

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 51. No. 9

SATURDAY, JULY, 24, 1971

7p (1s. 5d.) Fortnightly

NEW EDUCATION*

The Radicals Are After Your Children

By GARY ALLEN

(Continued)

The term "progressive education" had by now [1955] fallen into disrepute as parents observed that their offspring, assigned by the schools to "life adjustment" classes, had neither adjusted to life nor learned to read, write, or add. It was time to change labels. While the educationists no longer praise the name of John Dewey in public, nor refer to their programs as "progressive education", both the song and the melody linger on—humming along under more "modern" aliases. As Max Rafferty, former Superintendent of Public Instruction for California, has observed:

... to say that Progressive Education is dead just because it has changed its name and hidden behind various aliases is as unwarranted as it would have been for our grandparents to assume that Jesse James was dead because he had changed his name to Mr. Howard and was pretending to be a respectable family man.

The coverup was necessary because anti-Deweyism had risen to a crescendo following the Sputnik fiasco in 1957. For a time there was great rhetorical stress on academic excellence, particularly in the sciences. Then, using Sputnik as an excuse, America's first program of direct federal aid to education became law as the National Defense Education Act. Federal involvement had long been a goal of the National Education Association. Its proponents swore up and down that there would never be any federal strings attached to the federal monies. All they were interested in, they contended, was that the kiddies get a better education so that America could "catch up" with the Russians. Such talk proved as absurd as the earlier prediction that a compulsory public school system would permit the abolition of jails. As Congressman Noah Mason of Illinois warned at the time:

Federal Aid for Education is not a temporary program to meet an immediate emergency. It is an effort to put our whole educational system under Federal control and to keep it there forever.

Commenting on the bill, Representative Watkins Abbitt of Virginia declared:

There is here demonstrated an all-out effort to federalize the schools and nationalize the lives of American citizens . . . History teaches us that when the central authority gets control of the education of our youth, it is a long step toward a totalitarian government and dictatorship . . . Federal Aid means Federal Control.

No one should have been surprised that it turned out that way.

The next big step in the federalizing of education came with the 1965 appointment by President Lyndon Johnson of "Republican" John Gardner as Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. Gardner, you will not be surprised to learn, came to H.E.W. after serving for many years as president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Soon the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed as part of L.B.J.'s "Great Society".† It provided Secretary Gardner with billions of dollars each year with which to implement the wild educational schemes of his friends and colleagues at the Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Ford foundations. Indeed, wherever one finds radical experiments in education designed to destroy concepts of individualism and self-reliance and to promote socialism, almost inevitably one finds the names Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Ford.†

Today, the quest for academic excellence born in the aftermath of Sputnik has been all but abandoned. The emphasis in the journals of educational theory is now on "change". The word "change" seems to appear at least once in every sentence. The line being promoted is that technological "change" is so altering our lives that the old values of absolutes, eternal truth, traditions, and cultural standards have become obsolete. They are to be replaced by the "new morality" and "doing your own thing".

We are also told that the rapidity of technological change has "dehumanized" the individual, who can no longer function adequately in our society. In order to cope with such "change", it is necessary to develop a "relevant" curriculum. The word "relevant" now runs second only to "change" in the abracadabra of educationist incantation.

For years educationists have coded their messages in a sort of pedagogic Swahili, but today they are getting braver and braver about spelling out just what they are up to. An official release of the National School Public Relations Association, dated March 23, 1970, describes the new "relevant" education:

The major focus of the school curriculum in the 1970's is going to be a critical examination of the quality of life and society in the United States. This is

(continued on page 4)

*From *American Opinion*, May, 1971.

†A phrase coined by British Fabian Socialist Graham Wallas, and the title of a radical book he published in 1914.

†One of Richard Nixon's first acts after being elected President was to appoint the Carnegie Corporation's president, Alan Pifer, to head his committee on national goals.

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. Scouler, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

The *New York Times*, like the U.S.A. Government Administration, is controlled by the Super-Government in the U.S.A., referred to by the John Birch Society as the INSIDERS—an international group of whom only some are more or less permanently resident in the U.S.A. The facts 'leaked' to and published by the *New York Times* concerning the genesis and conduct of the war in South East Asia have been known to and published by serious observers of that situation, including this journal,* over several years. So their publication by an Establishment newspaper on the basis of official 'secret' documents represents merely a further development in the scenario.

It is quite beyond question that at the end of the Second World War the U.S.A. was the supreme World Power, able to impose a *Pax Americana* on the whole world. The whole of Europe, including the 'victorious' allies Britain and France, was defeated—a situation made manifest when Lend-Lease to Britain was abruptly terminated. The Russian war effort was only sustained by enormous American supplies, and although the secrets of and materials for the atomic bomb had been secretly delivered to Russia, Russia at that time did not have the bomb.

Such a *Pax Americana*, if benevolent on the British model, and particularly if accompanied by financial reform, could have ended war probably forever; and a tutelary colonialism by experienced colonial Powers could have effected a genuine emancipation of the peoples of the under-developed areas in conditions of stability and safety.

But the real but undisclosed objective of the World War was the imposition of a *Pax Communistica*, so that the end of the shooting war was merely the end of a phase or stage in a process to be continued "by other means", as Clausewitz puts it. In particular, reform of the financial system was the very last thing the INSIDERS wanted or would tolerate, the World Bank and International Monetary Fund being set up to formalise firm international control by the Money Power—the outward manifestation of the existence of the INSIDERS. The further progress of the conspiracy required the destruction of American military superiority and credibility *vis-a-vis*

'Russia', and credibility towards the whole world as a *responsible* Super-Power; it is this latter purpose which has been so brilliantly served by the Vietnam 'war' which having served this purpose, is now being terminated with the maximum of publicity and disgrace for the 'official' Administration. But it may be noted that an equivalent publicity is not being given to the fact that the U.S.A. is supplying to 'Russia' the materials which the Russians are supplying to North Vietnam—materials which of course have sustained this 'war' all these years. Nor is it being emphasised that American 'withdrawal' will leave in South Vietnam vast American installations and supplies for future use by the Communists, who are quite certain to subjugate and dominate South East Asia (as a preliminary step Southwards) as soon as the Americans have gone. If the U.S.A. cannot defeat the North Vietnamese after more massive bombing than ever occurred in the Second World War, how can the South Vietnamese resist a take-over? After that there will be the usual extermination of any potential opposition. India and Africa may be left for the present to rot, but South East Asia will be integrated into militant Communism.

The awful thing about all this is the fate that awaits the American people; and in connection with this it is well worth studying the late C. H. Douglas's *Programme For the Third World War*, and Chapter VIII in particular—written nearly thirty years ago. Douglas regarded the 'rediscovery' of America at the end of the fifteenth century as a component of an overall strategy for the conquest of the globe by what we are now calling the INSIDERS; and he remarks: "I should like to emphasise, for the benefit of those to whom it is necessary, that not only is the mass of the modern American people unconscious of the part it has been billed [our emphasis] to play, but is very uneasy as to its part in world affairs. Whether leading American statesmen understand the situation is also not plain. I rather doubt it. But that there is a small inner ring which does, I am confident, I have met at least one of them".

At the present time, those "masses" of the American (and other) peoples who can be conned into it are participating in the lethal "anti-Vietnam war" demonstrations, as planned in Hanoi as an integral component of the overall strategy, not only for the conquest of South East Asia, but of America as well. Probably millions of the American masses are billed for liquidation, or internment in slave-labour camps.

When the *New York Times* publishes secret documents relating to the activities of the International Monetary Fund and the Council on Foreign Relations, both heavily involved in the Vietnam manoeuvre, we will begin to think that the tide may be turning. But don't forget that Mr. Robert MacNamara, a key-figure in the Vietnam 'disclosures', has now moved up into the World Bank. Who moved him?

"Under [Mr. Heath], unemployment has increased, productivity has not and the economy has continued to display that curious combination of maladies—fever and anaemia. Inflation goes on, but its compensation—a high rate of growth—remains strikingly absent. No one is yet conscious of having more freedom, more security or more prosperity than he had under Mr. Wilson. The electorate has been largely alienated; organised labour is up in arms; liberal sentiment has been affronted by an Immigration Bill widely denounced as tyrannical."

*See *The Moving Storm*; in particular, the note beginning on p. 14.

Thus T. E. Utley in the *Daily Telegraph*, 18 June, 1971, on Mr. Heath's first year of office. It sounds rather like the incompetence for which Mr. Heath used to denounce Mr. Wilson; or else a recapitulation of the warnings to the Conservatives offered in these pages before the Conservatives won the elections. The Conservatives now *are* on the hot-spot, and particularly because of their promises, will be held to blame as the situation worsens, as it will.

The Conservatives talked at one time of restoring Britain's position East of Suez. But the Russians are more firmly in control there than ever, and before long may have the virtually exclusive use of the re-opened Suez Canal—a vital logistic link to their increasing presence in the Indian Ocean.

Mr. Enoch Powell's repeated warnings on immigration are steadily being justified; but the gravamen of those warnings was that something should be done at the time they were given. A time comes—as it has come to India in a different context—when it is too late; consequences have become irreversible. There is talk now of India making war on Pakistan. Well, the refugee problem is probably quite insoluble now; but war will only add to the catastrophe.

And increasingly, in one respect after another, it is becoming too late in Britain. But because they abdicated from their real responsibility as an Opposition, while deluding themselves as to a superior competence as a Government, the Conservatives have probably finally destroyed themselves and surrendered their country. An independent but non-sovereign country is a fiction, and as Mr. Powell is brave enough to say loudly and in public, the surrender of sovereignty is what the Common Market is all about. There is not much doubt about what would have happened to politicians who prior to 1914 had negotiated away Great Britain's sovereignty; and the 1939 war was fought to preserve that sovereignty.

If 'Britain' signs the Treaty of Rome, the British Parliament will be under formal outside *obligation* to pass legislation drafted in conformity with requirements laid down elsewhere. Debate, if any, on such legislation, would be meaningless. In these circumstances, Parliament might survive as a rubber-stamp, simply because of the relatively enormous salaries it offers to nincompoops; but sooner or later, the European need for 'economies' in a future crisis would put an end to that. But probably before then, the Communists will have taken over.

“Our aim remains a European Government after expansion. . . The argument over a United States of Europe or a Federal Europe is one of words. . . A European Government will take decisions on common policies. . .”

Adolf Hitler? Edward Heath? Joe Stalin? Brezhnev Doctrine?

The full extract, as quoted in *The Spectator*, June 26, 1971 is: “Our aim remains a European Government after expansion through British entry. The argument over a United States of Europe or a Federal Europe is one of words. A European Government will take decisions on common policies and will be subject to a European parliamentary control” (emphasis added).

Not Hitler; not Stalin. It was West Germany's Foreign Minister, Walter Scheel, one of the Troika type inner

Government of 'ex'-Communists who have set up a computerised “Power-house” to govern Germany (see T.S.C., 18-4-70*). It was Stalin who said that “good words must have no relation to bad actions”, and this seems to expose the genealogy of Herr Scheel's “The argument . . . is one of words”. Notice also “expansion through British entry”. Expansion: through 'entry' or through conquest—another matter of words?

For what it is still worth, Britain has the greatest tradition of Parliamentary control over Governments which make decisions. This control is now extremely attenuated, and it is abundantly evident that the Heath Administration is taking every step in its power to evade such control on the issue of “entry” and signing the Treaty of Rome. It has even been proclaimed that the Government has a strategy for securing entry—a strategy which, of course, is aimed against public opinion, not against Herr Scheel's objectives. This strategy is the well-rehearsed one of putting it about that British entry is ‘inevitable’—“whether we like it or not”.

In the face of British experience of attenuating Parliamentary control, the idea that a European Parliament would have any effective control over a European Government, energised, with little doubt, by the West German “power-house”, is not short of ludicrous. Parliament is a very effective smoke-screen; Hitler had his Reichstag, and equivalent ‘democratic’ institutions are preserved in Soviet Russia. But an effective Opposition drawn up from the diverse nationalities of ‘Europe’ is almost a contradiction in terms.

But even behind all this, there stands the Brezhnev Doctrine—that the function of the Red Army is to ensure the ‘solidarity’ of the Socialist countries. With the ‘inevitable’ (!) ‘re-unification’ of the ‘two’ Germanies there will be one Socialist Germany, Member of the Common Market of Socialist countries; and the Americans will assuredly be invited to go home.

The Australian Trade Union movement is being utilised to stir up a campaign of hate against South Africa, utilising the apartheid situation, and the visit of the South African Rugby team. This campaign is being re-inforced by the A.B.C., and such well-known agitators as Dr. Spock and the disgruntled expatriate South African Peter Hain, imported to Australia for the purpose.

At this time, reports of incredible brutalities and massacres are coming out of East Pakistan, but no protests are being organised against the West Pakistan Government, although its policy has evidently been to destroy the indigenous cultures of East Pakistan, by the destruction of temples and leaders. Of course neither India nor Pakistan offer any obstruction to the advance of Communism, whereas Southern Africa does.

It may very well be that the disruptions in connection with the Rugby tour will lead to more violence in Australia than is likely to be seen in Southern Africa.

**The Survival of Britain*, p. 17.

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11, for Books on Social Credit and the International Financial-Communist Conspiracy. Free Book List on request.

New Education

(continued from page 1)

the prediction of the nation's major curriculum voice, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). . . .

To provide a basis for a total and genuine reconstruction of the curriculum, ASCD's Board of Directors adopted a bold statement of critical concerns and commitments. It says, in essence, that educators have a responsibility to decide what aspects of a society cannot be tolerated and to do something about them. The statement commits ASCD to working, in both society and schools, for such goals as peace, social renewal, equality, women's rights, and individuality. It charges ASCD to develop a curriculum that "identifies economic and other national problems and educates for political action on them".

In other words, the schools are to be politicized from the ground up, and students are to be made into radical political activists as a part of the curriculum.

Under a release date of March 23, 1970, the National School Public Relations Association condensed a talk on this same theme by Professor Theodore Roszak of California State College:

It follows then, Roszak said, that the crisis in the schools today is not caused by an inferior "educational establishment", but by the "largely worthless" culture of an industrial society. This culture is not only uninteresting to "lively and unspoiled young minds", but worse still, it degrades "all natural humanity", he said. He explained that education exists to serve national priorities

Paul Brandwein, author of a series of textbooks for kindergarten through fourth grade which has recently been adopted in California, makes it clear that youngsters must be indoctrinated with "priorities" and beliefs which are directly opposite those they learn at home. Mr. Brandwein writes:

As a young person grows up he comes to share most of the basic values of the society in which he lives. He brings to school some previously developed attitudes toward the major social issues confronting us. Hence he never approaches the study of social sciences with the same degree of ignorance and the same unbiased frame of mind with which he begins his study of the physical and biological universe. The important work of the social studies at the early level is necessarily directed toward aiding the student to unlearn what he already knows. This frequently involves the unsettling of his convictions, to be followed by the attempt to get him to view questions as open which he may have considered as already closed, and to guide him in acquiring a new perspective.

Such promulgators of the "new education" are mostly behavioral scientists—sociologists, psychiatrists, psychologists. Almost without exception they are secular humanists, holding that man is his own god, and that truth, as the essence of social good, must be manipulated to support the latest social theories. Through programs pushed by such people our schools are abandoning the teaching of "facts" and substituting instruction in human relations. No longer do the educationists rationalize, stammer, and apologize for

poor performance in reading; now they claim that reading is no longer important. One junior high school principal, quoted in Mortimer Smith's *The Diminished Mind*, puts it this way:

Through the years we've built a sort of halo around reading, writing, and arithmetic. We've said they were for everybody

We've made some progress in getting rid of that slogan. But every now and then some mother with a Phi Beta Kappa award or some employer who has hired a girl who can't spell stirs up a fuss about the schools . . . and ground is lost

When we come to the realization that not every child has to read, figure, write, and spell . . . then we shall be on the road to improving the junior high curriculum.

Between this day and that a lot of selling must take place. But it's coming. We shall some day accept the thought that it is just as illogical to assume that every boy must be able to read as it is that each one must be able to perform on the violin, that it is no more reasonable to require that each girl shall spell well than it is that each shall bake a good cherry pie

(To be continued)

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

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

Contemporaneous commentaries on linked events of 1968-70

"This volume is a sequel to *The Moving Storm* which, together with its companion volume, *The Development of World Dominion*, traced the emergence of a long term policy in contemporary political and economic developments. *The Moving Storm* carried the story to late 1968, by which time the predicament of Europe—virtual encirclement by Soviet forces—was plainly visible to anyone not blinded by the episodic view of history. Since then, developments have been catastrophic. . . ."

Price £1.10 (clothbound) — Just published

THE TRAP

The Trap closed on Britain with the signing of the ignominious Letter of Intent from the British Government to the International Monetary Fund. What is left of British sovereignty? This booklet briefly reviews the situation.

13p (2/7) (posted)

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