

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 43 No. 26

SATURDAY, MARCH 28, 1964

6d. Fortnightly

Marxmanship in Dallas

By REVILO P. OLIVER*

(Reprinted from *American Opinion*†, February, 1964)

We all know what happened in Dallas on the twenty-second of November. It is imperative that we understand it.

Lee Harvey Oswald was a young punk who defected to the Soviet, taking with him the operational codes of the Marine Corps and such other secrets as a fledgling traitor had been able to steal while in military service. He not only forfeited his American citizenship by his acts, but also officially repudiated it under oath in the American Embassy in Moscow. He was then trained in sabotage, terrorism, and guerrilla warfare (including accurate shooting from ambush) in the well-known school for international criminals near Minsk, and while there he married the daughter of a colonel in the Soviet military espionage system (and possibly also in the Secret Police).** In 1962, after he had been trained for three years in Russia, the Communist agent and his Communist wife were brought to the United States, in open violation of American law, by our Communist-dominated State Department.

On his arrival in this country, Oswald took up his duties as an agent of the Conspiracy, spying on anti-Communist Cuban refugees, serving as an agitator for "Fair Play for Cuba", and participating in some of the many other forms of subversion that flourish openly in defiance of law through the connivance of the Attorney General, Robert F. Kennedy. In April of 1963, he was sent to Dallas, where he tried to murder General Edwin Walker. The failure does not reflect on the assassin's professional training: General Walker happened to turn his head at the instant the shot was fired. According to a story that has been neither confirmed nor denied officially at the time that I write, Oswald was arrested as a suspect, but was released through the personal intervention of Robert F. Kennedy, and all inquiry into the attempted assassination of a great American was halted.††

In November, Oswald was sent back to Dallas, where a job in a suitably located building had been arranged for him. He shot the President of the United States from ambush, left the building undetected, and would have escaped to Mexico but

for some mischance. He was stopped for questioning by a vigilant policeman, whom he killed in a moment of panic. Arrested and identified, he, despite his training, was so vain as to pose for photographs while triumphantly giving the Communists' clenched-fist salute; he asked for a noted Communist attorney, who had been a member of the little Communist cell that included the noted traitor, Alger Hiss; and he began to tell contradictory stories. He was accordingly liquidated before he could make a complete confession.

There are many other significant data, but I have stated the essentials. They are known to you.

The fact that they are known to you should give you—if you are an American—hope and courage. You will need both.

Obviously, something went wrong in Dallas—in our favor, this time. The best laid schemes o' mice and men gang aft a-gley—and so do schemes of Communists, sometimes. The identification of the murderer was a near-miracle. If not the result of divine intervention, it was the result of a series of coincidences of the same order as might enable a bum with a dollar in his pocket to enter a casino in Reno and emerge with a thousand.

It is highly significant that, after Oswald was arrested, you learned the facts. That proves that the Communist Conspiracy's control of the United States is not yet complete.

I firmly believe that in our nation as a whole the overwhelming majority of local policemen, whom we shamefully neglect and take for granted, are brave and honourable Americans. But I know nothing of the police in Dallas. It is quite possible that, as is usual in our large cities, they are subject to great pressures from a corrupt municipal government. I shall not be greatly astonished if, in the course of the Conspiracy's frantic efforts to confuse us with irrelevancies, it should be disclosed that pay-offs had been made by Jakob Leon Rubenstein, alias Ruby, and other members of the underworld that pander to human vice and folly. It is by no means impossible that crypto-Communists have been planted in that police force. But paint the picture as dark as you will, it remains indisputably true that, at the very least, there were enough honest and patriotic men on that police force to bring about the arrest of Oswald, to identify him, and to prevent both his escape and assassination "while trying to escape". It required a gunman from outside to do the job.

It is quite true that the Communist Conspiracy, through the management of great broadcasting systems and news agencies, through the many criminals lodged in the Press, and through

(continued on page 3)

* Révilo P. Oliver is Professor of Classics in the University of Illinois. During World War II he was Director of Research in a secret agency of the War Department. He has travelled widely. Dr. Oliver is an academician of international reputation who has published scholarly articles in four languages within the pages of twelve learned periodicals in the United States and Europe.

† Published monthly except July by Robert Welch, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont 78, Massachusetts, U.S.A.

We gratefully acknowledge permission to reprint.

** If you missed the detail about Mrs. Oswald's father, see the *Congressional Record* for December 4, page 22215.

†† Reprinted in *The Councilor* (228 Oil & Gas Building, Shreveport, La.), December 20, 1963.

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 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices—Business: 9 AVENUE ROAD, STRATFORD-ON-AVON. Telephone: Stratford-on-Avon 3976.

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, 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). 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.

The Temper of Bacon

Francis Bacon complained at Cambridge that Aristotle was "only fit for disputations", and tried throughout his life to turn men's attention from theories and logic to real things. As he put it later, men "see sharply in the darkness of their own notions but in the daylight of experience they wink and are blinded".

Catherine Drinker Bowen, the author of an important book on Coke, has now written a study of Bacon*, his rival, "a man in whose debt the world is proud to live", and describes the work as an *Invitation to Bacon*. We read again how Bacon (1561-1626) and Coke (1552-1634) contrasted and in fact complemented each other; for Coke stood solidly for defending the common law and raising new corn from the old fields, while Bacon looked in the new direction of practical experiment.

Bacon was well connected, being the son of Sir Anthony Bacon the Lord Keeper, nephew of Lord Burghley and cousin of Robert Cecil who later became Lord Salisbury. But when his father died he was not well provided for. He had such friends as Bishop Lancelot Andrewes. His brother Anthony served Elizabeth as foreign agent, yet Burghley did not advance him, possibly owing to his friendship for Essex. Bacon was returned as Member of Parliament in 1593 and in successive parliaments, and he opposed the triple subsidy tax. But despite the favour of Essex, Coke gained the post of Attorney General in front of Bacon and the hand of Lady Hatton as well. Bacon advised Essex against going to Ireland as Deputy General, and pleaded with the Queen for him on his return, so that he was freed, but after the futile rebellion Bacon rose in court against him.

The *Essays* appeared in 1597, to be twice enlarged, but the author was arrested for debt the next year, and he later quarrelled openly with Coke in the Exchequer Court. James I knighted Coke in 1603 and, three months later, Bacon, who wrote two years later the *Advancement of Learning* in which he instructed his readers to examine things and nature herself. Coke was made Chief Justice of the Common Pleas in 1606 and the next year Bacon was appointed Solicitor General. In

1613 Coke was made Chief Justice of King's Bench, against his wishes, and Bacon was sworn Attorney General.

In the next few years, Bacon rose to an insecure height of success, founded on debt: he was made Privy Councillor in 1616, Lord Keeper, Lord Chancellor and Baron Verulam in 1617, and Viscount St. Albans in 1620. He studied law reform and clarification, and was to be quoted two hundred years later, and he speeded up procedure in Chancery, but he had not lost sight of his instauration of science and education. His *New Atlantis* appeared in 1618 describing his ideal university, and the *Novum Organum* was published in 1620. Coke meanwhile attacked Chancery and defied the King, who summoned twelve judges and suspended Coke. Coke cited Bracton, that the King was under God and the Law, and James dismissed him. He was restored to the Privy Council after his daughter had married Buckingham's brother, although Bacon opposed the union. Coke and Bacon served on the Commission of Six which dealt with Raleigh after his disastrous voyage to Guinea and resulted in his execution in 1618.

Despite his hundred retainers, the Lord Chancellor seemed secure enough when he advised on a Parliament for 1621, the first for seven years. But the Commons resented Buckingham, the proposed Spanish marriage as well as the farming of customs duties and the monopolies of such goods as tin. They successfully attacked two monopolists and turned on the "referees" of monopolies, among whom were Buckingham's two brothers and Bacon. Buckingham apologised to the House of Lords, but a second committee was inquiring into abuses in the courts, and these came to a head in complaints about Chancery and presents that Bacon received. Buckingham was probably willing that the Commons should have any victim as long as it were not himself, and Bacon was impeached. C. D. Bowen remarks that the Commons behaved as if judging "what should happen", adding that "similar procedure" took place in the Nuremberg Trials.

The disgrace—he was in the Tower for a few days, was fined £40,000 and excluded from office and Parliament—nearly killed Bacon yet he survived for "a noble five years", as our author describes it. In these years he returned to his true vocation, saying that "nothing is to be feared except fear itself", and showed how investigation should replace logic, writing a *History of the Winds, of Life and Death, Apothegms, the History of Henry VII*, and a final edition of the *Essays*, and he died as a result of experimentally stuffing a chicken with snow.

Catherine Drinker Bowen has produced a clear account of the tangled times which invites the reader to read Bacon and to apply his methods. These certainly have been used in some departments, but others rigidly exclude Baconian investigation and realism, and use such methods as mystification and sentimentality: I'm afraid this still holds in such vital subjects as economics, finance and the large sphere of politics.

—H.S.S.

Reprinted 1963
THE NATURE OF DEMOCRACY

by
C. H. DOUGLAS

1/6 (plus postage)

from K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.
9 Avenue Road, Stratford-on-Avon

* Francis Bacon: *The Temper of the Man*, by Catherine Drinker Bowen. Hamish Hamilton, 1963, 25/-.

Retreat from Federalism

DUPLICATION OF STATE FUNCTIONS

Under the above titles, the following letter appeared in *The Sydney Morning Herald* for February 27:

SIR,—How many people, we wonder, recognise that the Liberal-Country Party policies on housing and education, which apparently found strong support at the November election, represent a further serious retreat from Federalism?

This is not to question the social benefits and desirability of doing more to assist our youth to attend universities by increasing the number of Commonwealth scholarships, besides giving our young married couples financial assistance to buy their homes.

The States, in terms of the Constitution, have their residue of powers to carry out such functions, and they already possess experienced departments for the purpose of doing so. Finance is their only deficiency, because the Loan Council, uniform income taxation and the Reserve Bank have combined to divert funds from them to the Federal Government.

Why, then, should the Menzies Government, whose declared policy is the retention of the Federal system, be now making arrangements to duplicate State instrumentalities by creating a Commonwealth Ministry of Housing, together with a new sub-department of education within the Prime Minister's Department?

"Another Invasion"

Surely this can only indicate that the Federal Government is preparing another invasion into the field of State authority, thereby putting yet another nail in the coffin of the Federal system, which the Australian people have consistently refused to alter, as shown by the results of 41 out of 45 referendums refusing the Commonwealth additional power.

It will be interesting to see whether the Senate, whose constitutional role includes the safeguarding of State rights, will oppose the new legislation that is seeking to enlarge the power of the Central Government.

Apart from electioneering considerations, there is no good reason why the Commonwealth, acting under Section 96 of the Constitution, should not have made grants to existing State departments, earmarked for the desirable social policies, and promised by all Federal political parties since the introduction of wartime uniform taxation in 1942.

It is a sad commentary on the present fading line of demarcation between the economic policies of our political parties that the Liberal and Country Parties, which are pledged to preserve the Federal system as an important check on the personal ambitions of politicians, should now be deserting their principles to embrace the Labour Party's policy of swallowing up State Governments.

H. D. AHERN,
Chairman,

Constitutional League of N.S.W.

Sydney.

"A Prophecy?"

This will be available shortly in booklet form, price 1/6, from

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.
9 Avenue Road, Stratford-on-Avon

MARXMANSHIP IN DALLAS (continued from page 1)

many indirect pressures (such as allocation of advertising and harassment by bureaus of the federal government), has a control over our channels of communication that seems to us, in our moments of discouragement, virtually total. As was to be expected, a few moments after the shot was fired in Dallas, the vermin, probably in obedience to general or specific orders issued in advance of the event, began to screech out their diseased hatred of the American people, and, long after the facts were known to everyone, went on mechanically repeating like defective phonograph records, the same vicious lies about the "radical right" until fresh orders reached them from headquarters. But the significant fact is that there were enough honest American newsmen, in the United States and abroad, to make it impossible to conceal the Conspiracy's connection with the bungled assassination. That is very encouraging.

The Show and the Sorrow

All that could be done at the moment to obscure the Communists' mischance was to stage an elaborate spectacle with all the technical virtuosity seen in a performance of *Aida* in the Baths of Caracalla or the amphitheatre at Verona, supplemented with the cruder devices of Hollywood's expert vulgarians. Every effort was made to incite an orgy of pathos and irrationality. For the most part, the good sense of the American people frustrated the efforts of the showmen. But we need to consider the facts clearly and objectively.

There are two basic reasons why the American people were shocked and grieved by the assassination. Neither has anything to do with either the personal character of the victim or the identity of the assassin.

(1) The victim was the President of the United States; he was therefore symbolically representative of the nation, and his assassination was a form of armed attack on our country. The alarm, indignation, and sorrow excited by such an attack made on American soil should have no relation to either the private or public character of the person who was President. To put the matter as clearly as possible, the crime would have been every bit as horrible and shocking, had it (*per impossibile*) been absolutely certain that on the very next day the President would be impeached, tried, convicted, removed from office, and executed for his own crimes. That would be tomorrow, and would not affect today when he is still legally invested with the dignity of his high office.

All decent men feel instinctively that the order, the stability, the preservation of civilised society requires that the officers whom that society has appointed in conformity with its own constitution be inviolate so long as they are clothed with the dignity of office, however mistaken and unfortunate their appointment may have been. So long as the officer has not outlawed himself by violent usurpation, any misuse of the powers legally bestowed upon him indicates either a defect in the constitution (which may grant excessive powers or provide inadequate checks) or the fatuity of citizens who tolerate abuses for which constitutional remedies are available. In either case, the abuse is primarily evidence of a weakness that the society must learn to correct legally. And if the society cannot learn from experience, there is no hope for it anyway.

(2) Regardless of office, political violence is always shocking and a warning of impending collapse. The Roman Republic

lic was doomed as soon as it became clear that the wealthy and high-born renegade, Clodius, could send his gangsters into the streets with impunity; when the decent people of Rome tried to protect themselves by hiring gangsters of their own under Milo, that was not an answer: It was a confession of defeat. The assassination of Kennedy, quite apart from consideration of the office that he held, was an act of violence both deplorable and ominous—as ominous as the violence excited by the infamous Martin Luther King and other criminals engaged in inciting race war with the approval and even, it is said, the active co-operation of the White House. It was as deplorable and ominous as the violence of the uniformed goons (protected by reluctant and ashamed soldiers) whom Kennedy, in open violation of the American Constitution, sent into Oxford, Mississippi, to kick into submission American citizens, whom the late Mr. Kennedy had come to regard as his subjects.

Such lawlessness, regardless of the identity of the perpetrators of their professed motives, is as alarming as the outbreak of a fire in a house; and if not speedily extinguished, will destroy the whole social order. That is a fact that all conservatives know, for it is they who read the lessons of human history and understand how hard it is to build and how easy it is to destroy—how perishable and precious are the moral restraints and the habitual observance of them by which civilisation shelters itself from the feral barbarism that is latent in all peoples. That is the very fact that “Liberal intellectuals” try to conceal with the contorted sophistries that they are perpetually devising to justify as “social good” or “progress” the murders and massacres that secretly fascinate and excite them. That is why conservatives try to conserve what “Liberals” seek to destroy.

The foregoing are two good and sufficient reasons why Americans were shocked and grieved by the assassination in Dallas. Let them suffice us. It is imperative that we do not permit ourselves to be confused at this critical time by a twisted proverb and residual superstition.

Taboo

The maxim, *de mortuis nūl nisi bonum*, has long been a favourite dictum of Anglo-Saxons (for some reason, it is seldom cited on the continent of Europe). Reference books usually attribute it to one of the Seven Sages, Chilo, who lived in the early part of the Sixth Century B.C.; but that is a mistake. In his precepts for prudent conduct, roughly similar to Benjamin Franklin's, Chilo urges us not to *malign* the dead (*ton techmekota me kakologein*). He was interested in our own integrity, not the comfort or reputation of the deceased, and the precept is on a par with his advice that we should not utter idle threats in a quarrel because that is womanish.

Whatever the source of the phrase so glibly and frequently quoted these days, the notion that one should speak only good of the departed is compounded of various sentiments. It undoubtedly had its origin in man's deep-seated and primitive fear of the dead—a fear lest the Manes may somehow hear what we say and, if angered, use their mysterious powers to work harm upon us. That residual awe is supplemented by our infinite pity for the dead, and our hope that after life's fitful fever they sleep well. Pity is reinforced by the strong impulse toward generosity and kindness that, although biologically inexplicable, is found in all decent men. And that

kindness is directed in part toward the living, for even the most odious and despicable beings may be survived by someone who grieves for them. Even Nero had one concubine who loved him. Acte wept for him and saw to it that his body was decently buried. And we honour her for it.

The dictum has become a fixed convention. We all know the story of the old men in a rural community who attend the funeral of one of their contemporaries. Having known the old reprobate all his life, they stand silently in a circle, tongue-tied, uneasily shuffling their feet, eyeing one another and searching their memories, until one is at last able to say, “Well, when Jake was a boy, he was mighty nigh the best speller in the sixth grade.”

As an expression of courtesy and personal kindness, the dictum is unexceptionable. In politics and history it is utter nonsense—and everyone knows that it is. Were the dictum taken seriously, history would be impossible, for no page of it can be written without recording the follies and the crimes of the dead. Not even the sentimental innocents who now, under expert stimulation, weep over the “martyred President” believe in the dictum *de mortuis*—at least, I have yet to hear one of them utter a lament for Adolf Hitler, although Adolf is certainly as defunct as Jack and therefore presumably as much entitled to post-mortem consideration.

Taboos are for barbarians, who indulge in tribal howling and gashing of cheeks and breast whenever a big chief dies or an eclipse portends the end of the world. We are a civilised race.

(To be continued)

The Conspiracy

Copies of “The Politician” by Robert Welch (12/6) are obtainable from

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.

9 Avenue Road, Stratford-on-Avon

There has been a heavy demand for this book which is now in its fourth printing.

We also hope to have available “One Dozen Candles”—the title is based on the old Chinese proverb, “It is better to light one candle than to curse the darkness”. The book is a “carton pack” of *American Opinion* reprints of twelve books exposing the Communist Conspiracy. The titles and authors will be given when space permits.

Wanted to Purchase

The Social Crediter in bound volumes. Offers to K.R.P. Publications Ltd.

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 9 Avenue Road, Stratford-on-Avon, and printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool 25.