

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Volume 43 No. 18

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1963

6d. Fortnightly

To See the Invisible

By REVILO P. OLIVER

(Reprinted from *American Opinion**, October, 1962)

[THIRD INSTALMENT]

Intertwined Talents

With a list of the Council's members in his hand, the reader of any newspaper will be able to see a pattern in evolutions no more complicated than the dance of the sylphs in Berlioz' *Faust*, but likely to inspire more speculation. I choose two items from the newspaper open on my desk. And it is merely a coincidence that both suggest the most awesome thing about the Council—the tremendous financial power that it represents.

(1) Thomas S. Gates (CFR) has become president of the Morgan Guaranty Trust, of which the chief executive officer is Henry C. Alexander (CFR), while the vice-chairman is Thomas S. Lamont (CFR), the vice-president in charge of commercial banking is Ellmore C. Patterson (CFR), and other past and present officers are members of the same exclusive club. Most Americans will principally remember Gates as the Secretary of Defense who, under President Eisenhower (CFR), ordered suppression of the Air Force manual which told the truth about the National Council of Churches. Earlier, when Under-secretary of the Navy, according to an article in the *Wanderer* (5 May 1960), he had Captain Robert A. Winston of the United States Navy driven from the Navy Department after Captain Winston discovered and reported "clear evidence—documented by official . . . correspondence—of collusion with *known* Communists by senior US officers on active duty". Furthermore, Mr. Gates, according to the article cited, when he found that Captain Winston would not vanish at a flick of his pen, tried to have him legally kidnapped on the usual pretext of "mental health". An effort was made to incarcerate Winston in the very same hospital in which a great American patriot, Secretary of the Navy, James Forrestal, according to the official report, committed suicide by strangling himself with the cord of his bathrobe, after which his corpse politely tied the cord in a hard knot, walked to the window, and jumped out. Although Mr. Gates' record suggests that he has noteworthy talents, it leaves Americans unprepared for the eclosion of financial genius presupposed his sudden flight to the highest perch in one of the most powerful banking institutions in the country.

(2) While Communist-fronters are agitating for the release from prison of a Soviet spy named Morton Sobel, that vicious creature's brother, who calls himself Dr. Robert Soblen, has jumped bail and scuttled out of the country to avoid serving the prison sentence that was imposed on him when he, too, was convicted of treason. The press reports that the greater part of the bail was supplied by Mrs. Helen Lehman Butten-

wieser, the noted friend and patron of Alger Hiss (CFR). The lady is not a member of the Council, which, we grieve to say, practises sexual discrimination in the choice of its members. But she is the wife of Benjamin Bottenweiser (CFR) of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., the great banking house that was once headed by Jakob Schiff, the noted financial angel of Bolsheviks and the intimate associate of "Colonel" House. She is also the niece of the noted banker, former Governor and Senator Herbert Lehman (CFR). Lehman was also a close associate of "Colonel" House and was identified in a report published in the *Chicago Tribune* (early editions, 29 May 1950) as the vice-regent of the "secret government", then commanded by Justice Felix Frankfurter (CFR), that really ran the United States.

Tomorrow's newspaper will probably suggest associations with other financial powers of such magnitude that many a would-be critic's blood will run cold in his veins at the mention of them. But if those powers, or a large part of them, are really involved in the Council's activities, it will be obvious that the Council must exert a vast influence over the economic life of our nation.

Even if we allow for coincidences, therefore, the evidence strongly supports the conclusions drawn by Mr. Smoot and the other writers: we are subject to an invisible government, and the Council on Foreign Relations, as an arm or instrumentality of that government, fills from its own ranks most of the really key positions in the visible government and exerts in many other ways a vast and hidden control over us. The high concentration of strange talent in the Council is far too great to be merely fortuitous. The evidence against the Council provided by the membership list is, to be sure, merely circumstantial. But it is the kind of circumstantial evidence on which grand juries return indictments for Conspiracy.

Bands Across the Sea

The Council on Foreign Relations co-operates with various foreign groups, most of which are listed by Mr. Smoot, who makes no effort to explore the connections. Only one of these groups is truly international in membership, but is particularly interesting because it is so secret that it is, so far as is known, nameless. Observers therefore refer to it as the "Bilderbergers" from the name of the hotel that was used as a place of meeting in May, 1954. Its existence was discovered by reporters who noticed the odd co-incidence that the same people were getting together at the same place, usually somewhere in Europe, at regular intervals.

This international band meets in the greatest secrecy about every six months under the presidency of His Royal Highness,

* Published monthly except July by Robert Welch, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue., Belmont 78, Massachusetts, U.S.A.

Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands.

One of the few meetings of the international cabal held on this side of the Atlantic took place on St. Simon's Island off the coast of Georgia on February 14-18, 1957. The American press in general averted its eyes as prudically as a Victorian maiden who had blundered into a burlesque show. But Westbrook Pegler in four of his columns, beginning April 12, 1957, called attention to the conclave that had been held with such elaborate secrecy that it seemed "as spooky as any midnight meeting of the Klux in a piney wood". What business was transacted is not known. It is generally believed, however, that His Royal Highness, escorted by some of the wealthiest and most powerful men in Europe, did not fly the Atlantic to play Pinochle.

Miss Davison gives a list of the "Bilderbergers", which is, I suppose, a compilation of the names of persons who have been observed to attend the various meetings. (It is in substantial agreement with the list of persons who attended, or were scheduled to attend, the meeting on St. Simon's Island.) Of the one hundred and eleven names on Miss Davison's list, seventy-six belong to persons who are known to reside in the United States. Of these seventy-six, sixty-eight are members of the Council on Foreign Relations! Among the seven who are not are Senator Fulbright, Senator Wiley, the notorious Sherman Adams, and Ralph McGill, editor of the carpet-bagger press in Atlanta, Georgia.

We have observed that the Council on Foreign Relations must be thought of as a kind of front organisation, but this can scarcely be true of the "Bilderbergers". For, it must be presumed that all who participate in the secret meetings know the purpose for which they are held. That purpose is known only to the participants. We can only guess, therefore, what the members are up to, but we may be pardoned if our guesses give us nightmares. Your guess will be as good as mine, so long as we both remember that we cannot *prove* that the "Bilderbergers" do not foregather semi-annually from the corners of the earth to play Post office.

So far as is known, the "Bilderbergers" do not include representatives of the Soviet Union. This fact lends particular interest to the conclave held during the week of May 22-29, 1961, at a small town near Yalta in the Crimea. There a choice delegation from the Council on Foreign Relations communed with three members of the Communist Party's Central Committee and numbers of lesser Bolsheviks. Aside from a vague statement that such titillating subjects as "disarmament" and "international peace" were to be discussed, there was no disclosure of what that assembly of select spirits planned for us. Mr. Smoot, however, says, "I think the meeting which the Council on Foreign Relations arranged in the Soviet Union, in 1961, was more important than President Kennedy's meeting with Khrushchev (a few days later)". And I suspect that Mr. Smoot, once again, is absolutely right.

The Handle That Fits Them All

When we see leaders of the Council rubbing noses with beasts from the Kremlin (including Khrushchev's most trusted henchman), we are justified in drawing inferences. But judgment of the Council as an organisation must depend on its activities as an organisation. Given the secrecy that masks many of its activities, the only indisputable evidence on this point is the nature of the propaganda that the organisation officially manufactures or sponsors.

In the present state of our knowledge, it is flatly impossible

to shown that this propaganda, as a whole, is of Communist origin.

The strongest single case against the Council is that of the infamous Institute of Pacific Relations, which is ably summarised in Mr. and Mrs. Courtney's book. As everyone now knows, the Institute was a Soviet espionage and propaganda agency. But few who have not read the Courtney's book know that Institute alone supplied twenty-two of the thirty-nine books which were purchased in great quantities by the United States Army and forcibly administered to eight million young Americans in uniform. It was all part of a great brainwashing operation directed by the notorious Lieutenant-Colonel Dr. Julius Schreiber, whom "the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee described . . . as the most important of the 'Communists and pro-Communists who seized key positions in the Information and Education branch of the United States Army during World War II.'" (The authors could have added that Schreiber, a psychiatrist by profession, was—naturally!—Director of the National Association for Mental Health.) And how did this bug-house expert get the power to inject Communist propaganda into the minds of our entire army? Why, he had been appointed by Major-General Frederick H. Osborn (CFR), a civilian who, unless he took a correspondence-school course in how to be a general, had no military capacities until he was created a Brigadier-General by our old acquaintance, General George C. Marshall (CFR). Now sensitive nostrils will not fail to detect a familiar odour in this episode and several like it. But the Council on Foreign Relations can disclaim responsibility for the acts of its members or even of affiliated organisations, such as the Institute of Pacific Relations, controlled by its members.

Some of the Council's subsidiaries publicly claim to be "anti-Communist". For example, the now exposed Foreign Policy Association operates largely through its own subsidiary Councils on World Affairs. Under the name of "Great Decisions" they distribute masses of cleverly manufactured material which not infrequently does make some mild criticism of the Soviet Union—but *always* in such a way as to suggest that we must "coexist" with it (until it is ready to swallow us). The Institute for American Strategy has a pet "Sovietologist" who says that Communism is indeed awful in distant lands—but usually ridiculous "silly" Americans who think that there is a Communist menace at home. Now it is easy to show, from official Communist documents, that those pronouncements are precisely what the psychopolitical technicians in the Kremlin want said to American audiences. But I know of no evidence to show that they directly instigated the saying of it. We need not undertake investigations which, even if our worst suspicions are correct, would tax the resources of a courageous Congressional committee freed from both political pressures and interference by the persons who sit on the bench of our Supreme Court.

The Council on Foreign Relations has an official publication for which it cannot disclaim responsibility, *Foreign Affairs*. And you have only to sit down with a file of that strange and ostentatiously high-brow quarterly to see what it is uniformly and consistently promoting. We need not wonder at the remarkable coincidence that the periodical has sent up trial balloons in advance of major Soviet advances. We need not marvel at the naivete of authors who were assuring us in 1947 that we were "ignorant of Russian purposes" and that our problem was that of finding a way by which the Soviet "can be induced to accept co-operation". They are the same

authors who, a decade later, were telling us that the United States was too weak to defend itself because "the idea of Fortress America is idiotically out-of-date". Nor need we try to reconstruct the mental processes of writers in recent issues who assure us that Khrushchev "understands the aspirations of his people for peace"; that a wondrous phenomenon called "polycentrism" has produced a "split in the Communist camp"; that in Yugoslavia, at least, Communism has "released the creative impulses of the working people"; that the wall that the Communists set up in Berlin was somehow the fault of "German militarists" and therefore means that "Germany must be neutralised and disarmed"; or that we must save ourselves by kicking white Southerners into their kennels in the hope that we may thus win favour from Ubangi-Shari, Gabon, and other great powers.

We need only note that nowhere is there evidence of the slightest concern for the independence and sovereignty of the United States; that, on the contrary, it is taken for granted that American taxpayers exist to work for the comfort and pleasure of "under-developed" or "uncommitted" savages or panhandlers just as horses and mules exist to work for their masters; that it is openly stated or delicately insinuated that "world peace" calls for further surrender of our nation to the "United Nations" or a "world court". And when we have recognised the theme which *Foreign Affairs's* orchestra is forever repeating, sometimes softly on muted strings and sometimes with the blare of brasses, we recognise the theme that is unmistakably present in all the propaganda produced by the whole nexus of organisations of which the Council on Foreign Relations appears to be the centre.

The cardinal, obvious, and undeniable fact is that *all* the propaganda conducted by the Council and its appendages is designed to destroy the United States by betraying us into the hands of the "United Nations" or some similar "world government".

That is so obvious that it will probably be conceded even by the Council's friends. But we will be told that we must not confuse saintly "internationalism" with naughty Communism. The implied distinction is one that we must consider both earnestly and rationally.

The Shadows of the Mind

In all such discussions we come sooner or later to the problem, old as history, of distinguishing between the motives of men who act and the rationally predictable consequences of their action. And sooner or later we find that the problem is simply that of effecting some accommodation between two regrettable facts: the psychological truth that even intelligent people are often moved by the most unreasonable motives, and the truth that, as a practical matter in a world in which thoughts can usually be hidden from all eyes less discerning than God's, we *must* assume that men *will* the *logical* consequences of what they do.

I am told that a number of years ago a young widow assured the police that she had put her late husband on an arsenic diet because she loved him so much that she could not bear the thought of the pain that he would feel if he discovered that she had been unfaithful to him. Despite the best efforts of her attorneys to dress up the story, the jury refused to believe it, and the aldy consequently died of a shock. Although that result was eminently satisfactory from a legal and social point of view, we cannot

deny the *possibility* that her mentality had operated in the way she described.

The human capacity for self-delusion is virtually infinite. You cannot turn a page of history without coming upon another proof that mediocre minds under the stimulus of vanity or ambition so lose touch with reality that they can believe almost anything possible.

Louis Philippe Joseph, Duke of Orleans, was accounted an enlightened and shrewd man in his day. He worked zealously—perhaps decisively—to incite the French Revolution because he was sure that as soon as Louis XVI was out of the way, he would automatically become King of France. The noble Duke became aware of his miscalculation shortly before he own head was chopped off.

There is an incident in the history of Florence that is memorable chiefly because it determined the fortunes of Petrarca's father and hence of the great Humanist himself. The Florentine exiles, who had been driven out by the victorious party, determined to retake their city by force of arms and devised a strategy by which two columns, advancing on the city from opposite sides, would simultaneously deliver a surprise attack. But the leader of the column that first reached its position had an inspiration: he ordered his followers to rush up to the walls vigorously flourishing olive branches and yelling "Peace! Peace!" This they did. There is no evidence that the peace-monger was a traitor; on the contrary, it is highly probable that an ideal had clotted in his brain. It is not recorded, however, that this probability afforded consolation to the survivors of his detachment while they were sprinting for their lives, or that it solaced the other members of his party when they finally died in poverty and exile.

One could fill pages with just the names of well-meaning dolts who wrought ruin to others—and often to themselves—to be remembered by posterity.

This is not to question the beauty of the ideal, or to deny that without it human life would be a *bios abiotos*, scarcely liveable for human beings. But ideals must be handled with the discretion that men normally learn by a slow, painful process that begins with the discovery that while it is both easy and heroic to slay giants who live at the top of beanstalks, suitable beanstalks are *very* hard to find—a process that must continue at least to the discovery that even women are not *quite* perfect. In "Locksley Hall", the narrator confesses that in his *early* adolescence he was excited by visions of a future in which:

*the war-drum throb'd no longer,
and the battle-flags were fur'd—
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.*

(continued on page 6)

THE BRIEF FOR THE PROSECUTION

By C. H. DOUGLAS

This book is the last of the contributions to the understanding of world politics written during the war of 1939-45 by the author of *Social Credit*. The series began with *This 'American' Business* (August, 1940) and continued and expanded with *The Big Idea* (1942), *The 'Land For The (Chosen) People' Racket* (1943), and *Programme For The Third World War* (1943).

8/6 (plus postage)

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.
9 Avenue Road, Stratford-on-Avon

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: EUS-ton 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: EUS-ton 3893). Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O. Sydney, N.S.W.

It is with very deep regret that we have to announce the death of Dr. Tudor Jones at midday on December 2, 1963. R.I.P.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"On February 16, 1962, President Kennedy issued ten Executive Orders with the respective provisions indicated below. The boss of each designated operation is to be the head of the Interior Department, or the Labour Department, or the Post Office Department, or of some other department or agency, which is named in each case.

"No. 10095. For the seizure and operation by an agency of the Federal Government of all communications media.

"No. 10097. For the seizure and operation by an agency of the Federal Government of all electric power, oil and gas, fuels and minerals.

"No. 10998. For the take-over of all food resources and farms, including farm equipment.

"No. 10999. For a general take-over of the modes of transportation, and control of highways and seaports, by an agency of the Federal Government.

"No. 11000. For the mobilisation of all civilians into a work force under the supervision of the Federal Government.

"No. 11001. For the take-over by the Federal Government of all health, education and welfare functions.

"No. 11002. For the Postmaster-General to operate a national registration of all persons.

"No. 11003. For the Federal Government to take over all airports and aircraft.

"No. 11004. For a Housing and Home Finance Agency to relocate communities, build new housing with public funds, designate areas to be abandoned as unsafe, and establish new locations for populations.

"No. 11005. For the Federal Government to seize and operate all railroads, inland waterways, and public storage facilities."

—from the John Birch Society *Bulletin* (Sept. 19, 1963).

The above, and other similar Executive Orders, are to be

put into operation "in times of increased international tension, or economic or financial crisis" by the Office of Emergency Planning, created by Executive Order 11051 of Sept. 27, 1962.

Any ideas, Mr. Wilson?

According to the *U.S. News and World Report*, Oct. 28, 1963, Government and private debt in the U.S.A. is now over one million million dollars. This is over 5,300 dollars per head of the U.S. population, or nearly 19,000 dollars per family. This debt is, of course, almost entirely owed by individuals, as debtors or as tax-payers, to institutions; and, in the last resort, to the banking system, since the only possible ultimate origin of such a debt is in advances by the banking system. The total amount of gold in the world's 'monetary reserves' is only forty-two billion dollars.

So it is not difficult to see why the U.S. population is being accustomed to demonstrations of force by Federal Marshals.

"Throughout 1962, public affairs in South Vietnam remained relatively stable and, though there were incidents, even showed some improvement. . . .

"On Jan. 18 the Hanoi radio announced the formation of a new 'Marxist-Leninist Vietnamese People's Revolutionary party' to serve as the vanguard for a Communist-managed 'National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam'. The 'Laos formula' was pushed as the first major goal of Communist policy—i.e. a neutralism which would wreck or incapacitate the military and political organisations of the anti-Communists."

—*Britannica Book of the Year*, 1963 (p. 842).

"President De Gaulle . . . recently threw out hints that Saigon and Hanoi could unite the divided country again and do without foreign ties. . . ."

—*Daily Telegraph*, Nov. 2, 1963.

"The Report of a House of Representatives foreign affairs sub-committee on South Vietnam, published today, gave a warning against the possible removal of the régime . . . the lesson of Cuba should not be forgotten . . . all American agencies should move with great caution.

"The report said that the régime was authoritarian, but it insisted that many of the repressive measures had been taken as a direct result of the war against the communist guerillas. . . ."

—*The Times*, Nov. 2, 1963.

The U.S. Government is giving clear signs (accompanied by the standard denials) of getting out of Europe (or of being caught with his pants down), in preparation for what appears to be the fairly imminent Communist take-over. The pages of this journal have with increasing urgency drawn attention to the accelerating approach of this crisis, and it is much too late to spell out the details of the conspiracy again. That conspiracy is, of course, the Financier-Communist strategy to impose a police tyranny over the whole world, and it is at least three-quarters of the way to the attainment of this goal. What will happen then will be a repetition of what has already happened in the Congo, Algeria, Cuba and elsewhere. Socialism, Progressive Toryism and other slogans of ballot-box democracy are only the preliminary steps; but naked police-power through terror is the ultimate intention. "Dollar

Imperialism" by and through the U.S. Government in collaboration with revolution leading to the massacre of Katanga, *et al.*, is the programme now pointing directly at us. And this is a situation which can now be seen more readily than it can be written about. One 'mistake' of U.S. policy might be conceivable; but not a whole succession of identical situations. This is gangsterism leading to a world safe for gangsters of the richest and most powerful kind, and utterly ruthless.

According to Air Commodore E. M. Donaldson, *Daily Telegraph* Air Forces Correspondent, "No country has yet been able to produce a workable plane using" variable geometry—a system of moving the wings backwards or forwards. "Dr. Barnes Wallace, the inventor, used large models in giant wind tunnels in America without really solving the problems of stability". The plane referred to is, of course, the American TFX. So now we know why the U.S. Government was so very anxious to sell it to Australia. The intention is clearly to "do a Skybolt" on us. Are Mr. Menzies and Mr. Calwell totally blind, or are they in the plot too? The U.S. Government is our deadliest enemy, and not to recognise that fact at this stage is treason.

Mandate for Change, 1953-1956

The White House Years, by Dwight D. Eisenhower. 650 p.p. Heinemann, £3.3.0.

The Times Literary Supplement review (November 28, 1963) includes the following:

"The assassination of President Kennedy has lent a graver interest to his predecessor's memoirs. General Eisenhower tells us candidly that the Republicans were in some doubt whether he was a Republican, and they had reasons for their doubts.

"President Eisenhower does not mention the odd effect produced by his nomination of a man who professed to want to abolish the Income Tax to head the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and he alludes only once to the curious career of Dr. Clarence Manion, Quondam Dean of Notre Dame University Law School. He does not notice the nomination of a man who was an enemy of public housing to head public housing (actually this nominee rapidly became a friend of public housing but the public perhaps did not know this). Much more than President Eisenhower realises, he has not appreciated what his appointees said and did."

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

"Whose Service is Perfect Freedom"	5/-
The Brief for the Prosecution	8/6
The Monopoly of Credit	12/6 (Postage 8d)
Economic Democracy) <i>These works may be borrowed by annual subscribers to THE SOCIAL CREDITER, on terms.</i>
Credit Power and Democracy	
Warning Democracy	
Social Credit	
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket	2/-

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

9 AVENUE ROAD, STRATFORD-ON-AVON, WARWICKS.

(Please allow for postage when remitting)

Bridging the Gulf

In our issue of September 28 we published a review of a report on "Choice in Welfare" in which it appeared that there is a strong body of opinion in the country in favour of choice in Education, Health, Pensions, etc., and, although this aspect of the matter would largely fall outside the scope of that report, there is some hope that greater freedom of choice might be a start towards the restoration of the natural human relationships and human kindness which tend to be lacking in the "clinical atmosphere" of state-controlled establishments.

To illustrate how delicate such relations can be and how easily destroyed, we recommend an article, "Welfare without Warmth", in *The Listener* of October 17 by Mr. Douglas Gibson, who is Director of the Central After-care Association (men's division). For four years Mr. Gibson with three other men and two women ran a shelter under two railway arches at Charing Cross which were fitted up during the war by the Westminster City Council for "tramps and deadbeats" who were too verminous, aggressive and difficult to share with the rest of the community the safety of the tube stations and crypts. The council paid the running costs but Mr. Gibson and his colleagues were unpaid except for board and lodging and 2/6 per week from a voluntary society.

He records that many of his "derelict customers" had become "so individualistic" that restrictions of any kind, even the simplest, were unbearable. But "we accepted them as they were; we made no attempt at reclamation, we preached no gospel; we only asked that their clothing and their bodies, if verminous, should be cleaned". Many found even this too difficult to accept and left.

He goes on to say: "We asked nothing and achieved little, but what we did achieve was a certain respect for one another." He believes that this was possible "because we did not violate each other in any way. We did not cajole or persuade. We allowed friendship to grow naturally. We accepted their derelict state and did not seek to change them. Yet, so many, over the years, did change . . . and were able in their own time to move slowly, step by step, towards a more healthy state of mind and attitude".

Since then Mr. Gibson has worked with delinquent children in approved schools; in prisons for 11 years and for the past two years has been looking after discharged offenders. But, he says, he has never since been able to establish any human relationships comparable with those experienced under the railway-arches. "The obvious reason," he says, "is because I have been in a position of authority and belonged to a system. Authority and systems tend to impose themselves, and once one individual imposes himself or herself on another, the relationship is unreal and largely unproductive. The gulf is fixed and the bridging of the gulf is almost impossible in terms of human relationships. . . This does not mean that relationships on a we-they basis are without value; they have value but are not of the essence of friendship, which I believe is the basis of the support to which we should all cling."

It is difficult to stop quoting: the article is so strangely moving. For instance he says: "Professional social workers now talk of professional standards, professional relationships—one must not become involved with one's clients." He also mentions the "mystique" of the hospitals, planning clinics, etc., and goes on: "It seems that the more skilful we become in techniques and the more deep our studies of human behaviour, the wider the gulf becomes. We are in fact too expert. . . . The clinical, unemotional professional approach . . . is a

comfortable role for the emotionally crippled. We have all wanted to take on this new role; it is a clean and tidy one. We sit at our office desks, we drive our motor-cars to the homes and hovels of our cases. We write up our case histories. . . ."

The Future of Africa

A letter from *The Times*, September 27, 1963:

Sir,—A fortnight ago I was in Southern Rhodesia. A week ago I was in Kenya. Though my knowledge of the latter country in no way matches Mrs. Huxley's, I want, with the consciousness of this recent experience still fresh in my mind, to support her letter of September 24 as strongly as I can. The seizure of power by African racialists in Kenya is now almost completely accomplished. It is foolish and irresponsible to try to delude ourselves that the small British community there has any hope of survival, other than as transient and barely tolerated expatriates. Mr. Bruce McKenzie, the Minister of Agriculture (who is now in London for the current constitutional talks), warned them quite explicitly, in a speech on September 17, that, if they were not prepared to accept an African government with Mr. Kenyatta as Prime Minister, if they criticised him or his senior Ministers, and if they voiced "South African" ideas and sympathies, they should go before they were deported.

The basis of freedom, of a civilised and ordered way of life, is being taken away from these people. It is a disagreeable process to watch. To share the responsibility of having inflicted it on one's fellow countrymen and women is even more disagreeable. This is where our muddle-headed substitute for an African policy has landed them—and us.

It is essential to realise that the whites of southern Africa have watched what has happened in Kenya, and have learnt its lesson. They have no intention of being urged, cajoled, blackmailed or tricked into a position in which they must either commit race suicide, or quit for ever their homes and their livelihoods.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN CONNELL.

7 William Street House, William Street,
S.W.1., Sept. 25.

Over-Industrialisation

The following letter, addressed to the Editor, appeared in *The Observer*, Cronulla, N.S.W., September 19, 1963.

Dear Sir,—Re your front page article of Sept. 12, "Sports Area Rejected". This news is by no means good, that the area is to be industrialised is worse, for the signs are clear to anyone with any vision—Sydney and the metropolitan area

is now over-industrialised.

However, adverse as this decision may seem, it must be remembered by the residents of Kurnell and the ratepayers, taxpayers and electors of the Shire, that whilst the Minister's present decision, or the present Minister's decision, is laid down as final in the matter—is not to say that the scheme, plot, or plan cannot be modified to conform to the desires and wishes of the residents in the Shire.

It has been written elsewhere that one-third of the world's population are privileged because they can either read or write. This, one must suppose to be approximate. One feels sure, however, that in this Shire at least 90 p.c. of the adult population can both read and write, and when not bedevilled by mass propaganda can think and act from correct principles and in a peaceable but firm fashion—and it would be to their own and for the benefit of posterity if they could bring themselves to pen a note of protest to the Minister concerned, and/or any member of the Legislative Council.

Further to the point, the defence of Australasia will not be made any easier by centralising both people and industry in and about the Sydney area.

J. W. STIRLING.

P.S.—The evil that men do lives after them,
The good is oft interred with their bones.

TO SEE THE INVISIBLE (continued from page 3)

Such ideal visions are as much a part of adolescence as the turning of the young man's fancy in the springtime. But young Locksley grew to manhood, and I think we should expect no less of educated men today.

But all these considerations will little help us when we are called upon to judge what we can ill ascertain, the putative motives of professed do-gooders. What we can determine are the results of what they have done and the probable consequences of what they are attempting to do. And that is precisely the point that will principally, if not exclusively, interest prudent and practical men. The motives of a man who holds a pistol to your head may be various, but they will not matter to you when he pulls the trigger.

I can see no reason why we need puzzle our heads over the motives of the "internationalist" who boasts himself:

A steady patriot of the world alone,

The friend of every country but his own.

It is obvious—and he admits—that he is trying to exploit and destroy our country for the benefit of—never mind whom. That is simply treason, and he, though he perversely insists on dwelling among us, is our declared enemy.

(to be continued)

THE UNSEEING EYE

Oration delivered at the London School of Economics on Friday, December 6, 1957, by

Sir Hugh Casson, R.D.I., M.A., F.R.I.B.A.

"... if we can borrow from the Social Credit enthusiasts their slogan—'Full enjoyment rather than full employment'—as an objective, then we might create between us a civilisation based upon freewill in which all men are artists and there will be no need, thank goodness, to talk about it." (Concluding sentence.)

Price 1/6d. from K.R.P. Publications Ltd.

Reprinted 1963 THE NATURE OF DEMOCRACY

by
C. H. DOUGLAS

1/6 (plus postage)

from K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.

9 Avenue Road, Stratford-on-Avon

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 9 Avenue Road, Stratford-on-Avon, and printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool 25.