

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Volume 40. No. 22.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1961.

Postage 2d.

6d Fortnightly.

### "Reflections On Soviet Russia" (1)

by BRYAN W. MONAHAN

[There are, no doubt, many of our readers who have not previously read this review, which was originally published serially in *The Australian Social Crediter* at the end of 1945 and early in 1946. Republication in *The Social Crediter* followed shortly afterwards.]

Anyone who has read two or three books on Soviet Russia, written from different points of view, can hardly have failed to notice the extraordinary discrepancy in accounts. Very little experience along these lines inclines one to the view that it is impossible to be sure of the truth, or even part of it. The output of books on Russia is colossal, and many of them are written by people who have visited or even lived in the country—many, indeed, are by exiled Russians, or by disillusioned pro-Russians, such as Eugene Lyons (*Assignment in Utopia*). The adverse reports of the latter, however, are offset by the glowing accounts of people as eminent as Joseph Davies (*Mission to Moscow*) and the Dean of Canterbury (*The Socialist Sixth of the World*).

If one views the two classes of books generally, one finds that one set emphasises the Soviet achievement, and the other its cost in the loss of human life and liberty. The former view belongs to the general view that the end justifies the means, and naturally has received added weight from the German-Russian war. This is important. A great deal of what has happened in Russia since 1917 can be explained by reference to the necessity, so long proclaimed by the Soviet leaders, of preparing for eventual attack. Sacrifices there had to be, since modern wars are chiefly wars of industrial output, so that it appeared, or could be made to appear, that if Russia was to survive, everything had to be subordinated to an unprecedentedly rapid industrialisation of the country. Against that, the critics urge that the same result could have been achieved at a lower cost.

Yet even the achievements, seen from this point of view, are hard to assess. Official policy keeps essential facts and figures secret. How much of the Russian success was due to Allied supplies again is indeterminate. That such supplies were crucial, however, is clear; the unconcealed risks taken, and the terrible losses incurred in providing those supplies are evidence of the urgency. And at the same time it must be remembered that Russia's population, excluding populations deported from Russian occupied countries, was two and a half times the size of Germany's; that by far the greater part of the physical damage wrought on Germany was wrought by Russia's Allies; and that Russia had consciously prepared for war (even against a combination of the 'Capitalist' powers) for twenty years. The Russian achievement by itself was clearly insufficient to beat Germany.

Official secrecy is one source of difficulty in assessing Soviet Russia; another, and far more important, is 'ideology.'

There are ways around official secrecy. Sudden silences indeed, have a meaning. For some years a series of official statistics is issued, and suddenly ceases. There are gaps in the reports of enthusiasts. Thus the Webbs in their large and detailed *Soviet Communism* pass over financial matters in a few lines and a footnote: money is not important. But the few lines reveal that appointments to high financial positions are subject to peculiar caution, the Commissar for finance appointing his successor. The footnote provides references to other works on Soviet finance—Leonard Hubbard's for example. Hubbard adduces quite sufficient material to reveal that finance is conducted on perfectly orthodox lines within the greater limits exploited by Germany under Schacht, and Australia under war Governments, which other forms of economic control provide. There is inflation; but it is conscious and deliberate inflation; there is payment of interest—because, no doubt, principal will never be repaid, so that the Government gets £96 or £97 for £3 or £4 per annum. Though the interest bill mounts and so do prices, the loans come in year after year.

The system is orthodox enough for standard methods of economic analysis to yield some of the missing data from the statistics revealed. Practising on the nebulous concept of our 'national income,' specialist economists have become remarkably skilful in producing conclusions which, whatever they are, and however little they may mean in themselves, serve at least for the comparison of one economy with another. In such work they write much less for the public than as specialists one to another, and are freer thereby from ideological necessities. There are plenty of them, of course, with a bias towards Soviet economy, for a planned economy is the economist's paradise.

From the objective point of view, Russia's problem is industrialisation. To the economist, this is a problem of providing funds for investment. In a free economy, investment funds come from private sources, and are largely unpredictable; in an intermediate economy, such as is advocated for the post-war world, funds are derived from both public and private sources. In Russia, however, all funds are public, and all investment is in the 'public' interest as determined and guided by the economists. So—the more the merrier. If the policy is industrialisation, then the 'public' interest demands the recovery of all possible funds for investment. The stabilisation of 'real' wages is a criterion of success in this.

(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 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

**Office—Business and Editorial:** 9, AVENUE ROAD, STRATFORD-ON-AVON.

**Telephone:** Stratford-on Avon 3976.

**MAIN EDITORIAL OFFICES:—**

**Business—**Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne.

**Editorial—**Box 3266, Sydney, Australia.

### THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

**Personnel—**Advisory Chairman: Dr. Tudor Jones. Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 36, Melbourne Avenue, Deakin, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. (Telephone: EUSTON 3893.) Canada: L. Denis Byrne, 7420, Ada Boulevard, Edmonton, Alberta. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W.

## From Week to Week

*American Opinion* devotes a composite issue for July-August and September, 1960, to a country by country survey in 107 countries of the degree of Communist influence up to June, 1960. The accuracy of the information on which the reviews are based is indicated by the fact that developments which were foreshadowed in June have become actuality since then, as for example in the Belgian Congo, the Central African Federation (the Rhodesias and Nyasaland), and Laos.

Introducing what *American Opinion* calls its "Score-board," in which Communist influence is given as an approximate percentage of total control, the journal remarks: "Basic Communist strategy for the conquest of the world, as laid down thirty-five years ago and relentlessly followed ever since, consisted of three steps: (1) Take eastern Europe; (2) next take the masses of Africa; (3) then take the rest of the world, including the United States. The Communists completed their first step in 1950; the second step is now at least three-fourths accomplished; and they have gone more than one-fourth of the way towards carrying out their third step. Which means that the Communists have now covered well over two-thirds of the total distance to their final goal of world dominion. And the momentum and the speed of their progress are steadily increasing."

Of the 107 countries dealt with, *American Opinion* rates only 16 as "relatively safe"; of the others, 33 are "in danger," but with less than 50 p.c. Communist influence; 21 "teetering on the edge"; 12 "sliding into the abyss"; and 25 "under Communist slavery."

All this has been accomplished (*and it has been accomplished*) under the phoney threat of war; "From the rape of the Baltic States in 1939 (with the help of Hitler) to the conquest of Cuba (with the help of the U.S. State Department), the International Soviet has expanded ONLY by using the diplomatic, economic, and/or military power of professedly anti-Communist governments."

In Africa, a continent of stone-age savagery, witchcraft,

ritual murder and cannibalism to an overwhelming extent, nothing less than a racial war to exterminate the whites has been unleashed. When this objective has been achieved, it is suggested that the natives either will in their turn be exterminated by the Chinese, or be absorbed by mongrelisation into a gigantic pool of slaves for the exploitation of the vital resources of the continent, and the policing of the world.

Such is the present momentum of Communist expansion that the fact that almost each week it becomes more plainly obvious, is of less and less importance; the situation is approaching such a decisive shift in the balance of power as to make resistance impracticable. We anticipated this state of affairs some years ago, when we remarked that what was being prepared was the appearance of something like an unexpected catastrophe, a contrived accident which would enable the traitors in our midst to say "Sorry . . . but there is nothing we can do now."

It is worth recalling that Douglas, who clearly apprehended the appalling danger in which Christian civilisation stood, from the war years onward recommended the trial, or impeachment, and execution of the traitors whose activity was obvious to him. At that time the Communist expansion was not so visible as it is today, and the complementary policy of Finance, in bringing about the conditions in which such an expansion was possible, was correspondingly important.

The battle against the Common Christian has been waged and financed on every level; but one of the most important channels of perversion has been the broadcast news-commentaries. It is highly revealing of the technique of this perversion to listen to the commentary on the latest crisis in a particular country, and then to read the account in *American Opinion* of the recent history of that country.

It is immensely important to grasp the fact that the unit of mankind is not the individual (whose supreme importance as such is not in question) but the family. The individual is finite; the family potentially immortal. It is the family which is the vehicle of culture. Now the adoption in infancy of a modern stone-age man (such as the African native) into a civilised family might conceivably result in a civilised adult, under favourable conditions; even of this we cannot be sure, because there is no deep understanding of the basic Negro mentality or of the influence of heredity or of the acquired characteristics (even if these are only Darwin's characteristics for survival in conditions of savagery). What is quite certain is that civilisation cannot be grafted on to savagery; the family cannot make a sharp bend in its development and acquire in a generation or two what has *grown* in a civilised family over hundreds of years. The individual at the moment is the exponent of what the family has become, which is why individuals are in general typical of their nations.

There are no nations in Africa. With the partial exception of South Africa (which will be eliminated if the murderous conspiracy succeeds) Africa is exclusively tribal, with a superimposed administrative division into areas, the viability of which as such stands or falls with the presence or absence of the colonisers who are, virtually literally, the nervous system of each colony. Take them away, and there is simply nothing there but tribalism. No amount of 'aid' can have the slightest effect on that situation, except to make it more catastrophic, like giving detonators to children. It follows from this that 'national self-determination' for Africans is not only impossible, it is a meaningless expression; and one of the least comprehensible features of our times is that the

expression is taken seriously by responsible politicians. Ghana for example, as such, cannot be represented at the United Nations or anywhere else. Kwame Nkrumah is simply the exponent of acquired views, destructive of the modicum of order which has been achieved in Africa, grafted upon fundamental savagery.

The only possible hope now for the natives of Africa is the re-establishment of 'colonialism,' conducted with the long-term aim of improving the lot of the natives, and with the realisation that perhaps hundreds of years are necessary to bring genuine civilisation of the natives to fruition, if it is possible at all. *The fate of Christian civilisation is dependent on the recognition of this necessity.* And the time, in historical perspective, is a second or two to midnight.

"We may feel for Mr. Macmillan, who inherited the Conservative government after the United States, leaping from ambush, clapped a pistol to the heads of her allies and forced them to the humiliating surrender of the Suez Canal to one of the Kremlin's most contemptible agents. But Mr. Macmillan, who as late as November 5, 1957, dared to say what he well knows, that the Soviet's single and unalterable objective is complete conquest of the entire world, now acts as Khrushchev's toady, rushing about to arrange 'Summit Conferences' that can lead only to the disgrace, if not to the surrender, of the West. And he apologizes for himself with verbal slobber that he is 'trying to reduce world tensions by open-minded and bold [*sic*] negotiations' that, he hopes, 'will lead to coexistence.' This is merely disgraceful; what is fatal is his policy of transferring British colonies to the Soviet with an efficiency that could not be exceeded by a paid hireling of the international conspiracy, and his attempt to destroy the British Commonwealth by insulting its most staunchly anti-communist members . . .

"Signs of disintegration can be found on all levels of society. Parliament cynically censured the Union of South Africa without a single dissenting vote; and the recent assault on the Public Schools, in which both Labour and Conservative members were active, although it failed, revealed a frightening prevalence of the malice and lust for destruction that are the mainsprings of the Communist mentality. In the meantime, conspirators have been extending their control of labour unions. The Printers' Strike of last year directed attention to the fact that the union was in the control of hard-core Communists who had attained power by the standard technique of arranging for the vote of the essentially conservative majority to be split among a large number of conservative candidates. The Communist grip on the electrical workers and heavy industry is so tight that some observers deem it possible that if England were attacked by Russia, the unions' officers would be obeyed by enough of the members to paralyse the island. Unions with millions of members have demanded in formal resolutions that Britain disarm and leave herself at the mercy of the Soviet . . ."

—From "Britain," in *American Opinion*, July-Aug. & Sept. 1960.

### Safeguards Against Tyranny

The following letter to the Editor appeared in *The Sydney Morning Herald*, January, 17, 1961:

Sir, Freedom versus tyranny is the issue in the world today, whether locally or internationally.

Freedom can be safeguarded only by Parliament. The alternative is anarchy. Parliament needs for its efficient working, first an impartial electoral system securing to the ordinary citizen his vote and the right to its free exercise; and the other, a Constitution enabling the Parliament to perform its proper function.

It is the second requisite with which the people are now asked to deal, namely, whether the Upper House is to remain or be abolished. Theoretically, the necessity for its continuance has been dealt with so frequently that repetition at present would seem unnecessary. What appears necessary is that illustrations should be given, with a minimum of detail, of some of its work.

As an example one might expect recognition of the work of the House in some matters where the protection of personal freedom is paramount. These include the defeat of an attempt to destroy the independence of the Judiciary—the ultimate refuge of freedom—and of the attempted destruction of local government.

The House protected the pastoral industry from ultimate ruin by an impossible tax and saved the western lessees from fine and imprisonment on a mere expression of "opinion" by the Minister, and a confiscation of the balance of their leases.

It prevented the imposition of penalties of £100 or six months' imprisonment for publication of a newspaper poster or handbill containing printed matter regarding a parliamentary election during the 70 hours preceding the taking of a poll.

It stopped the socialisation of the whole of the building industry and building materials, including the right of the Minister to do the following things: to control the working of factories which provide building materials; to terminate or modify contracts and enter into other contracts and dispose of property; to issue directions to be complied with by the owner; to impose penalties for obstruction or delay of £50 or £100 for the second offence, and for refusal to comply with direction, £1,000 for a company and for an individual up to £500 or six months' gaol or both.

Then came the Sydney City Council (Disclosure of Allegations) Bill, providing for production of documents or disclosing of information alleging corruption under penalty of £1,000 for a body corporate and £500 and 12 months' imprisonment or both in case of an individual; directors and officers of a body corporate were also to be liable to the same penalty and imprisonment. The Upper House, in its minority at the time, revealed this vicious measure so effectively that its repeal was effected after a period of suspended animation for three months.

These are some matters which I bring forward for consideration by the whole community when they are asked to abolish that branch of the Parliament which has so far protected them from these exhibitions of governmental tyranny.

HENRY MANNING.

Point Piper.

### The Crisis Of Our Age

. . . Similarly there is a limit to the digestion of heterogeneous elements by any cultural system, and this limit narrows with the advance of the culture to its over-ripe phase. When the limit is passed, an increasingly richer stream of heterogeneous elements brought into such a culture will re-

main less and less digested. More and more they will distort the style, the soul, and the body of the host culture and finally will help its disintegration. That result is exactly what we observe now in contemporary Western culture.

. . . Western culture has ceased to be a selective organism. Instead, it has become a vast cultural dumping place where everything is dumped, without any restriction. It has lost its own physiognomy, its own soul, and its discriminative ability.

This all-pervading syncretism is reflected in our mentality, in our beliefs, ideas, tastes, aspirations and convictions. The mind of contemporary man is likewise a dumping place of the most fantastic and diverse bits of the most fragmentary ideas, beliefs, tastes, and scraps of information.

. . . This jumble of diverse elements means that the soul of our sensate culture is broken down. It appears to have lost its self confidence. It begins to doubt its own superiority and primogeniture. It ceases to be loyal to itself. It progressively fails to continue to be its own sculptor, to keep unimpaired the integrity and sameness of its style, that takes in only what agrees with it and rejects all that impairs it.

—P. A. Sorokin in *The Crisis of Our Age*.

### The Individual and the Group

It is necessary to provide individuals, as *individuals*, not collectively, with much more opportunity to judge political matters by results, and to be able to reject, individually and not collectively policies they do not like, which involves a large measure of power to contract-out. Common Law is something which, if it changes at all, ought to change very slowly indeed, and the greatest difficulty should be placed in the path of an attack upon it, both by insisting on its supremacy over House of Commons enactment, and by making it subject only to something at least as arduous as an Amendment to the United States Constitution. It appears to me that a properly empowered and constituted House of Lords, Spiritual and Temporal, is the natural guardian of Common Law, as the Barons demonstrated at Runnymede.

The essential soul of a nation is in its character, its culture and tradition. The King is the natural embodiment of Honours and Sanctions—of Culture and Tradition and, as such, is naturally the Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces. So that our problem seems to resolve itself into a real understanding and restoration of the functions we have allowed to decay.

The individual voter must be made individually responsible, not collectively taxable, for his vote. The merry game of voting yourself benefits at the expense of your neighbour must stop whether by Members of Parliament who double their salaries as the first-fruits of an electoral victory or by so-called Co-operative Societies which acquire immense properties with the aid of Bank of England created money. There is a clear method by which to approach this end—the substitution of the open ballot for the secret franchise, and allocation of taxation according to the recorded voting for a programme which incurs a nett loss. This would also imply a large measure of freedom to contract out of legislation of a functional character, with a consequent discouragement of the spate of so-called Laws which are little more than Works Orders . . .

—C. H. Douglas, *Realistic Constitutionalism*.

### Hunting to Live

*The X Quarterly* Volume 1, No. 3, contains a pleasing article by a Dutchman, H. A. Gomperts which is translated by James Brockway outlining the distinctive characteristics of a three-fold élite, the ruling classes and also an esoteric élite comparable with the early Christians. This second élite is a thorn in the flesh to the first élite and there is mutual resentment.

After a time the hidden élite organises itself into professional federations. Democratic governments, in order to quieten the pangs of a guilty conscience, act in a patronising protective capacity. Art is subsidised with the compliance of the artists, who are guaranteed a back seat within the State set-up. They enjoy the adulation of the ruling élite and are employed by them as the people's public relations men. The hidden élite is no longer so very hidden and in "the world of ant-men" its members become "the permanent slaves of conventionality."

In the western world as opposed to the east "a hidden élite is always possible, in addition to the ruling group. One may assume that not all of its members will go over to the other side. There are still grounds for hope that a few will continue to prefer independence to collaboration. When the mass of the hidden élite has been incorporated into the ministries, a nucleus may still remain over, which will be truly hidden, and truly an élite, in the Christian sense of the word."

This is the third élite which "dissolves into its component parts, into individuals who regard it as their main task in life to preserve their own independence."

"They will display the solidarity of men who hunt to live" and their hunting grounds will be no preserve but the wide open world.

It would be trespassing too much on literary etiquette to quote the paragraphs on the glories of the chase, except to refer to a final distinction between the hunter and the maggot which feeds on putrescence.

—Written by P. L. Ye Olde Stratforde Arrow Monger who solicits orders for strait shaftes.  
A.D. 1960.

### REFLECTIONS ON SOVIET RUSSIA

(continued from page 1).

The effectiveness of economic controls is proved, so to speak, by the fact that the 'real' wages of Stakhanovites—the cream of the workers—remain at about the 1913 level of wages. Thus Russian experience and practice offer invaluable data for 'post-war planning.'

So that the pro-Russian, who points proudly to the statistics of the production of pig-iron, and the 'scientific' economist, who deduces the real wage rates from meagre statistics approach the same conclusion. Goering dispensed with the ballyhoo, and called the process "guns instead of butter."

(To be continued)