

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 51 No. 19

SATURDAY, 11 DECEMBER, 1971

7p. (1s. 5d.) Fortnightly

America 1971*

The politics of dollars and sense

By GARY ALLEN

(Continued)

While the President is working to centralize all Welfare in Washington, he is at the same time proposing "revenue sharing"—which he claims is necessary to decentralize a muscle-bound federal bureaucracy. Polite reporters have refrained from asking him about the apparent ideological contradiction between his Number One and Number Two domestic priorities. Of course there is no contradiction. Despite the rhetoric about reducing federal powers, which is being used to sell the revenue sharing program, revenue sharing is in fact a transparent scheme to further centralize control in Washington. Joseph Califano, a top advisor to President Johnson, observed in the *New York Times* of January 29, 1971, that Mr. Nixon's plan for revenue sharing "should be particularly appealing to those of us who believe in a strong Presidency". House Ways and Means Chairman Wilbur Mills explained the gambit in *U.S. News & World Report* for March 15, 1971:

Now, to me, that is just the reverse of what the proponents say it is. It may give temporary vitality to the State governments, but, in the long run, it makes them dependent entirely on the Federal Treasury and on whatever controls Congress subsequently wants to impose . . . It goes in the direction of centralized government. Look at the historical precedents. Has any entity of government that has received federal funds ever escaped federal intervention?

Chairman Mills said the Nixon "revenue sharing" proposal is a "trap", and "could become a massive weapon against the independence of State and local government". Members of the President's staff have admitted as much in private conversations, noting that the funds sent to the states will be used as a come-on to further centralize power. Paul Scott, Washington's most authoritative independent correspondent, explained what is happening:

The fine print in the legislation which is being readied for Congress clearly reveals that the President has set forth measures designed to shake federal, state and local governments to their foundations . . .

Despite Mr. Nixon's soothing assurances to Congress that his program will return power to state and local governments, this radical proposal would in effect make the proposed new Secretary of Community Development a policy-setting Czar for all community and housing development throughout the nation. It gives this proposed new dictator of Community Development vast new authority "to encourage states to develop, within an ap-

propriate time, planning and management programs that include comprehensive statewide development plans".

The "joker" in the proposed legislation is that, for the states to qualify for the vast revenue sharing assistance the President is dangling before them, their master plans [will be] subject to modification by the new Federal Development Czar . . .

In fact, legislation prepared by the White House for the revenue sharing program stipulates specifically: "State programs must be formulated so as to take account of relevant federal policies." Another section frankly states that it is designed to "change state and local government institutions to permit accelerated progress toward meeting social and development goals set by the federal government". Does that sound like a program to decentralize power? Columnist Paul Scott correctly read the situation when he observed:

This new "concept of government" being pushed by Nixon is of the type that David Lilienthal, a New Deal brainstormer of the Thirties, called the "decentralized administration of centralized authority". Under this theory of government, overall policy-making is centralized in Washington in the federal government, and state and local governments and semi-public agencies (like the Tennessee Valley Authority) are used to carry out federal policy. By having the state and local governments administer the programs under federal guidance, the President and his domestic policy advisors believe it will be easier to commit them to supporting the more radical programs for social change.

Richard Nixon has already created the machinery for carrying out the sort of program which David Lilienthal proposed. On March 27, 1969, he announced that the United States had been divided into ten regions, each with its own capital. Each capital would have its own Department of Labor, Office of Economic Opportunity, H.U.D. and other "give-away" and "grant-in-aid" organizations—where the states would apply for federal "grants". So when the President says he means to take power away from Washington, he is not telling a lie—not totally anyway. He has created ten federal administrative districts to carry out Washington's policies.

Mr. Nixon calls all this "a new American revolution . . . as profound, as far-reaching, as exciting as that first revolution almost 200 years ago". Balderdash! President Nixon's

(continued on page 4)

*From *American Opinion*, July-August, 1971.

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—£2.60 (52/-), Six months—£1.30 (26/-).

Offices—
Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11. Tel. 01-534 7395
Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Tel. 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, Rougement, P.Q., General Deputy Chairman and Secretary, H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Amongst the casualties to be anticipated from Britain's surrender of national sovereignty is almost certain to be the political commentary industry. No doubt freedom of speech and writing will survive for a while, but it will be pointless. The more British law is 'harmonised' with European, the more the administrative decrees emanating from Brussels will be directly applicable to British society, and it won't be much use aiming a kick at the pants of the Member for Wolverhampton.

But the greatest casualty, and probably the chief intended victim, will be monetary reform. Douglas was once asked what should be the first step any country should take in monetary reform, and his answer was "Arm to the teeth". Now the whole strategy of "Europeanisation" is national disarmament, to render impossible rebellion against Supranational Government. It is all very well to talk of no Parliament having the power to bind its successors. Treaties can be broken only when sufficient sanctions exist to assert independence—which, thanks to its natural resources, is, so far, the case with Rhodesia. But Britain lives on its imports, and therefore is exceedingly vulnerable to economic sanctions which could not be defied without military capability.

Everything possible is being done to make Britain's 'entry' to Europe a *fait accompli*, and Parliament's ratification a mere and unavoidable formality. But it is not so yet. It is being said that the Conservatives will support the Government because they are afraid of a Labour victory should the Government be defeated. But if the Treaty of Rome is signed, their future as Parliamentarians will be just as bleak—well-salaried rubber stamps.

WHO CONTROLS THE PRESS

by GARY ALLEN

A look at Establishment Newspapers, Television and the Mass Slicks — an *American Opinion* reprint.

25p posted

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

The World of BCC

I am grateful to the British Council of Churches for sending me, and presumably thousands of others, a free copy of their 15 page pamphlet, *Britain and the Common Market: a Christian View*. K. R. Johnstone has written it for the Department of International Affairs of the BCC, and it contains an appendix by Andreas Kees of the Ecumenical Centre in Brussels.

The appendix, doubtless included as a recommendation of the BCC's attitude, begins with a number of vague aspirations: "an evolutionary society keyed to the future", for instance; and the remark that integration "will increase the tendency towards an increasing social-political direction of economic affairs". He further says that "the setting up of European 'thinktanks' is urgently required".

But then he sets out the diabolical Mansholt Plan for the Reform of Agriculture. This plan proposes to "reduce rapidly the number of persons gainfully employed in agriculture" and to grant considerable aid to "the formation of large modern agricultural enterprises". And as a final infamy, it will "reduce the acreage used for agriculture while forestry and recreational areas would be enlarged considerably".

This plan, and its acceptance by the BCC, shows utter subjection to the forces of Mammon, as represented by Finance, and the wilful disruption of traditional ways of life—ostensibly for "social and moral" reasons—displays a callousness worthy of a commissar. Moreover it makes nonsense of the notions advanced by Mr. Johnstone that the Common Market will give greater opportunity to help the third world: for presumably a reduction of agricultural acreage will reduce the produce and further the illusion of a starving world. It must be clear that we are already dangerously low in manpower on the land, while modern methods must take their toll. Some fens are said to be drying out and shrinking and the only use for straw on "large modern agricultural enterprises" appears to be the lighting of enormous fires at harvest time.

The reader will find it difficult to make much of Mr. Johnstone, if he ever manages to separate quotation from comment. One agrees that "world government could mean a suffocating bureaucratic tyranny", although it could also mean Siberia and wholesale massacre. But why does he call it an illusion "that we can stay as we are", and who would be fool enough to think that "a patient reduction of military force and political, cultural and economic barriers" could bring "the two sides closer to each other" (Russia and the West).

He seems to have little respect for "hitherto self-bounded national states", preferring the wilder flights of "a peaceful and just society for all mankind" and the "gradually emerging world society". Yet in real life, people have to start where they are and make the best of that. In the British case, the benefits were widely diffused and the loyalties strong in a real peaceful world society. But Mr. Johnstone is "moved and excited by a historic experiment", urging the reader to look at "the incalculable" and to "regard the European venture in the light of what can be made of it". The possibility of damaging his own society—even treasonably—never seems to enter his head, although a less naive writer would never disregard the powerful presence of Mammon-Finance pervading the venture. —H.S.

Correction Please!

ITEM: From an article in the *Washington Post* for October 24, 1971:

Picasso is . . . the embodiment of Spanish and human virtue . . . He steadfastly supported the Spanish Republic which Franco defeated in the brutal 1936-39 Civil War with the help of Hitler and Mussolini . . .

CORRECTION: Quite obviously the "Liberal" *Washington Post* desires to portray Pablo Picasso as a great humanitarian who despises totalitarianism in any form. It mentions Fascist support of Franco but ignores Communist support of the "Republic". And, it completely ignores Picasso's long and well-documented participation in the most brutal, despotic conspiracy ever devised. Consider:

New World Review is a Marxist journal published in New York by the Communist Party, U.S.A. *New World Review* for December 1966 carried the following: "Pablo Picasso, most famous of living painters, was the center of attention in Moscow recently. On the occasion of his 85th birthday, members of Soviet and literary artistic circles gathered to pay tribute to the great artist." After describing Picasso as a "life long Communist", that Marxist journal even quoted from a congratulatory message sent to him by the head of the Communist Party in Spain, thanking Picasso for his support of Communist activities there.

Consider also the glowing tribute bestowed upon Picasso by the French Communist Party, also on the occasion of his 85th birthday: "According to your own expression, you 'went toward Communism as one goes to the fountain'. You are one of the most famed members of our Party. The Party is proud of you, you who labor so that there may shine for the happiness of the greatest number all the beauty born of forms and colors. Wishing you a continuation of your creative work in the service of art and humanity, we renew, dear Comrade Picasso, the expression of all our affection." It gets even more slavish, but if you have the stomach for it you can read the entire exudation in the *New Yorker* for November 5, 1966.

So important is Picasso to the Marxist Conspiracy that he has *twice* been awarded the Lenin "Peace" Prize. Yet, in spite of the adulation heaped upon Picasso, his works—as even Walter Scott of *Personality Parade* has pointed out—are not allowed behind the Iron Curtain because "his paintings are considered decadent, degenerate, and are not permitted to be shown, particularly in Soviet Russia". The Communists are well aware of the asinine quality of most of Picasso's works, and see their promotion in the West as an attack on the art of the West. Comrade Picasso himself told Giovanni Papini a few years ago:

"The 'refined', the 'rich', the professional 'do-nothing', the 'distillers of quintessence' desire only the peculiar, the sensational, the eccentric, the scandalous in today's art. And I, myself, since the advent of Cubism, have fed these fellows what they wanted and satisfied these critics with all the ridiculous ideas that have passed through my head. The less they understood, the more they admired me!" For example, David Rockefeller, chairman of the trustees of the Museum of Modern Art in New York, head of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and chairman of the Board of Directors of the Council

on Foreign Relations, paid \$1.5 million for a Picasso painting in 1968.

Yet Picasso has admitted: "When I am alone, I do not have the effrontery to consider myself an artist at all, not in the grand old sense of the word . . . I am only a clown, a mountebank. I have understood my time and have exploited the imbecility, the vanity, the greed of my contemporaries."

Why would Communist spokesmen in France and the United States heap praise upon such a morally bankrupt hack? Because Comrade Picasso has helped greatly to destroy traditional concepts of art. In 1959 the House Committee on Un-American Activities conducted an investigation into Communist exploitation of art. In a document entitled *The American National Exhibition, Moscow, July 1959* the Committee reported: "In the instant hearings, Mr. Wheeler Williams, president of the American Artists Professional League, Inc., which is the largest organization of professional artists in the country, testified on the use of art as a weapon by the Communists and gave an authoritative appraisal of certain of the art works selected for display at the American National Exhibition in Moscow. With respect to the reason for Communist subversion of art, Mr. Williams stated:

"They want to destroy all phases of our culture, and if they can destroy our faith in God and our faith in the beauty and wonders of our cultural heritage, including the arts and literature and music and so forth, they can take us over without a hydrogen bomb. They can take us over with pop-guns'. Commenting on Communist successes in subverting the arts, Mr. Williams stated: 'I would say they have been successful beyond their wildest possible hopes'."

We find it especially interesting to note what Mr. Williams observed about Picasso: "It is significant that outside of Russia, the leader of all leaders of the 'isms' is Picasso for them [*the Communists*], and Picasso has stated: 'Art is not to decorate apartments. Art is a weapon of revolution, and my art is revolutionary art'. Yet Pablo Picasso has been featured in almost every magazine in this country with rave articles this last year by some strange arrangement."

The *Washington Post* is one of many "Liberal" publications repeating this "arrangement" on the occasion of Comrade Picasso's 90th birthday. With an "artist" as truly awful as Picasso, such things don't just happen.—W.E.D.

UNO

The United Nations is in a desperate financial predicament. Its present deficit amounts to \$176,699,974, and it is even now seeking an additional \$20 million from our government. The United States already pays approximately one-third of the total cost for the operation of this Communist-controlled organization. The Communist bloc, however, is in arrears by a grand total of \$118,753,898. A few examples of the countries and amounts owed are: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, \$86,864,900; Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, \$10,421,357; Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, \$2,965,958; Poland, \$5,971,955; Rumania, \$1,713,629. Obviously two-thirds of the U.N. deficit is created by the Communist countries which caused the recent illegal expulsion of anti-Communist China and granted U.N. membership to the outlaw Maoist régime.

—From "An Intelligence Report" by Frank A. Capell in *The Review Of The News*, Nov. 10, 1971.

*From *The Review Of The News*, Nov. 10, 1971.

Bolivian Saga

The communistic president of Bolivia dismissed the mayor of Santa Cruz de la Sierra in East Bolivia and replaced him with Tomas Cabrera, a terrorist just back from a course on agitation in Cuba. The devout ladies of Santa Cruz found to their horror that the statue and church of Our Lady of Cocota had been profaned and when they left the church were ridiculed by students for their complaints, then savagely beaten.

Thereupon thousands of angry women, many very poor women, concentrated round the church, and were joined by groups of peasants. Priests tried to appease them, but the mass began to march downtown, praying, repeating anti-communist slogans or silent. They reached a marxist radio station and asked it to send a message. The station refused and was occupied, broadcasts started, and the red militia arrived.

Shots were fired, the radio station caught fire, the men stood by their women, and a batallion of "Ranger" troops refused to attack the people and took over the city. Army forts and city after city followed Santa Cruz and within a few days president Torres and his entourage of Bolivians, Chileans and Cubans fled the country.

This story of a popular revolt, despite the clergy, against an oppressive and blasphemous régime appears in TFP Press Release No. 9, 1971. The same issue tells of the breaking up of the Carlos Marighela conspiracy in Brazil, which resulted in four priests of the Dominican order in Sao Paulo being sent to prison. In the end, two priests were used as bait to capture Marighela himself. We read also of a member of the New York Living Theatre falsely accusing the TFP Society of being responsible for his imprisonment, saying they acted as the "Klu-Klux-Klan of Brazil". In fact a priest who did not belong to TFP charged the Living Theatre cast of corrupting the young in Ouro Preto, and the actors were gaoled after being found with a large assortment of drugs.

The visits of Chilean president Allende's to Argentina, Colombia and Ecuador aroused opposition in the shape of letters and petitions signed by thousands. The lady senator of Colombia called on the rest of the senators to leave on Allende's arrival and President Pastrana's own Conservative party issued a press release disapproving of the visit. The President of Ecuador, however, replied through the press to the "Young Ecuadorians for Christian Civilization" saying that the Vatican maintained cordial relations with Communist Cuba so he did not see why he should not receive the Chilean President.

—H.S.

Perfidious

Insult and imprison a nation's citizens, stamp on all religion and slaughter millions of countrymen, and you may expect a welcome to the United Nations by that government. On the other hand, behave correctly, adopt a tolerant religious policy, receive a nation's citizens in friendship, and that nation's government will vote for your expulsion. As a result, some 15 million people will find themselves unrepresented at UNO at which various tiny and oppressive states have danced and yelled with pleasure.

After this shameful and dishonourable treatment of friends, we could at least expect to be spared the moralistic

humbug about the governments of Rhodesia and South Africa. It will not wash.

—H.S.

America 1971

(continued from page 1)

"new" revolution is rooted in the one of 1848. It is certainly not American. As "Liberal" commentator John P. Roche, a former national chairman of the A.D.A., observed in his syndicated column of February 11, 1971:

A keystone of Marxist thought is the concept of the "withering away of the state", a doctrine that suggests that once the Socialist revolution has occurred, the state—a repressive capitalist enterprise—will simply have no function and disappear. Under President Nixon's auspices, we are witnessing the Republican version of this theory, at least as far as the national government is concerned.

And, just as in the Soviet Union, the Nixon decentralization is totally illusory; a complete reversal of truth. In making his proposal the President even used the Communist slogan, "Power to the People"—the battle cry of the Black Panthers and other revolutionary groups, taken directly from a little red book titled *Thoughts Of Chairman Mao*. Just as "Power to the People" in Communist China means "Power to the Communist Dictators", so the revenue sharing proposals of Mr. Nixon's program to bring "Power to the People" means "Power to the President". In Communist countries they call it "democratic centralism". Theoretically, the power in a Communist state resides in the "soviets", the local governments. But, as every child knows, the real power is in the Politburo. Richard Nixon is creating his own Politburo.

Meanwhile our people are growing weary and restless. The primary diversion during the past decade of Leftward escalation has been the Vietnam War. President Johnson could not clear it with the *Insiders* to bring that war to a close, so he wisely declined to face the electorate for another term. Mr. Nixon has apparently arranged to make it at least appear that the war in Indochina is being ended. As he does, he is moving to complete the program which will, if he succeeds, socialize America. The United States must be completely in the hands of a central authority before the conspirators will dare to move for World Government.

How long do we have? Establishment spokesman James Reston declared in his internationally syndicated column for the *New York Times* of May 21, 1971: "Nixon would obviously like to preside over the creation of a new world order, and believes he has an opportunity to do so in the last 20 months of his first term." My guess is that we have it in our power to stop him. It will not, however, be an easy task. We will certainly need your help.

(Concluded)

THE SURVIVAL OF BRITAIN

by BRYAN W. MONAHAN

Price £1.10 (incl. U.K. postage)

Special Offer until 25th December, 1971. 2 copies, £1.50; 3 copies, £2.00; 4 copies, £2.25, for maximum responsible distribution to contribute to the consolidation of the strong opposition to the Treaty of Rome.

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