

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 47 No. 25

SATURDAY, 9 MARCH, 1968

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

The Reith Lectures — 1967

The six Reith Lectures for 1967 were delivered by Dr. Edmund Leach, Provost of King's College, Cambridge under the general title of 'A Runaway World'. Subtitles were 'Men and Nature', 'Men and Machines', 'Ourselves and Others', 'Men and Morality', 'Men and Learning', and a final commentary and summary 'Only Connect . . .'. They are readily available for study in *The Listener* and are soon to be published in book form by the Oxford University Press (New York).

• • •

In the 1966 series Prof. J. K. Galbraith said that "it was part of the vanity of modern man that he can decide the character of his economic system against the imperatives of technology, organisation and planning". Dr. Leach, on the other hand, started off by asserting that "men have become like gods". "Isn't it about time," he asked, "that we understood our divinity. Science offers us total mastery over our environment and over our destiny, yet instead of rejoicing we feel deeply afraid. Why should this be? . . . If we chose we could participate in the processes of nature in a quite unprecedented way and fashion a world to suit our convenience . . . Why do so many of us talk as though the advancing sweep of technology were a natural catastrophe beyond all human control? . . . Why must the long-term consequences always be left in the lap of the gods? . . . Are we prepared to tamper with nature itself? . . . We simply must take charge of our own fate. We must somehow see to it that the decisions which have long-term consequences are taken by men who understand what they are doing and not by bewildered amateurs. And it could be so. Change could not be something that happens to us: it could be something that we choose to bring about."

Brave words, although "tamper with nature" is an ugly phrase. Indeed, the lectures tend to be spattered with phrases and sweeping statements which seem designed to shock and startle. Thus we are told, "Every manifestation of national consciousness is an evil; respect for tradition is an evil; every vested interest is at all times open to challenge." Traditional scholarship "can only offer a clutter of useless information" and "only those who hold the past in complete contempt are ever likely to see visions of the New Jerusalem". (my stress) "Education must show quite explicitly that the battery of concepts borrowed from Plato and Aristotle and the Bible which served so well in the past is not adequate for the 20th century."

Dr. Leach also spoke, without coming to any final conclusions, on population problems and whether the Hippocratic oath always applies; and, as might be expected, he spoke about modern teaching which, he thinks, separates knowledge into 'subjects' instead of integrating it. The pre-

sent system favours students who are merely good at examinations but are often conformist and orthodox types possessing little creative ability. "Only a tiny minority," he says, "thinks of education as a means by which human beings are given human interests and values so that they can fit together into the total jigsaw of society: for most of us education is an instrument of war, a weapon by which the individual beats down his competitors and defends himself against adversity." Modern education thus makes for separatism of individuals and families: "Our present society is emotionally very uncomfortable. The parents and children, huddled together in their loneliness, take too much out of each other. The parents fight; the children rebel. Children need to grow up in larger, more relaxed domestic groups, centered on the community rather than on mother's kitchen —something like an Israeli kibbutz, perhaps, or a Chinese commune."

As might be expected, statements like those quoted had a very mixed reception from the critics. A Conservative M.P. Mr. Angus Maude, wrote to *The Spectator*: "Where are those who know what they are doing?" He had "never met any", and he concluded that Dr. Leach wanted us to be controlled by "an unscientific young scientist, brought up in a Chinese commune, rejecting moral principles but without any doubts about the rightness of what he plans to do; emotionally involved in his data and having no truck with amateurs like us; holding the past in contempt; committed to arbitrary retirement at the age of 55 and, presumably, to euthanasia thereafter". (Dr. Leach recommended that those over the age of 55 who were concerned with scientific and technological development should not be allowed to hold *administrative office* in those fields, presumably because they would not be up-to-date.)

But, on the whole, the critics, whether approving or disapproving, would have done well to have waited until Dr. Leach had finished. While some of his more sweeping statements would make good debating material for the University Union, the last lecture, "Only Connect", was delivered with great earnestness and went far to correct some harsh and hasty impressions. A good follower of Marx and Lenin would hardly have recommended "a persistent disrespect for all forms of bureaucracy". Nor would he have said: "Live and let live . . . Tolerance is not such a negative creed either . . . We must recognise that we are now responsible for the future. We cannot 'leave it to fate'. But that does not mean that we must plan the future in detail. The most we should try to do is to determine the general direction in which things move . . . We could act like gods. That does not mean that we can control the universe, but that we can act confidently with a sense of purpose."

(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 40/-; Six months 20/-; Three months 10/-.

Offices: Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London E.11.

Telephone: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1

Telephone: 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001

Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001
(Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2600. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q. Secretary: H. A. Scouler, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

is a quality of great price, desperately needed in the world of today."

Sir Arthur Bryant quotes William White in the *Washington Post* of Nov. 22, 1967 as referring to "Prime Minister Harold Wilson's despairing courage in cutting the value of the pound sterling, once the most powerful currency on this earth . . ." But Richard Crossman gives the lie to that one. Courage to attenuate old age pensioners' purchasing power; to rob the thrifty of the value of their savings; to rob patriots of their dedicated careers and face them with the miseries of unemployment? Or scientific blackguardism, conspiracy, churlishness and fanaticism? A despairing courage which seeks solace in banquets in Moscow and Washington? But perhaps Prime Minister Wilson will proceed to New York to assist in removing the garbage with which Socialism's historic mission has clogged the streets.

U.S. News & World Report in its issue of Feb. 12, 1968 says that the French are reported to be aiming their missiles at capitals of Western nations. And the Wilson administration is dismantling the civil defence organisation, and destroying its records. Thus Europe, including Britain, appears ripe for a Communist take-over, perhaps without a shot being fired. Does anyone think Khrushchev was joking when he said that the Communists will bury us? The U.S. looks like being in the position of the man who was buried as the richest man in the cemetery. Writing from New York for *Spectator* of Feb. 9, 1968, Murray Kempton says that "the last two weeks have left us a defeated people . . . The United States is already so drained by its commitments in Vietnam that it was helpless in the Arab-Israeli crisis and can only palter with North Korea about the 'Pueblo'. In this sense Mr. Johnson is dependent on the restraint and the kindness of his enemies. It is a mark of his helplessness that he clings to the hope that they will help . . ." We have seen something of the 'kindness' of the enemy in the actions of the Viet Cong, in case anyone has forgotten the methods employed to crush the Hungarian revolt.

EPITAPH FOR OUR TIMES: The king by judgment establisheth the land: but he that receiveth gifts overthroweth it. *Proverbs XXIX: 4.*

To "Fall Among Editors"

A soldier who believed in the Reform Bill of 1832 was rewarded with 100 strokes of the Cat-O'-Nine-Tails for publishing a letter in which he expressed his views. The soldier became a hero of the English folk, and William Cobbett in an hotel in Coventry gave the hero advice upon his project of going to London. Cobbett says: "Now, you are going to London; let me give you a few words of advice. There are thieves in London who steal money; there are swindlers in London who make victims of the unwary; but there are worse people in London than thieves and swindlers; there are editors of newspapers; take care of yourself if you fall among editors. You are property for them. Each will try to get you exclusively to himself. They will traffic upon you. If one gets you in his den, and you do not always after go to that den, he will rush upon you some day and tear you to pieces. Take care of the editors: I know them well!!!".

—From *The Autobiography of A Working Man*,
by Alexander Somerville, page 341 (1848).

That day has come, says Sir Arthur. But to Mr. Richard Crossman devaluation and withdrawal from 'East of Suez' are "giant strides towards the historic mission of British Socialism".

Of course, there is no such thing as 'British' socialism. As Marx said, the British are too stupid to make their own revolution, therefore foreigners must make it for them. The overall benevolence of British colonialism was the outcome of the Anglo-Saxon character, which was mutilated in two contrived world wars, and swamped by alien immigration.

Sir Arthur says: "There are certain transmitted qualities in the British fighting services, allied with certain temperamental aptitudes in the British character when conditioned by discipline and *esprit de corps*, which are ideally suited for dealing with the violence engendered by inflamed popular passions and for combating the kind of war to which such passions and the Communist technique of infiltration and armed intimidation give rise. It has grown out of our history, and particularly our military and naval history, and

Red Orthodoxy

The English Roman Catholic biblical scholar, John Blenkinsop, wrote an article in *The Guardian* (Jan. 11, 1968) called *Revolutionary Christianity?* This article consists of extracts from a longer article from *The Newman*, a quarterly published by the Newman Association which was shortly to appear.

Astonishingly enough, Mr. Blenkinsop repeats almost word for word views which have recently appeared under the name of the Rev. P. Oestreicher, for in comparing early Christianity and what he calls the "events of 1917", he comments that "both pivot on prophecy and fulfilment". He continues, "Marx spoke out against the dehumanising capitalism of the nineteenth century and the conventional Christianity which acquiesced in and thereby furthered it in much the same way as the Hebrew prophets denounced social injustice and the highly institutionalised sacrificial religion which condoned it."

Then the career of Lenin illustrates "the translation of an idea into history . . . With Lenin, concept was translated into reality". Yet even prophecy may fail, for what he calls "the two most important liberating revolutionary movements of modern times, initiated in July, 1789, and October, 1917" showed that revolutions may "absolutise" the symbols of their freedom. Marx had prophesied that the state would wither away, whereas there arose "one of the most absolutist state-systems known in history". The Church is or was in the same kind of danger but when "a genuine human community" is achieved, the Church will wither away.

Yet perhaps an absolutist state-system was intended, for Mr. Blenkinsop says nothing of previous subversive activities, of enlightened priests or of the sealed train that brought Lenin to Russia in the middle of war. Marx himself believed as implicitly in the financial system of the day as any churchman, and various questions of the results of the set-up were stirring in Christian minds. Maurice, Kingsley, Cobbett, the novels of Disraeli come to mind as well as the papal encyclical of 1891.

Mr. Blenkinsop asks whether Christianity can be described as a "revolutionary movement" and seems to favour a "revolutionary role for the Church through service and witness". Yet the Church surely is called to witness to the truth, not to subserve a bogus revolution which results in slavery and destroys millions; it is called to discover the divine law, rather than to excuse those who deny any divine law at all, certainly not to confuse the facts of the case.

Possibly the replacement of Cardinal Ottaviani (whose "intemperate outbursts over the years against any dealings with communists", *The Times* berates) by Cardinal Seper of Yugoslavia as Prefect of the Holy Office is another straw in the wind. It could mean that changes which the retiring Cardinal was known to oppose "will quickly follow his departure". (Jan. 9, 1968)

As if these adjustments were not enough, Dr. Hugh Schonfield suggests an amendment of the Gloria to accord with a Hebrew prayer for which I can find no textual justification, namely "Peace to men with whom he is pleased". (*T'is Times*, Jan. 2, 1967)

—H.S.

Correction, Please!

(From *The Review of the News*, Jan. 24, 1968)

ITEM: From a Column by RALPH MCGILL in the *Boston Globe* for December 27, 1967:

Arthur Goldberg is a magnificent human being — one whose life is in the Horatio Alger tradition. There is nothing of dissimulation in him — only integrity.

CORRECTION: Now that the air is filled with rumors that in the near future Ambassador Goldberg is going to resign his post at the United Nations, various propagandists for the Liberal Establishments can be depended upon to provide the usual gushing tributes. One is hardly surprised that Mr. McGill's encomium for Mr. Goldberg does not stand up under scrutiny.

One of the most critical issues facing America today is the attitude of its national leaders towards the International Communist Conspiracy. When Arthur Goldberg was appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court in 1962 (without any previous judicial experience, by the way) he told the Senate Judiciary Committee: "I regard Communism to be a dangerous international movement incompatible with our democratic traditions. I've never deviated from that from the earliest days of my life. Communism is a perversion of what people have a right to expect from government and from life." According to the *New York Times* for September 14, 1962, Senator Alexander Wiley said that "Mr. Goldberg's answers should convince anyone who is not absolutely prejudiced that he had never sympathized with the Communist cause".

But let us look at the record of this man of "integrity", whose word, presumably, is his bond. The following is taken from *Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities In the United States, Appendix—Part IX* of the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

(1) On page 610, Arthur J. Goldberg is listed as a sponsor of the Chicago Conference on Race Relations, July 22, 1939. In the words of the House Committee: "The Chicago Conference on Race Relations had such well-known and publicly avowed leaders of the Communist Party among its sponsors such as John Schmies, William Patterson, and Joe Weber. Interlocked through their personnel with the Chicago Conference were such well-known Communist-front organizations as the following: National Negro Congress, League of Women Shoppers, American League for Peace and Democracy, International Workers Order, Workers Alliance, and the German-American League for Culture. Veteran fellow travelers of Communist organizations whose names appeared on the sponsor's list of the Chicago Conference on Race Relations included the following: Charlotte Carr, Pearl M. Nart, Ishmael Flory, and Gilbert Rocke."

In this list of sponsors, Goldberg is identified as the President of the Chicago Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, which is described on page 121 of the *Guide To Subversive Organizations and Publications* as the "foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions."

(2) On page 653, Arthur J. Goldberg is listed as a sponsor of the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7-9, 1940. This conference, which

founded the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, was described by Attorney General Francis Biddle as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program." (*Congressional Record*, September 24, 1942, p. 7687.)

(3) On page 1206, Arthur J. Goldberg is listed as a sponsor of the National Emergency Conference, May 13-14, 1939. On the preceding page, the House Committee said: "The personnel of the sponsors of the conference indicates clearly that it was a Communist-front organization. A check of the index of this report will establish the extensive interlocking directorate of the conference with other Communist-front organizations."

That Ralph McGill's desire to cover Arthur Goldberg with the mantle of integrity is obviously a cover-up is reflected not only in the preceding information but by his record as Ambassador to the United Nations as well. Consider, by way of illustration, the fact that one of his first major actions in that office was to compromise not only his own integrity but also that of the United States when he announced that our government would not insist that member nations abide by Article 19 of the U.N. Charter, under which they are required to pay their delinquent dues or lose their right to vote. This was a tremendous propaganda victory for the Communists.

Or consider his continued insistence that the United States agree to sign the fraudulent U.N. Treaty on Human Rights, even though it would commit our government to institute as "human rights" the welfare-state measures advocated by the world's Communist and Socialist parties.

Imagine a diplomat, representing the United States of America, advocating the use of military force to overthrow the legitimate government of a pro-western, anti-Communist government. Ambassador Goldberg has done exactly this. As the Allen-Scott Report for March 2, 1966 puts it: "They (U.N. Delegates) say Goldberg minces no words in letting it be known he favors the use of force, if necessary, to topple the Verwoerd government (of South Africa)." He even asked the Defense Department for an invasion plan, which they supplied, and which he circulated at the United Nations.

Few were surprised when Goldberg came out strongly in favor of the United Nations economic sanctions against Rhodesia, in spite of the fact that these sanctions were so clearly in violation of Chapter I and Chapter VII of the U.N. Charter (assuming for the moment that the Charter is a trustworthy document). As James J. Kilpatrick aptly pointed out, Goldberg's impassioned defense of these sanctions will not stand up under the test of history, or of law.

Integrity, Mr. McGill, is hardly the word to describe a man with such a record of ambiguity and duplicity. Try again.

Communism in Vietnam

by Rodger Swearingen and Hammond Ralph
9/6 posted

Aggression through agitation, terror, subversion, guerrilla war and the use of proxies to confuse world public opinion.
K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11.

The Reith Lectures - 1967

(continued from page 1)

One who wanted chaos and continual upset would not have said, "Divine invincibility is latent in us all—in you and in me—it is not reserved for genius. But do not forget that it is the power of destruction as well as the power of creation. By all means let us make the most of our powers and enjoy our *struggles with confusion* but, at the same time, when we assert dominance over the universe let's remember how things are connected up. The good and the bad, the weak and the strong—all have a right to exist". "You can," he said, "be as free as you choose, but only if you choose not to carry freedom to excess. If we choose always to ignore the interests of our neighbours, whether they be human or sub-human, we shall in the last chapter simply be dead."

It may be that some listeners switched off their sets after Dr. Leach's outburst about nationalism, tradition, etc. But Social Creditors will admit that Social Credit would inevitably involve radical changes of attitude on many matters and it may well be that the preservation of national consciousness is not the last word in human evolution: greater unity in the sense of co-operation for mutual benefit (not uniformity) is certainly preferable to the aggressive nationalism we see at present. Under Social Credit the motives for aggression would disappear and people all over the world could really get down to the business of making friends (which, paradoxically, involves learning to understand and mind one's own business) with results that can hardly be imagined.

But to return to Dr. Leach: when he says "we"—"we must do this" or "we can do that"—he is evidently not referring to a small clique but to people generally and when he speaks of scientists who "understand what they are doing" and, later, adds the proviso that they "must be men of goodwill" and that "the last thing we can afford is to abandon the laboratories to military maniacs and politicians", he means just that. All the same he must forgive the ordinary man if he requires firm safeguards regarding the application of discoveries, no matter who is responsible for them.

It is when Dr. Leach tries to answer the question as to what is to be done about it all that he falls short. "Men of goodwill" implies that there are men of bad will and he seems to have no inkling, and would probably scout the idea, that control of the springs of human action and of the resources of power could be monopolised by a comparatively small company with a very strong sense of purpose who are also "connectors" and integrators, but by compulsion and oppression instead of by educated freedom of choice and inducement. He seems to have no inkling either as to where power resides: it certainly does not reside with the "we" or "us", to whom he so frequently refers, nor with the "military maniacs and politicians". But if Dr. Leach had understood these things as Douglas did, and had known as Douglas did how power could have been, and still could be, distributed right down to the individual in a machine age, and had disclosed this knowledge, he would never have been chosen to deliver the Reith lectures.

T.N.M.

I was an N.K.V.D. agent

A top Soviet spy tells his story
7/3 posted

Printed by E Fish & Co Ltd Liverpool