

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 37 No. 16.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1958.

Postage, 2d.

6d. Fortnightly.

### Christianity and World Government

*(The substance of an address given in June, 1958, by the Reverend H. S. Swabey, to the Banbury & District Clergy and Ministers' Association at the suggestion of the Reverend G. L. Marriott, known to us through the Christian Campaign for Freedom. The first part appeared in our last issue).*

*(Concluded)*

Lord Brand in a shorter speech noted that Lord Beveridge had said that the World Government would have to be strong enough to abolish war—the implications of these words should be understood. “The World Government would have to tax all the individuals in the world to get the necessary revenues to create large military forces, in order to be able to coerce any recalcitrant members out of the one hundred or so nations.” . . . “Perhaps it is worth asking whether such a Government would be a democratic or an autocratic Government. Would it be a democratic Government? And can we imagine, with ease, a world general election taking place at the same time in every country on certain world issues?” . . . “At the present moment the only possibility of a World Government would be a Government created by force . . . to create a World Government would be more difficult and perhaps even more dangerous than to pursue, by all means, all possible disarmament and better political and social relations between the great nations.” . . . “I am all in favour of every means of reconciling social, political and religious opinions in the world, but I believe that at the moment it is a mirage to suppose that this can be done through a World Government.”

Lord Russell regarded World Government as “the only way of survival for our species” . . . to get it fully established would be by no means a short or easy task, for he admitted “it means placing a monopoly of all the serious weapons of war in the hands of that World Government.”

Lord Milverton, agreeing with Lord Brand, asked, “Supposing that there was a World Government—and the only World Government one can visualise is that one nation should conquer the world—what would that mean? However high might be the principles actuating those who held that authority, it would mean breeding a race of world slaves; it would mean, inevitably, the suppression of liberty.” . . . “The aspiring spirit of man always aspires, first of all, to control his fellow men, and I suggest that it is this itch to control one's fellow men which is at the back even of this high-souled Motion that we are discussing to-day . . . moral and cultural militancy is at the back of most of these suggestions for world government.”

Lord Chorley used the need for conserving the world's natural resources as a plea for World Government. They could be conserved and made use of in the most rational and scientific way “only by first of all planning the whole

problem out and then having a supra-national authority to enforce the decisions of the planning authority.”

—More work for the police! The emphasis on industrialism, the “creation of markets” and the forcing of exports, certainly drain the resources!

Lord Birdwood, approving the “great work” *World Peace Through World Law* (by the Americans, Grenville Clark and Louis Sohn) spoke of agreement on United Nations reform being a pre-requisite. Prominent among the reforms suggested in this book, he said, was the abolition of the Security Council and its replacement by an Executive Council of seventeen members to be elected by a reformed Assembly. These seventeen “would be responsible for international and total disarmament, to be achieved over twelve years, and . . . in the meantime there would have been set up this International Police Force of some 500,000.”

Lord Silkin declared: “What those of us who believe in world government want to do is to put teeth into the United Nations Organisation to make quite sure that a decision given by them will be operative and can be enforced. Before you do that, you must have a code of world law which has been accepted by the members of U.N.O. So we would endeavour in the first instance to create a world law, a world authority to interpret the law and to make decisions, and a world police force to enforce them.”

The Earl of Home, replying for the Government, stated: “There is a wide disagreement upon the relationship between the State and the individual, the rights of the individual under law, the principles of justice, either within a nation or internationally. These . . . are the questions which, in their practical application, constitute the dividing line between tyranny and freedom.” “World government, as seen through Soviet eyes, is an instrument to assert Communist domination over all.” . . . “The most astonishing feature of this debate has been that not one of the noble Lords who have spoken has mentioned the disarmament scheme accepted by fifty-seven of the nations of the world in the United Nations Assembly—by all, in fact, except the Soviet bloc . . . It covers balanced disarmament, dealing with both nuclear and conventional weapons . . . the halting and international supervision of new fissile material for weapons, and lays down the most elaborate scheme for inspection, involving inspection from the air, control posts, road stations and factories. . . . Only the Russians and the countries of

*(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 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 and Editorial: 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST.  
Telephone: Belfast 27810.

### THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

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

### Ballot-box Democracy

“One of the most vicious fallacies of the period is that numerical majorities have rights, simply because they are majorities. It originally had validity in the pragmatic fact that a sufficiently large majority could militarily overwhelm a minority.

“The opinions of the majority were never more unreliable and unrelated to reality than they are at present when they are misled by the Press and the ‘B.’ B. C. and have no appreciable military power.

“Only *individuals* have rights, and these are being systematically infringed by the manipulation of majorities, real and bogus.”

—C. H. Douglas, September, 1941.

The objective of Social Credit is Social Stability by the integration of means and ends. Incompatibles are Collectivism, Dialectic Materialism, Totalitarianism, Judæo-Masonic Philosophy and Policy. Ballot-box democracy embodies all of these.

### High Court

The Supreme Court's unprecedented Little Rock decision last week—ruling on a case that had not yet come before it—has set legal minds buzzing in the Capital, and has further stoked the fires of resentment against the Court. In declaring illegal the transfer of Little Rock high schools to a private corporation, the justices decided a case which was still being heard by a lower tribunal, and which had not been argued at all before the High Court. The upshot of this unheard-of procedure is to fix the Court more than ever as an object of angry attention and inquiry.

In particular, Capital eyes are now focussed on Associate Justice Felix Frankfurter, oldest sitting member of the Court. It has long been a current comment in Washington that Frankfurter is the ruling power in the Court, and that

he influences Chief Justice Earl Warren. (See “The Web of Warren,” by Frank C. Hanighen, in *Human Events* for January 6, 1958). In the current decision, many profess to read the complete ascendancy of Frankfurter—a persistent advocate of total Federal supremacy—over Court and country alike.

This apprehension takes on all the more significance in view of the disclosure, made last week by the New Bedford (Mass.) *Standard-Times*, that Frankfurter was at one time formally connected with the NAACP—chief plaintiff in the school segregation cases. In admitting the connection charged by the *Standard-Times*, Frankfurter alleged that he had never received financial remuneration for his services—a fact supposedly eliminating any “conflict of interest” on his part.

But financial remuneration, it is noted, has never been one of Frankfurter's chief incentives. Rather, he has preferred to take his reward in terms of power—in seeing his protégés placed in various strategic spots throughout the Government and in influential organisations. Thus Frankfurter's commitment to the NAACP cause cannot be judged by the absence of financial rewards. He would have been more than content simply to see the NAACP following a course prescribed by himself, to assuage what John T. Flynn has called his “yearning to exercise power from the sidelines”—“to shape affairs anonymously.”

—*Human Events*, Oct. 6, 1958.

### Communism and Desegregation

Washingtonians journeying to the South in recent weeks note the increasing tendency there to identify three issues of pressing importance to Dixie—communism, desegregation and the Supreme Court. These issues, most Southerners feel, are basically one, and they trace the sudden inflammation of race antagonisms in recent years to the efforts of Reds to divide the United States internally at a time of international peril.

This sentiment is not confined to the South. Many responsible Northern commentators are moving to the same conclusion, particularly in view of the fact—pointed out by Dr. J. B. Matthews in testimony before a Florida legislative committee—that “Communist leaders have asserted that ‘Negro liberation’ is their Number One issue on the domestic front.” Matthews, one of the country's top experts on Red subversion, declared that “the Communists are at work, with their customary fanatical dedication, in stirring up trouble in the field of public school integration in the South.”

As further background on Red agitation and racial strife, Matthews gave a list of the number of Communist-front affiliations for all officials of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People who had 15 or more such associations. The grand total, for 46 officers: 1789 affiliations. Democratic Congressman E. C. Gathings of Arkansas inserted similar information in the *Congressional Record* for February 23, 1956. His listings for NAACP leaders, culled from the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee, stretched from page 2805 to page 2846—41 pages in all. (See *Human Events* for September 28, 1957.)

—*Human Events*, September 29, 1958.

### "Freedom Wears a Crown"

*Freedom Wears a Crown*\* is probably the first book in Canada which penetrates into the metaphysical (but real) basis of the constitutional question. John Farthing, its author, was born in 1897 in Woodstock, Ontario. He attended McGill University, did post-graduate work at Oxford, lectured in economics under Stephen Leacock at McGill, resigned after a few years because of a disagreement in economics, and spent the rest of his life as a freeman and student, deriving his living for most of the time as a teacher at Toronto University High School. He died in 1955, leaving the manuscript of this book, which was prepared for publication by some of his friends. Besides the penetrating quality of his mind and the integrity which allowed him to forsake professional status as a goal, one other quality which appears characteristic of him was the absence of a desire to publish simply for his own satisfaction. After writing the manuscript of the book and revising parts, he doubted whether he should bother to get it printed.

The introduction to the book was prepared by E. Davie Fulton, now Minister of Justice in the Conservative Government. Mr. Fulton apparently knew John Farthing personally and pays high tribute to his penetrating and original mind and its devastating examination of our governmental system.

The *thesis* of the book is that "a truly democratic constitution . . . is concerned with ensuring that the life of a people shall be governed, not simply with convenience, but also in accordance with an ideal." Farthing is stringently critical of the fact that having inherited a great ideal, the British Constitution, or its fundamental aspects, in the Canadian Constitution, we are making a mockery of it. To incorporate the ideal or the principles which have been found to give stability to a government-within-which-are-free-men, some kind of order must be established. The purpose of this order would be to provide a social milieu congenial to the true development of individual life. That is the distinctive characteristic of a genuine democratic system, rather than the universal ballot which is commonly assumed to be the essential of democracy.

With swift insight, Farthing points out that political authority is something quite distinct from political power, although he does not elaborate that particular statement.

What are features of the British Constitution which Mr. Farthing feels are important and we in Canada have ignored?

The King-in-Parliament is one distinctive feature of the British Constitution. He compares it with the American Constitution. One of the most specific and scholarly stated, the American constitution pins its faith on Justice and on law. It maintains the viewpoint that if these can be enshrined in the written constitution of a country, then they will provide a central unchanging focus to which all litigious aspects can be referred. The objective is to provide the greatest liberty to all. But, somehow, making a kingpin of the letter of the law does not work out as ideally as might be envisaged. As has been said, laws are made to be broken. As most can realize from income tax and other regulations, a plethora of laws constitutes a necessity

to circumvent some of them. The "government," "the state," takes the attitude that its decisions must be retro-active and inviolable; the "common man" in defence takes the attitude indicated above. It is virtually impossible to invent laws which will be fair to all under all circumstances.

In comparison, the British Constitution has at its head, a sovereign. This sovereign enshrines a respect for individuality and provides a focal point for unity resembling that of the family. Justice and law are still basically important, but it is recognised that they have an aspect which is incomplete and idealistic (in an unrealistic sense). As in a family the British system recognises that the interests of its members depends more than anything upon a sense of responsibility. "The honour of an Englishman" has had some real meaning. Farthing contrasts the term freedom in British life with liberty in American. Freedom he interprets to mean the dictionary meaning of that word plus a sense of responsibility, and therefore of obedience and loyalty which are essential for its preservation. Liberty he interprets as being freed of as many restraints as possible. Man is master of his fate and all marks of division should be swept aside as evil. Somehow the best will evolve if he is unbound from any traditions which restrict him, so long as he does not run foul of the law.

The interpretation of the British Constitution, Farthing says, "is historical and involves an essentially religious interpretation of history; the American is a-historical natural and modern—scientific."

In Canada the King-in-Parliament is represented by the Governor-General. Besides being a unifying centre and a source of influence according to the Constitution the Governor-General must have and did have some real authority. The author is strongly critical of the fact that this authority was disregarded and destroyed in 1926. "Only when the King (through the Governor-General) is recognised as a prior significance to the Prime Minister will the Cabinet take its true place in our national government."

According to the British tradition, as expressed in the Canadian Constitution, a government is responsible to the elected representatives of the people and, likewise, Members of Parliament are responsible to their electorate. Farthing maintains that this has been circumvented. Party machinery has developed so far that M.P.'s are rubber stamps whose main duty is to vote according to caucus, to regard the whips, and to work to maintain their elected positions—mainly through a good press.

The reason for this state of affairs lies in a "heretical view of society." Farthing charges that ballot-box democracy is entirely antithetical to an authentic interpretation of the British constitution. A constitution cannot set at its forefront the King-in-Parliament idea, with authority (as distinct from power) recognised, and at the same time hold that there is no higher truth than the transient guesses of contemporary majorities, and that all should be left to the ambitions and propaganda-manœuvres of those whom they elect.

"In this political philosophy questions of right and wrong are irrelevant. All is determined by winning elections. Make the greatest number the law of our national life and it follows of necessity that the appeal to numbers justifies not only all that follows but all that

\* *Freedom Wears a Crown* by John Farthing, published by Kingswood House, distributing agents: British Book Service, 1068 Broadview Ave., Toronto 6, Canada.

precedes an election." (p. 60).

So what? What recommendations does John Farthing make? He does not make any specific proposals as such. And why not? Doubtless he would answer: What would be the point unless the ills are recognised? When enough individuals of ability and integrity agree that the situation needs to be corrected, they will be interested in a search for sound proposals.

—D.S.H.

#### CHRISTIANITY AND WORLD GOVERNMENT—

(continued from page 1.)

the Soviet bloc are preventing it." (Poor Beveridge had never, it seems, heard of this disarmament scheme!) The Earl of Home in concluding, stated, "I would say that the most promising exercise in international co-operation is that within the British Commonwealth of Nations . . . the most convincing example to the world of the possibility of world government in the future is the Commonwealth example."

The British contribution to peace over wide areas through the Commonwealth came from her *distributing* power, not concentrating it. We have no right to merge it again, or to enter a system of lower values. This would suggest the sacrifice of quality to quantity; St. Paul stood out against merging the infant Christian body in Judaism. To remove the economic cause of war would be a vital contribution to peace. It is impossible for us to take the International Police, seriously, as against Soviet or indeed United States aggression—unless it is to take over and direct our whole lives. Lord Chorley's suggestions went much further than those of Lord Beveridge!

These threats may possibly be designed to take our eyes off the subversion of our Christian heritage and loss of freedom in accord with Marx's manifesto, and the removal of such constitutional safeguards as those once used by the House of Lords itself and by the Sovereign.

Against all this we must maintain the Christian conception of individual freedom, rights and responsibility. Freedom means the ability to choose or refuse one thing at a time. We are losing it. Choice is disappearing. In the field of education we are confronted by the formidable "multi-lateral" school; in that of medicine, in the National Health Service, the doctor is under the control of a central authority and the individual, whose right to contract-out has not been recognised, has to pay National Health contributions, whether he has decided to remain a private patient or not; our bread is denatured and our water may be adulterated. Monopoly in fact is the order of the day—we see labour directed willy-nilly by unions, while the employers have as little concern for the consumer. I have even read of distinguished Churchmen commending the planners and their centralised power, and one pamphlet enunciated the false doctrine that only a Plan, in the days before the last war, would have averted revolution! Others, of course, care for none of these things and would in fact have the Church abdicate from her position as the vehicle of truth. We may recall the parable of the seven devils who entered into the place that was empty.

The advocates of World Government are active enough, for I see that General de Gaulle is to receive a delegation from the World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government (*The Times*, Sept. 3rd). The president of this Association, Mr. Clement Davies, M.P., is to lead the

delegation, accompanied by Lord Attlee! [This paragraph added to the notes, September, 1958].

St. Augustine, I believe, said, "It is left to Christianity to make real the barrier which philosophy has created in the way of absolutism" . . . to limit the power of the State became the perpetual charge of a universal Church.

It is now physically possible for the individual to have greater opportunities for freedom, but monopoly has encroached—Lord Hewart wrote of the "new despotism." Disraeli showed that power has receded from Kings to Lords, from Lords to Commons, and then into the hands of almighty financiers.

World government, as distinct from peace, would not seem practicable, let alone desirable, and although it may sound nice, really proves to be a distraction from the constant need of the Christian message—that we cannot abdicate our responsibilities. Coke, writing of Roman Law, was appalled that St. Paul should have been arrested, bound and questioned, in that order. He was writing in about 1600, but to-day this is common practice among millions . . . such is the result of the absence of Christian authority to guard the individual.

Islam and Israel enunciate a single absolute God, so their policy will tend towards absolutism. But Christianity professes a Trinitarian faith, so our policy will be one of balanced freedom—as Blackstone described it.

Mr. C. Michelmores spoke on Television on the great work of the British Council of Churches. No less great is our work at home in testing, rejecting or allowing policies in the light of our faith and doctrine. What is work, for instance, an *end*, as described by Boyd-Orr? Or is there need of vocation, of less employment and more leisure? This would most probably be possible. It is a matter of assumptions—of using man's heritage of inventiveness correctly. Dumping can be the cause of war, following on the lack of home markets for goods which may indeed be wanted, but which cannot be paid for.

About this time we recall St. Patrick's hymn, "I bind unto myself to-day the strong name of the Trinity. . . ."

#### By Whose Hand ?

"The important point was to ensure that when the final defeat of the German armed forces occurred we should have a political balance in Europe that would help us, the Western nations, to win the peace. This meant getting possession of certain political centres in Europe before the Russians—notably, Vienna, Prague and Berlin. . . . We could have grabbed all three before the Russians.

"But what happened? The possibility of seizing Vienna disappeared when it was decided to land the Dragoon force in Southern France. . . . Stalin wholeheartedly approved the Dragoon landing. . . . It made certain his forces would get to Vienna before ours!

"As regards Prague, the Third American Army was halted . . . for reasons which I have never understood. When it was finally allowed to cross the frontier . . . it was ordered not to advance beyond Pilsen 'because Czechoslovakia had already been earmarked for liberation by the Red Army.'"

—*The Montgomery Memoirs.*