THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 29. No. 19. Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper. Postage: home 1½d. and abroad 1d. SATURDAY, JANUARY 3, 1953. 6d. Weekly.

Social Credit Secretariat

(Lectures and Studies Section)

Diploma of Membership.

In announcing a forthcoming Examination for Candidates for the Diploma of Associate of the Social Credit Secretariat in our issue of December 13, the Registrar forecast the institution of a new grade of Diploma, that of Membership.

The reason for such action is the desirability of providing a certificate of high competency, as tested by examination, without exposing the candidate to the necessity of expending considerable time as well as energy upon the preparation of a suitable Thesis, presentation of which is now the main requirement before an entry for the Fellow's Diploma is complete.

The following regulations have been adopted for the conduct of the Examination for the new Diploma (Membership):—

REGULATIONS

(1) Candidates who hold the Diploma of Associate may enter for the Membership examination at any time following their admission as Associates, a fee of £1 1s. 0d. being payable by each candidate to cover the cost of his examination. He will be examined at the earliest convenient time following receipt of his application.

(2) The Director of Lectures and Studies shall have discretion to admit, or to refuse, other candidates, who, if admitted, shall pay the examination fee of £1 1s. 0d.

(3) Examiners will be appointed by the Director, whose choice shall be not limited to Fellows of The Social Credit Secretariat.

(4) The Examination for the Membership shall consist of three parts: *viz*:

Part 1. The Economics of Social Credit (Two Papers).

Part II. The Politics of Social Credit (Two Papers).

Part III. *Viva voce* examination lasting one hour. If at any place not in the British Isles, this part of the Examination will be conducted by a nominee of the Director from written instructions respecting each candidate individually after marks have been allotted by the other examiners for his written paper work.

(5) Before admission to the Examination, each candidate will be awarded a Basic Mark, to be determined by the Examiners in the light of such information as is available, concerning the candidate's general competency in political action. The highest attainable value of the Basic Mark shall not exceed one quarter of the total marks obtainable for the whole Examination. Notwithstanding this provision, a Basic Mark of *non satis* shall disqualify the candidate to whom it is awarded from further participation in the Examination. He shall be so informed immediately, and his Examination Fee returned to him.

• • •

NOTE ON THE GENERAL PREPARATION OF CANDIDATES FOR EXAMINATION

No course of reading for the Examinations of the Section is prescribed.

In economics and politics, nothing which Douglas wrote should be neglected. Nevertheless, an ability to recite from either the economic or the political writings of Douglas does not by any means constitute a complete Social Crediter, who is at all times confronted with widely different and indeed incompatible opinions, the nature of which he must understand if he is to counter them effectively.

If even a superficial inspection is made of Douglas's work, it will be apparent that he himself constantly refers to a wide range of authors, ideas and facts, a wider range, at first sight, than the special matters of the political and economic life of modern society.

What is most remarkable is the certainty he displays in relating opinions of a widely divergent nature to their origins, historical and philosophical, and in exposing the exact nature of their bearing on what passes as current thought. To deal with even moderate success with current discussion and the conscious expression of the forces moving men in society, it is essential that Social Crediters should follow as closely as they can this high example.

At the dawn of the first year of our life without Douglas as a visible, tangible guide and support, these things are of great consequence, and from a correct assessment and presentation of them may depend the whole future of our cause. The whole ethics of intellectual and practical life is involved. Knowledge at second hand is a fantastic impossibility. Opinion is a wine that goes to the strongest head. In our make-believe society it has largely usurped the place of knowledge, and the intoxication it has produced peoples the gutters of the world. How much must one know?—Enough! It is never enough to recite a garbled account—even if one has the 'luck' to avoid the recitation of it to someone who knows it is garbled, where it is garbled, who garbled it, and why. It is dishonest to say: "This is what Rousseau meant," if you do not know at first hand what Rousseau said.

Certainly there is one, possibly there are several historical parallels for the dilemma in which we find ourselves. The Franciscan Order was founded by one who considered learning "more dangerous than useful." St. Bonaventura was five years old when St. Francis died (1226), but lived to become a great and subtle scholar and General of the Order. How broad is the 'hair which divides the false from the true?'—A hair's breadth. Is the separation between know-

(*continued on page* 8.)

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: December 8, 1952.

(The Debate Continued.)

British Employees (Immunities)

Sir R. Acland asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs how far British citizens employed in the United States of America at the United Nations organisation's headquarters enjoy full diplomatic immunity.

Mr. Eden: No British subject employed by the United Nations in the United States enjoys full diplomatic immunity, but the United States Government accords officers and employees of international organisations located in the United States such immunities and privileges as are provided under the relevant United States laws. The most important are exemption from United States income tax on official emoluments and immunity from suit or legal process in respect of official acts, though the exemption from taxation does not apply to American citizens.

Sir R. Acland: Would the right hon. Gentleman make it clear that in regard to British citizens so employed, no question of their loyalty can arise except their loyalty to the United Nations, and that there could not be any question of their special loyalty to the United States or to any other individual country?

Mr. Eden: I do not think there is anything in what the hon. Baronet has said to which I could take exception.

Mr. Donnelly: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that all the political tests being applied at United Nations, regardless of the individuals concerned, are undermining the feeling of confidence in the impartiality of the United Nations? Is he further aware that there is a strong body of public opinion in this country which thinks that if this sort of thing does not stop there should be some thought given to the transference of United Nations to some other country?

Mr. Eden: There has already been a carefully thought-out Question to which I gave a considered reply, and I would rather stand by that.

Genocide Convention (Ratification)

Mr. Janner asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs which of the Dominions have now ratified the Genocide Convention; and why Her Majesty's Government have not yet done so.

Mr. Nutting: Australia, Canada and Ceylon have either ratified or acceded to the Convention.

Her Majesty's Government have not yet agreed to accede to the Convention for the reasons explained by my right hon. and learned Friend on 19th May.

Mr. Janner: Is the Minister aware that no specific reason has yet been given and that it is a very important matter? Will he consult those present at the Commonwealth Conference to see why they ratify and, if possible, come to the same conclusion?

Mr. Nutting: This has been very fully explained before in the House, both by the former Government and by my right hon. Friend. The position is that Her Majesty's Government do not wish to ratify or to accede to the Convention until and unless they are absolutely certain they can give effect in their domestic law to all the provisions, and to the spirit of the Convention. That is the position of the Government. As the hon. Gentleman knows, many complicated legal and technical problems are involved. We wish to sort them out and to see whether we can legislate to fulfil our obligations before we accede.

Mr. Paget: Has the hon. Gentleman any information as to the intention of the Czechoslovakian Government with regard to this Agreement?

House of Commons: December 10, 1952.

Development Corporation Schemes

Mr. J. Johnson asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies how many schemes of the Colonial Development Corporation have been liquidated since the advent of the new administration in October, 1951.

Mr. Lyttelton: Five undertakings have been abandoned since October, 1951, namely: British Honduras Stock Farm; Seychelles Fisheries; South Atlantic Sealing Co., Ltd.; Keningau Cattle Ranch; British Somaliland Camel and Sheep Abattoir and Trading Investigation.

Mr. Johnson: Will the Secretary of State not agree, in view of our economic position, that it is more imperative than ever that we should employ the Colonial Development Corporation for these schemes? Can he give us an assurance that this Government are not weakening upon the policy of the Labour Government since 1945 in this respect?

Mr. Lyttelton: Nothing but damage is done to colonial development when schemes which do not turn out to be possible are undertaken, but I can give the hon. Gentleman the assurance for which he asks. . . .

Uranium Deposits

Mr. Dugdale asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies in what quantities uranium has been found in Northern Rhodesia.

Mr. Lyttelton: A workable uranium deposit has been discovered and exploratory work is in progress. I cannot disclose the quantities that might be available from this source.

Mr. Dugdale: Is it not a fact that it was stated that large quantities were available—stated, I gather, by a spokesman of the Colonial Office—and can the right hon. Gentleman verify whether that is so?

Mr. Lyttelton: I do not know what is in the ground. I cannot disclose the quantities of uranium, and it would not be in the public interest to disclose how much ore is available from this source.

House of Commons: December 11, 1952.

Convicted Persons (Nationality)

Sir R. Glyn asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will consider including in the compilation

of criminal statistics information as to the nationality of persons convicted, indicating how many have become British subjects or live in the United Kingdom as Stateless persons.

Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe: I will bear this suggestion in mind, but I am reluctant in present circumstances to ask the police to furnish extra information.

Mr. Anthony Greenwood: Can the right hon. and learned Gentleman give the House an assurance that he will avoid any action which might tend to produce anti-alien feeling? This is a most dangerous suggestion.

Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe: That is an aspect of the matter which my Department always has in mind.

Sir R. Glyn: Is my right hon. and learned Friend aware that the purpose of the Question was to try to show that it is not necessarily the fact that all the crimes are committed by British people.

Productivity

Mr. Osborne asked the President of the Board of Trade in what form the promised Government help is to be given to halt the fall in productivity, which has now reached serious proportions and must be altered without delay.

Mr. H. Strauss: Measures to improve productivity are, of course, primarily the responsibility of industry. The Government lend their support wherever possible, for example by the various incentive measures contained in the last Budget. The Government also support the British Productivity Council who are preparing a programme of work designed to increase national productivity.

Productivity (Dispossession Orders)

Sir W. Smithers asked the Minister of Agriculture, in view of the fact that about 50 farmers a year have been dispossessed since 1947, if he will give an estimate of the extent to which production has increased because of this action.

Sir T. Dugdale: I regret that no precise estimate such as my hon. Friend desires is practicable.

House of Commons: *December* 12, 1952.

Cutlery and Silverware Industries

Mr. Frederick Mulley (Sheffield, Park): . . . My purpose in the short time at my disposal is to try to state the main and serious problems facing the cutlery and silverware industries, to make some suggestions to help them and to endeavour to solicit the interest, sympathy and support of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade and the President of the Board of Trade. . . .

. . . Sheffield, a constituency which I have the privilege to represent, has a deservedly high reputation for craftsmanship and quality goods. The words, "Made in Sheffield" are a hallmark of quality recognised throughout the world, bringing credit not only to the city but to the country also. It is on the long and proud tradition of excellence of these industries over 600 years that this prestige is based. Craftsmen of Sheffield have striven to fulfil the two conditions of Confucius, who said:

> "How may I recognise a good craftsman? First by the reputation of his ancestors for honesty and sincerity; then by his ability to create something new with an experience that is old."

Today there is a grave danger—and I say this with a due sense of responsibility and without desiring to be dramatic—that these ancient crafts will die out and the industries be crippled beyond repair within the next ten years unless something is done. . . .

The position today is even more serious than between the wars. I quote from the "Sheffield Telegraph and Star" of 2nd December:

> "No marked improvement in the state of the cutlery industry has been recorded since September and the drift of operatives to other industries continues to be a worry.
>
> This summing up of the position in the cutlery trade was given by the Regional Commissioner of the Board of Trade today."

It is estimated that over 1,500 workers out of a total labour force of about 8,000 left the cutlery industry between May and September and many others are working short time. The earnings of those left in employment have been cut by more than half in most cases. The position in silverware is if anything worse. It is estimated that the labour force has been reduced by at least 25 per cent. and a further 50 per cent, have suffered from short time and unemployment.

Happily many of the displaced workers have found other employment, but they are lost to the industry for good. While I agree that a substantial re-shaping of our economy may be necessary, I cannot think that it is advantageous to kill industries which alone by virtue of their high craft standards can compete in any market and which in addition do so much to enhance the reputation of British goods. Well-made cutlery and silverware is a standing advertisement for Britain on dining tables all over the world.

The industries are already short of craftsmen and of the skilled workers at least half are over 60. In many cases men of 80 are still employed and when they leave their craft will go with them. Hand forging has almost gone. I should like the Parliamentary Secretary to look at this blade which I am holding and which I saw forged entirely by hand in a few minutes from a simple bar of steel. That process is almost dead in the trade in Sheffield.

I regret that there is no training apprenticeship schemes for cutlery, although the silversmiths have done excellent work in this direction in conjunction with the School of Arts and Crafts. This, together with the uncertain economic future, and the bad working conditions in many cases, as described in the Shimmin Report, is having a bad effect on recruitment. Indeed, the Cutlery Working Party is the only one of the many set up whose recommendations have been completely ignored. Not one recommendation has been implemented. Cannot the Board of Trade give a lead in training craftsmen?

The industries have suffered badly on account of the restrictions imposed on many export markets. For example over 50 per cent. of the exports went to Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. Can the Parliamentary Secretary give us any encouragement about negotiations to open up these markets? I am bound to say that while it is

(*Continued on page* 7.)

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. 29. *No.* 19. *Saturday, January* 3, 1953.

From Week to Week

Viscount Simon has moved and the House of Lords (December 4) has resolved "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty praying Her Majesty may be graciously pleased to allow that her undoubted prerogative may not stand in the way of the consideration by Parliament, during the present Session, of any measure providing for the creation of Life Peerages that may be introduced."

What difference, if any, there is between the signification of Lord Lansdowne's phrases in 1911 and Lord Salisbury's in 1952 respecting the necessity for this procedure, we cannot assess. "Preliminary concurrence" arising from the "respect we owe to the Crown," "it is indispensable that the Royal assent should be signified before . . ." (Lansdowne) and "It is merely part of the machinery of our constitution" (Salisbury) seem not entirely in the same key. If the average expectation of life of a "Life Peer" were only fifteen years, there would, at the rate of ten creations a year, be 150 such in ten years time.

• • •

"Policy is engendered in solitude; power in society." (*T.S.C.*)

"The total policy of a man is his *character*." (*Ibid.*).

As with the Jews, the behaviour which convention and *apparent* example enjoin for the advancement of contemporary individuals is misleading. No Jew believes in the current miscegenation theories preached to the Gentiles (Gentlemen). Churchill and Roosevelt do not live like Bernard Shaw and T. S. Elliot. Salesmen of ideas like Bernard Shaw and T. S. Elliot do not live like Benas and Berenson, and culture-communicators like Benas and Berenson do not live like Leonardo da Vinci and Douglas, or like Socrates and Aristophanes. Leonardo, Douglas, Socrates and Aristophanes lived differently from one another. Recall the opening sentence of Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* in an English translation—is it Maude's?—: "All happy families are alike. Every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way." We are not suggesting that the Leonardo-Douglas-Socrates-Aristophanes family is an unhappy family. It is not a family, and happiness is not the essential which unites or disunites it. The essential which unites its members is a connection each possessed with reality. All things that are real are real eternally: Eternity and Reality are, in some sense, synonymous.

In *The Clouds*, Socrates and Aristophanes were enemies, yet jointly the co-enemies of the ignorance of the Athenians. Aristophanes heaped ridicule upon the greater sage, that they both might heap a greater ridicule upon their common enemy —the enemy (*demos*) which in the end ordered the hemlock. Yet, there is not a vestige of a doubt countenanced by one of them—Aristophanes, Socrates, Douglas, Leonardo—how men *must* live (if they live at all). The path seemingly may have any constitution but Compromise. Compromise does not enter into it. So Leonardo, though his prescription is not the only one. But, for himself, Leonardo says, and in so-saying says for us all:—

"To the end that well-being of the body may not injure that of the mind, the painter or draughtsman must remain solitary, and particularly when intent on those studies and reflections which will constantly rise up before his eye, giving materials to be well stored in the memory. While you are alone you are entirely your own [master] and if you have one companion you are but half your own, and the less so in proportion to the indiscretion of his behaviour. And if you have many companions you will fall deeper into the same trouble. If you should say: 'I will go my own way and withdraw apart, the better to study the forms of natural objects,' I tell you, you will not be able to help often listening to their chatter. And so, since one cannot serve two masters, you will badly fill the part of a companion, and carry out your studies of art even worse. And if you say: 'I will withdraw so far that their words cannot reach me and they cannot disturb me,' I can tell you that you will be thought mad. But, you see, you will at any rate be alone."

(And of the same man it is said that, of all Renaissance artists, he was the one who "most enjoyed the world. All phenomena captivated him—physical life and human emotions, the forms of plants and animals, the sight of the crystal-clear stream with the pebbles in its bed.")

This much Leonardo knew. He seems to have known other things not so congenial to the Holy Spirit. If this also is so of Douglas, we have not discerned it. Until we do so, Douglas is before not after Leonardo from the Cinquecento until our day, and how long afterwards we do not know. The path, the Way, is for his followers as for him. There is but one Way. The diversities are illusory: traps for vanity, temptations, pitfalls, scandals. Legion and Demos are blood-brothers, Satan.

Meeting of Social Crediters

We are asked to say that Dr. Tudor Jones greatly regrets that he has been unable to rearrange his time-table at short notice to address a meeting of Social Crediters in London during January.

The projected open meeting of Social Crediters and their friends to which references have appeared here will definitely take place between March 30 and April 20, 1953. London, Cambridge, Hereford, Cardiff, Belfast, Edinburgh, Newcastle-on-Tyne and Liverpool are among the centres which have been suggested as a place of meeting. If it is discovered that suitable accommodation will be available there for those who require it, London will probably be chosen, unless there is widely-expressed desire that the gathering should last over several days.

The Late Mr. C. Marshall Hattersley

A telegram from Edmonton, Alberta, dated December 27, announces the death there after a heart attack on the evening of Boxing Day of Mr. C. Marshall Hattersley, the former Mexborough solicitor, variously stated to have retired to the Canadian Province to write a book and to have been employed in a legal capacity by Mr. Manning's Government. Mr. Hattersley visited England last summer,

The Stilwell Papers

(II) Comments on Roosevelt and International Politics.

(Continued).

by

DRYDEN GILLING SMITH.

For many years the English reader has been familiar with what has been called "the dumb-ox hero" of the Hemingway novels, the heroes who show great ability and patience in dealing with the *effects* of government policies on the personal lives of the sufferers, but who treat these effects as if they were the decrees of providence. They never seem to investigate or think about the causes of their troubles on the governmental level, or even admit that there is a human or variable element in the causes. One has tended to think of this as a shortcoming of Hemingway, an unwillingness on his part to risk the displeasure of the powers that be (with resulting decrease of sales) by completing the picture with a report, in his normal "realistic" manner, of the "human predicament" on the government level.

Stilwell's remarks on politics however are a vindication of the accuracy of Hemingway's "reporting" on a type of man who plays an important part in American life. Stilwell admits that he never asked awkward questions about political happenings, being content to deal with effects on the military level. The war however gave him repeated "dunkings" in politics. This frequent immersion enabled him to overcome his innate disposition to leave politics as a "mystery for initiates" somehow expected to be super-men. Once he became accustomed to looking at politics in the same matter-of-fact way as he had looked at strategy, he realised what utter pigmies were the Roosevelts, the Chiangs, the Hopkins, *etc.*, to whom nations were entrusting their strategy as well as their politics. The shock of the discovery was almost unbearable. The climax in the discovery, the Cairo conference, left him speechless. He could merely add "Draw your own conclusions" to a record of the level on which "world-shaking decisions" were really made, or should we say "announced."

The Stilwell Papers, apart from their interest as war history, beat the "realistic novel" at its own game. They are more "realistic," have even more "punch" in the style, and are more satisfying to read, because in them we see the "strong-man hero" acquire a degree of perception and awareness of the *causes* of "troubles," which he did not possess in the situations where Hemingway and others had observed him.

The comments which Stilwell makes after Cairo on his own reactions to politics in the past set in a clearer light the views of an important body of Americans.

Stilwell's ancestor Nicholas Stilwell emigrated to America in 1638. He is therefore of the early generation Americans. It has been observed that a common trait in these early settlers and their descendents was an extreme reluctance to deal with politics and politicians (the latter were often operating on a "religious front" at that time). At the same time they were prepared to face tremendous odds when dealing with "nature in the raw" or straightforward enemies like Indians. They were forced into politics, on the clear cut issue of a denial of their common law rights, at the time of the War of Independence. As Fathers of the American Constitution they have a better political record than any other group of men entrusted with similar powers in recent centuries. Given a milieu in which the principles of the English Common Law were generally accepted and a Constitution growing up on these principles, these unpolitical gentlemen found themselves for once at home in politics. With the swamping of the country by immigrants of a different calibre, the Civil War focussing attention on the emotional red herring of negro emancipation and away from the "great betrayal" (the abandoning of the national credit to the Rothschilds), the early generation Americans found political life once more intolerable and went west.

The fortunes of the Adams family are a good symbol of this disappearance of the 'old guard' from public life. Thomas Adams was already playing a part in the ordering and governing of New England in 1628. His descendent John Adams, a constitutional lawyer who gradually acquired the most complete set of English constitutional documents in America, dating back to the 12th century, became the first President after Washington. His son John Quincey Adams was also President and his grandson Francis Adams was Ambassador at the Court of St. James. But by the end of the nineteenth century the next member of the Adams family, Brooks Adams was writing "The Law of Civilisation and Decay." As one of the earlier Adams remarked the American Constitution provided the framework but needed the right people to make it work. Its founders, though eager to free themselves from the overbearing House of Commons that had usurped unconstitutional powers over the colonies, were reluctant to cut themselves off from the sovereignty of the English King and only did so after he consistently refused their petitions to dissociate himself from the measures voted by the English parliament. This afforded the greatest disillusionment to that group of men who attached more importance to the English constitution than the English themselves (or more correctly than the Whig oligarchy then representing England). The King failed them so they made no provision for a dynasty in America, though the House of Braintree (the Adams) was often tipped as a successor to the House of Hanover and did in fact fulfil that function—while the Constitution survived. Pound remarks ("A Visiting Card") "In five generations we have had a president, another president, an ambassador and two writers; and now one or two almost anonymous officials, absolutely outside public life—with the nation in the hands of the enemy."

This able and forthright minority found little place in the public life of America after the Civil War and even less after President Wilson inaugurated the Federal Reserve Board in 1912, conferring on certain financiers a monopoly of credit, giving them such power as made nonsense of the careful balance between the other powers of the constitution. Who was left to try to stop Roosevelt from showing his utter contempt for the remains of the Constitution, first by packing the Supreme Court and later by his quadruple term of office, to mention only two of his better known ignominies?

The men who had gone west, first to escape from the British and later to get away from the internationalists who had taken over in the east, tended to blame the two bogeys

simultaneously, and as a result often identify them both as a single source of trouble. Stilwell, for example, sees Roosevelt pursuing a policy that is contrary to American interests and in the early stages at any rate presumed that this was a British policy, that Churchill had Roosevelt in his pocket. Patriotic British critics object to Churchill's having been in the pocket of Roosevelt, and having pursued an American and not a British policy. Should the British and Americans who put their national interests before the games of their internationalist leaders compare notes more effectively, they might find a means of dealing with this alien policy which is being forced on both in the name of the other. To prevent such contact every effort is made by the internationalists (or whatever) to brand the old guard patriots as "Anti-British isolationists" and at the same time to provoke "anti-British" sentiment by using "help for Britain" as a slogan to camouflage "un-American activities."

Stilwell's views on the internationalist easterners who have replaced the old guard in public life is unequivocal.

"DECK-HAND DIPLOMAT. A brief experience with international politics confirms me in my preference for driving a garbage truck. This is admittedly not the proper approach to the matter of international politics. It is a very serious business. A lot of big figures indulge in it, and a host of little ones trail along. Those who make the grade are of course interested to dignify and even glorify the profession, which can be done in a wink of the eye by using the term 'diplomacy'—a word we usually utter on a hushed respectful note. The term 'diplomat' to the average American usually evokes a vision of an immaculately dressed being—pin-stripe pants, spats, cutaway, and topper— and a coldly severe and superior manner which masks the lightning-like play of the intellect that guides the Ship of State, moving the pieces on the board with unerring precision, and invariably turns up in Washington without his shirt. Or rather our shirt. . . .

"It is very confusing to a deck-hand to be pitchforked in among this class of people, especially if he is a military deck-hand. . . . My introduction to the game of international politics was in the Orient. The first shock of immersion is severe, but rapidly passes over, due to the numbing effect of repeated dunkings. I had batted around China, Japan, the Philippines, the Dutch Indies, Indo-China, Siam and Malaya somewhat, but had always watched the show from a back seat in the balcony. This was my first opportunity to go behind the scenes and observe some of the headliners without their grease paint and other trappings, and I ran into many things back there that are not visible from the front." (The editor of the Stilwell Papers here states that this undated paper—included among the reflection on the Cairo and Teheran conferences—was never finished.)

Other statements on politics develop from the diary and letter entries on the result of the Teheran conference. "Stalin dominated at Teheran. He laid it down and they took it . . . we were lucky to get away with our shirts. . . Our Big Boy doesn't seem too interested in us. . . . Human nature being what it is I am still playing a lone hand. The day of the giants is gone and most of the biggest statues have clay feet. I don't care for the guy who greets me as 'Joe' and reaches for a knife when I turn around."

"Our fundamental conception of this game is wrong. . . We forget that as the richest nation in the world we are a standing temptation for chisellers. . . Playing international politics is much like playing poker. To make it remunerative, all you need in a fairly large group of contestants is one sucker, especially if he has plenty of dough and is sensitive to insinuations about his sporting blood. . . He can easily be induced to play table stakes, with real money in front of him, while those among the other contestants who have forgotten to bring their pocket books can write I.O.U.s on little pieces of paper and pass them over in full confidence that they will end up in the fireplace." The analogy also fits the suckers who have been playing with the British Empire as their stakes, or the landowners dispossessed by internal I.O.U. merchants, who pretended that their "promises to pay" were as real as the land they were playing for.

"A little more realism is the medicine we need, and we have a good example in the case of Russia. Have you noticed how they do it? There you have the direct approach. When they want to get an idea across, instead of saying, "Accept, dear Mr. Ambassador, my sincere hopes that the present harmonious relations between our two great nations will long endure," *etc., etc.,* they simply say, "If you don't throw those troops out of Shinegazabo right now, we will have to throw them out." Regrettably crude, perhaps; remarkably effective, however. Remember that gem of diplomacy that settled a knotty little problem of Japanese encroachment in Siberia? The message read: "If you Japs don't keep your pigs' snouts out of our garden, it will be too bad." The Japs needed no interpretation by the protocol boys to tell them just where they stood.

"I am not proposing that we assume a truculent or belligerent attitude; I am merely proposing a readjustment of mental attitude on a basis of realism, because, after all, life is real, life is earnest." The editor of the English edition who writes the second introduction finds it necessary to apologise to the potential English reader for the fact that Stilwell tended to take his job too seriously "in true American fashion." Though not so intended this is more a comment on the milieu of the English editor than on Stilwell.

A final comment by Stilwell on diplomacy: "I once took my family out for dinner at the San Diego Club and told them to order what they wanted. The youngest boy,

Ben, six years old, at once said, 'Roast Duck.' That seemed a little heavy for his age so I suggested cream of wheat. He leaned back and said, 'Duck.' Then the family pitched in and suggested some nice spinach, or some vegetable soup and mashed potatoes. He said, 'Duck,' once more without budging. I made one more attempt, to which he answered 'Duck,' so I then wiped the perspiration off my brow and ordered duck. He had never heard of Joe Stalin, but he knew the technique. He'd make an excellent Secretary of State but for the fact that he's going to be a doctor."

PARLIAMENT— (*continued from page* 3.)

true now that North America is the only free market, and that in the United States we have to contend with tariffs against us up to 244 per cent. *ad valorem*, with some honourable exceptions, the manufacturers have not shown such enterprise in promoting exports, and in advertising and publicity . . . .

. . . To a large extent the export efforts of both industries are hampered by, and the dearth of craftsmanship is due, to the Purchase Tax especially at the 100 per cent. rate, which is outside the control of the industries. I know that this is a matter for the Treasury but, as the Minister is responsible for these industries, I hope that at least he will press these considerations upon the Treasury and succeed where so far we have failed.

Time prevents my developing the general case for the abolition of Purchase Tax on cutlery and table silverware, though I am convinced that the case can be proved most emphatically. I want to plead for a slice rather than for the whole loaf and to ask that at once consideration be given to reducing the 100 per cent. rate to 33⅓ per cent. In my submission there is no need to wait until the Budget. The interests of the industry and the Treasury are at one in this matter. Sheffield would get more work and, indirectly, more exports, and the Treasury would get more revenue.

The surprising feature is that, although maintaining this tax, the Treasury have no idea of the revenue derived from it. No figures can be produced. It is playing blind man's buff with the national finances and ducks and drakes with the industries to continue a tax of that sort: I can only touch on the case today, but full memoranda have been sent by the trades and myself both to the Treasury and the Board of Trade. Of course, we should be only too delighted to send more if required.

Receipts from Purchase Tax generally on cutlery and silverware have dropped substantially. From the returns of 115 firms, it can be seen that for the quarter ended in June last the figures were 32 per cent. down compared with the previous year, and for the quarter ended September last they were 42½ per cent. down. Those figures are based on the 100 per cent. and the 33⅓ per cent. rates combined. Some idea of the 100 per cent. rate and its consequences can be gauged from the returns of the Sheffield Assay Office. During the year ended June, 1947, they assayed 927,000 ounces. In 1952 they assayed only 386,000 ounces, and during the last six months they assayed only 151,000 ounces. There is no shortage of silver. Its greater use would economise in the use of scarce nickel which is required for E.P.N.S.

The 100 per cent. tax is also killing two valuable ancillary trades, pearl cutting and ivory cutting. Whereas before the war nine firms were concerned with pearl cutting in Sheffield, now there are only three. The absurd feature of the 100 per cent. tax on mother of pearl and ivory is that for the most part the scales used by the cutlers are waste and can be used for nothing else. From one pearl shell three or four essential compass dials required for the Services may be obtained. The rest, except for buttons, can be used only for items which carry 100 per cent. tax and which are therefore unsaleable. The addition of pearl or ivory scales—waste material worth, say, ninepence—adds 100 per cent. to the entire wholesale price of a pocketknife.

The impossibility of home sales means that there is no hope of training craftsmen to perform these highly skilled processes. It also restricts the range of designs which the industries can offer for export. It is an urgent matter for the future of these industries that this 100 per cent. Purchase Tax should be reduced immediately. . . .

. . . The other matter is the question of the Copper, Nickel and Zinc (Prohibited Uses) Order, which is having a crippling effect in the E.P.N.S. hollowware section of the silver industry. Again, I think the Parliamentary Secretary will know something about this, because, in addition to having received correspondence, he has had representations from the trade, in which it is felt that there is a very strong case for the removal, or at least the drastic modification, of this Order, in particular since I understand that both copper and zinc are much more readily obtained now, although the position regarding nickel remains difficult.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Henry Strauss): . . .The silverware industry, of course, is mainly concerned with nickel silver, which is an alloy of all three metals, copper, zinc and nickel, and nearly all its products, except spoons and forks, fell under the prohibitions.

I am glad to tell the hon. Member that supplies are now better. The restrictions on the use of zinc were removed in August last and those on copper have now been removed. I have just signed an Order which will revoke the zinc and copper Prohibited Uses Order with effect from next Wednesday. A parallel Order is being made by the Ministry of Supply. There will then be freedom in the use of copper and zinc, but the restrictions on nickel will have to be continued. Even for nickel, however, minor relaxations in the operation of the control Orders are proving possible.

The hon. Member will have seen the Press announcement this week of two modifications in the licensing procedure under the nickel Order. These apply to all industries. One will allow nickel silver products of lower conversion value than hitherto to be made for export and so allow manufacturers to increase somewhat the range and scale of their production. The other will permit the use of nickel silver in certain circumstances in the manufacture of medals and other small Coronation souvenirs. My Department is also considering, in consultation with the silverware industry, whether it would be possible to make other

changes that would help that industry in view of its peculiar dependence on the use of nickel silver. . . .

. . . The 100 per cent. Purchase Tax is, of course, an important matter for the silver side of the industry. As the hon. Gentleman recognised, that is a matter for the Treasury; he has had some correspondence with my hon. Friend the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, and it will not be necessary for me to take any steps in that direction except to say that I will see that what the hon. Gentleman has said this afternoon is considered by my hon. Friend. . .

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT—

(*Continued from page* 1.)

ledge and ignorance but a hair's breadth? It makes no difference how wide it is: the breadth of a hair or a yawning chasm. The disaster is as great and final if you pride yourselves on your ignorance as on your learning. No learning is necessary to preach by example. Until Social Crediters receive the grace to labour, they are denied much opportunity to preach by example. So they need to be equipped, and while a necessary part of their equipment may be (and is) a full realisation of the truth of the Augustinian warning that the essence of Sin is to convert to use what is meant for enjoyment, and likewise to convert to enjoyment what is meant for use, fictions can neither be used nor enjoyed. We have said before that there is no limitation set to the accomplishment of any one but the limitation which he himself sets. Everything, every objective, which the imagination exactly envisages is attainable, *almost* instantly. But, as Douglas told our friends in the North of England, if you want to go to Edinburgh and board a train going to London, you don't get to Edinburgh. "Ask and it shall be given you." But you must *ask*. People don't.

The diplomatic service of the Social Credit movement needs staffing. Did you ever hear of a successful diplomat who had acquired his knowledge of the country to which he was accredited from the newspapers? Or his knowledge of his own? Don't read newspapers. Don't read compilations, certainly not such as Trevelyan's or his namesake's, Maccaulay's. Girls and boys in their teens are nowadays mastering the elements of Jurisprudence and more than glancing at the original sources inside a dozen weeks. Charged with the higher wisdom of Social Crediters, that is a month's work. Jurisprudence? Yes—Immanent and non-immanent Sovereignty. The adjective may not be used; but the principle is discussed. How could it be otherwise? Law has been the concern of mankind for a million years.

International Trade

It has been pointed out repeatedly that under the present financial dispensation, international trade is little more than a racket run for the benefit primarily of the institutions financing exports. Many people, while studying Social Credit, start puzzling their heads about export and import finance and generally get their minds thoroughly muddled. Many a promising student of Social Credit has given up further thought because of the complexity of this subject. At present it is put continually in the forefront of the economic scene, instead of being relegated to its proper place, the wings of the stage.

A general consideration of what might happen even now if the exchanges were not 'rigged,' or what would happen in a Social Credit economy, should help those who are puzzled. In the following example all except essentials are omitted.

Let us assume two neighbouring countries are both on a Social Credit economy. This assumption means that neither country is anxious to have what old style economists call a 'favourable' balance of trade, *i.e.*, more wealth going out of the country than is coming in. Let us assume that Blueland has Crowns as its currency and Redland has Sceptres. (In Great Britain the currency is Pound Sterling.)

Blueland has a surplus of articles *X* and Redland of articles *Y*. They decide to exchange some of their surpluses, which is international trade.

Owing to the peculiarities in each country, of labour, raw materials, industrial assets, *etc.*, article *X* is normally priced in Blueland at 100 Crowns and in Redland at 120 Sceptres. Similarly *Y* is priced respectively at 8 Crowns and 5 Sceptres. In tabular form it looks like this:

	Blueland	Redland
Value of one *X*	100 Crowns	120 Sceptres
" " " *Y*	8 "	5 "
Therefore the comparative values are:	cost of 12.5 *Y*'s = cost of 1*X* in Blueland	cost of 24 *Y*'s = cost of 1*X* in Redland

After some negotiation the two countries decide to exchange 10 *X*'s for 180 *Y*'s. Translated into money the position is now as follows:—

Blueland gains by import	180*Y*'s worth	1440 Crowns
Blueland loses by export	10*X*'s worth	1000 "
	Net financial gain	440 "
Redland gains by import	10*X*'s worth	1200 Sceptres
Redland loses by export	180*Y*'s worth	900 "
	Net financial gain	300 "

It will be seen that in the example both countries make a profit. It depends on the internal set-up of each, who benefits, whether the bankers, the importers, or the consumers.

The example may seem complicated to some. The transactions are however intelligible, which is more than can be said of the racket we suffer from today, export at all costs, particularly the consumer's.

H.R.P.

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