

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 32. No. 18.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.  
Postage: home 1½d. abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1954.

6d. Fortnightly

### New Zealand Tactics

Recent advices from New Zealand make clear the tactics used in preparation for the forthcoming general election, in which many candidates propose to stand under a 'social credit' label. That this political section of the New Zealand Social Credit Association is for the moment dominant is reflected in *The New Zealand Social Crediter* which, like the British Columbia Government, enthusiastically follows in the steps of the Manning administration in Alberta.

In New Zealand the party members are evidently of two kinds, one consisting of people with vague and sometimes mistaken ideas, who are always ready to alter doctrine if they think that that will make Social Credit popular enough to score the votes which will give them office. This section is inevitably biased towards conventional policies and surface remedies. Individuals may have the best intentions in the world, but the knowledge and understanding that they lack throws them wide open to the soft, sponge-like, absorbent 'Welfare' State.

The other group is of social crediters who were well persuaded of the truth of Social Credit as at first presented, which in the nineteen-twenties became fixedly concentrated upon demonstrating the financial technique. This aspect, if not excessively explored, was exploited by some to whom it particularly appealed, who thereby gained a considerable facility in argument, and by others not so well equipped. The work done by this early generation of social crediters in any case laid foundations which made possible the advance into regions concerned with social dynamics. This has made the history of the movement since 1933-4. Some followed into this new country and some remained behind still believing that suitable action must follow on exposure of the financial fault, which like a geological fault breaks the continuity of strata and in this case separates the plane of physical possibility from that of metaphysical and physical satisfaction. Their expectations have not materialised. On the contrary, proof and remedy alike are met with blank indifference on the part of those in power or subservient to it. Douglas wasted no time in protesting the accuracy of the truth he had uncovered but passed on to further stages in the problem of implementation. Many social crediters of those early days were either unable or unwilling to leave that stage in which they had gained proficiency. They were left behind, neglectful of the rule that it is a frequent if not invariable feature of organic growth that it must move on from one state to another. An august example of this is found in the earliest days of the Christian Church. In the words of the late Dom Gregory Dix: "*There seems to be a strict limit to the extent to which a local Church can ever afford to allow itself to become isolated from the general progress of Christian thought. The reception of*

*'The Gospel' is neither a static nor a mechanical process. There is an organic advance into its meaning, without any deviation from orthodoxy, which is part of the historical life of the Catholic Church. It is the heresies which usually represent some form of conservatism, some local refusal to advance beyond an old and inadequate understanding of the original 'Gospel.' The penalty [of losing contact] is fossilisation . . . and ultimately death.*"[\*]

Although with a different reference, there is substance in these words which may incline social crediters to re-view the range of doctrine which Douglas left for us to ponder, to apprehend that his advice was given only in relation to existing circumstances, and to use it at the utmost stretch of understanding as to when and how it is applicable. H.E.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK— (continued from page 2.)

but it would be distinctly odd if their pro-poetic rages were reserved for, let us say, Professor Wood Jones's views on adaptation, or one of the Mr. Cohens's views on the constitution of some molecular product of I.C.I. The occasion for these remarks is the recent reviews of Mr. Ezra Pound's "The Cantos." Like St. Thomas Aquinas, Mr. Pound has written in detestation of what he calls 'usury.' (He knows more than St. Thomas knew about it, because there is now more to know; but the 'Sin' is still the same 'Sin,' cheating, with, perhaps, murder added as the urge to plain cheating has become more insistent. Whether poets should actually say anything may be a moot point. Most of them did (though perhaps they don't now), and Mr. Pound believes firmly that they should. Yet "We should not allow ourselves to be led astray, either as admirers or detractors, by Pound's King Charles's head, his adherence to the economic theories of Major Douglas." *The Tablet* is in line with the rest. We have not seen one 'lamb' who was not rushing off to join 'the pack.' What is the explanation?

• • •

In the 'funny' papers, they are already trying out 'the idea'; vide the mock leading article from *The T\*m\*s* for August 11, 1959, in *P\*n\*h* for August 11, 1954, which concludes, "In a free society there is room for different varieties of Communism, and, where such differences arise, it is better to talk it out than to shoot it out." At that not very distant date (1959), we gather that extremist voices like Mr. Arthur Deakin's "may indeed be heard to complain of what they call 'the menace of Communism,'" but Mr. Bevan and Mr. Eden are at least united in being less extreme.

\**Jew and Greek: A Study in the Primitive Church*, Dacre Press.

## 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: 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST. Telephone:  
Belfast 27810. Editorial: 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL,  
15. Telephone: SEFton Park 435.

\*Note: The above rates cover subscription to *Voice*, appearing fortnightly in alternate weeks with *The Social Crediter*.

### From Week to Week

Oblique, but, we believe, unmistakable references to the admirable articles now appearing in *Voice*, the strategical counterpart of this review, counsel great discretion among its supporters not to distort the impeccable (as it seems to us) line of argument put forward there. Doubtless it would embarrass both sides if we counted Mr. Christopher Hollis a supporter; but anyone who reads his encomium on the passing of the Church of England from a national to a 'universal' status at Minneapolis (*The Tablet*, August 28), with its reminder that order exists for religion, not religion for order, will understand what we mean. Whenever 'the masses' may be presumed to be listening-in, there is strong temptation to sacrifice truth for the sake of understanding, and, 'as every schoolboy knows,' yesterday's lesson is always much easier than tomorrow's. (So, he says, 'let us have that one again.') It regard to one of yesterday's lessons, we are quite willing to accede. It is the lesson Douglas read us concerning the limitations to be placed upon Acton's interpretation of the corrupting effects of power. Having restored the 'tends' often omitted from quotations—"all power tends to corrupt,"—Douglas proceeded to point out that even so, this made the outlook pretty hopeless, since, on this earth, nothing could possibly be *done* except by the use of power. Believing that our situation was not hopeless, however grave, Douglas corrected Acton by distinguishing between personal power and accredited power. "All accredited power corrupts." We have noticed it. Personal power *may*, but *need* not do so.

If you saw a wolf raiding the fold, whatever revulsion you might feel, mixed, of course, with a resolute intention to take appropriate action, you would not, we imagine, say to yourself that the wolf was behaving out of character. On the other hand, what would be your judgment if you saw a lamb breaking out of the fold and going hell-for-leather (if lambs go that way) to join the pack? This seems to us to be the most appropriate imagery in which to present the recent behaviour of that blessed tribe, the reviewers of poetry. Many prejudices might afflict a reviewer, but there seems on the surface to be little to connect, *e.g.*, good taste in the highest form of literature with a detestation of any *particular* form of scientific demonstration. It is conceivable that most reviewers of poetry, or even most poets, might detest what nowadays goes under the name of 'science';

(continued on page 1.)

### Do Our Politicians Understand Communism?

Under the title, "Does Mr. Menzies really Understand Communism?" the *Intelligence Survey* of the Victorian (Australia) League of Rights for June gives interesting data, which, referring explicitly to an Australian politician, reflect as well the general failure of public men raised to eminence under our pseudo-democracies to live up to their claim to be 'responsible.'

The *Survey*, which is under the direction of Mr. Eric D. Butler, has no desire to launch a personal attack on Mr. Menzies, but is concerned because the true nature of the Communist conspiracy is not grasped.

The main purpose of the *Survey*, it is stated, is "to provide an intelligence service for what we term the *leader personnel* in the community." "The Leader" is, of course, one of the characteristic features of pseudo-democracy—almost universally referred to as Democracy—and is a phenomenon best understood as a *surrogate* for dictatorship from below:—

*Ich habe gar nichts gegen die Menge;  
Doch kommt sie einmal ins Gedränge,  
So ruft sie, um den Teufel zu bannen,  
Gewiss die Schelme, die Tyrannen.*

as Goethe wrote: ("I have nothing against the masses; though once they get into a scrape, to conjure away the Devil, they are certain to call up those rogues, the tyrants.") However that may be, the *Survey* goes on:—

An intelligence service is of no use in helping people to assess a situation unless all the known facts are accurately reported. Facts are neutral and we do ask our readers not to make the fundamental mistake of thinking that the presentation of any unpalatable or apparently astonishing facts concerning any public man is necessarily an attack upon that man. In last month's *Survey* we reported some facts concerning the public defence by Mr. R. G. Casey of the top Communist espionage agent in the U.S.A., Alger Hiss. We believe that we would be failing in our duty to suppress such an important fact. There are, of course, several very good reasons why Mr. Casey should adopt the attitude he has. This merely demonstrates that he is human and is not infallible. But unless such matters are dealt with objectively and honestly, there is no possible hope of understanding the conspiratorial aspects of Communism and therefore no hope of dealing with it.

Like many others, Mr. Casey no doubt felt that if his good friend, Mr. Dean Acheson, a well-educated and cultured man, publicly said that he could not believe that Hiss was a traitor in spite of the evidence, he should also accept this viewpoint. The Hiss case in America drove home the fact that well-educated people supported Hiss in spite of the evidence because they had met him socially and found him a courteous, cultured, and hospitable person. Those who have a high regard for education appear to find it difficult to believe that educated people can be the most dangerous Communists. It was the late President Roosevelt who, in the face of all the facts, said he could not believe that Stalin was anything but a Russian patriot. He was a "nice guy." The fact that modern education produces so many Communists and Socialists has in recent times caused a number of penetrating thinkers to ask whether perhaps education divorced from religion is perhaps only instruction

and not genuine education at all. But we do not propose to pursue this matter here as we hope to deal with it in a subsequent issue. However, we do report the fact that on polling day, May 29, Mr. Menzies told his Labour opponent, Mr. George Miller, whose integrity we can vouch for, that he was astonished in going around the polling booths to find that the Communists were all well dressed and well educated.

Mr. Miller said that he did not find this fact astonishing and that the Universities were producing the most Communists in Australia. When he mentioned that works by Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick and Mr. Vance Palmer were being used at Melbourne University, Mr. Menzies quickly terminated the discussion. The mention of Mr. Vance Palmer no doubt caused Mr. Menzies unhappy memories of a subject which all responsible people should consider. Now if Mr. Menzies is really astonished that Communists are well educated and not poverty stricken, it may well explain his attitude towards the furtherance of Communist ideas by both the Australian Broadcasting Commission and the Commonwealth Literary Fund. Again we stress the point that the facts are neutral. What we are looking for is an explanation of the facts, not accusations that we are "attacking" Mr. Menzies or anyone else. Such an explanation could possibly help Mr. Menzies and all other public men to realise that the Communist enemy is much more skilful than they have so far realised.

Now here are some facts: The following is from Federal *Hansard* of July 4, 1951:

"Mr. Mullens: Did the Prime Minister hear the Australian Broadcasting Commission discussion group broadcast on Monday, the 2nd July, 1951, at 8-40 p.m.? Is the right honourable gentleman aware that of the three speakers who participated in the discussion group, not one uttered any criticism of the policies of the Chinese Communist regime and based his statements on the now exploded views that the Chinese Communists are simply agrarian reformers and that Communist Russia does not control the policies of the Chinese Communists? Does the Prime Minister also know that two of the three speakers were the notorious 'party liners,' Dr. Peter Russo, of the Melbourne *Argus*, and Mr. C. P. Fitzgerald, of the School of Oriental Studies in the National University? Can the right honourable gentleman explain why it is that persons who hold views of this kind can always find an outlet for their expression through the Australian Broadcasting Commission whilst the opposing viewpoint rarely, if ever, finds expression from the national stations? Incidentally, I offer myself as an exponent of this opposing view.

"Mr. Menzies: I had the singular good fortune not to hear the broadcast in question, therefore I am quite unable to make any comment on it. As for the principle adopted by the Australian Broadcasting Commission in making its broadcasts, it is not for mere mortals like myself even to endeavour to understand it."

Needless to say, this rather off-hand and superficial reply by the Prime Minister caused grave disquiet amongst those students of the Communist conspiracy who understand how the fellow-travellers are even more dangerous than the Communists themselves. We have studied closely for years the commentaries given over the Australian national broadcasting stations and we are convinced that these com-

mentaries have, together with press commentaries, many written by the same fellow-travellers, done more to confuse the Australian people on Communism than all the material issued by the Communists under their own auspices. Unless Mr. Menzies and his colleagues understand the real nature of the Communist conspiracy, the attack upon the mind and the use of "useful innocents" to carry this attack, they cannot give the necessary lead to the Australian people in their great hour of peril.

As a further example of Mr. Menzies's remarkable attitude towards the Communist attack on the mind, we desire to deal at length with the manner in which the Commonwealth Literary Fund has been used to help Communist and pro-Communist writers. Labour Member, S. Keon, first raised this matter at Canberra on August 28, 1952. Mr. Keon prefaced his exposure by saying: "Whatever constitutional difficulties the Prime Minister may claim lie in his way in dealing with Communists, as chairman of this committee (controlling the Commonwealth Literary Fund) he has direct and personal responsibility." Mr. Keon then proceeded to show how Communists and pro-Communists had been assisted by the Commonwealth Literary Fund to turn out material furthering Communist ideas.

Mr. Keon was then supported by Mr. Gullett, Liberal Party Member and Government Whip. Mr. Gullett not only mentioned the Literary Fund but also said it was obvious that the Canberra National University was harbouring Communist and pro-Communist lecturers.

Now, instead of honestly facing the facts which had been revealed by both a Government and an Opposition Member, Mr. Menzies made what was described as a "sneering" attack upon the critics of the misuse of the Literary Fund. And his defence was most disturbing because it provided further evidence of the Prime Minister's apparent inability to understand how many intellectuals further Communist ideas. For example, Mr. Menzies said: "I was astounded to hear the hon. Member for Yarra suggest that there was something subversive about Mr. Palmer for I know him tolerably well and I know his work very well. I regard Mr. Palmer as a distinguished writer and for sheer, honest, disinterested and continuous work on the [Literary Fund] board, he will take a lot of beating." Now, if Mr. Menzies knows Mr. Vance Palmer "tolerably well" and his work "very well," we can only suggest that the Prime Minister has a "blind spot" which prevents him from seeing that it was far from certain that Mr. Palmer was "disinterested" in his work as Chairman of the Literary Fund Advisory Board.

In June, 1946, *Youth Voice*, the official organ of the Eureka Youth League, a Communist organisation, reported that Mr. Palmer was a patron of the League. In August, 1946, the Eureka Youth League's special New Deal financial appeal was backed by Mr. Palmer. Many similar facts could be quoted if space permitted. In 1951 Mr. Palmer was supporting the League established to protect the Communist writer, Frank Hardy, author of the famous *Power Without Glory*. According to Communist *Guardian* reports, Mr. Palmer has addressed Communist meetings. In 1948 he was chairman of a committee that organised a fund to send Mr. Coughlin, well-known Communist artist, to Europe. Mr. Palmer has also been associated with a number of pro-Communist organisations.

Bearing in mind Mr. Palmer's political background, it was not surprising that when the Literary Fund was criticised in 1952, no less than four fellowships granted by the Menzies-Fadden Government for novel writers were given to definite Communists. The other three fellowships were given to well-known fellow travellers. In reply to Mr. Menzies' astonishing defence of Mr. Palmer and other members of the Advisory Board, Mr. Keon said: "The Prime Minister accused me of wanting a political test applied to the persons who sought fellowships. I say unhesitatingly that the direct opposite is the truth. I want the works of writers to be judged on literary merit, and not on political affiliation. I was protesting against political judgments. . . . We have been asked by the Prime Minister to accept the fact that the literary ability of the Australian people falls far short of the literary ability of a small group of Communists. Does the Prime Minister invite honourable Members to believe that the awards were made under those circumstances purely on literary merit? If he does, then it is high time that he resigned from the advisory committee and allowed someone else to take his place who is prepared to thoroughly investigate this matter of the judgment of literary ability and the award of Commonwealth fellowships."

It was not without significance that the only support Mr. Menzies obtained in the House was from the Left-wing Labour Member, Mr. L. Haylen, who sought to prove that a writer's "political views are distinct from his literary activities." How little Mr. Haylen knows about Communists! He went on to say that "The great poetess, Mary Gilmore, is not a Communist." Then why is she given a special panel to give her views in the Sydney Communist *Tribune* every week.

Mr. W. C. Wentworth, strong anti-Communist Liberal Member from N.S.W., followed Mr. Haylen and agreed with the criticism made by Mr. Keon and Mr. Gullett. He made the following important comment: "The point I make is that there is throughout the world—this is not peculiar to Australia—a well-subsidised Communist literary machine the object of which is to build up the reputation of authors whose works fit in with the Communist idea and to pour scorn, or derision, upon any work of art, regardless of its merit, that is opposed to Communism."

Mr. Wentworth suggested that lack of time prevented Mr. Menzies from understanding the Communist technique of using people like himself to further their conspiracy. This explanation is probably partly true, although it is not very complimentary to the Prime Minister. However, it does draw attention to the fact that many public men are so busy today that they tend to rely upon the opinions of other people. The Communists and Socialists are well aware of this fact and have skilfully exploited it. And even after being exposed, they still continue being successful. We felt that after the 1952 exposure of the misuse of Commonwealth Literary Fund, the Prime Minister would have adopted a more realistic attitude. But apparently he continued having faith in Mr. Palmer and his Leftist literary associates. Only recently in his session, "Current Books Worth Reading," broadcast by the A.B.C. on Sunday mornings, Mr. Vance Palmer praised a recently-published novel, *The Unbending*, by Mr. Judah Waten. This novel, which reeks of Communist propaganda, was the result of a grant to Mr. Waten by the Commonwealth Literary Fund. Mr.

Geoffrey Tebbutt, reviewing Mr. Waten's book in the Melbourne *Herald* of June 19, criticised a blatant example of the taxpayers' money being used to finance political propaganda. The Sydney *Bulletin* of June 16 made the following very pertinent comment: "If Mr. Waten had written this novel under his own steam, it might have been dismissed as a piece of political propaganda with a few touches of artistry; but to have done it on a Commonwealth Grant, under a Liberal Government, elevates it to a really smart bit of business." It is reported that Mr. Waten has a grant to write a sequel to this novel!

Now Mr. Waten was one of those mentioned by Mr. Keon in 1952. Mr. Waten has been a most important Communist for a number of years. He was Secretary of the Jewish Council Against Fascism and Anti-Semitism for a number of years and, although he claimed in 1952 after Mr. Keon's criticism that he was a Communist in 1930, but had left the Party, the Communist *Guardian* of January 12, 1943, reported Mr. Waten as being in charge of the north-west Communist Party news. And right up until the present time he has been actively associated with Communists and Communist activities. No wonder the Sydney *Bulletin* said that it was "a really smart piece of business" for this man to get a grant under a Liberal Government to spread Communist ideas! Incidentally, Mr. Waten's novel was published by the Communist-front organisation, The Australasian Book Publishing Society, the manager of which rushed into print in the Communist *Guardian* to attack Mr. Geoffrey Tebbutt's criticism of the taxpayers' money being spent to produce this novel. We do not as yet know what Mr. Menzies thinks about all this. But judging by his reported statement on Communists on polling day, Mr. Menzies, like many others, still obviously finds it difficult to understand that most dangerous Communists are to be found in the middle and upper classes, and not amongst the lower-income groups.

We recommend to those who, like the Prime Minister, are astonished to find that many Communists are "well educated" people to consider the following extract from the American House Document, 100 *Things You Should Know About Communism*: "The real centre of power in Communism is within the professional classes. Of course, a few poor people respond to the Communist claim that it is 'a working class movement.' But taken as a whole the Party depends for its strength on the support it gets from teachers, preachers, actors, writers, union officials, doctors, lawyers, editors, businessmen, and even from millionaires." The above facts which have been demonstrated time and time again, are obviously very difficult for many to accept. But unless political leaders can accept these facts, it is certain that they can never really understand Communism.

### *The Fig Tree*

The publishers ask us to draw the attention of readers to the amended Order Form for *The Fig Tree* (quarterly) enclosed with this issue. It is more economical to insert this form in all copies, and, in its new wording, it will, it is suggested, be available for a friend's use. It is appreciated that many of our readers have already subscribed.

# THE FIG TREE

*A Douglas Social Credit Quarterly Review*

by Annual Subscription 20/- or quarterly 5/- (post free)

## ORDER FORM.

*Please do not write here—for office use.*

To the Manager,  
K.R.P. Publications Limited,  
Lincoln Chambers,  
11, Garfield Street,  
BELFAST, N. IRELAND.

From: —  
(Please use Block Letters)

Name .....

Address .....

Sir,

I enclose cheque, money order, postal order in the sum

of £ : : . (.....)  
(delete words not applicable)

Please send me quarterly on publication.....copy  
of *The Fig Tree*, commencing with Vol. .... No.....  
Date.....

Please send me.....copy  
.....copies of *The Fig Tree*, Vol. ....  
No..... Date.....

Please send.....copies of *The Fig Tree*, Vol. ....  
No's ...../...../...../...../..... now or on publication.

To: —  
Name .....

Address .....

(Date)..... (Signature).....

Additional instructions should be written on reverse side.  
Failure to receive official acknowledgement of order and remittance should be reported to K.R.P. Publications Limited.