

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 44 No. 25

SATURDAY, MARCH 13, 1965

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

### The "Australian" Press

The letters and comments which follow are as they appeared in *The Canberra Times* under the headings we show and on the dates given in brackets preceding these headings:

(February 12, 1965)

#### Our Viet Friends

SIR—From time to time articles and photographs appear in *The Canberra Times* which cause me, and many other persons of my acquaintance, to wonder whether the paper's editorial policy on world affairs is to be friendly to neutrals, neutral to enemies and hostile to friends.

By our friends, I mean any country, group or individual courageous enough to be forthrightly and steadfastly opposed to Communism in any shape or form. Further, the policy seems to be followed most rigidly when a friend is forced to take up arms against Communism as in the cases of Portugal in Angola, Tshombe in the Congo, the Right Wing in Laos, and the South Vietnamese in Vietnam. In this letter I concern myself only with the topical case of our South Vietnamese friends and this as the result of the photograph and caption which appears on page 5 of the *Canberra Times*, February 10.

The photograph, like another you published some time ago, purports to show a Vietcong prisoner being badly treated by South Vietnamese servicemen. I say "purports" because many other interpretations of the photographs including more logical ones than that given in the caption are possible. In this context, I would be interested to know whether or not you can unreservedly vouch for the accuracy of the caption to the photograph.

However, whether or not the caption is accurate is of secondary importance to the fact that the photograph and caption together seem to clearly represent a very clever exercise in propaganda which is blatantly anti-South Vietnamese military forces and pro-Vietcong.

It seems to be propaganda designed to generate sympathy for the Vietcong and loathing of the South Vietnamese military forces. Like all good propaganda its main effect however is not in what it shows or says but in what it seems to imply.

There is a clear implication that the South Vietnamese servicemen are cruel and brutal, that such a people could hardly have or be fighting for a good cause or that anyone could be justified in helping them with their fight. This in turn implies that U.S. and Australian policy in respect of South Vietnam is wrong and that there is no justification for U.S. and Australian military assistance to South Vietnam.

There is, of course, no indication of the fact that U.S. and Australian servicemen are serving, fighting and dying alongside the South Vietnamese servicemen in a cause that they believe in and a cause that reflects U.S. and Australian national policies. Whether or not the photograph and caption misleads and whether or not I have correctly interpreted their propaganda effect, the fact remains that you have shown "only one side of the coin" by publishing the photograph and caption.

Perhaps, you would care to correct this omission by publishing one of the many photographs and descriptions of some of the Vietcong atrocities perpetrated on servicemen and male and female civilians which are available from the Embassy of Vietnam here in Canberra. By doing this you will not only convert any misplaced feeling of sympathy felt by your readers for the Vietcong to a feeling of sick horror but might also convince a number of your readers that your editorial policy on world affairs is not aimed at encouraging Communism and discrediting anti-Communism.

GORDON WALLER.

Deakin.

Mr. Waller has a simple view of politics. We do not consider either Angola or the Congo as simple cases of "friends" taking action against Communism. In Laos, we support the Geneva Agreement which provided for a neutral government in that country and not one either of the Right or the Left. In South Vietnam, we broadly support the policy of the United States Government in trying to defend South Vietnam against Communist aggression though this does not mean that we necessarily approve everything that is done either by the Americans or by the South Vietnamese.

So far as the photograph was concerned, it was received from the American Associated Press, a very reputable agency, and was also published—with rather more prominence—by the Melbourne Age, the Melbourne Sun Pictorial and the Sydney Sun.

We cannot vouch for the authenticity of the photograph but we had no reason to doubt it. If it was authentic, then we believe we were right to publish it. It was not the duty of a paper to suppress unpleasant facts even if they may appear to discredit our side.

If we had received simultaneously a photograph showing an act of cruelty by the Vietcong, we should have been delighted to publish it too—providing, of course, it was not too horrible for ordinary readers. We have in the past published many, many photographs of American, Australian and South Vietnamese soldiers serving together in happier circumstances.

Finally, as our caption suggested, we know very well that war always involves cruelty and that the Vietcong have been responsible for some particularly grisly atrocities. But while cruelty on one side may help to explain cruelty on the other, we would not argue that it excused it. Even Communists are human beings.

—Editor.

(February 15, 1965)

#### Giving aid to the enemy

Sir,—In your editorial, published in your issue of January 28,

(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.

### FROM WEEK TO WEEK

One of the grounds said to justify the granting of independence to colonies is that colonial powers are supposed to exploit the colonies. But as soon as independence is attained, it is found that the former colony requires 'aid'. Exploitation means taking from, while aid means giving to; whence the transformation?

The term exploitation is if course merely a trick of psychological warfare. What the colonial powers do is 'invest' in the colonies. The real nature of this investment, concealed by financial terminology, is the provision by the colonial power of real capital to the colony, in the form of housing, roads, plant, equipment, communications, and services; and, some would say, of markets. This capital remains, and to the extent that it is efficiently administered, it increases the potential for better living standards for the natives of the country. Independence usually means a reduction in the efficient use of this capital, since it means, as a rule, the withdrawal or diminution of skilled administration; the displacement of a sort of bureaucratic efficiency by internal struggles for power and preferment among the relatively few educated natives. Thus 'exploitation' is really aid given under controlled conditions; a physical loss to the 'exploiting' nation, disguised as a financial 'profit' derived from a 'favourable' balance of trade—the excess of exports over imports; the loss of real goods in exchange for figures in bank books.

Those who remember the extraordinary events surrounding and following the Profumo scandal, which culminated in a massive campaign to get rid of Macmillan and discredit the Conservatives, may recognise its objective in the destruction by the Wilson administration of the British aircraft industry, thus finally disarming Britain except for such 'police' actions as the Moscow-Washington axis permit—that is, sufficient to bleed the economy without altering the balance of power. It is further evident that, having done what was expected of him, Wilson can now stay or go—anyone can do the job of handing over the remnants of the British nation and its assorted immigrants to the Common Market for absorption and obliteration. The desperate and declining 'condition' of the economy (in reality, potentially richer than at any time in history) will shortly necessitate intra-'European' mobility of labour, with, no doubt and in due course, the Europeanisation of language; unless Russian is to be

universal language of the proletariat. But a good deal of this will probably have to wait on the containment of the 'population explosion' by the systematic elimination of those who are opposed to 'progress', as in the French and Russian revolutions. Of course, if, as in Africa, the populations can be induced to exterminate themselves and each other, so much the quicker and better. Chou En Lai seems to think the prospects are good. So do we.

The pronouncements of de Gaulle frequently seem to foreshadow the future tactics of the Communist Conspiracy, so that it is quite possible that his remarks on the gold standard and related matters are a prelude to that universal economic crisis which is to provide the occasion for the final Communist takeover. The bomb has been completed; the fuse, if not already lit, might be lit at any time—all the sooner, since there is a growing army of informed conservatism in the U.S.A., which ultimately would be fatal to the Conspiracy if not destroyed in time.

### True Hearted Courage

Albeit, said Coke, various judges like Britton and Officers of the Law were men of the Church, yet they "ever had such honourable and true hearted courage as they suffered no encroachment by any foreign power on the Rights of the Crown or the Laws and Customs of the Realm." Edward Coke was commenting on the First Statute of Westminster (1275) in his *Institutes*. But this courage has evaporated, not only from men of the Church, and few are found to resist the encroachment by foreign powers on the rights of the Crown: Russia, UNO, the power of finance are all anxious to instruct us in our own affairs for their benefit.

A difference had arisen in the early days of Edward I between the Laws of Church and State on the timing of certain legal business, for Church Law forbade some seasons on the ground that they should be used "to appease debate". Yet it was a maxim that it is the highest charity to do justice for individuals at all times. An old author was cited who wrote that Kings, who serve Christ, make laws for Christ. The difference was amicably settled nearly 600 years ago.

In times when Britton, Bishop of Hereford, was an expert in Common and Canon Law and served as a judge without abusing his position, the judges' hours of business were limited so that their lives, said Fortescue, "may appear more contemplative than active." And although lives in those days were generally shorter, people knew more clearly how to use them. Laws today often seem to be enacted "for Marx"—even "for Freud"—and not on firm or divine ground. The object of life now appears to be labour. People are thus lost without constant activity, even of the bingo hall: the idea of contemplation would appal them, for "this sort of thing" is all done for them, pre-packed, on television.

But the severe and exact work of our ancient writers has had its effect in the United States Constitution and its defenders: for although the Charter of Liberties may be a dead letter in its country of origin, millions of Americans begin to understand that they are losing something, and that the high-sounding phrases of their leaders are a cloak for aggression by a foreign power, a good deal more deadly than George III. Their honourable and true hearted courage stirs and correspondence between word and fact return. And in Canada, Britain, Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere people remain who refuse to sacrifice reality to distortion in the spirit of the old legislators who refused to "sell

justice": yet I fear true justice may be delayed, for the debt system encourages robbery on a gigantic scale, while liberty is squeezed between tax and inflation.

Indeed British affairs are at the moment pulled in two ways by the dictate of finance—what we can "afford"—and by the desire to appease an electorate which gave the Government a paper thin majority. And people at last resent being called lepers or traitors for having a view of their own in a special situation: and would-be supporters reject a candidate not of their own choosing (the former Foreign Secretary) who stands for what they do not want.

The ancient legislators were not obsessed by numbers or parties or abstract theories, but acted on the conviction that they served God and the Right, and that the concrete laws of England were sound. As Coke put it, "So dangerous and ill success have ever had the breach of Maximes and ancient rules of the Common Law."

The difference between the modern vague idea of *liberty* and the notion of real *liberties* may be gathered from a comment on Magna Carta: "Generally all monopolies are against this great Charter, because they are against the liberty and freedom of the subject, and against the Law of the Land." We cover such breaches with a blanket term like "nationalisation."

Indeed the first Statute of Westminster, to which I referred earlier, generally reaffirms the Common Law, adding stiffer penalties for breaking it, and contains seven provisions against delay. The foundations were well laid, and the idea of repudiating sovereignty in favour of "world" government, would have been called treason, which carried the grimmest penalties; while Parliament's duty was to watch against the imposition of new burdens not, as today, to impose them. The various estates really represented a vital interest, whereas today interests and right only find support outside the official subservient channels. Fortunately people survive who still value our culture and contend against the monopoly of power.

—H.S.S.

**Sin and Virtue**

... crime breeds primarily neither on hunger nor illiteracy. Some of the most educated and fattest people in the world are the most wicked. Anyone with half a brain and a local newspaper can tell that thieves aren't after bread—they're after pie à la mode. Look at America; ours is the richest nation and the most crime-ridden. Empty bellies do not cause Communism, nor do they cause wars, nor—Victor Hugo with-standing—do they even cause crime. Germany started two wars on a full belly. Cuba went Communist in the year of its greatest physical prosperity. Italy and many others are on the verge of going Communist during their greatest prosperity of modern times. As Robert Welch has said: "There are more Communists with Harvard accents than in overalls." The war for the world is not between the haves and the have-nots. . .

—Tom Anderson in an article in *American Opinion*, Feb. 1965.

**THE BLUE BOOK**  
of  
**The John Birch Society**  
14/- plus 2/- postage

Presents the background, methods and purposes of the John Birch Society.

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

**CORRECTION, PLEASE\***

ITEM: From a Column by Marianne Means, White House Correspondent of Hearst Headline Service, as it appeared in the *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, January 20, 1965:

*South Viet Nam . . . remains the unslanted boil that has bothered three presidents and won't go away.*

*The President (Johnson) is thus far only determined upon one thing: not to give up and pull out.*

CORRECTION: The Chief Washington Correspondent of the Hearst Headline Service, Warren Rogers, is in sharp disagreement with Miss Means. In his column of February 2, 1965 (*Boston Record American*), Mr. Rogers writes:

. . . there is little indication that President Johnson is firmly committed to hang on in Vietnam for as long as it takes. Except to repeat the pledge in "duty" statements, like his state of the union message, the President has made no special effort, in word or deed, to restore the ebbing confidence of the South Vietnamese leadership, the American people, and even the officials close to him who are charged with responsibility in the unhappy affair.

Mr. Rogers describes Mr. Johnson as practising a "kind of Perils-of-Pauline decision-making [which] may be all right for politics, funerals and vacations. But it won't work in Foreign Affairs."

Where Miss Means sees the President "determined" not to give up and pull out of South Vietnam, Mr. Rogers sees just the opposite:

A policy of drift on so crucial an issue as Vietnam woos disaster. There are too many waiting to grab the helm—Communists, Buddhists and adventurists out there, and isolationists, drop-the-bombers and dunderheads here.

Since the President is writhing with indecision, the inference is that he has not completely rejected two other policy decisions open to him—escalate the war by attacking the North, or find an excuse to bail out through some sort of "negotiation." If he were fully committed to the present policy, there would be no indecision.

Mr. Rogers' thesis, that President Johnson has shown little indication of a firm commitment to hang on in Vietnam, is reinforced by the observations of two veteran Washington reporters, Robert Allen and Paul Scott. In their *Report (Hall Syndicate)* of January 6 and 26, 1965, they have traced the evolution of President Johnson's policy on South Viet Nam.

For example, on January 6, they wrote:

President Johnson has decided to "write off" South Viet Nam despite warnings from his military advisers that a U.S. withdrawal could mean the loss of all of South-east Asia.

The Columnists went on to say that this policy was decided by President Johnson in a conference at the LBJ Ranch with Senator Richard Russell (Dem.-Ga.), Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. The Johnson-Russell policy would include "a military smokescreen of tightly controlled tactical bombing raids in Laos and Communist North Viet Nam" so as "to cover its strategic retreat from South Viet Nam." In their Column of January 26, Messrs Scott and Allen claim that Mr. Johnson's Assistant, McGeorge Bundy, directs "these tightly controlled air raids."

At the same time, Messrs. Allen and Scott maintain that President Johnson "has secretly sent repeated messages through Moscow to Hanoi and Peking offering to withdraw U.S.

\*A Selection of extracts, reprinted with permission, from **Correction, Please!** and **A Review of The News** which is published weekly by Correction Please!, Inc., 395 Concord Ave., Belmont, Massachusetts 02178 U.S.A.

military advisers immediately in exchange for a military truce in South Viet Nam," and that Congressional leaders, who were briefed at the White House recently were told by Mr. Johnson that although his strategy "has failed to produce the expected results," he plans to continue it temporarily.

The widely circulated views of Messrs. Allen and Scott have not been subject to denials by President Johnson, Senator Russell, or Mr. Bundy even though it is indicated that an ally, South Viet Nam, is being deserted in favour of accommodation with the Communists.

Since Messrs. Allen and Scott made these serious charges, it has been announced that "trouble-shooter" McGeorge Bundy is being sent to South Viet Nam on a special mission. And the Soviet press has announced the forthcoming trip of Soviet Premier Kossygin to Hanoi, capital of North Viet Nam, with a stopover in Peking.

ITEM: From an Editorial in the *Providence [R.I.] Journal*, February 2 1965:

*To be sure, the expansion of any kind of Communist influence, be it Russian or Chinese, marks a set-back for the United States and its free world friends. But certainly it would be better to have the Soviets in Southeast Asia, challenging Chinese hegemony as we have been doing, rather than to see the strategic Southeast Asian peninsula fall into Chinese hands entirely, as now appears imminently possible.*

CORRECTION: The peoples of Southeast Asia would have difficulty in judging the relative merits of Soviet Communists vis-à-vis Chinese Communists. The source of torture, rape, pillage, and murder is of no consequence to the victim—the effects are the same.

ITEM: From a Column by Louis B. Fleming in the *Providence [R.I.] Journal-Bulletin*, January 4, 1965:

*Paul-Henri Spaak, Belgium's foreign minister, faced the question [racism] squarely in his addresses to the Council. He sensed not only the bitterness of the blacks but also the horror of the whites because of the Congo atrocities.*

*"Since the Second World War," Spaak said, "the whites, sad to say, may no longer give advice or lessons in the matter of human horror. Since Buchenwald and Auschwitz, no one of the white race has any right to give advice or lessons."*

CORRECTION: Paul-Henri Spaak's nation of Belgium surrendered to the Nazi regime on May 28, 1940. From October, 1941 through the year 1946, the United States armed forces suffered more than one million casualties in war against the Nazi authors of Buchenwald and Auschwitz and their allies. Such sacrifices certainly do not bespeak approval by any racial strain in the United States for Buchenwald and Auschwitz nor preclude Americans from criticising cannibalism or the other atrocities committed against Blacks and Whites in The Congo or anywhere else.

THE AUSTRALIAN PRESS (continued from page 1)

you gave a simple but, I believe, accurate summary of the politics which underlie the present debacle in South Vietnam. Sir Isaac Newton gave a simple explanation of the movements of celestial bodies. In general, the ability to take a simple view of a complex situation springs from superior mental ability combined with a profound knowledge of the situation. So that when you say in connection with this letter to you that Mr. Waller takes a simple view of politics, I hope you are not dismissing what he has to say as of no account. I have no doubt that he

could develop the simple view he expressed in his letter to any degree of complexity suitable for a particular occasion.

The Vietcong are Communists, and systematic terror an openly admitted strategy of Communism's openly admitted objective of world conquest. Another strategy is total psychological warfare, carefully taught in schools established for the purpose. Your caption, if it is yours, to the picture of which Mr. Waller complained, (Letters February 12) bears plainly the hall-marks of Communist psychological warfare. It is completely misleading to readers who are not familiar with the methods of Communism and the facts of the situation in Vietnam. If the Vietnam war were more obviously our war, the use of Communist inspired captions and phrases would be called giving aid to the enemy.

We were assured by the late President Kennedy, and by numerous top-ranking officials since, that the defence of South Vietnam is vital to the security of the United States. You yourself referred to "terrifying possibilities". What makes the possibilities—not to say the probabilities—terrifying is the proclaimed Communist intention.

I doubt if anyone would describe the situation in the Congo, in Laos, or in Angola as simple. But what is true is that Communism fights on every front and every issue it can exploit in the service of its ultimate aim. If the late President Kennedy was right, then we have to fight back, *for our lives*, and had better study, understand, and use the methods of psychological warfare. And civilian political stability will be achieved in Vietnam and elsewhere after, and not before, Communism is defeated, as the Hungarians and others tell us.

B. W. MONAHAN.

Red Hill.

### Puppets?

The *New York Herald Tribune* (4th February, 1965) reports that President Johnson was on 3rd February, at Washington, "honoured by the Anti-Defamation League, a branch of the Jewish fraternal organisation B'nai B'rith for 'distinguished contributions to the enrichment of our democratic heritage'."

It was on this occasion that the President said he would like to visit the Soviet Union in 1965 and that he hoped the new Soviet leadership would return the visit before the end of the year. "I am hopeful," he is reported to have said, "that such an exchange of visits would assure an anxious world that our two nations are each striving towards the goal of peace."

In "The Defeat of Communism" (Ludgate Press Limited, London, 1964), the author, D. G. Stewart-Smith writes (Part II, Chapter VI, "What is to be Done?", p. 423, ". . . Others advocate that the heads of Western Governments should meet the Communist leaders at short private meetings, in the belief that they can persuade them to renounce their lifelong ideology. This type of 'tourism' in which Western politicians fly to Communist capitals merely results in the 'vodka visitor' mouthing Communist peaceful co-existence slogans as puppets of soviet psychological warfare . . ."

### U.N.O.

The list of United Nations Organisation personnel, originally published in *The Social Crediter* of 18th July, 1964, has been reprinted as a single sheet.

Price 2s. 6d. a dozen including postage.

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

Printed by E. Fish & Co. Ltd., Liverpool.