

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 46 No. 4

SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1966

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

America

How It Is Being Communized

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

The "Liberals" continue to use the bogey of The Depression to import the Marxist experiments which have since prevented a full recovery of Free Enterprise. The Depression *was* a golden opportunity for the adherents of Marxism to vastly enlarge the federal bureaucracy and to increase the power of politicians. But, if Roosevelt had followed the 1932 platform of the Democratic Party, supplemented by temporary measures of relief and some needed reforms, Free Enterprise would have recovered fully in a few years and the United States would have moved forward toward the solution of man's age-old problems. As it is, we have yet to destroy all poverty, all hunger, all unemployment (or the man-eating shark), and we are bankrupt according to the legal definition of bankruptcy applied toward private business and industry.

But far worse than this, the United States has been pushed closer to Communism every year. This statement will be labelled "extreme" by the "Liberals," but it is easily supportable if one employs logic and an unjaundiced look at events.

On February 10, 1940, I published the first of a series of articles entitled "More Snakes Than I Can Kill" in *Liberty* magazine. Even at that time the following matters were apparent:

"Most people fail to appreciate the Communist menace to America because they are under the erroneous impression that a country can only be communized by violent revolution and they argue that we are in no danger of revolution. As a matter of fact the revolutionary method is employed only in countries where the conditions are favourable for revolution. In others a more subtle method is employed. The Communists and Marxists in the United States are seeking to sabotage by degrees the political and economic system of America in favour of bureaucratic state capitalism. It is their scheme to communize this country by degrees. All such proposals as the attempts to socialize medicine, law, etc., constitute steps in this program to accomplish gradually what they are unable to do by violent revolution. This is the strategy of all Marxists in America. It came from the following advice given to their disciples by Marx and Engels: 'The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production; by means of measures, therefore, which appear economically insufficient and untenable but which in the course of the movement outstrip themselves and necessitate further inroads upon the old social order.'

* Congressman Martin Dies of Texas served seven years as Chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the historic Dies Committee. Now practising law in Texas, Congressman Dies remains one of the most outspoken foes of the International Communist Conspiracy. He is author of the explosive volume, *Martin Dies' Story*.

"All shades of Marxism in America from the deepest red to the palest pink—the communists, the socialists, the crackpots, the so-called liberals—have united in support of this Marxist strategy. This united front of Marxists is, therefore, engaged in a campaign of sabotage of our political and economic system. The preparation of this campaign is to condition the thinking of our people along socialistic lines and to stimulate a feeling of self-pity in a large segment of our population. It is a vital part of this mental conditioning of the people to convince them that the government has a duty to support them, that poverty and insecurity can be abolished by the state, that property rights are in conflict with human-rights and that our economic system is outmoded in favour of bureaucratic state capitalism. The Marxists do not tell the people that if the government is to be charged with the responsibility of supporting the people, it must exercise the corresponding right to discipline them.

"The next stage in the communization of the country consists of various proposals to regiment agriculture, industry, the professions and labour under cleverly devised schemes of planned economy which make it impossible for the economic system to function. A vital part of these Marxian proposals is the bankruptcy of the country through the expenditure of borrowed capital or a resort to wild inflation. It must be borne in mind that the educated Marxists realize, as stated by Marx and Engels, that these measures are economically insufficient and untenable. Their purpose is to paralyze our economic system, which rests upon private initiative and the profit motive. They know that it is impossible to superimpose socialistic laws upon a capitalistic society without destroying the economic system.

"After the economic system is completely paralyzed by these measures and by public bankruptcy, the next stage in this process of gradual communization is the destruction of private property in favour of public ownership. Since this is no more nor less than monopoly raised to its highest power, dictatorship is the final and inevitable stage. Indeed, bureaucratic state capitalism is so unwieldy and inefficient that it can only be held together by force.

"The influence of the Marxists and their teachings has been steadily gaining ground in this country. Many people have been convinced that the government ought to support them. This has been demonstrated by the popularity of such schemes as the Townsend pension plan, the ham-and-eggs scheme, and the like.

"The Marxists favour private monopoly as a means of preparing the economic system for quick transition to communism. They do not believe in the enforcement of anti-trust laws or in the restoration and maintenance of competitive conditions. They know that a wider diffusion of private property, which can come about only as a result of the restoration and maintenance of

(continued on page 4)

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.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

A graph published in the *Times* on March 31, 1966, showed that in mid-1965 British currency reserves (gold and foreign currencies less liabilities) fell below zero, from a fairly steady average up to mid-1964 of about £1,000 million. According to orthodox economic theory, therefore British money is completely without value. To maintain the fiction that it still has value, international loans have been obtained, but this means that Britain has lost the last vestige of even apparent power of independent initiative: Wilson is nothing but the broker's man. The fact that he enjoys the position (after all, it is a position) and exults in pursuing internationalist villanies, is irrelevant. Anyone occupying the same position would be under the same absolute orders, because Britain can be reduced to absolute economic chaos within twenty-four hours. Britain depends first of all on imports (unlike Rhodesia) and therefore an international declaration that sterling was no longer recognised as an international currency would deprive Britain of the ability to buy essential imports—food and oil. And, Mr. Wilson having conveniently set the example, it is undoubtedly true that any attempt to evade the economic sanctions which, of course, depend on economic orthodoxy, by recourse to unorthodox but realistic economics, would be met by the threat or use of international force. Bankrupts can be thrown into prison.

The present position has been implicitly true since World War 1, but until roughly the mid-thirties could have been rectified. Since the mid-thirties, rectification has become progressively less possible, but the fact that the final crash has come in less than a year (it began under the 'Conservative' administration and has continued *at the same rate* under Labour) is a reliable indication that the time has come to demonstrate the reality of international government and power.

In the same way, it has been known for a long time that de Gaulle has been carrying out Communist objectives, but his now open destruction of NATO is simply the declaration that the conquest of Europe is complete.

All this would be painfully obvious to all people of reasonable intelligence who kept themselves informed of the main developments were it not for the operation of the greatest deception of

the many current—that the U.S.A. is anti-Communist—a deception sustained undoubtedly by a degree of wishful thinking that closes the intellect to the acceptance of quite patent and elementary facts. Including U.S. economic aid (which is widely recognised to have done more harm than good) every U.S. strategic action has been in conformity with Communist objectives, even to open collaboration with the U.S.S.R. in the Suez crisis, which marked Britain's final military defeat. Let no one suppose that the U.S.A. is fighting Communism in Vietnam. We stated before it occurred that when the U.S.A. stepped up its military operations in that country it would be a sign that all possibility of a stable South Vietnamese government had been eliminated, so that, after a show of force, the Americans could declare the situation hopeless and convincingly accept an invitation to leave the country. Now, only a few days ago, a B.B.C. Washington reporter stated that spokesmen for the U.S. administration privately admitted that the civil disturbances in Vietnam were restricting the American war effort and that they were concerned that a new government, including members of the Viet Cong, would be formed and would invite the U.S.A. to get out (leaving the huge American-built bases, and vast quantities of American military and other equipment, for the use of the Chinese in their conquest of Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, New Zealand and Australia). And what is left then for the U.S.A. but an 'accommodation' with the U.S.S.R. to set up a world government? The Australian minister for External Affairs has just said, after his briefing in Washington, "the greatest problem facing the world is to persuade the Chinese to join the community of nations and live in peace with their fellow men", or words to that effect. Get it?

Will there be war? Yes, of course—against South Africa, unless that country capitulates before impossible odds.

Peter Simple, who of all political commentators writing in large-circulation newspapers, writes more realistically than any known to us (how he gets away with it we do not know), asks in the *Daily Telegraph* of April 12, 1966, concerning Rhodesia: "How has this astounding situation, this obvious contradiction of our national interests, come about? Is it plain doctrinaire lunacy? Or—since that the British Labour Government is collectively insane is hard to believe in spite of all the evidence—is it simply a part of some international bargain, whose terms and ultimate purposes we are not told?"

Well, we hope that Peter Simple does not think that it is just a matter of paying your money and taking your choice—though you pay your money anyway. It is one thing or the other, and while there is plenty of lunacy in the apparent general acceptance of what the 'British' government is doing in the name of the British people, and the idea of lunacy in government is a good deal more realistic than the usual explanation of commentators—that politicians are either stupid or make 'mistakes' that the commentators would not themselves make—the evidence, now abundantly available, of conscious intention in implementation of a 'bargain' is overwhelming. The main intention, of course, lies outside Britain, and Britain is in no bargaining position. But we doubt if Peter Simple would get away with making that, and the reasons for it, plain.

It may be instructive, even if otherwise futile, to review the unorthodox economics and policies which, in the absence of the use of force against her, might extricate Britain from her present disaster.

Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Rhodesia, all English speaking and all stemming from a common cultural tradition, together form not only an immediately viable

economic entity, but a potentially immensely prosperous one. Britain, by abandoning the fiction that it is necessary to import international 'money' as a reserve for the provision of internal finance, could by simple book-keeping transactions increase the effective purchasing-power of sterling, thus giving it genuine economic *value*. The rejection of 'international money' would clear the way to realistic trade between the countries enumerated to the extent necessary to distribute resources of materials and skills to the best mutual advantage, not to obtain 'international' money but to facilitate production and distribution in the interest of the individuals comprising the various communities.

This economic realism should be combined on the diplomatic level with a denunciation of international financial orthodoxy, and an exposure of *all* the forces united in maintaining it.

Realistic accountancy, not gold, is the proper 'reserve' for 'money'. So every ounce of gold which can be produced from the countries enumerated should be devoted to paying off international debt, and all 'foreign exchange' derived from the expanded trade which would undoubtedly follow an appreciation in the purchasing-power of sterling should be devoted to the same purpose.

Paying off international debt along these lines may look like an interminable if not impossible task. But in fact a realistic beginning along the lines indicated, combined with diplomatic realism, would bring about the collapse of the international financial system as at present imposed, probably in a surprisingly short time. International finance in essence is a system of world government, and Communism is its handmaiden(!) and the U.S.A. its bastion. Concerted revolt against it by the English-speaking nations listed would bring about its downfall. For neither of the chief agencies of the world financial government, Washington and Moscow, would contemplate a real world war and probably neither could survive as such against the enforced exposure of their collusion in opposing a multi-lateral rebellion. They would be destroyed by internal forces in the U.S.A. and the furious uprising of the peoples of Russia's captive satellites.

And that, we fear, is all the comfort we can offer to the anti-fluoridationists.

The *Evening Standard* of March 7, 1966, carried the following report: "SALISBURY, Monday—A Rhodesian firm of toilet-roll manufacturers has threatened legal action against people overprinting its products with a caricature of Mr. Harold Wilson."

And Nigel Lawson in the *Spectator*, March 18, 1966 quotes H. Wilson from *Election Forum, BBC TV*, March 10: "I think we've been a very pragmatic government. We shall remain a pragmatic government." And the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*: "Pragmatic: . . . 2. Busy, active: *esp.* officiously busy in other people's affairs; interfering, meddling. 3. Opinionated, dictatorial, dogmatic."

As a result of parliamentary pressure, Mr. Wilson tabled in the House of Commons library the text of a letter dated October 2, 1964, to Dr. E. C. Mutasa, a coloured Rhodesian: "Dear Mr. Mutasa,—Thank you for your letter of September 20th. The Labour Party is totally opposed to granting independence to Southern Rhodesia so long as the government of that country remains under the control of a white minority. We have repeatedly urged the British Government to negotiate a new constitution with all African and European parties represented, in order to achieve a peaceful transition to African majority rule. Yours sincerely, Harold Wilson."

That document, whose existence was known to the Rhodesian Government, was part of the provocation offered to induce a

unilateral declaration of independence. We can imagine the further provocations offered in 'conferences' and other pragmatic occasions. Why? To lead to the use of force in Southern Africa. And so it has turned out, despite Mr. Wilson's repeated assurances that he would not use force. And illegally, at that. He asked the United Nations to 'authorise' armed interference in Portugal's trade, but didn't get it. Such authorisation can be given only under Article 27 of Chapter 7 of the UN Charter, which requires that all the permanent members of the Security Council must concur in a decision, but in fact Russia and France abstained, so that Mr. Wilson had no mandate, and acted unilaterally.

So we proceed from provocation to piracy, with worse to come.

The Menace of Mali

This country, of whose whereabouts few people have an accurate idea, was able to hold up affairs at the Security Council to the embarrassment of Britain, and together with several other such places served as an excuse for Britain to "legalise" force against Rhodesia or whoever owns the Ioanna V. Some of these ramshackle republics, often shored up by foreign aid, might constitute a threat to order in Africa, but together would hardly threaten the peace of the world. Peter Simple (*Daily Telegraph*, April 12, 1966) puts it neatly when he asks how this obvious contradiction of our national interests has come about: "Is it simply a part of some international bargain, whose terms and ultimate purposes we are not told?"

T. S. Eliot opened his poem *The Waste Land* with the phrase, "April is the cruellest month," and the failure of spring promise has certainly blighted the British peoples. Much of this results from distortion of which a clear instance has just appeared. The Bishop of Mashonaland complained that the British Council of Churches had said that the matter of clergy visiting the inmates of the Gonakudzwingwa restriction camp was closed. The bishop said the question was still under review. And we read (*New Christian*, April 7, 1966) "The illegal Smith régime in Rhodesia has now given permission for ministers of religion to visit the restriction camp at Gonakudzwingwa." This newspaper, which advocates war against Rhodesia, can hardly be suspected of prejudice in favour of the Smith régime.

Probably the individual initiative displayed by the oil tankers and by the Rhodesians has infuriated Mr. Wilson (and the international bargainers) more than the hard words of Africans, for this constantly threatens both tyranny and fantasy. A drugged British public will doubtless sanction anything, for Mr. Wilson has now consolidated his power and the opposition may well vacillate further.

Charity between the Churches increases, as *The Tablet* (March 26, 1966) reports, noting "Westminster Abbey half full of Benedictines, Church of England and Church of Rome." But charity does not extend to fellow believers in Rhodesia. The Rev. T. A. Beetham prophesies (*The Times*, March 25, 1966) that if Mr. Smith wins, "rigid apartheid is the future in store for the African population," and that one day "there will be no place left for Europeans at all". North of the Zambesi, he says, you move among Africans "whose energies have been released" while in Rhodesia you are in "the old regimented, spirit-destroying atmosphere." One would not have thought that an African who could help it would have stayed in the country, but in reality they have entered Rhodesia in large numbers and the natives have multiplied.

Mr. Beetham admits that "it is almost impossible in what for Africans is a police state to obtain chapter and verse" about acts of brutality. But a country in the grips of slow strangulation, as is Mr. Wilson's intent, can cause little surprise if it takes stern measures against agitators or objects to unsubstantiated charges. Unfortunately we may expect the attitudes of all, except perhaps of the Opposition, to harden. The Dean of Westminster called the gathering at the Abbey an "occasion for charity"; I should have thought that Rhodesia was another occasion for charity, as nothing else will resolve the situation.

—H.S.S.

America

(continued from page 1)

competitive conditions, will render impossible the communization of America. They likewise favour every measure which tends to centralize political and economic power in Washington. This is in accordance with the advice of Marx and Engels to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State." [The Editors of AMERICAN OPINION ask the reader to keep in mind that this accurate and amazing forecast was made by Congressman Dies in early 1940]

I must apologize for this lengthy quotation. It does state, however, a truth about Communism which is seldom known or understood. Most people associate violent revolution with Communism, forgetting that Communists employ any and every tactic deemed appropriate for the specific country in which they are working.

When anti-Communists contend that America is moving toward Communism, we are called "extremists" and referred to as the "lunatic fringe." We do not mean, as the "Smear Bund" says, that the weird and bumbling overt members of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. (like Gus Hall or Elizabeth Gurley Flynn) are about to capture the government in the ways in which their fellow Reds took Russia, or that we will necessarily have the same form of Marxism and dictatorship as that which the Conspiracy exhibits in the Soviet Union. What we do mean, and what the "Smear Bund" keeps the people from understanding, is that step by step America, herself, is being Communized.

The central government is steadily moving toward a form of Marxism which in time will necessitate dictatorship. As I previously stressed, the test in the early stage is control of private property and of the instruments of production. Eventually this control will pass to ownership. Yet, even in the present stage, the federal government owns more than one-third of American land, and hundreds of industries, businesses, and other forms of property. It is, of course, the biggest property owner in the United States and it is increasing its ownership every year.

In 1955, I introduced a Resolution in Congress to inventory and appraise the property—real, personal, and mixed—owned by the government of the United States. The Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives, under the able leadership of its Chairman, Hon. William L. Dawson of Illinois, has been doing a magnificent job in an attempt to carry out the objectives of that Resolution. Still, it has a long way to go before an accurate inventory and appraisal will be made. But, despite its many handicaps, the Committee estimated the value of all federal property as of June 30, 1963 at \$315,000,000,000. In itself this is an impressive ownership for any government except an acknowledged Communist government.

The American Forest Products Industries, Inc. (AFPI) states that government lands now exceed by 11 million acres the combined areas of Oregon, Washington, California, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah and the western part of South Dakota. Furthermore, AFPI says: "The U.S. Forest Service is seeking some 4 million acres in the next ten years—estimated to cost 200 million . . ."

According to the federal census, the total value of federal holdings exceeds the assessed valuation of our fifty largest cities and the value of all farms in the United States, including land, buildings, livestock, implements, and machinery. In the acquisition of property and the instruments of production, our central government is certainly following the advice of Marx to "wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state." If Marx were living, he would no doubt pronounce the progress of Communization most satisfactory.

(To be continued)

K.R.P. Publications Limited

245, Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11.

This office is open for customers on:—

Mondays	10.0 am to 12 noon
Wednesdays	and
Fridays	2.30 pm to 4.30 pm

(Apart from Public Holidays)

At other times—by appointment, due to part-time staffing arrangements

THE MENACE OF COMMUNISM

This brochure has now been reprinted. With particular reference to Rhodesia, it poses the question, "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?" A comprehensive list of books on the International Communist Conspiracy indicates where the answer may be found.

FREE ON REQUEST

America's Retreat From Victory

by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy

Few will believe this book until they have read it. But few fail to believe after they have read it. The almost incredible but fully documented story of George Catlett Marshall's betrayal of United States' interests throughout his career.

8/3

To enable wider distribution, additional copies of this and other issues of *The Social Crediter* are available at the following prices which include postage:

6 copies 6/6	25 copies 18/6
12 copies 10/6	50 copies 32/6

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

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