

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 46 No. 6

SATURDAY, JUNE 18, 1966

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

### Communism is Mellowing?

THE FOLLOWING ANALYSIS IS REPRINTED FROM

*The Review Of The News\**, MAY 25, 1966

The myth that Communism is mellowing is once more being given wide circulation and credence by the Establishment's mass media. The purpose of this new campaign is to morally and psychologically disarm us as we enter perhaps the most dangerous phase in our long war with the Communists. Because the rulers in the Kremlin do not at the moment find it necessary to maintain the kind of extreme and demented terror which existed under Stalin, we are being told that Communism has really become sort of humane. But this is exactly what we were told as far back as 1927. For example, in that year, Mr. Ivy Lee, Public Relations man for John D. Rockefeller Jr., wrote a book about his recent trip to the Soviet Union. That was at the time that Stalin had taken over and was consolidating his control and was yet to institute his own reign of terror. Mr. Lee wrote then:

*Stalin, who was a great admirer of Lenin, believes that the existence of the Soviet Government does not depend upon the dictatorship of labor but depends on the support of the peasants, and he therefore is said to be doing his utmost to depart in many instances from simple socialistic doctrines, and to encourage capitalistic enterprise when capitalism can provide the peasants with cheap products.*

Of course, Stalin was soon to exterminate several million Kulaks, the independent peasants, in one of the most horrible mass murders in history, thus ending his "encouragement" of capitalistic enterprise. Currently, the 23rd Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union recently held in Moscow, is being touted as evidence that Communism is indeed mellowing. For example, *Newsweek* of May 2, 1966, wrote:

*If there is a working definition of Communism today, it has to do primarily with making the U.S.S.R. into a land of abundance. Nowhere was this more clearly demonstrated than in the just-completed 23rd Party Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, where speaker after speaker pointedly skimmed the traditional ideological preambles and got right down to business: how to improve the day-to-day life in the country.*

A *New York Times* editorial of April 11, 1966 went even further when it said:

*The 23rd Soviet Communist Party Congress strengthened the evidence that the Soviet Union has become one of the world's great conservative powers, far more interested in the international stability it*

*needs for rapid internal economic development than in revolutionary adventures on a global scale.*

Whoever wrote that editorial must have a very peculiar idea of what the word conservative means. Certainly the Kremlin butchers must have had a great laugh over that one, for while Comrade Brezhnev was being hailed as a conservative by the *New York Times* he had just recreated the position of General Secretary of the Communist Party, a position which only Josef Stalin ever held. The *New York Herald Tribune* of March 31, 1966 reported the significance of the change:

*The dead tyrant carried the title from 1922, when it was conferred at the suggestion of Lenin, until 1934, when it was quietly dropped—perhaps as a sop to Stalin's contemporaries who feared he was amassing too much power.*

*The suggestion by the City of Moscow's First Secretary, Nikolai Yergorychev, that the general secretaryship be recreated came on top of a proposal Tuesday by party chief Leonid Brezhnev that the name of the ruling party Presidium be changed to the old title of Politburo.*

*Together, the two changes would recreate the top leadership of the party—and thus the nation—in the image it projected at the height of Stalin's power.*

So it would seem that the Stalinist machine for terrorism is being dusted off and prepared for future use. The *Herald Tribune* article continued:

*While the session was in progress, rumour spread through Moscow that Russian students from Moscow University planned a demonstration in Red Square against any rehabilitation of Stalin. Some foreign students appeared and confirmed the rumours, but no Russians showed up.*

Obviously, the students hadn't read the *New York Times* editorial. However, had they read Peter Grose's Moscow dispatch in the April 4, 1966, edition of the same newspaper they would have seen confirmed in print everything they were afraid of. According to Mr. Grose:

*Orthodoxy has been most vividly apparent in the last week for the tightening of party organization, in cultural policy and in the general approach to ideological indoctrination. . . .*

*The clearest illustration of this is the attitude toward culture. Speaker after speaker has echoed in increasingly shrill terms the warning of Mr. Brezhnev, the party leader, that art must serve the party, that intellectuals taking positions in their creative en-*

\*Published weekly by Correction, Please!, Inc., Belmont, Massachusetts, 02178, U.S.A.

## 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 NW1  
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.

*deavors that do not contribute to the building of Communism will be cut off . . .*

*The Soviet party is sounding an alarm against Western bourgeois ideology, its threats to Soviet youth and its sinister efforts to penetrate the Soviet frontiers . . .*

*Membership in the party will become more restricted in the future, according to Mr. Brezhnev's proposals and expulsion from the party will become easier. Automatic rotation of party officials is to be annulled.*

In the matter of consumer goods, the Soviet leaders didn't quite live up to *Newsweek's* description of them. The *New York Herald Tribune* of April 6, 1966, quoted Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin as having told the Communist gathering that more and more money would have to be put into armaments. The *Herald Tribune* then commented:

*In passages such as those Mr. Kosygin drove home the message that the Soviet Union would have to spend more money than it was counting on a year ago for defense and that this would detract to some extent from the cherished growth of consumer goods production.*

Of course, the millions of dollars the Bolshoi Ballet is gathering for Kremlin use from American suckers will help Comrade Kosygin balance the Red budget. It will also help the Communists kill more Americans in Vietnam while their kinfolk at home read all about how Communism is mellowing in *Life*, *Look*, *Time* and *Newsweek*. Comrade Brezhnev, however, left no doubt that Communism is not mellowing in Vietnam. In his speech, delivered to the Red congress and reprinted in the *New York Times* of March 30, 1966, he said:

*The C.P.S.U. has been consistently advocating the rallying of efforts of all Socialistic countries to provide assistance to the fighting Vietnam . . .*

*We declare categorically that in escalating the shameful war against the Vietnamese people the United States will have to contend with mounting*

*support for Vietnam from the Soviet Union and other socialist friends and brothers . . .*

*In connection with United States aggression in Vietnam and other aggressive acts of American imperialism our relations with the United States have worsened. The blame for this is on the ruling quarters of the United States.*

Obviously, Comrade Brezhnev hadn't read President Johnson's State of the Union Message in which our beloved President talked about building bridges to Eastern Europe. The President had said:

*And I will ask the Congress for authority to remove the special tariff restrictions which are a barrier to increasing trade between East and West.*

So how could Comrade Brezhnev speak so unjustly of America's "ruling quarters"? Why, President Johnson wants to help the Soviet Union, not hurt it. So does Dean Rusk, and all the other fine fellows in Washington's "ruling quarters." What can they do if a small time Congressman throws a monkey wrench in the works? For example, the *New York Times* of May 13, 1966, reported:

*The Administration's proposal to liberalize trade with Communist nations of Eastern Europe was dealt an unexpectedly swift and fatal blow in Congress today by Representative Wilbur D. Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.*

*The influential Arkansas Democrat announced that he would not introduce the legislation, submitted yesterday by the State Department on behalf of the White House. Furthermore, Mr. Mills ruled out any committee hearings on the legislation this year.*

*"I want to make my position clear," he told reporters. "I am not for it." . . .*

*The Administration had no hopes that the legislation would be passed at this session of Congress. But it had hoped for extensive hearing and discussion as part of an educational process designed to overcome the opposition and lead the way to passage of the legislation next year.*

*The legislation, long under consideration by the Administration, would give the President discretionary authority to lower tariffs to the Soviet Union and Communist countries in Eastern Europe—with the exception of East Germany—by granting them "most favored nation" tariff treatment.*

Apparently, L.B.J.'s progressive Congress is not quite prepared to commit wholesale treason in an election year.

However, a few Senators, whose unbounded enthusiasm for trading with the enemy no doubt endears them to our men in Vietnam, put their names on the line. For example, Senator Warren Magnuson, Democrat of Washington, had the honor of offering this bill to the Senate. According to the *Congressional Record* of May 17, 1966, he said:

*Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of the Senator from Montana (Mr. Mansfield) and myself, for appropriate references, a bill (S. 3363) to promote the foreign policy and security of the United States by providing authority to negotiate commercial agreements with Communist countries, and for other purposes, popularly known as the East-West trade bill . . .*

*Mr. President, Abraham Lincoln was greatly troubled by his inability to build bridges of friendship and understanding between North and South . . .*

*So today we have our doubts about the "abutments" in Communist Eastern Europe. But we also have a President with the courage and determination to build bridges of trade and understanding if it is possible to build them on a sound foundation . . .*

Other members of our "ruling quarters" who concurred with Senators Magnuson and Mansfield were Jacob Javits of New York (Republican) and George McGovern of South Dakota (Democrat). Senator Javits, using the convoluted reasoning usually associated with the mentally unbalanced, said:

*It is necessary that we trade with the central European bloc for the good of the free world, especially at a time when we hope, by virtue of our sacrifices in Vietnam and elsewhere, that the Russians may reverse their priority and stop trying to dominate the Communist world by competing with China in an effort to subvert South Vietnam.*

Senator McGovern was more direct in his enthusiasm for aiding our mortal enemies. He said:

*Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the splendid statements by the Senator from Washington (Mr. Magnuson) and the Senator from New York (Mr. Javits), who has long been an advocate of greater East-West trade. I agree enthusiastically with what they have said.*

As for Brezhnev, whose disappointment in our country's "ruling quarters" is quite understandable, he had this to say:

*Capitalism is running into increasingly harder times. Its doom is becoming more and more obvious. But the capitalists will never give up their domination of their own free will. It is only through tenacious class battles that the working class and the rest of the working people will achieve victory.*

This hardly sounds like a mellowed Communist. But then the *New York Times* would contend that Comrade Brezhnev doesn't really mean it.

### Mr. Bundy\*

McGeorge Bundy has left his position of President Johnson's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs. He has become President of the Ford Foundation. When a top member of the invisible government leaves so important a post in the White House to assume the leadership of the world's largest private dispenser of "philanthropy," one begins to understand how important the private foundation is in the grand scheme of things. One also begins to appreciate Mr. Bundy's importance in the scheme.

Walter Lippman, pundit of the invisible government, has always appreciated Mr. Bundy's importance. In his *New York Herald Tribune* column of March 1, 1966, he wrote:

*Mr. Bundy has had two predecessors, Col. House under President Wilson and Harry Hopkins under President Roosevelt. He and they have been closer to and more intimate with the President than were the men who served as Secretary of State.*

Mr. Lippmann, of course, should know, for as a Harvard Fabian Socialist he was one of Col. House's special protégés

who became active in the Colonel's front for millionaire internationalists, the Council on Foreign Relations.

Joseph Kraft, another admirer of McGeorge Bundy, described Bundy's function in the White House in an article he wrote for the November, 1965, issue of *Harper's* magazine. For all practical purposes, Bundy seems to have been President Johnson's major contact with reality in foreign affairs. According to Kraft:

*He (Bundy) organizes . . . the process of Presidential decision in foreign affairs. His daily job is to present to the President, in coherent and concise fashion, the oceans of information that flow in from the State Department, the Defense Department, and the intelligence community.*

In other words, the President knew only what his censor Mr. Bundy told him. One would imagine that Dean Rusk would be in charge of the briefing department. But obviously, the President had to be "advised"—or watched?—from much closer quarters than the State Department. Bundy worked right in the White House, where he could make sure that the President followed, without deviation, the line set down by the invisible government. Kraft writes:

*Able to work within any frame of reference, he (Bundy) commands all the tools to keep the game going, is almost always in a position to right a balance gone wrong.*

The invisible government's administration is very much a "game," since so much of it is dependent on pure fraud, deception, and make-believe. As for righting "a balance gone wrong," Mr. Kraft merely meant that when President Johnson wandered off the track on his own, Mr. Bundy was always there to get him back on. For example, that's exactly what happened in last year's Dominican crisis. For the first few hours of our intervention in April, 1965, President Johnson sounded like some sort of anti-Communist, but no sooner did Bundy get down there than he started to "right a balance gone wrong". Kraft describes what happened:

*When he (Bundy) arrived, American soldiers and American diplomats were day-by-day lining this country up more and more with the right-wing Junta under General Antonio Imbert Barreras against the left-wing (Communist) Constitutionalists, under Colonel Francisco Caamano Deno. The Bundy mission enforced upon the American military a genuine neutrality as between right and left.*

In other words, it was Bundy who stopped the anti-Communists from mopping up the Communists. One would have thought he knew better. After all, as Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard, Bundy had the privilege and honor of playing host to Fidel Castro when the "agrarian reformer" visited Harvard in May, 1959. Of course, Bundy had no inkling *whatever* that Castro was a Communist—although his brother William was a top man at the C.I.A. and could have told him—if he knew. It is, of course, possible that both Bundys—as well as Christian Herter, Allen Dulles, and Dwight D. Eisenhower—were duped. It is also possible, and far more probable, that both Bundys knew that Castro was a Communist and were simply playing their part in the grand "game" of deceiving the American people.

In the Dominican Republic Mr. Bundy decided to repeat

\*Reprinted from 'The Review Of The News,' March 23, 1966.

the game which had been played so successfully in 1959. He was a typical top-level American official about to make another "mistake." The only thing that kept this "mistake" from succeeding, however, was the basic anti-Communist reflex of the Dominican army. The Dominicans weren't in the mood for any of Mr. Bundy's "mistakes," which they would have had to live with after he went back to the soft, safe, well-fed life in Washington. The Dominicans are too close to Cuba not to have learned a few elementary lessons about Communist deception.

A man like McGeorge Bundy always seems to rise in prestige, importance, and power without even trying. Mistakes or no mistakes, it seems that his "intellectual sparkle" has just been too irresistible. So is his pedigree. According to Kraft:

*For one thing, Bundy is a creature of the Establishment, in every sense of the word . . . He takes his ease at stately homes with old friends from good families. He belongs to the best, that is to say the most exclusive, clubs.*

Please note that certain Liberals always refer to the Establishment when they really mean the "invisible government." They know that men like McGeorge Bundy are as basically revolutionary in their thinking as Fidel Castro. But by associating them with the "Establishment", they somehow come off as conservatives.

Both McGeorge and William Bundy are the sons of a Boston lawyer who became Assistant Secretary of State to Henry Stimson in the Hoover Administration. This gave the boys an entrée to Washington. During World War II McGeorge served as an aide to Admiral Alan G. Kirk, a family friend. He was stationed in London where he hobnobbed with Fabian Socialists. After the war, McGeorge helped Henry Stimson write his memoirs. Then, in 1949, McGeorge joined a small clique of Council-on-Foreign-Relations insiders, including John Foster Dulles, Allen W. Dulles, Christian Herter, and C. Douglas Dillon, all of whom were Thomas E. Dewey's advisers on foreign policy during the 1948 campaign.

After that, in 1949, he joined the Harvard faculty as a lecturer in government. At about that time his brother William, who had married Dean Acheson's daughter, came under the fire of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy. According to the *Boston Globe* of February 14, 1965:

*McCarthy raised a furor over the fact that Bill Bundy, then an employee of the CIA, had in 1949 contributed \$400 to the fund raised to help provide legal defense for Alger Hiss, who was under indictment in a Communist spy case.*

*Bill Bundy, son-in-law of former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, said he gave the money because Hiss deserved a full defense, which the Hiss family could not afford. McCarthy attempted to prevent Bundy from obtaining a passport to Europe, but failed.*

*McGeorge Bundy, who was just beginning his tenure as dean of graduate faculty of arts and sciences at Harvard University, got in some licks of his own at McCarthy.*

*He told a Senate committee that "the national security is not served when the security program becomes an instrument of insecurity and mistrust among men of good sense and high character."*

Despite his so obvious left-wing sympathies (or more likely because of them), McGeorge rose rapidly at Harvard. In four short years from a mere lecturer—with no more than an A.B. from Yale—he became Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the second highest position in the University.

Obviously, a man who was chosen to rise so rapidly in a university administration controlled by internationalists, would soon find his way to Washington making national policy. No sooner was John F. Kennedy in the White House than a call went out for the indispensable services of McGeorge Bundy. It helped, of course, that David Rockefeller and John F. Kennedy were members of the Harvard Board of Overseers. (Please note this interesting interlocking arrangement: David Rockefeller, President of the Chase Manhattan Bank, is Vice President of the Council on Foreign Relations; Dean Rusk, whom Kennedy chose as Secretary of State, was President of the Rockefeller Foundation; John J. McCloy, recently retired Chairman of the Board of the Ford Foundation was Chairman of the Board of the Chase Manhattan Bank and is presently Chairman of the Board of the Council on Foreign Relations. Mr. Bundy fits in just fine.)

In Washington Bundy "helped" shape the foreign policy that brought disaster at the Bay of Pigs, destruction in Katanga, acquiescence to the Wall in Berlin, escalation in Vietnam, boycott of Rhodesia, Communism in Algeria, and civil war in the Dominican Republic. For this splendid record he has been awarded the Presidency of the Ford Foundation.

Of course, the invisible government must choose someone to replace Bundy. In speculating on Bundy's successor, Walter Lippman wrote in his column of March 1, 1966:

*There must be someone who orders and orients the torrent of information the President must master in order to reach his decisions.*

*Some one will have to step into Mr. Bundy's shoes and show whether he can fill them.*

Who will step into Bundy's shoes? Maybe his brother William, who is now in charge of our "anti-Communist" Vietnam war, which is being transformed into a war against "poverty, disease and ig-ner-ence." A typical Bundy operation—with a Texas accent. Speaking of accents, McGeorge Bundy wrote in the *Saturday Review* of July 3, 1965:

*Whether the accents and actions of an Administration are those of Hyde Park, or of Independence, or of Abilene and the Army, or of Hyannis and Harvard—or the complex and wonderful set of actions and accents which I have the honor to serve today—they flow in a single stream.*

That stream, of course, leads to what Dean Rusk calls an "organized peace" or more plainly, World Government.

### The "Suppressed" Report

The AMERICAN OPINION reprint to which the article "Occult Paralysis" in THE SOCIAL CREDITER of 9th April refers, is now available from stock.

Price 1/4 including postage

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

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11.  
Printed by E. Fish & Co. Ltd., Liverpool.