

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 50. No. 16

SATURDAY, 31 OCTOBER, 1970

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

### TELESLICK

#### TELEVISION AND THE MASS SLICKS

By GARY ALLEN\*

"Communication is power", proclaimed Chairman Fulbright. He was talking about television, upon which the great masses of Americans rely so heavily for their hard news. This, despite the fact that such news is both distorted and limited. As Dean Burch, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, declared on 20 July, 1970: "The entire contents of a typical TV evening news show would take only three columns in a newspaper."

Even so, television in America has become almost as influential as the schools and churches in creating public opinion. There are in the United States an estimated 57.5 million homes with television, and somewhere between 40 and 50 million Americans watch television network news each night.

The ideological slant of television "news and commentary" has recently produced much indignant comment. But months before Spiro Agnew became a household word by shouting at the thunder of television's surf, a number of media newsmen had already complained to *TV Guide's* Edith Efron about the Leftist bent of their comrades. As Fred Freed of N.B.C. News put it:

*This generation of newsmen is a product of the New Deal. These beliefs that were sacred to the New Deal are the beliefs that news has grown on. This is true of the networks, of Newsweek, of the New York Times, of all media. Men of like mind are in the news. It's provincial. The blue-and-white collar people who are in revolt now do have cause for complaint against us. We've ignored their point of view. It's bad to pretend they don't exist. We did this because we tend to be upper-middle-class liberals . . .*

Bill Leonard of C.B.S. says that television newsmen are not only "Liberals", but they are bad reporters. Speaking of his TV news colleagues, Leonard notes:

*Most reporting is lousy. It's lousy because people are lazy, because people don't think ahead, because they approach things in rote ways. We have these kinds of reporters here, unfortunately. The worst problem of all is the reporter who doesn't ask the next question — the cheap, lousy reporter who'll quote an attack but doesn't go to the other side because the answer might kill his story . . .*

The severest criticism of television's Leftist bias came from one of the least-expected sources, A.B.C. anchorman Howard K. Smith. Mr. Smith, who describes himself as "left of centre" and a "semi-socialist", is well remembered as the

commentator who brought Soviet spy Alger Hiss onto nationwide TV to discuss "The Political Death of Richard Nixon". Just what motivated Smith to become the Joe Valachi of the television industry, we do not pretend to know. The inference in his confession, published in *TV Guide*° for 28 February, 1970, is that while he is himself a "Liberal", he is not like some of his colleagues an *anti-American*. Interviewer Edith Efron writes of Smith:

*He is generally in disagreement with political Conservatives on virtually everything. And, for that matter, he finds it psychologically easier to defend TV news departments than to criticise them. But on this issue of anti-American, pro-New-Left bias in the network news departments, his observations are identical to those coming from the right.*

*"Many of my colleagues," Smith says, "have the depth of a saucer. They cling to the tag 'Liberal' that grew popular in the time of Franklin Roosevelt, even though they've forgotten its content. They've really forgotten it. They don't know what 'liberal' and 'conservative' mean any more! They've forgotten it because the liberal cause has triumphed. Once it was hard to be a liberal. Today it's 'in'. The ex-underdogs, the ex-outcasts, the ex-rebels are satisfied bourgeois today, who pay 150 dollars a plate at Americans for Democratic Action dinners. They don't know what they stand for any more, and they're hunting for a new voice to give them new bearings".*

*The search for a "new voice", he says, has catapulted such men into the arms of the New Left. "They want to cling to the label 'liberal', and they cling to those who seem strong — namely, the New Left. The New Left shouts tirades, rather than offering reasoned arguments. People bow down to them, so they have come to seem strong, to seem sure of themselves. As a result,*

*(continued on page 4)*

\*From *American Opinion*, October 1970

° The enormously profitable *TV Guide* is owned by Walter Annenberg, Richard Nixon's Ambassador to the Court of St. James. Annenberg, who until recently was owner of the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, also inherited ownership of *The Daily Racing Form* from his father Moe, a quasi-hood who spent many years in prison as a result of conviction on tax evasion. Walter Annenberg is a recent addition to the board of directors of the Times-Mirror Company (*Los Angeles Times*, *Newsday*, etc.) along with Keith Funston (C.F.R.) former president of the New York Stock Exchange and a member of the conspiratorial Pilgrim Society.

# 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 45/-, Six months 22/6.

### 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., Secretary, H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

Vol. 50. No. 16

Saturday, 31 October, 1970

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

The American John Birch Society, like the Social Credit Secretariat, is a non-class, non-party organisation pursuing a definite policy without seeking power. That policy is: less government, more individual responsibility, and towards a better world. As the Society sees it, that policy is blocked by the existence of an international Conspiracy, including but not co-extensive with the International Communist Conspiracy: the latter is *part* of the former, but the most visible and identifiable part. The more important and almost invisible part is made up of International Finance, global cartels controlling industry and vital raw materials on an international level, and various mysterious personages referred to by the Society as INSIDERS. Some of these are known and have been exposed. What is not known is the nature and location of the inner Directorate, although both to a certain degree may be circumscribed.

The strategy of the Society is to remove the block. The method is by spreading an understanding of the Conspiracy as widely as possible, exposing such INSIDERS as can be identified, and encouraging and supporting patriotism. This is a long-term strategy, and of its very nature, unspectacular. But it has been patiently and faithfully pursued now for nearly eleven years, and is supported by an extensive paid staff to provide the necessary organisation and leadership for such a sustained effort.

The near anarchy in many parts of America is beyond question the outcome of the Conspiracy. The Communists provide the *organisation* which exploits the genuine grievances which are provoked by successive Governments which, while not comprising the Conspiracy, are effectively controlled by it — in the opinion of the Secretariat, mainly by financial means, but greatly aided by infiltration of the educational establishments from which proceed the “advisers” who are so important a part of Government.

The Society issues a monthly *Bulletin* (which is available by subscription to non-Members) and these reveal that the Society has pursued an undeviating course, despite monstrous and determined efforts to wreck the Society. And yet, conditions are obviously much worse than when the Society was founded.

But the foreword to the October *American Opinion* announces: “America is electric with a new mood. A new patriotism is fairly racing among her people . . . It is a runaway thing — beyond the control of the media and the politicians and the professors. Well out of control . . . Yes, our people are alive with a quickening patriotism, a renewed commitment to our land and the defence of her traditions. And, as the mood swells, America is identifying her enemies. Such enemies as those who tax millions from the people to finance guerrillas in our midst, and radicals of the Establishment Press who attack our every decency and moral value. America is at last *facing* her enemies. And, though they are far from defeated, they are no longer safe.”

They would be even less safe if the British Government would challenge the financial thrall which governs the actions of that Government, because such a challenge would force the INSIDERS into a more exposed position. As Major Douglas foresaw so long ago, the elimination of the British Empire was a major objective of the Conspiracy, because the character and institutions of the Anglo-Saxon were the great barrier to World Government. A challenge to international financial authority, combined with an exposure of the steps by which the elimination of the Empire was accomplished — the Government must have access to the vital documents of the period — might detonate American public opinion, so that the traitors in government would be forced out to be replaced by patriots. Then a determination to really use, to any extent necessary, American military supremacy would destroy the Soviet *military* threat. For it is the *pretence* — an essential component of the Conspiracy — that we are in danger of nuclear annihilation which is enabling the ‘peaceful’ penetration of Soviet forces into the key strategic areas of the world. In its *inception*, the Middle East ‘crisis’, represented to us daily as being the very brink of war, is completely phoney. It enables Moscow and Washington to join forces “to see that major war does not break out in the Middle East”. If anyone thinks that the Russians are in the Middle East to protect the Arabs against Israel, he should go back to the kindergarten and avoid government-controlled ‘education’ when he leaves it. *Israel* is in the Middle East to provide the pretext for the Soviet presence — a presence which, no doubt, will be strengthened with President Nasser’s timely death. For Moscow and Washington, together, are determined that disorder must not spread. In other words, OUTSIDERS *keep out*.

Nearly three vital years have gone down the drain since the Republic of South Africa was offered an opportunity of upsetting the timetable of this dreadful ploy; but it has gone relentlessly on. In this time we have had the build-up of Soviet naval power in the Mediterranean; the strategic deployment of Soviet forces in the heart of Europe, under cover of the ‘occupation’ of Czechoslovakia; the installation of a crypto-Communist Government in ‘West’ Germany; the signing of the Moscow-Bonn agreement, and now the U.S.-U.S.S.R. ‘understanding’ concerning the Middle East.

As reported in the *Daily Telegraph*, 16 September, 1970, “Allied forces in Europe are growing weaker while Soviet military strength is increasing and ‘exceeds anything the world has previously seen’, Gen. Andrew J. Goodpaster, Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, said in Dusseldorf, West Germany, yesterday”. The General added: “Before our

very eyes, but with all too little recognition of the consequences, a shift in the balance of security is occurring". The real question is, has the shift already gone beyond the point of redress? It probably has, and if so, only a real challenge to international financial control, through which, in general, this "shift" has been accomplished, offers any hope at all. For, the very last thing the INSIDERS want is full-scale war, which would end them, and their expectation of ultimate World Dominion, for ever. the nuclear "stalemate" is the last opportunity for Britain to act independently before nuclear MONOPOLY is declared. And there, we really are on the brink.

\* \* \*

There appears to be something in the British character which makes Britons averse to entertaining the idea of, and even more to mentioning the word, "conspiracy". When Mr. Enoch Powell merely hinted at such a thing in the Public Service, *The Times* came close to writing him off as a madman. This aversion is probably an aspect of the Anglo-Saxon character whose great achievement was to bring about and develop the British Empire, perhaps the greatest achievement of civilisation.

With what, these days, can only be called rare courage, and no doubt springing from a sense of patriotism too evidently lacking in a great many politicians whose chief concern appears to be to rise in the Party hierarchy, Mr. Angus Maude, M.P., has contributed an article on the idea of international conspiracy to the *Sunday Express*; it was published on 20 Sept., 1970. Mr. Maude accepts, or appears to do so, the 'split' in the Communist world: "The strange blend of Mao-ism and anarchism to be found in some of the utterances of 'protest' leaders . . . and discernible also among extremist industrial militants — owes nothing at all to the conventional Leninists of the Kremlin.

"But someone, somewhere, is keeping the pot boiling, and providing a fair amount of money to support a travelling troupe of young agitators who turn up with suspicious promptness anywhere that seems ripe for trouble" . . .

"Is it not remarkable that the Palestinian guerrillas should suddenly have achieved an unprecedented feat of co-ordination and efficiency in a skyjacking operation that has convulsed the Western world and thrown the whole Middle East back into the melting pot?"

But elsewhere Mr. Maude says: "The fact remains that the disintegration of Western societies has always been an object of Communist policy". We should add, that it still remains an object of International Communist policy, as a step towards replacing Western societies — a policy so successful that the Chinese-Russian 'split' was an essential strategic step to confuse the world as to the ultimate responsibility for that policy. Sir John Glubb's observation concerning "Russia's recent assumption of a dominating position in the Middle East by the use of armed forces but without firing a shot", that "The art of using diplomacy and armed strength together as a single integrated system is one requiring great skill and a high standard of technical proficiency", is entirely applicable to the "kind of pattern in the spread of violence and subversion, and particularly in the timing of outbreaks of disorder in various parts of the world" with which Mr. Maude is concerned.

If the "strange blend of Mao-ism and anarchism" owes nothing to the conventional Leninists in the Kremlin, it could only be because they have repudiated Leninism; but even this would only apply to the "blend", not the *pattern*. "Throwing the whole Middle East problem back into the melting pot" could only conceivably be to the advantage of the Arabs, who are those killed and to be killed in the slaughter. But it is Russia that has recently assumed "a dominating position in the Middle East". Student and other riots do not advantage student or coloured people or religious sects, but they may "disintegrate Western societies"; and the Communists, as organised and directed by and from the Kremlin — the operational headquarters of the "internationally organised conspiracy" are organised and ready to impose a New Order on the disintegrated remains of the Old Order: Christian Civilisation.

We hope that Mr. Maude will read the Note beginning on page 14 of *The Moving Storm*, or even the whole of it, and *The Development of World Dominion* too. And then perhaps he would consider gathering a few informed Members of the House of Commons to enforce a debate to ensure that what he suggests should be done is done: "Is it not time that Government leaders everywhere revealed a little more of what they know or suspect . . . If the threat is real, let us all take it seriously and be on our guard". If *all* were revealed, we might be saved. But it had better be soon.

## ATROCITIES AT LARGE

The *Church Times* gives prominent notice to the "first news of a massacre by Arabs of twenty-seven Christian refugees in the Southern Sudan" (4 Sept., 1970), adding that according to the Southern Sudan Association press-release, from which it quotes, "the Arabs had already killed several people they met on the way". The same source received a letter from a Norwegian television team, returned from filming in the Southern Sudan, which included the extract, "We saw shocking things indeed and I am convinced that the Arabs are committing what we call genocide in the Southern Sudan". And of course, for good measure, we need to recall the Arabs of Zanzibar who received shocking treatment a few years ago.

But despite the massacres and civil wars that have tormented the African continent, the World Council of Churches has granted £83,330 to anti-apartheid groups "including guerrilla organisations in Africa" (*Daily Telegraph*, 3 Sept., 1970). No wonder that South Africans have reacted sharply, that Mr. Vorster has urged the country's churches "to reconsider their membership of the body", and that his foreign minister, Dr. Muller, has said that it was "beyond comprehension how the Council could reconcile its decisions with Christian principles". Curiously enough, the views of the Rev. J. D. Vorster, Actuary of the Dutch Reformed Church, on the World Council are cut short in my newspaper: "It subscribes to what is known as the . . ." and the next line fails to appear. But Anglican leaders, including the Rt. Rev. A. H. Zulu, a president of the World Council, all condemn the decision to support the guerrillas. The Church of England makes an annual grant of £9,280 to the World Council.

The choirmaster of Stonegate Parish Church, Sussex, writes to the *Daily Telegraph* (9 Sept., 1970) as one whose

experience as a foreign correspondent has brought him into close contact with several guerrilla organisations. All, he points out, "are dedicated to violence and terror. All have been responsible for the death, injury, mutilation or physical intimidation of innocent fellow Africans . . . Several have their recruits trained in Communist countries". And he notes that the only armed African movement, of which he also has direct experience, "which, with sustained courage is fighting for the survival of a Christian community on its own soil, namely the Southern Sudanese, is not included among these beneficiaries of the World Council of Churches". All of which makes quite obvious what the real and hideous intentions of the World Council of Churches must be — subversion, in a word, with a blind eye towards atrocities.

— H.S.

**Teleslick**

(continued from page 1)

*there's a gravitation to them by the liberals who are not sure of themselves. This has given the New Left grave power over the old Left". It is this New Left "power" over many of the Nation's liberal reporters, he says, that underlies an anti-American and pro-radical bias in network coverage . . .*

The remarkable Mr. Smith went so far as to confirm that the term "effete snobs", applied to television newsmen by the Vice-President fits media reporters like a pink glove. The self-proclaimed sophisticates of network news are, he said, seriously self-deluded about the intentions of the Communists. Howard Smith explains:

*Some (newsmen and commentators) have gone overboard in a wish to believe that our opponent has exclusively peaceful aims, and that there is no need for armaments and national security. The danger of Russian aggression is unreal to many of them, although some have begun to rethink since the invasion of Czechoslovakia. But there is a kind of basic bias in the left-wing soul that gives the Russians the benefit of the doubt.*

The Leftist bigotry of the networks is not unappreciated by the Communists. In his incredible book, *Do It!*, published by the Establishment firm of Simon and Schuster, self-proclaimed Communist Jerry Rubin writes that "every revolution needs a colour TV". He cites Walter Cronkite of C.B.S. News as "the S.D.S.'s best organiser", and goes on to cheer about the way Cronkite "brings out the map of the U.S. with circles around the campuses that blew up today". Rubin calls these the "battle reports". He notes that "the first 'student demonstration' flashed across the TV tubes of the nation as a myth in 1964. That year the first generation being raised from birth on TV was 9, 10, and 11 years old. 'First chance I get', they thought, 'I wanna do that too'. The first chance they got was when they got to junior high and high school five years later — 1969! And that was the year America's junior high and high schools exploded! . . . TV is raising generations of kids who want to grow up and become demonstrators".

Jerry Rubin calls television news "a commercial for the revolution". And, he knows what he is talking about.

Alan Dale is a well-known singer and television entertainer who has recently become a newspaper columnist and

television critic in New York. He noted in a recent column that the TV networks are a propaganda machine "engaged in psychological warfare against the American people". Alan Dale says the networks "are waging the greatest advertising campaign in history — selling the propaganda of the Left to our children". Mr. Dale lays it on the line:

*You believe that communism cannot co-exist with free nations. The philosophy and doctrine that is communism tells you that; the communist conquests and enslavement of the peoples of 28 nations tell you that; the communist leaders tell you that. But the voices of TV say there is nothing to fear from communism. Your children buy it!*

*You believe that Revolution must be resisted by loyalists, and that treason is punishable by death. But the voices of TV say treason is an American tradition called "dissent" and America was founded on Revolution. The voices of TV compare Americans with the British of 1776. You think that's insane, but your children buy it!*

*You believe that only criminals "shoot it out" with the police. But the voices of TV say that certain groups are justified to shoot it out with the police. These groups wear uniforms and have their own "minister of defence" within our own nation. You believe only a sucker would fall for that trick twice in 30 years. But the voices of TV say that the police should be investigated for participating in such a shoot-out. Your children buy it!*

*You know drugs have been around since you can remember, so you believe that it is the climate of permissiveness and indoctrination that is now turning on a generation, including your own children. But the voices of TV say that if YOU can drink, the kids can turn on. Your children buy it!*

*You believe that in a nuclear age we need defence against nuclear attack — that such defence has probably prevented World War III. The voices of TV say America should forget about missiles and defence. Your children buy it!*

*You believe that socialism and a "one-world order" mean the end of individuality and freedom. You believe that a "one world order" under socialism is the consummate dream of the communists. Your dictionary tells you that is correct. But the voices of TV say socialism and a "one-world order" will be the salvation of mankind. Your children buy it.*

If there is a fault in Alan Dale's analysis, it is that he under-rates the vulnerability of adult viewers. Many of them also buy the propaganda line. Most would not recognise a Communist plot if you showed them the grave of Karl Marx. The media sell Marxists to the public as innocent and idealistic reformers, even as they depict Conservative anti-Communists as diabolical conspirators.

(To be continued)

**SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY**

Correspondence should Temporarily be Addressed to:  
THE LIBRARIAN, c/o K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,  
245 CANN HALL ROAD, LONDON, E.11

Circular Press Limited, Colwyn Bay.