

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 32. No. 21.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1954.

6d. Fortnightly.

From Week to Week

“Power is a self-explanatory word.” (*Vide The Times*, September 27—leading article: “Europe.”)

When you come to think of it (if you ever do), when we had dear Atlas with us in the more-or-less flesh, all he had to do was to hold up a plane surface which, incidentally, had nowhere to fall to. If the dear fellow were with us now, he would have on his shoulders a sphere about eight thousand miles in diameter and of a mass of 6×10^{21} tons, with quite evidently (seeing how fast it is going ‘down’) somewhere to fall to. Such is the ‘advance of science.’ Atlas retired. How wise those old Titans were!

“The coal supply position in Britain is more critical than has ever been publicly admitted, Mr. E. F. Schumacher, economic advisor to the National Coal Board, said at Middlesbrough yesterday. Addressing a conference of the women’s Advisory Council on Solid Fuel, he said that we were placing our hopes on atomic energy, but although this problem had been technically solved, economically it had not.” (*The Times*, October 8.)

It would be interesting to know which of the many problems associated with the replacement of the now obsolescent coal, oil and water-power sources upon which our Promethean industrial production rests by atomic energy Mr. Schumacher had in mind. Thorstein Veblen many years ago showed that organised sabotage of plant and capital goods generally was indispensable to industry as it is conducted under the control of the Money Power. From this point of view, the conventional practice seems to suggest no difficulty—as the coal fields (and the coal-miners) become ‘redundant,’ scrap ‘em! We have not heard the old catch question “Where’s the money to come from?” lately, and we suppose that it is now well understood that there is no difficulty in that direction. “Full employment”? Really that is not an economic question. Isn’t it rather a question of morbid psychology—or, if you like, Religion: the Jewish Religion of blood and sweat resurgent over the Christian Religion of Life Abundant?

While Mr. Schumacher was talking to the women, Mr. J. Eccles, the new president of the Institution of Electrical Engineers, was talking to the members about “fossil” fuels. (Coal; The old fossil!) He seems to have had still some use for water, and suggested that the countries’ excess water-power might be used to purify fissile material so that it could be exported as ‘packaged fuel.’ Export or die!

The *Daily Telegraph* for September 27 had something interesting to report concerning the unveiling by Lord

Goddard of a bust of Sir William Blackstone at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia.

Greetings from the Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of Oxford University were read in Latin by the Master of University College, Professor Arthur Goodhart.

He referred to the decision of the college, the second oldest in the United States, to appoint a professor of taxation. A degree of “Master of Law and Taxation” is to be created.

Dr. Goodhart recalled that in its early days under the British Crown the College of William and Mary was allowed to submit Latin verses in lieu of rent.

Study of the classics has never been one of Dr. Goodhart’s favourite pastimes but he went on to deliver part of his speech in Latin. The official translation ran:

“If only your new professor could restore that old custom of the reign of William and Mary, what happier arrangements could there be than to write a few Latin verses instead of paying a tax?”

Was there perhaps a trace of prejudice in his comment that most people might find it ‘easier just to pay their taxes’?—and why ‘their’ taxes?

A correspondent sends us a paragraph by Colin Jordan in *Free Britain* for October, which we quote:—

“SOCIAL CREDIT WITH A JEWISH ACCENT. There are many sincere nationalists and good friends of *Free Britain* among followers of the Social Credit doctrine. They would do well to keep a wary eye on certain of the personalities behind the recently formed ‘Company of Free Men’ (London), that is apparently an offshoot of the now defunct Social Credit Party, one of whose leading organisers informed me several years ago that it was a good idea to try and get Jews to back the movement.

“By its Constitution the new organisation freely admits Jews. It has found it possible to publish an expensive 28 pages two-coloured illustrated journal, *The Sun*, wherein one of its regular contributors, lurking behind the pseudonym of Crodon, Saxon God of Plenty, attacks anti-Semitism at length, rebuking Major Douglas, founder of the Social Credit doctrine, for this misdemeanour. Social Credit in the hands of the Jews would become merely another instrument for the realisation of their ancient ambition for world control over the Gentiles.”

Apart from the fact that the Arabs have as much claim as the Jews to the appellation ‘Semitic,’ and ‘anti-Semitism’ is, therefore, almost invariably a misnomer, this paragraph seems to us double-edged. Doubtless this is quite unintentional on the part of the writer, and we should not refer to it if the point at issue were not fundamental. The suggestion that in the hands of somebody—never mind who—Social Credit could ‘become’ something—never mind

(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 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*.

Politics and Police

Police organisation seems to undergo changes from time to time, as one might expect, and therefore it is not possible without special enquiry (which might be unfruitful) to attach precise labels to particular responsibilities at any given time. The description however is not misleading, if we say that a responsible official of one of those departments specially interested in political movements once told us: "We are not interested in abstract ideas. All we are interested in is something tending to civil disorder."

As patriotic citizens, we were more than mildly disappointed. Riot and revolution, so far from being blood-brothers, have no necessary relationship to one another, and may, indeed, be antagonistic to the point of incompatibility. Riot has been more often provoked in order to justify, and therefore to assist, exceptional measures of restraint in the interest of the *status quo* than to establish any new idea, or to dislodge an old but false idea. No legitimate interest whatsoever is promoted by rioting, which is wholly destructive. Revolution, on the other hand, when it is not merely 'vertiginous' (to employ Francis Bacon's multi-associational term), is, or should be, a turning of a corner of policy, a turning of the real point of the tyrannical sword. This is never effected by cutting off at the wrist the hand which holds the sword, whereupon it is instantly seized by another and a surer hand. It is effected only by a change—a revolution—in the attitude towards the rules of swordsmanship, and, since such rules are fundamental and not arbitrary, this means the establishment of conditions in which some thrusts are either useless or impossible of performance by anyone. Thus, during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries 'working harder' progressively and rapidly became a useless 'thrust' in the sword-play of the individual citizen, because conditions were established which made his 'work' (*i.e.*, his moving-things-about through expenditure of his own muscular force) a matter of relatively no importance at all: a flick of a gnat's muscles in comparison with the synchronised effect of the leap forwards of a hundred-thousand cart horses. "If you pay for my keep," said one of the horses, "you may ride on my back." This sounded 'fair'; but was not at all 'fair' if you consider that that particular horse didn't have a 'keep' to pay for. The 'keep' was the fly's.

We have said that as patriotic citizens we were disappointed because the brains of the police, the community's watch-dogs, were not concerned with revolution but exclusively with rioting. On consideration, this disappoint-

ment was unreasonable: to entrust the policy as well as the administration of the State to the police is to establish the Police State. So we asked, "Who employs you?" The answer, readily forthcoming, led us farther: "The Home Office."—"A department of the Government?"—"Yes, a department of the Government." "Not much hope, is there?" we asked. "What do you mean, 'not much hope'?"—"I mean that if your riots are manufactured for you, all you can do is to deal with them one by one and wait for the next: that won't do you much more good than it will do me, in the end, will it?" "Ah!" said he, "you'd be surprised!" "Really?"—"Yes, really!" We left it at that.

It is not necessary to infer from this conversation that the real fount of government in this country is the Home Secretary, who has the Prime Minister and 'his' Cabinet as well as ourselves entirely at his mercy. The real tragedy lies in the fact that, in the calendar of crimes, the greatest of all crimes, treason, is the only crime that carries with it the absolute certainty of an instantaneous free pardon the moment it succeeds in gaining its objective,—indeed it needs no condonation, being literally self-effacing. It is this fact that makes statesmanship so important; for the statesman should not be concerned with rioting but with revolution—indeed he should be himself both the revolutionary and the counter-revolutionary *par excellence*. That he is not, unless we are to take too low a view of the genus, is because he is under restraint. Indeed, he is under many restraints. It is the nature of these restraints—the self-imposed and the non-self-imposed—which is coming slowly under examination as political society sinks under a load too heavy to be borne.

A 'Free-Lance' Air Force

The *Western Producer* for September 9 carried an impressive photograph of an airman in full flight-dress standing, apparently in sunlight beside an aeroplane. The description ran:—

"A former Canadian pilot whose exploits against Chinese Communist air forces are legendary in the East has been sent to Canada by the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa to raise at least two squadrons of experienced jet and prop-driven fighter plane pilots. Albert Mah, seen above, is also after other young fliers willing to train for action in a cold war version of General Claire Chennault's Flying Tigers. Pilots who flew R.C.A.F. Sabre jets have been offered at least \$30,000 a year by Chiang Kai-shek, the money to come indirectly from the \$100,000,000 to be spent by the U.S. in Formosa next year. Aim of the free-lance air force, says Mah, is to fight against Asian Communist aggression 'in whatever way we see fit.'"

H'm! We await further news. The snag is, of course, the \$30,000 a year, and a 'free-lance' flyer is only free so long as he doesn't want to land on a non-free-lance run-way. But one of the very dreadful thoughts we have now and then is that there is a limit to control over functionaries, simply because they are individuals, and the greater their 'responsibility,' the greater the effect of their failing to discharge it.

Gold

An interesting article by G. H. Tallack, entitled "Siberia's Customers" appeared in *The Tablet* of September 18. It draws attention to what must be a mystery to most people; *i.e.*, who originates most of our legislation and how is it that certain powerful interests are able to secure exemption from legislation that in intention at any rate has a good or humanitarian origin. The legislation that H.M. Customs and Excise have to administer states: "Prison-made goods, other than goods in transit or not imported for trade or of a kind not manufactured in the U.K., may not be imported." That is reasonable, just, and Christian legislation. But there are a few exemptions among which is Russian gold.

The quotations in inverted commas which follow are taken from this article:—

"It is now generally accepted that the bulk of the output is produced by prisoners, both political and criminal.

"There is still room to question the propriety of the business in the light of the conditions in which the prisoners exist. It goes without saying that a Bolshevik jail is no Leyhill, and the available records make it quite clear that the convicts on the gold diggings are treated as expendable."

It has been estimated that in the condition of these prison camps one ounce of gold costs the equivalent of 7 United States dollars. The United States Treasury buy all gold at roughly \$35 an ounce. Washington does not enquire into the origin of the gold.

"Oddly enough, Russian gold does not appear to be sent to Washington direct. Instead, it finds its way to London, where the Bank of England pays Russia for it in pounds sterling at a price which, though unpublished, is presumably slightly below the equivalent of \$35 an ounce. The resulting addition to the British national gold reserve is then hailed as a great triumph of the Government's financial policy."

This is clear evidence of central direction and of collusion between central banks. Obviously all Governments concerned must be fully aware of the situation.

Mr. Tallack mentions that it was semi-officially reported that last December a million ounces of gold were delivered in London from Moscow, but that unofficial estimates suggest that the figure might be as large as 2 or even 3 million ounces. Formerly the weekly return by the Bank of England disclosed the gold movements.

"In view of the nature of the contemporary traffic, though, the secrecy with which international bullion transactions are nowadays surrounded is perfectly understandable."

In view of the propaganda in the United States against Communism—largely hypocritical—it will not do for gold bars to arrive in the United States stamped with the Hammer and Sickle.

"Once this is removed, however, they will accept it without demur for interment in the already gigantic Fort Knox hoard."

Some time in the 1920's the ex-President of the Gold Bank of Alaska spoke to a small meeting of Social Crediters. He admitted in reply to a question that he had never regarded the Gold Standard as anything other than a smoke screen behind which the controllers of the money monopoly could carry on, unsuspected and unhindered, their manipula-

tion of the world's finance. In any case the Gold Standard has long ceased to be even a pretence. It seems therefore obvious that the sole object of the whole of the transaction involving the Russian gold is to supply Russia with certain goods she requires. Mr. Tallack reminds his readers that among these are electrical generators from England, rubber from Malaya, wool from Australia and New Zealand, and many others.

"The metal is highly useful to Great Britain as a means of bridging the dollar gap, but it can hardly be said to do as much to fortify the economic resources of the free world as the countervailing goods fortify the Communist bloc. There is a curious alliance of left-wing economists and gold standard bankers prepared to defend American gold-buying policy as a contribution to international financial stability on the ground that gold is 'the universally accepted medium of settling international indebtedness,' but their arguments can be put to the test in a single sentence: Would Russia accept gold from the West in settlement of any obligations the West might incur?"

Mr. Tallack also mentions that gold is not the only scandal. During the war the United States supplied "Great Britain and certain Commonwealth and allied countries with some 400 million ounces of silver on lend-lease terms." 400 million ounces of silver at 6/- an ounce is £120 million. The silver has to be returned by 1957. It looks as if Soviet Russia is able to do good business in the silver market as well.

Mr. Tallack is to be congratulated on lifting this odd corner of the blanket under which international financiers are operating against the welfare of this and every other country.

H. R. PURCHASE.

Surpluses and the Atom

One thing is certain: no vested interests of capital or of labour will be able to prevent this revolution becoming effective. (Time and Tide on the Atomic Age.)

Our admirable contemporary *The Western Producer* (Canada) comments:—

"We regret to be constantly harping on this theme. But when an apparently highly intelligent writer says that 'no vested interests will be able to prevent the revolution from becoming effective' the revolution, that is, of the production and distribution of abundance—we are compelled to direct his and his readers' attention to what is going on before their eyes. It is the inability to evolve workable methods of distributing existing regional surpluses to those in need of them that is a major source of worry for agriculture in Canada and the United States today. What's the use of saying that the distribution of the teeming products of the coming atomic age cannot be prevented by vested interests when the distribution of the comparatively negligible surpluses of the present time is being effectively stymied? If our economy is to be saved from the collapse which the Iron Curtain countries are convinced is certain to overtake the West and if our free institutions are to withstand the insidious, resourceful, unceasing assaults, overt and covert, of Communist propaganda, the means must be found now, well in advance of the appearance of atomic plenty, to distribute surpluses and to encourage, not discourage, their continued production."

“Churchill Destroying British Empire”

The *New Times* (Melbourne) for August 13 says:—

“Most of the intense pro-British sentiment created by the recent tour of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, is now being rapidly destroyed by the disastrous appeasement policies of Sir Winston Churchill and Mr. Anthony Eden. We believe in the preservation and strengthening of the British Empire, but this objective is impossible of achievement while Sir Winston Churchill makes it clear that, in spite of all his brave words of the past, he is not very concerned about Australia, New Zealand and those parts of the Empire which are the furthest from Europe. An increasing number of Australians, gravely concerned by the Communist challenge to their North, are disturbed that a so-called Conservative Government in England is adopting a shameful policy of appeasement in dealing with the Communists.

“Policies of ‘moderation’ merely encourage the Communists to intensify their aggression. The subject of ‘saving face’ is vital in the East, and yet the British refuse to take any strong or definite stand. When Communist fighter planes shot down an unarmed British civilian airliner near the island of Hainan and murdered nine of the occupants of the airliner, Mr. Eden’s only reaction was a note of protest. Notes of protest do not worry the Communist gangsters. In the days when Britain was really Great, incidents like this would have been very drastically dealt with. But present British ‘leaders’ have become so effete that anyone can now twist the lion’s tail without any fear of retaliation. It was significant that when the Americans who were fired upon decided that more than notes were required in exchange, the Chinese Communists protested bitterly. But at least they respect a policy of strength. And the sooner all Western nations cease appeasement and start to implement policies of strength, the sooner they will start to regain face in the East.

“Australia today is in greater danger than she was even in 1942. Unless Australians can see some evidence that present British leaders are concerned about their peril, it is only natural that they will be encouraged to look towards the U.S.A. for support. Any American support will be paid for by a further surrender of our sovereignty to the internationalists controlling American policies today. This is the plight to which the policies of Sir Winston Churchill and Anthony Eden have brought us. But not content with what they have already done, including their endorsement of the Communist victory in Indo-China, they have given their blessing to the ‘goodwill mission’ of Mr. Attlee and Mr. Aneurau Bevan to Communist China. When Mr. Attlee comes to Australia and tries to persuade Australians that they should officially recognise a regime whose leaders are striving to conquer Australia, he will be endorsing the policy of Sir Winston Churchill.

“The overwhelming majority of Australians desire to preserve the ties of Empire. But they also desire to remain a free, European nation. If Sir Winston Churchill wants to preserve and strengthen the ties of Empire, he must immediately reverse policies which are widely interpreted in Australia as meaning that he regards Australia as ‘expedient’ in the struggle against Communism.

“The Radical Illusion”

Reviewing Mr. Russell Kirk’s book, “The Conservative Mind,” in the *Daily Telegraph*, Kenneth Young writes:—

“The shattering of an illusion may be seen by anyone who travels widely in Britain to-day. The most conspicuous outward alteration of British life is the abolition of private dwellings and the substitution of hideous expanses of communal housing: ‘a bee-hive condition—one more instance of the ominous tendency of modern society towards the organisation of the insect world.’ There is a corresponding, and more dreadful, inward alteration: an overwhelming boredom.

“What of the future? . . . Mr. Kirk sees that already from the newly submerged masses a new and dangerous governing class is arising. . . . This new *élite*, trained at uniform State schools in the new orthodoxies of secular collectivism, arrogant with the presumption of those who rule without the restraining influence of tradition and consecration and family honour, has been shaped and brought together, in George Orwell’s words, ‘by the barren world of monopoly industry and centralised government.’ Schooled beyond their proper worldly prospects, or indeed beyond their intellectual capacities, lacking property, religious faith, ancestors, or expectation of posterity, they seek by the acquisition of power to gratify their loneliness and their nameless hungers. State planning is all that is left, and thus becomes an end in itself.”

FROM WEEK TO WEEK— (Continued from page 1.)

what, is the point upon which we focus. A movement can, of course, be deflected from its objective, and nearly every political movement known to history has, in fact, been, to some extent at least deflected in this manner. There is nothing that we can see to prevent a collectivity of enlightened Jews from embracing the policy of Social Credit, unless it is that they are not built that way. It is on record that, if they did behave in this way, our advice to them would be to proceed towards their objective in a spirit of lofty independence, for after all there is a sense in which virtue is its own reward. Another name for Social Credit is unexploitability; and surely whatever race a man may belong to, he cannot exploit unexploitability. The error of our friendly critic lies in his probably unconscious conviction that Social Credit is a *scheme*. It is not a scheme; it is a policy.

THE FIG TREE

A Douglas Social Credit Quarterly Review.

Vol. 1. No. 2. (NEW SERIES). SEPTEMBER, 1954.

CONTENTS.

LAW	The Editor.
MR. MACPHERSON’S FEUD	L. D. Byrne.
THE CULTIVATION OF HISTORY	Hewlett Edwards.
SOCIAL CREDIT	C. G. Fynn.

REVIEWS:

MR. DOUGLAS JERROLD’S <i>The Lie About the West</i>	(by T. N. Morris).
SIR HERBERT READ’S <i>Anarchy and Order</i>	(by Beatrice C. Best).

By Annual Subscription 20/- or quarterly 5/-.
Post free everywhere.

K.R.P. Publications Limited.

Published by K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., 11, Garfield Street, Belfast.
Printed by J. Hayes & Co. (T.U.), Woolton, Liverpool.