THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 50. No. 15 SATURDAY, 17 OCTOBER, 1970 1s. 3d. Fortnightly

The Conspiracy Threatens America

By Reed Benson and Robert Lee in *The Review of the News*, 5 August, 1970

For over three decades, America's "Liberal" Establishment has taken the lead in misinforming the American people about the threat of Communism. To illustrate the point, let's take a brief look at just some of the examples gleaned from only one area of our national life — the Executive Branch of the Federal Government.

William C. Bullitt, former Ambassador to the Soviet Union, reported in *Life* for 30 August, 1948, that President Franklin D. Roosevelt had told him: "I have just a hunch that Stalin . . . doesn't want anything but security for his country, and I think that if I give him everything I possibly can, and ask nothing in return . . . he won't try to annexe anything and will work for a world of democracy and peace".

This statement was very much in line with Roosevelt's attitude toward Communism during his long years in the White House. On another occasion, he told Congressman Martin Dies, Sr., former Chairman of the Special House Committee on Un-American Activities: "I have never seen a man that had such exaggerated ideas about this thing. I do not believe in communism any more than you do, but there is nothing wrong with the communists in this country; several of the best friends I have got are communists". (*Congressional Record*, 22 September, 1950, Page A6832).

In the early Forties, Prime Minister Mackenzie King of Canada visited the United States, and during his visit provided our State Department with a list containing the names of various communist agents working in sensitive positions within our government. The Canadian Government had obtained the list from among papers confiscated from communist spies in Canada who had been arrested and convicted.

Unknown to our State Department, Prime Minister King had a close friend in Washington who was also a friend of Congressman Dies. And since the Canadian leader was well aware of the presence of subversives in the American State Department, and thus feared that the list would be destroyed, he gave it to his friend, who in turn supplied the names to Congressman Dies.

Writing in *American Opinion* for May, 1964, Chairman Dies revealed the details about the list for the first time :

> *I kept my list secret from everyone, including my own family, because I could not risk any slip of the tongue. In a conference with President Roosevelt, I told him that I had reason to believe that there were spy rings or cells in every important department of our government, and especially in our State Department. I mentioned to him some of the names, including Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White,* (Klaus) *Fuchs and others. I warned him that these spies were sending our most important secrets to their Communist masters in Moscow.*

And what was the President's reaction? "The President treated this information and my warning as a huge joke. He laughed heartily and cautioned me to stop reading spy stories. He didn't even bother to write down the names of those communists with which I furnished him".

After sufficient time had passed to protect the Canadian Prime Minister, Congressman Dies telephoned an Assistant Secretary of State and asked if he had the list of employees in sensitive positions who were suspected of being Soviet agents. Regarding the conversation, Dies recalled: "He seemed rather amused, but promised me that he would investigate and let me hear from him. Several days later he telephoned me that there was no such list and that I had been misinformed".

It was later proven conclusively that men such as Fuchs, White and Hiss were indeed part of the spy network within our government, or were Soviet agents working on classified government projects, and that they delivered to Stalin important information that our scientists had discovered about missile designs, the atomic and hydrogen bombs, and other crucial matters. The information supplied by Dies to the President had been correct. The President ignored it, and chose instead to ridicule Dies.

When President Truman assumed office the situation did not improve. In fact, when Harry Dexter White and Alger Hiss were finally exposed publicly, President Truman and high officials of his Administration rushed to their defence. At the same time, the President belittled the communist menace and ridiculed those who were trying to do something about it. On 28 February, 1947, for instance, he sent a letter to Governor George H. Earle of Pennsylvania, which declared:

> *People are very much wrought up about the communist "bugaboo", but I am of the opinion that the country is perfectly safe so far as communism is concerned — we have too many sane people. Our Government is made for the welfare of the people and I don't believe there will ever come a time when anyone will want to overturn it.*

It was this attitude which proved so embarrassing to Mr. Truman when, on 6 November, 1953, then-Attorney General Herbert Brownell reported during a speech in Chicago:

> *. . . the records in my department show that* (Harry Dexter) *White's spying activities for the Soviet Government were reported in detail by the F.B.I. to . . . President Truman . . . in December of* 1945.

(*continued on page* 3)

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.

Offices—
Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11. Tel. 01-534 7395
Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Tel. 01-387-3893

IN AUSTRALIA—
Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001
Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001 (Editorial Head Office)

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

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

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Armed conflict is the ultimate endeavour of the Government of one country to impose its will on the people of another, already having achieved sufficient centralised control over its own people to do so. As Clausewicz put it, war is the continuation of policy by "other" means. The "policy" is simply all-powerful Government, and the ultimate objective is World Government. In more primitive times, the objective of war was more clearly discernible — simply to enslave the conquered people — to force them to work for the benefit of their conquerors.

The export racket which for centuries has bedevilled the British represents the imposition of an alien policy upon them. Clearly, the astronomical debt which the British are alleged to owe to foreign financiers can, in the last resort, only be "paid" by a massive excess of exports over imports; but, who, apart from the "underdeveloped" countries *wants* those exports? The financiers who "own" the debts do not want and could not use the goods; but they can and do use the indebtedness to impose policy. The historic admission by the *Times* that "we", meaning the British Government, are not our own masters summarises the situation which we have endeavoured to make plain in these pages since the inception of this journal.

In no real sense could the British possibly owe the world the immense quantities of goods and services represented by the alleged monetary debt. The world, indeed, owes its industrialisation originally to British initiative *and exports*. There is, of course, a general impression, carefully promoted, that we are still paying for the wars we "won"; but in fact wars in actuality are paid for as they are fought; their "cost" is measured in the physical destruction entailed. And if Britain "won" the wars, then the Germans should have rebuilt devastated British homes and factories, supplied essential British *imports* for nothing, and furnished the British with cars and aircraft and all kinds of consumer goods, the British meanwhile living in holiday conditions until restitution had been made.

The plight of the British is so patently absurd — a country which led the world in industrialisation now threatened with what Mr. Carr calls "economic disaster" — that for *any* Government to allow the system to remain unchallenged, in the light of all the evidence of deliberate intent now available, is for it to be guilty of complicity. As an Opposition, the present British Government had an opportunity to expose the real situation; but its accusation of "incompetence" has simply boomeranged. If, as seems probable to the degree of certainty, "disaster", economic or phsysical, ensues in the near future, the present Government will be utterly discredited and destroyed. And all anyone outside Government can do at this stage is to make the fact crystal clear. The Government must either challenge, through financial reform, whoever "our masters" are, or the British will disappear as a political entity.

* * *

The present Middle East situation stems proximately from the Balfour Declaration, which has made possible the virtual Soviet control of the area. At stake is Europe's oil supply. Thus the Cold War is almost over, and the permanent enslavement ot mankind in sight. We have, for practical purposes, been through the Orwellian (1984) phase; the future begins to look more like Huxley's *Brave New World*. Any idea that we may be saved by conflict between Washington and Moscow, or between Peking and Moscow, is a carefully inculcated delusion. But without the simulacrum of such conflicts, how could the present catastrophic situation have been brought about? If the Nazis were where the Soviets are, the world would know what to think. But the brainwashing has blinded the world to reality and paralysed it.

Puzzled Prelates

Dr. R. Mortimer, Bishop of Exeter, expresses in his *Diocesan Leaflet* for September (*Church Times*, 28 Aug., 1970), the bewilderment of many who take notice of Anglican pronouncements about arms for South Africa. No one seems to worry about the French arms sales, he remarks, but "surely it cannot be right that the White South Africans should be disarmed and made defenceless, while north of the Zambesi guerillas are being trained and armed and encouraged to go in and kill them. Yet this prospect does not seem to disturb many Christian bodies in the very least." I suppose Bishop Huddleston could be numbered among these bodies.

Objectors to the South African arrangements might note the distinction that Peter Simple of the *Daily Telegraph* repeatedly makes, that whereas people may object to some features of life in Portugal, Greece, South Africa or Rhodesia, these countries have no intention of attacking Britain or anyone else in the West although the objectionable regimes of the East have often expressed this intention and are working towards it steadily. Otherwise, why all the submarines and the vast armies?

Moreover these bodies, completely oblivious of the bloody disasters that have attended premature Black rule in Africa, take no notice of what is happening under their noses. As Alderman Horace Hird puts it in the same newspaper which carries a report of the Bishop of Wakefield's opinion of *Oh! Calcutta!*, "so many of our Reverend Sirs have been so active this summer in condemning *apartheid* . . . and raising their voices against the sale of arms to South Africa that they have worn themselves out, and now a Rip van Winkle's silence has descended upon them . . . one would have thought that some Church leaders would have had the courage of Dr. Treacy

and would have spoken out on this matter before now". The Bishop may well feel surprise at this silence about a performance which he has described as "degrading to audience and players".

But corruption weakens the British, in the same way as treasonably running down our defence forces weakens the British, and these bodies apparently share the opinion that the British should be weakened and overrun. One may sympathise with D. J. Doyle who asks in *The Daily Telegraph* (1 Sept., 1970), after complaining that he is tired of anti-Christian plays, "Couldn't our dramatic hacks just occasionally turn out an anti-Jewish play? Or the anti-atheist play? Just to prove they are not biased. Or are they? . . . The censorship which is so lax in some directions is remarkably tight in others". Not entirely irrelevant to corruption are the designs used in "peace" movements, described at length in *American Opinion* (1 June, 1970): the famous fork in a circle embodies the crow's foot or witch's foot, a "Satanic medieval symbol".

But apart from corruption, positive destruction proceeds. D. Gedge, the organist at Brecon Cathedral, asks (*Church Times*, 28 Aug., 1970) why the Bishop of Southwark, in defending his reduction of grants to cathedral music, compares Southwark expenditure with that of the Welsh cathedrals. Apart from giving an incorrect figure for Brecon, £175 for £1,175, in the *Church Times*, the bishop cites among other cathedrals St. Asaph, the smallest. Another correspondent, J. Ewington, points out that the bishop "seems to have no qualms about spending some £35,000 to turn the retro-choir into coffee rooms".

— H.S.

The Conspiracy Threatens America

(*continued from page* 1)

In the face of this information, and incredible though it may seem, President Truman subsequently on 23 January, 1946, nominated White, who was then Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, for even more important position of executive director for the United States in the International Monetary Fund.

As soon as White's nomination for this sensitive post became public, the F.B.I. compiled a special and detailed report concerning Harry Dexter White and his espionage activities . . .

This new summary of White's activities as a spy was handed by the F.B.I. to Brigadier General Vaughan for delivery to the President on 4 February, 1946, and yet, the . . . Senate itself was allowed to confirm White on 6 February, without the Senate being informed that White was a spy . . .

Partly as a result of the scandals surrounding the Hiss and White affairs, the American people demanded a change in 1952, and elected Republican Dwight D. Eisenhower as President. But the tragedy continued.

For example, Eisenhower did everything possible behind the scenes to bring about the destruction of Senator Joseph McCarthy (R.-Wisconsin), the effective anti-communist Senator whose exposures of subversion in high places had made him the Number One target of the communist apparatus in America. In an article by General Eisenhower which appeared in the April 1969, *Reader's Digest*, we read: "From the beginning, I was urged by a great many people, even by some of my close associates in the White House, to 'smash' McCarthy by a public denunciation". The former President wrote that he "yearned in every fibre of my being" to do so, but refrained because of his conviction that "Instead of smashing him, I would only have enhanced his stature".

Note the contrast between this attitude toward an anti-communist Republican U.S. Senator and the invitation Mr. Eisenhower extended a few years later to communist Premier Nikita Krushchev. Despite the conclusive evidence proving that Krushchev had been personally responsible for more murders of helpless and innocent victims than even Hitler, Eisenhower insisted on bringing the Soviet dictator to our nation in 1959 for what turned out to be, up to that time, the greatest propaganda victory the communists had ever been given. And on 15 February, 1962, during a nationally televised interview with C.B.S. commentator Walter Cronkite, General Eisenhower reminisced: "Now, I don't think that Mr. Khrushchev is himself a cruel man . . I'm sure he loves children. He's always talking about his own family. When he met my grandchildren here, he invited them right to Russia . . . Oh, he's very, very much of a family man that way . . . "

Although Eisenhower considered the Butcher of Budapest to be a "family man", there *were* some individuals he considered to be "extremists". His 1969 article in *Reader's Digest* was entitled, "We *Must* Avoid The Perils Of Extremism," and while he did not label as "extremist" a single communist, he did attack — in addition to Senator McCarthy — George Wallace and the founder of the anti-communist John Birch Society!

During President Kennedy's Administration, General Edwin A. Walker, one of America's most dedicated and patriotic military officers, was cashiered from his command in Europe specifically *because* of his anti-communist educational efforts among his troops, and it was under Kennedy that the infamous programme of censoring anti-communist statements of military leaders was carried out so extensively. In addition, air cover which had been promised to anti-communist Cubans sacrificed at the Bay of Pigs was withheld at the last moment, and the 1962 missile "crisis" resulted in a pledge to Khrushchev that the United States would protect Fidel Castro's regime from any anti-communist harassment launched from the U.S.

Also during the Kennedy Administration, security risk J. Robert Oppenheimer, whose associations with the communist movement were well known, was awarded the tax-free 50,000 dollar Enrico Fermi Award, a gold medal and a Presidential citation. (The actual presentation was made at the White House by President Johnson on 2 December, 1963). And at a famous press conference on 24 January, 1962, Mr. Kennedy vigorously defended another notorious security risk, William Arthur Wieland, in a heated and widely heralded exchange with reporter Sarah McClendon. (Wieland, while serving as Director of the State Department's Office of Caribbean-Mexican Affairs in the late Fifties, suppressed the communist background of Castro and served — said the Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee in 1962 — as an "active apologist for Fidel Castro". In 1965, he was promoted to a 24,000 dollar-a-year consular post in Australia).

During the Administration of Lyndon Johnston, aid to, and trade with, our communist enemies was expanded to

simply incredible proportions. Even our men in Vietnam became victims of policies which the Administration *knew in advance* would be detrimental to their safety. For instance, on 1 February, 1968, President Johnson made a statement in rebuttal to Leftists who were urging him to implement a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam. He declared:

> *Let those who would stop the bombing answer this question: "What would the North Vietnamese be doing if we stopped the bombing and let them alone?" The answer, I think, is clear. The enemy force in the South would be larger. It would be better equipped. The war would be harder. The losses would be greater. The difficulties would last longer. And of one thing you can be sure: it would cost many more American lives.*

All of which was obviously and unquestionably true. Yet, on 31 March, 1968, the President proceeded to tell a national television audience that he was ordering a unilateral halt to the bombing in an area of North Vietnam which included almost ninety per cent. of North Vietnam's population and most of its territory. And later in the year, — just prior to the November election — he halted *all* bombing of the North. The results were predictable.

In an interview which appeared in the 7 April, 1969, issue of *U.S. News & World Report*, Secretary of Defence Melvin Laird admitted that American casualties were rising, and thar communist forces in South Vietnam were much stronget than they were when President Johnson had halted the bombing. So the tragic results of a bombing pause which President Johnson had foreseen on 1 February, 1968, actually came to pass because he himself did exactly those things he had admitted would cause them!

Thus far in the Nixon Administration it is business as usual. The persecution of anti-communist Rhodesia, for example, has actually been increased (with the closing of the U.S. consulate in Salisbury on 17 March of this year), and the "new" Administration has instituted policies which have surpassed even those of President Johnson in arranging for increased trade with the communists while brave men die in a no-win war.

This brief survey has consisted of simply a handful of the examples which could be cited to illustrate the pattern of support for pro-communist activities and individuals, and vilification of *anti*-communist activities and individuals, which has developed during the last three decades in only one branch of government. Any honest review of other areas — such as education, the news media, book publishing, the movie industry, and dozens more — will reveal the same sinister pattern. And through it all, there is the clear implication that something more than just chance or stupidity is to blame. As former Secretary of Defence James Forrestal once observed, "consistency has never been a mark of stupidity. If they were merely stupid, they would occasionally make a mistake in our favour."

Abraham Lincoln has been quoted as saying:

> *We cannot absolutely know that all these adaptations are the result of preconcert, but when we see a lot of framed timbers gotten out at different times and places by different workmen and we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house, all tenons and mortices exactly fitting . . . not omitting even the scaffolding . . . in such a case we find it impossible not to believe that the different workmen all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan drawn up before the first blow was struck.*

And Thomas Jefferson once observed:

> *Single acts of tyranny may be ascribed to the accidental opinion of a day; but a series of oppressions, begun at a distinguished period, and pursued unalterably through every change of ministers, too plainly prove a deliberate, systematical plan of reducing us to slavery.* (The Works of Thomas Jefferson, *Volume* 1, *Page* 130).

In more recent times, J. Reuben Clark, Jr., who served as both Under-Secretary of State and Ambassador to Mexico, and was one of our nation's most astute and knowledgeable Constitutional lawyers, warned:

> *And do not think that all these usurpations, intimidations and impositions are being done to us through inadvertence or mistake; the whole course is deliberately planned and carried out; its purpose is to destroy the Constitution and our constitutional government; then to bring chaos, out of which the new Statism, with its slavery, is to arise, with a cruel, relentless, selfish, ambitious crew in the saddle, riding hard with whip and spur, a red-shrouded band of night riders for despotism . . .* (Church News, 25 *September*, 1949).

Would you have thought ten years ago that America's most prominent universities could be turned into anti-American revolutionary stomping grounds? Or that the torch would be set to American cities as a result of communist-instigated racial violence? Or that policemen could be shot down in our streets by revolutionary terrorists, only to have the news media glorify and make martyrs of the terrorists? Or that our own government would seek increased trade with enemy nations serving as the arsenal for those killing our sons in battle? Or that our government would, at the same time, persecute a friendly nation which wants to help us win the war?

All of these things, and hundreds more of the same nature, have occurred. And they cannot all be explained away by reference to "Liberal" gullibility or "honest" mistakes. They are being *made* to happen. What we are dealing with in America today is not a "conspiracy theory", but rather a conspiracy *fact*. As Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once observed, when confronted with evidence involving criminal activity of a much less brutal and extensive nature, "Even a dog can distinguish between being stumbled over and being kicked".

Circular Press Limited, Colwyn Bay.