

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 25. No. 2.

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

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

### Western Union—Safeguard or Danger?

THE WRITER OF THIS SHORT MEMORANDUM KNOWS THAT NOTHING IS BEING DONE TO MEET THE SOVIET MENACE BY THE MEANS HE SUGGESTS. HE IS ABLE TO SAY THIS BECAUSE HE HAS BEEN FOR A CONSIDERABLE TIME IN CLOSER TOUCH THAN ANYONE ELSE IN GREAT BRITAIN WITH THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE RUSSIAN EXILES' DIFFERENT ORGANISATIONS.

ALTHOUGH HE HAS FOUND THOSE GENTLEMEN RELIABLE, WELL-INFORMED AND STATESMANLIKE, HE FEELS THAT HE SHOULD EXPLAIN THAT THE VIEWS HE EXPRESSES ARE NOT SOLELY, OR EVEN CHIEFLY, DUE TO INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM THAT QUARTER. HE HAS BEEN IN TOUCH WITH RUSSIAN AFFAIRS SINCE A CHILD IN CONSEQUENCE OF THE RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL APPOINTMENTS OF HIS NEAREST RELATIVES AND THEIR INTIMATE FRIENDS, AND HE HAS HIMSELF BEEN RESPONSIBLE, AS AN OFFICER OF THE GENERAL STAFF, FOR INFORMATION FROM WITHIN THE SOVIET UNION. HE HAS MANY AND VARIED SOURCES OF INFORMATION.

The people of Great Britain and other countries are being led to believe that what is needed to meet the menace of "Russian Imperialism" is, first and foremost, a political and military union of European states subordinated to a new, centralised authority. Those who accept this theory may soon find that they have been grievously misled.

What is the nature of "Russian Imperialism"? The people of Russia, although they showed magnificent patriotism in both the recent wars with Germany, are not given to military aggressiveness. Putting aside the complications of ancient history, many of which arose from the Dardanelles issue, it should be recalled that the Emperor Nicholas II, far from being a militarist, traditionally or otherwise, was the founder of the Permanent Court of International Justice at the Hague—the only international authority of purely political origin which has ever functioned effectively. Further, before 1914, Russian ministers, by order of His Imperial Majesty, were the first to approach the other Great Powers with a view to initiating a disarmament programme. There is no menace of "Russian Imperialism," but there is indeed a Soviet menace.

Soviet aggression operates on two planes: one subversive and revolutionary, the other military and diplomatic. The ultimate objective of both is world revolution, to which end the immediate objective is the final liquidation of the British Empire and the ending of British influence—as stated consistently by the Soviet rulers ever since the time of the Russian revolution. It is not inevitable that this liquidation of the British Empire would be a matter of profound regret to the leading politicians of all the surviving Great Powers, such as those which now harbour the chief personalities in international finance.

In seeking to estimate the present intentions of the

Soviet rulers, there are two major considerations to be borne in mind. One is that they would clearly find it best suited to their purpose to injure Great Britain's vital interests at some point where other nations would be least concerned to help her. The other is that they would naturally seek to do this injury in some manner whereby it would help, and not retard, the revolutionary activities now in progress under their direction among the British people. British politicians and publicists pay wholly inadequate attention to this latter consideration, although it has a supremely important bearing upon the success or failure of world revolution and upon strategic policy.

Only a very small number of persons in the United Kingdom are members of the Communist party or engaged quite deliberately in promoting Communism. These revolutionaries are experts in the technique of fostering, and then exploiting, grievances and in turning to their own advantage the wage-earners' loyalty to each other. They are able to exercise a considerable and troublesome influence in industry and trade. On the other hand, there is no doubt that the wage-earners in general are proving very slow to adopt Communism as their political creed and remain, as a body, sincerely patriotic men and women. If there were to develop a military movement generally believed to be a direct and obvious menace to Great Britain, with the Soviets or "Russia" as the enemy, it may be predicted, almost with certainty, that the great mass of British people of all classes would rally immediately to the support of any Administration then in office, regardless of its political colour. In other words, the revolutionary movement in all British countries would suffer a disastrous set back if the Red Army crossed the Elbe and started rolling towards the Channel ports. If that happened, it might well transpire that the Soviet rulers had made an irremediable blunder in the execution of their plan for world revolution. Unfortunately, they do not make such mistakes.

The Red dictators have, however, a means of attacking what have become, quite unnecessarily, vital British interests in a manner that would not provoke an immediate patriotic reaction among the British working classes but might actually assist revolutionary agitators in the British Empire.

Since 1940, the Soviets have succeeded in extending their power, if not the recognised frontiers of the Soviet Union, into every country neighbouring upon Russia with the exception of Turkey, Persia and Afghanistan, but there are not the smallest grounds for supposing that those countries will be for ever immune from Soviet attentions. They are outside the areas to which the Atlantic Pact and Western Union now apply. This is of special importance where Persia is concerned. That country is badly governed, its people are not contented, it is remote from all the Great Powers except for the Soviet Union, it is pitifully weak militarily and will

so remain no matter what help it receives from outside by way of war material or military advisers—as the Persians themselves would be the first to admit. Nevertheless, as matters now stand, Great Britain's very independence, military, economic and political, must disappear if she loses her source of oil supply from Persia and the neighbouring countries of the Middle East, where the Iraq to Haifa oil pipe-line is already closed.

A Soviet 'liberation' of Persia could be effected in a very few days. It would arouse neither the indignation nor the fear that would cause the British wage-earning masses to clamour for direct military intervention. Far from that being so, great numbers of all classes would bitterly resent being involved in yet another great war for the sake of what would be called "the financiers' oil interests." The issue would be attributed to corrupt capitalism of the worst description. With the people being told to sacrifice life and treasure for oil, there would arise a golden opportunity for subversive agitation of which, we may be sure, the Communists and their sympathisers would not fail to take full advantage. It can hardly be doubted that the revolutionary movement would gain much ground in the United Kingdom. That is just what the Soviets want.

It is quite impossible to predict with positive assurance what action by Soviet or other politicians, or what fortuitous incident, will be the starting point of the impending world war; but it is important to realise that the Soviets' overriding aim would be best served if the war began in a place where Great Britain has vital interests at a considerable distance from her own shores but near the Soviet frontiers, as in the Middle East. In that case, there being no German army to take the field, the support of the armies of Luxembourg, Belgium, the Netherlands and Denmark would not be available, nor that of the French army if ordered and willing to fight, and the United States under no obligation to intervene. Great Britain might be entirely isolated and torn by internal dissension.

If the Soviet dictators are able to choose the direction of their next forward move—and it is evident that they are—both revolutionary and strategic considerations would weigh against their electing to attack all their opponents simultaneously in the west, where those opponents are potentially strongest—or, let us say, least weak—when they have the means of disposing of them piecemeal. Apart from an advance in the Far East, which might be primarily of a diversionary character, a suitable beginning would be with Great Britain in the Middle East, where she has neither forces nor friends but only vital interests. It is uncertain whether the Soviets are themselves in need of more oil, but Great Britain's dependence upon Middle Eastern oil is her Achilles Heel, while the huge chemical deposits in Palestine add to the importance of that region. Moreover, the command of the eastern Mediterranean and the Suez Canal is at stake, which makes most significant the recent opening of a headquarters of the Cominform in Egypt, the headquarters for its South American operations being in the important oil bearing country of Venezuela.

Even if there is only a modicum of reason in the foregoing appreciation of the position, Great Britain's policy in these matters ought to include two essential aims. First, immediate and strenuous efforts ought to be made, as they can be made, to reduce her dependence upon Middle Eastern oil. Secondly, every possible step should be taken to derive advantage from the complete divergence between the aims

of the Soviet dictators and the aspirations of the Russian people, of whom all but a few are bitterly opposed to Red rule. The greater the tension between the British Empire and the Communist dictators of Russia, the greater the need to bring the people of Russia to understand that the British people, while opposed to Communist tyranny, seek the liberation of Russians from their oppressors and are wholly well disposed to true Russian aspirations.

ARTHUR ROGERS.

(July 20, 1950.)

## Disraeli's Tancred

by H. SWABEY.

(concluded)

Politically also, "a jaded population is not a source of national prosperity," and no remedy was to be found in "The material system that proposes the supply of constant toil to a people as a perfection of polity." Employment was not enough. "You have announced to the millions that their welfare is to be tested by the amount of their wages. Money is to be the cupel of their worth, as it is of all other classes. You propose for their conduct the least ennobling of all impulses. If you have seen an aristocracy invariably become degraded under such influence, if all the vices of the middle class may be traced to such an absorbing motive; why are we to believe that the people should be more pure . . . ?"

A spiritual remedy was clearly needed. But that proposed turns out to be material after all. "The world that since its creation has owned the spiritual supremacy of Asia is losing its faith in those ideas. . . We think therefore the time has come when Asia should make one of its periodical and appointed efforts to reassert that supremacy. We wish to conquer the world, with angels at our head, in order that we may establish the happiness of man by a divine dominion and . . . utterly extinguish the grovelling tyranny of self-government."

We should, I think, seriously question the notion that "Christianity is Judaism for the multitude," and object that "the intellectual colony of Arabia" was a very inadequate definition of Christendom. Nevertheless, there is a key of some importance in the previous paragraph's quotation. It appears that the ethical side of Hebrew thought, distinct from the tribal or racial which Disraeli so emphasises, does run to universalism; it forgets that others have not had the same experiences as itself, perhaps. David Lubin, the centenary of whose birth was celebrated last year, considered that it was the mission of Israel to be a blessing to the Gentiles; I am sure he succeeded in helping farmers through the International Institute of Agriculture that he founded; he believed that society needed to rest on the tripod of Town Labour, Country Work and Commerce, *etc.* But the point is that his inspiration was a type of universalism, in that he dealt with the international aspects of agricultural price.

In *Count your Dead*, a brilliant political pamphlet (1937), W. Lewis takes Disraeli severely to task for this very reason: "We are an 'Empire people' since Disraeli taught us. We weren't that before. Disraelian imperialism did tend to *internationalize* the Englishman. The *civis Romanus* notion led to the hybridization of Imperial Rome, the decadence of the imperial city set in, with the pauperization

of the old Roman stock, who were better soldiers and colonial administrators than stockjobbers. Disraeli's patent jingo Britain, in theory accepting as brother the Bush-boy, the Bengalee, the Black Jamaican, has made it easier for England to be run as an international concern . . . 'Briton' means something a little comic." Mr. Lewis, however, commended Disraeli's dictum: "The Tory Party will yet rue the day that they consented to the Poor Law Bill, for they acted contrary to principle, *the principle of opposing everything like centralised government, and favouring in every way the distribution of power.*"

There is always danger in universalism, particularly if it is joined to racialism, which is a special Old Testament doctrine that did not get very far in the New. Disraeli was acute enough to remark that confiscation and taxation "come to the same thing"; but appreciation of his quickness needs to be tempered with wariness; otherwise the reader could soon miss the (dizzy) contradictions.

### "The Democratic Process"

The following letter appeared in *The Scotsman* for August 24, 1950:—

"Sir,—Your correspondent Mr. George Dott is so entirely right in suggesting that democracy does not lend itself to newspaper debate, that, in replying to his letter and that of Mr. W. J. Logie, I propose to confine myself to a brief clarification of the issues.

"Democracy—rule by 'the people', an abstract collectivity, implies, if it does not actually state, that the *locus* of sovereignty is, or could be, in 'the people': *Vox populi, vox Dei*. The extreme form of the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings is transferred thereby from an individual who can be made responsible to an abstraction which, of its nature, is irresponsible.

"As your correspondent points out, 30,000 men cannot conduct a business, so our British method has been to substitute another abstraction: that one man can 'represent' 30,000 individuals whose interests range over the whole gamut of human affairs. Together with 600 odd—sometimes very odd—others, they form a Parliament (omitting for the moment the Second Chamber component). This Parliament, acting on the tacit assumption that God is on the side of the big battalions, elects a Government, said to represent the majority.

"This Government is supreme over the collectivity—'the people'—who have resigned their hypothetical sovereignty. To quote the late Professor Laski, 'The core of the British Constitution is the supremacy of Parliament'. Lord Courtney of Penwith was even more emphatic, proclaiming the authority of Parliament to be 'absolutely unqualified, embodying the supreme will of the State.' (Working Constitution of the United Kingdom).

"In order to bring out the essential feature of this situation—that neither Right, religion or morals limit the activities of the Legislature, compare Lord Sumner in the House of Lords (1917): 'My Lords, with all respect to the great names of the lawyers who have used the phrase 'Christianity is part of the law of England,' it is really not law, it is rhetoric.'

"That is to say, the principle of the Separation of Powers which operated in the days of an effective Church

and Second Chamber has disappeared under the application of our system, whether it can correctly be termed democracy or not.

"Every business must have a code of morals enforceable by sanctions over which it has no control. This is just as true of a nation or a United Nation Organisation as of a grocery—in fact the larger the business, the more imperative the code. Within the frame-work of such a code, which in past days was furnished by religion, but was frequently known as Natural Law, it is possible for men to be governed to the general advantage.

"The Whig idea that there are no limits, human or divine, to the power of the Legislature was the primary cause of the American Revolution, and has invariably proved fatal.

"To modernise a widely used slogan of the period, 'The power of Governments has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished.' It can hardly be contended that an anonymous ballot box determination of a majority forms an effective instrument to that end.

"I am, etc.,

"Lawers, August 22, 1950.

W. L. Richardson."

### "Hard with the Poor"

Recently, on Killiney Hill, near Dublin, the following inscription cut in the face of a monument was pointed out to a correspondent:—

LAST YEAR BEING HARD WITH THE POOR  
THE WALLS ABOUT THESE HILLS AND  
THIS, etc.,  
ERECTED BY JOHN MAPAS, Esq.,  
JUNE, 1742.

This eighteenth century example of "public works" for the prevention of unemployment is remarkable for the complete absence of any trace of utility from "This" and the structures adequately described as "etc." Natural rock would have given as comfortable seating accommodation, and, in fact, the public, rich or poor, had until lately no access to the walled enclosure.

### Labour and Insurance

According to the Annual Report of the Ministry of Labour and National Service for 1949, just issued, local offices of the Ministry, acting as agents for the Ministry of National Insurance, dealt with 1,270,500 fresh claims for unemployment benefit during the year and 1,465,700 renewal claims; 15,228,800 payments were made, representing nearly £19,000,000 in benefit and over £4,200,000 in supplementary National Insurance grants.

Unemployment, says the Report, "continued at about the same level as in 1948, varying according to seasonal trends from 375,700 in January to 243,000 in July and 330,300 in December. Of the total number of unemployed workers in December, about 133,800 were in the Development Areas and nearly one in three of these had been idle for more than six months."

Order the book you need from:—

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., LIVERPOOL.

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free:**  
 One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: CENTRAL 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone SEFTon Park 435.

Vol. 25. No. 2.

Saturday, September 9, 1950.

### From Week to Week

"A retreat from a wrong direction is the only honest move in the right direction."—Tiorio.

The Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries (Red Herrings?) has appointed a Working Party on the subject of the use of toxic chemicals in agriculture.

The Chairman of the Working Party is Professor Solly Zuckerman "of the Office of the Lord President of the Council." Solly is the son-in-law of Mr. Isaacs, Marquis of Reading.

An inquiry and report on the activities of Professor Zuckerman is long overdue.

Any reader of the American press, and more particularly the magazine press, who also ponders the attenuated remains of its British equivalent, must be struck by the radically divergent attitude to foreign affairs almost invariably characteristic of them.

American publications regard the approach to problems outside the United States as being axiomatically conditioned by their bearing on the welfare, real or supposed, of the citizens of U.S.A.; the post-war, at least, assumption of British politicians and publicists seems to be that the inhabitants of these islands have no legitimate interest; that if the Hottentots have anything left over the British can have it; but that there is only one admitted excuse for "Britain's" continued existence, and that is to send men, ships and planes to fight for the U.S.A. and, in the interim, if any, to pay for the Heavenly Manna, dollars, with anything the American citizen doesn't want to make himself.

A widely read periodical, writing of American policy in China, and its debacle, complains "We not only lacked the most-favoured-nation privileges which had always been our aim [our emphasis, Editor, T.S.C.] in China, but had no privileges of any kind."

Now, if that *cri de cœur* had appeared in an English publication, there would have been a howl from the Labour and Left-Wing Press at the Tory reactionaries, the Jingo Imperialists, and the Capitalist war-mongers. We are far from admiration for the antics of Washington and Wall Street in the realms of foreign affairs, or anywhere else; but we are convinced that it is high time we made up our minds whether we have any policy, and if it contemplates Fair Shares for the British, or merely Full Employment for the Estate Auctioneers.

We have small doubt that the British are bemused by skilful propaganda on this issue; but there are certain facts which require recognition. Just as the U.S.A. makes no pretence of seeking anything but its own aggrandisement, so the United Kingdom, which appears to be the name of what is left, having gone all globealoney, may in fact be working solely for international Finance. There is a hang-over from the days of the British Empire and *Pax Britannica*; and the Nonconformist inferiority complex, the Labour matrix which fostered the Staffordshire pot-banks and Black Country, but raged at the oppression of four hundred million Indians by fifteen hundred Civil Servants, has always had its eyes on the ends of the earth. Mr. Attlee who appears to personify the Cassellabs, made no secret of the fact that "Labour," ex the London School of Economics, would sacrifice British interests to what he called world interests; and as the London School of Economics was "to train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State" in the interests of Sir Ernest Cassell and his friends who are now mostly in Wall Street, Tel Aviv and Moscow, there may be no real contradiction in the divergence of ideals on which we comment.

It is clear enough that the quality which is conspicuously lacking in the effective leaders of the British people is that which is expressed by the rather old-fashioned word, "judgment." The word is one which does not seem to have an exact alternative in the English language, although the misnomer, "common-sense," also decreasing, is a component of it.

This lack of almost the supreme quality of the human being, far transcending mere intellect or "cleverness," and from its nature conditioning the development of every other virtue, or vice, is almost certainly connected with the peculiar over-concentration on the present which is characteristic of pseudo-scientific Socialism. The almost incredible conceit that two or three generations span the wisdom of the ages, involves an inability to "judge" events as they will affect ourselves. If we *really* understood the elements of cause and effect, we should rebel against our politics, though the skies fall.

### New Zealand

"If when the Labour Government came to power, Mr. Attlee had created 500 Labour peers in order to ensure the success of a vote abolishing the House of Lords, what an attack the Tory Party would have launched!

"Yet that is exactly the tactic used by Mr. Holland, Tory Premier of New Zealand.

"Now a British Dominion has abolished the Upper House and is governed by a single Elected Chamber. It is an experiment we shall watch with interest."—*Reynolds News*, August, 20.

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

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

## "Full Employment" I.

By JAMES GUTHRIE\*

By some means the people of this country will have to be shown that those responsible for the launching of the political battlecry "Full Employment" are deliberately attempting to misdirect human effort.

As one examines the consequence of this policy one finds revealed a plan which, in its effectiveness, is second only to war in controlling the destinies of large numbers of people, and in robbing them of the fruits of their labour. "Full Employment" is war on every Christian society.

One has only to take a cursory glance at the officially sanctioned "works" to realise the colossal amount of energy and skill and human potential which is so effectively tied up, that few, if any, of their benefits can trickle through to the homes of the ordinary man and woman.

When one knows that there is a very limited supply of skilled men in any community, one must view very seriously the diversion of highly skilled men from useful production to the creation of such things as the atomic bomb. The organised terror campaign, based on atomic stories, is being used to expand the armed forces of every country, and so tie up great numbers of skilled men; added to this is the huge army employed by government and semi-government bodies, and in the latter must be included many of the big industrial monopolies, which exist only by virtue of government and trade union protection.

Some of these monopolies have a labour force out of all proportion to their needs, and it is well known that the skilled labour in these mammoth concerns is forced to spend a great deal of its time loafing, while, immediately outside, the community is starved of skilled labour, and is held up to ransom for the humblest and most essential service. In Great Britain we see a spectacular exhibition of industry centrally organised and directed for export purposes, which is probably one of the simplest methods of ensuring "Full Employment" and, at the same time, depriving the natives of essential services.

The ordinary man has got to be shown that to draw a wage or salary is not enough; he has got to be shown that while the baker draws a wage he delivers bread in return, whereas the bureaucrat delivers nothing in return.

The centralised organisation of manpower and the diversion of labour from useful work is one of the greatest political crimes of the century, and no one is profiting from these activities but the New Aristocracy. It is important to realise who constitute this new aristocracy—they are the directors of government departments, the directors of big monopolies, trade union bosses and the party chiefs, temporarily in power.

It should be obvious to men of average intelligence that after centuries of experience in the industrial and agricultural arts, and with the assistance of every imaginable power-driven tool, men of reasonable ability should win through, in fairly large numbers, to economic independence; yet we find that the percentage of the population so doing is perhaps less than ever. And the lack of independent men is one of the tragedies of our times. Economic and political power has been so centralised that access to power is only obtainable after careful "screening" by the inter-

national policy-makers, the only people who can pass through the "screen" being those who conform to directives and who refrain from discussing such dangerous topics as are discussed here.

What "Full Employment" really means can be seen by examining the following priority list for "Full Employment":

1. Atomic Bomb production and research.
2. The Bureaucracy.
3. Defence Forces.
4. Public Works.
5. The Export Drive.

Examine these carefully and ask yourself these questions: Have I or any of my friends any voting power in these activities? Will any of these activities supply me with cheaper and better food? Do they produce any houses?

Will they release men from unnecessary labour?

Will they enable us to get more assistance in the home?

Will they progressively reduce the cost of living so that each one of us will look forward to the future and share in real progress?

Will the securities I leave to my wife and family retain their value?

The answer to each one of these questions is a loud and emphatic No, and the people of this country should realise that "Full Employment" is designed by evil men to rob them of the fruits of past and future labour and invention, and is cleverly designed to prevent the wealth of human endeavour and initiative reaching the home.

The slogan "Full Employment" is a good example of how directives of the international policy-makers operate, and its universality shows also how obligatory are those directives. A study of the characteristics of slogans such as "Full Employment" is instructive. These may be listed as follows:

1. *The slogan is international.*
2. *The slogan is "official," i.e., it is "accepted" by all political parties and large organisations, communist and anti-communist.*
3. *Its aims are contrary to natural law, which means they cannot be implemented without constant interference with private aspirations.*
4. *It has an esoteric meaning, i.e., its real meaning is known only to a select few, and is entirely opposite to the meaning given to the public.*
5. *The acceptance of something as unnatural and illogical as "Full Employment" is made possible caused by the same policy-makers who originated only by fear of the repetition of past "events," these "events" being caused by the same policy-makers originated the slogans.*
6. *The realisation of its aims inevitably concentrates power in the hands of the policy-makers.*

If we consider the aims and desires of intelligent men everywhere, no one would suggest that these were full employment in a mass-production factory, or full employment for fifty years on repetitive work, or on work from which the community receives no benefit; on the contrary, one would say that man's desire was to do away with un-

\*In *The Australian Social Crediter*, May 27.

necessary "Official Employment" so that more time may be employed on his own affairs.

When we look at it this way we see that those in control of policies have put the whole idea of human progress into reverse, and have substituted their own idea of "Progress." The official idea of progress is spelt with a capital P. It is instructive to examine this word "Progress" in the light of the items 1 to 6 above.

If you are to protect your family from some of the effects of "Progress" and "Full Employment," then you will have continuously to ask some very homely questions about unproductive activities in your own district for which you are paying such a very high price.

(To be continued).

### The Australian Anti-Communist Bill

In an article in its issue for July 7, *The New Times* (Melbourne) says of The Anti-Communist Bill:—

"A close study of the manner in which the Federal Labour Opposition has treated the Government's Anti-Communist Bill leaves no doubt that there is a powerful section of the Labour Party, led by Mr. Chifley and Dr. Evatt, which, under the guise of defending British justice, is merely pursuing a policy which it is hoped will yield considerable political dividends. It is true that there are many sincere Members of the Labour Party who, while being strongly opposed to Socialism, are genuinely concerned that no individual shall be treated unjustly. But it is the basest hypocrisy for Labour Members like Dr. Evatt to be claiming that they are really interested in British justice and individual rights. Apart from his attitude towards the Australia First Members during the war, and his attempted intimidation of leading Social Crediters like Mr. Eric Butler prior to the 1944 Referendum, Dr. Evatt was one of the principal architects of the infamous Palestine Partition which helped pave the way for the driving of hundreds of thousands of Arabs from the land they and their forefathers had lived in for centuries. This man should be the last to speak about British justice.

"Whatever plausible reasons he advances for his part in ensuring that the Federal Government cannot even make a limited attempt to deal with the Communist conspiracy—and we must emphasise the point that the Anti-Communist legislation by itself is quite inadequate—Dr. Evatt and his wholehearted supporters like Mr. Chifley, Mr. Pollard, Senator Morrow, Mr. Ward and others, are by their obstructionist tactics mainly serving the purposes of the Communists.

"The Federal Government has wisely accepted many amendments—in fact it introduced a great number itself—to its original Anti-Communist Bill. Most of these amendments have been designed to remove some of the dangers to which we ourselves drew attention.

"But Dr. Evatt is deliberately attempting to confuse public opinion for the amended Onus of Proof Clause. The issue is, to us, very clear: If the appropriate authorities have suspicions that a man is a Communist, they 'declare' him. However, if a 'declared' person enters the witness box and swears that he is not a Communist, the onus is upon the Crown to prove that he is. The same principle applies in ordinary criminal law. The police can charge a man with murder if they have reasons for believing that he is a murderer. But they must then prove a case or allow the charged

man to go free. They cannot hold a man indefinitely without proving a case against him. No loyal person need have the slightest fear of the amended Onus of Proof Clause in the Anti-Communist legislation; it is only the Communist who is concerned, because he knows that if the authorities 'declare' him, they would be happy to have the onus of proof made their responsibility by the 'declared' person entering the witness box and swearing that he was not a Communist.

"In opposing the Anti-Communist legislation to the stage where another Federal election becomes certain, Dr. Evatt, Mr. Chifley and other Labour leaders must surely feel that this election will not be fought solely on the Communist issue; that by the time the election is held—in the New Year of 1951 at the very earliest—the problem of rising prices will be so concerning the people that they can exploit the situation to their own advantage.

"Mr. Menzies political future—and the future of all of us—may therefore well be decided by what action, if any, is taken to defeat the inflation menace. If Mr. Menzies and his colleagues will only take constructive action in the immediate future to reduce prices, they will not only deal a smashing blow against the economic conditions which the Communists and Socialists are exploiting for their own evil purposes, but they will also ensure that, perhaps even without an election, the Labour Party will of political necessity be compelled to allow action against the Communist conspirators under the Anti-Communist legislation.

"We appeal strongly to all our supporters to make clear to all Liberal and Country Party members the points we have made in this article. Now, as never before, is the time for all genuine patriots to be up and doing; to insist that their Federal members declare themselves on the question of what they propose to do about inflation as part of a major assault upon the Communist conspirators."

### National Service

The total number of young men registered under the National Service Acts during 1949 was 303,600—all men born in 1931.

At September 30, 1949, there were 75,536 men whose call-up was deferred on industrial grounds (47,300 employed in agriculture, 20,000 in coalmining, 8,100 in the Merchant Navy and 136 in the cotton industry); this total included 28,200 men born in 1929, 32,437 born in 1930 and 14,899 born in the first half of 1931.

At the same date, there were 117,100 men whose call-up was deferred on account of apprenticeship or training for a professional qualification; of these, 34,300 were born in 1929, 52,200 in 1930 and 30,600 in the first half of 1931.

Deferments granted to students wishing to go up to Universities, technical colleges, agricultural colleges or similar institutions in October, 1949, numbered 7,957; in addition, deferment was granted to 618 graduates to undertake University courses of further study or post-graduate research.

The number of first applications granted for postponement of liability for call-up on grounds of exceptional hardship was 2,428, and the number of renewal applications granted was 754—a total of 3,182.

During the year, 597 men (about 0.2 per cent. of the total registered under the National Service Acts) were registered provisionally as conscientious objectors.

## Thought Provoking

(What follows is the editorial from *The Shuttlebox*, the quarterly Magazine of a textile factory.)

"Each quarter, marked by the appearance of *The Shuttlebox* and one's electricity account, is a milestone on the road we are travelling. Which statement leads naturally to the thought: What road are we travelling? And to where? Perhaps it isn't the place of an organ like *The Shuttlebox* to ask these deep and searching questions; but we are supposed to record progress, and to do that we need to know the aim of our own organisation in a general sense. For what object does it, or any producing organisation exist?

"That is a straight question, and it asks for a straightforward and simple answer, which is easy enough to give, though it may not be so easy to answer all the queries that rise out of it. A manufacturing plant exists in the very first place to produce wanted and usable goods—commodities, as they are called. That is not to say our firm doesn't serve other useful purposes, such as supplying the means of earning a livelihood to very nearly thirteen hundred people in what we hope are fairly happy circumstances; paying dividends to those who have adventured their savings in our enterprise; helping H.M. Inland Revenue Department by collecting insurance and P.A.Y.E. contributions, and even in promoting the Social and Athletic Club. But all those are secondary matters. Absolutely the first are the production and sale of all the various lines we make—Linen, Cotton and Rayon Household goods, and Furnishings of all kinds, Carpets, Children's Wear. So you see it is possible to talk of the aim of a business—the real object for which it exists—without mentioning wages, salaries or dividends. Because what we are producing, and are really interested in, is what the economists call the Standard of Living, and that, of course, includes not only linens and carpets, but eggs and bacon and leisure for bowls and gardening and tennis and books and everything else as well.

"Now this is a very clever age we live in, full of ingenious machines to help in production. And one would think that this Standard of Living should never be in any doubt. But it doesn't require *The Shuttlebox*, editorially-speaking, to remind you that that is not the case. No one today feels particularly secure as to his material future, quite apart from any threat of war. And this is so even in the United States where all the milk and honey seems to be accumulated at present.

"Why is it? The usual answer is that we're not working hard enough; at least that is what the shareholders and managements are in the habit of saying about the workers. While the workers complain that the managements, and the people who have saved a bit and invested it, are no better than drones and parasites. And the Government, alternatively, appeals to, and complains of everyone. We all say the trouble is—Nobody works. It would, perhaps, be nearer the mark to say—Nobody thinks. However, the net result, in spite of all our labour-saving machinery, is that output remains too small, and—what is worse—quality is not what it used to be. What is the reason for it?

"In order to answer that, or at least to suggest the direction in which the answer lies, we appeal to the sports lovers, and particularly to golfers (though everyone who wields a hammer, or a cold chisel, will know what we mean) and ask: What is the result if you take your eye off the ball, or off the head of the nail, or chisel? We know the

result is definitely bad, and that is in accordance with what are called the laws of nature. But have we any right to suppose that these laws don't operate in bigger things,—Industry, for instance? Isn't it likely that if we make the same mistake as the golfer, who takes his eye and his mind off the ball he has to hit, and looks ahead at the hole he wants to reach, or the bunker he has to get over to reach it, or even the cup on the clubhouse mantelpiece, to the winning of which all these things are preliminary, its effect will be the same? Bad golf; and bad golf means—no cup.

"Now bring your mind back from golf to industry, and try and see what is happening. Politicians, and economists, and Trades Union leaders, who are a sort of combination of the two, are continually asking us—directors, and staff, and workers; all those actually engaged in production—"to play the game." And when you ask them what the game is, so that we may know how to go about it and what is the first thing we need to do, they give the wrong answer. They don't say it is to produce goods; but they say it is to give work. The first plank, as it is called, in the political platform of all political parties, is Full Employment not Full Output. In other words, they maintain that the first object of a business organisation—ours, for instance—isn't to produce Household Linen and Furnishings, which are part of the general Standard of Living, but to provide employment to as many people as possible, and hand out pay-envelopes on Friday evenings.

"Now as a piece of practical advice, that answer is as bad as if a golf pro. were to tell you it didn't matter how you addressed the ball as long as you kept your eye on the green ahead. To argue that because what's in the Friday pay-packet buys the Standard of Living the result is the same, is as intelligent as to argue that this keeping of the eye on the ball is nonsense, because you'll get to the green anyway, even if it takes a few more strokes. But everyone can see that in terms of golf that is rubbish. If you don't play the game properly, keeping your eye on the ball, and get round in few strokes, you can't gain your object. And it's the same in the industrial game; without efficient and economical production the pay-packet may bulge with notes at the end of the week, but they can only buy the Standard of Living that the week produced. And if that was poor in quantity and quality—which is what is must be if our eyes are not kept on the ball—then the pay, however big it may appear to be, will be poor."

## Korea and Controls

"If there is considerable suspicion around that Korea is intended to be the grave of the American free economy, the fault is surely the Administration's. An Administration which has moved heaven and earth to bring about the adoption of all sorts of semi-socialistic measures and relies on the advice of Neo-Keynesian economists and soothsayers can hardly complain if some people smell a rat. The temptation to use the Korean war as a pretext for permanent changes in our economy is real enough, and there are plenty of planners in the Government departments who are eager to yield to it. There are also politicians who are not above making political capital from the widespread misunderstanding of the history of controls in wartime.

"Mr. Truman made at least a token resistance to the urgings of those who want Government control of everything.

Just the same, we suggest vigilance. Controls should be limited to those which are needed in this emergency, not merely reproduce those which had partial success in the different conditions of World War II. A time limit should be set on such controls as are needed, and their administration supervised by some sort of advisory council made up of men whose interest in controls does not include the desire to boss other people around or to "make America over" in the image of the countries whose dictatorial systems we are supposed to be against."—*Saturday Evening Post* (August 26).

### Waking?

"The question now is *how to expose* the paid traitors, get them out of the woodwork of our bureaucracies, businesses, schools and universities, our social life. They are far too powerful an influence to remain concealed. . . . We have the right and obligation to ask for *answers* to some long-unanswered questions. Who engineered the division of Korea and gave Russia the industrial half? Who put the jokers in the U.N. Charter that have given the Kremlin such an advantage? Who painted the conquest of Manchuria, then China, as merely a spontaneous agrarian revolt against land owners? Who delayed, sabotaged and effectively prevented the delivery of aid to the Chinese? . . . Who was and is behind the determined drive to smear MacArthur? The slimy trail leads back step by step.

"Who sold the Administration on the political nurturing of Reds within the Democratic Party—permitted their infiltration into every echelon and bureau of Government, Who has so effectively prevented their exposure again and again? . . . We can only conclude that *the one way to get the Communists out of Government and influence*, while we still have a government, is to retire the current misleaders and rely on the many able men in Congress, of both political parties, who should take over now. This is no time for softness or protection of anyone."—*Department Store Economist* (New York) (*Editorial*).

"It is a matter of grave doubt that the U.N. will be in shape to provide a popular sounding board for Acheson forensics. The descent of the prestige of that fraudulent international body is of roller-coaster variety. No one can overlook the popular indignation that other U.N. Powers have contributed no soldiers to help out troops in Korea. Also, not a few persons resent the official description of American boys as robots in a 'United Nations force' under a U.N. flag; instead of earning their battle-scars under the honourable designation of 'United States Army' and the banner of the stars and stripes. This spreading popular feeling derives nourishment from a growing bombardment not merely of the inadequacy of the U.N., but of its very existence.

"It is noteworthy that two prominent columnists, Dorothy Thompson and Frank Kent, who can by no manner of means be associated with 'isolationism,' are now attacking the U.N. in the most severe and injurious terms. Miss Thompson refers to it as a 'fraudulent piece of goods,' says that no one 'who has listened to its debates can conceivably believe that it promotes peace'; and invokes the sovereignty of the American people against the dangerous internationalism of the U.N."—*Not Merely Gossip* (Washington, D.C.)

### Reynolds and B.B.C.

"The B.B.C. last week barred a housewife from a non-political programme because the Housewife's League did not like her political views. On Friday night, a television variety comedy act was sprinkled with anti-government cracks and finished with the friendly suggestion that the Cabinet should be stuck in the 'ruddy Exhibition.' Strange ideas of 'Politics' are abroad at Alexander Palace."—*Reynolds News*, August 20.

### PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR

By C. H. DOUGLAS.

PRICE 2/- (Postage 3d.)

Obtainable from:

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

### BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

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

#### ALSO

Elements of Social Credit, 6/-.....	(Cloth Edition) 7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage...7/-	
Introduction to Social Credit	
by Bryan W. Monahan .....	5/- (cloth 8/6)
Human Ecology by Thomas Robertson .....	21/-
Odlum v. Stratton	
(Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Protocols of Zion .....	2/-
Communism in Action	
U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp. 1/6	
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans	
by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.