

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 16. No. 3.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 23, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

### From Week to Week

"The Government should issue some stirring slogans such as "Victory in our Children's Lifetime" or "Another Hundred Years will see us Through." You need tonic battle cries, such as these, to become a valiant fighter in the great new crusade against Adverse Factors in the Nation's Trade Balance."— "Scotsman's Log" in *The Scotsman*.

The Danes are complaining of the quality of British coal we are sending them. They should try the coal our coalmerchant doesn't send us.

"While Britain [*sic*] and Europe were clamouring for food, the (Australian) Federal Government was disbursing large sums of money to Western Australian farmers under the heading of 'acreage restriction'... These farmers were actually paid a total of £1,470,000 on some harebrained theory of economics not to produce wheat. It is the same story all along the line. We know of thousands of tons of potatoes that rotted in stores, while housewives were unable to procure potatoes. We know, too of large quantities of eggs, which, through mismanagement, went bad and were dumped as refuse. This, at a time when the public were paying 2/6 a dozen for eggs—if they could be bought"... "We in Australia have some grim jests to remember. One of these was a message cabled to us during the British General Election that Labour candidates were holding up Australia as a shining example of a community under Labour Government."

— *The Scotsman*, March 9, 1946.

Now, Clarence, where do you think the instructions to the Australian Federal Government are coming from?

In common with many thousands of others, we have received, as usual, the Annual Report of Columbia (New York) University, an institution which, with its President, Mr. Nicholas Murray Butler, appears to be so interlocked with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace that they are practically indistinguishable. The latter institution has just taken on itself the provision of funds to carry on the thoroughly vicious Army Bureau of Current Affairs which has drenched the serving soldier with Socialistic (Monopolistic) propaganda at a time when he was unable to escape from it.

As befits an institution concerned with International Peace the Report of the President of Columbia is chiefly a narrative of the services rendered by its Staff to the Armed Forces of the United States, and in particular, we gather, the practically unique and nearly comprehensive part in the development of the atomic bomb ("particularly Dr. Carl Cohen"). A certain assistance was rendered by "Leo Szilard,

a British citizen originally from Hungary"; but otherwise "Professors Urey and Pegram were sent to England in October, 1941. Their reports on their return helped to make it clear that the United States would need to assume the chief responsibility... in the attainment of an atomic bomb." That disposes of "Britain's" share.

Waal, waal, waal.

"The master [of National Socialist propaganda in Spain] was a very sinister Eastern Jew, Lazar by name... In Vienna he had served Hitler well as a journalist and propagandist in support of the Anschluss. Since then he had become an important figure in the Nazi [National Socialist] world, and the *eminence grise* or rather, *jaune*, of the German Embassy in Madrid."

— *Mission to Spain*, Sir Samuel Hoare.

It has been stated that the reason that the police never apprehended the perpetrator of the notorious Jack the Ripper murders in the nineteenth century was that he was mad, and that therefore it was impossible to apply the rules of logic to his actions. He was never where a sane man would logically be found.

We have no doubt whatever that, in the broad meaning of the term, those in major control of world policy are insane, and if any evidence were required, it is not necessary to go further than the Allied Food Control.

So far as we are aware, until the dawn of Our New Order, if we exclude various pseudo-missionary organisations of quite minor significance, no one concerned himself very seriously about the food situation in, say, India or China, outside those agencies or Governments specifically concerned with the problems arising from them. In a period when it appears to be much more important to mind other people's business than to attend to your own, this may appear lamentable, but it was so. And the world in general, and certainly this country in particular, was not only much happier then, but famines were sporadic and local.

Let us assume for the purpose of breaking into the vicious circle somewhere, that the world has really become poorer and less able to provide itself with bed, board and clothes, and that the immense pressure on production, the claims of chemical fertiliser manufacturers, the immense improvement of Socialist administration over private enterprise, mechanical farming, and other Better Ways for Newer Days permit no palliative. Is this really the right moment to regenerate China, India and the Hottentots? Since Sir Ben Smith tells us that our coupons, rations and other prison documents will remain in force until at least 1950, and Mr. Shinwell feels that petrol rationing is here to stay permanently, it would be interesting to know why subsidies for non-cultivation of land were paid in Australia and the United

States only a year ago. And particularly, why it is that none of the penalties of scarcity seem to fall upon the United States from which the policy appears to proceed. And, as we are asking questions, are the twenty-three course dinners, complete with six wines, being rationed in Moscow in order that the contribution (if any) of Russia to UNNRA may be increased? It may be remembered that in the days of the Czars, when the general standard of living of the Russians was higher than it is now, Russia was the largest exporter of wheat in the world.

Our distinguished contemporary, *The Tablet*, quotes Senor de Madariaga, *Victors, Beware*, as answering Mr. Henry Wallace's verbiage about "the century of the common man," as follows:—

"Life is made rich and beautiful to the common man by men out of the common, and your flattery of the common man is a betrayal of the true values of our civilisation." Because we believe this statement to be basic, and not because we regard Miss Ellen Wilkinson in any other light than as, to us, an abstract lay figure, we return to certain qualities of which she appears to be an exhibit. One of these is "commonness" in a peculiarly English sense for which there does not appear to be an exact synonym. It has nothing whatever to do with either social position or worldly riches; the agricultural labourer is hardly ever "common," or the good craftsman. There are many "common" persons in the peerage, and the "B."B.C. appears to collect them. The British soldier quite possibly brought the classification from India in his translation of the Hindi *jat nai hai*—"he ain't no class"; and everyone knows what he means. The "common" individual may have—often has—considerable ability; but one ability is always absent—that of inspiring respect. Of all the disasters which an educational system could foster, we can think of few worse than the spread of "commonness." And Miss Wilkinson is Minister for Education.

Anyone reading the translation of Marshal Stalin's attack on Mr. Churchill must at once have been struck by the incongruity of the language employed with that of an illiterate Georgian peasant, who, until a few months ago, had never been outside Russia. "Mr. Churchill's tragedy lies in the fact that he, as a die-hard Tory, does not understand this plain and obvious truth." If that sentence had been composed by Professor Laski, we should not notice it; under its ostensible auspices, we look round to see if any of the Fellow-Travellers are away for the week-end.

One of the very few heartening circumstances in a darkening world is the unmistakable conjunction of the Church of Rome with the British Empire as objectives of a vicious and sinister attack, both from within and from without. It is, we believe, entirely possible to confess to what may be termed technical ignorance on doctrinal matters without detracting from the validity of a great admiration for the lead which, alone amongst the titular Christian Churches, is everywhere manifest in Catholic action.

It cannot, more particularly at this time, be too clearly held in remembrance, that a philosophy is only to be judged by its policy—"by their fruits ye shall know them."

If anyone can tell us what is, *e.g.*, the policy of the Church of England, those of us who have at least a senti-

mental attachment to it, and remember it as a power in the land, and an institution representing at least a respected culture and a diffusion of scholarship, might be assisted in estimating its part in the coming crisis.

## PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: February 28, 1946.

### SUPPLY: REPORT— ECONOMIC AFFAIRS (MANPOWER)

*Mr. Oliver Stanley* (Bristol, West): ... So far as attacks upon Conservative politicians are concerned, in the words of the right hon. Gentleman himself we can "take it." It may be annoying to have our efficiency—after all, we cannot all go to the London School of Economics—and our motives impugned all the time, but we have read day after day the sort of article that appears under the name of the hon. Member for Devonport (Mr. Foot), which I regard as typical of all. [An HON. MEMBER: "Worse."] *Ex pede Herculem*—which might roughly be translated as, "You can tell Lord Southwood by his foot." ...

*Lieut.-Colonel Sir Walter Smiles* (Down): ... The hon. Member for Smethwick (Mr. Gordon Walker) was a great advocate yesterday of unbalanced budgets. Indeed, from his speech I made out that the more unbalanced the budgets were, the better for us all. I thought it was a sort of Social Credit speech which, up to date, has not been proved even by Major Douglas in Alberta. I do not agree with that doctrine, that the more you unbalance your budget the more work there will be in this country. ...

But we want to forget now the blood, and sweat and tears. We have all had enough of that. Let us go in for a bit of food, fuel and fun at the week-ends.

*Mr. W. J. Brown* (Rugby): This Debate has lasted for nearly two days, the hour is late, and I shall be as brief as I possibly can. I start with the assumption that whether hon. Members are advocates of a Socialist State, advocates of unrestricted capitalism, or advocates of that peculiarly English combination between Socialism and capitalism which is now being worked out, we all want the best and the most effective disposal of the available manpower of the country that is possible to us. It would be very easy indeed to attack our present dispositions in relation to manpower, and I myself in earlier Debates have quoted many of what I think are remarkable cases of the waste of manpower in Britain. But tonight I want to look very briefly at a wider canvas than that would represent. The most remarkable social phenomenon of the last two centuries has been the amazing increase in the productivity of mankind in the machine age. The machine has multiplied by hundreds and thousands man's power to produce goods. But it is almost an equally remarkable phenomenon that there has been no rise in the standard of life of the people to compare with the vast increase in the productive power of the machine. I think it could be argued that the position of the British workman to-day is rather worse than it was at the time of Henry VIII. If anyone doubts that let him read the opening chapters of Froude's *History of the Tudors*. Froude describes conditions in the early part of the 16th century. There were many articles of consumption which were inordinately cheap. Strong beer was 1d. a gallon. Wine was 1s. a gallon. Beef was two pounds for a penny, and mutton was three pounds for a penny. And there was nearly a strike about the unduly high cost of living!

It would be common form to suppose that this vast increase in the productive power of the machine had been drained away by the cupidity of the capitalist, and I do not doubt that many examples of the cupidity of the capitalist might be cited. But I think that there has been another and vastly more important element than that at work. It is the terrific growth in the proportion of the population now employed upon unproductive work. . . .

That is not only true in relation to the Armed Forces, but also in relation to other Services. Before the great war of 1914-18 the Civil Service numbered about 200,000. It has grown during my contact with it to 750,000 to-day. Please do not misunderstand me. It is no part of my case that these men are not working hard. It is no part of my case that they are not doing a useful job, but it is part of my case that all this labour has to come out of the total limited reserve of manpower. And if you use it on one type of occupation you cannot use it for another. I remember that when I joined the Office of Works in 1912 the total staff was less than 200, and all of us were accommodated in one Georgian house in Birdcage Walk. The Office of Works to-day has a staff approaching 15,000, and it occupies 39 buildings in the London area alone. Here again, it is no part of my case that these men are not doing a thunderingly good job of work, but I am saying that the growth of the proportion of people unproductively employed, because they are carrying out Government policy, is a fact to which we have to have regard in determining our manpower position. . . .

### SUPPLIES AND SERVICES (TRANSITIONAL POWERS)

*Sir John Mellor* (Sutton Coldfield): I beg to move:

"That the Order in Council, dated December 20, 1945, with respect to Defence Regulations relating to the Control of Transport (S.R. & O., 1945, No. 1623), a copy of which Order was presented on January 22, be annulled."

The Order which this Motion seeks to annul is that which, by virtue of the Supplies and Services (Transitional Powers) Act, 1945, extends for a period of the next five years the power given to the Minister of Labour to control employment under certain regulations which have been operative during a large part of the war. I shall have to make particular reference to Regulations 58A and 58AA. I must ask the House to refresh its memory as to the power which these regulations give to the Minister of Labour. Regulation 58A begins as follows, leaving out the unnecessary words:

"The Minister of Labour . . . or any National Service Officer may direct any person in Great Britain to perform such services in the United Kingdom or in any British ship . . . as may be specified . . . being services which that person is, in the opinion of the Minister or Officer, capable of performing."

It proceeds:

"Any services required by a direction given under this Regulation to be performed shall be performed under such terms as to remuneration and conditions of service as to the Minister or a National Service Officer may . . . direct."

They are enforceable under severe penalties—two years' imprisonment or a fine of £500. I pass over a variety of other powers, themselves of quite a drastic character. . . . Then I come to the provisions of Regulation 58AA. That provides that the Minister—

"may by order make provision. . . for prohibiting, subject to the provisions of the order, a strike or lock-out in connection with any trade dispute."

It seems to be a most astonishing thing, at a time when hon. Members on the Government side are getting so excited about repealing the Trade Unions and Trade Disputes Act, that they should now acquiesce in permitting the Government to continue to have available powers which are infinitely greater than anything the Trade Unions and Trade Disputes Act ever gave. Surely, if ever there was a case of straining at the gnat and swallowing the camel, it is this.

*House of Lords: March 6, 1946.*

### RECIPROCAL ECONOMIC AID

*Lord Altrincham* had given notice to move to resolve, That this country should maintain and promote the policy of reciprocal economic aid between kindred peoples as indispensable to the coherence of the British Commonwealth, the welfare of the Colonial Empire and the free development of regional co-operation amongst such other states as may desire to strengthen their economic systems in that manner; and further as calculated to stimulate multi-lateral trade and world recovery. . . .

On this point I hope you will allow me to quote an authority, who again cannot be dismissed as a militant or reactionary Imperialist, Sir Norman Angell. He has written one or two very interesting articles about recent travels in the United States, and this is what he said in one of them contributed on January 3 of this year to the *Daily Mail*.

"Any Englishman travelling or living in America is likely to find himself asked to 'explain the British Empire' in much the

(Continued on page 7)

## THE BRIEF for the PROSECUTION

by

C. H. DOUGLAS

8/6 net.

"... Major Douglas possesses one of the most penetrating intellects of our time; he has a profound knowledge of the 'set-up' behind governments—and he is fearless—a combination of gifts most rare in a time-serving world."

"Major Douglas at his best."

— Truth.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,  
7, Victoria Street, LIVERPOOL, 2.

## 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. 16. No. 3.

Saturday, March 23, 1946.

### Loop-holes

It is symptomatic of the popular psychology of these decayed times that the 'loop-hole' has come to mean a way of escape (which it always might be, in the last resort) instead of a way of attack, for which it was designed. It is a slit in the wall for the discharge of small arms. The individual in modern society has only small arms, and even those are of a distinctly unexplosive character. He is disarmed rather than armed, and a part of the disarming is the suggestion, unceasingly pressed upon him by the kind of person who does these disservices free, gratis and for nothing, that, bad as things are, "of course, you can't do anything about it." There is no 'loop-hole.'

That the suggestion is so insistent indicates that in the absence of it, 'loop-holes' would become visible, and vision would speedily draw the victim from his retirement in his darkened corner, and lead to his practising a few trial shots, which practice might make dangerously effective. The enemy evidently knows there *are* loop-holes. He knows that loop-holes are devices for attack as well as for escape from attack. His insinuation to the contrary is proof of it.

We do not use his weapons, and it is not counter-suggestion but the fruits of observation which leads us to point out that the outlines of some of the 'loop-holes' are becoming reasonably clear against the greater darkness around them.

(1) The man who says: "Yes, that's quite right. I am glad someone has done that; but taking a quite frankly selfish view of the situation I am not going to do anything about it" may be lacking in a full understanding of his responsibility, but, unless he belies himself and proceeds in a less watchful environment to negative his conviction, he has at least contracted out of participation in the action which has been resisted by counter-action. He has withdrawn his quota of good-will from the support it gives to the other side.

(2) That blessed thing 'Discussion' is quietly settling down to a less preoccupied tone as bombing and attendant evils recede. There is a lot of it. The gulf between the 'officials' and the 'officials', widens and becomes more obvious, the conviction that there is more sense in the body of silent listeners than in the flamboyant cynicisms of the platform stronger, the desire that 'someone' (still 'someone else') should start 'something' readier of expression. That is a 'loop-hole' for Social Crediters. Contracting 'out' of that atmosphere and 'in' to the more invigorating atmosphere of radical exploration of the realities of social organisation is a contract easy to get signed, sealed and delivered. All that is lacking is initiative in alliance with a knowledge of a genuine source of inspiration. Truth is a great fortifier.

(3) M.P.s at £1,000 a year each aren't worth a quarter

what M.P.s at £600 a year were worth (which, as we know, wasn't much). There are values (or there is a value) which will, and does, survive the otherwise general decline to the two-penny-halfpenny level. As to the 'hack' scribblers of an earlier generation are added the 'hack' civil servants, 'hack' parliamentarians, 'hack' doctors, 'hack' industrialists, 'hack' clergy, 'hack' wives and husbands, of a not-so-brave New World, the comfortableness of serene honesty becomes apparent to all who desire life to be more, not less, abundant. Did we ever imagine we should destroy Satan or come into our own except through a 'loop-hole'?

### The Study of Social Credit

The obvious answer to our opponents' suggestion that the active agents of anti-Social Credit propaganda should possess themselves of the course of lectures distributed through the Lectures and Studies Section of the Social Credit Secretariat is to make the distribution of this material as general as possible.

Arrangements have therefore been made to print the lectures and to publish them, without restriction upon their distribution, at a reduced price of five shillings, post free, to subscribers of this amount before the date of publication, June 1. Thereafter, copies will be available for general distribution at 6/-, nett, per copy.

Students of Social Credit in various parts of the world who are already registered as preparing for examination on the Associate standard will receive a copy of the printed course without further payment, and amended terms for examination will shortly be announced.

### New Zealand

(From a Correspondent)

Wanganui, N.Z. February 2.

This is to be an election year in New Zealand. While the present Government has lost sympathy it is too early to predict results. The National Party have learnt nothing and forgotten nothing, and offer no alternative to 'Labour' beyond vague promises of a return to 'private enterprise.' During the last days of the last Parliament, a spate of legislation was put through, including a bill to nationalise the Bank of New Zealand, which is a trading bank quite distinct from the Reserve Bank. It was founded in the early sixties of last century and has played a prominent part in New Zealand history. At least two directors who strongly opposed 'Nationalisation,' Stronach Patterson and A. T. Donnelly, will retain their seats on the directorate under 'Nationalisation,' and no fundamental change of policy is expected. Even *The People's Voice* (Communist) for November 14 says: "If the policy of the Bank, as distinct from the mechanics of administration, is to remain the same under the Government as under private control, then nationalisation is not worth while."

We are genuinely short of power... Our planners have decided to build ten major power stations on one river, the Waikato. The first is in operation, and the second under construction and to be in operation by the end of the year. Work has commenced on a third, the largest of the ten... Two thirds of the average consumer's power bill goes to pay interest charges.

## "The Socialist Consciousness of Justice"

It is of vital importance to the adjustment and preservation of Western culture to see and understand the significance of the Russian Revolution from as many aspects as possible, and as soon as possible. For years the quality of its thought, its ideology, has been drifting over Europe and across the Atlantic like a fog, and to see our way through it grows daily more difficult. To this end, a specialist's view of Russia—that is, other than that universal specialist, the Sociologist; we are all Sociologists nowadays—can be very useful, having a professional objectivity of its own that transcends mere "wishful thinking."

In this category, Dr. Schlesinger's treatise,\* is more than ordinarily valuable to those desirous of achieving as unbiased a "political" view as possible of the nature of the Russian problem. It serves excellently to bring home the radical difference in habit of thought, between what the Russian revolution stands for and our own Western outlook. As a term of differentiation we can call Marxism Eastern, and it is not without significance that Russia is the ethnical and geographical, and "religious" area where East and West most obviously meet.

To the Westerner the Law is the law, something not "us"; and this concept holds good whether we abide by it or make a practice of breaking it. But to the Marxian, Leninist doctrinaire, the Law is definitely not that. It is purely a personal attribute of power, like the arbitrary, Jehovistic commands of the Old Testament. One must suppose that there is some comprehensible and ordered view of Life behind such a concept, even if, to the Westerner it is incomprehensible, and bears the hopeless appearance of an attempt to rationalise chaos, or codify the unpredictable.

With the Revolution in Russia traditional Law was abolished. "The only written Law to be applied were the decrees of the Soviet Government," says Dr. Schlesinger. "If there was no Soviet law ruling the issue, the 'Socialist consciousness of Justice' has to decide." That is, organic tradition was replaced by the Departmental Order, and a Judge might be anybody, simply by virtue of the fact that he, or she, was a person, born into this world with "a Socialist Consciousness of Justice" along with a pair of legs and other attributes. To our Western view, when it has not been infected by the Eastern bug, the standpoint appears precarious for all concerned, and we find it difficult to realise that it does not appear so to the Marxist. We have to admit that in Western, plutocratic society there tends to be one law for the rich and another for the poor, a fact which gave Disraeli such indigestion; but the mistake which Utopian reformists make is in identifying that fault in the Law itself and not in its administration. In short, they fail to see the defect where it really inhabits, in the human heart, as poor Charles Stuart justly observed. As a result of that delusion you get your Revolution, with all its customary attendant miseries, and you change all your textbooks and law codes, while the defect itself lies snugly and undisturbed where it always was, in the minds of individuals.

As having grown up in a comparatively blessed and stable society, which takes the Rule of Law more or less for granted, just as we do our climate, notwithstanding its

palpable imperfections and limitations, we must not underestimate the iron consistency of this doctrinaire point of view, which comprehends and permeates every department of existence, stopping short only at the door of the aforementioned human heart. To the Leninist, the Western Anglo-Roman Law—what he calls the Commodity Exchange Law—is anathema. According to Stuchka, one of the first official codifiers of Soviet legal theory, such law as "an effluence of the political rule of a certain class, ordering social relations in its own interest." As an analysis of the situation, that is only shrewd if it includes the realisation that for all the evidence to the contrary, that is how one would frame the laws oneself, were one of "a certain class" *i.e.*, in power. Failing that, it merely indicates a low mentality, just one more addition to the world's sum of ignorance and confusion. A self-righteous and puritanical Party is no alleviation to a self-satisfied and hedonist Plutocracy.

To the Marxist, Western Law embodies financial tyranny, and is to be condemned because it bolsters up property. What the Socialist mentality fails to see—or seeing condemns—is that since the preservation of individual ownership is the objective of Western Capitalist Law, that fact ensures that it is not fundamentally tyrannical because private property is the basis of personal independence, even of the Law itself. It is just because the Eastern conception of Law is tyrannical and arbitrary and personal—Ghengis Khan or the State, it makes no difference—that there is such opposition to the Anglo-Roman Property Law; such an entirely vicious onslaught made upon its chief modern upholders, the English-speaking nations.

The evolution of Soviet legal practice is a good indicator of the mental stages of the Revolution. And these stages are of particular importance to us in this country, so that we may note, and when possible influence, its anglicised reflection operating over here. Dr. Schlesinger treats of them all at some length. First the period of War-Communism—the Russian equivalent to P.E.P.'s "under war, or threat of war"—when the Socialist Consciousness of Justice was particularly invoked to deal with the hereditary property-owners. This was up to 1922, and notwithstanding its avowedly temporary nature, and the compromise of the redistribution of the confiscated land to the peasants, the author assesses it as the period of supreme Marxist effort. Are we, one wonders, enjoying its equivalent at the present moment?

Following on that, from 1922 to 1930, came the period N.E.P.—New Economic Policy—representing Stalin's compromise with the Revolution-created agricultural peasant proprietors, who threatened its success by refusing to function except in their own, individualistic way. To quote Dr. Schlesinger, "They would drop the Bolsheviks, just as the French bourgeois had dropped the Jacobins when, after the victory of Fleurus, the latter had ceased to be the indispensable organisers of victory, and had become a mere obstacle to the enjoyment of the fruits of victory. Lenin succeeded in 1921, where Robespierre had failed in 1794." Does one see a faint reflection of this "retreat to prepared positions" in the changed tone of Sir Stafford Cripps, and his verbal "hand-out" to Lancashire, and "private enterprise" generally? If so, there is one more reason to take note of what followed in Russia.

As it proved, the inauguration of the N.E.P. compromise represented, not so much a retreat or softening of the

\**Soviet Legal Theory* by Rudolph Schlesinger, Ph.D.(Lond.), Keegan Paul.

doctrinaire heart, as a stepping back for the final spring. Instead of nationalising the whole country *en bloc* as was hoped in the first flush of revolutionary success, it was realised by Lenin and Trotzky that the meal could only be achieved by mouthfuls. And it is now fully recognised in Socialist circles, according to our author, that such tactics, "far from being a mere compromise forced on Russia by the extreme backwardness and overwhelming peasant majority of the population, the principle of the N.E.P., *i.e.*, the concentration of the nationalisation of industry at key points, and the gradual absorption of the rest of the national economy by the influence exercised from those "commanding heights," is most likely to be accepted by the Socialist Revolution wherever it may arise." And again: "Should the need for Socialist reconstruction arise in some country on the basis of a political regime with a basis broader than the original Soviet regime, there would be an even stronger desire to concentrate on nationalisation at certain key points, and to let the majority of the middle classes and the lower middle classes pursue their traditional way of life." "Let the middle classes and the lower middle classes" in Britain take note and examine the origin of this outcry against the mine owners and railway shareholders, and other bogeys.

So from 1921 up to almost 1930, Private Enterprise, —outside the area of key-control compromising broadly coal and electricity, steel and the chemical industries, and transport—was given a modified rein, and a new and dense undergrowth of small private enterprises took root all over the country, a catch crop, destined ultimately to be ruthlessly "ploughed in." Agriculture, alone among "commanding heights," was left alone, perforce, from its very vastness and primitive decentralisation. Viewed even at this short distance, the whole course of events assume a recognisable pattern, the repetition of which, granted the difference in terrain and circumstances between Britain and Russia, it should not be impossible to forecast.

During the period of the N.E.P. the struggle within the Party, between the economic realists and the political idealist must have been terrific. It is impossible not to admire the machiavellian restraint that was able to encourage, and live on the very conditions it was intended ultimately to destroy. It cannot have been easy to watch the steadily increasing agricultural output—by 1927 it was well above pre-war—under the system one was pledged to break up; sensing the growing potentiality of the successful kulak rivals whom one had helped to their farms, and the disrespect of their prospering urban prototype, the Nep-men. For the N.E.P. succeeded directly in nothing it set out to do, except the consolidation of the Party and the mental regimentation of a rising urban generation. This was partly because excessively centralised control of, particularly, Power and Transport, had paralysed industrial output generally; the failure of which only served to emphasise the unrehearsed counter-demonstration given by peasant proprietorship and petty Private Enterprise.

It is not surprising if the extreme doctrinaire sizzled and rebelled at having, as it were, to assist in a counter-revolution. But apparently Stalin held the balance within the Government and in favour of the Right Wing realists, like Bukharin, who still supported the Kulaks. Stalin never wavered, as did the older Leninists, at the practical demonstration which the N.E.P. gave of the truth, that if it was general prosperity that was wanted, here was the direction

in which it was to be attained. That was the weakness of the natural consuming human, but your power-maniac has mortified his human nature. Even general prosperity is no more to him than the means to an end, and that end his own devouring, quite insatiable power hunger.

The psychological moment arrived—or the bursting-point in the situation—when the effectiveness of a comparatively small, organised Party, occultly fortified, must be matched against organic, but unorganised peasant agriculture; the last, and greatest "commanding height" must be stormed and taken; the Party, the State, must be preserved at all costs. Thus it present itself to the mind dehumanised by excessive power. *L'état c'est moi*. So, in 1930 Stalin swiftly deliberately turned Left-wards and released his trained forces upon the slow agriculturists with direct and dreadful effects which were still in operation when the second World War broke out. And all those men, Bukharin, Zinovief, Radek—old, tried Leninists—who had allowed their eyes to wander from the ball—the Party's, Stalin's ball—were subsequently liquidated along with the reality—the factual increase—which had caught their wandering attention. One has only to read accounts, like that in Eugene Lyons's *Assignment to Utopia*, to realise the terror of the famine that followed and the still unrecovered drop in living standards.

It is useful to find recorded here the reflection of all these politico-economic happenings in terms of a feverishly adjusting system of judicature. To a layman brought up in Western ideas, it comes hardly to give the name of Legal System to a state of affairs that seems from his standpoint as the negation of both legality and system; starting out as it did, to found itself on the precarious generality that "the interests of the proletarian dictatorship were superior to its laws." Men suffered—and still suffer—the extreme penalty under it, not because they transgressed any generally-accepted ethical code—to the Socialist that smacks of primitive revenge—but because they impeded, or were thought to impede, the latest Party expedient to ward off the inevitable results of its last, desperate experiment. Often they suffered for the sole reason that *someone*, some part that was not the whole Party, must take the blame for the failure of the latest makeshift in which they were all forcibly engaged. And when they had been mentally and spiritually "pulped" in private, they were publicly exhibited in batches before the microphone, and in this "rendered down" condition, and under the glare of arcs and spotlights, and clicking cameras, made to play out a legal fiction for the sake of the "general good," *i.e.*, the preservation of the Party.

Such proceedings may, indeed must, be in obedience to Natural Law, but only in the sense that bodies washed down a flooded valley are "law-abiding"; and as such I suppose one can regard them objectively. But put forward as a comparable alternative to our painfully built-up, though, no doubt, defective Western legal system, designed largely to prevent just that sort of thing, they present a real problem in understanding. Here you have one aspect of the clash that at present convulses the world—East and West: Pagan and Christian. And always this strange element in Communism, of inverted Christianity; a reading of the Gospels that grasps at the vision of a Liberal society, and insists on it, before practical steps have been taken towards liberation, thus leading to the impossible concept—a contradiction in terms—of a compulsive freedom.

—NORMAN WEBB.

## PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

same offensive tone that a man might ask you to 'explain' how you came to be carrying his umbrella. For about 99 out of 100 Americans regard the simple existence of the Empire as a crime. They believe the time for repentance—and liquidation—has come."

*Lord Calverley*: As long as we put them in as the receiver.

*Lord Altrincham*: It is inconceivable to me that because the Americans do not understand the Commonwealth and Empire, we should ourselves be false to it. Surely the right and honest course is to explain exactly where we stand, and that in certain matters we are governed by ties of liberty and sentiment which we cannot break for any consideration in the world. . . .

"Let no man," said Mr. Churchill last night "under-rate the abiding power of the British Commonwealth and Empire." We all desire the fraternal association which he urged between ourselves and the United States. But such an association must depend on strength and virtue in all its component parts, and, in particular, on unity in the British Commonwealth. Without one essential wing, our wing, the great structure will be built on sand, unstable, crumbling and valueless. It is that governing, ineluctable truth for which we must seek American recognition and understanding. . . .

*Lord Croft*: . . . Very remarkably we won our way to victory and saved our peoples from enslavement and serfdom. I believe it is essential that we should preserve our liberty in all ways. I feel most strongly that we must be no party to any policy which will deprive us of our power of fiscal decision or make us subordinate to the policy of any single foreign land. . . .

March 7, 1946.

## THE FOREIGN SITUATION

*Lord Altrincham*: . . . I suggest, then, that the Government should define exactly what our vital interests are, and I hope that an exchange of views between ourselves, Russia and the United States may very soon prove possible on that basis. We have something to contribute. We have, I think, a freer international sense than either of those two great Powers. We have long had to deal—much longer than they have—with the outside world. We are the heart of a Commonwealth which consists of absolutely free but nevertheless very unequal States. We have therefore, I think, an understanding in these matters which they in their very much more closed systems have not got. I hope therefore that we shall play this middle role which seems to me essential to our security and to the peace and recovery of Europe, and that we shall begin the process by stating quite clearly what our vital interests are.

*Lord Lindsay of Birker*: . . . We mean by democracy the kind of thing in which there is a responsible and tolerated opposition. If you will excuse me being pedantic, nobody meant that by the word "Government" before Oliver Cromwell; until his time we all supposed that you had to believe the same thing and have the same faiths and that toleration was a wrong thing. I used to have the pleasure and pride of possessing a rare American pamphlet called "The Simple Cobbler of Agawan in America," which, in about page 4, suddenly says:

"My heart has naturally detested four things; the adulteration of the coinage; the standing of the Apocrypha in the Bible; the coming in of foreigners to take the bread out of our country-

men's mouths, and the toleration of divers religions or of one religion in segregant shapes."

Then it goes on to say that:

"He that assents to this last, if he examine his conscience by daylight, he will find he is either an etheist, a heratic or at the best the captive of some lust."

That is the view of people who do not believe in toleration and who passionately believe the other way. . . .

*Lord Saltoun*: . . . The Duke of Wellington, after eighty years of unexampled experience, used to say that, in his view, the greatest crime that a man or a nation could commit was to do anything to foment civil disaffection in a neighbouring country. After sixty years of very undistinguished life, I say exactly the same thing. I think that it is probably the greatest crime that any man or any nation can commit. Having regard to the special position in Spain, the ferocity that is aroused, the murdering, the raping and the looting that inevitably take place when there are any civil disturbances in that country, I feel that if the action of His Majesty's Government were, in any way, to produce any unrest in Spain unnecessarily, it would be a stain on every one of us. It would cause me, personally, very great pain, and I am sure that in the end there is a Nemesis for these things.

*Lord De L'Isle and Dudley*: . . . It seems to me that we must look to events and to actions rather than to motives.

If I were a Russian ruler, I must confess I should be tempted to the line of action which is being taken very much by the policy of the other Powers, and, in particular, of this country itself. I feel, much as I hope and much as I desire good Anglo-Russian relations, if we make it an end in itself, rather than a means to an end, and if we pursue it with excessive enthusiasm we shall lose it. Let us remember that the end of our policy must be directed, as it was when we entered the war in 1939, to maintain liberty and justice even at great cost to ourselves. We shall not found, I am certain, reliable organisations for the government and regulation of the world unless we recognise the rule of law. I cannot see how confidence can be founded on any other basis, and, so long as treaties are not respected, I cannot see how we can build on that foundation. It is building on a quicksand.

I know I shall be saying something controversial here, but I think it ought to be said, so I will say it. The Foreign Secretary, whose conduct in these negotiations I admire greatly, when he went to Moscow, offered to extend our treaty with the Russians from twenty to fifty years. In Article (5) it is specifically laid down that the contracting parties will eschew all territorial aggrandisement or interference in the power of independent States. To put it at its mildest, it is questionable whether Article (5) has been observed. If it has not been observed, is it really wise to extend a treaty from twenty to fifty years when we are not certain that the terms are being observed now? . . .

## Oblivion

"Modern education, press, and propaganda have almost eradicated memory. If the public memory could last ten years, few ministers would hold office twice. If the public memory could last ten weeks, how many newspapers would be read for the accuracy of their news, or the consistency of their opinions?"

— The Earl of Portsmouth.

**SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT**

The following Groups and Associations are registered as working in association with the Social Credit Secretariat:—

**GREAT BRITAIN**

- ABERDEEN D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., W. J. Sim, 18 Adelphi, Aberdeen.
  - BELFAST D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. A. Crothers, 20 Dromara Street, Belfast.
  - BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., A. Davies, 73 Manor Road, Blackpool.
  - BRADFORD D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.
  - CARDIFF D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., Miss H. Pearce, 8 Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.
  - GLASGOW D.S.C. Group: W. Forrester, 81 Mitchell Street, Glasgow, C. 1.
  - LIVERPOOL D.S.C.A. Hon. Sec., Mrs. Trayler, 67, Caldwell Road, Liverpool, 19.
  - LONDON D.S.C. Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.
  - MIDLAND D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. Sanders, 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.
  - NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE and GATESHEAD D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., T. H. Rea, 23 Clarewood Place, Fenham, Newcastle, 5.
  - PORTSMOUTH and SOUTHSEA D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., Mrs. Waite, 50 Ripley Grove, Copnor, Portsmouth.
  - SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., C. Daish, 19 Coniston Avenue, Redbridge, Southampton.
  - STOCKTON D.S.C. Group: L. Gilling Smith, Eastrea, Durham Road, Stockton.
- Registered Groups are also working at LEPTON (Yorkshire), RUBERY AND REDNALL (Birmingham), WOKING, WOODFORD (Essex), and in BERKSHIRE. The last mentioned is a Services Group. Enquiries concerning all these should be addressed c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

**EUROPE Hon. Secretary.**

COPENHAGEN D.S.C. Group. J. P. Gjerulff.

**AUSTRALIA**

**New South Wales**

D.S.C.A. AND ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN OF N.S.W.  
DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION OF YOUTH

- COWPER D.S.C. Group
- NEWCASTLE (N.S.W.) D.S.C. Group
- BELMONT D.S.C. Group
- BATHURST D.S.C. Group.
- SUTHERLAND V.P.A.

Miss K. W. Marlow.

- A. Ferguson.
- J. McDonald.
- B. V. Murray.
- S. H. Morrow.
- R. R. Brazier.
- W. Prescott.

**South Australia**

- ADELAIDE D.S.C. Group
- GLENELG D.S.C. Group

C. H. Allen.  
E. C. Finn.

**Western Australia**

- PERTH D.S.C. Group

W. F. Andrews.

**Queensland**

- QUEENSLAND D.S.C. Association

A. W. Noakes.

**Victoria**

- HEADQUARTERS Group
- MELBOURNE D.S.C. Groups:

L. C. Hargreaves.

- A Group
- B Group
- C Group

A. J. O'Callaghan.  
F. C. Paice.  
Miss G. F. Greig.

**Tasmania**

HOBART D.S.C. Group James Guthrie.

**NEW ZEALAND**

- PATEA ELECTORATE V.P. Association G. J. Billinghamurst.
- AUCKLAND D.S.C. Group Mrs. W. James.

**SOUTH AFRICA**

PORT ELIZABETH D.S.C. Group L. W. Smith.

**CANADA**

- OTTAWA (Parliamentary) D.S.C. Group
- OTTAWA D.S.C. Bureau of Canada Ralph L. Duclos, Pres.
- VANCOUVER D.S.C. Group J. Vans Macdonald.
- LIVERPOOL (Nova Scotia) D.S.C. Group T. E. D. Watson.
- SOUTH EDMONTON (Alberta) D.S.C. Group R. H. Ashby.

**To all Social Credit Groups and Associations, Home and Overseas**

\*Associations desiring to act in accordance with the advice of the Secretariat are asked to fill in the following:—

Name, address, and approximate number of members of Association .....

We desire to follow the advice of the Social Credit Secretariat.†

To acquaint ourselves with the general character of this advice and the reasons underlying it, we agree to subscribe to *The Social Crediter* regularly in the proportion of at least one copy for every five members.

We agree not to discuss with others, without authorisation, the details of special advice received from the Secretariat.

Date..... Deputy's Signature.....

To accompany the above form, a brief statement is requested giving the history or account of the initiation of the group, and its present activities and intentions.

HEWLETT EDWARDS,

Director of Organisation and Overseas Relations.

\*For this purpose an Association to consist of three or more Social Crediters.

†The Secretariat is the channel used by Major Douglas, the Advisory Chairman, for the transmission of advice.

**"There was a Campaign"**

"... Mr. Churchill is not the man to embarrass his hosts. We now know, too, that for a week or more before he spoke at Fulton many influential American newspapers created the right atmosphere for him to say precisely what he did say. In other words, there was a campaign, and Mr. Churchill's speech formed a part of it." — *Truth*.