

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 47 No. 26

SATURDAY, 23 MARCH, 1968

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

A Closetful of Skeletons

AN ANALYSIS FROM *The Review of the News*, FEBRUARY 14, 1968.

The astute American voter marching down Memory Lane in an election year might do well to re-encounter the revealing and sad case of Tyler Kent. A study of it will be most rewarding as it exposes a whole closetful of political skeletons, dulls the lustre of bureaucrats on both sides of the Atlantic, and affords political cynics a holiday.

The case broke in May of 1940. Franklin D. Roosevelt was maneuvering like mad for his third term in the White House. Winston Churchill had just become Prime Minister of the British Empire. The Nazi blitzkrieg had taken out Poland and the Low Countries, and the ignominy of Dunkirk was pending. The Ambassador of the United States to the Court of St. James was the Boston Irishman, Joseph P. Kennedy.

At this time Tyler Kent, a code clerk in the American Embassy, was arrested by the British authorities with the permission (or instigation) of Ambassador Kennedy for alleged transmission of information to the enemy. This, doubtless, on instructions from the U.S. State Department: that is to say, President Roosevelt. Of course, by permitting such action Ambassador Kennedy violated the treaty protocol between the United States and Britain requiring that any accredited member of the foreign services of either nation has "diplomatic immunity" and is answerable only to the courts of justice of his own nation.

Something very strange was happening. Tyler Kent, who had served brilliantly in his post, had during his period in Moscow been reproved by the Soviet NKVD for his criticism of Stalinist methods and Communism in general. His ancestors had fought in every American war. This fiercely patriotic young man was permitted to be sentenced to seven years hard labor in British prisons. Later the State Department claimed that Kennedy first dismissed Tyler Kent and that thereby the latter lost his rights as an American citizen. Of course, not only was such summary discharge impermissible under State Department rules, but no U.S. citizen can thus be legally deprived of his citizenship.

Of course, Tyler Kent could not have been guilty of transmitting any information to the "enemy" because at the time the United States had no official enemy and was to remain "neutral" until war was declared on Japan 18 months later, after the Japanese were provoked into attacking Pearl Harbor. The smearbund insinuated that it was the Russians to whom Kent transmitted the information; but, although the Soviet Union had a non-aggression treaty with Nazi Germany, Russia was "neutral" and technically at peace with all countries except Poland and Finland. More important, Kent was rigidly anti-Communist.

Tyler Kent was confined for six months before he was tried in November, 1940. Then, contrary to Anglo-Saxon practice, the trial was held in secret. Kent was represented by the English solicitor, F. Graham Maw and the English barrister Maurice Healy, but notably *not* by the solicitor of the U.S. Embassy, part of whose duties is to intervene for and represent American citizens fallen afoul of the law.

In the meantime, the sainted Winston Churchill had during his first week as Prime Minister juggled 600 prominent British subjects, even including one member of Parliament (an acid critic, Captain Archibald Ramsay). Captain Ramsay's arrest was protested by numerous Members of Parliament as a violation of their rights under the Magna Charta; but then, Churchill (like Roosevelt) was never a stickler for legality. Ramsay and the others were jugged by the great mouthpiece of Anglo-Saxondom; and Tyler Kent, albeit an American, went with them to the hoosegow.

Later, F. Graham Maw, Kent's British solicitor, was able to require the prosecution to drop the original charge, changing it to "larceny of confidential documents". Solicitor Maw held that "the verdict was one of expediency and under outside instruction".

Be that as it may, Kent was sentenced to seven years' imprisonment at Wandsworth gaol—not as a political prisoner, you understand, but cooped up with common criminals. He went on a hunger strike which ended in hospital confinement. Apparently somewhat contrite, Ambassador Kennedy sent an Embassy staff member to visit the hunger striker (who had "lost" his citizenship, remember), and shortly afterward Kent was transferred to an old monastery on the Isle of Wight. Overnight, now, he had ceased being a common thief and became a political prisoner again, although the charge of transmitting documents to an enemy had been dropped. There were 120 of Churchill's other political prisoners there, including Ramsay and Admiral Domville, a retired British naval officer, and other prominent anti-Churchillites.

Meanwhile, Mrs. Ann H. P. Kent, Tyler's widowed mother, was busy making inquiries. She lived in Washington, D.C. Her deceased husband had been a veteran of the Spanish-American War, had served 20 years in the U.S. Consular Service, and she drew a War Department pension.

Mrs. Kent learned that Ambassador Joseph Kennedy had almost immediately regretted his impropriety in turning Tyler over to the British Lion, but had nevertheless sent two U.S. Embassy secretaries (one of them Rudolf Schoenfeld) to give supposititious testimony against him in the British court. Later Tyler Kent told a friend who visited him in

(continued on page 3)

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.
Telephone: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1
Telephone: 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 2600. 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. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

The *Sunday Express*, February 11, 1968 concludes its editorial with the paragraph: "The Government's policy does not even begin to make sense."

This simple theme is that on which probably the majority of the political commentators who make their living by marketing their opinions base their complex but on the whole discordant variations. But perhaps the discordancy arises from a flaw in the theme, and the real question is: in what context does the Government's policy make sense? For nobody ever seems to accuse Mr. Wilson and several of his colleagues of any failure in intellect or ability; rather the reverse.

Mr. Wilson, most of his colleagues, his promoters and his (mostly concealed) backers, are *Socialists*. To the true Socialist, whether of the Communist or Fabian variety Socialism is Internationalism, of which the main component is the destruction of nationalism and the emergence of world government.

If Mr. Wilson were to address the British nation and say: "The measures being taken by my Government are designed to fit this country into a world-wide system of government, and this necessarily requires the transfer of national sovereignty in all its forms to international institutions, and the merging of all forms of economic activity under more and more centralised direction under the control of overseas capital, etc." he might have some justifiable fears for his own safety, if he hasn't already. But by creating the conditions of recurring economic crisis, the objectives of Socialism can be achieved under the aspect of emergency. Thus Mr. Richard Crossman was exulting, not dissimulating, when he pronounced devaluation and the exodus from the East as "giant strides towards Socialism".

In real terms—i.e., in ability to produce the goods and services required by *its own people*—Britain is ever more wealthy. The physical limitation imposed on this ability is the necessity to import the raw materials other than the imports required for exports. This is a problem which could

easily have been dealt with within the confines of the English-speaking Commonwealth—so long as Britain maintained the military sanctions to enable her to mind her own business. Since the premise of international Socialism is that nations should have their business managed for them by international Authorities, the disarming of Britain and the international cartelisation of her industry make entire sense. And since this process goes against the grain of the Anglo-Saxon character, the destruction of the latter by mongrelisation, subversion, and mis-education is equally to be expected.

The true but unspoken slogan of Socialism is "all proletarians are equal": factory-fodder.

The people with their fingers on the triggers of the atomic bombs and missiles are those who have far and away the most to lose if the bombs go off. This fact exposes the hideous reality of the war in Vietnam. A fraction of the fire-power unleashed by the U.S. in Vietnam, if directed to the nerve centre of Viet Cong *control* would terminate the war in very short order. But in fact the U.S. is supplying Russia which is supplying North Vietnam, thus keeping the war going. The object, of course, is to 'defeat' the U.S. without damaging its industrial equipment, which is what the Communists are after. As a result of the 'escalation' of the war, the U.S. is very seriously depleted not of gross man-power, but of key personnel such as pilots and technicians in various critical fields, and therefore is in no condition to police or protect the rest of the 'free' world. In this situation, Europe is probably vulnerable to mere ultimatum; and following Europe, the U.S. itself.

All the ingredients of catastrophe appear now to be fused, probably to be detonated by a universal economic crisis ('collapse' of the dollar). In contemplating the mess, remember that many of the *top* Communists or call them what you will are, perhaps temporarily, resident in the U.S.

The A.B.C. chose as its Guest of Honour on Feb. 18, 1968 Sir Hugh Greene, Director-General of the B.B.C. In his talk, Sir Hugh made much of the independence conferred on the B.B.C. by virtue of the fact that its income is derived from individual licence fees and not from centralised, such as government, funds—an observation which highlights the dependence of socialised medicine and education. The B.B.C., said Sir Hugh, is independent of outside pressures and is thus free to use its own judgment in presenting both sides of controversial issues—like (he did not say) the parson who after preaching the Christian view of morality, concluded his sermon by presenting the Devil's view. But Sir Hugh did emphasise one exception to the B.B.C.'s impartial morality, or immorality—the one unqualified evil he admitted to is racialism. This is rather like the roué who, proposing to seduce the sweet young maiden, took her for a carriage ride through the brothel district. The sure provocation to racialism is the publicity accorded it.

The B.B.C. may be free from outside pressures; but what is certain is that it is subject to the internal pressures of subversion and corruption. This is euphemised by Sir Hugh as 'freedom' for programme directors to present material as they see fit, and the result of this lack of moral (or immoral) restraint was described by Kenneth Young in an article in the *Sunday Express* of Sept. 17, 1967: "Day after day by

omission, slant, innuendo—or even a tone of voice—news is far from objectively presented . . . Why . . . have religious programmes been progressively drained of specifically religious content? . . . Such subjects as abortion and homosexuality were hammered at by the B.B.C. far beyond what their importance justified . . . In the same way, drug-taking became the staple fare of discussion and enquiry programmes to the point where a minority problem was boosted into something like incitement. A constant stream of plays and documentaries presented life as both sordid and sexually loose, marriage and family life as ludicrously old hat, and religion as beneath consideration.” And Mr. Young quotes Sir Hugh, as reported in *Time* magazine, as saying: “The programme (*Till Death Us Do Part*) offends a great many people—but those one is glad to offend.”

The caption to Mr. Young’s article remarks that B.B.C. programmes—TV and radio—“seem intended to undermine Britain and the standards of the people”; and Mr. Young writes: “Oddly enough, what they are doing at the B.B.C. is *exactly* what Communism would *like* to do.”

Guest of *Honour*? Well, there is said to be honour among thieves, who no doubt would unanimously agree as to the immorality of birds of a feather flocking together. Perhaps when the mixed flock of Communists have exterminated the Vietnamese, they will turn their attention to the sparrows, swans, and birds of Paradise.

A Closetful of Skeletons (continued from page 1)
 . . . a bribe so durance vile that the ever solicitous Kennedy had offered to procure his release on condition that he (Kent) swear never to divulge the contents of certain cablegrams coded and decoded through the preceding winter of his discontent. Kent refused the bribe.

When arrested, Tyler was held incommunicado. The only American observer at Kent’s secret trial was Consul General George G. Erhardt, who had known Tyler since the latter’s boyhood. He was, nonetheless, placed under oath not to disclose any of the details of the hearing. Returning to the United States, Mr. Erhardt told Mrs. Kent: “Tyler did nothing reprehensible . . .” Mrs. Kent saw Ambassador Kennedy after his resignation from his London post, and asked him if her son had been rightly accused of being a spy. He replied that there was no basis whatever for that suspicion. Walter Trohan, famed *Chicago Tribune* reporter, stated that Kennedy told him: “I am very ashamed of the part I played in the Kent Case—I lost my head.”

It was not until May of 1941 when President Roosevelt was hell-bent for war and surreptitiously aiding the British that Tyler Kent’s mother learned that there had been secret cables in code between Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt which Tyler Kent had had to decode in the course of his duties. These cables, she learned from Robert Scott, a newsman formerly of the *Washington Post* and later of the *Pittsburgh Gazette*, dealt with the conduct of the war, plans for Anglo-American cooperation, and specifically with the Lend-Lease formula. In them Roosevelt had been promised the full support of British propaganda sources in his third-term election campaign, in which he promised the mothers and fathers of America that he would never send their sons abroad to a foreign war—*unless attacked*. He

would move to Britain’s support, he promised in the cables, as soon as Churchill superseded Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain at 10 Downing Street.

Churchill was at the time First Lord of the Admiralty and had no powers to communicate with any head of a foreign state about foreign policy. In fact, Churchill had seriously violated British law and for that deserved to be canned—if the facts were known. Roosevelt, of course, had violated the Constitution of the United States, and revelation of the secret wires would have blown him to Campa-bello.

At the behest of Mrs. Kent, a young public relations expert named Otis T. Wingo, a classmate of Tyler Kent, interested himself in the case. From two officials of the British Embassy in Washington, in July 1941, Mr. Wingo learned that the controversial cables were coded and decoded on Ambassador Kennedy’s instructions. As the two British officials in Washington put it: “We did not want to try this case, but since his own Government and Ambassador *insisted*, there was nothing else to do . . . His mother has been to see us and we hope she is satisfied, because publicity in this matter would be most embarrassing to both Governments.”

When Tyler Kent first learned of the direction of the correspondence between Churchill and Roosevelt, he had tried to resign but Ambassador Kennedy would not accept it. The Ambassador did not dare chance letting Kent out of his sight. So the patriotic Tyler Kent, outraged by the mare’s nest of intrigue, subversion and treason he was uncovering, kept copies of all these cables in his room, apparently planning to send them to those in the States who might save America from World War II. Now, alas, the British had him—and the cables.

On November 11, 1941, a short month before the Pearl Harbor “day that will live in infamy”, some \$64 questions were put in the House of Commons. Richard M. Stokes, Labor M.P., asked whether or not a British subject who sent telegrams to President Roosevelt, using the U.S. Embassy code, had thereby evaded the British censorship, and whether or not the guilty person had been prosecuted. Independent Laborite John C. McGovern asked: “Cannot the Home Secretary say whether any of these cablegrams or messages were sent by the Prime Minister (Churchill) behind the back of the then Prime Minister (Neville Chamberlain)?” The Home Secretary, the distinguished Laborite Herbert Morrison, smugly replied on the floor of the House of Commons: “No information can be properly given out about confidential documents which are extracted from the American Embassy.” Doxology!

American editors stopped the ball, but for most of them it was a grounder too hot to handle. A few weeks after the extended British debate, Oliver Lyttelton, Minister of War Production in the British Cabinet, revealed in a speech that Roosevelt had purposefully provoked the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. When Roosevelt’s “Charlie McCarthy”, Secretary of State Cordell Hull, challenged Lyttelton’s charge, the Britisher tempered his statement but did not change its sense. Later Eleanor confessed that everybody in the White House expected the attack, and historian Charles C. Tansill established the proof of the charges in his scholarly *Back Door to War*.

Tyler Kent’s friends suggested that the Russian Secret

Service procured the Churchill-Roosevelt cables either photo-statically or textually by entering his room during his absence. The Bolshies were watching the vigorously anti-Communist Kent anyway. They might also have procured the text of the cables in the English courtroom where, on demand of the barrister, they were exhibited. However the Stalinists got them is immaterial. Colonel A. O. McGuire of Washington, D.C., substantiated the possession. It was pointed out that this put the Soviet Government in a position to use the improper interchange between Churchill and Roosevelt in such manner and such time as best suited Kremlin policies. It has been said that Stalin did use them at Teheran to blackmail concessions out of Roosevelt and Churchill.

In the summer of 1941, Mrs. Kent had sought in vain to get a passport out of the State Department to visit England. She then got a Baltimore newsman, Ian Ross MacFarlane, to go to England for her, at her expense, interview Mr. Maw, the British solicitor and, if possible, see Tyler Kent in confinement on the Isle of Wight.

MacFarlane made the trip in March of 1942 and accomplished both assignments. Kent told him that the task of handling the surreptitious cables preyed on his mind and conscience. The Foreign Service oath is: "I do solemnly swear or affirm that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, etc." Kent considered his assignment a violation of this oath, since he was charged at the time with preserving the neutrality of the United States. It was then that he asked for a transfer to a post where he could uphold the law and his oath. Kennedy refused, and then Kent divulged the cables to Churchill's most active political opponent in Parliament, the leader of the Right Club, Captain Archibald Ramsay—hardly "the enemy".

The exchange of cables began in October of 1939. The first cable from Churchill read in a sense: "I am half American and the natural person to work with you. We evidently see eye to eye. If I could become Prime Minister of Britain we could control the world." After a few weeks, Franklin grabbed the bait, and thenceforward the rate of exchange accelerated.

Otis T. Wingo says he was told by John Cowles, publisher of the *Des Moines Register and Tribune*, that Wendell Willkie came to him after luncheon with Churchill one day and said: "I have a good story, but it is strictly off the record and by no means for publication. Mr. Churchill has just told me that long before Congress heard of it, he and the President had arranged a Lend-Lease Agreement." Then Willkie added: "If you do publish it I will kill it at once by denying it."

An interesting sidelight on the Tyler Kent Case was the death on January 2, 1944 under mysterious circumstances of John Bryant Owen, usually known as John Bryan, grandson of William Jennings Bryan and son of our former Minister to Denmark, Ruth Bryan Owen. He had returned to America with Ian Ross MacFarlane in September, 1942, landing in Newfoundland and continuing to New York by boat.

Bryan's grandson had interested himself strongly in the Kent Case, familiarized himself with the position of the Right Club headed by Captain Ramsay, and had strongly criticized both the British and American Governments.

Owen was released from a six-month prison sentence in London just at the time MacFarlane was leaving and was expelled with only ten shillings to his name. It was Mrs. Kent's money, furnished by MacFarlane, that enabled him to take passage home. When the New York police found John Bryant Owen dead, MacFarlane dissociated himself from the case, or even mention of it, because he feared for the personal safety of Tyler Kent.

The fear was not groundless. Mr. Maw had applied for a cancellation of the deportation order which had stood over Kent's head since his imprisonment. The solicitor expressed his belief that it would be unwise for Kent, for reasons of bodily safety, to re-enter American jurisdiction or leave British jurisdiction until the U.S. Government became more friendly to him.

On June 15, 1944, debate broke out in the House of Commons concerning the right of the Government to hold one of its members, Captain Ramsay, four years without trial. Labor, Liberal and Conservative M.P.'s participated. Soon the dam broke in Washington—in both the House and the Senate. Senators Henrik Shipstead, Tom (Tom-Tom) Connally, Burton K. Wheeler and other solons harried the Administration through several pages of the *Congressional Record* of June 19, 1944. The State Department, eager to hush up the scandal, sent a special man to try to mollify Senator Wheeler. It was pointed out in the Senate floor that if, indeed, any papers had been stolen, it was a violation of American, not British, law; and that if anybody were arrested it should have been Churchill for secretly sending cables without passing them through censorship in wartime—cables which went behind the back of the British Government, and in essence conspired for the downfall of that Government.

Roosevelt, of course, "never said a mumblin' word"; nor did Governor Thomas Dewey of New York who was Republican candidate for President in 1944. As a final effort on behalf of her son, Mrs. Ann H. P. Kent sent a résumé of his case to the Democratic and Republican Conventions in June and July of 1944. Upton Close, the radio commentator, gave it nationwide disclosure. Big newspapers now featured it. The debate became so hot that even ex-Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy rushed to the defense of the New Deal—without, of course, acknowledging the nature of the controversial cables.

Tyler Kent was finally released from prison after World War II was over. He returned to this country, married, and never since has spoken of the matter of the cables. Some explain his silence by the fact that the New Deal had cannily tacked on a rider to an innocuous bill providing a penalty of ten years' imprisonment for divulging such "secret information".

—GEORGE S. SCHUYLER

Communism in Vietnam

A Documentary Study of Theory, Strategy and Operational Practices by Rodger Sweatingen and Hammond Rolph Price 9/6 posted
This book, commissioned by the American Bar Association Standing Committee on Education About Communism and Its Contrast with Liberty Under Law, "is a factual uncovering of the nature of 'modern' aggression through agitation, terror, subversion, guerrilla war and the use of proxies to confuse world public opinion. It is crucial to the future of freedom that the court of world opinion be guided by facts rather than superficial slogans, by the weight of evidence, not the length of the picket line."—Preface, July 1967. K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11.

Printed by E Fish & Co Ltd Liverpool