

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Volume 41. No. 13.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1961.

Postage 2d.

6d. Fortnightly.

Corridors

After our experience with the Polish corridor few people could doubt that trouble would arise from the Berlin corridor. Such an absurd method of arranging boundaries was asking for trouble—courting disaster.

The aim was undoubtedly to see that the threat of war should be maintained. Under threat of war people will accept propositions which they would indignantly reject in peacetime. Less refined terms for the process are “softening up” or “blackmail.”

I don't think that one person in a thousand could give a coherent reason for the recent increases in taxation, and not one in ten thousand could say why pressure is being exerted on this country to enter the “Common Market.” Policy is being dictated and there can be no doubt that this policy clearly involves the dissolution of all ties between people of British stock and the rapid advance of Communism in Africa and South America.

President Roosevelt clearly disliked the British system more than he disliked the Soviet, and did all he could to undermine it—in the Middle East and elsewhere. But all the experiences of the intervening years have not deterred President Kennedy from sending his personal representative to Africa to stir up tribalism there. U.N.O. is another weapon against stability, as events in the Congo demonstrate.

We read of a hammer being used to crack a nut, and it might appear that all the mighty forces of the world are now directed at the shreds of a once powerful empire. But the very swagger of these powers is an admission of failure or at least of uneasiness—for the nut to be cracked is the human spirit and its love of freedom, as exemplified in the nobler peoples of mankind. The Soviet thesis is the dominance of the material, and it would seem that the American leaders—not the American people or many of them—very often hold the same view, so that any show of independence (scurrilously called “reaction”) is an open challenge to their whole system.

While Mr. Mennen Williams continues his dubious pilgrimage round Africa an English student of the London School of Economics is arrested, ironically enough, on the charge of provoking race trouble in North Carolina. We read that “a white settler punched Mr. Mennen Williams, United States Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, on the jaw at Lusaka Airport last night,” but in this case the resident, and not Mr. Williams, is criticised for the trouble. (*Daily Telegraph* August 30, 1961).

Peter Simple, in the same issue of the *Daily Telegraph*, sums up one aspect of the process in a paragraph headed “Fatal”:

“Moise Tshombe made one fatal mistake. He should have declared the independence of Katanga *before* the Belgians left the Congo.

“He would then have qualified automatically as a hero

of national liberation. Instead he defied a hugger-mugger collection of native politicians even more inept, ridiculous and destructive, if less sinister, than the United Nations themselves.

“This makes him at best a stubborn reactionary, at worst a Fascist beast.”

Sir Roy Welensky said at Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, (*Daily Telegraph*, August 31, 1961) that he could not see how what was happening to Berlin and what was being contemplated by the United Nations in Katanga could possibly be reconciled.

Just as hard to reconcile is the flight of refugees into West Germany with the illegal immigration of numerous Africans into South Africa, which is usually described as a tyranny as severe as East Germany! One might have expected a stream in the opposite direction!

We should, I am sure, be wrong to conclude that everyone had gone mad. The famous test, “Who benefits?” would reveal “American” and “Russian” interests as the beneficiaries—certainly not the African natives—while Britain and the other European powers are the losers. And, while a fracas is engineered over the corridor, we find a curious unanimity between these large powers on the elimination of ourselves as rivals. It looks in fact as if one single force, like finance, had its hand on all the controls.

Finance itself, like the Bomb, is only a weapon, and the question that confronts mankind is, “Who is using force and fraud to monopolise power?”

—H.S.S.

Progress

“... From Macaulay onwards a superstitious faith, almost Calvinistic, in unnecessary improvements is universally discernible.

“This outlook was assumed by no one more heartily than myself. Brought up without any specific theological outlook, save perhaps an aversion from Judaism (from the exclusive tenets of which particular racial religion my forbears had long been emancipated), there was everywhere about me that atmosphere of predestined betterment which harmonised well with gratifying statistics of increasing national revenue, trade returns, railway mileage, mineral exploitation and general statistical prosperity.

“The teaching of Marx and his school was founded upon Hegel, and Hegel it was who had taught the doctrine of Progress by Antagonism, a metaphysical support to the deterministic outlook of material evolution.”

—Sir Henry Slessor, *ex-Lord Justice of Appeal*.

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.

Offices—Business: 9, AVENUE ROAD, STRATFORD-ON-AVON. Telephone: Stratford-on-Avon, 3976.

Editorial: PENRHYN LODGE, GLOUCESTER GATE, LONDON, N.W.1. Telephone: EUSTON 3893.

IN AUSTRALIA:—

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

Editorial—Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, Australia (Editorial Head Office).

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.

The Summit

"A remarkable change has come over the world's monetary authorities in the past year. Within a matter of months they have been shaken by a run both on the dollar and on the pound. For the first time since the war the financial structure on which the free world's, and even a large part of the Soviet bloc's trade is based, has been under intense scrutiny and suspicion

"Many ideas have been put forward in recent months for improving the system Others again have suggested and have urged the transformation of the I.M.F. into a world credit-creating body"

(From the first leading article in *The Times*, September 18, 1961).

Note: The italic emphasis in the above is ours, and draws attention to the admission, the first we have seen, that the financial system of the Russian Communists does not depart from orthodoxy, as communists claim. "A large part" (i.e. not the whole); this is reminiscent of Lord Woolton's statement: "I know banks create credit; but they also lend their client's deposits." Try that as a parlour game, one of you lending a sum of money he has "created," placing it instantly to your credit on deposit . . . and so on. By "credit-creating body" at the end of the passage quoted, the leader-writer obviously means *financial-credit-creating*. Real credit is created by the customers who are denied access to it except on terms.

The "dictatorship of the proletariat" is—well, ask a citizen of East Berlin whether he is dictated to or does the dictating. A last service *The Times* has rendered in this article is to make possible the clarification of the well-worn phrase, 'A Summit Conference;' a summit conference is a conference called by The Summit.

50

Education by the State

"Were the duty of enforcing universal education once admitted there would be an end to the difficulties about what the State should teach, and how it should teach, which convert the subject into a mere battlefield for sects and parties, causing the time and labour which should have been spent in educating to be wasted in quarrelling about education. If the government would make up its mind to require for every child a good education, it might save itself the trouble of providing one. It might leave to parents to obtain the education where and how they pleased, and content itself with helping to pay the school fees of the poorer classes of children, and defraying the entire school expenses of those who have no one else to pay for them. The objections which are urged with reason against State education do not apply to the enforcement of education by the State, but to the State's taking upon itself to direct that education; which is a totally different thing. That the whole or any part of the education of the people should be in State hands, I go as far as anyone in deprecating. All that has been said of the importance of individuality of character, and diversity in opinions and modes of conduct, involves, as of the same unspeakable importance, diversity of education. A general state of education is a mere contrivance for moulding people to be exactly like one another; and as the mould in which it casts them is that which pleases the predominant power in government, whether this be a monarch, a priesthood, an aristocracy, or the majority of the existing generation; in proportion as it is efficient and successful, it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by natural tendency to one over the body. An education established and controlled by the State should only exist if it exists at all, as one among many competing experiments, carried on for the purpose of example and stimulus, to keep the others up to a certain standard of excellence. Unless, indeed, when Society in general is in so backward a state that it could not or would not provide for itself any proper institutions of education unless the government undertook the task; then, indeed, the government may, as the less of two great evils, take upon itself the business of schools and universities, as it may that of joint stock companies, when private enterprise, in a shape fitted for undertaking great works of industry does not exist in the country. But in general, if the country contains a sufficient number of persons qualified to provide education under government auspices, the same persons would be able and willing to give an equally good education on the voluntary principle, under the assurance of remuneration afforded by a law rendering education compulsory, combined with State aid to those unable to defray expense."

—John Stuart Mill (1859).

Ideas for the Destitute

"APPLICATION FORM: Article 237—From now on the Government will be subject to increasing pressures—political, agricultural, industrial. They must keep a reasonably free hand . . . The Prime Minister stressed that the negotiations may be long and detailed. They could easily stretch out so as to come within the shadow of the next General Election. At that point the Government would need great courage to refuse to assure this or that section of the community, that it will not be hurt . . ."

—*The Times*, August 1, 1961.

British and Commonwealth Trade

The following letter to the Editor appeared in *The Daily Telegraph*, August 25, 1961:

Sir—Mr. George Edinger asks what alternative opponents of the European Common Market have to offer, but surely the onus is on the supporters of the Common Market to make their case—which by all accounts involves a complete disruption of our present trading pattern as well as the prospective loss of political sovereignty and independence for this country.

This country, which can only grow enough food to feed half the population and possesses virtually no raw materials within its borders has nonetheless built up a standard of living only exceeded by the United States of America and, possibly, Canada and Sweden. One of the prime causes of this achievement lies in the complementary nature of trade between this country and the Commonwealth, which accounts for more than 40 per cent. of our entire overseas trading.

For the most part the Commonwealth countries have the food and raw materials which we need, and we supply them with the manufactured goods which they want. The population of the Commonwealth is around 650m. people, and the potential growth in trade over the next ten years gives every reason for expecting our dealings with these countries to double themselves.

As compared with this natural and logical complementary trade, only 14 per cent. of our overseas trade lies with the European Economic Community countries, which all manufacture the same goods as we do and which are all as deficient in raw materials, broadly speaking, as we are. Their total population is 170m., or slightly more than one quarter of the Commonwealth population.

Notwithstanding this, fanatical European idealists try to get away with the devout hope that greater prospects of expansion are possible between this country and the E.E.C. countries by all taking in each other's washing machines, as it were, in an area where no complementary element of trade exists at all.

When, to this basic absurdity are added the other disadvantages of

- (1) The weakening of Commonwealth ties, which every Commonwealth statesman knows to be a certainty through closer British association with Europe.
- (2) The colossal economic hardship which will be caused to our oldest and closest Commonwealth friends, Australia, Canada and New Zealand;
- (3) The inevitable upheaval for British agriculture for which the present price-support system would have to be abandoned in three to four years at the most;
- (4) The abandonment of Britain's independence and traditional balance of power policy in Europe;
- (5) The serious hardship and unemployment (which will result for employers and employees in this country from severe Continental price competition)

it is small wonder if those who have studied the hard facts believe that the Common Market offers no compensating gains of any account—just a collection of pious hopes.

Those of us who are opposed to the Common Market policy see a greater future for this country in a still more vigorous expansion of trade between this country and the Commonwealth, coupled with a more enlightened policy by the British Government itself. If only the Chancellor of the

Exchequer and his advisers would tear themselves away from their Crippsian mentality, and instead go in for a policy of expansion, this country would have no fear of the greater development currently taking place in Europe, nor would our standard of living be imperilled.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN PAUL.

London, W.8.

Collectivism

"If we then describe the deadly danger which threatens our whole Western civilisation we do not doubt that we shall be fully understood by everyone. We are surely within our rights in speaking of Collectivism as the fundamental and mortal danger of the West and in describing it as nothing less than political and economic tyranny, regimentation, centralisation, the despotic organisation of every department of life, the destruction of personality, totalitarianism and the rigid mechanisation of human society. And we do not doubt that we can count upon general agreement when we say that this resulting insect State would not only destroy most institutions and values which comprise a development of three thousand years and which, with a conscious pride we designate Occidental civilisation. It would not only rob society of that organic structure and internal support which gives it its stability, but above all it would take from the life of the individual just that essential purpose which only freedom can bestow; and with the loss of individual liberty every vestige of intrinsic worth and dignity would perish from the earth. In speaking thus we are expressing convictions which comprise the very core of Christian thought and which must perish with it."

—Wilhelm Ropke in *Civitas Humana*
William Hodge & Co., Ltd.)

Khrushchev

Of course, Khrushchev was a reliable supporter of Stalin just as he is a dedicated believer in Communist doctrine. Were he not both he would not have survived and won high office. But Khrushchev is not Stalin and he did not follow the Stalin path to power. He was once asked by a reporter how it was that he, a man who had not been very prominent before Stalin's death, had moved up to the top.

"It once happened," he replied, "that there were four persons in prison in the Ukraine—a burly anarchist, a clever Social Democrat, a dedicated Communist and a little Jew named Pinya. They often disagreed and decided to elect the little Jew as their chairman to resolve all disputes. Finally they decided to escape from prison. They dug a tunnel, and the question arose of who should go first. Each had some excuse because it seemed sure that the first man out would be shot by the guards.

"The little Jew intervened. 'I am your leader,' he said. 'You elected me by a democratic process. So I will go first.'

"The moral," said Khrushchev, "is that each man, whoever he may be, finally rises to the level of the responsibility which he is given.

"You know who that little Jew was?" Khrushchev asked. "That little Pinya, that was me."

—From "After Khrushchev Who?" by Harrison E. Salisbury in *The Saturday Evening Post*, March 5, 1960.

Leisure and the Arts

... The need for leisure—for those who feel it at all—is a negative matter. It is a demand to be freed from the various impediments to the quiet working of the mind. As such, it is profoundly uninteresting to the social world and it is the last thing that cultural institutions of one sort and another provide for. They, after all, are largely concerned with providing factitious motives for those who like to imagine that they are busy about art. It is unflattering to the great or little public which floods about such institutions, and sit on their committees, to be told, in reply to the question: 'How can we help the poet or artist? 'You can leave him alone.' And yet that is the most unarguable of the conditions which are requisite for the production of anything worth reading or looking at. The few people who can produce such things have to be given an opportunity to do so. An institution which gave away money for no special reason would be useful. Most cultural institutions entertain the public rather than promote the arts, though one has to admit the possibility that the merchants of culture may occasionally and as it were by accident, promote an interest which results in the painter selling his picture or the writer his book, so that they might occasionally be the indirect means of giving leisure for meditation to someone who needed it

... Now that the advertised social ideal is the industrious making of money, the ordinary man is bound to ask (and to be unable to answer) why a young man who calls himself a poet should think that other people should work to keep him? The most certain point of morals left is that everybody ought to work.

In a world in which there is so much work to be done—even though not a little of it is in the making of superfluities—this is, naturally, no new idea. There have always been stout protesters. So Thomas Gray:

I am never so angry as when I hear my acquaintance wishing they had been bred to some poking profession, or employed in some office of drudgery, as if it were pleasanter to be at the command of other people, than at one's own; and as if they would not go, unless they were wound up.

And William Cowper:

But this provoke me, that a covetous dog who will work by candlelight in a morning, to get what he does not want, shall be praised for his thriftiness, while a gentleman shall be abused for submitting to his wants, rather than work like an ass to relieve them.

The social acceptability of such protests has gone with the society that supported them. Instead, it is thought proper that the poet should be put to work in a culture-factory—say the English Department of a university—or at promoting the legitimate diversion of high-brows through the Arts Council. All this is due to a theory of work, not to a theory of art.

(From "X," A Quarterly Review—August, 1961. *Leisure and the Arts* by C. H. Sisson).

The Scottish Acts of Parliament

"The whole Scottish Acts of Parliament, down to the Union are contained in three duodecimo volumes. And yet, in these three little volumes is to be found more of the spirit of real freedom, more wise resolution and practically beneficial legislation, and better provisions for the liberty of the subject . . . than in the whole thirty quarto volumes of the British Statutes at large."

—Sir Archibald Alison, historian and lawyer.

Sinister

The more one thinks about the United Nations coup in Katanga, the more sinister and alarming it appears. What is this mysterious organisation which can forbid the right of self-determination in one place while upholding it in another and can call upon some of the most pugnacious soldiers in the world—Irishmen, Gurkhas, Swedes—to carry out its unaccountable orders?

There are those—the world calls them cranks and eccentrics—who believe that the United Nations is merely an instrument of a world-wide conspiracy run (according to taste) by a committee of freemasons, reincarnated lamas or Elders of Zion.

But even if there is nothing more sinister at work here than the progressive's lust for tidyness at all costs, the implications are still alarming enough. Katanga is not the only anomalous region in the world which has dared to claim the right to run its own affairs.

If the United Nations insists on unity in the Congo, what is to prevent it, at some future time, from insisting on unity in Ireland or the Indian sub-continent, suppressing Orangemen or Pakistanis by trickery and force?

—Peter Simple in *The Daily Telegraph*, August 31, 1961.

Freemasonry

The Sunday Telegraph (October 1st) reports that the Bishop of Southwark, Dr. Mervyn Stockwood, has asked clergy in the diocese to submit copies of forms of Masonic services which are to be held in their churches. The bishop says some of them have contained "heretical" sentiments.

After pointing out that the Anglican Church includes many Freemasons, one of them being the former Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Fisher of Lambeth, *The Sunday Telegraph* says there have been suggestions in the past that some features of Masonic services, including phrases, were not entirely compatible with the orthodox forms of worship.

Of Freemasonry, Dr. Stockwood said, "I find it difficult to understand how a Christian can reconcile his beliefs with the membership of a secret society. It doesn't help the spirit of brotherhood within the church if some of the brothers are linked together in a secret group."

Facts On Tax

The new administration has several new programmes calling for increased spending. Who will pick up the tab? Here are some interesting facts on who pays. If the Government took 100 per cent. of all income over \$10,000, in one year that would amount to an additional \$4.5 billion. At present spending rates this would run the Government for three weeks. Further, if the Government took 100 per cent. of all income over \$25,000 the Treasury would get an additional \$700 million. This would run the Government for three days at present spending rates. It should be fairly apparent who will have to foot the bill. The average family will always be called upon to finance the bulk of Government spending. There isn't anyone else.

—*Human Events*, May 12, 1961.