

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 51. No. 10

SATURDAY, 7 AUGUST, 1971

7p (1s. 5d.) Fortnightly

NEW EDUCATION*

The Radicals Are After Your Children

By GARY ALLEN

(Continued)

Today's Frontier Innovators tell us that the printed word has served its purpose.† Oh, it served well enough until technology gave us so many alternative forms of communication. Now, however, the printed word is increasingly *passé*. More and more schools are using records, tapes, film strips, and movies to replace the antiquated printed word. Who knows, some day books may be as rare as stereoscopes. Or so the line goes. As part of this movement many school districts are abandoning textbooks altogether and substituting class discussion.

Under such "relevant" education the class is conducted without lectures or texts according to a new system called "inquiry", which is based on endless open-end discussions. Subject matter includes such "relevant" matters as the Vietnam War, ecology, community control, the New Left, drugs, the draft, the "peace" movement, the new morality, the pill, and abortion. These, you understand, are topics for grammar school students as well as those in junior and senior high.

In many of the "relevant" education programs the teachers prepare packets of "information" taken from a variety of periodicals on a "relevant" topic and pass them out to pupils for review and discussion. For example, students might compare treatment of a subject such as air pollution by an Establishment magazine like *Time* with the same subject as presented in a "progressive" periodical of the nature of the *New Republic* or *Village Voice* . . . so that students see "all sides" of an issue.

Just how students can be capable of reaching rational conclusions on emotionally charged political matters without a basic foundation of history, political science, economics, and morality is difficult to understand. Obviously they can't. They are being asked to accept canned "Liberal" opinions on fad subjects. The teacher guides their conclusions to what is "socially correct". Truth is redefined as a "social good". It is no wonder so many of our teenagers are intellectually confused and emotionally distraught.

In the past, parents expected teachers to reinforce parental values and discipline. Now the child is praised for his brilliance and his courage on "social" problems while the parent is ridiculed for stubborn rigidity and old-fashioned morality. Much of what we call the Generation Gap is really a teacher-parent gap. What is happening is Marxist class warfare, based on youth versus age rather than capital versus labor.

Yet those promoting the "inquiry" system under a plethora of names and guises (the most famous of which is the

Glasser System§) claim that it teaches young people to be "problem solvers" rather than filling their heads with "useless" accumulated knowledge. The product of this type of teaching is described by Dr. Joseph Bean:

The student, according to the "inquiry" concept, must view all knowledge as tentative rather than absolute, and "facts" are subject to continuous revision. No one is to be viewed as an authority on any subject—the student reads what he will and then "makes up his own mind" in the critical light of his teacher and peers. Not surprisingly, this system usually abolishes grading. It is also not surprising that many students are enthusiastic about it since bull sessions are substituted for hard academic work.

The result of instruction given our children in social studies classes is evident in rejection of family standards of morality and ethics, and in the student protests, demands, riots, destruction of property, and destruction of life which we see all about us. The process of instruction sensitizes students to drop out with the hippies, turn on with the hopheads, or tear down with the revolutionaries.†

But the behavioral scientists are not content merely to load the curriculum. They have introduced what can only be termed psychological brainwashing techniques in order to "change" the character and personality of students. In an article titled "Forecast For The 70's", the *N.E.A. Journal* observed in its issue for January 1969:

The roles and responsibilities of teachers will alter throughout the next decade. Future-think suggests that between 1970 and 1980 a number of new assignments and specialties will materialize if present trends continue.

For one thing, the basic role of the teacher will change noticeably. Ten years hence it should be more

(continued on page 4)

*From *American Opinion*, May, 1971.

†A recent Lou Harris poll showed that 18.5 per cent of Americans aged sixteen or older are illiterate. These products of the public school system are obviously ahead of their time!

§This is thoroughly described in Dr. William Glasser's book *Schools Without Failure*, which might also be subtitled "Schools Without Learning".

†Dr. Bean was until recently a member of the Glendale, California, School Board. He resigned after discovering the hard way that the state and federal governments have virtually removed all local control of education from the individual communities.

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

The fourteenth annual *Scoreboard* of percentage Communist influence over various countries of the world—a total of 141—is published as usual in the July/August number of *American Opinion*. The scores represent the composite estimate of a number of expert observers on six continents. The overall result indicates that Communist control has increased in 44 countries—an increase of 32% in twelve months. And only 21 countries—15%—are shown as having less than 50% such control. These include, of course, the more obviously anti-Communist countries such as Portugal, South Africa and Nationalist China which are prime targets for Communist propaganda and attempted subversion and student and other 'demonstrations'. It is overall Communist influence which is driving Britain into the Common Market and subordination to the Treaty of Rome, although, perhaps, Mr. Heath would be shocked if he realised it. Top Communist influence in such countries as Britain and Australia is exerted through Fabian or—at one remove—London School of Economics and other infiltrated-University trained economists and advisers in Cabinets and bureaucracies, and other positions of power. Of other English-speaking countries, Canada is a special example, for Prime Minister Trudeau has a well-defined Communist back-ground, so that no one should be surprised at his recognition of the Communist Government of Peking, now being exploited to the full to embarrass the Australian Government.

South African Review for March 1971 publishes an aerial photograph of a Russian freighter with a deck cargo of military vehicles, including tank transporters, sailing in the Indian Ocean off Port Shepstone—near the southern tip of Africa—for an unknown destination.

As has often been remarked in these pages, there is no evidence anywhere that any country with sufficient power to defeat Russia has any intention of attempting any attack. But there is ample evidence of a continuing build-up of Soviet and Soviet-controlled forces, and their distribution to key strategic areas. Where are the military vehicles spotted by South Africa going, and what are they to be used for? Well—to increase the carnage in India and Africa, as likely as not. And this relates directly to the international pressure

to prevent the sales of arms to South Africa. But we have quoted Sir John Glubb's opinion: "I consider it essential to our survival to maintain a fleet in the Indian Ocean". But the point is approaching where it will be a question of *re-establishing* a fleet, which Russia might denounce as an act of aggression.

The deteriorating situation of "the West" as against the expansion of Communism grows more evident, if not from day to day, certainly from month to month; but few apparently want to recognize the fact. This unwillingness is sustained by the mythical 'split' between Russia and China—a split which is a strategic manoeuvre of an essentially monolithic Communism—and a faith that in the end, the U.S.A. will save us.

Writing in *Human Events*, June 5, 1971, Col. Robert H. Heintz on the basis of more than a month's tour of bases and military installations throughout the United States reports: "Intolerably clobbered and buffeted from within and without by social turbulence, pandemic drug addiction, race war, sedition, civilian scapegoatism, draftee recalcitrance and malevolence, barracks theft and common crime, unsupported in their general travail by the general government, in Congress as well as the Executive branch, distrusted, disliked and often reviled by the public, the uniformed services today are places of agony for the loyal, silent professionals who doggedly hang on and try to keep the ship afloat".

This situation has been brought about largely by the deliberately "no win" war in Vietnam, which has served as a propaganda base for highly skilled subversion. And of course, the more subversion succeeds, the more a country must rely on its Armed and loyal Forces to defeat revolution.

Against this background, the chances of the U.S. saving Europe from a Communist take-over are becoming increasingly negligible. But to make matters very much worse, there is a strong probability of an economic collapse in the U.S., precipitated by deliberate inflation. Then the whole thing will look like a gigantic accident—until the Communists have established their "dictatorship of the proletariat", when they will proclaim victory for their strategy.

A report from Catherine Dodds published in the *Sunday Telegraph* of July 4, 1971, states that "a monetary package deal [is] now being fixed between the Six", which "would have the effect of devaluation of the pound without the loss of prestige it entails".

Devaluation means that to import a constant volume of goods, an increased volume of goods must be exported, and thus is an indicator of economic 'mismanagement', and so far as the Government assumes the responsibility for 'management', an indication of the incompetence of which Mr. Heath accused Mr. Wilson. However, devaluation was forced on Mr. Wilson; and it now appears that in a covert form, it is being forced on Mr. Heath. But *vis-a-vis* the other countries of Europe, if Britain joins the Common Market, and a common currency is adopted as proposed, devaluation will no longer be possible. And if Britain simply does not become more 'competitive'—which means a greater industrial output for a given wage structure and level—Britain will go to the wall, as the traditional escape-route will be closed.

How this situation will contribute to Britain's unrivalled opportunity to regain "greatness" Mr. Heath seems reluctant

to make clear. The U.S.A. is in effect a "Common Market" of all the constituent States, with the added advantage that it possesses within its own boundaries the great bulk of all the raw materials it requires. Yet the U.S. is faced with increasing inflation and rising unemployment, the economic base of crime, riots, and revolution. In what way is the "United States of Europe" going to avoid this fate? By successfully 'competing' with the U.S.A., thereby worsening the condition of that already unhappy land, on which Europe, already mistakenly, relies for its defence?

The Pentagon Papers

(A Correction, Please! article from *The Review of the News*, July 7, 1971)

ITEM: From an article in *Newsweek* magazine for June 28, 1971:

The top echelon of the [New York] Times—managing editor Abraham M. Rosenthal, Washington bureau chief Max Frankel, foreign editor James Greenfield, and columnists James Reston and Tom Wicker . . . strongly urged publisher Arthur Ochs Sulzberger to let them give the Pentagon papers maximum coverage.

CORRECTION: There is no mention that Sulzberger, Rosenthal, Frankel, Greenfield (who had charge of this project), and Reston are all members of the Establishment *Insiders'* elitist Council on Foreign Relations—as is the now famous Daniel Ellsberg, who admits releasing the secret papers. Nor does *Newsweek* mention the fact that Ellsberg's present employer is the Center for International Studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, set up with a multimillion-dollar grant from the Central Intelligence Agency.

But the hypocrisy does not end there. Not long ago the *New York Times* led a bitter attack on Otto F. Otepka, a patriotic State Department security evaluator. Otepka's crime? He had dared to deliver three "confidential"—not "top secret"—interoffice documents to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to prove he was telling the truth about the lax security in the State Department. As nationally syndicated columnist Clark Mollenhoff noted on June 27, 1971: "The *Times* found a 'dangerous departure' from normal procedures on Otepka's delivery to a Senate staff lawyer who was cleared for security matters. Otepka didn't make the papers public. His only deviation from proper procedure is that he did not clear delivery of the three documents with the man he was proving was a liar". What was to the *Times* a "dangerous departure" for the anti-Communist Otepka has become an act of crusading journalism now that the *Times* has done it to serve the interests of the Establishment Left.

If the *Times* is really so anxious that the public be given all the facts about every vital issue, why did it so readily acquiesce when the Warren Commission announced that vast amounts of its evidence dealing with Communist assassin Lee Harvey Oswald would be locked up in government archives for seventy-five years? Obviously the *Times'* vaunted preachments about the right of the public to know the truth are as phony as a three-dollar bill.

Already many observers have noted that no really new information has been published by the *Times* or the other

newspapers which obtained access to the government documents "stolen" and distributed by Daniel Ellsberg. In fact, the *Times* itself published a series of articles five months ago about the Vietnam contingency plans exposed in the Pentagon papers without any stir being created. Why the furor now? And why is the Liberal Establishment behind it?

It was Edwin A. Roberts who asked in the *National Observer* for June 28, 1971: "Why didn't the Justice Department move against the *New York Times* immediately, instead of waiting a couple of days?" Certainly the government had ample warning that something was going to break, for radical journalist Nat Hentoff revealed in the *Village Voice* for May twenty-first that he had "reliable information that the *New York Times* has a breakthrough unpublished story concerning the White House, the Pentagon and South East Asia". The government chose to sit tight. As *Time* magazine notes in its issue of June twenty-eighth, the Justice Department sought a temporary restraining order only after three instalments had already been published in the *New York Times*. Clearly the Nixon Administration wanted that story to break.

What have been some of the results so far? First the New Left anti-war movement has been given a new lease on life, as N.B.C. television carefully noted on June twenty-seventh. It has also created in America a new mood of disgust and frustration over the Vietnam War. Thus, these documents were published at just the right time to create a mood favorable to the cries for complete withdrawal from Vietnam which were being voiced in the Senate. Because of this mood the Mansfield Amendment, setting a specific date for withdrawal from Vietnam, was approved. It was exactly what the Communists have been calling for.

As a result of all this, the stage is now set for President Nixon to continue his Vietnam pullout just as the Left has been clamoring for him to do. Mr. Nixon never sought victory over the Communists in Vietnam, but he would suffer politically if the Communists were immediately to seize control of the country. The *Insiders* who advise him realize this. As Daniel Ellsberg, himself, wrote in the Spring 1971 issue of *Public Policy*, published by the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard: "The risk that 'losing' Vietnam would pose some risk from a faction within the President's own party was one that Johnson in 1964 shared with Eisenhower in 1954. Even Richard Nixon has seen himself as facing comparable problems in 1969-71. His special assistant, Henry Kissinger, has reported in numerous 'backgrounders': 'If we had done in our first year what our loudest [*Liberal*] critics called on us to do, the 13 percent that voted for Wallace would have grown to 35 or 40 percent; the first thing the President set out to do was to neutralize that faction'".

It is already clear that Mr. Nixon and his C.F.R. advisors are delighted with the release and promotion of the Pentagon papers by their fellow members of the Council on Foreign Relations. You may be certain that it was planned that way at the highest levels.—W.E.D.

Whitlam's Progress

STOP PRESS

Australian Federal Opposition leader reported Ping-Ponged, Hong-Konged, Pekinised, Shanghaied

New Education*(continued from page 1)*

accurate to term him a "learning clinician". This title is intended to convey the idea that schools are becoming "clinics" whose purpose is to provide individualized psychosocial "treatment" for the student, thus increasing his value both to himself and to society.

All across the country tens of thousands of teachers are attending classes and seminars to prepare them as psychological technicians, ready to go to work on the minds of your children . . . turning them into activists for the "new [socialist] society". These semi-trained amateur psychiatrists call themselves "change agents". Dr. Jerrold Novotney, a trainer of "change agents" for our schools at U.C.L.A., explains:

Leadership is directed towards changing the behavior of people. Changes in people's behavior are manifestations of changes in their goals, their perceptions, their understandings, insights, values, beliefs To bring about changed behavior in people, would be generally to alter one or more of these factors

The change agent as he deals with human beings in groups must perceive himself as a leader working with human organizations. Successful change agency starts with unfreezing the system.

This strategy for changing society was worked out by Kurt Lewin, the father of sensitivity training, at the N.E.A.'s National Training Laboratory. It consists of "unfreezing" old beliefs and attitudes, "moving" to new socially relevant concepts, and then "freezing" these "changes" into the personality of the subject individual. All of this, to which parents are expected to surrender their children, is done in groups. Individual thinking is to be surrendered to group thinking. As "change agent" trainer Kenneth Tye explains: "Individuals have different goals. If they are to work together effectively [as a force for change in society], they must cooperatively determine the direction of their efforts".

The "inquiry" or "problem solving" type of "relevant" curriculum, previously discussed, is tailor-made to subject emotionally and intellectually unprepared youths to the experiments of the teacher clinicians. Tye tells his trainees: "The change agent who wishes to use problem-solving as a way of entry for creating change should start with problems which are real to the group".

The man who originated the idea of turning our classrooms into psychiatric clinics for experimentations on our children calls himself Dr. Jacob Levy Moreno. Born behind the Iron Curtain as Ivan Vladimir Morenovsky, he is described by the *Los Angeles Times* of May 4, 1957, as a "New York mental expert famed as the discoverer of psychodrama, group therapy and sociometric technique in psycho-therapy".

Detailed discussion of the sociometric movement and its derivative techniques, which include sensitivity training, is beyond the scope of this article.* Basically it involves the methods of mind manipulation used by "change agents" to alter the personalities of young people. Moreno's strategies call for the assuming of roles, group criticism, and group confessions. In his book, *Who will Survive?*, Dr. Moreno

credits John Dewey with persuading the schools to introduce his systems. In its "Forecast For The 70's", the N.E.A. *Journal* predicts that Moreno's "sociometry" system will play an increasingly important role in the coming decade.

What sort of an operator is this Dr. Jacob Moreno to whose charge millions of American children are to be delivered? Certainly he makes no attempt to hide his hatred of individualism and love for collectivism. In his book, *Who Will Survive?*, he writes: "If God would come into the world again he would not come into it as an individual, but as a group, as a collective" But here Moreno is speaking figuratively, for he obviously does not believe in God. Moreno claims, "The only way to get rid of the God syndrome is to act it out [through the sociodrama]". And he proclaims coyly:

I have heard that a form of sociopsychodrama is used for Communist propaganda . . . to convert people to communism This is an illustration in point that highly directive sociodrama can be used for the indoctrination of any set of values, religion, communistic or fascistic.

And the celebrated Dr. Moreno says of Communist Karl Marx:

He raised the question as to who should govern the means of production in order to assure society from uneven and unjust distribution of income. Thus far Marx was correct.

But, concluded Dr. Moreno, Marx looked at man as solely an economic being and overlooked the role that psychiatry could play. Moreno claims that by using sociometry he can do a better job of bringing about Communism than did Marx. "How can we avoid the errors which Marx has made on the theoretical and on the practical level of revolutionary action?" Dr. Moreno asks rhetorically. He answers:

We can avoid the theoretical error by replacing the theory of socialism with the theory of sociometry, and the practical error by replacing the global hit or miss socioeconomic proletarian revolution with "small" sociometric revolutions

A scientific knowledge of economics is important but insufficient for a true change of social order Socialism is the revolution of one class, the economic proletariat; sociometric revolution is a revolution of all classes without exception

The sociodrama is an instrument by means of which social truth, truth about social structure and conflicts can be explored and social change transacted by means of dramatic method

(to be continued)

THE SURVIVAL OF BRITAIN

By Bryan W. Monahan

By 1968 the virtual encirclement of Europe by Soviet forces was plainly visible. Since then, developments have been catastrophic.

Clothbound £1.10p (£1 2s. 0d.) posted

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

*For details see the *Sixteenth Report*, California Senate Investigating Committee On Education, Pp. 136-171.