

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which 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 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: CENTRAL 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: SEFTON Park 435.

Vol. 31. No. 16. December 12, 1953. 6d. Weekly.

NOTICE

Change of Address

Until the arrangements now proceeding are completed for the collection of all the business activities of the Secretariat and its agents under one roof, ALL COMMUNICATIONS INTENDED FOR Messrs. K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., and the Social Credit Secretariat should be addressed to the present Editorial Office at

49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15

AUSTRALIAN, NEW ZEALAND AND CANADIAN SOCIAL CREDIT NEWSPAPERS PLEASE COPY.

From Week to Week

We are not surprised that the reporters can't get within a mile of the V.I.P.s at Bermuda. Why should they? Would it be safe? *Candour* for December 4 comments caustically on the absence of British troops to welcome Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth with the traditional fire from 21 guns, and their presence a providential week later to provide a glamorous military background for what it calls the 'condominium' of Churchill and Eisenhower. The (personal) Security element which invests the Bermuda talks is evident. Besides the possibility of a tête-à-tête with Mr. Malenko, what are they likely to talk about? Mr. Gouzenko?

We have heard Mr. George Schwartz described as the Nat Gubbins of the *Sunday Times*. Whether it comes to that or not, it comes to this:—

"How do you account for the fact that after the experience of our generation Ministers of Finance can still show their faces in daylight? I am told that some of them are received in the best homes. Not in mine. Recidivists, if you like, but none of that brood. . . ."

"Since January last, when the Minister promised to give the case earnest consideration, 23 of the 359 officers involved have died. Which just shows the political virtue of not rushing things. The survivors are asymptotically approaching the X-axis, which I must be pardoned for denominating the dead-line. With this natural acceleration in mortality there will be no problem at the end of a decade. *Solvitur moriendo.*

"On the subject of educational courses for the Forces. Someone should go round with a paper on 'The Good Faith of Politicians.' It would provide a lively discourse

on bilking, bunco-steering, the three-card trick, thimble-rigging, long-firm frauds and ringing the changes."

When an Englishman laughs a thing 'off'; he has finished with it—it's 'on.'

The leader-writer of *The Times Literary Supplement* has returned to the subject of Mallock's "Critical Examination of Socialism" written half a century ago. Reviewed last August, a correspondence followed, to which an editorial postscript is now written. "Mallock is saying, in effect," says the journalist, this:—"Socialists say that wealth should go to those who produced it. A great part of our national wealth is produced, in reality, by the posthumous influence of the dead. Society as a whole has no right, on Socialist principles, to this proportion of the national wealth, since society as a whole did not produce it. The best available claimants, therefore, are those to whom the producers of wealth expressly bequeathed it and to whom they might have given it had they survived."

"To this argument there is one fundamental objection to which Mallock's critics have drawn attention. It is impossible, they contend, to prove that any given proportion of the nation's wealth was produced by any particular class of person, since none of it could have been produced without the co-operation of several classes of person. This is a valid objection to Mallock and to those early Socialists who used the argument of causality to justify the claim of the workers to appropriate all profit. It is fallacious, however, to suppose that because two classes of person are necessary to the production of a particular commodity, each of them must therefore be entitled to an equal share in its proprietorship. The proper conclusion is that attempts to determine the distribution of national wealth by asking 'Who produced it?' are futile because *the question is unanswerable*. Mallock believed that he could answer the question, but held that the answer, *i.e.*, that most of it had been produced by the capitalist class, with its corollary that they should have even larger rewards than they do, was so preposterous in practice that it could never be the basis of a social policy. It must be used solely as a stick to beat the Socialists. The Socialists made the graver mistake of supposing not only that they could answer the question, but that their answer could be and ought to be the basis of a social policy."

At that point, the journalist changes the subject. What a pity his pen did not follow his mind, setting forth correctly: "So Douglas was right. The only defensible destination for the proportion of current production traceable to inherited skill in invention is the National Dividend." It didn't; but readers may tick off another Social Credit axiom conceded. Truly, the Socialist answer can *not* be, and ought not to be (though it is), "the basis of the social policy—of all parties."

Public controversy so rarely adds anything to general knowledge that we place on record the statement of Mr. David Astor, the Editor of *The Observer*, in rebuking a fellow editor, that *The Observer* "Belongs outright to a trust composed of Mr. Dingle Foot (Chairman), Lord Portal of Hungerford, Mrs. Mary Stocks, Dr. Keith Murray, Mr. Max Nicholson, Colonel C. H. Golding and honorary trustees, Mr. Arthur Mann, C.H., and Dr. Thomas Jones, C.H."

Constitution mongering is still active. *The Daily Telegraph* for December 3 said:—

“The proposal first exclusively reported in *The Daily Telegraph* yesterday, that Malta should have a new constitutional relationship with Britain, may have a wider significance if accepted. The scheme is to bring the island under Home Office jurisdiction in a manner comparable to the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands.

“It could provide a pattern for relations between Britain and the smaller Colonies and Dependencies. These, although managing their own affairs, might not be able to sustain complete independence for special or economic reasons. . . .”

“It is evident that the proposal made to Malta is at present one of broad principle with many details to be filled in. For instance, it could mean the inclusion of Malta in the structure of a National Insurance, Health and other welfare services.

“A number of Conservative M.P.s have urged that fusion of the Commonwealth Relations and Colonial Offices would make possible a general Commonwealth Civil Service. . . .”

Gouzenko

The touchiness of Canadian politicians and British newspapers concerning the suggestion that Mr. Igor Gouzenko should be reinterviewed by the United States State Department has some curious features quite separate from those to which attention is drawn publicly.

Mr. Gouzenko's story is well told in the Report of the Royal Commission of the Canadian Judges, Mr. Robert Taschereau and Mr. R. L. Kellock, “to investigate the facts relating to and circumstances surrounding the communication, by public officials and other persons in positions of trust of secret and confidential information to agents of a Foreign Power.” The Report is dated June 27, 1946, and was immediately reported upon by this review, whose publishers, and not H.M. Stationery Office, were instrumental in supplying it to more than one Chief Constable in England, on his initiative, when a certain disinclination to handle it in official quarters was evident and exposed by the late Sr Ernest Graham-Little in the House of Commons.

It is now suggested that the hitch between Mr. Jenner and Mr. Lester Pearson concerning the secrecy of whatever it may be which Mr. Gouzenko might communicate touches the sensitivity of the Canadian Administration on the score of its own corresponding disinclination to do anything more than “send Mr. Gouzenko back where he came from”—the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa.

At the time these lines are written, it is uncertain whether the interview between Mr. Gouzenko and the officials of the American State Department will ever take place. Mr. Gouzenko says he has nothing to reveal that he has not already revealed to the Canadian police, and while it is admitted that not all of this is reflected in the pages of the Report of the Royal Commission, it is also claimed that nothing was kept back from the Americans at the official level. Mr. Gouzenko himself says he only wants to give the Americans some advice. Why not? No one in an official position in Canada would be seriously apprehensive lest Mr. Gouzenko's advice should be accepted by the

Americans if it is of such a nature as to be rejected by the Canadians.

Mr. Gouzenko is presumably at present living *incognito*. Undoubtedly he is earning his living, not receiving a pension. Unexplained absence from work might lead to the penetration of his secret by his workmates. The danger of loss of personal security has already been mentioned as a matter to be borne in mind by Mr. Gouzenko before he goes too far. But those who made this suggestion may quite well have entertained completely divergent views concerning the reasons for Mr. Gouzenko's immunity from personal attack from those entertained by Mr. Gouzenko himself. And probably they would be the better informed. On November 30, Mr. Gouzenko himself contributed a signed ‘copyright’ article to the *Toronto Telegram*, purporting to set forth the nature of the ‘advice’ which the author has to offer the Americans. But why the Americans? *The Times* summarises this article by saying that “This obviously rules out his appearance before a public session of the sub-committee, but not necessarily a private meeting in Canada under conditions carefully devised for his protection.” We may remark that here respect for copyright is excessive. In fact, First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, five definite proposals are set forth as a solution of the “escapee problem.”

And do they come near the bone of the International Monetary Fund, which is the very shadowy background to the Dexter White case?

Well, yes, in a way, they do; but so fundamentally as almost certainly to ensure their rejection as being the idealistic excogitations of a sincere and very courageous man in exile, a good Code Clerk and all that, but . . . Mr. Gouzenko seems to think that Western Civilisation is perfect except in its failure to provide peace and security for those upon whose shoulders rest the burden of maintaining it, particularly the brave. But here, Mr. Schwartz surely speaks for us all: “We can proffer them the consolation of philosophy” (*Sunday Times*, December 6). Mr. Schwartz is speaking of disinflated army officers, and British at that; but the argument is the same. Has “McCarthyism” really got out of hand? We doubt it.

A feature of the Gouzenko case which should not be entirely overlooked is that reported in *The Social Crediter* for February 2, 1946, concerning the communist note-book which fell inadvertently into the hands of well-instructed Social Crediters in Western Canada. In the hands of the late Mr. Norman Jacques, it was, we believe, a material factor in getting the unwilling Mackenzie King to act. But that does not mean that Mr. Gouzenko understands anything more than an average Canadian about money.

Correction

We thank correspondents for drawing attention to a line in the annotations to the article “Don't” last week. The statement “Evil is the deprivation of Good” is *not* of course, a Christian heresy. The passage should read:—“A little more definitive is the assertion that ‘death is only the absence of life’ (cp. ‘Evil is only the deprivation of Good’). It brings to mind Catharism (which is an ancient heresy).” (Reference asked for:—*Inter alia*: *The Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Centuries*, H. L. Mansel, a Dean of St. Paul's, 1875.)