

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 51. No. 8.

SATURDAY, JULY 10, 1971

7p (1s. 5d.) Fortnightly

### NEW EDUCATION\*

#### The Radicals Are After Your Children

By GARY ALLEN

(continued)

Dr. George Counts soon wrote a book titled *Dare The Schools Build A New Social Order?* in which he spelled out openly how the Dewey "progressive education" would be used to build a Marxist Utopia in America. Here are his words:

*In the collectivist society now emerging the school should be regarded, not as an agency for lifting gifted individuals out of the class into which they were born and elevating them into favored positions where they may exploit their less-favored fellows, but rather as an agency for the abolition of all artificial social distinctions and of organizing the energies of the nation for the promotion of the general welfare . . . .*

*Throughout the school program the development of the social rather than the egotistic impulses should be stressed; and the motive of personal aggrandizement should be subordinated to social ends. In promotion practices, in school activities, in the relations of pupils and teachers and administrators, the ideal of a cooperative commonwealth should prevail . . . .*

*All of this applies quite as strictly to the nursery, kindergarten, and the elementary school as to the secondary school, the college, and the university.*

That John Dewey's "progressive education" was a scheme designed to infect students with Marxism is obliquely admitted by Dr. Counts, who explained the Dewey line as follows:

*If progressive education is to be genuinely progressive, it must emancipate itself from the influence [of the upper middle class], face squarely and courageously every social issue, come to grips with life in all of its stark reality, establish a theory of social welfare . . . .*

*You will say, no doubt, that I am flirting with the idea of indoctrination. And my answer is again in the affirmative . . . .*

None of the ideas of Dewey and his educationist satraps were unique. Historians are in agreement that they were largely based on the concepts of the French Illuminist, Jean Jacques Rousseau, who contributed so much to the philosophy of chaos which precipitated the bloody French Revolution. But "Liberals" have learned that calling something "new" or "progressive" will attract flocks of empty-headed social climbers who flutter forever after the latest asinine fad.

Even so, John Dewey and his colleagues, known as the "Frontier Thinkers", made little headway until they attracted the attention, and the financial support, of the powerful Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations. René Wormser, chief

counsel for the Reece Committee, which investigated foundations for the House of Representatives in the early Fifties, writes in his book, *Foundations: Their Power And Influence*:

*A very powerful complex of foundations and allied organizations has developed over the years to exercise a high degree of control over education. Part of this complex, and ultimately responsible for it, are the Rockefeller and Carnegie groups of foundations. The largest of the foundation giants, The Ford Foundation, is a late comer. It has now joined in the complex and its impact is tremendous; but the operations of the Carnegie and Rockefeller groups start way back.*

Popular misconception has it that Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller established their foundations as a charitable device to counter adverse public opinion resulting from their predatory business dealings. While this may have motivated some of their giving, both of these men had strong ulterior motives in using their money to influence what would be taught in America's public schools. ‡

Carnegie, in his book *Triumph Of Democracy*, reveals his dream of reuniting America with England. † He shared Cecil Rhodes' idea of a World Government dominated by England, and used his fortune to found the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in order to help promote that end. After Carnegie's death, his foundations came under the control of J. P. Morgan and his partners and colleagues, who installed Morgan deputy Nicholas Murray Butler as president of Columbia where Dewey and his nest of Marxists were carefully nurtured to promote British Fabian Socialism in America.

John D. Rockefeller put his assistant Fred Gates in charge of his General Education Board. Gates tipped the Rockefeller philosophy on education in the Board's *Occasional Paper No. 1*:

*In our dreams we have limitless resources and the people yield themselves with perfect docility to our moulding hands. The present educational conventions fade from our minds, and unhampered by tradition, we work our own good will upon a grateful and responsive rural folk.*

(continued on page 4)

\*From *American Opinion*, May, 1971.

‡See reprints of my monographs on "The C.F.R." and "Foundations And Tax-Free Cash" (with Harold Lord Varney), available from *American Opinion* at, respectively five and two for one dollar.

†A native of Scotland, Carnegie made millions out of the steel business in America but never became an American citizen.

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free: One year £2.60 (52/-), Six months £1.30 (26/-).

### Offices—

Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11. Tel. 01-534 7395  
Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Tel. 01-387-3893

### IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001  
Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001 (Editorial Head Office)

## THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2603. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougement, P.Q., General Deputy Chairman and Secretary, H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

*It does not matter what happens to the Indians.* "Indians" means the various peoples who are indigenous to the sub-continent of India, largely segregated into 'Indians' and 'Pakistanis'. That it does not matter what happens to peoples as peoples is the fundamental mechanism of the World Revolution; as Douglas wrote so many years ago, its promoters "care no more for the immolation of the peoples of a continent than for the death of a sparrow". It is worth recalling this in the context of the ghastly tragedy in Bengal, now unfolding. It was foreseeable, and was foreseen. But worse, it was premeditated, if not in detail, at least in principle.

Anti-colonialism never was a movement for the benefit of oppressed peoples. It was and remains a strategy for the downfall of the strong and independent national powers who, contrary to what propaganda teaches, poured great wealth into undeveloped areas of the world. This was not done primarily for altruistic reasons; but the long-range effects were altruistic. The industrialisation of India, with all the ancillary services—sanitation, communications, land reclamation, irrigation, all to the immense benefit of the indigenous populations—was achieved *at cost to the British*; and on the independence and partition of 'India', Britain was supposed to owe her—or them—£1,500,000,000 sterling at 1948 values.

None of this is referred to in connection with the current tragedy of Pakistan and Bengal, and ultimately, perhaps, of the whole sub-continent. The tragedy is being exploited to make political capital for the Socialists, by way of demands for more 'aid' and relief, although the present catastrophe is largely attributable to monetary aid given after the undermining and destruction of a colonial administration which, as Douglas said, was once the envy of the world.

It is most improbable that the damage achieved in 'India' can be rectified, anyway within several generations. But the lesson ought to be immediate. *The objective of the anti-apartheid demonstrations is precisely the same as the objective in 'India'*—the destruction of civilisations at least founded on Graeco-Roman-Christian principles and traditions, and more particularly, the Anglo-Saxon incarnation of them. Southern Africa, and to a much lesser extent Australia

and New Zealand, are the last remaining enclaves of this independent tradition, and traitors (most, no doubt, brain-washed and often drugged dupes) within, and enemies without, are rapidly undermining their position.

It is simply to be blind to the history of the past 25 years to suppose that the granting of 'majority rule' in Southern Africa would not be followed by blood-baths, destruction, and disease. The same is true of Papua-New Guinea, where even the native peoples are fearful of what the Australian Socialists will do when they gain power.

The history of these times is simply the increasingly visible history of the most gigantic Conspiracy in all History. It is gigantic not so much in intent, for World Power in the context of the times has always been an aspiration of one Power-Grouping after another. The contemporary gigantism is a function of the unprecedented means available for its achievement. It no longer seems worthwhile to re-iterate in these pages the steps by which the present catastrophic situation has been brought about. But current events—the manoeuvrings to subjugate Britain to the Treaty of Rome; the steady deterioration in Black Africa; the defeat of the U.S.A. in Indo-China; the dissolution of 'India'; the situation in the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean; the foreshadowed re-opening of the Suez Canal, which is now of almost exclusive value to 'Russia'; street revolution and anarchy in the U.S.A.; the likely withdrawal of American forces in Europe (the Americans to physically withdraw across the ocean, while the Russians, as a token, withdraw from the frontiers, while leaving their logistic arrangements intact)—all this and more form a background against which the books *Development of World Dominion*, *The Moving Storm*, and the forthcoming *The Survival of Britain* might well be carefully studied. It is exceedingly late in the day; but the John Birch Society in the U.S.A., which has survived massive attempts to destroy it, but which is stronger and more widely based than ever, may yet turn the tide, and against that possibility, the more people everywhere who are correctly informed as to the real political situation, the better.

One of the 'conditions' of Britain's entry to the Common Market is that she should contribute hundreds of millions of money to the European budget. What is she supposed to get in return? What can the Commission, or the Council of Ministers, do for Britain that she cannot do for herself? The advantages of 'joining' seem so far to be quite hypothetical, or else negative—i.e., that some unspecified (or in the case of *The Times*, specified) disaster will befall her if she remains 'outside'. It is high time that a demand should be made in Parliament for an advance accounting of the 'benefits' to balance those millions of pounds.

The European 'Community' is a form of Federation, and the history of Federation has always been the steady usurpation of power at the expense of the autonomy of the constituent members. In Australia and Canada the States and Provinces are mendicants. The Federal Governments produce nothing but increasingly restrictive Laws, although they do provide 'employment' for ever-expanding and non-productive bureaucracies, and build palatial offices to house them, with *materials* furnished by the States.

Of course, if France and Germany would only go to war with each other—excluding the use of nuclear weapons—

Britain could have a wonderful market in the export of munitions, and could become rich again, even once more a creditor nation. And what a market in raw materials that would provide for the Dominions! But this prospect exposes the essential nonsense of the whole idea of the Common Market which, for Britain, represents 'victory' for Europe, and the Treaty of Rome a sort of Treaty of Versailles in reverse, with Britain's 'contribution' to the European Budget a form of reparations, to be spent in Europe for the benefit of Europe, or anyway for the benefit of Eurocrats.

A thorough-going reciprocal trading arrangement between Britain and the Dominions, based on a common if attenuated Anglo-Saxon culture and tradition, could undoubtedly create a magnificent "co-prosperity sphere"—but also, of course, a barrier to World Dominion—a barrier which it took two world wars to demolish. The inclusion of Southern Africa in such an arrangement would constitute such a "third" world power, at least economically, as 'Europe' is supposed to become. Of course, such an attempt might invoke military sanctions, for the One-Worlders do not contemplate being thwarted on the eve of victory; but against this should be set the fact that nuclear war really is dangerous to the One-Worlders, so that the credible threat of its use should prove a sufficient umbrella for a realistic economic restitution along the lines suggested. One atomic bomb or missile on Brussels would be finish for the European Commission. That would still leave Moscow and Washington, but their position in the overall Conspiracy would be more exposed.

To judge by *communiqués* issued by various Dominion officials from time to time, an English-speaking communism based on a regard for common interests both in trade and tradition would be more than welcome. Britain's craven attempt to crawl into the Common Market is widely regarded as a sell-out to the more than half-way there of the Communism of Europe, where the Brezhnev Doctrine stands ready to enforce the obligations under the Treaty of Rome.

### THE DEVELOPMENT OF WORLD DOMINION

By C. H. DOUGLAS

The selection of commentaries comprising this very important book make it unique among Douglas's works, and highly relevant to the current situation.

Paper cover 66p (13/2) (posted) — Hard cover £1.33 (26/7) (posted)

### THE MOVING STORM

Contemporaneous commentaries on linked events of 1964-1968, with an Introduction on historical significance by Bryan W. Monahan.

Paper cover 66p (13/2) (posted) — Hard cover £1.33 (26/7) (posted)

### THE SURVIVAL OF BRITAIN

PRICE £1.10p (Cloth Bound) AVAILABLE SHORTLY

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

## Counter-subversion

South America brings to mind kidnapping, terrorists and Red Chile, but a society called TFP recently held its third week "For Anti-communist Education" in Sao Paulo, Brazil, attended by students from 25 cities in 14 states of the Union, and by "dozens of youths" from 7 other South American countries, including Chile. The President, Professor de Oliveira, spoke of "the perennial values of Christian Civilisation". (TFP Press Release No. 3, 1971). Consul Gomide visited the TFP headquarters after his release by the Uruguayan Tupamaros.

Professor de Oliveira complains, in the same Release, that the Vatican Broadcasting Station has on occasion replaced its usual "Christus vincit" with the modern "Jesus Christ, Superstar", degrading him to a "mere actor, a superactor". *The Canadian Churchman* (April, 1971) describes its authors as "former Anglicans" and the Canadian Bishop Hunt calls much of it "brilliant". From the jingle quoted, I should rather side with the Brazilian professor.

The Professor goes on to contrast the attitude of the Polish bishops to their government. ("We want to collaborate. . .") with that of the National Conference of the Bishops of Brazil towards Bishop Calheiros, suspected of subversion. Father Comblin, "a subversive", or the Dominican fathers "involved in subversive activities". And he asks, "Two weights, two measures, aren't they?" He mentions the "excellent economic development index attained by the government" of Brazil where this subversion is nevertheless taking place.

Another article tells of groups of rebel priests—"the priests for the third world" in Argentina and the Golconda group in Colombia—who form the "spearhead of subversion" in Latin America. One of the Golconda group was killed by his own comrades. Fortunately the TFP is active in Argentina, Chile and Uruguay while similar organisations work in Equador, Colombia, Peru and Venezuela. One hopes that these significant guardians of their own heritage may be open to ideas of realism as advocated here.

The Rev. G. H. Nicholson, Rector of Burghfield, Berks., also strikes against subversion in his publication *The Terror of the Days to Come*, tracing it through Adam Weishaupt who founded the Illuminati in 1773, Anschal (Rothschild), Marx, the Fabians and other conspirators who "poured scorn on the Christian faith, Christian ethics, patriotism and culture". He has a remarkable quotation from Winston Churchill about "this world conspiracy", of 1920. Brian Williams, in addition to his *Shock Report on Palestine* has issued a pamphlet on *The Plot Against the Throne*, which contains 42 points of the communist take-over. "Every conceivable means", he writes, "is being used to deprave our morals, destroy our Christian heritage, debase our Monarchy". He also reproduces an unpleasant cartoon of the Queen from the *Black Dwarf*, part-edited by Tariq Ali, a paper which calls for the violent overthrow of law and order, and a fine portrait of the Queen on the front of his publication.

We may further note that the Portuguese have withdrawn from UNESCO and dealt with the "White Fathers" in Mozambique, of whom one "recruited people for terrorism and another insulted the Portuguese flag". (*Daily Telegraph*, May 29, 1971.)

—H.S.

**New Education***(continued from page 1)*

Later, the General Education Board expanded its horizons to take into its "moulding hands" the city folk as well. To this end the Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations, which often had interlocking directorates and many times acted in unison, began in the early Thirties to back Dewey and his Marxist educationists with enormous amounts of money. As René Wormser observes:

*Research and experimental stations were established at selected universities, notably Columbia, Stanford, and Chicago. Here some of the worst mischief in recent education was born. In these Rockefeller-and-Carnegie-established vineyards worked many of the principal characters in the story of the suborning of American education. Here foundations nurtured some of the most ardent academic advocates of upsetting the American system and supplanting it with a Socialist state . . . .*

*Whatever its earlier origins or manifestations, there is little doubt that the radical movement in education was accelerated by an organized Socialist movement in the United States . . . .*

At the same time the National Education Association, the country's chief education lobby, was also financed largely by the Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations. It too threw its considerable weight behind the Dewey philosophies. As an N.E.A. report maintained in 1934:

*A dying laissez faire must be completely destroyed and all of us, including the "owners", must be subjected to a large degree of social control.*

Traditionalist teachers, who had been strongly resisting Deweyism, were soon swamped by education propagandists backed with a flood of Rockefeller-Carnegie dollars. In 1934, the Carnegie Corporation financed to the tune of \$340,000 a study by the Commission on Social Studies of the American Historical Association, which decreed:

*Cumulative evidence supports the conclusion, that, in the United States as in other countries, the age of individualism and laissez faire in economy and government is closing and that a new age of collectivism is emerging.*

The report concluded that boards of education must "support a school program conceived in terms of the general welfare and adjusted to the needs of an epoch marked by transition to some form of socialized economy". Professor Harold J. Laski, a close friend and colleague of Dewey, and the chief philosopher of British Fabian Socialism, said of it: "At bottom, and stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the report is an educational program for a socialist America". Laski was delighted!

The study was immediately cited as an excuse to produce a flood of textbooks aimed at fulfilling the prophecy of the Carnegie-financed Commission. As René Wormser explains:

*There were plenty of teachers ready to follow the lead of the American Historical Association's Commission on Social Studies, and their efforts extended into all aspects of education. New textbooks were required to take the place of the standard and objective works used in the schools. These new books could be used to indoctrinate the students, to give them the pathological view of their country upon which sentiment for col-*

*lectivism could be built. The writer of a conservative or classic textbook has difficulty getting the funds to enable him to produce his work . . . .*

*. . . radical writers found it a simple matter to get foundation bounty. Under the influence of cliques in the world of teaching, the schools in the United States were flooded with books which disparaged the free-enterprise system and American traditions.*

It goes without saying that, by controlling the textbooks, the progressivists gained an open sesame to the minds of millions of students in the government schools. As John T. Flynn observed, it wasn't necessary to poison every glass of water coming out of every tap in a given community. It was necessary only to drop one cup of poison into the reservoir.

Following World War II, the emphasis on creating a new economic and social order in America was expanded to include the entire globe. This philosophy was officially adopted with the acceptance of U.N.E.S.C.O. source material by the N.E.A. As one textbook for teachers phrases it:

*Allegiance to a nation is the biggest stumbling block to the creation of international government. National boundaries and the concept of sovereignty must be abolished. The quickest way to abolish . . . sovereignty is to condition the young to another and broader allegiance. Opinion favorable to international government will be developed in the social studies in the elementary school.*

All of this was just fine with the boys at the Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford foundations. The idea of world government is music to the ears of the clique of super-wealthy radicals using the socialist cant for their own purposes. If you want to establish and preserve a monopoly on a national level you need to control the national government. If you want to establish and preserve a worldwide monopoly, you must establish and control a World Government. These boys think big.

But the penthouse conspirators were not the only ones pushing "progressive education". Dr. Bella Dodd, who for many years headed the New York City Teachers' Union while a high-ranking officer of the Communist Party, broke with the Communists after a religious conversion and testified before a Senate Committee:

*The Communist Party as a whole adopted a line of being for progressive education . . . . [It] was eagerly seized upon and championed by the Comintern as the ideal system for limiting the ability of children in capitalistic societies to read, write, or to think for themselves or to act for themselves, and so to cause them to depend upon the state for a guaranteed livelihood and for the protection against the hazards caused by their inadequate training for the battle of life.*

So successful was this conspiracy that by June of 1955, the Progressive Education Association which had been founded by John Dewey officially disbanded. Dr. H. Gordon Hullfish, the Association's president, explained:

*Founded in 1919, the PEA was a protest movement against traditional education, based in large part upon the philosophy of John Dewey. One reason for PEA's end is that many of the practices it has advocated have been adopted by the nation's schools.*

*(To be continued)*