

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 42. No. 23.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY, 16, 1963.

6d Fortnightly.

This Leadership Nonsense

Mutatis mutandis, THE COMMENTS MADE IN THE ARTICLE BY C. H. DOUGLAS IN VOL. 1, No. 2 OF *THE SOCIAL CREDITER*, SEPT., 24, 1938, AND REPRINTED BELOW ARE CLOSELY APPLICABLE TO SOME ASPECTS OF THE PRESENT SITUATION. RETCHING IS A PHYSIOLOGICAL RESPONSE, AND WHILE SOME OF US HAVE STRONGER STOMACHS THAN OTHERS, NONE IS IMMUNE.

The recent months in Social Credit history have been marked in the main by the growing success of the policy being pursued by the Government of Alberta in clarifying the issue between the people of Canada and the Money Power, and a wide enlightenment of the British Public in regard to the same issue through the agency of the Lower Rates Campaign. It was not to be expected that the enemy would not hit back. The devil is no fool and confusion not clarification is his aim. An honest agent is his best servant.

There have also been two attempts "to wrest the Leadership of the Social Credit Movement from Douglas"—all with the best intentions be it understood.

One of these, that of Mr. Hargrave and his little band of Greenshirts is quite orthodox, honest and understandable. It is of the type familiar to everyone from the days of Brutus to those of Baldwin. I am surprised that anyone can fail to see the pathetic fallacy under which Mr. Hargrave's followers labour, but I should be the last to complain. He is, at any rate, an honest opponent, and there is no nauseating "loyalty to Douglas" about him.

The more recent attempt, from another quarter, frankly makes me retch and beyond an expression of genuine thanks that I am thereby relieved of further contact with the tools of it, I do not propose to refer to it further, unless compelled by necessity.

Now anyone who is neither a fool nor a charlatan will repudiate responsibility without power. To avoid any possibility of misconception: *If it is possible to return that which does not exist; which I have never had, do not want and regard as a trap, then here and now I return the "Leadership" which has not been "wrested from me," to that nebulous body from which presumably it could only be derived, the Social Credit Movement.*

Leadership implies "sanctions". The military penalty of disobedience is death. Anyone who takes responsibility for an arduous and lengthy undertaking without very formidable and far-reaching powers of reward and punishment may

call himself a "Leader," but, with, I hope, due modesty I do not. I really do hope that I am not that kind of a fool.

For the past twenty years, I have regarded it as my duty to offer certain advice from time to time. I count myself more than rewarded for the personal loss and labour in which this has involved me, that when that advice has been followed, good has come of it. Perhaps the least important quarters in which it has been followed are those professing Social Credit views.

With due regard to the Scriptural (and, more important, sound) advice regarding pearls and pork which I have perhaps unduly neglected, I shall do what I can, while I can, when I can and where I can to give any advice which is desired and useful, quite irrespective of any irritation it may cause to Leaders, serious or comic. The responsibility for the advice is mine and will be judged not now, but many years hence. The acceptance or rejection of it rests with others and the responsibility for that decision rests with them also.

A spate of advice is often worse than no advice at all. To the readers of this paper (need I emphasise the affection I have for so many of them?) I would suggest:

(1) Don't take the temperature of the Social Credit Movement every five minutes and wonder if its going to die. The defeat of the bankers isn't a five minute job, either. Watch your enemy.

(2) The eyes of a Fool are on the ends of the earth. Wish Alberta, Canada and New Zealand well and help where you can, but your immediate job is to get your rates down.

[The contemporary job is the Now or Never Campaign. Ed. T.S.C.]

Treason

"To be merged with our friends and allies or subordinated to any of them is to be destroyed as a nation, and is therefore treason, Air Vice-Marshall Donald Bennet writes in a booklet published to-day. 'The defeatist who says that we are unable to defend ourselves and must therefore go under is guilty of this crime.'

"The booklet presents the case for the preservation and development of the British independent deterrent and attacks the Nassau agreement . . . Air Vice-Marshall Bennet said in London yesterday most Britons were disgusted and ashamed at the pessimism prevalent among a minority of

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: EUSon 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: EUSon 3893). Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O. Sydney, N.S.W.

people in Britain including professional commentators, culminating in the humiliation of Nassau.

“They are greatly disturbed because of the idea of our being under the thumb of a foreign power which shall say ‘yea’ or ‘nay’ to us. What I find particularly disgusting is that we seem to be accepting the idea that we should be underdogs, that we should be taking it lying down . . .”

—*The Times*, January 4, 1963.

Mr. Kenneth de Courcy

The Times for January 10, reports:—

“Kenneth Hugh de Courcy, aged 53, described as an editor, of Cerney House, North Cerney, Gloucestershire, was charged at Bow Street last night with an offence under section 13 of the Prevention of Fraud (Investment) Act, 1958. He is to appear in court today.

“The charge alleges that on February 18, 1959, in the county of London, de Courcy, by a misleading statement in a circular, induced other persons to invest in Sarsden Consolidated Properties Ltd.”

The early news bulletins of the B.B.C. repeated the substance of these paragraphs, and later in the day added that Mr. de Courcy was remanded at Bow Street on bail of £10,000, until the following Tuesday, when the hearing would be adjourned to Marylebone Police Court, where it would occupy at least five days, from March 14th.

Mr. de Courcy's solicitor was reported as saying that he had been instructed to state, in view of the publicity given to the case, that his client was innocent and had a complete answer to the charge against him.

The *Evening Standard*, January 15, reported that Mr. de Courcy was further remanded on bail totalling £27,500 at Bow Street that day after his counsel said he might have to visit Canada at short notice.

The news bulletins of the B.B.C. on Tuesday, January 15, did not refer to the case, but *The Times* on the following

morning quoted Mr. Michael Corkrey, for the prosecution at the resumed hearing, as saying that the defendant desired to go to Canada in respect of certain legal proceedings and the prosecution were agreeable to accept an increased bail of £27,000 made up of £10,000 and four sureties for a total of £17,000. The defendant had agreed to hand his passport to the Canadian police as soon as he landed and it would be handed back to him when he boarded the aircraft to return to this country.

Mr. L. J. Belcourt, for the defence, said his client had no personal desire to go to Canada but was involved in substantial legal matters there. Sir George Bull, the solicitor acting in this country, was doing everything possible to obtain an adjournment of the Canadian proceedings.

The accused, said *The Times*, was then remanded until March 14 on £27,000. Sir Hugh Arbuthnot, of Andoversford, Gloucestershire (£4,500), Mr. John de Courcy, of East Finchley (£5,500), Mr. Christopher Paul Baker, of Dorking (£3,000), and Mr. John Walter Ferlex Lloyd-Jones, of Hay Lane, near Swindon (£4,500), were accepted as sureties.

Dictatorship

“Air Chief Marshal Sir Philip Joubert, wartime chief of R.A.F. Coastal Command, challenged the Government last night to use the next three years to produce a British nuclear deterrent independent of American control. He was speaking at a rally at Caxton Hall, London.

“The crowd cheered as he said: ‘The Minister for Defence has decided to go ahead with the contract for 42 V-bombers which, equipped with Blue Steel, will give us an effective force for three years.

“‘Why can't we make up our minds to do something in these three years to introduce an equivalent to Skybolt?

“‘I am sure we have got the know-how and I am sure we must not give away the things which have brought us success in the past . . .

“Sir Philip went on: ‘The Nassau communique makes no reference to China as a possible enemy. How much use would the Polaris submarines be in war with China? To me it is absolutely deplorable that here there is a crowd of people in this country who think that because we no longer have the opportunity the Skybolt missile offered we must resign ourselves entirely to the hands of America and accept the things they are kind enough to offer us.

“‘In the past wars we have defeated two dictators. Now we are faced with more of them and none is so dangerous in my view as the President of the United States.

“‘Mr. Kennedy, I am sure, is a most estimable man. But he is the son of his father.

“‘I am sure he is determined on two things:—

“‘If there is only going to be one finger on the nuclear trigger that finger is going to be his:

“‘By pushing us into the Common Market he will make quite sure that diplomatically and nationally we become quite definitely a third class nation.’”

—*The Daily Express*, January 4, 1963.

The Common Market

"Historian Sir Arthur Bryant warned yesterday that if Britain joined the Common Market she would become a minority without the right to withdraw.

"In an interview in *The Director*, journal of the Institute of Directors, Sir Arthur says: 'The French, like the Germans accept, as they always have done, police and authoritarian power in a way that Britain would never tolerate. Even today they are supporting a virtual dictatorship.'"

—*The Daily Express*, January 7, 1963.

That Word "Exploit"

The highlight of a brilliant letter from Mr. Robert Murray to the *Daily Telegraph* of January 3rd, 1963, was his last paragraph, in which he pointed out that "The biggest sufferer in the changes in Africa up to now has been the African peasant, the ordinary man. He has merely changed one despotism for a worse one." The letter was entitled "Scramble for Africa."

If by 'peasant' Mr. Murray signified the same class in Africa as the kulak of Russia, then we may decry a pattern of liquidation. For the peasant class is one that achieves a measure of independence by useful work or service, like producing food. And clearly, in the minds of the world's real rulers, there is independence and independence. The kind of which they approve is reliance on themselves instead of, say, Britain, while they disapprove of the kind of independence that frees a person or a country from their direct control.

A letter in answer to Mr. Murray appeared next day over the signature of R. Casey which complained that Katanga has "wealth to pay mercenaries to maintain order" and so "cannot but be peaceful compared to the rest of the Congo." I suppose that by 'mercenary' the writer means non-Katangese, for presumably the local gendarmerie are paid; and I do not see the great crime in keeping order, which I had considered to be the prime responsibility of government. Nor is it very obvious why the various Indians, Swedes, Irish and Ethiopians, who compose the U.N.O. forces can be called other than 'mercenaries' since they are presumably paid and are certainly not native.

Mr. Casey hopes that "the outbreak of fighting is not attacked too readily by Britain at the United Nations. Let United Nations troops crush Katangese hotheads and mercenaries for good . . ." This is fighting talk, and if a few Belgian women are shot to death, that is presumably their fault for getting in the way; for it is inevitable that in any war of this kind the most barbarous 'mistakes' will occur and the most bitter suffering be endured by any who live in the area. Old tribal and personal scores are even paid off sometimes, and the more helpless the victims the more ruthless their treatment. Mr. Casey is surely aware of these facts.

Mr. Arthur W. Dorling, whose letter of January 5 appears in *The Times*, January 9, writes: "The U.N., having brought bloodshed and chaos to the only well organised and peaceful state in the Congo, now has the audacity to demand that Mr. Tshombe should disband foreign mercenaries and

advise them to leave the country. Is there no voice left in England to tell the U.N. that that is precisely what *they* should do? . . . Surely we can still speak the truth fearlessly and courageously."

But the biggest stick with which the Katangese and the Belgians and, if they can be involved, the British are beaten is the one word "exploitation," which is used to justify every crime in the book, notably such pastimes as rape, murder and arson. This, like the rest of the vocabulary used to stir up the blackest passions of race hatred, is packed or loaded with emotionalism. Yet it has two distinct meanings, which the opponents of peace and order are for ever confusing. It has a good meaning, to make the best use of any resources, which is illustrated in the parable of the talents. And it has a pejorative meaning, to grind down and use for selfish ends, to treat people inhumanly.

I believe that the African peasants and a number of whites in Africa, have "exploited" the country in the best possible sense and that nothing could stop their building up an ordered and happy society between them, except chaos, bloodshed and the foulest propaganda. This is being amply supplied by all those, U.N.O. included, who have set on the Continent like a pack of wolves: it would indeed be more correct to say that they have "been set on Africa" by those whose interest it is to destroy emerging stability in the interests of their own power. If Mr. Casey, of the *Telegraph* correspondence columns, could locate them and deal with them in his own heavy-handed way ("crush" was the word he used), then he would perform a signal service to Africans white and black, and the invaders could be packed off home on indefinite leave.

Meanwhile it is the duty of writers to examine most carefully the words that are used in all discussion of the problem. It is said that an Arabic sentence may be correctly translated one way, but may also be correctly translated to bear an entirely different meaning. So the words of politicians and "liberators" are often used to cause a fatal confusion. In simpler times, it was said, "Let your 'Yea' be 'Yea.'"

In the same columns the Rev. W. Bertrand Smith mentions "three distinct attempts at world domination, first by Hitler, then by Stalin and Co., now by President Kennedy." " 'The military onslaught' " (against Katanga's attempt to secede) " 'was brought on by the Americans,' stated Mr. Tshombe." (*Daily Telegraph*, January 1, 1963.) "They will take over from the Belgians. It is they who are directing the attack because they want Katanga's copper. We all know that Katanga will be crushed because the Americans would have it so."

Earlier Mr. Maurice Watt had written "U.N. policy in Katanga—or should one say 'American policy'?—was aptly described by Tacitus nearly 2,000 years ago: 'They make a solitude, which they call peace.'" (A more forceful translation would be "They make a desolation . . .")

While I am sure that these views are correct enough, the point surely is that Mr. Kennedy and "American policy" are quite naturally playing their own game. The height of folly—exemplified by the hurried and undignified trips of our officials across the Atlantic—is to expect them to care a jot for any other interest than their own. If Britain's leaders had been as faithful servants of their own people as the

American office holders are to their own policy makers, then we might still be really free. As it is we are "interdependent" and were, until de Gaulle's intervention, being edged into a "common market," and very effectively hustled out of our British heritage. The declared dismay at this intervention (which, as the *Evening Standard* leader-writer stated on January 28th) was "no more than a comment on the fundamental impossibility of integrating this country into the new Europe" must be so much humbug.

President de Gaulle also is playing his own game, but even if we may suspect that he has subtle, inimical, undeclared aims, yet in his Common Market point he has "merely put into plain words what is implicit in the demands of the Rome Treaty: that while such a system may suit Europe, it does not suit Britain." There have even been a few Englishmen who have dared to make known their approval. On the very B.B.C. a voice was heard to say, "If we had someone in England who was as awkward in the defence of his country as de Gaulle is in the defence of France . . ."

It seems we have been given a little time—but no relaxed stance will avail. Our enemies are still working overtime to push us over the edge. H.S.S.

The Three Rules

In 1954 we published the following. It may have been forgotten by some of our older readers. In any case it should interest our newer ones.

Not at first hand, but *via* the parish paper of All Saints, Margaret Street, W.1., London, we quote the following extract from the forthcoming book, *Six Nonlectures* by E. E. Cummings, which has appeared in the Oxford Press's *Periodical*. In our source, Mr. Cummings is said to have explained why "the Christian Religion is not popular, and why popular religion is not Christian." While this particular 'reciprocal dissociation' or 'dissonance,' may be a fact, if it is so, it is *inter alia*, and the phenomenon is of major social and political significance:—

"Rather recently—in New York City—an old college chum, whom I hadn't beheld for decades, appeared out of nowhere to tell me he was through with civilisation. It seems that ever since Harvard he'd been making (despite all sorts of panics and panaceas) big money as an advertising writer; and this remarkable feat unutterably depressed him. After profound meditation, he concluded that America, and the world which she increasingly dominated, couldn't really be as bad as she and it looked through an advertising writer's eyes; and he promptly determined to seek another view—a larger view; in fact, the largest view obtainable. Bent on obtaining this largest obtainable view of America and America's world my logical ex-pal wangled an appointment with a sub-subeditor of a magazine (if magazine it may be called) possessing the largest circulation on earth; a periodical whose each emanation appears simultaneously in almost every existing human language. Our intrepid explorer then straightened his tie, took six deep breaths, cleared his throat, swam right up, presented his credentials, and was politely requested to sit down. He sat down.

"'Now listen' the sub-subeditor suggested 'if you're thinking of working with us, you'd better know The Three

Rules.' 'And what' my friend cheerfully inquired 'are The Three Rules?' 'The Three Rules' explained his mentor 'are: first, eight to eighty; second, anybody can do it; and third, makes you feel better.' 'I don't quite understand' my friend confessed. 'Perfectly simple' his interlocutor assured him. 'Our first Rule means that every article we publish must appeal to anybody, man, woman, or child, between the ages of eight and eighty years—is that clear?' My friend said it was indeed clear. 'Second,' his enlightener continued, 'every article we publish must convince any reader of the article that he or she could do whatever was done by the person about whom the article was written. Suppose (for instance) you were writing about Lindbergh, who had just flown the Atlantic ocean for the first time in history, with nothing but unlimited nerve and a couple of chicken (or ham was it?) sandwiches—do you follow me?' 'I'm ahead of you' my friend murmured. 'Remembering Rule number two' the subsub went on 'you'd impress upon your readers' minds, over and over again, the fact that (after all) there wouldn't have been anything extraordinary about Lindbergh if he hadn't been just a human being like every single one of them. See?' 'I see,' said my friend grimly. 'Third' the subsub intoned 'we'll imagine you're describing a record-breaking Chinese flood—millions of poor unfortunate men and women and little children and helpless babies drowning and drowned; millions more perishing of slow starvation; suffering inconceivable, untold agonies, and so forth—well, any reader of this article must feel definitely and distinctly better, when she or he finishes the article, than when he or she began it.' 'Sounds a trifle difficult' my friend hazarded. 'Don't be silly' the oracle admonished 'all you've got to do, when you're through with your horrors, is to close by saying; but (thanks to an all-merciful Providence) we Americans with our high standard of living and our Christian ideals, will never be subjected to such inhuman conditions; as long as the Stars and Stripes triumphantly float over one nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all—get me?' 'I get you' said my disillusioned friend. 'Good bye.' "

The Bretton Woods Agreement

In the House of Representatives, Canberra, on October 9, 1962, Mr. G. H. Gray, Member for Capricornia, asked the Treasurer the following question:—

"Is he aware that the value of the American dollar in Australia in 1939 was 4/2d? Is he aware also that the value has now risen to approximately 8/9d? Can he give any reason, apart from the provisions of the Bretton Woods Agreement, why this fall in the value of Australian currency should have taken place? Does he agree that this artificial devaluation is today the greatest handicap which Australia faces in seeking new markets?"

Mr. Harold Holt replied:—

"I do not know that I can satisfy the honourable gentleman's curiosity completely, but, having just returned from America, I can tell him that one can get a haircut much more cheaply here, and that even the price of beer is lower in Australia."

The reply given by the Treasurer could hardly have conveyed less information. Either he does not know the answer or does not intend to supply the information.