

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 51 No. 12

SATURDAY, 4 SEPTEMBER, 1971

7p (1s. 5d.) Fortnightly

NEW EDUCATION*

The Radicals Are After Your Children

By GARY ALLEN

(Continued)

The next step is to feed test results from the local data bank into the regional computers. Doubtless the Taxonomy program is to be set up one step at a time to prevent the identification and isolation of whatever opposition to it might develop. Meanwhile, the Carnegie Corporation and the U.S. Office of Education have bankrolled a group known as the National Assessment of Educational Progress (N.A.P.E.) to work on the establishment of a national computer evaluation program.

That is simply catastrophic. But consider *this*. In its "Forecast For The 70's", the N.E.A. Journal predicts:

Biochemical and psychological mediation of learning is likely to increase. New drama will play on the educational stage as drugs are introduced experimentally to improve in the learner such qualities as personality, concentration, and memory. The application of biochemical research findings, heretofore centered in infra-human subjects, such as fish, could be a source of conspicuous controversy when children become the objects of experimentation.

According to Paul Beach in the *Congressional Record* of September 17, 1970:

Such programs are no longer speculative. School systems using "behavior modification" drugs on elementary pupils have surfaced in districts across the nation—in Anaheim, California; Omaha, Nebraska; and Montgomery County, Maryland, schools. Most so far use amphetamines, like Ritalin or Dexedrine, on so-called hyperkinetic (overactive) children. Among addicts, such drugs are known as "speed". According to press sources, school officials admit having put "tens of thousands" of youngsters on these or similar drugs, or as much as 10 to 20% of elementary students in particular districts.

While the drugs work as stimulants on adults, they have the opposite effect on youngsters. Nobody knows why, and nobody knows what the long-term effects will be, but that has not stopped the educationist experimenters from requiring their ingestion by certain active children—mostly fidgety boys. In one California elementary district, one-third of the student body is already on these drugs; ten times the number that could reasonably be expected to be hyperkinetic.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare supports this program and speculates that these drugs, which are highly addictive to adults, are not addictive to children. But

already many doctors and school personnel are grumbling privately that educational policy-makers must never have been boys, and that the only effect of drugging children will be to raise "a generation of junkies and speed freaks". One of the problems which has already evolved is that kids on the playground are now engaged in pill swallowing. At the very least, it will be impossible when these youngsters are teenagers to tell them that drugs are dangerous. How do you get them off "speed" when they've been popping pills since kindergarten?

Other radical educators are not so much concerned about pumping amphetamines into their charges as they are about the fact that they do not get their hands on your child until age five. In its "Forecast For The 70's" the N.E.A. declares: "As nonschool, pre-school programs begin to operate, educators will assume a formal responsibility for children when they reach the age of two". What worries these certified government child molesters is that too many parental values are transmitted to the child during the early years.

But, of course, the child doesn't belong to the state! Really? Then why did President Nixon tell the recent convention of governors at Colorado Springs that "we have declared the first five years of a child's life to be a period of special and specific Federal concern"?

When the White House Conference on Children and Youth met in Washington last December, one of the most important matters to come before the session was that of establishing a vast grid of federally funded child care centers, a system which will probably be established this year. It would cost some \$10 billion per year to operate these federally controlled centers, plus construction costs. The White House Conference even recommended that the federal government provide an "advocate" for our children who would serve as a "protector" between parent and child.

The Master Planners are also discussing other charming ideas in this field. One of them is compulsory national service at age eighteen for both males and females. Those who do not choose the military would be required to do social work as federal bureaucrats. Someone wants to make awfully sure your child has no chance for independent thinking between the ages of two and twenty-one.

Among other schemes being contemplated by the illumined educationists are mandatory foster homes for children removed en masse from the influence of socially or politically unacceptable parents. Serious discussion of billeting children from poverty areas to affluent neighborhoods is already

(continued on page 4)

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.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

Extra copies of current numbers, while stocks last, are available posted at:

6 for 25p (5/-); 12 for 40p (8/-); 24 for 70p (14/-)

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

British absorption in the European Community has been variously represented as an economic necessity, the only way to avoid economic disaster, a great opportunity, a chance for 'renewed' greatness, a prospect of 'leading' the Six, and generally as something for which it is worth paying some sort of price. The 'negotiations', of course, have concerned the size of that price. The *Times* (May 4, 1971) indicates that no price could be too high, since a failure of the negotiations would be "a total, disastrous and unmitigated defeat". Well, obviously this leaves the Six (or the Germans dominating the Six) in the position of having won total victory, and Britain in a condition of unconditional surrender. It is quite to be expected in these circumstances that the British 'negotiators' should represent the terms agreed under this sort of duress as a victory to be celebrated by a champagne breakfast (public not invited). On the other hand, it is queer to have Mr. Heath reporting that the Six expect the Government to use its Parliamentary majority to ensure British entry. There does not seem to be much "take it or leave it" about that. It is far more likely that behind the closed doors of the 'negotiations' some threats and realities which no British Government would dare disclose to the British public have been spelled out—that "disastrous defeat" to which the *Times* apparently has been privy.

But all this is peripheral to the real issue. The notion of a prosperous Europe, a third (or is it now a fourth?) Super-Power, is a chimera, a bait, a trap for the unwary. The fate which awaits Europe is final Communist conquest. This situation has been analysed often enough in these pages, but another straw in the wind has recently come into view.

Reviewing Harold Wilson's *The Labour Government 1964-1970: A Personal Record*, Enoch Powell* quotes Wilson's recollection of an interview with de Gaulle, when the latter was asked what France would be like without de Gaulle. The General replied (not for the first time) "*Les délices de l'anarchie*". This is apt, and probably intended, to be written off as mere egotism. But it is in fact a *double entendre*, for de Gaulle was guided by a vision (manufactured in Moscow from a design drawn in New York) of a

**Spectator*, July 31, 1971.

Socialist Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. The prospect of anarchy (with its delights for the Communists) is not a prophecy but a disclosure—a disclosure of the *modus operandi* of the Communist take-over. And further light on this is shed by a further remark of de Gaulle's. Wilson writes: "Did he not fear that post-de Gaulle France would be relegated to a second-class status against the power of a strong Germany? He warned to his theme. '*Les Allemands*,' he said, '*seront toujours les Allemands*.'" Wilson comments: "He had no doubt what would happen, but he would not be there to prevent it." Did Wilson have any doubt?—Does he now? After all, Wilson raised the question.

The essential point to grasp is that Communism as exemplified by 'Russia' is not a Super-Power bent on the military conquest of the globe; Communism in Russia is an element, albeit a very important one, in a global Conspiracy to establish an all-powerful World Government to be maintained by whatever military means prove expedient—chiefly the Red Army. The deployment of Soviet Forces over the globe is preparatory. In his Dedicatory Letter, written in 1952, to *France: The Tragic Years* Sisley Huddleston wrote: "Having smashed every barrier to Communism, having divided country after country, having abolished the sense of justice and pity, we await, inadequately defended, the coming of the Police State, with the promise of a new liberation when the Continent has become a cemetery." Undoubtedly Huddleston means the cemetery of Græco-Roman-Christian civilisation.

A Student of Politics (*Spectator*, July 17, 1971) considers that the European Community will be dominated by a Franco-German alliance. But France is a shambles as compared with Germany, who may be expected to dominate the Community. But just around the corner is Soviet backing for a 're-united' Germany, implying the application of the Brezhnev Doctrine to the remainder of Europe.

In all probability, Britain's signing the Treaty of Rome would be the all-clear for the unleashing of economic disaster in the U.S.A.—a disaster which already is imminent, and which in any case could only be averted by a radical change in financial methods. President Nixon forecast a reduced deficit in the budget for 1970-71; instead it is a massive \$23,000 million—a clear indication that the operation of the financial system is inherently defective. But on top of this is mounting unemployment and rising prices; and economically disastrous strikes threaten. All this adds up to a situation made to order for the Communists—not only in the U.S.A., but throughout the world with the temporary exception of South Africa.

To imagine that Britain's 'joining' Europe could possibly avert the threatening universal economic crisis is too unrealistic to be taken seriously. On the other hand, *refusing* to join—together with a correct explanation of the reasons for refusing—might upset the Conspiracy's time-table, and alert public opinion everywhere as to what is really going on, to the fate which is being prepared for us. The preparations are obviously terribly far-advanced; but conspiracy is fatally vulnerable to exposure—if this is achieved in time.

We would not think there was any hope at all at this stage, except for one factor—the continued existence (against all the odds) and increasing activity of the John Birch Society in the U.S.A. The programme of the Society at the present time is devoted almost entirely to exposure of the aims and methods of the Conspiracy—by the relatively

massive distribution of books and pamphlets, the showing of films and film-strips, public speaking engagements, and the recruitment of patriotic and dedicated Americans to expand their efforts as rapidly as possible. Now it might appear outside the Society, and particularly outside the U.S.A., that it is not having much success. But what it is doing, in effect, is placing psychologically explosive charges whose effectiveness will not be apparent until they are detonated; and it is circumstances—the maturation of the Conspiracy—which will provide the detonators. Now a successful and public exposure of what really lies behind the attempt to have Britain adhere to the Treaty of Rome might make a vital difference in this situation, and this is the justification for continuing every effort to defeat the attempt to 'join' Europe. If the several anti-Market organisations would get away from the 'economic' arguments—which are fallacious on both sides—and concentrate on the fundamental political issue, there might be one last chance of Britain's helping to save herself, and by example the world.

From this point of view, *the next two months* are critical—the final period for any sort of effective public debate in Britain. If the Treaty is signed, the race will be over, and discussion, even if permitted, useless. According to David Wood (*Times*, Aug. 2, 1971) "Some of the most important managerial decisions have to do with the procedural handling of Common Market legislation in the Commons. The *short but crucial* Bill authorising the Government to accede to the Treaty of Rome is to be taken through all stages on the floor of the House" (emphasis added). After that, of course, it will be a case of "the Government knows best". The "harmonisation" procedures will be highly technical and legal, and apart from procedural requirements, quite unsuited for general Parliamentary debate. So, according to Wood, the harmonisation Bill "will be put through under a timetable guillotine and will go upstairs to a standing committee".

This is the point where the loss of the 'inessential' part of sovereignty will begin to be felt—by Members of Parliament in the first place. Parliament will begin to look much less worth while, for it is to what the European Commissioners have to say that the Government will have to listen, not to back-benchers. There will be no question of Parliament's disallowing the Commission's Regulations, so why debate them? If they are laid on the table, they will be "for information only". But somewhat later the public will begin to feel the effect of the loss of 'inessential' sovereignty, for, as Wood says, the harmonisation Bill "touches a thousand and one aspects of the British way of life". Of course; the unity of the Community requires homogenisation of its subjects, in the interests of 'efficiency' and 'progress'. Could Hitler have done less?

Perhaps once more it should be emphasised that the alternative to 'joining' the European Community is the determined assertion of our national sovereignty by a unilateral reform of the monetary system, and the purchase of our necessary raw materials in the cheapest markets. The objective of monetary reform should be the steady reduction of prices to consumers, and the progressive reduction of taxation, and the substitution of universal dividends in place of 'social service' payments. These are *principles*, embodying the concept of society as a fruitful association of free individuals enjoying the benefits of the unearned increment which arises from such association. There are several possible

methods of reform, but at the present time probably the most appropriate is by the conversion of the internal national debt into a National Capital Assets Account; this would remain unmonetised, but would form the base for the creation of monetary credit in the form of "interest" at a given percentage. The National Assets Account would be written up or down on the basis of variations of "productivity" (a term now familiar to and beloved of certified 'economists'). Variable valuation of assets is a process quite normal to industry, and sometimes forms the basis of distribution of benefits in one form or another, usually convertible to cash, to share-holders; all that is proposed here is that this normal practice should be generalised. The distribution of benefits could take the form of a subsidy to vendors to reduce prices at the point of sale (negative sales-tax); this is equivalent to an increase of purchasing-power in the hands of the individual. The further distribution of capital appreciation would be by the payment of universal dividends, beginning at a quite low level. The effect of increased purchasing-power and a gradually rising income would be to make it progressively possible for family units to make provision for themselves of those 'social services' which are at present expensively provided through a centralised and frequently inefficient bureaucracy.

(This economic alternative to the European proposal is not to be taken as a concrete proposal, let alone a definite *plan*. It is the basis of what might be called a feasibility study. There are plenty of people intellectually qualified to draw up a technically practicable scheme based on the true economic situation existing at any given time, and in the light of other variable factors, when once the fundamental question of *policy* is decided. The question of policy is: retention or abrogation of national sovereignty. Retention of sovereignty entails modification of the financial system, and the above outline is merely to demonstrate a *possible* modification. Abrogation of sovereignty means subjection to the Economic Commission's plans, which include redistribution of wealth between the industrialised and the non-industrialised areas of the globe—White Paper, para. 53. Discussion of economic alternatives is futile until the question of policy is decided.)

Probably the best way to grasp what the "Common Market" is really all about is to realise that it is *designed* to make impossible reform of the financial system along the lines and according to the principles outlined above. The Common Market is a non-military step towards World Government by so-far undisclosed World Governors backed by World Military 'Police'. It culminates that secret undermining of individual national sovereignty (the "inessential" sovereignty of the White Paper) disclosed by Dr. Arnold Toynbee as an objective of the Royal Institute of International Affairs.

The publication of the White Paper discloses clearly for the first time the battle lines. **THE ISSUE IS NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY: THE ECONOMIC 'ARGUMENTS' ARE A CALCULATED DELUSION AND DECEPTION.** *The White Paper does not reveal ONE concrete, economic benefit*, merely a conglomeration of assumptions and opinions. Who would buy shares in a Company which issued a Prospectus along the lines of the White Paper?

We strongly urge *all* anti-Marketees in the next two months to proscribe all economic arguments, and to bring out and concentrate on the real issue—the preservation of

national sovereignty—for at stake is national survival as a people of identifiable culture. Remember the enormous contribution of Anglo-Saxon culture to the civilisation of the world; and remember Attlee's boast that the Socialist Government threw a thousand years of British history out the window. Do the Conservatives really want to burn down the house?

New Education

(continued from page 1)

underway. There is also discussion of establishing kibbutzim where children would live in a commune, learning to be "socially acceptable". Elizabeth Koontz, president of the National Educational Association in 1968, and named head of the new network of child care centers by President Nixon, is already pushing for the establishment of this sort of arrangement for children.

These "innovative" ideas are emanating from hundreds of so-called P.A.C.E. (Programs to Advance Creativity in Education) Centers, established by Congress as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Centers, scattered over the nation, have been funded by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Ford Foundation, and are staffed by the usual radical psychiatrists, sociologists, and educators. Their job is to design experimental programs for the various school districts in their area.

In order to make sure that the "new education" juggernaut is not derailed, the National Education Association operates as one of the most potent lobbies in the country. It is a very cute operation indeed. On January 29, 1970, N.E.A. President George Fischer proclaimed: "We plan to make it political suicide to vote against [what we think is good for] the kids and education". In July of 1970 Fischer told an N.E.A. convention in San Francisco: "The world has never seen an organization of this magnitude". Mr. Fischer said that by the end of the Seventies "the President of the United States will consult with the officers of the united teaching profession on all issues of national importance". He did not say *or else*, but he added that teachers would reach their goals by strikes, contract negotiations, and political action.

And the N.E.A. is well prepared with counter measures should parents try to protect their schools from the attacking waves of behavioral scientists. Along with other "educational" groups the National Education Association is now conducting seminars in how to sell the new programs and head off opposition. The first tactic is always to accuse those who oppose letting teacher play psychiatrist of being some sort of extremists or religious fanatics.

Okay, what *can* parents do to protect their offspring from the Orwellian people planners? It is customary here to urge parents to become "involved", to join the P.T.A., to discuss the situation with teacher, to protest at the local school board. More often than not, these are merely exercises in frustration.

In some cases it still may be possible to head off the "new education" programs if local citizens can mobilize enough pressure on the local school board. But more and more these programs are being taken out of the jurisdiction of local boards and mandated by state law or federal guidelines. Within a few years, local school boards will have no power

at all and we will have a Federal School System. Even in cases where local pressure can be brought to bear, unless the pressure is constant, "Liberal" school boards will tend to sneak faddish programs in the back door as soon as the furor out front calms down.

It is vital for a totalitarian state to control the education and indoctrination of youth. Knowing this, the collectivist social engineers are working constantly to destroy independent private schools. They scream that it is "un-Democratic" for you to try to keep your child out of their clutches. As social engineer James B. Conant, the former president of Harvard, expressed it:

I do believe there is some reason to fear, lest a dual system (public and private) of secondary education may, in some states, come to threaten the democratic unity provided by our public schools. I refer to the desire of some people to increase the scope and number of private schools. Our schools should serve all creeds. The greater the proportion of our youth who attend independent schools, the greater threat to our democratic unity.

Those who would socialize America will do anything to keep their education monopoly from being broken. They see private schools as a serious threat to their power. But so bad are the public schools that more and more parents are now willing to make the financial sacrifices necessary to keep their children out of the hands of the certified government child molesters.* After all, how much is it worth to keep your son or daughter from being turned into a hippie, a revolutionary, or an obedient little Marxist?

Private schools, unfortunately, cannot be a panacea. Many of us simply cannot afford them, and others live in areas so sparsely populated that maintenance of both public and private schools is not practical. Parents in these situations must run their own schools at home after regular school hours. If they are not to see their children destroyed they have no other choice.

What were once community schools, organized for the convenience of parents and supported by them, have now become government indoctrination centers, increasingly financed and controlled by Washington. Their products are the Spock-marked generation of delinquents, drop-outs, and drug freaks we see all around us. Their tools are no longer those of Socrates or Christ, but of Dewey, Moreno, and the behavioral scientists. As Dr. Joseph Bean has observed: "When you consider that the ultimate goal of warfare is the control of the behavior of the vanquished by the victor, you realize that we are now in the greatest conflict in the history of mankind. Welcome to World War III".

(Concluded)

*This is not to contend that all private schools are good schools. Many are more futuristic than the public schools. But when you are paying the bill *privately* you can pick and choose.

WHITEPRINT FOR BETRAYAL

This article has been printed in booklet form at the following prices posted:
5 copies. 25p; 10 copies. 40p; 15 copies. 55p; 30 copies. £1.00

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