

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 27. No. 15.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.  
Postage: home 1½d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1951.

6d. Weekly.

### From Week to Week

The Pilgrim Fathers, a hundred in all, left England because they were huffed by even the Protestantism of James I. "Lifting up their eyes to heaven, their dearest country," they crossed the Atlantic. Disease engendered by hardship carried off half their number, and "some fifty men, women and children remained alone on that rugged and ironbound coast, to form a nucleus for the New England of the future. For ten years little addition was made to their number. Some few came out to join them. Others occupied the most promising positions round, to fish, to trade with the Indians, sometimes to plunder and cheat them." (Gardiner).

The English Reformation was brought about by men "who start upon an entirely new principle, and who strive to realise an ideal society *which commends itself to their own minds*. They answer, in short, to the Whigs and Radicals of modern political life." It seems that the characteristic of the Whig, as of the Puritan, is that he cannot envisage Authority excepting as something inorganic, in the case of the Puritan a book (the Bible); in the case of the Whig a book also (the Statute Book) or a 'body' dependent wholly upon it (the Senate).

Lord Radcliffe has explicitly dissociated himself from the 'mediaeval' notion that there is such a thing as Authority, to be distinguished from 'the authorities' (the powers-that-be); and note how fixed is the idea in his mind: he contradicts himself expressly to underline it:— "Thus an American can know that he has certain individual rights which stand above ordinary laws: things which he cannot be made to submit to by any law. Some of these rights. . . . The principle has arisen, . . . but in the result it has produced the most effective barrier against encroachments of power that has been thrown up by the political science of the modern world. For it has not proved a mere parchment barrier. Statutes that violate the limitations of the Constitution are not bad laws: they are not laws at all. They are not laws that still have to be obeyed, even if with protest or resentment: they are words that can be ignored with impunity. *It is the mediaeval doctrine over again—a supreme law that overrules the law-making of men—but with the written words of the Constitution in place of the uncertain theories of Natural Law. I must not make it too simple*" (sic). Is the passage nonsense, or is it an assertion that Natural Law must subordinate itself to 'the written words of the Constitution,' and, if this is (legally) effected, there is no great harm after all in that absurd mediaeval doctrine?

We have asserted that Social Credit is, in one aspect, a technique for the establishment of the correct relationship between Power and Authority. We add that no other has been proposed throughout the Christian or any other centuries. If Power and Authority are interchangeable terms, as they are in Lord Radcliffe's manipulation of them, there

is, of course, no need for the establishment of a correct relationship between the things they represent. But the state of the world, the fruit of the Whig vine, shows that there is such a need.

• • •

What a *Truth* reviewer understands by "the patterns of international finance which have yielded world power to its practitioners" may be something very different from what we understand. We cannot, therefore, warmly second or coldly discourage his advice to Mr. Douglas Reed to 'give his brilliant mind to an analysis of these activities,' although, with the reviewer, we notice that he studiously avoids a study which might lead him our way.

• • •

A topic of discussion in financial circles is the unprecedented failure of the recent capital issue of Unilevers. The total offered was £14,000,000, of which the underwriters have to carry £13,000,000. That is, of course, all new money. Naturally the price rapidly fell to 96 in an attempt to unload onto the public. We hear whispers of even larger infusions of credit into our tottering economy—all at the wrong end of the production system. "Where is the money to come from?" is not asked if it is to make work.

• • •

The *Church Times* returns with reluctance to the subject of Masonic services held in Christian churches in its issue for November 30, and, in addition refers editorially to "a letter circulated to the clergy in the diocese of Chichester during the recent proctorial election, and an open letter from the candidate concerned to the Grand Master of the United Grand Lodge of Masons of England. The correspondence speaks for itself. But attention may justly be called to the fact that the reason suggested by the Dean of Battle for withdrawing support from Dr. H. S. Box is that his alleged attack upon the members of a Society (which he himself knows cannot reply in full), may prejudice the appeal for the increase of clergy stipends. It is incredible that motives of this character should be voiced. Unfortunately, there are known instances where unworthy action of this kind has been set in motion against individual clergymen, who refuse to seek membership of the Craft. But Dr. Box has launched no attack. He has asked for an investigation of fact and dogma. Is membership of the Christian Church compatible with such allegiance? Neither he, nor this paper, is concerned to attack Masonry, as such, nor its members as individuals. It is a matter of allegiance and of conscience, and must be decided in that sense."

The newspaper prints both letters in full. Mr. Box's

is as follows addressed to the Earl of Scarborough at Freemason's Hall:—

"My Lord,

"May I venture to lodge a word of very friendly protest against the un-Masonic conduct of the Right Worshipful Provincial Grand Master of Sussex, the Very Rev. the Dean of Battle, in most irregularly intervening in the proctorial election for the diocese of Chichester?

"Although not standing for election himself, he has seen fit to circularize all the electors with an attack upon myself. He lacked the courtesy of including me on his mailing-list, but several clergymen have already written to me saying how much they deplore this intervention, which has only increased their suspicions that Freemasonry is afraid of being subjected to an authoritative investigation on theological grounds.

"I am communicating the text of this letter, together with the Dean of Battle's circular, to the Press.

"I remain Your Lordship's obedient servant,

H. S. BOX.

"The Vicarage, Scaynes Hill,

"Haywards Heath, Sussex.

"26th November, 1951."

## PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: November 19, 1951.

### NATIONAL INSURANCE

#### Retirement Pensions

*Mr. Stephen Swingler* asked the Minister of National Insurance if he will introduce legislation to amend the National Insurance Act for the purpose of providing an optional old-age pension of 10s. per week without a retirement condition.

*The Minister of National Insurance (Mr. Osbert Peake)*: No, Sir; I am not aware that there is any general desire for an option of this kind, which would run counter to the provision for old age made in the recent National Insurance Act.

*Mr. Swingler*: Will not the Minister consult with the Chancellor of the Exchequer about this, and is not he aware that the Chancellor suggested this measure in the Conservative Party's programme in 1950? Is this to be another case of broken pledges?

*Mr. Peake*: The hon. Gentleman will observe that this proposal found no place in my party's proposals in the year 1951, and second thoughts are often best.

*Mr. Sydney Silverman*: Without regard to the amount, can the right hon. Gentleman say what useful purpose is served, in these days of a general manpower shortage, in having a retirement condition at all?

*Mr. Peake*: That is a much wider question than the one on the Order Paper.

### National Coal Board (Policy)

*Mr. Charles Grey* asked the Minister of Fuel and Power what is His Majesty's Government's policy in regard to the structure of the National Coal Board.

*Mr. Geoffrey Lloyd*: The primary responsibility for making such changes as may be needed from time to time to secure the best organisation of the industry rests with the National Coal Board. The newly constituted National Coal Board are actively engaged in an examination of the organisation and have already taken some steps which they believe will be helpful. Further measures to strengthen and encourage local initiative and responsibility are, I understand, under consideration.

Any major measures that the Government might at any further date think necessary in the national interest would only be taken after full consultation with those concerned.

I should like to make it clear that it is not the intention of the Government or of the National Coal Board to revert to District Wages Agreements or inter-district competition.

*Mr. Grey*: Is the Minister aware of the deep suspicion existing in the minds of the miners about the Government's attitude to the structure of the National Coal Board, and the general feeling that they are going to be let down by the party opposite? Do I take it that the party opposite have abandoned their idea of decentralisation? If so, may I ask if the Minister or his party will withdraw from their party manifesto their references to decentralisation?

*Mr. Lloyd*: Not at all. Not only is my reply quite in tune with the Conservative manifesto, but it is also in tune with the statement of the right hon. Member for Leeds, South (Mr. Gaitskell) when he introduced the amending Coal Industry Bill, in which he said:

"All the time there is a movement in favour of and in the direction of more decentralisation down to the area level. There is no dispute about that. The National Coal Board is quite clear on this point and I can give an assurance that it will continue."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 29th November, 1948; Vol. 458, c. 1752.]

*Colonel Alan Gomme-Duncan*: Does not my right hon. Friend agree that if there is any doubt in the minds of the miners it must have been placed there by the Socialists?

*Mr. A. Woodburn*: Is the Minister aware that this statement will clear the minds of the Scottish miners particularly, who suffered very greatly under the old system of district boards and who certainly would refuse to go back to them?

*Mr. Lloyd*: Yes, Sir. I do believe that hon. Members in all quarters of the House will realise that my statement will clear the minds of a great many miners on this point, and I hope that hon. Members in all quarters will do their best to further it.

*Mr. Nabarro*: Is it not a fact that certain structural changes in the Coal Board's administration will be very welcome to the National Union of Mineworkers, and that they have on many occasions pressed for this in the last Parliament?

*Mr. Swingler*: Will the Minister confirm his assurance by saying that when he states that the Government will only sponsor measures after consultation with those concerned "those concerned" include the National Union of Mineworkers?

*Mr. Lloyd*: Certainly, Sir, and also the National Coal Board and other professional organisations in the industry.

### Council of Europe (U.K. Delegation)

*The Prime Minister (Mr. Winston Churchill)*: I desire,

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, to make a statement. The Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe will meet at Strasbourg on 26th November. I have appointed 18 delegates from the United Kingdom. The distribution of the appointments between the parties is nine Members of the Conservative Party, eight Members of the Labour Party, and a representative of the Liberal Party. The appointments of the Labour and Liberal representatives have, of course, been made on the basis of nominations by the leaders of those parties.

My right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Liverpool, West Derby (Major Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe), the Secretary of State for the Home Department, will be the head of the delegation. My hon. and learned Friend the Member for Northwich (Mr. J. Foster) will be the deputy head.

The others will be: from the Conservative Party, my hon. Friends the Members for Preston, North (Mr. J. Amery), Aberdeenshire, East (Mr. Boothby), Armagh (Mr. Harden), Devizes (Mr. Hollis), Lancaster (Mr. F. Maclean), Windsor (Mr. Mott-Radclyffe), and Aberdeen, South (Lady Tweedsmuir).

From the Labour Party, the right hon. Gentlemen the Members for Belper (Mr. G. Brown), Colne Valley (Mr. Glenvil Hall) and Smethwick (Mr. Gordon Walker), and the hon. Gentlemen the Members for Sheffield, Hillsborough (Mr. G. Darling), Lincoln (Mr. de Freitas), Hull, Central (Captain Hewitson), Edinburgh, Leith (Mr. Hoy) and Faversham (Mr. P. Wells).

From the Liberal Party, the noble Lord, Lord Layton. Substitutes have been appointed to act for the delegates when they are absent from Strasbourg.

*Sir Herbert Williams:* Can my right hon. Friend say whether these delegates have had any instructions, or will they merely express their private views at Strasbourg?

*The Prime Minister:* In this as in so many things there is a happy combination of private views and national or party politics.

### Foreign Affairs

*The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Anthony Eden):* . . . What, then, is the present position? It is that the great Persian oil industry is almost at a standstill and the economic position of Persia appears to be deteriorating seriously and rapidly. Now, Sir, it is necessary that I should make plain certain factors about the position of His Majesty's Government today. We are grateful for the untiring efforts of our American friends to find, in discussion with Dr. Mossadeq, a basis on which negotiations can be resumed. We, too, are concerned at the growing deterioration in the internal conditions in Persia. We have a long tradition of friendship with that country, and its independence and prosperity must always be a first objective of British foreign policy.

. . . Let me make it clear, meanwhile, that His Majesty's Government are ready at any time to resume negotiations for the settlement of this painful dispute. Its continuation benefits no one. I think it might be of assistance to all who wish to see such a solution if I state now what we regard as the essential elements of a satisfactory solution. They

are three, and none of them is inconsistent with the principle of the nationalisation of the oil industry in Persia—none.

First, and most difficult of all, there is what I call "practicability," and by that I mean that Persia's economy cannot be assured unless the oil industry can be efficiently operated in all its stages. This applies to the fields themselves, to the refinery, and to the selling organisation as well. For instance, no company—I do not care of what nationality—could commit itself to take over the distribution of oil products to the markets of the world unless it was satisfied that the supply of oil from the fields and the manufactured products from that refinery would be forthcoming over a period at the right time, in the right quantities and at an economic price. That is, I say, the most difficult of all practicabilities.

Second, the benefits of the Persian oil industry should be fairly shared between Persia and those concerned in developing her oil resources. But this distribution must be such as to permit the price of Persian oil to be competitive in the world's markets. It must, therefore, have some relation to the terms generally prevailing in other countries. Finally, fair compensation must be paid for the act of nationalisation and its range of consequences. The amount of compensation should be settled by agreement or by arbitration; it cannot be settled by one party alone.

I do not accept that it is really impossible to work out an arrangement which takes account of these three elements. At any rate, we certainly do not despair of doing so. It is, therefore, our intention to continue to seek, in the closest consultation with the United States Government, a way by which a solution may be found. Though I raise no hopes in this business, I do not yield to despair.

Finally, I think that maybe a word would not come amiss at this moment about the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company. It is when a lot of hard words are said about people that one ought perhaps to look at the other side occasionally, and it is fair to say that, without the initiative of this Company, the oil industry in Persia would never have developed to anything approaching its present size; nor could it possibly have commanded the world markets on which the industry depends now. This has been a prodigious achievement.

Much can be said about the division of profits. There is a lot I could say about my thoughts in years gone by, about who has been greedy, and so on, and who has taken too much out of the industry in the past. But it remains true that it was the receipt of the large oil revenues which enabled Persia to contemplate the financing of an extensive seven-year plan for economic development. It is also true that under the supplemental agreement, which the Majlis itself failed to ratify, Persia's revenues from the Company this year would have been increased to between £40 million and £50 million, which is approaching the sum which they are now asking the United States Government to give them or lend them—there is not much difference, probably, between the two expressions. That is all I have to say on that, except that we shall continue in our efforts to find a solution.

Now about Egypt. I observe that the Egyptian Prime Minister, a few days ago, accused us of preferring violence and of having recourse to brutal force rather than choosing peace and admitting the facts. That is not true; it has never been true. We fully understand that Egypt should demand a

(continued on page 8).

## 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. 27. No. 15.

Saturday, December 8, 1951.

### Power and Authority

A University (Liverpool) which is about to take the last step in the reversal of the meaning of Education, as it has been understood since at least the days of Cicero, by refusing its questionable benefits to all but the physically fit ("fit for work"), has just elected the Most Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury, K.G., its Chancellor. Unprecedented pageantry, even the motley train-bearing page not omitted; fanfares "for a dignified occasion;" "Conservatism" regenerate in the speeches; even the Whig, Trevelyan, muttering that "Mass production might be necessary in industry. It is fatal in education;" *Marcia Eroica*.

*The Times* had a scrappy paragraph. *The Liverpool Daily Post*, which might have been expected to give the new Chancellor's address in full, omitted his reference to the Constitution, but gave enough to disclose to a discerning reader that the Constitution is a topic of conversation in high "Conservative" circles. For example:—

"What, he asked, was the right balance between liberty and authority in the modern world? To those of his own generation the events of recent years, with the decay of liberal institutions and the growth of totalitarian government, had caused a sense of deep disillusionment.

"They had been brought up in the faith that the solution of the age-long conflict between liberty and authority had at last, been found in the device of parliamentary democracy; that the main cause of the evils of past history was that power vested in the hands of a dictator, or a small ruling class often actuated by personal ambition or other unworthy motive, and that the cure was a transfer of power to the broad masses of people, who were essentially moderate and peaceable.

"It was perfectly true that the ordinary citizen of any civilised country was of a peace-loving disposition, but the fact remained that the advent of what was called the 'century of the common man' had coincided with the two most catastrophic wars in history, and gone far to abolish free institutions in wide areas of the world.

"What had gone wrong with the calculations of our fathers?

"As he saw it, . . . ."

Shorn of irrelevancies, Lord Salisbury saw the subordination of the group to the individual as the subordination of the individual to the group; yet blithely continued:

"The decay of political liberty, so apparent in international affairs was deplorably visible also in the internal affairs of many so-called civilised countries; but, though

political liberty was threatened, the character of the threat was entirely different.

"In the international sphere the danger arose from the fact that individual nations were too strong, whereas in internal affairs it was the community that was too strong and imposed its will too ruthlessly on the individual."

Are these men merely makers of speeches suitable to the occasion, or are they, as they claim vicariously if not directly to be, 'doing their best'? It is a poor best. We have lately, though largely ineffectually, tried to draw the attention of our own adherents, of Major Douglas's adherents, to the persistence, even in themselves, of forces derived from *gnosticism*, and we have defined that word as well as we can through the mouths of experts. Some of them (our adherents) have persisted that they are 'authority.' We are not, and they are not. But there is Authority, separate from and overriding Power; and this Authority the World (which cannot give, and cannot take away) denies, and is denying with overprotestation at the present time.

We link this observation with the 'paradox' of the Marquess of Salisbury's words in the assertion that there is afoot an evil determination to set the mind of living men against the truth that Power and Authority are distinct and different Persons of the Trinity, though One. Not Power, but Authority is of the Father. No state, of Nature or of Society, can persist, which does not obey. Only Authority is Eternal.

Like Lord Radcliffe, upon whose broadcast addresses we have commented, the 'Central Office' is determined to confuse this issue. It will look anything in the face which does not entail a revision of the heresy, a repudiation of the heresy, that Power and Authority are identical: that Authority is incapable of transference—even to it. They claim it as their own, as James claimed the Divine Right as *his* right. The wheel has turned full circle.

As was remarked after the ceremonies at Liverpool, it is a pity that, being willing, at last, to touch on fundamentals, our 'leaders' are incapable of saying the right things about them.

Frankly, we deem them not incapable, but resolved. They are staging a 'discussion,' to prepare for a predetermined end.

T.J.

## THE MONOPOLY OF CREDIT

By

C. H. DOUGLAS.

The Revised and Enlarged Edition published in 1937 is again on sale.

12/- net.

"The standard literary instrument for the correct information of the public concerning the technical aspects of Social Credit"—*The Social Crediter*.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

We are publishing the following article, whose author is the distinguished Chairman of the Scottish League for European Freedom, in view of the great importance of the subject, and, of course, without endorsement of his strictures on the views of our esteemed contributor, Captain Arthur Rogers, O.B.E., to whom we shall afford the fullest opportunity for reply, should he so desire.

### The Russians, the Bolsheviks and the U.S.A.

In the issue of *The Social Crediter* of 8th September there is an article by Arthur Rogers with the above title. Where the writer obtained his history and his "facts" it would be interesting to know; at least they accord very little with truth.

As to Kerensky, his position can be clearly stated in much less space than is allotted to him. He was a small politician before the Revolution in Russia, who, after the fall of the Russian Empire, made himself Prime Minister in July, 1917, and, after the most futile Russian sway on record, and after letting the Bolsheviks in, fled from them in November of the same year, and eventually turned up in the U.S.A., where he has been living in safety ever since. If unsuccessful as a statesman, he or his confederates seem to have the power to charm the dollars out of the pockets of the ever generous and muddle-headed Americans. He appears to have behind him very large sums and the more or less tacit support of the State Department and the sinister powers behind that institution. Recently he turned up in Germany, and, according to himself, has succeeded in "amalgamating" the "five Free Russian Organisations," whoever they consist of, and now, with American money, has set up a powerful radio station in Germany from which he and his tools propose to broadcast to the "Russian peoples" in the U.S.S.R. In the U.S.S.R. there are 70 odd million Russians in their ethnic territory, but apart from these there are no Russian peoples; there are, however, 180 million non-Russian peoples in their ethnic territories hating all Russia stands for, and has always stood for, and that is not Tsarism, Bolshevism, Kerenskyism, Communism, nor anything but Russian Imperialism. It is that which is and has always been the enemy of civilisation and the seeker after world conquest.

Here I would like to quote a more sound authority than Mr. Rogers.

"The Czars of Russia had the instinct of conquest from the reign of Ivan the Cruel; they employed artifice and violence by turns, and succeeded with rare ability in augmenting their territory at the expense of their neighbours. It was under Peter the Great, however, that Russian policy first assumed that decided and stable character which it has retained to this day.

"All the objects which Russia pursues unceasingly, with indefatigable perseverance—amounting to nothing less than the subjugation of the greater part of Europe and Asia—were already conceived and designated to his successors by Peter the Great. . . . The impulse which his iron will gave to the nation still continues, and by an extraordinary concourse of circumstances, Russia has come alarmingly near to the attainment of his object without Europe having succeeded in stopping her. Internal difficulties may have from time to time retarded her progress, but the spirit of Peter still hovers over his Empire, and his pitiless ambition

still lies at the bottom of every Russian heart." The italics are mine.

The foregoing is not a bit of anti-Russian propaganda of any of the non-Russian peoples in the U.S.S.R. The words are taken from the Memoirs of Prince Adam Czartoryski, a member of the Russian Imperial Court, an intimate friend of the Grand Duke Alexander, a confidant of the Tsar Paul, and a Russian Ambassador. He lived from 1770 to 1861, and his Memoirs were published in 1888.

I think it very possible that a "cavass of Russian exiles discloses a marked inclination to favour a restoration of the monarchy." In fact, I am sure it would, as your contributor's "émigrés" are apparently a counterpart of the French émigrés who escaped from their country at the time of the French Revolution and took refuge in Britain. During their exile they learned nothing, and, after a lapse of time they ventured to return, expecting to find the France they left, with themselves in their old privileged position. They had lost touch with reality; so have Mr. Rogers's émigrés. No wonder they favour a restoration of the Monarchy! I think my authority is somewhat better than your contributor's—it is my own.

Between the two wars my professional work took me journeying some thousands of miles in Soviet Russia, far from the tourist or distinguished (more or less) visitors' track. I lived for months in innumerable peasants' homes as one of themselves for periods of a day to a week. As a Scot, my own instincts are all almost fanatically monarchist; in all of Russia that I saw, and in the conversations I had with innumerable Russians, I did not find the slightest trace of a desire for the return of any kind of Tsar. They had various reasons, but a very general and simple one was that, at the time of the Revolution, Lenin told the peasants to murder the landowners and aristocracy and seize the land, and they carried out his suggestions whole-heartedly. Certainly Lenin meant from the first to take it all back again (as he did), but they did not know that, and it did not alter the fact of what they had done and for which they naturally expected vengeance if the "émigrés" ever came back. Their descendents have been brought up with that belief, inculcated not only by their parents but by the Bolsheviks.

The non-Russian peoples in the U.S.S.R. unanimously repudiate the right of Kerensky or any other Russian to speak for them; none has any objection to them or anyone "freeing" the Russian people if they can, when the "freed" can adopt any kind of Government they like, but what they object to is any attempt by these Russians to "free" them.

As to the monarchists' policy being a "land-owning peasantry, and true freedom for the workers," that was certainly not the case under Tsardom, and ever since the time of Prince Andrey Boholubsky in the Twelfth century there has been in the Russian Empire no such thing as "law and truth, faith and faithfulness." Had there been, why has it from that time been necessary for Moscow to deport or massacre millions of those they subjugated? For these two political methods did not originate with the Bolsheviks—they are naturally Russian. Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great, Catherine, Suvarov were not Communists or Bolsheviks or Kerenskyists, they were simply Russians. Among countless atrocities, Ivan drowned 60,000 helpless civilian men, women and children at Novgorod; Peter deported hundreds of thousands from Ukraine in the far south to St.

Petersburg in the north to build his new capital in the marshes of the Neva, knowingly sending these people to their deaths from hardship; it was he who inflicted the seven years "Great Wrath" on peaceful Finland when he attacked it, seven years of massacre and torture which make these fine people shudder to this day; it was Peter whose general made a complete waste of peaceful little Estonia and was able to send the message to his master that "not a cock crew nor a dog barked between Lake Peipus (the boundary between Estonia and Russia) and the Baltic;" it was the Russian Chancellor who instructed the Russian general to cut off the noses and ears of any Estonian who could be caught, and for seven years those Estonians who escaped murder had to live in caves like wild beasts; it was Catherine who drowned 30,000 Cossacks (again men, women and children) in the Black Sea; it was Suvarov who, sent to pacify Poland, sent the message to his sovereign that "peace reigned in Warsaw," having massacred the people and destroyed a great part of the city. Russian "peace" is and has always been the peace of death.

As for the monarchists' promise of land, justice and so on, the well-known couplet seems to apply:—

When the devil was ill the devil a saint would be;  
When the devil was well the devil a saint was he.

Mr. Arthur Rogers's statements about the Ukrainians is a most extraordinary travesty of facts and history. I wonder who is "the person of no political importance who has, at the best, a negligible following." I happen to have the most intimate knowledge of the Ukrainian Resistance Movement and all its leaders, and I know that the Movement has behind it the support of the entire Ukrainian nation of over 40 million people, the largest in Europe next to the Germans. How otherwise could that resistance have been maintained through the years in spite of the most terrible reprisals and atrocities by Moscow? Nor, unless it is a national movement, would Moscow have found it necessary to deport or destroy by direct murder certainly not less than 10 million Ukrainians—by shooting, by planned famine, by the introduction of vile diseases and the prevention of help by the Red Cross.

I think the most extraordinary statement is that the Ukrainians are Russians, with all the added force of your contributor's italics, and that the Dukes of Kiev became Dukes of Moscow and the progenitors of the Emperors of All the Russias! Where did he get this?

To compare a nation of 45 million people in its relation with Russia with the people of Devon or Cornwall in their relation with England is too silly for further comment.

The Ukrainian Resistance Movement is not a thing of today or even yesterday. While Ukrainians have always opposed Muscovite domination, the present Resistance Movement began as long ago as 300 years, and has never ceased. At the opposite pole from the Muscovites (the proper name of the "Russians"), with their unbroken slave mentality, the Ukrainians have, from the beginning of their recorded history, and that is centuries before the Muscovites emerged from their dark forests and marshes round Moscow to the half light of nearby civilisation, the Ukrainians were noted as a freedom-loving people, prizing the ideals of honour and freedom, of human dignity, chivalry, warfare and a fanatical love of fatherland.

The present Resistance is not foreign "intrigue," nor

"banditry," nor "separatism," nor anything but the centuries-old struggle to win back freedom and independence to the Ukrainians, to live their own lives, as different from that of the Russians as night is from day. They have paid an appalling price in human life and suffering but still the struggle goes on. Ukraine is a nation, with its own geographical area, its own population, its own history, culture and traditions, going back many centuries before the Muscovites became known to the West.

The idea of the union of all Ukrainians with the great and progressive Kievan State received, in its abiding state, its greatest impetus in the reign of Volodymyr the Great, as far back as 981 to 1015, and gained strength till it reached its zenith in the reign of King Daniel (1202-1264), when Ukraine extended from the Dnipro to the Carpathian Mountains. There was almost again the realisation of a United Ukraine during World War I, and with clear-sightedness and mere honesty on the part of Britain and France, there could have been no World War II, Russia would not have been in the heart of Europe, and we would not today be spending thousands of millions in defence measures, and suffering the heaviest taxation and one of the lowest standards of living in the world. With worse to come.

In its early recorded history, we find that Ukraine, under the name of Rus, with Kiev not only as its capital but as the capital of Eastern Europe, became an independent State in the 9th century. In the end, it will be noticed, that Russia not only stole the territory of the Ukrainians, but their ancient, historic name.

Kiev was totally destroyed by Prince Andrey Bogolyubsky in 1169, and the political and cultural life of Ukraine removed to western territories, where a new and powerful Ukrainian State emerged, uniting all Ukrainian principalities and extending to the Black Sea.

The Tartar invasion of Eastern Europe in 1240 played a decisive part in the complete estrangement of the Muscovites from Ukraine-Rus. The Muscovite rulers humbled themselves before the invaders and married their daughters, and maintained that attitude for 200 years. The Western Ukrainian State resisted the Tartars and kept them from invading Europe, where their resistance was so vital that the Pope called Ukraine "*antemurale Christianitatis*" in recognition of its services in saving Europe from the Tartar horde, while the Muscovites grovelled before it.

The ups and downs of Ukrainian history are too long for this article, but it may be mentioned that, exhausted by wars with more than one adversary who envied the rich natural resources of Ukraine, its Hetman, Khmelnytsky made a Treaty of Friendship with Moscow by which it was to retain the character of a sovereign State in every respect, including the right to conduct foreign policy. This Treaty of Pereyaslav was concluded without the approval of the Ukrainian people and Khmelnytsky regretted it as soon as he had signed it, for, from that time, the Russians began to encroach on the provisions of the Treaty, to occupy the country with their armies, and to curtail Ukraine's autonomy. Completely disillusioned, Khmelnytsky looked for other allies, and planned a great union of Sweden, Lithuania, Ukraine, Moldavia and Transylvania, which would have ended both Muscovite and Turkish aggression, but before it could be concluded he died, in 1657. He was the real founder of the Ukrainian Liberation Movement which

has gone on to this day. Unfortunately, he had no successor of equal calibre.

Coming to the time of Peter I, the real founder of the Russian Empire, that Empire was founded by an Ukaz in 1713. Up to this time his State was known as Moscovia, and he was known to other rulers as Tsar of Moscovy. It was now he stole the ancient name of Rus from Ukraine, renamed his country Russia (Rossiya), and his subjects Russkiye. Rossiye had been the name given by the Greeks to the ancient Kievan State, and by this action Peter attempted to adopt for Muscovy the history and traditions of Kiev, the Mother of the cities of Rus, and also to deny the existence of the Ukrainian people as an independent nationality. In the three Partitions of Poland (1772/95), Peter seized the parts of Ukraine and White Ruthenia which had been under Poland. Constant wars went on between Russia and the Ukrainians, but we must pass on and lead up to the present day.

A large part of the Tsar's armies was composed of non-Russian peoples in the U.S.S.R., and it was to them that the success of Lenin's Revolution was due, not to the actual Russians, who had comparatively little to do with it till it was all over. The mass of these, with their age-long slave mentality, were not the material of which active revolutionaries are made. The bait held out to the non-Russians in the armies was the sovereign independence of their countries Ukrainians, Balts, Georgians, Turkestanians, Cossacks, and others, and, when the Revolution was accomplished he told them all to go to their own countries and set up their own Governments which they all did. It was merely typical Russian hypocrisy, for, as soon as the new Red Army was trained and equipped by Trotsky, he attacked and invaded all the States in turn, beginning with Ukraine, which was therefore the first country to fight Bolshevism.

It should be said here that both Britain and France had recognised the independent State of Ukraine, the latter in an effusive Declaration dated 11th, January, 1918 by General Tabouis, the French representative. The British equally unequivocally recognised the restored Ukraine at the same time, and, to quote their representative, Sir Picton Bagge, "My Government has charged me to assure you of its best intentions. It will support with all its strength the Ukrainian Government in the task it will undertake in creating an efficient administration." This was plain enough. But what happened? Hypocrisy and double-dealing would not seem to have been confined to Russia.

When the Red Army attacked the Ukrainians the latter could have defeated it decisively, and expected at least moral support from the West. But, by this time, Russian "White" armies had been organised in a quite hopeless attempt to restore Tsardom, and Britain went back on her pledged word and supported the "Whites" under General Denikin, who, instead of confining himself to the Reds, joined in the attack on Ukraine. France acted even more heinously, and the French navy in December, 1918 landed troops on the shores of the Black Sea. A Polish army had been equipped and trained in France under General Haller to fight the Bolsheviks, but, seeing the prospect of rich booty, this army also attacked Ukraine and so helped Bolshevism to its ultimate victory. Ukraine is one of the richest countries in the world in natural resources, and, not to be out-done, Hungary, Rumania and the Czechs all attacked

Ukraine. The result, the defeat of Ukraine standing alone, was a foregone conclusion.

As from that time till today, there was no coherent policy among the Western allies, while Moscow knew exactly what it wanted and kept steadily towards its goal, while Western resistance fizzled out.

Contrary to Mr. Rogers's statements, Germany did not back the Ukrainian Movement. It is true that, when Germany attacked Russia in 1941 and marched east, the Ukrainians, like all the peoples from the Baltic to the Black Sea, welcomed the invaders as liberators. When the Ukrainians realised they had come as conquerors, they at once set about organising resistance, not at the time when a German defeat was on the horizon, but when Germany was at the peak of her power, and they fought the Germans till they had to retreat from Ukraine and had much to do with Hitler's ultimate defeat.

I have never believed in the Russian people's detestation of the regime, or that there is any possibility of their rising against Stalin. They have never been a free people. The children, from the time of understanding anything, have had instilled into them the worship of Stalin, "the Great Father and Teacher of All Mankind," but so have their young parents.

The far-and-away best book about the present situation in Moscow that I know of is "Moscow Close-Up." It was published recently, and is by a member of the staff of *British Ally*, the newspaper published till closed down last year by the Soviet, published in Moscow by the British Embassy there. The writer is an experienced journalist and observer, and he has no belief in a rising against Stalin. The latest opinion of all of any value was published only a week or two ago by a member of the delegation of the Society of Friends who went to Moscow on a "Peace" mission. He thinks that reliance on a revolt of the *Russians* against Stalin or the regime is a dangerous illusion, and he does not believe that the Russians feel themselves oppressed, whatever we may think about it. I agree with these two views and disagree with Mr. Rogers, and I may add that my experience of the Russians was that no one had yet plumbed the depths of hardship they would undergo without noticing it.

So the *Russians* need not be expected to revolt or to support the schemes of Mr. Rogers's friends, but it is a different matter with the non-Russian peoples in the U.S.S.R. As for the dismemberment of Russia, no one wishes to dismember Russia, the non-Russians only want, not separatism, but the restoration of the freedom and independence of which Moscow deprived them by violence or fraud. As for outside support "playing directly into the hands of the Red dictatorship," the very opposite would happen. Probably the majority of the men of the Red Armies belong to the non-Russian States. We know that they are very well aware of the position in their various countries, and if they were assured beyond doubt that freedom would be restored to them they would find means of reaching and fighting for their homelands. And the Red Army would disintegrate. And there would be a prospect of peace and security in the world which will come in no other way. What the Russians would do then is their own affair.

It may be news to Mr. Rogers that, in the last year or two, large numbers of Russian "émigrés," especially from France, have found means of getting back to Russia, where

their admiration for Stalin's success in still further extending the Russian Empire is much greater than any antipathy to his regime. What becomes of them whether they are welcomed or shot, I don't know, but I would think the former.

One could go on exposing the woolly-mindedness of Mr. Rogers and his friends and knock down their Aunt Sallies without any difficulty.

In these days, when India, Burma, Indonesia have received their freedom, and when we are frantically seeking to push freedom on to half-savage Africans, can we find any justification whatever for the imposition of an atrocious rule by a minority, savage in the extreme, atheist and without a redeeming feature, on a huge majority of peoples with centuries-old traditions of democracy, culture and religion, differing in every respect from their oppressors? Surely not.

Mr. Rogers tries to fasten Nazism and pro-Germanism on the Ukrainians. In actual fact, while the Germans occupied Ukraine, they not only stole the stocks of food and left the people to die of starvation, but they committed terrible atrocities. Here is only one, but it is typical.

On July 14, 1944, at Malyn, in the Province of Dubno, the people were driven by force into the wooden church and burned alive. Those who could find no room in the church were driven into the former village hall and into barns and burned too. In all 850 people perished and their shrieks were heard as far away as three miles.

Can anyone, even Mr. Rogers's "émigrés" believe that the Ukrainians are pro-German?

I agree with Mr. Rogers when he says "Such displays of ignorance are now so frequent as to be dangerously misleading."  
JOHN F. STEWART.

#### PARLIAMENT.

(Continued from page 3).

place of equality in any treaty instrument which is concluded with her. But in passing, I might observe that to give an ally facilities on one's own soil is not necessarily derogatory to one's own sovereignty. If that is so, this country is doing precisely that thing now.

However that may be, the House will recall that in 1936 we concluded a Treaty of 20 years' duration with the Egyptian Government. I myself signed that Treaty for this country and Nahas Pasha, the present Prime Minister, signed it for Egypt. Nahas Pasha publicly welcomed it with great enthusiasm. I remember that very well. So much did he welcome it that it is the only occasion on which I have ever appeared on a postage stamp side by side with him. It was an Egyptian postage stamp. I do not know what has happened to all those postage stamps now.

But we do not hold to the position—and our predecessors did not hold to the position—that this Treaty can in no circumstances be revised. Indeed, the Treaty itself provides for revision. What we have said, however, and what we repeat, is that it cannot be denounced by one of the parties to it. We are quite prepared to supersede the 1936 Treaty with a new joint arrangement, to which a number of Powers would be parties. We offer Egypt equal partnership in that agreement, a partnership which would involve her in no more derogation of sovereignty than we have accepted in our joint Western defence plans.

Let us be quite clear what our offer means. Though the Treaty runs till 1956, we are prepared to revise it now and to substitute for it a mutual arrangement between the four Powers and Egypt on full equality. If Egypt does not wish to be associated with us alone, here surely is an opportunity for a wider partnership with the United States, Turkey and France, as well as with ourselves. Despite all that has been said and done, the four-Power offer to Egypt remains open still. I hope that wiser statesmanship will yet prevail. Meanwhile, His Majesty's Government have no choice but to maintain their position in the Canal Zone, basing their rights to do so on the Treaty of 1936, and that is what we intend to do.

There is another aspect of the question which is important to Egypt and to all the States of the Middle East. I refer to the Middle East Command, in which the United States, France and Turkey are joined with us, and with which Australia, New Zealand and South Africa are in close and cordial association. We hope that the States of the Middle East as a whole will realise the over-riding importance to themselves and to the free world of these defence plans and will work with us and with the other Powers who are associated with us to give them effect.

The Arab States and Israel were informed of the offer made to Egypt, in order that they might be aware of the proposals which were in the minds of the four Powers for the defence of the area to which they belong. Egypt, unfortunately, rejected the offer summarily, without even consulting the Arab States at all. I learnt, when I went to the Foreign Office, of some fears which the Arab States were expressing that association with a Middle East Command might prejudice their independence and their freedom of action. Nothing could be further from the truth. . . .

The four Powers ask no more of Egypt in the base which they wish to maintain there than has been asked of Britain and freely given. Is it too much to hope that wiser counsels will prevail and that the chance of building up a defensive system on terms of full equality between us and our Allies will not be thrown away? That is all we seek. I know that the Arab States have begun to understand this message. I hope that Egypt will understand it, too. If so, she will find us ready and willing to work with her. But there is this warning which I must utter. If any conversations between us are to have a chance of success, the terrorists' activities against us in the Canal Zone have got to be called off. . . .

(To be continued).

### THE REALISTIC POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By

C. H. DOUGLAS:

(Postage 1d.)

PRICE EIGHTPENCE.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LIMITED, LIVERPOOL.

Published by the proprietors, K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2.  
Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton.