conflicting philosophies of the times. He warned the British of the fate being prepared for them—the fate which has now befallen them. Once-Great Britain is now derisively referred to as the Sick Man of Europe. This did not "just happen", nor was it, as it appeared to be, mere incompetence. It was the maturation of long-prepared conspiracy, preparing the ground for the *coup de grâce* under the Wilson Administration. The selection of commentaries comprising this very important book make it unique among Douglas's works, and highly relevant to the current situation.

13 - posted

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11.

Printed by E Fish & Co Ltd Liverpool