

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 52. No. 22

SATURDAY, 20 JANUARY, 1973

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

Who They Are*

THE CONSPIRACY TO DESTROY AMERICA

By GARY ALLEN

(Continued from our issue for November 11, 1972†)

BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL

Another extremely influential *Insider* organization is the Business Council, described in *Dun's Review* for January 1970, as "America's most powerful private club". Like the C.F.R. and the Bilderbergers with which it is deeply interlocked, the Business Council is an instrument of super-wealthy corporate socialists who recognise that socialism is not a share-the-wealth program, but a device to consolidate and control the wealth.

According to the *Review*, published by Dun & Bradstreet, "In the ranks of the Business Council are 160 of the most powerful businessmen in the country. Several times a year they meet with government figures at both The Homestead [hotel in Virginia] and in Washington to discuss the economy". And yet, reported Hobart Rowen in *Harper's* for September 1960: "The public has been told very little about the Council and this is unfortunate; its participation in government policy-making is undeniable and its workings raise fundamental questions about the way decisions are made in Washington".

The Business Council began life as the Business Advisory Council to the Commerce Department during the early days of the Roosevelt Administration. It was originally set up not so much to advise the government, but as a vehicle through which to sell the moguls of Big Business on backing the New Deal. Organizer of the B.A.C. was Sidney Weinberg, an energetic *Insider* who was a partner in the international banking firm of Goldman, Sachs & Company. Weinberg, who sat on the board of directors of thirty of the nation's largest corporations, was nominally a Democrat, but floated back and forth between the two parties supporting "Liberal" candidates.

At first the B.A.C. was not notably successful in selling collectivism to the magnates of American industry and the organization was beset with mass resignations. But, over the years, the Establishment *Insiders* gradually turned the Business Council into a club for Big Business "Liberals" and used it to offset the influence on government of the then Conservative leadership of the National Association of Manufacturers. According to *Dun's Review*, during the early days of the Kennedy Administration "the BC decided to go it alone. It officially severed relations with Commerce, dropped the 'advisory' from its name, and declared itself ready to advise not only Commerce but 'all areas of government requesting its services.'" And, *Dun's Review* explains:

The Council proceeded to set up liaison committees

with five major federal departments—Treasury, Labor, State and Defense, in addition to Commerce—as well as with the Council of Economic Advisors and the White House itself. (It has since added HEW, HUD, Transportation, Interior and the Post Office.)

Politically, the tastes of most members of the *Insiders'* Business Council have run to support for "Liberal" Republicans. In 1964, of course, such *Insiders* contributed to the Johnson campaign and attacked Goldwater. The 1968 race was more to their liking. While most Business Council money backed Nixon, founder Weinberg (who had been Eisenhower's chief fundraiser) served as the primary money hustler for Hubert Humphrey.

Traditionally the Business Council, like all of the *Insider* fronts, shunned publicity. The twice-annual meetings between its business executives and high government officials have been as secret as Howard Hughes' phone number. That is, until October of 1950, when five venturesome reporters attempted to crash the festivities. When they were turned away, one of the reporters persisted clandestinely and wrote a version of the meeting in which he alleged that the chief business was dividing up lucrative Korean War contracts. Following that experience, which was of course decried as a hoax, the Business Council decided to hold a press conference after its meetings to provide an official briefing. So while it is now true that there is an occasional mention of the Council in the newspapers, reporters are still not allowed to attend the meetings and must rely for information on public-relations releases. That they are willing to do so, under the circumstances, is flabbergasting!

Consider, after all, that among the C.F.R. members who are active in the Business Council and attend its secret meetings are Roger Blough of U.S. Steel; Henry Alexander of Morgan Guaranty Trust; Crawford Greenewalt of DuPont; Thomas Watson Jr. of I.B.M.; Allan Sproul, formerly of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York; Winthrop Aldrich of the Chase Manhattan Bank; Lucius Clay of the international banking firm of Lehman Brothers; Donald K. David of the Ford Foundation; Keith Funston, formerly of the New York Stock Exchange; Paul Hoffman of the U.N.; Ralph Cordiner of General Electric; Marion Folsom of Eastman Kodak; Robert Anderson of the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas; Douglas Dillon of the international

(continued on page 3)

*From *American Opinion*, October, 1972.

†This continuation was delayed to give priority to the publication of "Alternative to Disaster".

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.

Vol. 52. No. 22

Saturday, 20 January, 1973

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

In August, 1965, the following report and comment appeared in *The Social Crediter*:

The weekly news-paper, *Human Events* (Washington) in its issue for July 17, 1965, quotes what we believe to be the very reliable *Allen-Scott Report* on what took place at the Hanoi "labour conference" held from June 2-6 inclusive, and attended by delegates from all over the world. According to the Report, the conference cost the Hanoi-Peking axis over half a billion dollars.

"Nothing was left to the imagination of the 600 delegates. *Country by country* they were briefed on how to implement the 'vigorous mass aid Vietnam and resist America movement' which the hosts said 'is unfolding throughout the world'. This labour conference obviously was vital to Mao's strategy." [Our emphasis.]

The conference was, in fact, a briefing in integrated sabotage as appropriate to the various countries represented, in the main, aimed at disrupting transport and promoting anti-war demonstrations. And so we have seen the Teach-ins and other propaganda activities, combined with water-front strikes and other attacks on communications.

In the meantime, the U.S. refrains from bombing vital targets, but terrifies the public with postponed announcements of vastly increased military efforts—probably made in the secure knowledge that the communists will have won before the efforts can be effective. The 'management' of the news concerning Vietnam ought to be enough to convince anyone of the complicity of the invisible government of the U.S.A. in the strategy of International Communism. And when our turn comes, it will be "too late" for the U.S. to do anything.

It is vital to do everything possible to inform public opinion to a point where it will *force* the U.S. government to *win* the war against Communism. Conferences with a winning enemy are merely steps in a pattern of surrender.

In the seven years since the above was written we have seen the U.S. "no-win" strategy pursued to the point where it is now possible for President Nixon to say, in effect, that

Hanoi will be bombed continuously until President Thieu surrenders: if he does not, *all* U.S. aid, military and economic, to South Vietnam will be cut off. Thanks to Mao's far-sighted strategy, public opinion has been brought to the point where it will thankfully accept this 'solution', which involves the retention of sufficient Communist troops in South Vietnam to collect the 'blood debt' (see *T.S.C.*, Oct. 28, 1972).

The American Administration is now cheerfully conceding the loss of numbers of supposedly invulnerable B52 bombers to the "most sophisticated anti-aircraft defences in the history of warfare". There are only two places those defences could have come from—the U.S.A., or the U.S.A. *via* the USSR (see *T.S.C.* referred to above).

Superficially, the U.S. involvement in Vietnam appears as the most incredible stupidity in history. In fact, however, it is a vital step in preparing the way for the collection of a world-wide 'blood-debt'; and high on the list will be such dupes as the Wilsons, Heaths, Trudeaus, Kirks and Whitlams who, in the final accounting from the Communist point of view, will rank with President Thieu, because of their personal ambitions and self-deceptions. Communism, once established, is intended to be for ever, and party-politicians are but a temporary expedient.

Choosing the News

A meeting of the Monday Club recently criticised the B.B.C. for "lack of accuracy" (*Church of England News-paper*, Nov. 17, 1972). John Braine wanted an "impartial" BBC to report on the atrocities of the Viet Cong, to give an objective view of Senator Joe McCarthy's life and an hour's programme on the imprisonment of Mr. Hathaway, the Pentecostal minister who smuggled bibles into Czechoslovakia. Mrs. Mary Whitehouse asked what the media would have done "if South Africa rather than Czechoslovakia" had imprisoned Mr. Hathaway.

Mr. David Levy said that he could understand the difficulties in presenting programmes accurately on television, for one could film South Africa "but not Tibet, so Chinese oppression there did not get coverage". And he turned to the deeper problem that "the BBC recruited chiefly from the ranks of the radical Left, so that anything British was to be denigrated and national pride must give way to the myth of a vague internationalism". The radical Left, he added, like the World Council of Churches, had identified Racialism as the evil of today.

But the BBC does not stand alone in giving a partial slant to the news. The martyrdom of a young Soviet soldier, as described by the Rev. Michael Bourdeaux in *The Church Times* of Nov. 3, 1972, has received little or no mention in other newspapers. This young enthusiast was refused food for five days, and then was forced to spend five nights of Russian winter outside in summer uniform. When this treatment had no effect, they murdered him and sent the body home in a sealed coffin. I wondered if his faith and enthusiasm had come from some of the Russians who met Pastor Wurmbbrand in Rumania. The Rev. B. Hruby, in the *East-West Digest* of November, 1972, says that the Soviet Government, with the help of the new English edition of the Moscow Patriarchate's Journal, is trying to "impress and brainwash" Western opinion that the people of the USSR

enjoy full religious freedom. But the West would rather believe the novelist A. Solzhenitsyn's saying that "a Church dictatorially directed by atheists is a spectacle that has not been seen for 2,000 years", together with "other Orthodox voices, and testimonies of suffering Baptists, Jews, Lithuanian Catholics and other believers in the USSR".

I would further question the view expressed by Bishop Lamont of Umtali, Rhodesia about Bishop Muzorewa and the African National Council that it "truly represents the African people" (*Catholic Herald*, Nov. 17, 1972). The African people may outnumber Europeans by "over 20 to 1", but the majority of these Africans are represented by Chiefs and live in the country, while Bishop Muzorewa draws most of his support from the towns. The Christian Council of Rhodesia has stated that "quite apart from the claims of justice, responsible government of Rhodesia must be based on majority rule" (*Church of England Newspaper*, Nov. 17, 1972). But they do not mention events in Uganda which show that "majority rule" may conflict with justice or ask how, with this forbidding example, the Europeans are to be expected to throw their country away. (The fallacy called *petito principii* assumes what you wish to prove.)

Various Europeans are quite willing to treat their country in just this way. *The Sunday Express* (Nov. 19, 1972) says, "The Foreign Secretary . . . suggests that there will be no change in the treatment of Commonwealth visitors. Who does he think he is fooling?" It prints in the same issue a letter from an Australian lady which concludes: "If Britain is trying to sever relations altogether with her Commonwealth brothers she is going the right way about it". Foreigners from Europe, the editorial points out, are to be placed in positions of privilege, while our "kith and kin" from the Commonwealth are to be placed in the position "once reserved for aliens". No one could conceive that such a *volte-face* was achieved without the most intensive planning.

—H.S.

Who They Are

(continued from page 1)

banking firm of Dillon, Read & Company; Albert Nickerson of Mobil Oil; Ralph Lazarus of Federated Department Stores; John T. Connor of Allied Chemical; Harold Boeschstein of Owens-Corning Fiberglass; and, Thomas Gates of Morgan Guaranty Trust.

Little wonder that *Dun's Review* has observed: "Given the kind of economic muscle it commands, it is obvious that the power of the Business Council to influence the nation's economy—and the decision-making of its elected leaders—is little short of awesome . . ." And Hobart Rowen concludes:

No one can . . . prove that any specific bargains, commitments, benefits, or even plans flow from these BAC meetings with government officials. But it can not be denied that the BAC has a unique privilege not accorded to labor, agriculture, consumer or academic groups, or indeed to other business groups.

Membership in the Council gives a select few the chance to bring their views to bear on key government people, in a most pleasant, convivial, and private atmosphere . . .

Such indications that spokesmen for powerful eco-

nomie interests—like the BAC—have privileged relationships with the government raise a question of fundamental importance in our society. Are key public decisions influenced excessively by powerful private groups? This is a matter which deserves constant scrutiny and a vigorous effort to get the facts.

In the case of the BAC, so little has been known about it that the question has scarcely been raised. But the public should be aware that from Administration to Administration, this elite group has had a continuous privilege to participate in government decisions with no public record or review. And it should demand to know more.

The power of the Business Council is even more awesome when one looks at its interlocking directorate with the Council on Foreign Relations, the Bilderbergers, and other *Insider* combines.

COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

While the Business Council dealt with high officials of the federal government on a one-to-one basis it lacked a section for policy planning and formulation. So *Insiders* of the Business Council established the Committee for Economic Development (C.E.D.) to fill this gap. As William Domhoff, the anti-Establishment "Liberal", observes in his book, *The Higher Circles*, "the BAC was not equipped to educate its members or to carry out extensive research, and the CED was formed to fill this need. With but two exceptions the early members of the CED were BAC members".

Credit for the founding of the C.E.D. is usually given to multimillionaire Leftists Paul Hoffman and William Benton, both members of the Council on Foreign Relations. So influential has the C.E.D. become, says Domhoff, that "the importance of this organization, on both domestic and foreign policy, probably cannot be over-estimated." The C.E.D. has over the years employed batteries of Keynesian economists who have formulated most of the economic and fiscal policies which have become the law of the land during the past twenty-five years.

Once more, every effort is made to further the conspiratorial purposes of the Establishment *Insiders*. An Annual Report of the Committee for Economic Development states that the "CED is an organization of 200 businessmen and educators whose primary function is to use objective research to determine private and public policies which will promote economic growth . . ." Here is one more *Insider* organization made up of powerful private citizens blatantly admitting that one of its functions is to "determine . . . public policies." You will not be surprised to learn that nine of the fourteen members of the Executive Committee of the C.E.D. are also members of the Council on Foreign Relations. Forty-eight of 190 C.E.D. trustees we checked were at the same time members of the C.F.R.

The Committee for Economic Development truly came of age in 1957, when it was able to establish a Commission on Money and Credit. Donald K. David, then chairman of the Committee, explained:

Although CED had envisaged a commission created by government, the inability of government to obtain the concensus required for launching the study became as apparent as the need for avoiding further

delay. So, after receiving encouragement from other research institutions, leaders in Congress, the Administration, and from various leaders in private life, CED's Trustees decided to sponsor the effort, assisted by a grant from the Ford Foundation

In all there were twenty-seven members of this Commission, including David Rockefeller; Walter Heller, President Kennedy's chief economic advisor; Henry Fowler, President Johnson's Secretary of the Treasury; and, David M. Kennedy, President Nixon's first Secretary of the Treasury. It succeeded in making adoption of the Keynesian "New Economy" the official policy of the U.S. Government—resulting in a debasement of our coinage and massive inflation, an enormous expansion of the debt-money structure, and conversion of our system of Free Enterprise into a Fabian Socialist collective.

Having consistently recommended economic collectivism over a period of three decades, the C.E.D. has of late begun to dabble in social revolution. As Emilio Collado, chairman of the C.E.D. Research and Policy Committee,* puts it:

American business must do more to help solve the nation's social problems Business and government must develop the same kind of effective partnership in social problem-solving that has hitherto only been achieved in major wartime emergencies I think it is entirely appropriate that CED take the same kind of leadership on the social problems of today as it did in planning the reconversion of the economy after World War II

Approaching social problems as one would a "major wartime emergency," by creating a business and government partnership, amounts to as neat a definition of fascism as you are ever likely to see. And that is the name of the game. In 1971, the C.E.D. issued a study entitled "Social Responsibilities Of Business Corporations." It made clear that the object is to funnel billions of dollars of tax money into private corporations to engage in social work—Marxism at a profit.

Among the collectivist schemes currently being promoted by the C.E.D. are continued wage and price controls; socialized medicine; federal control over local law enforcement; and, metropolitan government. If the C.E.D. is for it, you can bet your last lollipop that it will expand the role of Big Brother in the lives of each of us.

KEY FOUNDATIONS

It would require a volume just to outline the role of the great foundations in promoting the interests of the *Insiders* in socialism and World Government. Such a volume, *Foundations: Their Power And Influence*, by Rene Wormser, counsel to the Reece Congressional Committee when it investigated the Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie Foundations, was published by the admirable Devin Garrity in 1958. Regrettably, this book is now unavailable. For a more detailed study of foundations than space here permits, I recommend the booklet, "Foundations And Tax-Free Cash," available from American Opinion Bookstores for fifty cents. You might also wish to review Cleon Skousen's book, *The Naked Capitalist*. Beyond these two monographs, there is

almost nothing else available. Few authors are willing to endanger their careers by challenging the foundations.

The Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations were established in the early part of the century. From the beginning they worked together, sharing the same philosophy and legal consultants. As René Wormser put it, the "overlapping of foundation administrators is an old story. In his foundation, John D. Rockefeller employed some of the same men to whom Andrew Carnegie had entrusted his endowments."

The fact is that both foundations were run from the start by the Establishment *Insiders* about whom you have been reading. While these foundations have done much good in the fields of medicine, public health, and scientific inquiry, this has been used as a cover for the enormous harm they have done in the spheres of international relations, the social sciences, and education.

The Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations jumped into the financing of education and the social sciences with both Left feet. In fact, the major foundations (principally these two) stimulated two-thirds of the total endowment funding of all institutions of higher learning in America during the first third of this century. During this period the Carnegie-Rockefeller complex supplied 20 percent of the total income of colleges and universities and became, in fact, a sort of *ex officio* Ministry of Education. The result was a sharp Leftward turn on the college campus. As René Wormser phrased it:

A very powerful complex of foundations and allied organizations has developed over the years to exercise a high degree of control over education. Part of this complex, and ultimately responsible for it, are the Rockefeller and Carnegie groups of foundations.

These foundations were primarily responsible, by way of grants amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars, for the nationwide acceptance of socialist John Dewey's theories of progressive education and permissiveness—the products of which may be seen marching on almost any college campus. Since control of America's public schools was decentralized, the great foundations had elected to concentrate on influencing schools of education (particularly Columbia, the spawning ground for Deweyism), and on financing the publication and promotion of "Liberal" textbooks which were soon adopted nationwide. They were so heavily slanted in favor of socialism, Wormser reports, that "it is difficult to believe that the Rockefeller Foundation and the National Education Association could have supported these textbooks. But the fact is that Rockefeller financed them and the N.E.A. promoted them very widely."

(To be continued)

NONE DARE CALL IT CONSPIRACY

By GARY ALLEN

1 copy, 50p.
10 copies, £3

3 copies, £1
25 copies, £6

ALTERNATIVE TO DISASTER

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

1 copy, 30p. 3 copies, 75p. 10 copies, £2 25 copies, £4.25p

Prices include postage

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

*Mr. Collado is also a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and is vice-president of Standard Oil of New Jersey.