

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 44 No. 22

SATURDAY, JANUARY 30, 1965

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

CORRECTION, PLEASE!*

ITEM: From a Book Review by George E. Taylor in the *New York Times Book Review*, December 13, 1964:

Within a year of taking over they (the Chinese Communists) took a calculated risk of engaging the military forces of the United Nations and used their participation in the Korean conflict to heighten the tempo of change at home.

CORRECTION: Calculated risk? Certainly the Chinese Communists were not risking retaliation in the territory of China. This was most evident in the testimony given before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (September 29, 1954) by General James A. Van Fleet, who served as a Commanding General of the Allied Forces in the Korean War. We quote the questions asked of the General, and his replies:

(Q.) General, you frequently state that the ceasefire in Korea freed Communist power for further marauding. Is it not likewise true that the neutralisation of Formosa the second day of the Korean war freed the Chinese Communists for action in Korea?

(A.) Yes, it would certainly help them; give them a feeling of security that they could go north free from a threat in the south.

(Q.) Does that make sense, from a military point of view?

(A.) No.

That is the unfortunate part about the whole Far East situation. There are so many fronts, to win on any one you need to put pressure on all.

(Q.) Do you believe that the Chinese Communist would have crossed the Yalu without assurance that our military action would be limited?

(A.) No; he would not have entered Korea if he did not feel safe from attack in north China and Manchuria.

(Q.) He felt pretty secure, did he not?

(A.) I am sure he must have, or he would have been foolish to have entered Korea.

(Q.) Have you ever speculated as to the source of this assurance?

(A.) I have no evidence on where he would be assured.

(Q.) General, we are looking for the "they."

(A.) I merely have a guess that he would get it through some embassy source in Peiping.

(Q.) At Wake Island, General MacArthur is reported to have said that he doubted that Red China would enter the war in view of our overwhelming sea and airpower and atomic potential. If any participant in that conference had already committed this country to limit our retaliation, not to employ these normal military measures, should our military commander not have been informed?

(A.) I think he should have been informed; yes, if there were such a promise to Red China.

(Q.) And do you think there was such a promise; or they would not have come in?

(A.) My own conviction is that there must have been information to the enemy that we would not attack his home bases.

The privileged sanctuaries in North China and Manchuria from which the Red Chinese operated against the Allied

Forces in Korea were made possible by British-U.S. collusion. We quote former President Harry S. Truman, who said in Volume Two of his *Memoirs* (Doubleday, 1956):

Assistant Secretary of State Dean Rusk pointed out that we had a commitment with the British not to take action which might involve attacks on the Manchurian side of the (Yalu) river without consultation with them . . . Mr. Rusk also mentioned the danger of involving the Soviets, especially in the light of the mutual-assistance treaty between Moscow and Peiping.

It is worth noting that Rusk, in a speech on November 15, 1950, had dismissed any and all evidence that the Chinese Party acted on Moscow's instructions. At that time Rusk said that "we do not know" whether Communist intervention in Korea is part of a pattern of "worldwide aggressiveness, we do not know the real explanation."

When General Van Fleet guessed that the assurance to the Red Chinese that North China and Manchuria would not be attacked came from an embassy in Peiping, he was certainly making an educated guess. Throughout the entire Korean War, while British soldiers were dying in battle against Red forces, British diplomats were feverishly seeking to establish complete diplomatic relations in Peiping.

ITEM: From *Time* magazine, December 18, 1964:

(Kenya's President Jomo) *Kenyatta remains one of Black Africa's more responsible statesmen.* . . .

CORRECTION: *Time* belies its own description of Kenyatta in its very next paragraph:

But recently Kenyatta joined other African states in criticising the US-Belgian rescue operation in the Congo, welcomed Congolese rebel leaders to last week's ceremonies, during which he dedicated a Communist-financed "Lumumba Institute" that will train government party officials in "socialism and patriotism." Also present: a large Red Chinese delegation, which will stay on for trade talks. There are reports that plane-loads of Kenyan "students," trained in subversion in Russia and Red China, have debarked secretly at Nairobi Airport.

The statesman (*sic*) Kenyatta, who formally became a Communist agent in 1929 and who later compounded this depravity by becoming the patriarch of Mau Mau, said of the US-Belgian rescue mission:

Events brought to a head by this military intervention have aroused new passions and emotions at a time when it was critical for all actions and attitudes to be pacified. We shall not lose heart. We cannot lose heart. But this contemporary tragedy has pointed to the paramount need of removing from the Congo scene all outside influence and contribution from whatever source and directed to whatever cause.

The US-Belgian rescue mission, which Kenyatta deplors as military intervention, was far too late to pacify "new passions and emotions". According to the *New York Times'* correspondent in Leopoldville, Lloyd Garrison: "Quite likely, well over 100,000 Congolese civilians lost their lives at the hands of rebel execution squads, and this is an extremely conservative estimate". Beyond this, of course, was the massacre of White men, women and children in an indescribable orgy of rapine, torture, mutilation and cannibalism. And so

(continued on page 4)

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

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

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

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free: One year 40/-; Six months 20/-; Three months 10/-.

Offices: Business: 5 New Wanstead, Wanstead, London E.11.
Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London N.W.1.
Telephone: EUSton 3893.

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne.
Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, Australia (Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

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

The Neighbours

“Soekarno’s policy of confrontation indicates that Indonesia has further territorial ambitions. An insight into this question may be gained by an examination of the proceedings in 1945 for the establishment of Indonesia’s independence. This was a particularly critical period in Indonesia’s political history in which the intellectuals of the day wrestled with the ordeals of launching a new and independent state upon the backwash of World War II. Since the return to the Constitution of 1945, by Presidential Decree on July 5, 1959, and related events pertaining thereto, the period in which the present Constitution was framed constitutes a valuable source of information as to Indonesian political behaviour today. Much of Soekarno’s recent political action particularly appears to rest upon concepts which he formulated or accepted at that time (1945).

“The territory of the future Indonesian state was one of the major considerations of the two bodies established under the Japanese occupation to frame an Indonesian constitution: the Badan Penyelidik Kemerdekaan Indonesia—BPKI (Body for the Investigation of Indonesian Independence)—and the Panitia Persiapan Kemerdekaan Indonesia—PPKI (Committee for the Preparation of Indonesian Independence). On July 11, 1945 (the morning of the second day of the second plenary session), the BPKI voted by secret ballot, after much discussion, on three proposals concerning the territory of Indonesia. These proposals and the number of votes cast accordingly are as follows:

1. The former territory of the Netherlands East Indies, and the territories of North Borneo, Brunei, Sarawak, Portugese Timor, Malaya, New Guinea, and surrounding islands*	39 votes
2. The former territory of the Netherlands East Indies	19 votes
3. The former territory of the Netherlands East Indies combined with Malaya, and omitting New Guinea	6 votes
TOTAL	64 votes

“Of the two remaining votes, one was blank and the other vote was for a different plan.”

—Extract from *Australian Outlook*, Journal of the Australian Institute of International Affairs, April, 1964.

*Our emphasis. Is AUSTRALIA one of the surrounding islands?

Civil Rights

Today from Havana Robert Williams broadcasts three times weekly to the Southern states over Radio Free Dixie, and mails out a monthly newsletter, *The Crusader*. In last February’s issue he blueprinted the coming black revolution as he sees it:

“When massive violence comes, the U.S. will become a bedlam of confusion and chaos. . . . The factory . . . telephone . . . and radio workers will be afraid to report to their jobs. All transportation will grind to a complete standstill. . . . Essential pipe-lines will be severed and blown up and all manner of sabotage will occur. . . . A clash will occur inside the Armed Forces. At U.S. military bases around the world local revolutionaries will side with Afro G.I.s.

“The new concept of revolution defies military science and tactics. The new concept is lightning campaigns conducted in highly sensitive urban communities, with paralysis reaching the small communities and spreading to the farm areas. The old method of guerilla warfare, as carried out from the hills and countryside, would be ineffective in a powerful country like the U.S.A. Any such force would be wiped out in an hour.

“The new concept is to huddle as close to the enemy as possible so as to neutralise his modern and fierce weapons. The new concept dislocates the organs of harmony and order and reduces central power to the level of a helpless, sprawling octopus. During the hours of day sporadic rioting takes place and massive sniping. Night brings all-out warfare, organised fighting, and unlimited terror against the oppressor and his forces. . . .”

—From an article by William Worthy in *Esquire*, October, 1964.



“This civil rights programme, about which you have heard so much, is a farce and a sham—an effort to set up a police state in the guise of liberty. I fought it in Congress.

—Lyndon Johnson, May 22, 1948 at a rally in Austin, Texas.



“I am not now, and never have been an advocate of civil rights. I don’t think I ever will be.”

—Lyndon Johnson, in the *Madison Capital Times*, Wisconsin, Feb., 1960.

The New United Nations

“It is indispensable to keep in mind that what we call the United Nations today is not what the United Nations started out to be. A sharp distinction must be drawn between the constitutional provisions of the Charter and the manner in which the agencies of the United Nations, under the pressure of unforeseen political circumstances, have actually performed their functions under the Charter . . .

“The international government of the United Nations, stripped of its legal trimmings, then, is really the international government of the United States and the Soviet Union acting in unison.”

—From page 375 of the November, 1958 edition of *Commentary*, journal of the American Jewish Committee, New York. It was written by Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau, Director of the University of Chicago’s Centre for the Study of American Foreign Policy.

The Whole Man

By B. C. BEST

An article in *The Hibbert Journal* entitled “The Whole Man” by Professor Erling Scorpen of the University of Nevada traces

the genesis of the idea from the Greeks. The next step was the Renaissance ideal when man became conscious of himself—"only as a member of a race, people, party, family, or corporation—only through some general category." This was followed by the next stage in man's development when, after the reformation, "the language of Western man indicates the discovery of the modern ego and its unexpected dimensions."

"Man's feelings turn inwards"—and, according to Professor Scorpen—"It may be that science itself arose from man's discovery of his inner world". "Without it," he asks, "could there have been sufficient distance between the ego and physical nature to guarantee the objectivity so vital to science?"

So far, so good, apparently. However, not so fast, for "now we meet an intriguing—even terrifying and frustrating development". And Thomas Mann is quoted as saying—"in his prelude to Joseph and his brothers"—"Very deep is the well of the past. Should we not call it bottomless? . . . The unresearchable plays a kind of mocking game with our researching ardours" and more to the same effect, and the Professor concludes "The same is true of the self. It looks as though the classic ideal of human completeness has all this time been a hopeless aspiration, a search for what cannot be found." Later he sums up this situation briefly as "The Greeks detached a man from nature, and the Italians the individual from the species; the modern age has split the ego, for clearer understanding of self-identity". Though how or why that he rightly entitles "this schizophrenic account of man's nature" should lead to a *clearer* understanding of the self is not analysed or explained. Incidentally it may be noted as a curious commentary on the genesis of the ideal of wholeness from the Greeks, that the word schizophrenia derives in part from the Greek word Schizein—to split, and phrenia—mind, and the perhaps more fanciful or frivolous notion that Satan is always depicted with a cloven hoof.

"What is the effect", Professor Scorpen asks, "of this latest divorce on our aspiration for wholeness of character which we have inherited from the Greeks and the Italians?" And he claims that "in one respect it is devastating; for if man's inner resources are infinite, he can never hope to exhaust or fulfil them. This is disturbing to those who take life seriously—just as some people are distressed to find that the search for truth is endless, and that no one can know the whole truth about anything." But, he adds, "Others however may rejoice that complete fullness is impossible". And contends later that "The ideal of wholeness of being, long sought in the Western world, has not entirely lost its validity, just as the quest for truth has not been rendered invalid by the discovery that it is not to be grasped once and for all".

"But", he maintains, "wholeness has now a new meaning . . . Now it means the integration of a man's two selves, the inner and the outer, so that the two are not at war with each other as in self-deception and neuroticism, but united in the quest for greater fullness of being, *even if complete fullness is impossible*. (My italics.) The alternative to integration is personal disintegration and despair." This conclusion poses a problem. If truth may not be grasped "once and for all", and if complete fullness of being is impossible then must we not conclude that both truth and fullness of being belong to the domain of the purely conjectural or, at the most, the ideal? Have we the right, or grounds, to claim reality for either of them?

A verse in a poem by E. V. Milner that follows on the article by Professor Scorpen, has a certain bearing here and may reasonably be quoted—

"In the toils of the clerkly treason
My being is torn apart,
For the relative claims my reason
But the absolute holds my heart."

This does not, of course, resolve the dichotomy; but a hold is more difficult to loosen and unbind.

So what, finally, one may ask, does Professor Scorpen offer as a remedy or cure for "personal disintegration and despair" that must result from our failure to integrate the inner and the outer self "so that the two are not at war with each other"?

For that, we are told "The whole man must still be a speaker of words, and a doer of deeds . . . still cherishing the Renaissance struggle for multiple accomplishments. But in addition to this classical wisdom there is need today to listen to the silence out of which speaks what is deepest in man and to communicate from this silence to one's fellow men."

This remedy sounds an esoteric note and is meaningless if we are given no guide or direction as to the nature of the silence to which we must listen, and whether it has some common denominator so that communication would be possible, and integration both individual and social might result. It is therefore somewhat surprising since Professor Scorpen aims at achieving what he calls "that other kind of wholeness, the union of man's two selves" that he did not include in his long list of names, both classical and modern, one who proclaimed that "The truth shall make you free", and of whom it was said "As many as touched him were made perfectly whole". But this would not support his contention that "complete wholeness is impossible", and that "no one can know the whole truth about anything". And it might also be objected that those words relate to the Kingdom of Heaven, and would have no relevance to Professor Scorpen's thesis which only has regard to wholeness and truth as possible of attainment in the world here—on earth; although then, what becomes of the exhortation "Thy Kingdom come on earth as it is in heaven?" And it is fair to ask the Professor whether modern man can achieve this "other kind of wholeness, the union of man's two selves"—unless this voice of the silence becomes incarnate and articulate, unless, in short, it becomes the spoken word of reality and truth?

Such a word was spoken at the end of the first world war and was communicated to those who would listen and attend to its authenticity. But the silence is a void which can be filled and used by innumerable voices which may conflict and destroy the ground for true communication and may leave man in "the toils of the clerkly treason", and far from effecting a union of man's two selves "tear them apart", leaving a *breach**.

It is to the interest of that Power that plans to win sovereign control over all mankind, to widen the breach and prevent it from being closed, making for confusion, and causing, as it does, conflict and division, and hence the need for increasing controls.

A verse from the prophet Isaiah (Chap. 58, v.12) which alludes to "The repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths to dwell in", may be read as a foreshadowing of Douglas's discovery of "The Flaw in the Price System", and his remedy for repairing it.

It is for the enlarging of the "breach" and the widening of the "crack" for which the Power that plans to rule mankind awaits. But it is a bogus power, and is itself controlled by the need to employ means of bribery and corruption, and the control of man's mind by the press, radio and television. It is the power of a lie, and no holds are barred to maintain it, for its greatest fear is its exposure by the supreme power of the truth. It therefore awaits the moment when the breach has been made wide enough by all devious means to allow it to achieve its long-awaited pyrrhic victory of the greatest "take-over-bid" of all time.

*It may not be without significance that Sir Winston Churchill in his Romanes lectures of 1930 referred to a mysterious crack or fissure between the consuming and producing power.

CORRECTION, PLEASE! (continued from page 1)

Kenyatta ("one of Black Africa's more responsible statesmen") welcomes the perpetrators of these atrocities to his inaugural ceremonies.

ITEM: From *Time* magazine, November 13, 1964:

For 15 years, since Chiang Kai-shek's tragic defeat, the U.S. has not exactly tried to ignore Red China—certainly the Korean war bitterly acknowledged its existence—but to ostracise and isolate it.

CORRECTION: Ostracise Red China? On June 5, 1954, in Warsaw, the U.S. Ambassador to Communist Poland, U. Alexis Johnson, began a series of highly secretive conferences with Red China's Ambassador to Communist Poland, Wang Ping-nam. Johnson's successor, John Moors Cabot, continued the conferences until they numbered one hundred and twenty. Cabot has continued this practice with Wang Ping-nam's successor, Wang Kuo-chaun, and the two conferred as recently as September 23, 1964. The only announcement made at that time was to the effect that the next meeting would be held on November 25, 1964. These conferences—rather than ostracise Red China—have served Communist purposes by taking the curse off the United States' official policy of non-recognition.

... the U.S. does not really expect Red China to launch invasions, believes that Peking has a reasonably healthy respect for the U.S. Seventh Fleet. . . .

CORRECTION: This is sheer nonsense. On June 23, 1962, in one of his conferences with Red China's Ambassador to Communist Poland, U.S. Ambassador John Moors Cabot assured Wang Ping-nam, in effect—what informed Americans already knew—that the U.S. Seventh Fleet would continue to protect the Chinese Communists from any invasion by Chiang Kai-shek across the Formosa Strait. (See *New York Times*, June 27, 1962.)

ITEM: From a Report by Tad Szulc in the *New York Times*, November 28, 1964:

Michael P. E. Hoyt, the United States Consul rescued three days ago in Stanleyville, said tonight the Congolese rebels [were essentially more a military faction out to win power rather than a pro-Communist movement. . . .

In careful answers, Mr. Hoyt agreed that it would not be accurate and, indeed, would be too "simplistic" to portray the rebels' so-called Peoples' Republic as a Marxist or Communist-oriented movement. . . .

This evaluation coincided in general with the views held by most Administration officials familiar with the Congo problem. . . .

CORRECTION: Or, as the U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of the Congo, Edmund Gullion, said on January 30, 1964:

Obviously Communists are trying to establish a beachhead here in Central Africa. They . . . must be checked before it (the rebellion) becomes bigger.

Or, as the *Associated Press* reported, on May 6, 1964:

Red China virtually acknowledged today it is deeply involved in the terrorism that has swept the Eastern Congo. . . . The official *Peking People's Daily* . . . praised the Congo terrorists for resorting to violence rather than Soviet-style peaceful coexistence [sic].

Or, as Senator Thomas J. Dodd (D.-Conn.) said of the rebellion's leader, Christophe Gbenye, in 1961:

Christophe Gbenye . . . a Prague-trained Communist . . . as Minister of the Interior in the pro-Communist régime in Oriental Province was directly responsible for instigating the murder and rape and terror against the white residents of the province.

ITEM: from an Editorial in the *Edmonton (Alberta) Journal*, as quoted in *Saturday Review*, December 12, 1964:

It is preposterous to go on pretending that Formosa is a great power and entitled to one of the five permanent seats on the (UN) Security Council. Regardless of how much one may detest the masters of Peking, they are the rulers of and the spokesmen for a fifth of the world's population.

CORRECTION: The masters of Peking are the spokesmen for the Communist Party on the mainland of China. These tyrants were not voted into power by a fifth of the world's population.

COLOUR, COMMUNISM AND COMMON SENSE

By MANNING JOHNSON

7/6, plus 9d. postage

In this short book the author, himself a Negro and for ten years a member of the Communist Party, exposes the Party's cruel deception of American Negroes and shows how the "Civil Rights" movement will eventually benefit only the Communists.

A LETTER TO THE SOUTH, ON SEGREGATION

1/-, plus 4d. postage

STOP, LOOK AND LISTEN

Additional copies of the reprint from the John Birch Society which traces the growth of Communist influence throughout the world and which was included with the issue of November 7, are now available, price 4/6 per dozen including postage, single copies 6d. each.

THE INVISIBLE GOVERNMENT

By DAN SMOOT

7/6, plus 8d. postage

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION REPORT ON COMMUNISM

2/6, plus 6d. postage

THE TRAGEDY OF FRANCE

One of the American Opinion Dollar Reprint Series which tells the story of the betrayal of Algeria into Communist hands.

7/6, plus 9d. postage

THROUGH ALL THE DAYS TO BE

By ROBERT WELCH

A speech dealing with the Communist Conspiracy and its methods.

2/6, plus 6d. postage

NONE DARE CALL IT TREASON

By JOHN A. STORMER

A careful compilation of facts from hundreds of Congressional investigations of the Communist conspiracy to enslave America.

5/6, plus 8d. postage

THE FEARFUL MASTER

A Second Look at the United Nations

By G. EDWARD GRIFFIN

15/-, plus 1/3 postage

from

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

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

Printed by J. Hayes & Co. (T.U.), Woolton, Liverpool 25.