

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 46 No. 23

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1967

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

War: The Laboratory of Truth

THE FOLLOWING SATIRE WHICH WE ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED IN 1946 IS REPRINTED FOR THE BENEFIT OF OUR NEWER READERS:

These imaginary scenes of 1920 are reproduced with a few small alterations, from the issues of "The Nation" published in the last quarter of the year 1917 and the author desires to express his thanks to the Proprietors and the Editor of that paper for permission to collect and present them in this new form.

In one of my early voyages of discovery amid the warrens of the war-bureaucracy, I came upon Paston, whom I had left some years ago at Oxford, a young philosophy don, one of the brightest and most enthusiastic exponents of the Pragmatist gospel. He explained to me that he had chucked the 'Varsity and was engaged in war-work. Seeing me smile and guessing the cause (for Paston had been President of the Norman Angell Club) he thought some explanation was desirable, and urged me to come into his "hut" and have a talk. I gladly accepted the invitation for I was interested to learn what line of war-work could have attracted Paston.

Pretending to be surprised at my surprise, he spun out quite a convincing story. "Why, the war brought me the chance of a hundred life-times. I might have spent all the remainder of my days grinding out futile plausibilities in that fusty old place without ever discovering the glorious significance of Pragmatism if it hadn't been for the war." "But what," I interjected, "can the war have to do with Pragmatism?" "Why just everything," he replied. "Of course I remember you didn't take Greats but you must have gathered in a general way what Pragmatism means."

"Why, yes," I replied, "I gathered that you Pragmatists held that the actual world of experience was a sort of jelly on which a man stamped his own meaning and personal purposes and that the truth of any statement depended on whether it worked." "Yes," he broke in "You've got the gist of the idea quite right. Truth is what works. But works for what? The one weak spot in pre-war Pragmatism was its failure to give a really convincing answer to that question. With a sudden flash of illumination, war, the intensest of all human purposes, brought the needed answer. Truth is what helps to win the war. Directly I realised the supreme significance of this judgment, I saw also how famously it fitted on to that political philosophy of State Absolutism which came to us from Hobbes, not from the charlatan, Hegel, as the men of Balliol so falsely taught. I had discovered what Pragmatism was really 'for'. I felt myself a man with a mission, and immediately offered to put at the disposal of the Government a general scheme for the production and distribution of war-truth, substituting a really scientific method for the clumsy empiricism of their censorship and war-news department."

"Well, I gather that they took you on, though I must

say the project seems on first view to have an uncommonly German look. They have made you manager of a sort of Wahrheits-Fabrik I suppose from the large lettered inscription over your door 'Psychological Laboratory for the Preparation of War-Truth.' I must confess that your whole conception of war-truth is a little disturbing to an old-fashioned fogey like myself."

"Well," Paston spoke a little warmly, "we are all put upon war bread, why not war truth? If you reflect, you will realise that the analogy is just and even necessary. As Emerson so beautifully expresses it 'The laws above are sisters of the laws below.' It is, indeed, the philosophic harmony that gives validity to all our spiritual war-processes. This you would better understand if I explain the fuller military service of which I am only a divisional commander." "Well, go ahead," I replied, "it's all new to me, and I want to understand."

And then he launched into the whole story of the Conscriptio of Mind. "Though quite clearly in the conflict we had pretended to regard it as a War of Ideas, it took several years before we were really prepared as a nation to mobilise upon this basis. We didn't see at first that in a War of Ideas the State must have complete control over the intellectual and moral resources of the nation. So for some years we went fumbling on with departmental censorship, continually overlapping or tripping one another up, and allowing all sorts of damaging talk and writing to go on because of foolish distinction made in Parliament between suppression of news and suppression of opinion. A Pragmatist would have pointed out at once, of course, the utter absurdity of the distinction, as if there were any fact apart from its presentation and as if all presentation did not involve the personal equation of opinion. However, they went on some time suppressing and doctoring what they called 'news' and merely conniving at mob-violence for the suppression of inconvenient opinions.

"This loose sham-voluntarism lasted for several years before it was recognised how essential a war service it was to drill the whole intellectual and spiritual forces of the nation into complete harmony with the supreme purpose of a State at war. A joint conference of the leaders of the Churches, the Universities and the Press, was the instrument by which the War Council was at last induced to sanction a complete scheme of intellectual conscription, the natural concomitant of military and industrial conscription in that it placed the minds as well as the bodies of all persons under military discipline. Of course, in an informal sort of way, a good deal had already been done in our schools, universities and churches to bring them into line with the purpose of a patriotic culture, and a genuinely British Christianity. But much remained to be done, and I am vain enough to think that the word Pragmatism has proved of inestimable value, by supplying the really funda-

(continued on page 4 in column 2)

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.
Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1
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.

The Development of World Dominion

There is higher authority than ours for the observation that though one rose from the dead, yet would they not believe. Yet, to take only the period of history covered by the three hundred years since Cromwell, the evidence for the existence of a conscious organised, Evil Purpose in the world appears so overwhelming that it would seem axiomatic that mankind could have no prior interest than to root out its incarnations wherever found. Yet, so far as we can judge there is general though not universal apathy on the subject, and where there is not, the concern lacks focus.

It is probable that one factor in this situation is the identification of nations with the policies they appear to pursue. For nearly two hundred years, Germany has been the embodiment of this Evil Power, yet it is not intrinsically German. Russia appears to compete with the United States for possession of the Banners of Hell, yet Russians, as individuals, like Americans, are no doubt good, bad, and indifferent.

The situation is in fact not greatly dissimilar to the group psychology explored by Gustave le Bon in such books as *Psychologie de Peuples*, and, recognising this, we can see that a nation, considered as a group, is not rational; it is a force, not an intelligence; and therefore one nation or group after another can be used and manipulated by a concentrated Supernatural, Conscious Intelligence. The geographical shift of the Storm Centre in Europe from Spain to France, via Holland and England to Germany, and now to Russia is paralleled by the shift of certain activities, largely but not wholly Financial. This Storm Centre has, of course, its secondaries, its "Fifth Column" everywhere.

"Britain" is now apparently the target of the most venomous hatred by its manipulators, a position we have usurped from Imperial Russia; and the practical lesson to be learnt from this analysis is to direct our attention to the current Storm Centre. It is not in Russia, except as a fulcrum for Wall Street; Russia is finished; it is in New York.

—C. H. Douglas (Sept. 11, 1948.)

Cuba

AN ANALYSIS from *The Review of the News*,

JANUARY 11, 1967.

New Year's Day was the eighth anniversary of the Communist takeover of Cuba. For eight agonizing years the American public has had a front-row view of what happens when the international criminal conspiracy takes over a country—not some primitive, jungle ex-colony in Africa or Southeast Asia, but a tropical paradise in the Caribbean with a relatively high standard of living. The Cuba of 1958 was a booming free-enterprise economy in the throes of spectacular expansion. It was a mecca for American tourists and a lucrative place for American investment. And suddenly, it all came to an end on January 1, 1959.

Anyone who has studied the incredible details of the Communist capture of Cuba knows that it could never have happened without the complete and conscious connivance of persons in the highest positions of power and influence in the United States. This would include such members of the world-government power clique as Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, his successor Christian A. Herter, and Dulles' younger brother, Allen, head of the Central Intelligence Agency. It could also never have happened without the complete knowledge and approval of the Rockefellers, whose control of our foreign policy and interests in the Caribbean area—in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Venezuela—are such as to preclude any political development in that area not to their liking. It should be noted that before he became Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles was Chairman of the Board of the Rockefeller Foundation, that Christian A. Herter was married to the granddaughter of Charles Pratt, one of the founders with John D. Rockefeller of Standard Oil, and that Allen W. Dulles has been a Director of the Council on Foreign Relations—a Rockefeller front organization—since 1928. There is no question that all three men knew who Castro was and what he was doing. It should never be forgotten that it was President Eisenhower's suspension of all arms deliveries to the Batista government in March of 1958 which spelled doom to any further opposition to the Castro takeover. John Foster Dulles, one of the prime movers of the world-government conspiracy, was our Secretary of State. Our present foreign-policy guide, incidentally, who has permitted the Communists to consolidate their Gibraltar in the Caribbean, is none other than Dean Rusk, President of the Rockefeller Foundation from 1952 to 1960.

The major culprit in making sure that the American people didn't know what was going on, however, was the *New York Times*, whose present Chairman of the Board, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, has been a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation since April, 1939. It was Herbert L. Matthews, a member of the editorial board of the *Times*, who wrote numerous articles in Castro's favour, thus influencing an important segment of American public opinion in the wrong direction. For example, as late as July 16, 1959, after Castro had been in power for six months and had been denounced as a Communist by his own Air Force Chief, Major Pedro Luis Diaz Lanz, who had defected and testified before the Congress of the United States, Matthews wrote in the *Times*:

This is not a Communist revolution in any sense of the word and there are no Communists in positions of control . . .

The accusations of the former head of the Cuban Air Force, Maj. Pedro Luis Diaz Lanz, before the United States Internal Security subcommittee are rejected by virtually all Cubans. It is stated here that before his resignation Major Diaz was removed from his high post for incompetence, extravagance and nepotism . . .

There seem to be very few in Cuba—and one need have no hesitation in saying this—who believe Fidel Castro is a Communist, is under Communist influence or is a dupe of Communism. The problem of communism, which aroused little interest in Cuba until Americans picked it up, can be easily summarized. The point of view among the most experienced and knowledgeable Cubans is as follows:

There are no Reds in the Cabinet and none in high positions in the Government or army in the sense of being able to control either governmental or defense policies. The only power worth considering in Cuba is in the hands of Premier Castro, who is not only not Communist but decidedly anti-Communist, even though he does not consider it desirable in the present circumstances to attack or destroy the Reds—as he is in a position to do any time he wants . . .

The rest of Mr. Matthews' article was as nauseating as the portion we have quoted. Of course, two years later, on December 3, 1961, the *New York Times* was forced to print a story which just about branded Mr. Matthews as a purveyor of lies and misinformation. That story was as follows:

Havana, Dec. 2 (UPI)—Premier Castro explained in this speech today that he had hidden his belief in communism from the Cuban people and from his American friends for years "because otherwise we might have alienated the bourgeoisie and other forces which we knew we would eventually have to fight."

Referring to his policy of keeping secret his belief in Marxism during the early days of the revolution, he said:

"If it were known then that the men who led the guerrilla fighting had radical ideas, well, all those who are making war against us now would have started it right then."

He said that the "first thing for revolutionaries to do, right after winning out, is to smash the machinery of the old régime as I learned by reading Lenin's book, 'State and Revolution.'"

In other words, Major Diaz had been right and Matthews had been wrong, and one would have thought that after that, the *New York Times*, and especially Mr. Matthews, would have apologized to its readers and learned something of a lesson about Communist takeovers. However, no such apology or reassessment of Communist strategy took place. Matthews, who then spoke before a group of journalists at the Overseas Press Club four days later, was quoted by the *New York Herald Tribune* of December 7, 1961, as saying:

"I don't believe anything he says. He's fantastic, incredible. Today Castro may believe he's a Communist, but tomorrow he may believe something else. I don't think you can give him a label. He's too wild, too disorganized."

If Mr. Matthews couldn't believe Castro when he himself admitted that he had been a Communist all along, then why should we go on believing Mr. Matthews or the *New York Times*? The whole *raison d'être* of a newspaper is to report facts to readers who want to know what's going on in the world. Thus, when a top journalist tells us that he has no way of distinguishing fact from fiction, then perhaps he ought not to be a journalist but ought to be an astrologist. But eight years have gone by since Castro took over Cuba and Mr. Matthews is still a member of the editorial board of the *New York Times* and still writing about Castro. His latest offering on the bearded criminal appeared in the *Times* of January 2, 1967. What did Mr. Matthews have to say? Here is a sampling:

The Cuban revolution begins its ninth year today as a strong, completely Communistic, personalized and struggling state. [Good of you to admit it. Mr. Matthews.] . . .

It is understandably hard—and often impossible—for North Americans to contemplate Cuba with equanimity or objectivity [especially since you, Mr. Matthews, have been their source of information] . . .

Yet it is important for United States citizens to try to understand Cuba in her own terms and to realize that the picture is neither all black nor all white. [It's just red.] . . .

Nevertheless, the revolution exists [so does cancer] and as this anniversary proves, it is going on and on. It is better organized and stronger than ever . . . [which should make you very happy, Mr. Matthews.]

The history of the past eight years is as confusing as it is dramatic [confusing only to your readers, Mr. Matthews]. Fidel Castro and his associates came into power full of ideals and a grim determination to help the people by making a drastic social revolution. [Really, Herbert, how dumb do you think we are?] However, the little group that wielded power under the complete and personal domination of Castro were ignorant of economics, finance, politics and government administration. [They knew enough to be able to take power from all of the politicians, administrators, property owners and bank presidents—with your help, Herbert.] They found it easy to destroy the existing social, economic and political structure [using Lenin's blueprint, "State and Revolution"]; but when it came to creating a new one there was an appalling series of blunders [tsk, tsk].

Castro, who became a Communist and led his revolution into the Communist camp at some period in 1960, even today, is far more of a revolutionary than he is an orthodox Communist by any European or Chinese standard.

And so, as we see, Mr. Matthews is still at it, and he knows it. Mr. Sulzberger also knows it, but doesn't seem to mind. We know it and don't like it. We don't like to be "informed" by the *New York Times* that Castro became a Communist in 1960, when the slightest bit of research, such as opening a book, will show you that Castro was already engaged in Communist revolutionary activity as early as 1948. Nathaniel Weyl devoted an entire chapter of his book, *Red Star Over Cuba*, to Castro's early involvement. He wrote:

The Bogota uprising of 1948 was the arena in which Fidel Castro played his first serious role as an instigator and organizer of Communist insurrection. At the time, he was 21 years old and a student in the faculty of laws of Havana University. He had been exposed to Communist indoctrination for the past two years, had accepted Marxian ideology eagerly and had probably submitted himself to Communist discipline. On this last point, there is some difference of opinion. Undoubtedly, Mr. Weyl had had Herbert Matthews in mind. Nevertheless, he goes on to inform us:

Security Chief Nino [of Colombia] lists the following as foreign Communists implicated in the preparations for the Bogota insurrection: Salvador Ocampo, Machado, Luis Fernandez Juan, Eugene Kerbaul, Milorad Pesic B., Frances MacKinnon Damon, Blas Roca, Rafael del Pino and Fidel Alejandro Castro.

In terms of Red hierarchy, Castro was in distinguished company, for most of the nine alleged agents named by Nino were veteran Communists and either responsible Party leaders or seasoned Soviet agents.

Mr. Weyl goes on for several pages citing detail after detail of Castro's participation in this Communist insurrection. We are sure that Mr. Matthews is thoroughly familiar with all of the facts. Considering that he is an experienced journalist, an "expert" on Latin America, and attached to the editorial board of the world's most authoritative newspaper, Mr. Matthews could not afford not to know what was in Mr. Weyl's book, particularly since Mr. Weyl had devoted a considerable number of pages to exposing Mr. Matthews. Thus, one might ask: is the *Times* in the habit of paying "journalists" high salaries for misinforming its readers? The answer is yes. Also, one might ask, would the Rockefellerers, with their billions at stake, pay anyone to misinform them? The answer is clearly no. But there is no doubt that they are quite interested in misinforming just about everybody else.

Invasion of Red China?

Tokyo, January 10—Taiwan-based Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek expresses an eagerness to invade the Chinese mainland with his 600,000-man army if the current turmoil sweeping Red China gives him an opportunity to do so according to newsmen here in Japan.

Washington, January 10—State Department Press Officer Robert J. McClosky tells newsmen that the United States is unaware of any plans by the Nationalist Chinese to invade the mainland. Furthermore American policy regarding Chiang and the mainland is still based on an exchange of notes in 1954 between Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and his Nationalist Chinese counterpart, says McClosky. In the exchange both governments agreed that "Use of force will be a matter of joint agreement subject to action of the enemy . . . the character of which clearly exercises the inherent right of selfdefence." The notes were signed on December 10, 1954, eight days after the United States and Nationalist China signed a mutual security pact.

—*The Review of The News, Jan. 18, 1967.*

The Truth in Time IF YOU WANT IT STRAIGHT . . .

2/6 per copy posted
K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Street, London E.11.

War: the Laboratory of Truth (continued from page 1)
mental conception without which even the most bellicose of Deans or the most abject Master of a College would have spent his patriotic efforts to little purpose."

"And pray, what is that conception?" I asked perceiving that Paston was still labouring with undischarged information.

"Well," he went on, "it is the simple notion that truth is a raw material, infinitely malleable and adaptable to purposes of State. Once grasp that notion, and the full potentialities of our Psychological Laboratory will become quite clear. We begin by accepting the familiar distinction, true for me, false for you. This idea of the relativity and adaptability of knowledge is then generalised and applied in the processes of our laboratory, for producing out of the same raw material the separate truths which war requires for the home consumer, the ally, the neutral and the enemy. The crude fact is the same for all; everything depends upon the treatment.

"You would be surprised to learn how quickly it becomes a matter of laboratory routine. Here is the 'stuff' and there the recipient mind upon which a particular war impression is to be made. Given the analysis of the recipient, it becomes merely a question of preparing and applying the requisite Alloy." "Alloy!" I exclaimed, "Do you mean that you deliberately falsify the facts?" "Not at all," he replied a little warmly, "you do injustice to the delicacy of our art. It is our duty to compose the sort of news which it is good for the respective parties to receive, and to mould the sentiments and opinions it is good for them to hold. And then, when our expert taster says that we have got it just right, it is pumped into the news-agencies and the other publicity machines."

(To be concluded)

Third World War

Additional copies of our last issue of *The Social Crediter*, containing this article, are available at specially reduced prices to enable wider distribution. A book list will be included.

6 copies 5/- 12 copies 7/6 25 copies 12/6

Step by Step

A Bird's-eye View of the Communist-Advance. Recently published in T.S.C. and now available as a leaflet.

3 copies for 1/3 6 copies for 2/- 12 copies for 3/3
Postage included

United Nations Packet

containing:

- 1 The Fearful Master by G. Edward Griffin 8/6
 - 2 The Bang-Jensen Tragedy by Julius Epstein 4/6
 - 3 46 Angry Men by the Katanga Doctors 8/3
 - 4 Congressional Comments on the U.N. (six speeches) 4/6
 - 5 More About the United Nations (five pamphlets) 4/6
- complete 16/6

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