

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 51 No. 25

SATURDAY, 4 MARCH, 1972

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

## Get US Out!\*

### THE U.N. THREATENS THE UNITED STATES

BY GARY ALLEN

(Continued from our issue for February 5, 1972)

It is doubtful that one American in a hundred has ever heard of the Council on Foreign Relations, or that one in a thousand can explain anything at all about its goals. Despite the fact that its 1,450 members include some of the most famous men in America from the worlds of high finance, industry, government, the foundations, academe, and the mass media, the C.F.R. operates in almost complete anonymity. Yet nearly half of its members have served in the federal government, and President Nixon has appointed more than one hundred members of the Council on Foreign Relations to key posts in his Administration. Henry Kissinger, for example, came to the Nixon Administration from a staff position at the C.F.R.

The annual report of the Council on Foreign Relations for 1958-1959 discussed an informal talk made on May 21, 1959, by Walter Mallory, then retiring after thirty-two years as Executive Director of the Council. Mallory observed:

*When I cast my mind back to 1927, it seems little short of a miracle that the organization could have taken root in those days. You will remember that the United States had decided not to join the League of Nations . . . . On the domestic front, the budget was extremely small, taxes were light and we didn't even recognize the Russians. There were a few men who did not feel content in the comfortable isolationist climate . . . .*

The C.F.R., composed of just such uncomfortable men, worked diligently to change all that. "A Record Of Twenty-Five Years", published privately by the Council on Foreign Relations in 1947, reveals how it achieved a hammerlock on American foreign policy:

*. . . [in 1939] Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of "Foreign Affairs", and Walter H. Mallory, Executive Director of the Council, paid a visit to the Department of State to offer such aid on the part of the Council as might be useful and appropriate in view of the war . . .*

As a result of this meeting, the State Department authorized the C.F.R. to "form groups of experts to proceed with research under four general heads: Security and Armaments Problems, Economic and Financial Problems, Political Problems, and Territorial Problems . . ." Then, according to the C.F.R., "the Rockefeller Foundation was approached for a grant of funds to put the plan into operation". However, by February of 1941, the State Department took over the whole operation, absorbing the C.F.R.'s top operators into post-War planning activities. Remember, this was ten months before Pearl Harbour.

During World War II it was increasingly taken for granted that as soon as the fighting was ended a new international organization would be formed, and that it would be called the United Nations. Planning for creation of that organization was taken over by members of the C.F.R.—lock, stock, and barrel of borscht. The man termed "the architect of the United Nations Charter" by *Time* magazine in its issue for May 18, 1953, was Russian-born Leo Pasvolosky (C.F.R.), Chief of the Division of Special Research in the State Department. Born of Communist parents, Pasvolosky was raised a radical and infiltrated into our government in 1934. He rapidly rose to the key position from which he worked to effect the transfer of U.S. sovereignty to the United Nations.

Working side by side with Pasvolosky in formulating the U.N. Charter was Alger Hiss, who was at the same time a member of the Communists' Harold Ware cell in Washington, a Soviet espionage agent, and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Hiss played key roles at Yalta and Dumbarton Oaks, where agreements were worked out with the Soviets on the content of the U.N. Charter. According to lengthy testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, it was Alger Hiss who sat at F.D.R.'s side as his top specialist on international organization.

In 1950, the State Department issued an official report entitled *Postwar Foreign Policy Preparation, 1939-1945*, which named the men who did the planning and shaped the policies that led to the creation of the new World Organization. That list and similar official records revealed these men to have been (in addition to Alger Hiss): Harry Dexter White, Virginius Frank Coe, Dean Acheson, Noel Field, Laurence Duggan, Henry Julian Wadleigh, John Carter Vincent, Davil Weintraub, Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, Harold Glasser, Victor Perlo, Irving Kaplan, Solomon Adler, Abraham George Silverman, William Ullman, and William Taylor.

The State Department could hardly have anticipated what a disastrous confession this would prove to be. For since then, with the single exception of Dean Acheson (C.F.R.), who had himself been hired by Joseph Stalin to serve as Soviet Russia's legal counsel in the United States, every one of those seventeen men has been identified in sworn testimony as a Communist agent. It is hardly startling that such men were willing to make every concession to the Soviets at Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, and at the official founding of the United Nations at San Francisco.

(continued on page 3)

\*From *American Opinion*, January, 1972.

## 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, Rougemont, P.Q., General Deputy Chairman and Secretary, H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Writing on contemporary science in an article entitled "Anti-religion" in the *Spectator*, Jan. 29, 1972, Bernard Dixon refers to Jaques Monod—"one of the founders of molecular biology—the branch of science centred upon the hereditary material (DNA\*) and other molecules inside cells that determine the behaviour of animals and plants". That Monod is right about this is confirmed by a report of a statement made by the Gautama Buddha during a materialisation a few years ago in New York†: "I have to tell you this, Every thing alive has come from an egg. In that egg is dust, and dust, as I have said, which is not alive but dead. This dust is arranged in a certain pattern, and that pattern determines whether the egg will become an insect, or a dog, or you, or any other living thing that you could name. The arrangement of the dust, and that alone, causes you to be beautiful and intelligent, and Mrs. Hamilton Bitney to be, as you say, nutty. The way the dust is piled up determines what the living thing shall be, exactly as the way the saw-dust is arranged in Ananda determines he shall look like a dog. There is no escaping from this rule.

"You will now readily see the jest. Mankind is about to discover exactly what makes up this dust—what sort of dead dust put in which order makes a philosopher or a spider, a sinner or a saint, or an octopus. That is to say, said the Buddha, raising a finger, 'somebody, who is what he is because of dust, will discover that same dust which makes him what he is. He will—and mark carefully what I say—discover the arrangement of the dust which has made it inevitable that he is a human being who will discover the dust's arrangement. Do you understand me?'"

This pronouncement of the Buddha's makes nonsense of the alternative way of describing DNA—of saying, for example, that the behaviour of animals and plants determines the functioning of DNA. As Bernard Dixon says, "modern biology reveals chance and randomness at every point in the origin and evolution of life on earth". That is to say chance, the absence of assignable cause, has now been shown to be a causal agent—indeed, even the First Cause. Of course, it

\*DNA is a contraction for Dust Not Ashes.

†*SheLa* by Aubrey Menon, p. 75: Hamish Hamilton: London, 1963.

has been recognised for a long time that on the macroscopic scale the behaviour of a motor-car, whether a Model-T Ford or a Rolls Royce can be explained exclusively on the basis of physics and chemistry, and "there is no need to invoke design and metaphysics to account for such apparently purposive behaviour". The same applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to pianos, violins, and even orchestras. The science of acoustics is a relatively long-established discipline. This also explains why some books have a dusty flavour, and why the only difference between Mr. Heath and Mr. Wilson is that one has been swept under the carpet.

In an article in the *Daily Telegraph*, Jan. 22, 1972, Paul-Henri Spaak recalls a speech made by Mr. Edward Heath after the Macmillan Government had announced its decision to join the EEC: "It was therefore in the Quai d'Orsay, in the famous Salon de l'Horloge, that Edward Heath, in an excellent speech in which he announced the decision of his country to accept all the consequences, direct or indirect, of the Rome Treaty, presented the British candidature".

How, at that time, Mr. Heath could know *all* the consequences of the Rome Treaty, and whether 'his' country would be prepared to accept them, it is hardly possible to imagine. No doubt he had been briefed, even in those days, by the Chatham House "gang", as Douglas called them. But it is more than doubtful whether he was *fully* briefed. On the other hand, there can be no doubt that the British public had no inkling of what was intended—the surrender of British national sovereignty, this time without a fight.

For the forces behind the Common Market idea are the forces—including the Bank "of England"—which financed German re-armament, and after Germany's defeat in the consequent war, financed her "economic miracle"—to create a 'Europe' to which Britain, having been ruined financially by the same forces, mainly now operating out of New York, could be subjected by Treaty. And if anyone thinks that the "indirect" consequences of the Rome Treaty will not be enforced if the British attempt to evade them, he does not know what international politics is really all about. The Government is bound now to take the attitude that *because* Mr. Heath has signed the Treaty of Accession, even though by subterfuge, Parliament *must* pass the legislation of surrender. Thereafter the Laws and Regulations to govern us will be in foreign hands—the Social Democrats of World Revolution. And high on the list of these, of course, is Herr Willi Brandt, 'ex'-Communist Chancellor of 'West' Germany; and M. Pompidou, of Rothschild connections. Mr. Heath's association is with the banking firm of Brown Shipley & Co., representing New York interests, and which, through Mr. Montagu Norman, ran the Bank "of England" during the inter-war years when Great Britain was physically and morally disarmed, and German re-armament financed to the accompaniment of soothing leading articles in the *Times* and the suppression of Mr. Douglas Reed's revealing reports from Germany. Mr. Reed, of course, resigned, and had recourse to books to make his information public.

In 1870 Karl Marx sent a message to the (Communist) Internationale: "The British are incapable of making a socialist revolution, therefore foreigners must make it for them. The point to strike at first, is Ireland, and in Ireland they are ready to begin their work".

In its 12.30 P.M. news-broadcast on Feb. 5, 1972, the A.B.C. reported (but not in subsequent bulletins) Mr. John Lynch as saying that his Government was considering asking for Soviet aid if "friendly" countries did not assist in resolving the disorders in Ireland. Some time ago it was reported that munitions destined for Ireland from Czechoslovakia had been intercepted in Holland. And some time ago Peter Simple of the *Daily Telegraph* referred—jokingly, of course—to the possibility of Red paratroopers in Ireland. When is the kissing going to stop?

## Acceptability

Responses to the Rhodesian settlement appear predictable enough, but *The Tablet* (Dec. 4, 1971) heads its editorial, "Rhodesia: the Best of a Bad Job", and admits that "the emergent African middle class, which is both responsible and ambitious, is likely to accept" the proposals. It points out that the extremists of ZAPU and ZANU which have merged into Frolizi (Front for Liberation of Zimbabwe) present "the most serious danger", and suggests that Mao's China is financing them and that President Kaunda "is not likely to encourage actions" that will upset a settlement which brings him considerable economic advantage. The article recalls the Matabele uprising of 1896 and the refusal of Rhodesia to join South Africa in 1923 and 1964.

But after reporting a thanksgiving service in Salisbury attended by "hundreds of people of all races", the *Church Times* (Dec. 3, 1971) produces as chief authorities Bishop Skelton and Mr. Clutton-Brock, whose views do not represent many. The bishop, when in charge of the diocese of Matabeleland, tried unsuccessfully to compose a dossier of injustices committed by Mr. Smith's government, and he refers to "memories of the past ten years in Rhodesia". Mr. Clutton-Brock, no longer a Rhodesian citizen, feared that political and economic power would continue totally in "colonist hands", adding that public opinion could not be formed without the release of "leading figures". Yet these figures cannot be imagined as representative either.

In these reviews, unfortunately, the opinion of Rhodesians does not emerge and the protagonists, after the church bells and hundreds of worshippers, disappear from the scene. The emergent African middle class also sounded promising. But we are left with the views of a former bishop and an ex-Rhodesian.

Lord Dilhorne writes (*The Times*, Dec. 3, 1971) to express surprise that this newspaper gave front page publicity to an attack on Lord Pearce, adding that "it is a Judge's duty to decide a question of law", it not being for him to legislate. No one of course can be very surprised at *The Times*. Nine "lawyers from Rhodesia" follow with a long criticism of the settlement and list various acts, such as the Emergency Powers Act, which interfere with the normal course of the law. These acts arose due to the threats of terrorism, which the lawyers fail to mention. Mr. Patrick Wall M.P., however, writes more hopefully, saying that the settlement will ensure "gradual African development" and that the Bantustans will emerge "as independent states", as will their opposite numbers in South West Africa, while South Africa's good neighbour policy "is paying dividends", so that South African technical assistance moves north "faster than the guerilla fighters are penetrating to the South". The guerillas have

passed their peak and he holds that a solution based on evolution rather than revolution is not only more desirable but "far more likely".

Meanwhile Harvard experts have challenged the egalitarian idea itself, for Richard Herrnstein shows from tests that "I.Q. is 80 per cent genetic inheritance and less than 20 per cent the result of environment". (*Evening Standard*, Dec. 1, 1971.) D. Moynihan blames a "breakdown in the structure of the Negro family", not the whites, for the plight of black Americans. J. Coleman concludes that "cultural surroundings in the home" affect their performance in school, and A. Jensen points to the fifteen per cent difference in the I.Q. of the races. Herrnstein adds that improving the environment "will only increase genetic superiority". This Harvard group evidently tends to exculpate the whites. It seems that every myth, even those of the so-called liberals, may be exploded, except the money myth itself.

—H.S.

## Get US Out!

(continued from page 1)

The U.N. Charter was thus a product of both major arms of the International Communist Conspiracy. Our delegation to the San Francisco Conference in April of 1945 was headed by Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius Jr., a member of the C.F.R. and a former partner in the international banking firm of J.P. Morgan & Company. Serving as Secretary-General of the Conference was Alger Hiss, both a member of the C.F.R. and a Communist. Apologists for the U.N. never mention the key part Hiss played at Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta, where the general format for the U.N. was hammered out with the Soviets, nor his years of work with Pasvolosky in preparing plans for the international organization. And they have done their best to dismiss the role he played at the San Francisco Conference. But a contemporary issue of *Time* magazine noted even in advance of the San Francisco Conference:

*Alger Hiss will be an important figure there. As Secretary-General, managing the agenda, he will have a lot to say behind the scenes about who gets the breaks.*

He certainly did!

The U.S. Treasury's representative at the San Francisco Conference was Harry Dexter White, who gave special attention to the establishment of U.N.E.S.C.O.—the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization—which has had such an influence on the writing of textbooks for our schools. But White's main duty was establishment of the World Bank, an institution dear to the hearts of the *Insiders* of high finance. Subsequently Harry Dexter White was identified in sworn testimony by both Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers as a Soviet agent who gave them stolen government documents for transmittal to the Kremlin. White's lieutenant at San Francisco was William Ullman, also identified by Miss Bentley as a member of the Communist underground.

Yet another key advisor at the San Francisco Conference was Dalton Trumbo, who served as ghost-writer for Stettinius and others. A wealthy screen writer, Trumbo later was identified as a member of the Communist Party and was one of the infamous Hollywood Ten who were sentenced to jail for

contempt of Congress as a result of their behavior before a Congressional Committee investigating Communist activities in the movie industry.

Working in tandem with the seventeen or so Soviet spies at San Francisco were forty-three members of the Council on Foreign Relations.\* Some of the more interesting C.F.R. members in the delegation had strong international banking ties. They included John Foster Dulles (J. Henry Schroeder Bank, the bank that financed Hitler), Edward R. Stettinius (J.P. Morgan & Company), Nelson Rockefeller (whose family controls Chase Manhattan Bank and First National City Bank), John J. McCloy (Chairman of the Board, Chase Manhattan), and Artemus Gates (New York Trust Company).

At the conclusion of the San Francisco Conference it was Alger Hiss who was entrusted with taking the Charter to Washington. On Page 23 of *Life* magazine for July 16, 1945, was a "picture of the week" showing Hiss arriving in Washington with a large package. The caption read:

*At the conclusion of the San Francisco Conference the Charter of the United Nations was bundled off to a waiting plane and gingerly placed in a 75-pound fire-proof safe equipped with a small parachute. Attached to the safe was a stern inscription: "Finder—do not open! Notify the Department of State—Washington D.C." Chief custodian was Conference Secretary-General Alger Hiss, shown here with the Charter at the end of the cross-country trip . . .*

The *Chicago Tribune* of June 11, 1945, described the presentation of the United Nations Charter to the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee:

*The hearings in Washington started, appropriately enough, with a lengthy statement read by Mr. Stettinius, but apparently written by Mr. Pasvolsky. When the time came to ask questions Mr. Stettinius gracefully yielded the center of the stage to the same Mr. Pasvolsky, who knows all the answers.*

*This is more than a little odd. Mr. Pasvolsky's expertise is said to result from the fact that he wrote the original draft of the treaty, but that was quite a long time ago and his work meanwhile has undergone considerable modification. Nobody has yet explained why the Department entrusted the drafting of this document to a foreign-born functionary, whose training has been in economics rather than diplomacy. It is even more curious that the natives among our delegates, two of whom are members of the Senate Committee, did not assert for themselves the right of interpretation.*

*The diffidence—if that is the word for it—of Mr. Connally and Mr. Vandenberg, to say nothing of Mr. Stettinius and the rest, has given the country the impression that it is really Mr. Pasvolsky's treaty, not theirs; that he understands it and they don't; that men with a good deal of experience in foreign affairs who were themselves participants in the negotiations have only an incomplete grasp of the content and purpose of this intricate and difficult document. They were at San Francisco, it appears, to assist him rather than he to assist them . . .*

Only five days of testimony about the Charter were heard by the Committee. A few raised their voices against this

permanent entangling alliance, but their voices were a whisper in the wilderness. So universal was the managed acclaim for the U.N. Charter, sight unseen, that it was ratified by the Senate on July twenty-eighth, virtually without debate, and few had bothered to read the thing. The vote was 89 to 2. The two Senators who voted against the Charter had read it.

The Senators would have done well to inspect the U.N. Charter more carefully. It bears a remarkable resemblance to the Constitution of the Soviet Union. Many of the phrases and clauses employed in both documents are virtually identical.

Cleon Skousen, former assistant to F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover, notes in his book *The Naked Capitalist*:

*Anyone familiar with the Communist Constitution of Russia will recognize in the United Nations Charter a similar format. It is characterized by a fervent declaration of democratic principles which are sound and desirable; this is then followed by a constitutional restriction or procedural limitation which completely nullifies the principles just announced!*

The Charter also gives the U.S.S.R. three votes in the General Assembly under the hypocritical guise that the Soviet states of Ukraine and Byelorussia are "independent" republics. This little ploy was worked out between Stalin and Alger Hiss, but America has yet to hear the first "Liberal" complaint about it, or so much as a suggestion that Byelorussia and the Ukraine receive the sort of treatment just accorded to Nationalist China.

There is also a striking resemblance between the U.N. flag and the Soviet arms banner, highest emblem in Communist heraldry, found on the cover of the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. That this is something other than coincidence is attested to by the fact that the U.N. flag was created and designed by Carl Aldo Marzani, head of the presentation branch of the U.S. Office of Strategic Services, in April of 1945. Marzani was later found to be a member of the Communist Party who operated under the Party name of Tony Whales.

[To be continued]

## BRITISH SOVEREIGNTY AND THE E.E.C.

The four pamphlets—

**WHITEPRINT FOR BETRAYAL** — an appraisal of the British Government's White Paper

**POSTSCRIPT TO WHITEPRINT FOR BETRAYAL**

**"UNDER THREAT OF WAR"** — Sovereignty and the E.E.C.

**"PROPHETIC DOOM"** — The Assault on Sovereignty

may be obtained as a set for 25p posted, or 12 sets for £2.00p in addition to the quantity prices already advertised.

The Special Offer of reduced prices for two copies of THE SURVIVAL OF BRITAIN or more, has produced an encouraging response. We are therefore extending the offer for a further period: 2 copies £1.50p; 3 copies £2; 4 copies £2.25p, and additional copies pro rata.

\*Out of an American staff of less than 200.

# Mr. Heath's Common Market Policy MUST GO

FROM WEEK TO WEEK (cont.)

(The Social Crediter, 4th March, 1972)

The definition of **treacherous** is: "Violating faith or betraying trust; perfidious; not to be relied on, deceptive".

There can be no doubt Mr. Heath has deceived the British. They elected the Conservative Party because they were dissatisfied with the Socialists; they were told that the Conservatives would "explore" the possibility of British entry to the Common Market, but there would be no prospect of entry without the "full-hearted" consent of Parliament and people. But from the time "negotiations" commenced, the trust that the British put in the Government has been betrayed. The Government embarked on a strategy of deception to utilise the machinery of Parliamentary procedure to defeat the manifest will of the people.

The European Communities Bill — not disclosed until after Mr. Heath had signed the Treaty of Accession — makes it quite clear that the central issue is national sovereignty. It is a **POLITICAL**, not an economic, document. Yet all the considerations originally adduced in favour of "joining" Europe were economic — and fallacious at that. There is not even approximate unanimity among officially recognised economists as to the economic consequences, favourable or unfavourable. But the White Paper dismissed the matter of national sovereignty with the words: "There is no question of any erosion of essential national sovereignty"; whereas the European Communities Bill proposes to give "the force of law in the United Kingdom to present and future Community law which under the Treaties is to be given **legal effect without further enactment**" (emphasis added). This is not an "erosion" of national sovereignty; it is complete abrogation of such sovereignty, as adumbrated over many years by the Royal Institute of International Affairs, of which Mr. Heath is an Honorary President.

Mr. Heath must have known that so far from there being "full hearted" consent of the British people, almost every test of such opinion has demonstrated dissent by a far greater majority than is represented by the slim majority in the House of Commons "engineered", as Mr. Enoch Powell said in a speech at a dinner at the Commons on 11th February, 1972, "by intimidation and shady dealing".

The Bill is not yet law, so the betrayal of the British is not yet consummated and a truly massive post-card campaign — **MR. HEATH'S COMMON MARKET POLICY MUST GO — SAVE OUR SOVEREIGNTY** — addressed to their Representatives from all constituencies might avert this perfidious surrender.

If this ultimate campaign is not undertaken, Britain will be, by Treaty, another **province** of World Government. But if Mr. Heath is repudiated, the suppressed patriotism of Parliamentarians may save the day, as the patriotism and loyalty and initiative of the British people saved them at Dunkirk. It is the same situation, brought forward in time. As Mr. Heath said, "We shall achieve, by other means, what Napoleon and Hitler failed to achieve. . . ."