An Introduction to Social Credit*
By BRYAN W. MONAHAAN

Part 1.—PHYSICS.

(continued)

Bearing in mind that the solution of a particular problem, or apparent problem, is only an application of Social Credit like the application of algebra to Zeno's problem, we may approach the greater subject through the well-known "paradox of poverty amidst plenty."

Seven years of war and post-war disturbance have admittedly abolished both the poverty and the plenty. Poverty is thought of as a financial condition, and plenty as a material one; and at the present time incomes are widespread and at a high level, while goods of most descriptions are in short supply.

Unless a further phase of the war supervenes shortly, however, it is certain that both poverty and plenty will return. This at least seems to be a basic assumption of official economics, which, in consequence, is freely forecasting a depression in the near future.

The nature of "plenty" is the first subject we have to examine; this is the field of physical and industrial science referred to earlier.

From the purely physical, material point of view, man is a machine performing work by the conversion of energy. He is a form of internal combustion engine, obtaining energy by the burning of fuel. Now the primary condition of individual life must obviously be that the amount of energy obtained from the "fuel"—food—shall be sufficient to allow for the expenditure of energy in the searching for and consumption of food. It is possible to conceive of a state of life where the consumption of food just balanced the expenditure of energy in obtaining it, and in these circumstances no other activity would be possible. Life must have started at least slightly above this level, for otherwise no progress beyond it would have been possible. Now the difference between the energy-expenditure necessary merely to sustain life, and the energy available altogether, represents "profit" in its most fundamental sense. It forms the basis of the ability of the animal to pursue other ends than the mere obtaining of food.

A thorough understanding of this basic physical reality is essential to our subject, for it lies at the very heart of Social Credit. An individual which has to devote the whole of its time to obtaining the mere necessities of its existence has the nature of its activities wholly determined by this necessity. But as soon as it has a surplus energy above this fundamental requirement, it has a choice as to how it will expend it.

* Now appearing in The Australian Social Crediter.
from generation to generation, a growth and a condensation; for a knowledge of the original knowledge is commonly lost. But—in this context—the knowledge inherited is a working knowledge; the individual inherits with the spade a knowledge of "spade-practice" without which the spade has only a fraction of its possible usefulness.

This working knowledge, this knowledge of process and practice, in all its wide ramifications, inherited parallel with physical inheritance, we call the cultural inheritance. This again is a fundamental conception of immense importance, as real as, and more effective than, the longevity of tools and structures. For it enables not only the adequate use of the tool, but the tool's replacement.

Thus we have found basic physical meanings for the terms profit and investment. Profit we may define as improved efficiency accruing to the individual; and investment as the application of profit to the enhancement of efficiency. Profit, investment and inheritance, especially cultural inheritance, are basic elements of economics, and a correct understanding of them apart from any economic, and particularly financial, theories is essential.

"Plenty" has its origin in these elements; it begins in the little surplus energy at the disposal of the individual, is increased by the application of this surplus to the improvement of process, and enhanced through the accumulations of the cultural inheritance.

(To be continued).

Who Are The Economist's Readers?

Last week's funny-page article in The Economist again touched the constitution issue and "laughed off" the Revolution. It began: "By kind permission of the publishers, the Stevenage University Press, we are privileged to print the following extract from a forthcoming book, to be published early in 2048, by the Silkin Memorial Professor of Political Mechanics." By way of a reference to whether or not, "if a Minister's wife did not observe . . . limitations and the Minister was officially advised to divorce her," he would be constitutionally bound to accept advice from "his" permanent staff; a sly association of "the aged Duke of Montgomery" with political eminence; and other details of "broadening down from precedent to precedent," the article comes to a conclusion with—"It was not until 2013 that an Act was passed formally legalising the position that the real nomination to the permanent staff of "the reality of power" above the Law] lies with the Committee of the Athenaeum. This happy blend of classical learning derived from Greece, of a self-perpetuating Soviet derived from Russia, and of the mandarin system imported from China, illustrates the flexibility and adaptability with which the British Constitution has evolved through so many centuries without any of those forceful revolutions that have brought so much tragedy to less fortunate peoples."

Documents of Communism

"Speaking at Canberra [on November 29 last], Mr. Archie Cameron, M.H.R., in criticising the appointment of Mr. Mountjoy to the executive of the C.S.I.R., mentioned the Canadian spy ring. He went on to say that he had previously asked the Attorney-General the number of members of the Soviet Legation in Australia. The reply showed that there is the astounding number of 84."

"Mr. Cameron complained that the reply to his question had not been published in Hansard. This is a serious matter, and some searching questions should be asked by the electors."

—The New Times.

Tidings for January 25 states that copies of the Report of the Canadian Royal Commission are now obtainable from H.M. Stationery Office, and that memoirs by Alekseev (mentioned on page 8 of this issue) may be expected to be published.
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Responsibility of the B.M.A.

Dated January 20, 1947, the Medical Policy Association addressed all representatives to the B.M.A. meeting held on January 28. The letter said the true issues had been obscured by emphasis upon subsidiary details and irrelevant arguments and overlaid with prejudice and material interests. It continued: "The plain facts are as follows: This is an Act which is designed to deflect the profession of medicine from its ancient and legitimate end and convert it at a stroke into a means to an end; that end being, not the health of the nation nor the care of the sick and needy, but the balancing of Treasury accounts. It is designed, further, to degrade the status of the individual doctor from that of a freeman freely using his knowledge, skill and judgment, after the manner of a profession, in the interests of his patient and for the advancement of medical knowledge, to that of a servant of the Civil Service, liable to fines, imprisonment and dismissal unless he obeys to the letter the arbitrary orders of Whitehall. Ninety-five per cent. of British doctors know this in their hearts and fear it. They know that they can serve under this Act only with a loss of self-respect. That doctors do not openly acknowledge this and act upon it, is due to another fear, viz., that they may find themselves in a minority and be compelled by economic pressure sooner or later to conform. In other words, they distrust their fellows. This uncertainty—the fear of the unknown being greater than the fear of the known—holds them back and impels them to disguise their real motives with substitutes. The latest of these is to doubt the legality of flouting constituted authority. It is a curious commentary on this argument that men are now being tried in Germany at the instance of the same Government for failing to do what we are told not to do!

"If, then, we are right in suggesting that fear of the other fellows' disloyalty is the primary impediment to wholesale refusal by doctors generally to serve under this Act—and we are far from implying that this fear is groundless—it's removal should not be beyond the scope of statesmanship. We submit, therefore, that the results of the plebiscite authorize the Representative Meeting to instruct the Council of the B.M.A. to draw up a Solemn League and Covenant, the terms of which should be short, precise and unambiguous, which every practising member of the profession in these Isles should be invited to sign and thereby bind himself irrevocably to refuse service under this Act or any other Act which centralizes control of professional activities in a Government department or Ministry or any single corporate body. This is the answer to the Minister and to his ignoble mouthpieces, and now is the time to give it. We believe that only on these lines can the profession be mobilized to express their true feelings and to make a stand for freedom, individual, professional and scientific, and save the sick of the nation from the fate of receiving care and attention in their hour of need that falls short of the very best that modern medical resources can provide.

"The Minister desires above everything to force the doctors, by guile, into accepting joint-responsibility with him for an Act that is certain to prove unpopular. This must not be. Let him be solely responsible for his own Act or let the three Presidents share responsibility with him. For it is as certain as that day follows night that Mr. Bevan will authorize the Representative Meeting to instruct the Council to make it known that he is responsible for his own Act and we are far from implying that this fear is groundless. It is the answer to the Minister and to his ignoble mouthpieces, and now is the time to give it. We believe that only on these lines can the profession be mobilized to express their true feelings and to make a stand for freedom, individual, professional and scientific, and save the sick of the nation from the fate of receiving care and attention in their hour of need that falls short of the very best that modern medical resources can provide.

"But an upright and staunch man, however, is one who, in directing your activities to the good—not exclusively to your class but to the good of the entire nation, lays the nobility and aristocracy even in those democracies of which it is certain that they are no exceptions, aside! Thus, individuals and families will be able without difficulty to lead a life according to the laws of God—to live orderly and be happy.

The Pope to the Patricians

Addressing the Roman nobility on January 9, the Pope said, inter alia:

"To-day, it is less difficult for you to determine your possible lines of conduct. The first of these is inadmissible. It is that of a deserter, or someone who is justly called an "emigre à l'intérieur." It is the abstention of a vexed and annoyed man who through spite or discouragement, makes no use of his gifts or of his energies. He takes no part in the activities of his country or of its needs, but withdraws himself while the fortunes of his country are at stake.

"Also an unworthy line of conduct is that which is the result of a lazy or passive indifference. This is sometimes hidden under the mask of neutrality—it is not neutral, it is guilty.

"But an upright and staunch man, however, is one who does not allow himself to be shaken in his convictions either by the upheaval of the people or by the menacing frowns of the tyrant. Such a man remains firm even though the world may be falling to pieces around him. An upright man will feel the obligation to resist, to stop the cataclysm, or at least to lessen the damage.

"This means that you must face the present situation as it is, and in directing your activities to the good—not exclusively to your class but to the good of the entire nation. Thus, individuals and families will be able without difficulty to lead a life according to the laws of God—to live orderly and be happy. . . .

"In this way, there opens before you the task for the future. Last year on this same occasion, we showed where the nobility and aristocracy even in those democracies of which it is certain that they have no feudal traditions behind them.

"This nobility is the society of families who, in keeping with tradition, give all their energy to the service of the State, its government and administration, and on whose fidelity it can count, on every occasion."
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From Week to Week

"... Mr. Byrnes recently said to a Foreign Office official 'I think you English are mad. You want dollars; you sell us whisky at 6/- a bottle [4/9, Editor, T.S.C.] which will sell in the U.S. for 20/- a bottle and in South America for £5 a bottle. I am convinced you English are Mad.' —Sunday Express, January 19, 1947.

No, Mr. Byrnes, not in this case. There is an uglier word for it. Ask some of your own importers who know all about it.

You haven't heard that we are sabotaging barley so that there will only be small quantities of whisky left, have you? That ought to leave the market free for American whiskey.

Sir Stephen Bilsland, Chairman of the Scottish Council (Industry) gave five reasons to the Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce on January 17 for the resumption of whisky distilling. Not one of those reasons had any connection with the supply of whisky to Scotsmen.

It is becoming increasingly rare for anyone to suggest that you should make something because you want it, Clarence. Take care you aren't put away under 18B.

Perhaps one of the most surprising features of the French situation is that the only sign of financial sanity anywhere evident, should be in a country which has been notorious for its financial corruption and chicanery since Carlyle's Glorious Revolution which opened the door to it.

As we have always insisted, credit in its monetary form is primarily a function of prices: falling prices, "good" money; rising prices, "bad" money and the flight from it. We are afflicted with streams of unctuous nonsense from the work to be done under the direction of Professor J. Z. Young, partly at the Biological Station at Naples and partly at University College, London. Applications are invited from men or women with training in Biology or Medicine. The appointment will be for three years in the first instance in Octopus; the work to be done during the previous summer. Durnsford Smith, National Research Council engineer, was the last suspect to be convicted, being sentenced to five years' imprisonment in Kingston Penitentiary. On various dates, seven others were sent to prison, one was fined and five were acquitted. The...
Neville Chamberlain
By NORMAN F. WEBB

It is difficult to decide what can be done within the limits of a critique with a subject as massive as this *The Life of Neville Chamberlain.* Comment it for what it is, yes; because it is an extremely able biography, well told and, as far as anyone can judge, no more biased than any friendly (and by that I mean understanding) biography has a licence to be. From his literary and historical qualifications, its author, who never actually knew Neville Chamberlain, would seem eminently well qualified for his work; but when that has been said, all has in fact been said. The next step is to procure the book for oneself and read it, and get its extraordinary flavour of the English industrial ruling class of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—the class that, not only pioneered the Industrial Revolution, but found time in conjunction with the remnants of the landed aristocracy, to govern the country, and introduce almost all the ameliorative and restrictive social legislation of the period. The age of Peel and Palmerston and Gladstone (Disraeli simply defies definition) and Joseph Chamberlain and Asquith and Baldwin. The whole epoch—with the loss, perhaps, of some of its saving Anglo-Saxon ripeness—seems to be summed up in Neville Chamberlain; all its integrity, and real gentlemanliness, and its pragmatic narrowness, and stiff honesty, come, as it were, to a head in his slow maturity, and fall—yes, even if only for a time, fall—when he fell in May, 1940.

In a sense the story is simple; because Englishmen, the best of them, are simple, and there can be no two opinions at the end of this biography, no matter how differing one’s political opinion, that Neville Chamberlain was comparatively speaking, a “good” man. Perhaps, according to Lord Acton’s dictum, and for that same reason, he was not great, though I think that as statesmen go, he was wise and sagacious under the most bewildering concentration of events that it has ever been the fate of a British Prime Minister to meet. And for the reason that he had no power-monger and no dictator—he said of his predecessor: “It has come to me without my raising a finger to obtain it, because there is no one else, and perhaps because I have not made enemies by looking after myself rather than the common cause”—for that reason he was not corrupted, was in a way incorruptible.

Both the outcry released at the time of “Munich” and the subsequent fall are made quite plain and understandable in this narrative, lacking no plausibility, but only significance, which to re-arm. “And there are numerous other notes in the same strain. It may be criticised that his vision was too limited—nevertheless, their instinct was always truer and ahead of reality. Chamberlain came to have in them long before his premiership—nevertheless, their instinct was always truer and ahead of public opinion, oppressed and moulded as it was by the Times-inspired Left propaganda. To hope against hope, and to re-arm at the greatest possible speed without disrupting earliest days, and industrially on the best of terms with them, he had no very high opinion of them in their political capacity, especially when he fought them in local Government and reprobated their determination to use it for political ends. “Their gross exaggeration,” he says, “their dishonesty in slipping over facts that tell against them, and their utter inability to appreciate a reasonable argument, do embitter my soul sometimes, and if I seem hard and unsympathetic to them, it is the reaction brought about by their own attitude.” Chamberlain had none of Baldwin’s easy-going finesse. He found it hard to disguise his thoughts, and he would subscribe to nothing he did not wholly feel. In Parliament, in later years, his clashes with Labour were frequent and biting.

But it fell to Neville Chamberlain from 1934 onwards, not in his ministerial capacity of Chancellor of the Exchequer, but actually because he, beyond all others in the Cabinet, saw the dire necessity for Britain to rearm, to press this unwelcome and internationally unpopular policy on the reluctant British public. It was the last thing the financiers of Hitler and Goering wanted. So British political labour was swung into action, and responded as eagerly and blindly to their extra-territorial “whip”, as did the “Canadian” men and women recently tried and condemned in Ottawa. Had not Clement Attlee—unless he is incorrectly reported—said at Southport in 1934: “We have absolutely abandoned any idea of nationalist loyalty. We are deliberately putting a world loyalty before loyalty to our country.” I think, above everything, it emerges from this autobiography that Neville Chamberlain was re-armament, and re-armament Neville Chamberlain. He who had the courage to say in Parliament in 1936 “Britain has no policy”, had from 1934 onwards a very definite view of what had to be done, that was to re-arm, and do everything possible to postpone hostilities. In July, 1936, when Hitler guaranteed Austria’s integrity, his diary records: “I do not take Hitler’s peace professions at their face value… once again we are given a little more space in which to re-arm.” And there are numerous other notes in the same strain. It may be criticised that his vision was not large enough. Probably Churchill felt this; but Churchill had not to deal with a reluctant British public, fed almost exclusively from the Left, and a Labour and Liberal opposition that blocked any move towards his goal. Doubtless, with the use of such ballyhoo and mass-psychology methods as were employed in Germany at the same time, the scope might have been enlarged. But having regard to the country and particularly, the man, we must recognise that that was not a real possibility—the worse for Britain had it been so. Nothing can be more certain than that the “Left” mentality, the psychological condition upon which the international forces of evil play their disruptive fantasies, is fundamentally inconsistent. They cry for collective security and individual disarmament; for sanctions and “the strong line,” when through their exertions their national unit has been rendered powerless; and, as in this case, they send up a scream of outrage when the result of their own reactions force a humiliating compromise on their country. Admit the poor showing of the successive Baldwin governments—and this book, incidentally, shows what a predominating hand Neville Chamberlain came to have in them long before his premiership—nevertheless, their instinct was always truer and ahead of public opinion, oppressed and moulded as it was by the Times-inspired Left propaganda. To hope against hope, and to re-arm at the greatest possible speed without disrupting
industry or totalitarianizing the country (the armament budget for 1939 was £1,500 million; no small sum!) and to gain time—that became the only practical policy. It was, too, a British policy, and Chamberlain who was the initiator of it and the chief impulse behind it, was the natural target for all the anti-British international forces.

Then came the split with Eden, handled with almost too great delicacy here, over the danger of throwing Mussolini into the arms of Hitler, and lighting the European bonfire before we had got together sufficient equipment to put it out. And the pressure behind Eden; America, and his fear of alienating her public opinion. Then, inevitably, came Munich, and whatever its faults of arbitrariness and lack of diplomatic tact, it was absolutely in the sequence of the policy which Chamberlain had set himself. It achieved its pragmatic end, and the Left Wing doctrinaires congregated in New York and London and screamed in outrage.

Finally, war came, and Britain met its impact with her wheels turning in the right direction and to some purpose, due almost entirely to Neville Chamberlain. But the Left, still and always under extra-territorial orders, refused co-operation to the man who had done all the spade work, and bid their time. Then came Norway and the sudden personal attack imposed in an atmosphere of panic, and Neville Chamberlain's "fall". A new design was given to the war, a personal, centralized strategy of the most brilliant kind, and since its alternative was not to be tried, there is no more to be said. And whatever was the subtle "international" difference between Churchill and Chamberlain at the highest levels—and personally between the two men, acting and reacting together since the declaration of war, there was absolutely no difference; their relationship is one of the reassuring things that emerge from this book—by his own removal, as Chamberlain knew, Labour and Liberals were enabled to enter the Cabinet without losing face. Finally, in 1945, the doctrinaire Left picked up the broken threads, and are now busy showing the world what a futile thing it is to fight a war, no matter with what brilliance of strategy and eloquence of exposition, if you don't know what it is all about.

At the beginning of Chapter 33, there is a magnificent photograph of Neville Chamberlain fishing in Scotland; the last, golden word in English leisured, homespun gentility and statesmanship. That is what fell in 1940, all that upright, self-contained insularity and confidence. And the world waits to see what is going to take its place.

Priority Number One

In the foregoing review of Mr. Keith Feiling's work I have accepted the subject more or less as the author did, at its face value—a picture of British statesmanship in the inter-war years, wrestling with "events" largely as unrelated phenomena. There is not the slightest suggestion in the book—as I think there was none in the mind of its subject—that "events" were other than they appeared to be, and fortuitous, or that particular cards were being forced on Great Britain; nor that the problems that confronted the Government might have been tackled other than in the way they were tackled, to a large extent in isolation and in their own sequence. That is, of course, mainly how men live and act on this plane of consciousness—more so today perhaps than ever—and I begin to think it is the chief reason why they are so much the victims of eventual circumstances. They take things entirely—as to some extent we all needs must—in the sequence in which they present themselves in time, whereas actually, if we wish to dominate and solve our problems, that sequence will be found more often than not to be a false one, destined to make us the slaves, not the masters of events.

Never, I think, were the practical results of this procedure more clear, or its disastrous fruits plainer to be seen, than in the inter-war period exactly covered by this biography of one of its most considerable and effective political figures. What had happened was, I believe, something like this. To deal instinctively and successfully with problems and events as they come and in isolation—and in one sense that is the only effective way to deal with them—one must concentrate and more or less forget other considerations. But for proper co-ordination there must exist a strong, agreed and underlying principle or policy; such for instance as was supplied by the Mediæval Church, or in a much more limited sense is supplied by a military war. Granted that fundamental and common agreement, individuals and nations can let their creative impulses blossom with comparatively little fear of collision and in reasonable safety. But remove the unifying principle or policy, or purpose, and creative exuberance turns rapidly into exclusive ambition, and dictatorship. That is the present world's dilemma; it is without a common policy or principle, and so every separate nation, organisation, individual, tends automatically to exclusiveness instead of co-operation.

But "Back to Mediævalism", or resort to any kind of moralistic "religious" revival, is, I feel, no cure; nor is it feasible. The instinctive phase of human thought is over. With the disappearance of the external, mediæval discipline to compel us to listen to the inner voice of conscience, individuals must learn to obey a new form of "internal" prompting, and for a different reason; not for a moral reason, but for practical reasons, for the love of realism—in short, for results. The New Principle may arise in one or many guises, but it will, in its nature, I feel sure, approximate to the principle promulgated in England a hundred and fifty years ago, of "Enlightened Self-interest," with the emphasis on the enlightenment. Under its influence—and this is my point here—statesmen and individuals will begin to refuse to receive "events" and the sequence of their occurrence as a result of blind fate, the will of God, to be accepted as such, but will apply to them a more scientific analysis and a more sceptical and open frame of mind. Through the promptings of Francis Bacon and his continental coadjutors, the deductive and finite frame of thought of the Mediæval schoolmen regarding learning and research, was broken, and an overwhelming flood of "practical results", technological expansion, was released. And the same procedure—individually realistic, in place of generally prohibitive—must be applied to the deductive and finite frame of moral thought. It will have to be a frame of thought that will assist individuals to attain to the concept of self-interest as the only path to realism (Reality: God), and enlightened self-interest as that which realizes that one's own and one's neighbour's interest are for all practical purposes one and indivisible.

"And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

That reflection is something of a digression, but it is born of my study of Mr. Feiling's admirable picture of an intelligent, upright Englishman, dealing just so—in a
The answer to this riddle of the unnatural blindness of most men in positions of authority—at least, the answer to the main part of it—is comparatively simple. Almost all men are to some extent power-mongers, potential scoundrels; certainly it might be safely said, all that get to high political positions, and they instinctively scent the threat to “power” implicit in the realistic destruction of poverty. That is largely how it comes about that they are prepared to see society tied up, even to take a hand in the process, in a hopelessly impeding net of remedial legislation, designed (quite mistakenly) to mitigate the worst effects of their acquiescence in so palpably unethical a deception. I speak, of course, of the more “well-meaning” careerist-politicians, rather than of the much cruder dictator-gangsters. But manifestly, Chamberlain, particularly, was no power-monger in this excessive and enslaved sense; comparatively speaking, he was an exceptionally free man. He may have been bound up with a Party that had over-sold itself—it is hard to believe that Baldwin’s successive Governments had not—but it is plain that Chamberlain himself had given few hostages to fortune from the usual motives of personal ambition. And even if he had scented danger in economic enfranchisement, surely in the inner sanctum of his diary he would have canvassed the possibility of a deficiency of purchasing-power, had it ever occurred to him. The conclusion is that it never did, any more than did the real nature of the dark forces—“the evil things” he referred to in his war-declaration broadcast—ever really present itself to him. “They” were Hitler and his gang, then, because Nazi Germany was for the second time in twenty-two years the chosen instrument of a “necessary” war directed against individual freedom—the war that the avoidance on his part of Priority No. 1, and on the part of all men of influence all the world over, had made inevitable and unavoidable.

To the last he hoped against hope, and put in herculean labour and effort that the inevitable might be avoided. And when war came, it came to him as the arbitrary decision of a raving maniac, the man with whom he had fraternized so heroically the previous Autumn. Along with much else of...
significance, he had shut his eyes to the picture of the six
million unemployed in the Germany of 1932, which was
Hitler's justification and his ladder to power. He could not
see the pattern behind Hitler. His view was the inhibited
and conventional one of the English politician, of the man of
affairs, of the man of this world, heightened in significance by
his honest gentlemanliness and simplicity.

How valiantly and how vainly he strove to avoid the war
made inevitable by his own, and his fellow ministers' inertia!
His blindness would be pathetic, were it not actually so crass
made inevitable by his own, and his fellow ministers' inertia!
land
of statesmanship, and particularly from the Social Credit
lain's moral record is a relatively grand one, such as could
be to comprehend the true nature and potency of the opposition
belonged, among the disloyal reactionaries and obstructionists,
and thus added personal animus (a deadly force) to the
international propagandist pressure under which they acted,
against the day of his downfall.

I say that on the evidence of this book, Neville Chamber-
lain's moral record is a relatively grand one, such as could
not, alas, be paralleled today; a credit to him and to the
land that produced him. But viewed from the greater eminence
of statesmanship, and particularly from the Social Credit
standpoint of economic realism, it is pathetic, without purpose
or principle, like the tragic and opportunist period which it
covered. As he himself said in 1936, "Britain has no
policy." How could she? When her ministers dealt with
grave national and international crises just as they were
tossed to them, like buns into a bear pit, without discrimination
or any kind of constructive thought. In the latter end
nothing could have been done probably; events came crowding
in more like thunder rain on a tin roof, drowning completely
the last chance of a hearing for the still small voice of reason
contained in the book Economic Democracy. Hitler's
election, the World Economic Conference, Mussolini's
African ambitions, the Purge of '34, the walk into Alsace, the
Spanish Civil War, the Constitutional Crisis, the occupation
of Austria, etc., etc. The only thing left to do was to avoid
being bounced out of the frying-pan. And at least the
awful unemployment figures were going down monthly. But
of statesmanship, of policy, there was none. What a degrading
sight. And presiding over it all, Baldwin and Macdonald,
in uneasy and undignified duplication, like overgrown twins
in a double pram. Dreadful! And it might all have been
so comparatively easily avoided, if First Things First had
been Great Britain's political motto, instead of Catch-as-
catch-can.

Today, we have in the Conservative Party the potential
heirs to all this, without one man approaching the moral
integrity of Neville Chamberlain, and captained by a
Specialist—one of the most brilliant, probably the world has
ever seen—in military strategy. To those familiar with
Lewis Carroll's Hunting of the Snark the parallel will come
instantly to mind; and it would seem that the Party is only
saved from an accentuated repetition of the Baldwin reign of
ignominy by the fact that the electorate has thrown it out on
its neck. Still national and international crises come
crowding and jostling into the post-war arena, and Ernest
Bevin, on whom, to quite a considerable extent, the mantle
of Chamberlain has fallen, flies from one world conference
to another, propping up the four corners of a tottering world.
But on the Home Front now—and this is grim to see—there
is selection and direction, a policy at work; an anti-British
policy, a policy that is rapidly tying up the wretched Anglo-
Saxon individual in a net of petty restrictions, and destroying
the beautiful, delicately adjusted, self-acting mechanism of
Great Britain's free-working economy. It is true that this
anti-British policy is little more than an extension of the
policy inaugurated by Chamberlain himself following the
year 1931; but it is being carried forward now with a
swift ruthlessness that has nothing of the blind well-
intentioned, fumbling of the pre-war Coalitionist Govern-
ment. Men, most of them of far less integrity and ability
than the old Baldwin team, are going about the liquidation
of the British Empire and the disintegration of Anglo-
Saxon culture—to leave Christianity out of it altogether—with
a conviction and effectiveness and lack of any compunction that
shows what can be done even with potentially decent,
God-fearing Englishmen by a course of international (alien)
conditioning à la the London School of Economics, and the
Fabian Society and P.E.P., etc., etc. Neville Chamberlain's
"evil things" that, as he lay dying in Hampshire, with the
Battle of Britain raging over his head, and with what he
regarded as his life's work in ruins about him, were still
being heroically beaten off, as we thought, seem to have won
the war in spite of all Winston Churchill's strategic brilliance.
But the end is not yet, and in as far as these things are
evil—and to what degree they are, is beyond the capacity of
any mortal to say—we must, and do, believe that they carry
within them the seeds of their own destruction.

Soviet and Extradition

The Washington correspondent of The Times, writing on
January 21, said the State Department had that day made
known the substance of a Note handed to the Counsellor of
the Soviet Embassy in reply to a demand for the extradition
of Kirill Alekseev, former Soviet trade representative in
Mexico, who had abandoned his post and made his way to
the United States and was charged by the Russian Govern-
ment with embezzlement of funds.

"In reply," the message states, "the United States cites
the well-established principle of international law 'that no
means for extradition exists apart from treaty,' remarks that
no such Russian-American treaty exists, and recalls a
declaration by the Supreme Court that the power to provide
for extradition is not confined to the executive branch of the
Government. The State Department is therefore unable to
comply with the request that Alekseev be turned over to the
Soviet authorities."
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