

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 25. No. 5.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage (home and abroad) 1d.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

A Policy for Eliminating Bolshevism

[We have pleasure in giving publicity to the further memorandum which follows by the close student of Foreign Affairs who composed the commentary we published on September 9:—]

The conspiracy for extending throughout the world the ruthless power of the Soviet dictators still meets with success after success. There is no indication that the initiative is passing, or even likely to pass, to the Western Powers. Judging from their public utterances, it is doubtful whether the political leaders of the British Empire and Atlantic Pact countries yet understand what must prove the decisive factor in the present struggle. Where their actions are concerned, [Collective actions is here understood—Editor, T.S.C.] it is evident that as yet nothing is being done to meet one of the most important requirements of the situation.

On the Soviet side there is a definite plan of advance, directed methodically and with great technical ability. In the west there is no general acceptance of a well-defined faith no formulated strategy, political or military, for defending what is left of Christian civilization. Against organised "fifth columns" and hundreds of army divisions—all under utterly unscrupulous but skilful control—wishful and boastful speeches proceed interminably, but there is no comprehensive counter-plan. There are signs that it is becoming increasingly recognised that Communism, as a political doctrine for the poorer masses, can and must be countered by propagation of the Christian faith and the establishment of a Christian social order. For this we may be thankful, but the actual efforts being made to that end are lacking in the energy needed while they do not, and cannot, dispose of the immediate and pressing danger due to the fact that the violently anti-Christian organisers of Communist revolution, who are by no means poor people, have now at their disposal all the material resources of Russia and other countries of eastern Europe besides a half of Asia.

The main strength of the Red dictators, which certainly is not in the truth of their doctrines, does not lie in their political technique, their terrorism or their physical power but in the failure of their opponents to appreciate the facts.

In a political struggle of this nature, as in war, it is essential to search for the antagonist's weaknesses and to oppose, or attack, him where he is weakest. It is equally important not to help him to overcome his weaknesses. The Soviet State suffers from one great weakness. If attacked with a knowledge of the facts and in the right way, the whole Soviet structure can be brought down like a house of cards.

It is now abundantly clear that Soviet rule has been detested, especially during the last twenty-one years, by at least ninety per cent. of the Russian people, including a majority of those who are in the administrative machine and

even the personnel of the secret police. This weakness of the Soviets was well known to the German General Staff before the German invasion in June, 1941. They quite realised that if they played the role of liberators from Communism, even only as a pretence, then the Soviet administration would collapse within a few weeks. But Hitler intended to be a conqueror and said so, rejecting the advice of the General Staff. There was thus aroused the fervent patriotism that is always present with the Russian people, so Hitler shared the fate of other would-be conquerors of Russia. All information, from varied and independent sources, including Russian, German and other eye-witnesses, is in agreement as to what happened. When the Germans crossed the Russian frontier, they were met by enthusiastic people greeting their imagined liberators. The armed forces did not fire a shot: the Germans were able to advance along the roads without troubling to open a tactical front. But as soon as it was seen that the Germans were the enemies of Russia the Russian people offered resistance, and it became possible to bring the army into action to play a leading part in Germany's defeat. It is not yet possible to support this statement of fact by quotations from authoritative documents, but any reader of this memorandum who cares to make the effort can procure corroboration by means of separate inquiries.

As is now generally realised, the Soviet dictators were compelled to give orders that war-time propaganda must be nationalist and not Communist. The Russian soldiers were told of the glories of Russian history. They were shown films depicting the triumphs of former Emperors and the great thanksgiving services which followed. New military decorations were named after Russian heroes of old. It was necessary to stage an elaborate pretence of restoring the Orthodox Church to its former status.

Their experience of the Germans was a bitter disappointment to the Russian people, who had hoped and believed that if the West made war on the Soviet Union it would be only as the enemies of Communism. To add to this, Great Britain and the United States signed the Yalta agreement, in accordance with which the British and American authorities in occupied Germany handed over many thousands of Russians to the Soviet authorities, by whom they were butchered. These factors and the still prevailing confusion in political utterances between "Russia" and the Politbureau, as between the "Russians" and the Bolsheviks, are all leading to a situation in which, if a clash comes soon, there may be no spontaneous non-belligerency in Russia but a nation actually believing the Red propaganda that the western Powers are the enemies of Russia but not of Communism.

British propagandists and publicists—official and unofficial, lay and clerical—seem to be doing their utmost to bring about a further involuntary union between the Russians and their rulers. The Communist menace, now backed and organised by those rulers, is the greatest moral and political

danger the world has known. As though this were not enough, no effort is being spared to make it a national issue too and, by that means, to help the Soviet dictators to overcome their one great weakness. Russians, as such, are perpetually abused for the actions of the Politbureau. The self-righteous boasting about the perfection of social conditions in the West, as compared to the horrors within the Soviet Union, which are well-known to the Russians, make them believe they are being mocked in their miseries. They are told about ideas for a partition of Russia, for example by creating a separate Ukraine, which arouses the patriotic resentment that Englishmen would feel if they were reviled by foreigners because England has no right to be in occupation of Wessex. Russians are sneered at as orientals although Russia, as a great Christian nation, was for centuries Europe's first line of defence against the inroads of marauding Asiatic hordes. In these and innumerable other ways immense harm is being done. So great is the blundering ineptitude of nearly all those who believe themselves engaged in anti-Communist propaganda that their words are often reproduced in full and without comment in the official publications of the Soviet Union.

One of the most urgent needs of the whole world is to prepare the means by which the Russian people can be persuaded, before it is too late, that the West is not anti-Russian but only anti-Communist. That is what most Russians would like to believe. If told that it is true by their compatriots now abroad, they would believe it and join the enemies of Communism at the first opportunity. Propaganda for this purpose, however, might be discounted as the enemy's war-time lies if it began only after hostilities were in full swing. But it is by no means impossible that, by the means suggested here, the desired collapse of Red rule could be brought about without the development of a full scale war. In any case, it is, as matters now stand, the only means of avoiding the terrible slaughter and destruction that would leave nothing but a shambles, whoever the nominal victor might be.

It may be supposed that the Russians are so sealed off from the rest of the world that there are no means of influencing their views. This is not true. Difficulties there are, but they can be overcome. The Russians now outside the Soviet sphere now fall into two categories: the relatively small number who became exiles at the time of the revolution; and the very much greater number who have left their country since 1941. Of the latter, who may be counted in tens of thousands, most are former soldiers who succeeded in evading the consequences of the Yalta Agreement. These young men are the best judges of the way in which information or inducements ought to be presented to their former comrades. Among the exiles generally there are some who have for years been able to maintain contacts with compatriots in the Soviet Union.

All these Russians have a burning desire to return to their families and homes but know that they would be killed if they attempted it now. They have therefore every inducement to do their utmost to help to bring about the fall of Red rule. They are active in sending information to Russia by the means at their disposal but only on the scale possible for private persons, with the slenderest resources, who are entirely without backing from those states which are said to be anti-Communist—even of an indirect

nature. They are not even recognised, or consulted. They ought to be helped, but nothing is done.

Inside the Soviet Union the radio and all printed journals including their advertisements, are under Communist control. A consequence is that the people have ceased to react, as planned, to what they are intended to hear and read and are correspondingly eager to receive and discuss news and views from other sources. A little propaganda goes an abnormally long way. Now, however, the Russian exiles cannot tell their compatriots that the Western Powers, if opposed to the Soviet dictators, are the friends of Russia and the long-suffering Russian people. There is no assurance that this is so. In the place of a definite policy in this vitally important matter, there is muddled-thinking, influenced by crypto-Communists, by those who profit from war and the threat of war and by those who, it seems, would be disappointed if there were not soon a vigorous exchange of atom and hydrogen bombs to demonstrate the merits of those "latest advances in scientific progress."

The western Powers have the means of uprooting the evil growth of Communism from the ground whence it draws its sustenance. The political requirements of the situation are in harmony with the moral law. *The time has come for the opponents of Communism to declare whether their attitude to the oppressed but patriotic people of Russia is one of hatred or whether it is just. Upon this the future of the world may depend.*

A number of countries are now ranging themselves openly against the Soviet Union and its satellites. Even so, the Communist dictators, as matters now stand, have great strategic advantages which would not be overcome even if western Germany were rearmed and mobilized. It is therefore time for the nations antagonistic to the Soviets to decide whether they desire as an ally or as an enemy the nation which has infinitely greater cause than any other to dislike Communism. That nation, Russia, possesses an immense reserve of man-power notwithstanding the terrible fact that seventy millions of her people have perished since 1917.

If it is the help, and not the hostility, of these anti-Communists that is desired, it must be remembered that they are, as they have always been, an intensely patriotic people. Their friendship can be gained neither by atom bombs nor by new-fangled, man-made "ideologies" which seek to supplant patriotism in its natural and virtuous form.

If the only sensible decision is reached as to the attitude to be adopted towards Russia and the Russians, there will be no overwhelming difficulty in procuring at least their non-belligerency and probably their active support. No decision seems to have been reached. It lies therefore with all men and women of good will to exert themselves—to ensure that their representatives press insistently for adoption of the right course. *It will soon be too late.*

ARTHUR ROGERS.

For correct information concerning the Constitution of
THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT,
 Social Crediters and others are invited to apply for
 the Statement published in July, 1949, (postage 1d.)
 K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

In the Line of Truth

by

NORMAN F. WEBB.

"With full appreciation of the gravity of the statement, we affirm that there is no philosophy, and consequently no policy, which deviates less from the philosophy of Christianity than that of Social Credit."—*The Social Crediter*: "From Week to Week."

Since the day of Pontius Pilate there has always been a tribute of ridicule paid to anyone who permits himself even to speculate about Absolute Truth. And the reason for this not altogether unhealthy scepticism must be a general realization of the common tendency to advance personal opinion regarding anything and everything as the whole Truth about it, regardless of the fact that human knowledge is of its nature only partial. In that sense, any answer to Pilate's question, What is Truth? must be ridiculous. On the other hand, to discuss or criticize human policies or institutions, all of which must inevitably partake of the same opinionated and partial nature, in relation to anything except their approximation to Absolute Truth—the wholly unknown quantity—is even more ludicrous and futile. Everything of which we are conscious, our consciousness itself, is relatively in line, or out of line with Truth, whatever it may be, and all *real knowledge* is concerned, and exclusively concerned with the evidence—the sensible indications to which our consciousness reacts—through which we can learn to recognise what is, and what is not *in the line of Truth*. For only so can confidence, leading to belief, or credit, be built up. So that to ridicule honest speculation and research regarding the attribute and nature of Absolute Truth, and dismiss it as impractical and useless, is to set a premium on so-called real ignorance and play directly into the hands of the powers of darkness.

The quotation at the beginning of this article, from a recent number of this journal, contains a statement by the author of Social Credit not lightly to be made. It appears with another, of almost equal significance, regarding one of the greatest—if not the greatest—human institution in existence today, the Church of Rome, to the effect that, notwithstanding that its secular policy is so tortuous and inconsistent as to give the appearance of a complete lack of co-ordination, there is in fact an overall and well-understood social objective behind it. These weighty observations are drawn from Douglas by reading in a critique dealing with some theological work, that "the Church of Rome has a way of disowning . . . its most effective apologists." This propensity, he says, is not confined to the exponents of doctrine and theory, but "applies equally to the impact of Vatican policy on the affairs of everyday life." In other words, the Church is equally apt to repudiate those who might well suppose themselves to be actively implementing her avowed policy and even reacting to specific encouragement drawn from recent Vatican Encyclicals. He goes on to say, "Some of the finest examples of the Roman priesthood . . . have been exponents of Social Credit, and it is within our first-hand and indisputable knowledge that they have been warned off their activities by the highest dignitaries of the Church." Douglas concludes: "We think we know the reason for this very regrettable fact. It is connected with the overwhelming

importance of Faith, Credit . . ." And he suggests that this connection is worth study.

Since the first publication of his exposition of Social Credit (then called Economic Democracy); in what Douglas has written, as well as his followers, in various textbooks and in the pages of this journal, there has been accumulated a considerable body of observed fact or real knowledge, all more or less closely related to the natural integrity of human association—as the name Social Credit implies—and with the observed behaviour of human beings in association. On this body of real, and therefore relatively Christian knowledge, a Social Credit policy has been framed, carefully calculated to meet the facts of the present circumstances more especially as they are affected by the impact of industrial specialization, or Series Production as it is called, on the rigid and academic mental outlook on finance-accountancy which has so far obstinately persisted in the face of the revolutionary situation created by advances in technological knowledge. It is this policy, together with the philosophy it is designed to realize, which its author claims to be the nearest approximation to the Christian, as expressed in practical sociology, currently available. And the Movement which Douglas himself inspired, and which bears his name, has always at whatever immediate and apparent cost, kept its policy as close to its philosophic beliefs as is humanly possible.

Now prominent in this body of observed fact upon which Social Credit policy is based, is this: that there is no policy (individual activity) that has not a personal philosophy behind it, ranging from the most elementary and blind urge to reproduce life and sustain it, right up the scale of emotional enlightenment to such conscious heights as Paul's passionate desire "to know even as we are known." Social Credit philosophy has been clearly, if broadly expressed by its author thus: ". . . that the end of man, while unknown, is something towards which most rapid progress is made by the free expression of individuality . . ." That, it must be admitted, is a fairly general statement, and it might be open to criticism on that head if it were not attached, as it is, to an indication of the first specific step towards its own practical realization in at least one important field. Douglas goes on immediately to say, "and that, therefore, economic organisation is most efficient when it most easily and rapidly supplies economic wants without encroaching on other functional activities." Which amounts to the statement that an objective, or philosophy, of social conditions allowing a maximum freedom for individual development and expression, demands as a policy the maximum available economic independence, based on freedom of choice, as at least a first step. That surely puts the Social Credit Standpoint clearly, and demonstrates a close alignment between the avowed objective and the means of gaining it.

There is another well-authenticated fact to which Social Credit gives a place of equal importance to that relating to the identity of philosophy and policy; and that is the tendency in all organisations to substitute means for ends—a tendency that increases in strength in proportion to the concentration of control at the centre. All material associations are predominantly, if not essentially, methodical, mathematical; the putting of two and two together for the sake of an ultimate product. But human organisations are composed of human beings with a vested interest in keeping

(continued on page 6)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
 One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
 Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: CENTRAL 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone SEFTon Park 435.

Vol. 25. No. 5.

Saturday, September 30, 1950.

From Week to Week

BULLETIN DE-CODER FOR THIRD WORLD WAR:

"American Marines" means "U.S. Armoured Columns advancing through unoccupied country planting American flags."

"United Nations troops" means "U.S. troops, armour and artillery being pushed back by assorted Communist Orientals."

"All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."—Edmund Burke.

That is to put the doctrine of Original Sin into a form with which every sane man must agree—that entropy is the normal dominant of society, just as gravity is the normal attribute of matter. The only hope for society is in the effort of unusual men, who build *against* gravity.

The de-gradation of the British Isles, and (we think) Scotland in particular in the last fifty years, can be identified with the drain, partly due to war and partly to the politics of the residue, of those who in various ways fought against social entropy.

We rate the intelligence of the readers of this review highly. It is not written for morons, who we recognise are widely catered for in productions of much larger circulation.

The full recognition of these facts enables us to dismiss at once any idea that there is some stratum either of society or Government composed of individuals who, if only we could penetrate it, would see the light, and work effectively towards it.

Let us make this point as clear as we are able, because it appears to lie at the root of wide misapprehensions. World Politics are (irrevocably, we think) committed to the centralisation of Power. We are committed irrevocably to the decentralisation of Power to the limits of the capacity of the individual. The first Policy postulates the equality of all men and women; the second recognises the absolute individuality and increasing differences of every human being.

There can be no greater practical mistake at the present time than to suppose that Social Crediters can engage usefully in what Lord Keynes called Essays in Persuasion, directed to the conversion of conscious opponents.

The die is cast; whether the phrase "the war between Christ and Anti-Christ" is taken to be symbolical or literal, one side must win.

Now, the practical effect of this is to put to some extent technical arguments into cold storage. Not the least of the fundamental fallacies of Fabianism was that Economics pre-

ceded and conditioned Politics. Precisely the opposite is true, and our task is, *not to capture politics*, but to fragmentate them.

With this preamble, and in the light of it, we make the following suggestions which do not replace, but rather re-inforce, previous Constitutional proposals:—

- (1) The Bank of England should be de-nationalised.
- (2) The shareholding should be distributed to individuals as a basis of pensions.
- (3) The Ways and Means Account should be abolished, and Supply voted directly by means of deduction from wage rates (P.A.Y.E. accompanied by an analysis of the destination of the deducted money).
- (4) All Government expenditure to be audited by accountants paid by local Councils.

That the fate of the British Steel industry, which is as much as to say, the fate of British economic power and War Potential should (ostensibly) be decided by the counting of noses most of the owners of which are profoundly incompetent to hold any opinion on the issues at stake, and quite a considerable minority is in Parliament to wreck "Britain," is so fantastically absurd that it seems incredible. But of course, the real position is far worse than absurd. With a slow, cunning patience, extending over hundreds of years—perhaps much longer, the threads of control have been centralised into a bastard "democratic Parliament" ("The core of the British Constitution is the supremacy of Parliament") so that sooner or later, with mathematical certainty, all power must come, as it has, into the hands of the Plotters. Once there; they feel confident that they will never let go, and their astonishing success in wrecking the British Empire in the space of five years is evidence that they have some grounds for confidence.

As the *Protocols of Zion* so clearly phrased the situation. "Our Right lies in Force. . . . Our Countersign is Force and Make Believe."

'The Powers of Evil' a 'Friend in Need'

A correspondent writes:—" Yesterday morning when I switched on the wireless for the weather I caught the last words of the Radio Parson. They are too sweet to pass into oblivion:—

"The Powers of Evil are active enough to guarantee Full Employment.' Time 7-54, Wednesday, September 20.

"Those who advocate Full Employment should feel very proud of their Ally. A Friend in Need! . . ."

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of *annual* subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is in regular use. The Library contains, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, Croft House, Denmead, Portsmouth.

The Right Hon. Winston Churchill

(The following are copies of correspondence:—)

(1)

Penrhyn Lodge,
Gloucester Gate, N.W.1.

August 23, 1950.

Dear Sir,

It is reported that you are to make a broadcast speech in the near future.

As former supporters of yourself we have, during the last few years, viewed with increasing misgivings the policies which you, Sir, have been pursuing.

While formerly you appeared to be one of the strongest advocates of the British Empire, it seems quite clear from one of your recent speeches that you are prepared to surrender the sovereignty of this country "for the sake of a world organization." Your advocacy of a "European Army" is also a pointer in this direction.

If "the abrogation of national sovereignty" forms a part of so-called "Conservative" policy, then we shall be compelled to repudiate that Party and its leader. Our loyalty is to His Majesty the King.

We would end by asking how it has come about that the British Empire, even now the greatest potential political force in the world, has been handed over to the "Americans" without at least a protest from yourself and other leading politicians of the once-Conservative Party?

Yours faithfully,

(signed) Basil L. Steele, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.
Russell V. Steele, M.B., B.S.
Evelyn Steele.
Anne Steele.

The Right Hon. Winston Churchill, O.M., C.H., M.P.,
House of Commons, S.W.

(2)

House of Commons,
London, S.W.1.

September 6, 1950.

Dear Sir,

I am writing on behalf of Mr. Churchill to thank you for your letter of the 23rd August.

Without more details I am afraid your criticisms of Mr. Churchill are quite incomprehensible. You do not state to which speech you are referring which is naturally necessary for the correct answer to be given you.

The suggestion of a European Army, in which all freedom loving nations would contribute their share does not diminish the national sovereignty to which you refer any more than did the fact that we were fighting side by side with many allies in the last two wars. I should have thought that Mr. Churchill's record during the great struggle of 1939-1945 would cause him to be remembered as one of the greatest exponents of British and Empire prestige and, if his foresight in regard to the dangers that lie ahead cause him to suggest a close unity of the powers ranged against Communism, I think you can rest assured that this will in no

way imperil the national sovereignty to which you refer in your letter.

Yours faithfully,

(signed) EDWARD A. H. ODDY,
Hon. Secretary.

Basil L. Steele, Esq., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.

(3)

(Will the Private Secretary kindly pass to Mr. Churchill for personal perusal).

Penrhyn Lodge,
Gloucester Gate, N.W.1.

September 14, 1950.

Dear Sir,

We thank you for your letter of September 6.

While our quotation was from your speech made during the House of Commons Debate on the Schuman Plan, it would appear from your letter that its content does not differ sufficiently from other speeches to render it identifiable as a departure in policy.

With all respect, may we point out that during the Schuman Plan Debate you pressed to a decision a motion censuring the Government for not participating in the discussions on the Plan in Paris, although such participation, as M. Schuman himself insisted, involved agreement in principle to a surrender of sovereignty over the nation's heavy industries. To abandon that independence of economic action would obviously be, for a heavily industrialized country such as our own, an abandonment of political independence.

It is true that the Conservative Party later produced a compromise scheme, but that was only after Major Legge-Bourke and other Conservatives had strongly expressed themselves on the subject.

The question here is quite a simple one:

Did you, Sir, wish, or did you not wish the British Government to agree in advance to the principle of placing our coal and steel industries under an international authority?

Then, Sir, there are your Strasbourg activities. Mr. Robert Boothby, generally regarded as one of your protégés, has often publicly expressed the hope that the Council of Ministers will become the Cabinet, and the Assembly the Parliament, of a Federal Europe. Has Mr. Boothby ever been repudiated, or even reproved, by his Chief?

The Bretton Woods Agreement, involving a clear surrender of sovereignty and making possible a situation wherein the Dominions might be obliged to apply economic sanctions to Great Britain, and *vice versa*, was regarded as of so little importance that you, Sir, did not even take your followers into the lobby to vote against it or against the provisions of the American Loan Agreement. Why?

Again, it is now generally known that the bilateral pacts signed by the Western European countries and the United States, together with the agreements reached at the recent Atlantic Pact conferences in London, imposed upon Great Britain a virtually dictated arms production policy—as a

result of which we are committed to specialisation in light naval craft and fighter planes, while the heavy striking forces are to be very largely an American Monopoly. If this policy is realised, it will ultimately be impossible for this country to engage in any war without the authority of the United States. Yet so far from leading a revolt against the Government's surrender of sovereignty you, Sir, appear not only to have condoned it, but to be restless because the process is not being intensified and accelerated.

Coming now to another point—that of your advocacy of a "European Army"—fighting side by side with Allies in the last war is, with all due respect, quite a different thing from becoming "integrated" in a European Army. When France "went bad"—if she were not "bad" from the start—it was at least possible to pull out at Dunkirk, whereas an integrated army would be unlikely to countenance any such power of detachment.

In any case, is it not correct to say that you have not become an advocate of a "European Army" solely because of Communism? Were you not, Sir, very closely connected with the New Commonwealth Society? This Society, in the Thirties, agitated for an International Army involving, one can only suppose, the releasing of British troops from any allegiance except that which would be owed, not to the King, but to an international junta.

In view of these facts and the additional one that in 1940 you offered the French a common citizenship with ourselves, what confidence can we have that you will uphold and fight for the national sovereignty of this country?

We should be the last to contest your qualities as a War Minister, which are indisputable. We feel, however, that Great Britain has "won" three great wars in this century, and in each case has suffered a heavy defeat in the succeeding "peace"; that she is now threatened with a fourth war from which she cannot possibly emerge otherwise than as a vassal of either one major contestant or the other; that without attributing unique responsibility to yourself for inter-war policies which have demonstrably made each successive war inevitable, (but which could have been avoided), you are identified with all of them; and that, possibly by coincidence, they have uniformly tended to the interests of those whom it may be convenient to call "Americans"—as well as to the disintegration of European culture.

We must disclaim immediate interest in "freedom-loving nations"; our concern is with the descent, in less than fifty years, of the greatest Empire the world has ever known, to the position of a hanger-on to the last Power to abolish chattel slavery.

While the British Empire is almost visibly falling to pieces and Dominions such as Canada are being deliberately led along a separatist path, it is most distressing to find that you, Sir, appear to be doing nothing to retrieve the situation, or to re-charge in the Motherland the British dynamic which could still be one of the most potent factors in the world.

Instead, the impression given is one of the frittering away of great energies in a series of cosmopolitan causes which have no roots and therefore no organic life—and which surely cannot be supposed to be a more reliable factor in Great Britain's defence than is her own spirit relying in the main upon her own strong right arm.

Your replies to these questions and considerations would be gratefully received.

We are, sir,

Yours very truly,

(signed) Basil L. Steele, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.
Russell V. Steele, M.B., B.S.
Evelyn Steele.
Anne Steele.

The Right Hon. Winston Churchill, O.M., C.H., M.P.,
House of Commons, S.W.

IN THE LINE OF TRUTH (continued from page 3).

their jobs; and who, if they are not prevented, are bound sooner or later to substitute the mere preservation of the organisation they serve, as such, as an objective superior to that for the sake of which it was originally formed. However benevolent or mild in form it may be, such a state of things is essentially a tyranny; for what it amounts to is, that individuals, whether knowingly or not, are kept together (organised), and where possible prevented from separating (contracting out) against their wills; that is, for an ulterior and occult, or hidden, purpose which was not theirs in forming and supporting the organisation.

It can be seen, then, that all organisations are incipient tyrannies, and their executives, or functional experts, potential tyrants in dangerous proximity to large stores of centralized power, which in the last analysis means Monopoly; that is, absolute control of all power. And just as Social Credit, or social good faith and integration, which is the fruit of mutual trust, implies a readiness to agree in the progressive dispersal of power to the common benefit, it being the just increment of properly balanced association (organisation correctly used), so its opposite, anti-social distrust or bad faith, which is the result of an absence of social confidence or credit, involves an unjust, and progressive concentration or monopoly of power—the ab-use of organisation—resulting in dis-integration of society. For communal integrity is at one and the same time the cause and effect of Social Credit, the calculable, material characteristic of which is its common availability and multiplicity, arising directly from the communality of its origin. Its incalculable, spiritual essence lies in its individual uniqueness; because the first step towards faith in one's neighbour is faith in oneself, since all that you can know of him is what you know of yourself; in just the same way that all we can know of that abstract we call God is what we know of men. It would seem therefore, that Christian Faith or Credit is confidence in the ultimate identity of what we call Truth, Reality and what seems to us to be experienced Good, or resulting satisfaction. And that, surely, is the Christian message of the New Testament—if it has any at all?—the gospel of the identity of mutual faith and abundance. That, at least is how it looks to Social Crediters, who regard their policy as most specifically and scientifically designed to liberate the individual from the utterly unnecessary bondage of a rigid and academic outlook on cost-accountancy and the monopolistic stranglehold of every kind it tends to perpetuate.

From this particular angle, as we have seen, the characteristic of Social Credit is its availability, as that of Monopoly

is its exclusiveness. Now if you apply these two terms adjectively to power or energy, which is the physical or material expression of what we call Life, of being alive, and the thing for which all living organisms must inevitably strive, we see that the policy of Social Credit is to make it as common and dispersed and abundant as possible. The question as to whether or not the Douglas Proposals are the best designed to achieve that end does not arise at this point. That objective represents the philosophic frame of mind known as Social Credit—the widest measure of individual freedom naturally and currently possible, beginning on the simplest and most elementary plane of economic freedom, choice, implying the maximum access for everyone to the material product of the association or community to which he or she belongs. That represents in practical form the faith of Social Crediters, who have always been prepared to stand by their beliefs to the furthest extent, of trying them out economically, *i.e.*, politically, in the assurance that they represent the nearest approach to workable common-sense and equity and, let it be said, Christianity of anything available or applicable today.

If, therefore, what has been said of credit or faith in its social aspect, as well as its individual one is approximately correct, we have to ask ourselves why it is that the highest dignitaries of that Church which understandably regards itself as the highest religious authority in Christendom should condemn such a policy. It might be objected that the embargo on Social Credit has been practically universal up to the present, and therefore why distinguish where Rome is concerned, and that to disapprove another's policy is not necessarily or invariably to condemn his philosophy; you may merely consider he goes about it wrongly. Nevertheless, it is bound to make those whose policy is so condemned, examine the philosophy of their critics to make sure that they and he are aiming at the same result. But there are very special reasons in the present instance, arising from the fact that, as we have seen, the members of the Social Credit Movement regard their practical policy of distributing power as in the direct line of Christianity or Truth—or should one say, in the most nearly direct since claims to infallibility are meaningless—of any at present available. If it is not immediately acceptable in what purports to be a Christian world, they must (to quote the author of Social Credit) as "a body of individuals . . . whose primary question to Christianity is, Is it true? . . ." either disavow Social Credit altogether, or else attempt to discover the reason for its unacceptability. Besides, it has been seen that the Church of Rome is the only religious organisation that, to our knowledge, has definitely pronounced against Social Credit at the highest levels. Surely, sooner or later it was inevitable that in their search for the cause of this general embargo, Social Crediters should address themselves to those who claim to be the only authentic exponents of Christianity extant, actually teaching their members to deny the name of Christian to any other Western community.

Why, then, does the Church of Rome deny the claims of Social Credit? It can't be because they regard it as excessive to claim that "there is no policy that deviates less from Christian philosophy than that of Social Credit . . ." Can it be that the authorities of the Church fear the commonality of Social Credit policy; the universal and common availability it postulates and on which the Founder of Christianity laid such stress, and which, as we have seen constitutes

an absolute threat of monopoly of physical power? Is the Church a monopolist, on the side of the monopolies? In this respect, what we must not forget is that the Church of Rome is an immense and highly centralized international body, and that in accordance with that Law, particularly noticed by Social Crediters, which operates as a tendency in all organisations to substitute means for ends—the means of their own continued existence and numerical growth for the ends of their members,—it would be what is called miraculous if she had altogether escaped its operation. The mere suggestion that the widespread and majestic organisation known as the Church of Rome was only a scaffold, to be taken down when it had served its turn in the slow building-up of the structure of Christian knowledge, is not one that any of us finds easy to grasp, and must seem little short of blasphemous to quite a number of highly-placed persons in the organisation itself. Nevertheless, it is a general truth regarding all potential rigid human associations and arrangements, that tend always to be in incipient rebellion against their natural and correct destiny; which is never to exist, let alone persist, in their own functional right, but only at the will, and for the benefit of their voluntary members.

In our search for the connection between the philosophic meaning of the term Credit, or Faith and the repudiation of the Social Credit policy, it is obvious that the real issue we are trying to define lies far deeper than the current assumption of a world divided between the Communist Countries and the so-called Christian Democracies, which only faintly reflects the underlying division. Such terms as Communist—and even Christian, when men begin to lay absolute claim to it,—though they may be very useful to highly centralized organisations as a means of branding and segregating their members, are little more than abstract generalities, and altogether too vague when it comes to doing something practical about it. Though we may not be in a position to define it in a word, it is plain that the division we are looking for begins *quite definitely*, if comparatively ineffectually, in the individual human consciousness, and is expressed, always with decreasing clarity, but terribly increased potency as to its effects, in proportion to the centralization of control and, to a lesser extent, the actual mathematical size of the organisation involved.

The secret of the true, or Christian employment of material power to the general increase of *values*—the value or worth of life to the individual—lies in its dispersal to the individual members of society or organized collective; a secret as yet only instinctively recognised by the community at large, being consciously understood as yet, only by the few at the top of organized society, plus those who have a real understanding of Social Credit. It is the faculty—let us hope, the destiny—of Social Credit to disclose that secret generally, to show how the dispersal of power can be, at least initiated, in the conditions created by the somewhat sudden and unaccustomed bounty of the technological revolution. As its author says, "We do not affirm exclusive possession of the law and the prophets": for the simple reason that Social Crediters disbelieve in the reality or effectiveness of Monopoly of any kind whatsoever, and pre-eminently Monopoly of Truth. On the understanding that Truth is everywhere and cannot be hid, if Truth, true and correct knowledge, has a product—which we firmly believe it has—it must in equity be common, free, like the sun and

the rain, to all individuals, as the founder of Christianity pointed out. To attempt to monopolize Truth is either an enormity or an absurdity, according to the angle from which you regard it. There are no special kinds of Truth; to speak of Christian Truth is to be guilty of a redundancy. Truth is one and indivisible; there cannot be true Truth and false Truth; Communist Truth and Democratic Truth; Roman Truth and Protestant Truth. And to profess a monopoly of Christian Truth whatever may be meant by the qualifying adjective is not only to associate two utterly incompatible ideas, but to lay claim to a falsehood. All of which, while not specifically mentioned, is implicit in Social Credit, and equally in all single-minded and scientific search for the correct way to do anything.

Now, besides many other things, we see that the Church of Rome maintains two things particularly pertinent to this argument; first that its Christianity is the only true Christianity, in other words, that it has a monopoly of Christianity. And second, that the policy advocated by Social Credit, and presumably, therefore, its philosophy is mistaken, false. Those two things affirmed are both complementary and inevitable, because it is the philosophy of Social Credit advocates that Real Truth and Real Power (Right and Might) are one and the same, and universal. Which statement, while it appears to us to embrace a very large part, if not the whole of the Christian ethic or philosophy, is the flat contradiction of all claims to power monopoly or dictatorship of any kind whatsoever over the mind or body of another. From this can be deduced, not only the real nature of the world issue or problems, which in the final analysis is between the willing individual and the organisations he has himself set up to implement his will; but also the actual point at which alone it can be solved, which is within the individual consciousness or seat of willing—volition, as it is called,—where judgment and initiative, and all there is of credit, take their rise; where the rational, free spirit, and the irrational executive mind meet and are either reconciled or do battle. No organic or organisational arrangement can be final and true, but only if wisdom and commonsense are allowed their part, in the line of Truth.

Jewish Anxiety in U.S.A.?

The Jewish Chronicle for September 8, contained interesting material from its New York correspondent and editorial comment as follows:—

“The many Jewish names mentioned recently in connection with the arrest of Communist spies and propagandists in the United States has apparently caused much anxiety among American Jews.

“The question was raised first in the Yiddish press by the editor of the *Jewish Daily Forward*, who merely drew attention to the sad fact that some of the leading suspects who were arrested for giving atomic secrets to Russia were Jews, and that this fact, which was worrying many Jews, should not be hidden, but faced frankly.

“Now the question has passed into the English-Jewish press, and there, curiously enough, it is assuming a more emotional form. Last week, one of the liveliest Jewish newspapers of the Middle West, the *Intermountain Jewish News*, of Denver, published an interview by its editor, Mr. Robert Gamzey, with Mr. Louis Levand, publisher of the

Wichita Beacon, of Kansas, which clearly indicates that the anxiety of some Jews is rising rapidly to the point of hysteria. . . .

“Mr. Levand emphasised that the combination of the Korean war, the American reversals and battle casualties, and the recurrence of Jewish sounding names in spy cases, have already resulted in a set-back to Jewish public relations as far as Kansas and the Middle-West is concerned. . . .”
From Washington, *The Jewish Chronicle* reported:—

“Without referring to Jews by name, John Rankin, the antisemitic Congressman, last week made a scurrilous attack on Jews by listing the names of Jewish Communists who were recently arrested for spying and subversive activities in the United States. In each instance he cited biographical details, where they were born, and where their parents were born.”

Editorially, the newspaper refers to American Jewry as “incomparably the largest and most influential Jewry of the Diaspora,” and says, “The dispatches that we publish this week from our correspondents in Washington and New York show that the war in Korea against Communist aggression has had some disquieting repercussions upon the situation of American Jewry.”

We regret that, owing to exceptional pressure on our space, we have to disappoint the many readers who find value in our regular selected extracts from the Debates in Parliament. The material prepared is only held over.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy	6/6
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The “Land for the (Chosen) People” Racket.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England	8d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

Also

Elements of Social Credit, 6/-.....(Cloth Edition)	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage...7/-	
Introduction to Social Credit	
by Bryan W. Monahan	5/- (cloth 8/6)
Human Ecology by Thomas Robertson	21/-
Odlum v. Stratton	
(Verbatim Report of Proceedings).....	2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Protocols of Zion	2/-
Communism in Action	
U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	1/6

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.