

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 49 No. 21

SATURDAY, 10 JANUARY, 1970

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

The Ordeal of Otto Otepka *

(A BOOK REVIEW FROM *American Opinion*, DECEMBER, 1969)

Drop everything! Go out and get people to read this book. Read it yourself, even if you think you know everything in it. You don't. Nobody could. I'm sure even the author can't remember it all, it is so crammed full of facts. But he remembers what it proves, and you will too. It proves that the United States suffered a "complete collapse of internal security throughout the government by mid-1968". (Page 439.)

Proves, too, that the Nixon Administration has changed nothing essential. Much as I hate to give away any part of the end of the story, which has action, plot, suspense, I'll tell you now (you're going to read the book anyway, of course) that on Page 452, having put you through a graduate course in the subversive perfidy of Dean Rusk's State Department as it progressively entrapped, isolated, demoted, harassed, and attempted to ruin patriotic security officer Otto Otepka, author William J. Gill reminds you that on February 21, 1969, Richard Nixon's Secretary of State William Rogers "upheld Dean Rusk's decision" to reprimand Otepka and remove him from security work in the State Department. *And*, says Gill (correctly, without any doubt), it was a decision which climaxed a "conspiracy against Otepka and the dismemberment" of State Department security.

It seems that it did little or no good to change Party labels in the last election. Well, it did this much good—it showed that you can't save the country just by voting out one set of usurpers. The Conspiracy has a platoon system of front men.

Internal security has been the American Achilles' heel ever since the Nazi menace was destroyed. We made common cause with the Communists against Hitler—or we let them make common cause with us, for they were not always against Hitler—and they have been in our system like strontium 90 ever since. I firmly believe that there is not an agency in Washington which does not have Communist commissars in control positions within it. Not only does this mean that we are *incapable as a government* of thwarting any vital interest of world Communism, it means also that the foreign fiascoes such as Cuba and Vietnam, and the domestic disasters such as the destruction of higher education and the return to Detroit of the savage Robert F. Williams†—that these successive national landslides down the slope to Avernus—are not simply accidental or natural.

**The Ordeal Of Otto Otepka* by William J. Gill. Arlington House, New Rochelle, New York; 505 pages, \$U.S.8.00.

†Reminiscent of Lenin's return to St. Petersburg in 1917. Do you suppose Detroit will one day be named "Williamsburg"—in Swahili?

Forgive the tautology, but internal security is necessary to national security. Internal security is necessary above all in the Department of State, our executive agency for foreign relations, and in the Department of Defense. We simply don't have it in either agency. The Otepka case is a ghastly paradigm of the intricate peril of an America caught in the Communist net.

Yet lesser Leviathans than the United States have escaped from nets before, and we will escape from this one. William J. Gill's remarkable book is in more ways than one a specific reason for hope. In the first place, the fact that he had the courage to write it, and Arlington House had the courage to publish it, proves that we are not wholly a nation of sheep. In the second place, the knowledge, industry, and skill which he reveals in the writing prove that professional journalism of a high order has not, as we are so often tempted to fear, sold out lock, stock, and barrel to the Conspiracy. (Yes, I know, *American Opinion* and *The Review Of The News* have been proving that for some time, but help is surely needed.)

It takes courage to call Dean Rusk a "Number 1 villain", and to call Deputy Undersecretary of State for Administration William J. Crockett a "cover-up man", as Gill does (Pp. 364-365)—and that is just one example taken at random of the strong language with which the book is peppered. It takes knowledge, industry, and skill to document that strong language so thoroughly with facts that no matter how much apoplexy *The Ordeal Of Otto Otepka* may produce in Foggy Bottom—or at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue for that matter—nobody is going to sue anybody and no charges are going to be brought on account of this book. The Establishment certainly does not want William J. Gill to get on a witness stand and say under oath what he here says in salty reporter's prose.

The elements of the Otepka case can be summarised as follows:

1. Otto Otepka, a lifelong civil servant who holds a law degree, rose from being an investigator in the Civil Service Commission in 1942 to top advisor on loyalty cases for that Commission, from which he was recruited into the State Department by the late Scott McLeod, who in 1961 called Otepka "the best [security] evaluator in government today". For the last four years of the Eisenhower Administration Otepka was Deputy Director of State's Office of Security.

2. Immediately upon the selection of Dean Rusk to be Secretary of State, and before he actually took office with the

(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, Three months 11/6.

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

Telephone: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Pearhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1

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

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

In our issue of Aug. 14, 1965 we quoted from the *Allen-Scott Report* of the Labour Conference held in Hanoi from June 2-6 of that year. The Conference was in fact a carefully prepared briefing operation to Communist Party operatives throughout the world: "Nothing was left to the imagination of the 600 delegates. Country by country they were briefed on how to implement the 'vigorous aid Viet Nam and resist America movement' which the hosts said 'is unfolding throughout the world'. This conference obviously was vital to Mao's strategy".

Four years later, we can observe the manifest success of 'Mao's' strategy. All, or as many as necessary, of the Vietnamese are, like U.S. Presidents when they have served their turn in fronting for the Insiders, expendable in the overriding purpose of discrediting the U.S. as the World Policeman. Then U.N. Forces, uninhibited by outmoded patriotism and conditioned to the ruthless savagery of crushing rebellion to World Government, can take on the job. Arrangements to this end are now under way at Helsinki. So:

"And when, the smaller gangsters having disarmed the individual, the larger gangsters disarm the smaller gangsters, then, of course, the gangsters who are left will be transformed into ministering angels, and their international police will spend all their time helping international nursemaids to cross the international traffic. Anyone can see that". (C. H. Douglas, *Programme For the Third World War*, 1943)

Full Employment and High Taxation represent the disarmament of the individual; the abrogation of national sovereignty, the policy of the Socialists, would be treated as the treason it is by a community of largely economically independent individuals such as modern industrial methods would make possible. The shackles of unrepayable international debt represent the disarmament of the Socialist gangsters, culminating in Strategic Arms Control—by the Insiders.

Total Corruption

Total dementia and corruption possess the minds of the politicians dealing with African problems. While the utter lack of judgment of the phrase, "weeks rather than months", and the brutality of the advice, "a quick kill", are fresh in the memory, Group Captain Cheshire, V.C., brings fresh evidence of the persistence of this state of mind. In a letter to *The Times* (Nov. 13, 1969) he refers to the Prime Minister's speech at the Guildhall complaining of the "bad faith" of Biafran leadership. The Group Captain had himself visited Biafra at the suggestion of the Foreign Office and when he handed in his report he was told that "it did not conform to the true facts", although no Foreign Office representative has ever set foot in Biafra. So official assessment is based "on indirect evidence only". Group Captain Cheshire's view is that "sufficient fundamental good will and sincerity exist in Biafra, as unquestionably they do in Nigeria, to make a just and honourable settlement possible". The British Government refuse to believe in this "basic sincerity" and will not try to draw it out. We should, says the Group Captain, use the "whole weight of our authority to stop the fighting", for we are after all "the father of Nigeria". Starvation could be stopped, he adds, if the armed forces were to deliver by day the prepacked food which the Prime Minister "says is awaiting transport". In other words, a man who knows the position by personal investigation believes that peace and negotiation are possible, but the British Government will not have it.

Rhodesia too produces paranoia, as an article in *Human Events* (Oct. 18, 1969) by Rep. Thomas Pelly demonstrates. He heard, he says, from the Department of State, that it would be "inconsistent" with obligations under the U.N. Charter to trade with Southern Rhodesia. He points to a more glaring "inconsistency", namely the purchase of chromite from the Soviet Union at \$48.00 a ton. The Rhodesian price was \$31.35 a ton. While Russia supplies 80 per cent of the equipment used in Viet Nam to kill Americans, Rhodesia "has never been responsible for the death of one U.S. citizen". Meanwhile the flagships of the United Kingdom carry materials to North Viet Nam "during the time of a tragic and trying conflict". As for a racial issue, he mentions the "violent anti-Jewish policies" of Russia. The Bishop of Matabeleland, a harsh critic of Mr. Smith, admits (*The Times*, Nov. 8, 1969) that sanctions have made "very little difference to the policy of the Rhodesian Front" and says that the British Government should "at least have no illusions left as to the possibility of the growth of wide opposition to white domination".

And then we read of the reactions to those who defended their right to watch a game of football with the Springboks. A leader of the demonstrators called them "rugby thugs" and accused them of "brutal mob violence". Civil demonstrators have perfected the technique of provoking people to violent acts. Mr. John Lee, M.P. for Reading, called for an "investigation" into the conduct of the police, several of whom, incidentally, were injured in doing their duty. Mr. Hugh Jenkins, M.P. for Putney, asked for a Home Office enquiry "to see whether the rest of the tour should be called off". I cannot see how the caving in by the forces of law and order to a small minority of demonstrators could possibly be called

democratic". But William Edwards, Merioneth M.P., complains of the "ferocity" of the police measures. Lawless measures by a band of demonstrators naturally meet with a robust response, and rugby vigilantes are probably as robust as any. In fact, *The Daily Telegraph* (Nov. 7, 1969) from which these reports are taken, warns against the result of street demonstrations, for they "diminish democracy and do not enhance it . . . those who sow the wind may reap the whirlwind".

—H.S.

Sign Sign-in in Another Tax?

While the World Council of Churches plans a meeting in Geneva next January to discuss "development aid" (*Church Times*, Nov. 7, 1969), Lord Hawke dealt ably at the Church Assembly with a proposal to make a token offering for "the developing nations". (*Church Times*, Nov. 14, 1969.) He warned that if the members were to ask people if they were prepared to be taxed more heavily "in order to provide handouts to underdeveloped countries", they would meet a very hostile reception. For people were conscious of the "irresponsible policies" of these countries once they became independent and resented the way in which they had "ganged up" against Britain in the United Nations. The present contribution moreover had "a negligible effect on the disparity between the rich and poor countries of the world".

I believe the question of tax to be important, for as the Rev. Maurice Garton pointed out (*The Times*, Nov. 12, 1969), all who take part in the proposed "sign-in" should realise that they will either have to pay higher taxes "or reduce Government expenditure on other objects". (And a higher tax limits the freedom to spend responsibly or indeed to give.)

The Bishop of Durham, Dr. Ramsey, spoke at the Church Assembly in support of giving on the spot and mentioned the "injustice of the plight of the under-developed countries" adding that the imbalance between richer and poorer countries "was the greatest threat to the peace of the world". Yesterday it was the racial problems. But the real problem of richer and poorer—etc., is one of competence. I suppose Canada was pitifully "under-developed" until the French and British arrived, also New Zealand, and such parts of Africa as thrive owe their stability to the competent settlers and their descendants who have stayed there: while the plight of other African territories may be attributed to a racial prejudice that expels the competent and harasses them in other countries through encouraging terrorists. We may say that they have been unjust to themselves, but a hand-out will only encourage this injustice or divert it to tribal lines.

Responsibility may of course be instilled or encouraged in other parts of the world, but the attitude to Europeans in Africa suggests that competence or justice have little to do with the "sign-in". Lincoln observed that you cannot further the brotherhood of man "by encouraging class hatred" or help the wage-earner "by pulling down the wage-payer", and discouraged indiscriminate interference.

The white man brought with him order, peace and some prosperity to those countries, and these benefits largely departed with him. He may still be able to help marginally, if not taxed out of existence, but in Africa, for instance, the best hope comes from the more sensible attitude towards South Africa of Ghana and Madagascar, as well as of Malawi. Arrivals elsewhere have provoked a different response, as is evident from the tragic refugee camps in the Middle East, but I do not imagine that the Bishop of Durham had these sufferers in mind when he spoke of injustice. And I wonder how clear his conscience is over Biafra.

Perhaps it is a measure of socialist demoralisation that people can imagine that an extra tax or a collection would achieve anything while these grave problems remain unsolved and the menace of communism increases.

—H.S.

The Ordeal of Otto Otepka

(continued from page 1)

inauguration of John Kennedy, he asked Otepka's judgment as a security officer on the eligibility of Walt Rostow for clearance to take a top job in the State Department. Otepka, who was already familiar with Doctor Rostow's file, pointed out that such clearance could not *legally* be granted under the terms of Executive Order 10450 (which required that doubts be resolved in favor of the country rather than the applicant), and not without a full F.B.I. investigation even if E.O. 10450 were rescinded. Present when Otepka gave Rusk this opinion in December 1960 was Attorney-General-to-be Robert Kennedy, who was obviously exasperated by the judgment, as quite evidently was Rusk also, though the latter was more circumspect in revealing his attitude.

3. Throughout the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations Otepka was at cross purposes with Rusk and officials intermediate between the two of them in the "chain of command"—such as the William J. Crockett already mentioned; such as John Francis Reilly, head of State's Office of Security; and, from time to time, others. All these took it for granted that a security evaluator's purpose was to tell the big brass what they wanted to hear and to rubber-stamp any appointments that might come down from on high. Otepka, on the other hand, was singularly literal-minded in adhering to the principle that he had taken an oath to uphold the Constitution and laws of the country, and that his first duty as an evaluator of files was, as any umpire should do, to call 'em as he saw 'em. You get the impression that the man really is stubborn, and that of course is just what we need on our side.

4. In spite of the fact that ways could be found to get around Otepka's bull-headed patriotism and sense of duty, the security officer became more and more a thorn in the flesh of the outriders of Camelot, particularly Rusk, Bob Kennedy, and Rostow.

Oh yes, Rostow, of course, got into the Department.

He was first cleared by Presidential order into the White House and then sent down to State over the head of Otepka and other security zealots there, if any. (There were a few, under Otepka. They got it when he did.) Later Rostow went back to the White House, succeeding McGeorge Bundy as Special Assistant to the President for National Security

Affairs—"the most important job in the White House, aside from the President", as Lyndon once put it, with characteristic conceit. (Nixon is conceited too; he thinks *he* is more important than Rostow's successor, Henry Kissinger.) Imagine the top Presidential advisor on national security being a man who can't honestly be cleared by regular security procedures! Otepka could hardly imagine such a thing, but he didn't have to. There it was in the flesh.

Well, it was not comfortable to have in government anybody who knew as much about Rostow as Otepka knew, and who had such a "Neanderthal" attitude about security. Rusk and company set out to get Otepka. It wasn't easy. He had Civil Service status, you know, and was a lawyer himself; besides when the going got really rough he hired Roger Robb, the crack attorney who made the case against Julius Robert Oppenheimer. In the end, however, they got him—framed him on charges of giving confidential information to—guess who—the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Terrible! Now if it had been the Soviet Embassy . . .

Actually, Otepka was technically in the clear all 'round, and in the spirit of the law as distinct from the letter, was more than in the clear. He was a national hero—a reluctant hero, because a lifetime of service in the bureaucracy had conditioned him to *want* to play ball with his organizational superiors. But he couldn't play ball if his bosses were violating the rules and throwing the game to the opposition.

5. In the course of his struggle to save his career, which came to a climax in the last years of the Johnson Administration, Otto Otepka naturally attracted the attention not only of patriots but also of politicians who had reason to profess dissatisfaction with Lyndon and his top Cabinet officer, Dean Rusk. Richard Nixon made campaign promises about seeing justice done in the Otepka case. Not that he might not have done so anyhow, but he was specifically egged on by Senator Strom Thurmond, whose support of Otepka was at all times sincere and strenuous. Nixon had to have Thurmond, at Miami Beach, and later to keep the Carolinas and Virginia from going for George Wallace.

No one can say that Nixon himself double-crossed Thurmond about Otepka or that he double-crossed Otepka. After all, he did appoint him to head the Subversive Activities Control Board, at a considerably better salary than Otepka had ever made before. That was not, *however*, the job Otepka wanted, or that Thurmond wanted him to have. They wanted Otepka to be given a chance to clean up the State Department.

The difference in money could not have consoled Otto Otepka for failure to get reinstated at State (he should have been significantly promoted); the record is clear that Otepka, though prudent, is the least mercenary of men. The fact is that S.A.C.B. is an empty shell of an agency. Otepka, \$36,000 per annum or no, is a victim of that particular shell game.

Okay, so who pulled off this nutty trick. They say William Rogers doesn't really have all that much power. "They" don't always know what they are talking about. Then again, sometimes they do. They also say, you know, that Henry Kissinger does have plenty of power—resident political intellectual plenipotentiary. It's hard to tell about Bill Rogers, but as a rule a cosmopolitan guy like Henry Kissinger absolutely can't abide a chauvinist like Otto Otepka.

Look, I didn't mean to tell the story. I don't summarize books. You know that. But a man gets carried away. I want you to know something, starting right now, about this Otepka case. You still don't know much compared to what there is in Gill's storehouse of information. Dig in. Let's promote this one. True, the book is not perfect. I could point out errors, including typos, including some worse than typos. Example: Gill says that Owen Lattimore's book *Ordeal By Slander* (which he correctly points out Abe Fortas helped write) was directed against the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Actually it was written against Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, and was a subject of interrogation when Lattimore later appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. I mention errors in Gill's book only to show I read every word of it—and, of course, to show off—but really the errors are negligible.

A final confession. I am prejudiced in favor of Gill's book because his emphasis on Rusk, Rostow, and Bobby Kennedy (nor does he neglect Robert McNamara, Abe Fortas, and Nick Katzenbach) so strongly supports my own thesis in *The Usurpers*. In many ways I think *The Ordeal Of Otto Otepka* is better than *The Usurpers*. Now write and tell me you disagree. I'd love to hear it. Let's get an argument going as to which book—and other entries in the contest are welcome—more effectively exposes the "end-of-nationhood" apparatus in Washington. The prize you win may be your country. But to enter the contest you must read *The Ordeal Of Otto Otepka*.

—MEDFORD EVANS.

THE FEARFUL MASTER

A Second Look at the United Nations

by G. EDWARD GRIFFIN

Describes the behind-the-scenes realities of the United Nations, whose permanent staff is dominated by Communists, with the heads of most of its agencies coming from Communist-controlled countries.

10/- posted

NONE DARE CALL IT TREASON

by JOHN STORMER

The almost incredible but carefully documented story of the progress of Conspiracy in America.

7/6 posted

THE ART OF THE POSSIBLE

by BRYAN W. MONAHAN

This booklet is the text of an address given in Sydney in May, 1966. It endeavours to delineate the large background of today's extremely dangerous international situation, which has come about despite the fantastic technological progress which should make life more pleasant and secure on an ever-widening scale. If we understand why this contra-indication exists, and how it has come about, we may be able to take action to remedy the situation. But if we do not understand, the destruction of Western Civilisation, probably within a very few years, and its replacement by a police-state collectivism, appears certain for those who survive the revolution which already engulfs us.

3/- posted

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

Printed by Circular Press Ltd., Colwyn Bay