

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 37. No. 23.

SATURDAY, MARCH 7, 1959.

Postage, 2d.

6d. Fortnightly.

Report of American Bar Association

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON COMMUNIST TACTICS, STRATEGY, AND OBJECTIVES

THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION TOOK NO ACTION ON THIS REPORT, BUT SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES INSERTED THE REPORT IN FULL IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It was reprinted in *American Opinion*, December, 1958.

MR. BRIDGES. *Mr. President, a friend in California has supplied me with a copy of the report just filed with the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association by that association's special committee on Communist strategy, tactics, and objectives. Senators will recall that this is the outstanding committee which was formerly headed by the former Senator from Maryland and our former colleague, Herbert O'Connor, and which is now headed by Peter Campbell Brown, former Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board.*

The report is an outstanding piece of work in its field. I believe I may have the first copy to reach Washington. So that I may share it with my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Supplemental Report of The Special Committee On Communist Tactics, Strategy, And Objectives

PAUL REVERES ARE NOT ALWAYS HEHEED

A Night to Remember tells of the five iceberg warnings sent by wireless to the *Titanic*. When the sixth message "Look out for icebergs," came in, the *Titanic's* operator wired back: "Shut up, I'm busy." Just thirty-five minutes later, the ship, whose captain had said "God Himself could not sink it," was sinking.

The phrase "Remember Pearl Harbour" should remind us that we, people and leaders, were cocksure and complacent before the afternoon of December 7, 1941. The F.B.I. had warned of frequent messages from the Japanese consulate at Hawaii to Tokyo telling of the presence and absence of American warships at Pearl Harbour. Dies Committee reports of Japanese espionage by fishing vessels were ridiculed as headline hunting. Capt. Laurence Safford who was recently awarded \$100,000 by a grateful Congress for his World War II coding and decoding inventions, had decoded all the Japanese pre-Pearl Harbour war messages for his superiors. Yet, the attack came as a stunning surprise.

Most persons who are informed on communism think our country is now in greater danger than were the *Titanic* and Pearl Harbour. The thesis of J. Edgar Hoover's new

book, *Masters Of Deceit*, is:

"Communism is the major menace of our time. Today, it threatens the very existence of our western civilisation."

In his speech to the 1957 National Convention of the American Legion, Mr. Hoover warned:

"To dismiss lightly the existence of the subversive threat in the United States is to deliberately commit national suicide. In some quarters we are surely doing just that."

On July 6, 1958, Prof. J. Sterling Livingston, a Pentagon consultant, stated:

"The doctrine of pre-emptive war is definitely a part of Soviet strategy. The Russians plan as part of their strategy to strike a forestalling nuclear blow against their enemies."

The lawyer-author of the Gaither report to the President on national security recently told our association:

"Our security is in unprecedented peril . . . The ultimate objective of international communism is world domination, and the Soviet Union will pursue this objective ruthlessly and relentlessly, employing every possible political, economic, subversive, and military strategem and tactic."

I.

COURT DECISIONS ON COMMUNISM

The 1953 midyear report of this committee praised the opinions of Chief Justice Stone in *Schneiderman v. United States* and of Mr. Justice Jackson in *American Communications Association v. Douds* for the conclusion, based on Communist documents, that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is not a political party but, to quote Mr. Justice Jackson: "Is a conspiratorial and revolutionary junta, organised to reach ends and to use methods which are incompatible with our constitutional system."

Similar statements were made by Chief Justice Hughes when, as Secretary of State, he refused to recognise the Communist Government of Russia, and by Chief Justice Vinson in his scholarly opinion upholding the convictions of the eleven top Communists under the Smith Act.

In the last two years, the Supreme Court has decided the following twenty cases:

(Continued on page 2.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which 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 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
 Offices—Business and Editorial: 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST.
 Telephone: Belfast 27810.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Advisory Chairman: Dr. Tudor Jones. Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 36, Melbourne Avenue, Deakin, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. (Telephone: EUSTon 3893.) Canada: L. Denis Byrne, 7420, Ada Boulevard, Edmonton, Alberta. Secretary: H. A. Scoullai, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W.

From Week to Week

The Times (January 9, 1959) reports an interview with the Astronomer Royal, Dr. R. de Vere Woolley, on a statement attributed to a professor of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, that "Russia may try to land a manned rocket on Mars or Venus in the autumn."

From a close watch on the Press we have come to the conclusion that for a 'scientist' to cast doubt on the possibilities of space-travel is to invite either a charge of 'McCarthyism,' or some form of scientific ostracism. In these circumstances, we consider Dr. Woolley's comments, as reported by *The Times*, a model for scientists: "If they get to Venus they will find it boiling hot. If they get to Mars they will find it freezing cold. On neither planet will they be able to breathe. The best of luck to them."

About moon exploration he said: "There is no doubt that if an astronomical observatory were established on the moon it would have certain advantages over the ones we have on earth. But it would be enormously expensive, and there are far better ways of spending money."

These comments are so perfect "in their generation" that we do no more than recommend them to the intensive contemplation of our readers.

According to the *U.S. News and World Report* (Jan. 23, 1959), which has conducted a survey of its own, and reports a survey published in *Electronic News*, Jan. 12, there has been virtually no objective confirmation of the U.S.S.R. reports on the missile which it is claimed was designed to orbit the moon, but missed, and is now alleged to be in orbit around the sun. It appears that in the U.S., only the Jet Propulsion Laboratory at Pasadena, California, was able to track the missile at all, and that only intermittently for three hours. No British observations were obtained. The U.S. State Department, however, confirmed the U.S.S.R. claims—on what basis is not disclosed.

"... —the First World War, which made possible the Balfour Declaration; the Hitlerite persecutions, rolling back the tide of progress, came when Zionism was an established force, but one with the realisation of its aims in the millennial future. . . ."

—*The Jewish Chronicle*, Jan. 23, 1959.

REPORT OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION—

(Continued from page 1.)

1. *Communist Party v. Subversive Activities Control Board*. The Court refused to uphold or pass on the constitutionality of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, and delayed the effectiveness of the act.

2. *Pennsylvania v. Steve Nelson*. The Court held that it was unlawful for Pennsylvania to prosecute a Pennsylvania Communist Party leader under the Pennsylvania Sedition Act, and indicated that the anti-sedition laws of forty-two States and of Alaska and Hawaii cannot be enforced.

3. *Yates v. United States*. The Court reversed two Federal courts and ruled that teaching and advocating forcible overthrow of our Government, even "with evil intent," was not punishable under the Smith Act as long as it was "divorced from any effort to instigate action to that end," and ordered five Communist Party leaders freed and new trials for another nine.

4. *Cole v. Young*. The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that, although the Summary Suspension Act of 1950 gave the Federal Government the right to dismiss employees "in the interest of the national security of the United States," it was not in the interest of the national security to dismiss an employee who contributed funds and services to a not-disputed subversive organisation, unless that employee was in a "sensitive position."

5. *Service v. Dulles*. The Court reversed two Federal courts which had refused to set aside the discharge of John Stewart Service by the State Department. The F.B.I. had a recording of a conversation between Service and an editor of the pro-Communist magazine *Amerasia*, in the latter's hotel room in which Service spoke of military plans which were very secret. Earlier the F.B.I. had found large numbers of secret and confidential State Department documents in the *Amerasia* office. The lower courts had followed the McCarran Amendment which gave the Secretary absolute discretion to discharge any employee in the interests of the United States.

6. *Slochower v. Board of Education of New York*. The Court reversed the decisions of three New York courts and held it was unconstitutional to automatically discharge a teacher, in accordance with New York law, because he took the Fifth Amendment when asked about Communist activities. On petition for rehearing, the Court admitted that its opinion was in error in stating that Slochower was not aware that his claim of the Fifth Amendment would *ipso facto* result in his discharge; however, the Court denied rehearing.

(To be continued)

Stock-taking

By L. D. BYRNE

(The conclusion of the substance of an address to Vancouver Social Creditors on November 8 and 9, 1958)

V.

I have done no more than touch upon the nature of the religious and social revolution which was destined to be the turning point in the history of Christian civilisation. I leave you to trace the progress of its policy in the impact of the Illuminati and the Grand Orient on Europe, the rise of the Money Power leading to the all pervasive influence of Zionism, and the effect of substituting a Man-centred society for one essentially God-centred, with the inevitable emergence of the heresy of Super-man, leading to the Liberal-Socialist-Communist perversion which has infected Society. What I wish to bring out and emphasise is *the nature* of the task which we have on our hands. And at this point I want to draw your attention to two important contributions which have been made in recent months—both in Canada—to clarifying the issue.

The first is a book by the late John Farthing called *Freedom Wears a Crown*. Its purpose is to arouse Canadians to a realisation of the systematic sabotage of their constitutional heritage. In it he brings out certain important aspects of the essential difference between the British Monarchical concept of organic nationhood, and that of the republican ideal of organised society. I commend this book to your attention.

The second contribution to the issue was made in a series of C.B.C. broadcasts by Dr. George Grant, Professor of Philosophy, Dalhousie University, under the title "Philosophy in the Mass Age." In these broadcasts he develops very plainly the fundamental difference in the Reformation and that which emerged from the Protestant revolt. I quote from the text of Dr. Grant's talk:

"If you think within natural law, then man's destiny is but part of an order greater than himself. In natural law theory, man is not ultimately responsible for shaping the world. He chooses to conform or not to conform to an order which he himself does not make. But as the system is greater than him, if he chooses not to conform then the order simply breaks him and brings his effort to naught. To go against the natural law is just to descend into chaos and nothingness. And this means that finally the individual has no choice but to accept that God-given order. Man, if he is to be happy, must come to know that he is *not his own*, that he is a creature who did not make himself.

"How different the humanist view of life is. Man makes the world, and there is no over-all system which determines what he makes. To act is to choose what kind of a world we want to make. In our acts we show what things we regard as valuable. We create value, we do not participate in a value already given. We make what order there is; we are not made by it. In this sense we are our own; we are independent. We are not bound by any dependence on anything more powerful than ourselves. We are authentically free because what happens in the world depends on us, not

on some providence beyond our control. The fate of man is in his own hands. We and not God are the creators of history."

Later on he has this to say about the emergence of modern humanistic thought:—

"The new idea of freedom (call it if you will 'subjectivity') appears first as religious freedom in the life and thought of the Reformation. It is this which makes the theology of Luther so very much worthy of study. Indeed the Reformation may seem negative in the sense that it smashes the old ideas without seeing systematically the consequence of what it has done. It is a protest, and it is from that word that the term Protestant comes. But it is more than negative, it is positive in the sense that it asserts absolutely that the principle of freedom must be regulative of any future practice or theory. Indeed it asserts this freedom only within the religious sphere, but once it has been so asserted it cannot be limited simply to the religious sphere. In the next centuries the idea of man's freedom spread through all aspects of human existence, into the sphere of politics, of art and science. Marx, for instance, was to say that the overcoming of the difference between the citizen and the state which he saw as necessary to democracy was but an extension of the Reformers' overcoming of the difference between the lay and clerical orders. That is why I have called this talk the Rebellion of the Enlightenment. By Enlightenment I mean that consciousness by man of his own freedom; by rebellion I mean the way men have revolted against anything which seemed to put limits on that freedom. Men saw themselves as free in history to build the Kingdom of Man.

"This freedom has often been expressed negatively; as in the long tradition of criticism by the middle-class European intellectuals. This criticism was man's refusal to accept any beliefs that were not his own. The old philosophical and theological tradition was attacked as clerical imposition of illusion on the freedom of the mind. The old religion was accused of having prevented man from exercising his freedom, by holding over him the idea of God—that is, of a master to whom he must be subservient. These witty criticisms of the idea of God appeared in Europe from the 18th century to the present day; from Voltaire's essay on the earthquake at Cadiz to Freud's *The Future of an Illusion*."

Dr. Grant contends that the seeds of the upheaval we term the Reformation were already inherent in Christianity. He points out that prior to the Incarnation the universally accepted philosophical basis of the social concept was recognition of Natural Law to which man, with all Creation, must conform. There was a notable exception to this. The Jewish peoples, and the Jewish peoples alone, held the contrary view of God intervening in history to lead His chosen people to the goal He had ordained for them. This,

he asserts, was the essential element for Hebraic philosophy which was embodied in Christian teaching and remained as a disruptive element within the Church until it exploded in the Reformation. The more consideration that is given to this fact of history, the clearer becomes the nature of the touchstone which has resulted in the growing domination of the post-Reformation period by Judaism, and the more apparent is the essential nature of the issue which is disrupting civilisation.

• • •

At the time the Reformation had a shattering effect in England. True to form, the revolt against the Church's authority led to revolt against the Monarchy and the martyrdom of the King. Puritan republicanism was imposed on the country by force of arms and the Constitution was flouted by England's new masters. However, after a short period the nation sought to regain the inspiration of their traditional ideal, the monarchy was restored, and the damaged but substantially unimpaired Constitution re-instated. However, the issue between the Cavaliers and the Roundheads or Puritans—constitutionalism versus the new liberalism—continued to divide the country, and emerged in the political sphere as "Tory" versus "Radical" and subsequently "Conservative" versus the various "Liberal" groups—"Liberal," "Socialist," and so forth. The tragedy is that against the growing economic and political power of the "liberal" cause—a cause whose appeal to self-centred material advantage has proved all too persuasive to mobs and power-seekers alike—the opposing "constitutional" forces have given ground, compromised and abandoned principle in the name of expediency. Yet, despite the retreat of its champions, and notwithstanding the progressive attack to which it has been subjected, the sheer rightness of the traditional British Constitutional ideal, centred in the Monarchy, has survived the onslaught of the forces which have sought its destruction.

VI.

I hope that I have made clear beyond any possibility of doubt—having regard to the cursory outline I have given you—that the central issue of the present world turmoil is between two diametrically opposing metaphysical concepts of society inherent in two mutually conflicting and irreconcilable philosophies—the one God-centred and recognising observance of Natural Law, the Canon, as the key to human happiness; the other Man-centred and recognising only the supremacy of the human mind; the one organic and the other organisational.

The policy which is Social Credit stems directly from the former. As Douglas has stated, its incompatibles are Collectivism, Dialectic Materialism, Totalitarianism—products of the latter Judæo-Masonic Philosophy and reflecting its Policy. And "ballot-box democracy" embodies all of these. That, I think, is the complete answer to those who insist that Social Credit can be introduced by means of the diametrically opposite policy of which party politics is a mechanism. It is not only stark folly but it is evidence of a complete lack of understanding of either Social Credit or the nature of the issue involved.

If you have followed me, you will concede that what we are engaged in as Social Crediters is in a very real

sense, the bringing to birth of a new civilisation—that the forces of destruction unleashed by the policy now dominant in the world have reached a momentum that cannot be checked by any attempt at a head-on clash—and that, with a full sense of responsibility, we must work to ensure that there will be a sufficient number of informed persons with the necessary attributes of character and influence, over a sufficiently wide area, to intervene effectively when and if the opportunity arises.

If you have grasped the nature and importance of this task you will realise that it is not enough merely to direct attention to the evils of the financial system or to the World Plot. As I see it—and to me it is blindingly clear—the urgent and essential task is to reach out to those whose philosophical convictions are rooted in the pre-Reformation and traditional Medieval Christian traditions, to clarify for them the issue involved in the present world crisis, and to make available to them the knowledge we have been given in trust—of the policy which stems from that philosophy in a world of potential material abundance.

Where are we to find these allies? I suggest that they are most likely to be contacted among those who have attached themselves to those political and religious bodies who have withstood the onslaught, if somewhat ineffectually, against the traditional Christian Philosophy—the philosophical basis of Social Credit. I consider that, broadly our appeal should be directed to conservatives and Catholics. I hasten to add that by this I do not mean exclusively, or all, those persons attached to Conservative Parties politically or exclusively to the adherents of the Roman Catholic communion of the Church. And let me make it clear that I refer only to the field open to us in the Western World. Persons in those categories which we can term broadly "conservative" and "Catholic" are more likely to be attuned to what we have to say—and, with understanding, to have aroused within them "the emotion of an Ideal" which is the spring-board of action. By the same token those whose convictions have attracted them to Judæo-protestant or liberal-Socialist groups are likely to find our message both incomprehensible and objectionable.

In conclusion, I wish to stress an aspect of the issue we have been discussing, which I consider to be of fundamental importance. I know that I shall be accused of introducing religion into the Social Credit arena. I make no apology for doing so. If the policy of Social Credit is not basically a binding back to Reality, then it is meaningless. The issue in which we are involved is essentially religious, but not theological.

It is my conviction that that issue expressed in its simplest terms is God versus Satan—that the policy which we are opposing in all its aspects is Satanism by whatever other names we may call it—and that the issue being fought out on this physical plane is but a reflection of one which extends far beyond its limitations.

Of the outcome there can be no doubt. But for each of us there is the plain challenge of how we shall discharge our responsibility. We have it on the Highest Authority that you cannot fight Satan by invoking Satan. The command implied in that is inescapable.