

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 44 No. 15

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1964

1/3 Fortnightly

CORRECTION, PLEASE!*

ITEM: From an Editorial in the *Milwaukee Journal*, reprinted in the *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, August 22, 1964:

[Canadian Prime Minister] *Lester Pearson has a long and proud record of opposition to what Communism stands for.*

CORRECTION: We quote from *National Review* (February 8, 1956):

The *Daily Worker* praises Canadian Secretary of State Lester B. Pearson for proposing in *Look* magazine that Communist China be recognised. The Communist mouthpiece agrees with Pearson that the Soviet leaders "are not plotting all-out military aggression". Both admire the "candour and realism of the Soviet leaders". ***This is the same Mr. Pearson who granted a passport to the convicted traitor and Communist spy, Fred Rose. ***Elizabeth Bentley in her testimony has referred to Pearson as a source of information to the American Communist spy ring.

In 1956 when Pearson was appointed as one of the "three wise men" to revise and expand the functions of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), the *Daily Worker* was jubilant—and for good reason. Pearson not only advocated diplomatic recognition of Red China and its admission to the UN, but he was strongly opposed to emphasis by NATO on military aims. The aims were ostensibly to protect Western Europe from Soviet aggression.

In 1958 Pearson launched a vitriolic attack against the United States and especially the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee because the SISS had uncovered irrefutable evidence that a Canadian diplomat, E. Herbert Norman, was a Communist who had worked in the United States and had a peculiar talent for cultivating United States Foreign Service officers.

As had been reported in *American Opinion* (July-August 1964):

Mr. Pearson, it is true, was personally involved, since he had had in his possession since 1940 evidence supplied by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police showing that Norman was a Communist agent, and had thereafter appointed him to the diplomatic posts in Washington, Tokyo, New Zealand, and elsewhere in which Norman served as a Soviet spy, and had been instrumental in procuring Norman's appointment as the representative of Canadian [!] Intelligence at General MacArthur's headquarters.

But Pearson's impudent claim that dear Herbert was just an "idealist", who, although as innocent as Mary's little lamb, had committed suicide because his nerves were upset by the investigations conducted by wicked witch-hunters in the United States Senate, and his even more impudent attempt to use that preposterous story to incite hatred of the United States in Canada, were efforts that would not have been made by a man of even moderately good judgment. (For a concise summary, see the Report of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security for 1957, pp. 101-109.)

From *Human Events* (April 27, 1957), we quote:

Writing in the *Montreal Gazette*, columnist Arthur Blakely scathed Pearson for six years of "trimming, shuffling, and embroidering", which kept the facts about Norman from the Canadian public. Now, Blakely notes, Pearson himself confirms "the essential truth of statements that the late Ambassador . . . had 'Communist associations'—and had himself 'had mistaken beliefs and had been following a false ideology'—statements which for six years [Pearson] had angrily repudiated as 'unsupported insinuations', 'innuendoes' born of malice, and 'slanders' deserving only of contempt."

Another influential Canadian columnist, George Bain of the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, also flayed Pearson for his reluctance to speak unequivocally about the Norman case, and blasted Pearson's threat of refusing security information to U.S. authorities as "90 per cent a sham".

This line of attack was followed by Canadian Opposition Leader John Diefenbaker, who repeatedly challenged Pearson to say that "the statements made before the Subcommittee of the United States on March 13 and 21 were untrue and unjustified and have no basic fact". Pearson answered: "I am not going to say at this moment whether any single statement made in a United States Subcommittee is accurate or not."

ITEM: From an Editorial in the *New York Times*, September 9, 1964:

When the Belgians left on July 1, 1960, the Congo, like Humpty Dumpty, fell off the wall and all the U.N.'s forces and all the U.N. made a valiant effort, which for a while seemed to be succeeding.

CORRECTION: "Valiant" seems to be *Time's* word for more than four years of pillage, rape, murder and assorted atrocities by the UN in The Congo. For further details, see G. Edward Griffin's *The Fearful Master: A Second Look At The United Nations*; Philippa Schuyler's *Who Killed The Congo?*; Smith Hempstone's *Rebels, Mercenaries and Dividends*; Conor Cruise O'Brien's *To Katanga And Back*; Ernest von den Haag's *The War In Katanga*; Civilian Doctors of Elizabethville and their 46 *Angry Men*; and Michel Sturdza's *World Government And International Assassination*.

* 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.

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. Scouler, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

It is now more than a year since the late President Kennedy began giving urgent warnings of the seriousness to the U.S.A. of the situation in South Vietnam. This was followed by visits of numbers of Administration officials to Vietnam. Some Buddhist burnings accompanied by sensationalism in the Press reports culminated in the overthrow of the government, and the murder of the President, Ngo Dinh Diem, and his brother.

A three-part article in *U.S. News & World Report*, Sept. 14, 1964, gives from experts what we consider a reliable account of the U.S. intervention in South Vietnam. First, the U.S. organised heavy divisions with a corps superstructure. These "were roadbound, burdened with heavy equipment, dependent on a continual flow of supplies into operational areas, whether in the dense jungles and mountains, or the water-logged swamps and rice fields of the Mekong River Delta". The U.S. Military Assistance Group (MAAG) "declined to have any part of a programme to pay, train and equip paramilitary and police forces to provide security in the countryside for villagers and Government officials", although the neglected paramilitary forces "were doing most of the fighting and suffering most of the casualties in the preliminary stages of a war that the Pentagon didn't seem to realise was going on". This situation was allowed to persist from 1955 to 1961, when the Pentagon took over responsibility for training and equipping paramilitary forces. The *Britannica Book of the Year* states: "Throughout 1962, public affairs in South Vietnam remained relatively stable and, although there were some incidents, even showed some improvement".

According to a second report, the danger was not of a clear-cut military victory by the Viet Cong; "The danger, instead, comes from the possibility of political collapse. The country stands today only a hair's breadth away from being leaderless".

The third report describes the training of Vietnamese at Fort Bragg, N.C., where "most courses stress theory, not practice". Moreover, high rates of pay, "winning and dining", and being shown "democracy at work" have a softening effect on the trainees who on their return to their own country prefer life in Saigon to guerrilla warfare in the swamps and jungles.

Now, as usual, the article referred to attributes the disasters in Vietnam to U.S. "blunders" and "errors", even though the writers, who have been on the spot for years, claim to have repeatedly reported the facts of the war as they are. It is not conceivable that what was known to the reporters was not known to U.S. intelligence services. But seen from the point of view of a conspiracy to enslave the American people under a world government, U.S. policy makes sense. The first necessity is to deceive the American people by the exhibition of massive "aid"; if the real effect of that aid is to undermine stable government in South Vietnam, then South Vietnam can be made "to fall without making it look as if the United States had pushed it"—as Owen Lattimore advised Mr. Acheson in the case of Korea. What is being contrived is a disaster which *apparently* the U.S. did all in its power to prevent. And, in essential strategy, a similar situation is being contrived in Malaysia.

What is happening is well described in a speech by U.S. Senator William Jenner: "Someone, somewhere, conceived the brilliant strategy of revolution by assembly line. The pattern for total revolution was divided into separate parts, each of them as innocent, safe and familiar looking as possible. But . . . when the parts of a design are carefully cut to an exact size, to fit other parts with a perfect fit in final assembly, the parts must be made according to a blueprint drawn up in exact detail.

"The men who make the blueprints know exactly what the final product is to be . . . This assembly line revolution is like a time-bomb . . . It is ready to go off, but it is not going to be set off until the time is ripe, until a switch is pulled. The switch is not to be pulled until the American people are conditioned, or convinced that resistance is hopeless."

We are convinced that the evidence—now, fortunately, readily available—of such a conspiracy is incontestable. Twenty years ago it was a matter of speculation as to the ultimate mechanism of the conspiracy, but for the last few years the mechanism has been discernible enough through the fog of news management. At the end (?) of the Second World War, the U.S. could have imposed its rule on the world by force of arms, but the U.S. was not designed for that role; the U.S.S.R., like Germany in its day, was. So the role of the U.S. is, in the guise of resisting Communism, to promote World Government through world socialism; to prepare the alternative—surrender to World Communism or to the United Nations.

It is in the nature of conspiracy that its progress must be in advance of appearances. Thus, South Vietnam is almost certainly lost already, in the sense that only open and declared war by the U.S. could retrieve it. But the U.S., although Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have declared that the defence of South Vietnam is "vital" to U.S. interests, has made it clear that it will not enter into a war that could "escalate" into a nuclear war involving Russia. So, does the point where it is officially admitted that South Vietnam is irretrievably lost mark the point of no return? If not, how much more of the world need be lost before the American people are convinced "that resistance is hopeless"? Australia? Why is Russia committing resources to Indonesia? For Indonesia's *defence*?

It is now five years since General Wedemeyer stated that in his opinion the progress of the Conspiracy was such that from our point of view it was already "too late", though he subsequently amended this by saying that he was not completely a

pessimist, "but it is very, very late"; and he said that Soviet strategy would be to avoid major war, "but employ the satellites in brush-fires or limited wars."

The situation has both deteriorated and improved since then; Communist progress has continued, but the extent and nature of the total Conspiracy have become far more widely known and appreciated. Thanks to courageous and massive publishing ventures, vital evidence, in the form of books which had been almost totally suppressed, has been made readily available, and is being studied. Mr. Robert Welch relates that several years ago it took him months even to locate to borrow and read a copy of *I Saw Poland Betrayed*, an account by the U.S.A. ex-Ambassador to Poland of the exact technique by which Communism took over Poland. Ambassador Lane reported what was happening, but the U.S. government did nothing. In protest, Mr. Lane resigned from his diplomatic career, in order to publish the facts, but his book was suppressed.

Similarly, Major Jordan, who was assigned by the U.S. Army Air Force as United Nations Representative to the 34th Sub Depot, Great Falls, Montana, after the war published a book based on diaries which he kept during this assignment. Great Falls was the base from which Lend-Lease supplies were air-lifted to Russia. In 1943 Major Jordan discovered that the Russians, under cover of diplomatic immunity, were shipping vast quantities of plans, blueprints and espionage material. He also discovered, without the slightest idea of the significance of the discovery, information on uranium, atomic reactors, and even considerable quantities of uranium itself. He attempted to report this information "through channels", but nothing happened. At the beginning of 1944 he went to Washington to report, but again could get nowhere. It was not till the explosion of the first atomic bomb that Major Jordan realised the significance of what he had seen, but because of top official assurances that Russia could not possibly explode a bomb for many years, he took no further action. However, when just four years later, the Russians did explode an atomic bomb, he managed to make his disclosures—through Senator Bridges and Fulton Lewis—by radio broadcast.

Here is eye-witness evidence, fully documented, that top levels of the U.S. Administration knew that Russia was in a position to explode an atomic bomb much sooner than they led the public to suspect. Of course, efforts were made to discredit Major Jordan, but his disclosures had been fully substantiated by an F.B.I. investigation lasting months.

How many people today know this? But facts such as these are the surest evidence that the U.S. Administration is in the grip of a conspiracy, which operates at the top levels and penetrates downwards. The only way to break its grip is to expose it to such a number of people as will arouse public opinion. And if all readers of this journal would form and guide study-groups to learn the facts, progress could be made proportional to the effort and the need.

CORRECTION, PLEASE! (continued from page 1)

ITEM: From "Editor's Report" by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., in the *Boston Sunday Advertiser*, September 6, 1964:

The statement that the present Administration [Johnson's] doesn't understand the nature of the threat to peace, the nature of the enemy, or the nature of the conflict, is a generalisation which simply doesn't stand up.

CORRECTION: It stands up when we recall President Lyndon Johnson's effusive appraisal of Soviet Premier Khrushchev on April 11, 1964: "I am glad to see that Mr. Khrushchev is playing the role of peace and seeking to preserve peace in the world . . . when he talks in peaceful terms he will always have my ear."

It is . . . regrettable that the Senator [Goldwater] continues to employ the convenient, attractive, high sounding catch-phrase technique in his efforts to woo the American people. Americans require no such appeal to innate decencies and affections for truth and morality in life. I think they prefer their political medicine straight.

CORRECTION: The American people can hardly expect to get their political medicine straight as long as Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, remains as a spokesman for the Johnson Administration. Sylvester, who served in the same capacity during the Kennedy Administration, has been dealt with by the *Chicago Tribune's* correspondent Willard Edwards:

A great deal of shocked indignation was expressed in the newspaper world last October 30—and since then—when Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, voiced an astounding confession of manipulation of news by the Kennedy Administration during the Cuban crisis.

It is essential that the full meaning of his words be explored, so I read them:

"News generated—mark the word 'generated' which means to create, to make news—News generated by actions of the government as to content and timing are part of the arsenal of weaponry that a President has in the application of military force and related forces"—to what end? Sylvester says the end is the solution of political problems and the application of international political pressure.

"In the kind of world we live in (he continued) the generation (and mark that word again) of news by actions taken by the government becomes one weapon in a strained situation. The results, in my opinion, justify the methods we used."

Five weeks later, on December 6, Sylvester, in another statement, got down to earth and made his meaning crystal clear. The government, despite the storm of criticism about his first statement, he said, would continue its policy of "generating" news because "information is power". And then he added, defiantly, perhaps, but very, very firmly:

"I think the inherent right of the government to lie—to lie to save itself when faced with nuclear disaster—is basic."

There we had it. The government has both an inherent and basic right to falsify news in the name of self-preservation. . . . (Human Rights, February 16, 1963.)

ITEM: From an Associated Press Dispatch in the *New York Herald Tribune* (Paris Edition), August 7, 1964:

Though the name of Ho Chi Minh is well known throughout the world, it is not his real one. No one knows what he was called when he was born in Nghe An, in north Annam, in 1890.

CORRECTION: The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress and the House Committee on Un-American Activities agree that Ho's given name was Nguyen Tat Thanh.

During World War II, the allies in Chungking used the revolutionary movements [including Ho's] in Indo-China to gather intelligence and sabotage the Japanese.

CORRECTION: Ho Chi Minh provided no "intelligence" which could be used by the Allies. And his only encounter with the Japanese was an incident in an isolated village where eight Japanese were killed.

[Ho Chi Minh], known as a Communist, was jailed in south China, but he soon persuaded his captor, the provincial governor, that his group could do a better job of taking over Indo-China than the [Vietnamese] Nationalists.

CORRECTION: Chinese General Chang Fa-kwei, a southern war lord, released Ho Chi Minh from jail and recognised Ho's Vietminh Front as a "government"-in-exile, on the insistence of U.S. officials. The U.S. was promising to the Chiang Kai-shek régime the northern portion of Indo-China. This was to compensate Chiang for the miserable treatment he was being accorded as U.S. officials were favouring the Chinese Communists over Chiang at the time.

Chang Fa-kwei, however, had a personal ambition to take over the rich provinces of Kwangsi, Yunnan and Kwantung from Chiang Kai-shek's control, and part, or even all, of Indo-China from French control. Chang Fa-kwei planned to use Ho Chi Minh, armed by the Americans, to rout the Japanese, then the French, from Indo-China. Then Chang could run off Ho!

The plan benefited only Ho. And Chang Fa-kwei eventually found himself an exile from the mainland and Formosa—a victim of a double-cross.

Thus, when World War II ended, Mr. Ho had an underground army supplied, equipped and encouraged by the United States and its allies.

CORRECTION: Underground? By 1945 when the war ended, Ho's "government"-in-exile had full diplomatic status and was established as a going concern in Luchow. It was to Ho Chi Minh that the Japanese surrendered their arms when they gave up in Northern Indo-China. Previous to this, Ho was armed—not by the Allies—but only by the United States.

Mr. Ho knew that in the struggle which would follow he could lead Vietnam not as a Communist but as a Nationalist. He kept up the fiction until 1951 . . . [and] because he knew that Vietnam did not want a communist dictatorship, he established a government that included a number of non-Communists.

CORRECTION: There never was any fiction that Ho Chi Minh was anything but a Communist, except the fiction presented to the American people by the American press and the Roosevelt-Truman Administration. As early as September 2, 1946, Ho Chi Minh set up a Communist régime in Saigon in South Vietnam. He immediately arrested hundreds of French nationals and looted their homes. Within three weeks Ho's forces began a series of massacres against French civilian men and women in Saigon, Hanoi, and other major cities in North Vietnam.

ITEM: From an Obituary Notice in the *New York Times*, August 24, 1964:

In his 31 years as a member of the [Communist] party, Mr. [Benjamin J.] Davis saw it reach its period of greatest influence in the Depression and the era of good feeling toward the Soviet Union in World War II and then slide almost to dissolution.

CORRECTION: The *Times* may view the Communist Party as sliding "almost to dissolution", but this is not so, according to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover. In June 1964, Edward J. Mowery of the *Newark Star Ledger* asked Mr. Hoover to appraise "the status quo of the Communist Party, U.S.A., its strength overt and covert". Mr. Hoover gave the unequivocal reply: "The Communist Party,

U.S.A., remains today as it has always been—a serious menace to our internal security. Ever since its founding in 1919, the party has been completely loyal to the Soviet Union." And, in a *Colum (Orangeburg [S.C.] Times and Democrat*, July 12, 1964), Mr. Hoover wrote:

I have often called attention to the intensive programme of the Communist Party, U.S.A. I have cited pertinent facts which should be known to every citizen who considers himself well informed about international communism. These included the fact that 40 million Communists now rule approximately one-third of the earth's 3 billion inhabitants and a fourth of her land surface. That, like it or not, communism exists legally or illegally in more than 70 free world countries, including our own. In the United States, international communism is represented by an aggressively defiant party whose members have an unswerving allegiance to the Soviet Union.

Social Credit Library

The Library, which is for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter*, contains, as far as is possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit, together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

For further particulars apply to The Librarian, 67 Glanmore Road, Slough, Bucks. (Intending readers should enclose a deposit of 5/- for the cost of postage.) Catalogue available, price 1/-.

The following books have been added to the Library since January 1962:

The sections are E (Expository); A (Ancillary); M (Miscellaneous), as well as F (Fiction) and P (Pamphlets).

A Welch, Robert: *The Politician*.

A Heisenberg, Werner: *The Physicist's Conception of Nature*.

A American Opinion Reprints: *One Dozen Candles*.

A Powicke, Sir Maurice: *Medieval England*.

A Heller, Erich: *The Disinherited Mind*.

C de Jouvenel, Bertrand: *The Pure Theory of Politics*, Cambridge 1963.

C Jennings, Sir Ivor: *The British Constitution*, Cambridge 1961.

C Jennings, Sir Ivor: *Party Politics Volume III—The Stuff of Politics*, Cambridge 1962.

C Emden, Cecil S.: *The People and the Constitution*, Oxford 1962.

C Chapman, Brian: *British Government Observed—Some European Reflections*, London 1963.

C Mumford, Lewis: *The Condition of Man*, New York 1963.

C Young, George K.: *Masters of Indecision—An Inquiry into the Political Process*, London 1962.

C Robbins, Lord: *Politics and Economics—Papers in Political Economy*, London 1963.

C Wootton, Graham: *The Politics of Influence—British Ex-Servicemen, Cabinet Decisions and Cultural Change (1917-57)*.

C Koestler, Arthur: *The Sleepwalkers—A History of Man's Changing Vision of the Universe*, London 1959.

C Stalin, J.: *Problems of Leninism*.

P Monahan, Bryan W.: "Aims of Education" and "Why I am a Social Crediter".

P Monahan, Bryan W.: ". . . Neither Do They Spin . . .".

P Social Credit Secretariat: *Social Credit in 1962*.

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 5 New Wanstead, Wanstead, London E11.

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