

# THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 44 No. 21

SATURDAY, JANUARY 16, 1965

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

### Reflections on the Elections

(CONTINUED FROM *American Opinion*\*, DECEMBER, 1964)

#### IV

With regard to every aspect of the Communist danger now closing in on us from every side, these forty-two million people voted for Adlai Stevenson's recommended course. This is that we protect ourselves from being murdered by committing suicide; or, more specifically, that we prevent the Kremlin's agents from making us Communist slaves by beating them to it, through communising our country and becoming communist slaves on our own initiative and volition.

The two foundations on which the Communists establish and maintain their power are collectivism and amorality. Our forty-two million Johnson camp followers voted for every manifestation of advancing collectivism. They also voted to condone and accept the gradual destruction of all moral principles and of every sound sense of values that has been laboriously developed by ages of belief in the responsibility of the individual for himself and his actions. But most of the Republican campaigners were restrained indeed in discussing the moral disintegration taking place all around us. So that very few of the voters had any help towards realising how effectively this moral decay has been playing into the hands of the Communist plotters.

The sad fact is that a huge majority of the American electorate seemed determined to prove Harry Hopkins was right, when he claimed that the American people were simply "too dumb" to know what was happening to them. Which anybody else would be too, when massively enough and continuously enough deceived, with no way to learn the extent to which they are being deceived. And in this first really practicable opportunity in thirty years to undeceive them, there were very few campaigners, even among the Conservatives, who took the trouble and had the courage to tell the people even a fraction of the truth.

The Republican leaders were willing to state their positions on many controversial issues, or in general to stand behind positions already taken; but not to explain and expound, and come out fighting for, the correctness and reasonableness of those positions. There were some twenty-six million Americans who had somehow found out enough of the truth for themselves, in one way or another over recent years, to make them Conservatives. But they had precious little help, towards informing and converting others, from any of the politicians in the late lamented campaign. The Conservative politicians were willing to get the benefit of the fact that these voters had been awakened, but they were not willing to use their influence, energy and opportunity for the vitally needed task of awakening more.

And that policy seems to us to be the key to what happened.

Somebody has said that the campaign simply proved the truth of the old adage that an army of sheep led by a lion will always be victorious over an army of lions led by a sheep. This does not seem to us to be applicable or fair; for we think that Senator Goldwater, for instance, displayed plenty of lion-like courage. In fact, we think that much of the criticism of the Senator overlooks, or the critics fail to understand, the incredible array of hidden forces that were organised against him. So we are not trying to add to any of the criticism, but simply to give our own honest opinion that a wholly different strategy was imperative.

Somebody else has said that the Johnson campaign was run by one man, while the Goldwater campaign was run by a committee—with the inevitable results of any such confrontation. There is certainly some truth to this observation, because Senator Goldwater was in a position where he is bound to have been relentlessly urged in many different directions by many different advisors and supporters—and where he felt that he simply had to give consideration to them all.

But while this committee-like operation (which may even have included some enemies posing as friends) certainly contributed to the defeat, it was not in our opinion a major cause of that catastrophe. For the cause was much simpler, and more basic. Which brings us back at last to the statement in the very first paragraph of this article, that the Republican leadership never did understand the nature of this campaign, or what should have been its nature, as well as the great mass of supporters of that leadership. What was wanted, what some twenty-six million good Americans were desperate and almost dying to have, was a crusade against the collectivist menace, or against the frightening moral decline in high places and everywhere else, or against both. What they got, instead, was an old-fashioned political campaign which was as unrealistic in our present circumstances as using horse-drawn watercarts to put out a forest fire.

Suppose the Republican leadership, from the very hour Goldwater was nominated, and even in his acceptance speech, had come out fighting unequivocally and unceasingly for the beliefs of the members of the Convention who had given him the nomination and made him their standard-bearer. Suppose that this leadership had then used every dollar, every hour, every opportunity to explain to the American people, over and over again, the sound reasons for their position with regard to Social Security, and the equally sound reasons for equally firm Conservative opposition to a dozen other major panaceas and pretences of the immoral collectivists. Or, suppose even that every Republican speech from the very beginning of the campaign had been of the same kind and calibre as the one speech delivered by Ronald Reagan, and the last-minute contribution by John Wayne. What would have happened?

\*Published monthly except July by Robert Welch, Inc., Belmont, Massachusetts 02178, U.S.A.

(continued on page 4)

## 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: 5 New Wanstead, Wanstead, London E.11.

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, 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.

### Tug O'War

Lord Salisbury and Canon Collins, of St. Paul's, London, appear to be having a struggle for the mind of the British nation: For we read in the *Daily Telegraph* (December 7) of the efforts of both in contradictory directions.

Lord Salisbury contributes a letter of eminent sense and of sober warning. He criticises the paper for dismissing as "growing pains" the recent events in the Congo, and warns of the "terribly formidable and enduring nature" of the crisis which faces us. The Congo events were "all part and parcel of the great struggle between East and West". He notes the "minimum of protest from the political and spiritual leaders of this country at the atrocities committed on priests and nuns and the torture of thousands of Congolese. They are the "victims of a terrorist campaign deliberately fomented and supported by the East to drive the West out of Africa".

He continues, "The egregious folly of the Western nations . . . has allowed a power vacuum to be created which the Eastern bloc have hastened to fill". We may wake up and find "Western Europe entirely outflanked". We have an uneasy feeling sometimes that "the pass has already been sold".

And he recommends doing our best for those in the Congo who, like Mr. Tshombe, stand "for the same things as we do". Secondly, we can stop insulting those countries—the Rhodesians, the South Africans, the Portuguese—who are "broadly speaking on the side of Western civilisation . . . To do what we are doing now is not a policy. It is madness."

At St. Paul's, however, the "first Free Churchman to preach a sermon at a statutory service . . . at the invitation of Canon Collins" was Dr. Martin Luther King. He complained in his sermon of the 370 million people living on less than £30 a year. He did not say, I think, how many of these lived in the United States. But at a Press Conference, with Canon Collins in the chair, the Nobel Prize winner ventured further.

Dr. King complained of our housing arrangements, and said that the present immigration laws are "not in keeping with the laws of God". *But does God really intend a black-white hotch-potch race?* I am sure there are plenty of fine coloured men and women who desire no such thing, and do not believe it is the "law of God". And Dr. King advocated a "massive economic

boycott" of South Africa. This prize man too evidently advocates the suicide of the West.

The uncommitted reader might then turn to an article in the same issue by Richard Beeston, the journalist expelled from Kenya. He notes the "Chinese-backed Minister of Home Affairs, Mr. Odinga" who has his own private army and unlimited money from China. He leads the Luo tribe and "the first group of Chinese-trained Luo guerillas and saboteurs" have now arrived from China. A Soviet-trained group arrived last month.

Mr. Harry Stanley, present acting High Commissioner, refused "even to attempt to see Mr. Kenyatta" on Mr. Beeston's behalf. Yet Britain is preparing "to give the Kenya Government £30-million to buy up two million acres of thriving British-owned farms." African smallholders have already reduced a million acres of such land to "subsistence farming". The loyal and hard-working British deserve the support of the British Government "and at the moment they are patently not getting it".

As a grain of consolation for all this "madness", we read that Mrs. Bandaranaike is "apparently" about to advise the dissolution of Parliament, before she and the Marxist group have controlled the Press.

The picture is perfectly clear. We are still free to enquire, Who inaugurated this madness, who has continued it, and who plans it for the future? Luckily a few people still know their duty. Which must be to answer these questions and to deal with them.

—H.S.S.

### R.I.P.

We have lost a Melbourne friend, Mr. John Smith. To his daughter, herself a Social Crediter, we send our sympathy.

### The New Year

A good New Year to all our readers

#### THE POLITICIAN

By ROBERT WELCH

The documented story of Dwight David Eisenhower

Was he simply a clever politician, too naïve to know what he was doing, or consciously serving a conspiracy?

14/-, plus 2/- postage

We regret the long delay in supplying outstanding orders for *The Politician* by Robert Welch. Our stocks are temporarily exhausted and we await further supplies from the publishers in the U.S.A.

#### THE BLUE BOOK OF THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

14/-, plus 2/- postage

#### THE FEARFUL MASTER

A Second Look at the United Nations

By G. EDWARD GRIFFIN

15/- plus postage

From

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 5 New Wanstead, London E.11

## CORRECTION, PLEASE!\*

ITEM: From an Editorial in the *San Diego Union*, September 3, 1964:

*Cuba, for example, was lost to Fidel Castro before the highest echelons in the State Department were made aware that he was a Communist and not a modern Robin Hood.*

CORRECTION: The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, in its Report of October 16, 1962, said: "The State Department was kept fully informed by its ambassadors in Latin America regarding the inherent threat of Fidel Castro". None of these ambassadors talked of Castro in terms of being "a modern Robin Hood". For example, former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba Arthur Gardner testified that he told various officials of the State Department that "Castro talked and acted like a Communist".

Former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba Earl E. T. Smith testified:

After I had been in Cuba for approximately 2 months (in 1957) and had made a study of Fidel Castro and the revolutionaries, it was perfectly obvious to me as it would be to any other reasonable man that Castro was not the answer; that if Castro came to power, it would not be in the best interests of Cuba or in the best interests of the United States. \*\*\*Castro was a revolutionary and a terrorist. From the time that he was a university student, he was a gun-toter. I was informed by a diplomat that he had killed one nun and two priests in Bogotá during the uprising in 1948.

In a meeting with State Department officials, six weeks before Castro came to power, former U.S. Ambassador William D. Pawley said:

I have told (William Arthur) Wieland and other members of the Department of State, including (Roy) Rubottom and members of the CIA, just that, prior to Batista's fall, in meetings in which I participated both in the CIA and in the Department of State—and I told Wieland in the meeting of several people, "If you permit Fidel Castro to come to power, you are going to have more trouble than you have ever seen in your life".

Former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba Spruille Braden, in a speech delivered to the United States Inter-American Council on June 12, 1959, said:

I had given an interview in 1957 in which I referred to Castro being a communist or a communist stooge—I didn't know which—but I also referred to the record of his having taken part in the Bogotazo.

At our meeting, two years ago, on October 4, 1957, in that suite in the Savoy Plaza, our luncheon speaker was Terry Sanders, who is one of my old boys and splendid Foreign Service career officer of highest integrity, who worked for me in Colombia, now head of, I think, the South American Division.

I got Terry aside at that meeting and said, "Terry, I have just gotten the information—not as it was reported later in the press of April 1958—that we have notified Batista that we are going to stop the shipment of all arms to him". That meant not only all the arms and munitions that his government had bought and paid for, but including those that had been recommended by our military, air and naval missions.

I said, "For God's sake, don't do that. Please tell the higher echelons in the department what I am saying to you. It is impossible for us to be neutral in this matter. The Cuban government has been defending us in the United Nations, tooth and nail. They're a friendly government. We have forced them to buy many of these arms. But the thing that concerns me, knowing the Cuban people, is that they will interpret our stopping these shipments as meaning that we are for Castro and against Batista. If they do that, you're going to put Castro in power; if you get Castro, you're going to get chaos, the communists are

going to capitalise on that chaos and take over Cuba."

I added that the Department knew of my head-on collisions with Batista; that I knew his good and his bad points; his régime might be like having ulcers, but Castro and communist control would be a painful and fatal cancer.

Terry went to Washington and wrote me to say he had transmitted the message to Dick Rubottom and to others further up the line.

ITEM: From President Lyndon B. Johnson at a press conference, as reported in the *New York Times*, September 10, 1964:

*I want to announce the formation of a panel of distinguished citizens who will consult with the President during the coming months on major international problems facing the United States. \*\*\*The members of the panel are Arthur Dean, John Cowles, Morris Liebman, General Omar Bradley, James Wadsworth, Arthur Larson, James Perkins, Teodoro Moscoso, Robert Lovett, George Kistiakowsky, Roswell Gilpatric, Dean Acheson, Paul Hoffman, Eugene Black, John McClay and Mr. Allen W. Dulles.*

CORRECTION: The *Times*, which reported the formation of this panel, provided the barest identification of the members. Overlooked, however, was a rather important common denominator for at least eleven of the sixteen panelists: their membership in the Council on Foreign Relations. The *Times* itself is, of course, controlled by Council members. (For an excellent analysis of the CFR, see Dr. Revilo P. Oliver's "To See The Invisible", *American Opinion*, October, 1962.)

ITEM: From an Article by James MacGregor Burns in the *New York Times Magazine*, June 28, 1964:

*If the conservatives won, the real danger to the nation would lie not in their attempts to reverse history by repealing the income tax or pulling out of our United Nations commitments. The crisis would come when such efforts failed to solve anything and when the conservatives, frustrated in making headway and embarrassed by their reckless promises to the voters, turned to some dangerous adventures at home or abroad.*

CORRECTION: Political Science Professor Burns reveals an astonishing ignorance of the conservative mind and history. "Reckless promises to the voters" are not made by conservatives, but, rather, by liberals, who proceed to promote reckless programmes. As for "repealing the income tax or pulling out of our United Nations commitments", both the establishment of the income tax and involvement in the UN were reversals of history. We wonder why what is sauce for liberal Professor Burns can't be sauce for the conservative.

## An Introductory Study Course

The following titles are recommended as an introduction to the International Conspiracy:

A Prophecy?	1/6 (postage 6d.)
No Co-existence	1/- (postage 3d.)
What We Face	1/- (postage 3d.)
None Dare Call It Treason	5/6 (postage 8d.)

As a package of four they are available at 8/6 postage paid. There are reducing prices for quantities of individual books.

From

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 5 New Wanstead, London E.11

\*Extracts, reprinted with permission, from CORRECTION, PLEASE! and A Review Of The News which is published weekly by Correction, Please!, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Massachusetts 02178, U.S.A.

## Senator Barry Goldwater

THE FOLLOWING BRIEF BIOGRAPHY, WHICH APPEARED WITH A COVER PORTRAIT IN *American Opinion*, DECEMBER, 1964, IS REPRINTED TO COUNTERACT A FALSE IMAGE CREATED BY OUR CONTROLLED PRESS:

Barry Goldwater is no common man. Neither is he a man to mislead or deceive the "Common Man". It is by intellectual acumen and natural instinct that he does and is everything which irritates the proponents of modern "Liberalism"—who have sought to make a fetish of the commonplace, the ordinary, the pallid, and the usual. For here is a man who yet values truth and worth and liberty—qualities now grown rare and unusual. This man, Barry Goldwater, is not and would not be a "Common Man". His military service is characteristic of this. In World War II, like so many of the current political leaders, he could have remained safely in the Quartermaster's Corps; but, though then over-age for a military pilot, he bluffed his way into training and was soon flying single-engine P-47s across the Atlantic. Before war's end, he carried out dangerous transport assignments "Over the Hump" into China. Today he is, by merit, a Major General in the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

Even in so seemingly small an affair as his pursuit of recreation he has been most uncommon. Back in 1940, he decided to make a trip down the Colorado River—over the rapids and through gorges. Major Powell had done it in 1869, and the Kolb brothers survived their ordeal in 1911. The few others who had tried this hazardous exploration never reported what happened. Goldwater, a man of iron nerve and great personal courage, made that trip, and made it successfully.

After the war, Barry Goldwater decided to enter politics. But, unlike the synthetic statesmen now so common, he (being an "uneducated man", as the "Liberal" élite always point out) determined that it was his duty to first fully examine the meanings of liberty. Thus, he read Plato and Aristotle on Politics; St. Augustine on the *City of God*, as contrasted with the *City of Man*; Edmund Burke on Eighteenth-Century liberalism; the *Federalist Papers* of Hamilton, Madison, and Jay; de Tocqueville's commentaries and observations on America; and Lord Acton on freedom. He read deeply—and he came to understand the source of our modern debacle. As a result, Goldwater in politics proved to be an inspiration as well as an innovation. The man who had conquered the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, and who flies jet planes, stirred young Americans to a massive political action which left the Party hacks and the New Republican pundits becalmed in what they called, with unconscious humour, "the mainstream of Republicanism".

By heredity, Goldwater acquired stamina as well as humour from his pioneer Jewish forbears and from his mother's solid New England ancestors. In his darkest hour he could still smile. It was heartbreaking, no doubt, but it had a strangely amusing side too; as when he learned of a fellow Arizonan (who had once resigned a high government post because "F.D.R. would not balance the budget") campaigning for L.B.J.—who was pledged not to balance the budget. Often he must have turned his thoughts to that Sixteenth-Century ruler who observed: "You would be amazed, my son, if you knew with how little wisdom this world is governed".

By the grace of God, this Republic has been raised up and, in times of peril, preserved by uncommon men. Let us hope that Americans remember that fact before, let us say, 1984. If they do, they will then judge no man more worthy than Barry M. Goldwater of Arizona.—FRANK CULLEN BROPHY.

## REFLECTIONS ON THE ELECTIONS (continued from page 1)

Well, for one thing, the Rockefellers and Henry Cabot Lodges and even the Eisenhowers would have made noises like the fury of a woman scorned. But what of it? Despite all of the drives and concessions for "harmony", most of these people made only the shallowest pretenses of supporting the ticket, if any at all, and in many cases actually worked against it behind the scenes. Their loyalty to "Liberalism" was far greater than their loyalty to the Republican Party; and, as always, they were tremendous advocates of good sportsmanship and unity only on the part of the other fellow and in whatever ways it might help their own aims. Certainly the loss of their "support" would not have been worth a second thought in the kind of campaign that was needed.

And what would also have happened was a dramatisation—rather than a slurring over—of the issues; an enlightenment of the American people to the shocking identity of so many "Liberal" positions with those laid down in the Communist blueprints for taking us over; and the use of the whole campaign as a wonderful means and opportunity for informing and educating more millions as to what has been going on while they slept. Whether the Goldwater-Miller ticket would even then have won, who knows? They would certainly have come closer. Because even from a purely political point of view they had so little to lose and so much to gain by such a course. But, far more important, all that they did would have been substantive and cumulative, in the continuous, massive, educational programme that simply has to be carried out, far enough and fast enough, as the only chance of saving our own country from the great danger of Communist enslavement.

In 1956 Coleman Andrews and Tom Werdel ran for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency on Conservative principles and received less than two hundred thousand votes. The two factors involved were the complacency of the American people, and the massive roadblocks carefully built up by the "Liberals" for twenty years to keep American Conservatives from having any way of expressing themselves at the polls. By 1964 both of these barriers had been overcome to the extent that the Conservative position received over twenty-six million votes. The difference was achieved largely by the vilified and heartbreaking, but nevertheless unceasing, campaign of a growing number of dedicated, patriotic Americans, who have been trying to bring to their fellow citizens a sufficient understanding of the realities of human life, on the planet Earth, in the middle decades of the Twentieth Century. It is time for the political leaders and statesmen, who are themselves Conservatives, to fight to maintain every inch of the position and every ounce of the influence which this educational crusade has enabled them to obtain—and to use that position and that influence as mighty levers for opening the door wider to a much greater understanding.

Last night a taxi driver in Chicago said to this writer: "Mister, I don't know who you are or where you stand. But I'm having a bumper sticker made for this car right now. It will read ONE OF THE 26 MILLION AND PROUD OF IT." And anybody who doesn't want to ride can take another cab." Conservative leaders and voters alike may find some encouragement in that incident. And it will not even cost them the half dollar extra tip which it cost me, on my leaving such delightful company.

—ROBERT WELCH

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd. at 5 New Wanstead, Wanstead, London E.11.

Printed by J. Hayes & Co. (T.U.), Woolton, Liverpool 25.