

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 30. No. 16.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: home 14d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, JUNE 13, 1953.

6d. Weekly.

Elizabeth II and The Second Elizabethans

(Concluded.)

"Now you've had your bread and circus games! Back to your kennels!"

So *The Times* the day after the coronation: ("The British people have had a holiday long enough . . . 'A new Elizabethan Age' is in danger of becoming an incantation, a magician's hey presto! . . . Present ease is being subsidised by future penury . . . The British people are a good people grown careless.")

"If strain of incantation wild
"The shuttered doors (*) elude,
"And wafted on the breezes mild
"Seems in thy brain renewed,
"Thine eyelids close, thy head incline,
"With reverent finger trace,
"Upon thy breast, O brother mine,
"The sign invoking grace."

There must be monopoly even of incantations, and the surprisingly prompt leading article from which we quote must not be taken to inveigh against all wizardry. *The Times* itself has given countenance to the New Elizabethanism. Its public disclaimer, however, serves to allay apprehensions in Mond-Turnerist quarters that the hope springing eternal in even a Little-British breast may provoke too energetic a disposition devoted not to building more factories for producing unwanted and (financially) unsaleable gadgets, but to establishing a genuine New Order of society.

The Times was not alone—far from it. But there was another note, concerning which the best we can say at this moment is that it was, and will remain unless it can be brought to give more than passing attention to the fact underlying Douglas's criticisms of the working of the financial system, in that state and condition of which it was said (and this also by Douglas) that Evil will always prevail over good so long as it monopolises understanding of its tools. If however confirmation were needed of our thesis that the battle is at last joined, and that in the unparalleled public spectacle of the coronation currents of epochal force and depth were revealed to be contending for mastery, the forthright article on Sovereign Prerogatives in the first "Coronation Supplement" of the *Daily Telegraph* would supply it, viz.:—

"The Commons have clipped the Lords, and possibly paved the way in due time to the worst excesses of single-

party government. In an imaginary crisis, only the royal prerogative—affirming and supported by law—stands as bastion against dominance by a clique or individual in a single Chamber.

"The Queen may still reject a Bill, and she may still dismiss a Minister or a Parliament, thus offering the electors a chance to express their second thoughts.

"Even if we thought well to strip it of its ancient glory and high romantic spell, though in no sense is that conceivable, the Queen's prerogative remains as it were a communication cord in the cause of liberty—not indeed to be pulled improperly, but rather to be retained against its rightful purpose, which is a crisis within the realm."

The same newspaper it was which mentioned that the embroidered white kid glove presented to and worn by the Sovereign signifies "gentleness in levying taxes." (We agree that what would to us be sadistic, fantastic and unnecessary, would without doubt be the cooing of a dove to the ogreish *Times*.) The forces in which Social Crediters are interested are converging. On the one hand there is the clear intention to carry the policy of super-production with enslavement and control as its twin objectives to a conclusion—the All-the-World-a-Factory-Elizabethan-Age: Mond-Turnerism in hose and doublet. On the other is a progressive reorientation towards the sort of society which would be a worthy objective of the willing co-operation of individuals.

What are the distinguishing features of a 'Great Age'? Do 'Great Ages' share with Great Men that characteristic which led Lord Acton, for example, to say that all great men were evil men? What are the distinguishing features of a social order which does not bear within itself not only the seeds of its own destruction but the seeds of inevitable and accelerating advance towards human extinction! Let all these questions be answered with at all events a sufficiency of precision to enable us to recognise what objective it is that we entertain and what compass-bearings we can take to assess the direction of our course—towards the goal, or away from the goal—, what instruments are then available to resist the unprecedented compulsion under which men in society labour to go or to be swept away from their common objective?

This last question defines the predicament of Social Crediters not only at the present critical moment but ever since the close of the last military phase of the revolutionary struggle in society. Over and over again Douglas defined the issue and the strategy to be pursued. Many summaries

(*) Doors of the Lodge.

of this are possible, but the most comprehensive and that most directly relevant to present opportunities was that enjoining us to clarify the content already existing in confused manner in the minds of those who ventured to occupy themselves on any level with the social and political question. Yet always to do so not with assumed or borrowed suggestions of superiority, but with certainty or not at all. Among the freakish uncertainties of the present, one thing is certain: the world never in its long history had less use for freaks and cranks. One might deduce so much, if the objective evidences were not universally present, from the all-but complete dominion of the prescribed and fostered—the almost absolute authority of functionalism as the sole permitted activity and interest of men in society.

Now, whatever we may think of the Darwinian bias of Jung, which perhaps colours his ideas as well as his expression of them, (we are not arguing the point), or the consequences of functionalism, on the modern tendency towards, the impulsion towards, functionalism, and on the connection, hidden, strong and unbreakable between functionalism and the disorders of society as well as of the individuals composing it, scarcely anyone has ever written so copiously, so authoritatively or so usefully from our point of view as Jung. Yet it is not, perhaps, Jung but the poet Schiller, whom he quotes from a relatively inaccessible work (*Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen*: a collection of letters addressed by Schiller to the Duke of Holstein-Augustenburg), who gives clearest expression to at least one aspect of this matter. He says:—

“And with the sphere into which man confines his operation, he has also made unto himself a ruler; which fact not infrequently results in the suppression of his other faculties. Whereas, in the case of the former, the luxuriating power of imagination makes a wilderness of the laborious plantations of the mind, in the latter the spirit of abstraction consumes the fire that should have warmed . . .” etc. “When the commonwealth makes the office or function the measure of the man, when of its citizens it does homage only to memory in one, to a tabulating intelligence in another, and to a mechanical capacity in a third; when here, regardless of character, it urges only towards knowledge, while there it encourages a spirit of order and law-abiding behaviour with the profoundest intellectual obscurantism—when, at the same time, it wishes these single accomplishments of the subject to be carried to just as great an intensity as it absolves him of extensity—is it to be wondered at that the remaining faculties of the mind are neglected, in order to bestow every care upon the special one which it honours and rewards?” Jung comments: “The favouritism of the superior [superior because of its greater differentiation] function is just as serviceable to society as it is prejudicial to the individuality. This prejudicial effect has reached such a pitch that the great organisations of our present day civilisation actually strive for the complete disintegration of the individual, since their very existence depends upon a mechanical application of the preferred individual functions of men. It is not man that counts, but his one differentiated function. Man no longer appears as man in collective civilisation; he is merely represented by a function—nay, further, he is even exclusively identified with this function and denies any responsible membership to the other inferior functions. Thus the modern individual sinks to the level

of a mere function, because this it is that represents a collective value and alone affords a possibility of livelihood.”

Jung asserts “The time will come when ‘the cleavage in the inner man must again be resolved,’ that the undeveloped may be granted an opportunity to live.”

Who is to resolve it? We do not know. What we see is giant shadows cast upon a screen. Some are the shadows of friends of man; some of man’s enemies, yet even they are themselves the shadows of men. This screen should not separate us from the combatants, and it is a flaw in the characteristics of ourselves if it continues to do so. Not as suppliants, nor yet as instructors, but on level terms we should be at the side of those whose movements we see thus projected, and only a false psychology prevents the development of certain means to attain this partial objective.

Liberation by Social Credit

Points from the address given by M. LOUIS EVEN, Director-General of Social Credit in French Canada, to the Front Universitaire de Montreal on April 21, 1953, are as follows:—

Plainly, the full meaning, bearing and importance of the propositions of Social Credit cannot be grasped by listening to a one or two hour lecture. They are indeed logical and rich in humanism; but very different from the conceptions of finance now generally recognised, or, rather, accepted without inquiry.

Moreover this study, as all science, requires at least some time and much application. It must also be approached with an open mind, and not merely to confirm a conclusion made beforehand.

Nor must any particular measure be singled out from among the Social Credit propositions, to consider the possibilities of its application within the present financial system. Nothing is more sure to falsify the issue.

For instance: a periodic dividend for everyone, without tax; the lowering of prices without loss to the producer; the automatic financing of production without inflation; all these are manifestly incomprehensible if one aims to realise them without first making a major change in the manner of issue and cancellation of money, and in the monetary policy of the distribution of product. To the fish which has always lived in water the notion of flying through the air must have all the characteristics of cloud-cuckoo-land; but the bird sees the thing differently.

The study of Social Credit is complicated by the fact that neither Social Credit, nor anything approaching it, has ever been applied, nor even put to the test, anywhere. Thus, there can be no question simply of explaining or interpreting experiments already made. We are concerned with the investigation of what is possible in an economy which does not exist, and of which there is no instance in history—of a possible system of economics—which admits of no other limitations than those set by the nature of things themselves. Properly to make such an inquiry it is necessary to disregard the economic world we know and to re-think the basic propositions of finance, economics and above

all of the philosophy of economics. For Social Credit is a return to reason and to the integration of means and ends, now severely strained by the economic system.

FUNDAMENTAL POSTULATES

It is impossible to understand the substance of Social Credit if certain principles, certain fundamental postulates which underlie all social credit theory, are not first admitted. The Social Credit literature presented to French Canada comes back many times to these postulates. To mention no more than a few:

1. The earth and its riches was created for all men. For all without exception. So, every living human being should be able to obtain a share at least sufficient for his needs of existence. To refuse him this share is to refuse him the right to life.

A system is human or inhuman in the measure to which it facilitates or makes difficult to each man access to these goods.

2. Means must be subordinated to ends, and not *vice versa*. Instances:

Economic activity has for its end the satisfaction of human needs. It is to this end that all the economic apparatus must be ordered, including finance.

The end of industry is to furnish goods, not to give employment or work. Industry is most efficient when it makes more goods with less human labour.

The end of industry is *not* to finance the buying of the goods. Industry no more exists for salaries than for profits. Profits and salaries concern it only as means, as stimulants to mobilise producers.

3.—There is also a jurisdiction of functions. The function of production is discharged by industry (manufacture, agriculture or others). The function of distributing the goods belongs to society itself. It is for society to establish a mode of sharing out, of distribution, which best attains the economic end, and to actualise each person's inalienable right to a share of earthly goods.

4. Modern production owes more to process and technique, resulting from the inventions and applications of science transmitted and perfected from generation to generation, than to the individual efforts of those whom the production occupies. This factor in production is a common heritage, a social capital, which becomes more and more productive and which should consequently profit everyone, as all are its co-proprietors. The salary, payment for individual effort, should not be the only title to the fruits of production.

5. Money being a title to goods, to every sort of product or service offered, its volume should not be regulated otherwise than socially. How may it be admitted that an individual or a private institution has the right to dictate at whom what ought to be created on the basis of the production of all society? The global purchasing power must also be related to the global production according to need, because production exists exactly to satisfy those needs.

6. Finance should not be either a system of govern-

ment, nor a system of rewards and punishments, nor a substitute for morals, nor a dictatorship of production or of needs. It should on the contrary serve production and not impose limits on it.

7. The end of a financial system rightly understood should be:

(a) To finance production according to need.

(b) To distribute the fruits of production efficiently.

It is difficult to deny any of these postulates, even though the fourth sounds new and raises controversy. But the present system of finance takes account of none of them.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: May 21, 1953.

(The Debate Continued.)

Employment (Agriculture)

Mr. Slater asked the Minister of Labour the figures, as at April, 1953, of those who are engaged in agriculture; and how this figure compares with the years 1951 and 1952.

Mr. Watkinson: Figures for April, 1953, are not yet available. The total number engaged in agriculture (including horticulture) at March, 1953, is estimated to be one million compared with 1,017,000 at March, 1952, and 1,035,000 at March, 1951. The total includes farmers and other self-employed persons as well as employees.

Mr. Slater asked the Minister of Labour, in view of the increasing demand for greater production in agriculture, what steps are being taken through his department, in conjunction with the Ministry of Agriculture, to offset the fall in employment on the land.

Mr. Watkinson: Vacancies in agriculture are amongst those to which the employment exchanges give first preference. They bring employment in agriculture to the notice of all suitable workers, and last year they placed nearly 37,000 workers in regular or seasonal employment in the industry. In addition, this Ministry recruits trainees for the vocational training scheme run by the Ministry of Agriculture, and last year over 900 trainees were placed in the industry after practical training on farms. Each year conferences are held with representatives of both sides of the industry in the counties and other organisations concerned, to assess seasonal labour requirements and to make arrangements to meet the needs of the harvest.

House of Commons: May 20, 1953.

MIG FIGHTERS (Surrender Awards)

(This Debate should have preceded the foregoing.)

Mr. Hector Hughes asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs how much money has been claimed and how much has been paid by the United Nations Command in

(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. 30. No. 16.

Saturday, June 13, 1953.

From Week to Week

"Big Business—Curse or Blessing?" is a question which exposes the questioner to contrary replies; but here as in other matters battles cannot be won unless they are fought, and to be fought they must be staged. For this reason, we surmise, the Deputy Editor of *The Economist*, Mr. Roland Bird, reviews in the house-organ of Unilever Limited, *Progress*, David E. Lilienthal's book, published in America, *Big Business: A New Era*. Mr. Lilienthal complains that America's anti-trust laws are tying one hand of Big Business "behind its back." The reviewer says that Mr. Lilienthal's opening sentence "poses the paradox: whereas big business has become a basic fact in the creativeness of mid-century America, many and perhaps most Americans hold it in deep-seated fear and emotional repugnance; and the rest of the book argues for a change in public sentiment so that the creative possibilities of bigness in industry can be most fully realised. Fear and suspicion of large business debase the functions of the business man in society; the anti-trust laws, which spring from suspicion, instil in him the caution of the lawyer and dilute his enterprise in management; and because they lead to endless and fruitless litigation, they bring the law and the courts into disrepute. So, argues Mr. Lilienthal, Americans suffer from split personalities; they are against the sin of bigness but they want the fruits of the big productive unit 'which has performed economic wonders with one hand tied behind its back.'"

How deep is the "deep-seated fear" of Americans is illustrated by a dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Douglas in the case of United States *v.* Columbia Steel Company:—"We have here the problem of bigness. Its lesson should by now have been burned into our memory by Brandeis. '*The Curse of Bigness*' shows how size can become a menace—both industrial and social. It can be an industrial menace because it creates gross inequalities against existing or putative competitors. It can be a social menace—because of its control of prices. . . . Industrial power should be decentralised. It should be scattered into many hands so that the fortunes of the people will not be dependent on the whim or caprice, the political prejudices, the emotional stability of a few self-appointed men. The fact that they are not vicious men but respectable and social-minded is irrelevant. That is the philosophy and the command of the Sherman Act."

It does not reassure us that "a New Competition" is replacing "competition" described as "competition between alternatives—the substitution of one product for another or the creation of new products for newly-found needs."

"INTERNATIONAL MERRY-GO ROUND: Highlights of the heated international situation:

"(1) The real impetus behind the attack of former Premier Attlee on Senator McCarthy was not his exposure of Reds, but his exposure of British trade with Red China. McCarthy's revelations have had wide popular repercussions. That is what hurts the British.

"(2) The real motive behind anti-McCarthy attacks by certain sections of the American press for his rebuttal to Attlee was more of the same old game of trying to split the GOP Administration. 'Liberal' Democrats are behind it.

"(3) The whole McCarthy-Attlee affray was of far less importance than the real struggle—which is between Churchill and the Eisenhower Administration.

"(4) Churchill's unforgiveable sin was to handicap severely the U.S. Government in its haggling with the Reds over the Korean truce. Churchill came out for the India Plan on prisoners, which is a trap (see our piece 'Korea,' April 8). Under the India Plan, the U.S. and neutrals would be outvoted by Communist and fellow-traveller nations. At present, the U.S. stand is against forced repatriation of enemy prisoners who do not want to be sent home, who came over to our side as a result of our promises to harbour them. What Churchill did was to give backing to the enemy's terms.

"(5) But the worst British blow was the suggestion that Red China be admitted to the United Nations. As the Scripps-Howard papers put it, 'If the Communists can shoot their way into the UN, it isn't any place for us.' On Capitol Hill, there are demands that the U.S. get out of the UN, if our Chinese Red Enemies are admitted.

"(6) Shrewd observers in the Capital speculate that the above British moves are blackmail, that the British want financial help and would stop their diplomatic sabotage, if the U.S. gave them a loan. The *Chicago Tribune* has reported that high British Treasury officials have arrived in Washington to hold secret talks with our Government." (*Human Events*, Washington, D.C., May 20.)

Why should it be thought "queer" that a Dominion Premier, or any other modern politician for that matter, should be a crystal-gazer, a reader of 'fortune' from the tea-leaves at the bottom of cups, an 'automatic writer,' a hoarder of bits and pieces, and a believer in the immortality of dogs? Does he not, *au fond*, "represent" an even wider assortment of mental curiosities?

Mr. Manning

A circular dated June 6 has reached us which has its source in a Social Credit Group *some of whose members* are supporters of the Secretariat suggesting that "if opportunity occurred, Mr. Manning should be attacked . . ." when he spoke in London this week. The Secretariat desires it to be known that it has not distributed any advice, privately or otherwise, concerning this matter, and would not have distributed this advice in any case.

And so to Nuremberg*

by

DRYDEN GILLING SMITH.

After his last meeting with Hitler, von Papen went to Berlin only to find many members of old German families caught in the net of the purge which followed the attempt on Hitler's life. He tried to help some of them but his correspondence with Himmler produced no noticeable result. In September, 1944, he returned to his home in Wallerfangen, only to see the broken army of occupation retreating from France. "The hopelessly confused columns showed what ludicrously swollen staffs we had built up during four years of occupation." The Paget book on Field Marshall Manstein showed how it was the deliberate policy of playing the army off against the party, which caused Hitler to counteract the military successes of the army during the early years of the war by handing over the territories they had gained to such party organs as the S.S. This was of course fatal in the Russian campaign where the army was unable to control the intelligence service in the area behind the lines. The party organs not only appealed to the power urges of the dregs of the population, but, as we have seen, the 'party' form of human association has a strong demoralising effect on its members. In the west this 'party,' instead of military, occupation, played right into the hands of the Resistantists. Many Frenchmen have described the startling contrast between the extremely 'correct' and often charming behaviour of their enemies in 1940 and their later behaviour. They have often wrongly presumed that this was a change of face in the same individuals, and calculated by them from the first. They do not explain why an army which had won such a hands-down victory should automatically behave itself and retain its discipline. They might gain a better understanding of the situation if they tried to look for parallels. Before the Normandy landings von Papen was entertained to lunch by Laval and the German Ambassador in France. "In a private conversation Laval assured me that after the fall of France it had always been his wish to co-operate with Hitler in the re-organisation of Europe, but that Hitler had always prevented this." The threatened invasion could only have been resisted with the co-operation of the French "whom Hitler had so cruelly deceived."

We have always assumed that the 1944 advance of the allies through France and Belgium, was halted by the Arnhem disaster, now known to have been caused by our misplaced confidence in some Dutch resistentists, who passed on advance information on the landings to the Germans. However von Papen tells us that the famous West Wall existed only in the imagination—all its barbed wire entanglements had been removed to the Atlantic. The only reserve available on the 50 mile sector between Trier and Saarbrücken consisted of an N.C.O. school at Saarlouis. "If the Allied Command had followed the classic prescription of harrying a beaten enemy by every available means, they could have been across the Saar and on the Rhine overnight." As it was "A handful of cadets held the great fortress of Metz and the German armies were given time to reform." Bearing in mind the later admissions of

**Franz von Papen—Memoirs*, André Deutsch, London, 1952.

General Patton and others that in the spring of 1945 they were refused permission to advance through Germany to Czechoslovakia, by their Supreme Commander, General Eisenhower, one feels that the winter standstill on the western front may have been pre-arranged, to allow our "gallant Russian allies" to occupy Poland, Hungary, Austria, the Balkans, Czechoslovakia and a good deal of Germany.

On April 10, 1945, an American platoon surrounded von Papen's house in Westphalia, and the sergeant placed him under arrest. He protested however that he was over 65 and held no military command. At the end of April he was taken to Eisenhower's H.Q. and interrogated by four generals, including two Russians. Here he found himself in the company of the aged Admiral Horthy, who had already been kept in prison in Bavaria for over six months by Hitler. In May they were taken to a billet surrounded by two high barbed-wire pallisades with watch towers and armed guards, and completely devoid of all furniture except for camp beds and trestle tables. "Horthy was aghast. 'Is this the way you treat a head of state, even of a defeated country?' he asked . . . Our food, such as it was, was brought in an old tin can from the other hotel and always arrived cold." Horthy soon had a complete collapse and von Papen asked for the American Colonel in charge and protested, "What do you mean by treating the head of a state in this disgraceful fashion? Are you not aware that the United States has signed the Hague Convention which lays down rules for the treatment of Prisoners of War? How can you possibly treat an old gentleman well over seventy in such a scandalous fashion as to bring him to death's door." The Colonel replied that he knew nothing about 'head of state' and was merely responsible for the guards. Von Papen then pressed the question whether they were prisoners of war or civilian prisoners. On being told that they were prisoners of war, he asked whether the United States did or did not sign the Hague Convention, to which Colonel Andrus replied "That does not interest me in the least."

The next day however they were told that they could, under certain conditions, write letters. Horthy wrote to Churchill and to the King of England, stressing the point that in the hour of need he had remained at his post, and did not leave his post as Benes had left Czechoslovakia after the Munich agreement. Von Papen sent an appeal on Horthy's behalf to the King of Sweden, and wrote a personal letter to Eisenhower, rejecting the theory of collective responsibility for the war "and asking for some indication of the war crimes with which I was to be charged. There was no reply to any of these communications."

In August von Papen was taken to the Nuremberg prison. In the lorry which took him to the Luxemburg airfield, he found himself alongside Goering, Ribbentrop and Rosenberg, whom he had not seen together since the party rally in Nuremberg in 1937. In the cell there was only wire mesh over the windows and the hatch in the door was open to keep him under the guards' continual surveillance, so that as winter came on there was always a draught. "Without any light, we were obliged to go to bed at dusk, and as the days got shorter I often spent long hours sitting glumly on the edge of my bed, not even able to read . . . The worst thing was not knowing why we were in prison or what we were being charged with . . . At the end of

August . . . I came face to face with Admiral Horthy. We were unable to speak but I was amazed that he should be in prison. He did not look well, but still retained his air of authority, in spite of the sly remarks of the guards."

In September von Papen was questioned in detail by an American, Mr. Dodd, who soon showed that he had only a superficial knowledge of events in Germany. "Much less agreeable were the visits of the gentlemen who called themselves psychiatrists. It was their duty apparently to determine our sanity, though few of them gave the impression of having any genuine scientific qualifications. If they had, people like Goering and Ribbentrop would have been fascinating subjects. Instead we were called upon to undergo intelligence tests, together with silly problems like explaining what we saw in certain abstract splodges of ink . . ."

"It was not until October 19 that I received a copy of the indictment . . . I was charged with having conspired to wage war. In my ignorance of the new juridical procedure to be adopted, I imagined it would be easy to prove my complete innocence and my strong opposition to the declaration of war. Moreover I still thought that each of us would have an individual trial, and I wrote a cheerful letter to my wife, saying that I expected the proceedings to last two or three days and that I would be with her by the end of November."

There could be no doubt which of the allied countries was having the greatest influence in the imposition of its 'legal' and 'criminal' proceedings, on the combined effort at Nuremberg. "Arthur Koestler, in his book *Darkness at Noon* (Cape, London, 1940), has given us a vivid description of the methods used in the mass Soviet trials to obtain confessions from the accused. In the Nuremberg trial the prosecution had thousands of documents on which to base their case and none of us were required to sign confessions, but we were subjected to a prison regime which bore many resemblances to Koestler's description. A system had been devised by which our resistance was gradually lowered, through sleepless nights with a light shining in our faces. By the time the trial ended, although my mind was still working, I was physically a broken man."

Comic relief was rare, but on one occasion whilst von Papen, Neurath, Doenitz and Schacht were lunching together out of their tin cans, an insolent American photographer, started taunting the 'mighty who had fallen.' Schacht wasted his cup of coffee by throwing it at the creature, who squealed for the guard. "For soiling a United States uniform, Schacht was forbidden his exercise period for four weeks, during which time he was given no coffee."

A great to-do was made in the press about how Goering obtained the poison to commit suicide. However von Papen states that "on more than two occasions American guards offered me the means of killing myself in order, as they put it, to escape certain hanging."

Among those on trial there was an unwritten law that each was to conduct his own defence without implicating any of the others. Once the trial started the victims saw a good deal of each other, and were often able to talk quietly to their neighbours and pass notes between themselves, by this means, often learning the explanation of events in the Nazi era which had always puzzled them.

The defence unfortunately lacked its greatest master of argument. Goebbels was dead and the Propaganda Ministry was represented by Hans Fritzsche. "It is a pity in a way. The dialectical ability of the satanically gifted doctor would have given the Tribunal some hard nuts to crack . . . Those who now appeared to answer for their actions were, with the exception of Goering, not of first rank. He completely outclassed these *dei minores*, and was the only one who had the courage to defend what he had done and what he had tried to do. 'Not a word against Hitler,' he said to us on one occasion when the guards attention was elsewhere." However, this was not followed by the defence, but only by the prosecution. The more evidence that was produced the more absurd became the attempt to put a régime on trial, without reference to the most important figure in that régime. Whatever one's opinion about the 'legality' or otherwise of the whole proceedings, one would have thought that from the prosecution angle it would have been more logical to try Hitler, even *in absentia*, but "no accusation was levelled at Hitler, either in the indictment or the verdict."

"In the conversations I had with Goering during the period between the end of the trial and the pronouncement of the sentences, I found him the same uninhibited and jovial character I had always known. Completely unconcerned at his certain fate, he often discussed with Neurath, Keitel and myself certain phases of the past. At one period I had tried to find out why this 'crown prince' of the Third Reich had not intervened when he saw that Hitler's policies must lead to war and the collapse of Germany. Now I tried again, but on this point it was still not possible to pin him down. 'I have accepted full responsibility for everything that happened,' he answered. 'I could not prevent the war, even though I regarded it as a great mistake. You or Neurath could probably have made peace, but Ribbentrop was incapable. All he did was to blabber what he thought was in Hitler's mind.' He told me that in the latter years of the war he felt that Hitler was probably insane, but he was unable to do anything about it. As a person Goering had many virtues. He was a man of open, masculine nature, with great personal charm. This he retained to the end."

• • •

It is one of the basic rules of good statesmanship that one should never make martyrs of one's enemies. The victors at Nuremberg not only did this, but advertised the fact on an unprecedented scale. The mere 'human predicament' of the victims could not but excite the sympathy of countless Germans and others, who, had there been no trial, would have had little pity to spare for those who had lost the war. It is difficult to see any motive on the part of the victors in arranging this trial when the foreseeable results were so unfavourable to themselves. Only two explanations, which are not mutually exclusive, have been put forward to explain the proceedings. One is that the trial was designed to serve as a warning to future national governments, of what lay in store for those who did not obey the dictates of some international power, or for those who lost a war against the armed representatives of the non-national power. That the trial was not conducted in the interests of any national power seems obvious. But Great Britain had shown as early as 1940 that her war aims

disregarded the interests of Great Britain. 18B and the use that was made of this infamous regulation to lock up anyone who attached more importance to the interests of his country than the internationalist or extra-nationalist policies of Winston Churchill's coalition government, indicated the way we were going. The Nuremberg trials were the logical conclusion of 18B. Those who fought for Great Britain under the Churchill-Morrison flag, are as much responsible for the destruction of Europe and her national institutions, and placing the dregs of humanity, whom we had picked up as allies, in positions of undisputed power, as are those who fought for Germany under the Hitler flag. The patriotic elements in both countries were either gulled, or, if they understood what was happening saw no way out but the impossible alternative of treason. 'The government can do no wrong' has been the accepted dogma since the renaissance, and action against any sort of government is considered treason in the popular view (unless you are a permanent revolutionary bandit or resistentialist). Count Bismarck and his circle were among the few people who faced up to the issue and made the basic distinction between treason, and the necessary removal of an obviously treasonable government. They were unsuccessful. No one even tried in this country or America.

The second possible explanation of the Nuremberg business is that it was the prelude to a ritual killing modelled on some of those we read about in the Old Testament. Even among people who have no more idea of Christianity than the soggy lees of nineteenth century liberalism, many of the Old Testament calculated brutalities are so familiar that their repetition in contemporary events would excite no surprise. Why the Jews should wish to have a ritual killing of people, who had raised their stock so enormously in the victorious countries (publicity again for martyring or supposed martyring of enemies), and who had provided the conditions favourable to the flooding of Palestine with Jewish immigrants enabling the Jewish seizure of power in their new happy home, is difficult to understand. However the great interest which the Jews appeared to take in the Nuremberg business and the part which they played in the subsequent 'denazification' trials, suggests that they may have had some obscure motive in promoting a ritual killing. Their non-European minds work in a mysterious way, and they often act in a manner which would seem completely unreasonable to any European, should he find himself in similar circumstances. This is not to suggest that most ordinary human beings, European or Asiatic, are normally reasonable. But then it is not ordinary human beings who can organise an affair like the Nuremberg trials and executions. In people of such proved ability one is justified in looking for some greater sense of consequence, for some motives other than those of momentary whim or sentiment, however much we may disapprove of these motives.

For anyone not physically nauseated by the prospect of post-mortems, mortuaries, pamphlets on kosher killings (*i.e.*, that circulated by the R.S.P.C.A.) and the most barbaric passages of the old testament, I would suggest a re-examination of the known facts of the Nuremberg executions. An initial reading of the book of Esther (in full with the apocrypha passages, and possibly a comparison of different versions, Douai, *etc.*), should be followed by a check up on such incidents in the executions, as their continual postponement

as if to some special date, the fact that the corpses whose photographs were to have been front-page news happened to be disfigured and were either not shown, or shown as back-views, or shown with explanations of broken trap-doors, *etc.* Then there was the story of the cremated ashes being released from the trap-door of some aeroplane.

None of this, of course could prove anything, nor would the proof be particularly useful if it were forthcoming. However the study of all these phenomena together, does enable one to understand a peculiar mental state which has existed (*vide* passages of the Old Testament: nobody has yet accused the O.T. of being a 'forgery') and which still manifests itself in the detailed ritual of kosher killing (though the 'Society of Christians and Jews' thinks it most unsporting of the R.S.P.C.A. to draw public attention to such practices of animal slaughter). If we can find no reasonable motive for the Nuremberg executions, we are forced to scrutinise the unreasonable motives, and among these the most striking seems to be the mental state of so many members of a tribe that still attaches importance to ritual killings.

• • •

We have so far regarded the Nuremberg trial as (a) a fatality that arrived from the blue into the lives of the victims and (b) as the possible keystone in a programme for a ritual slaughter of Europeans. It is now necessary to examine the particular mechanism of the trial. It went on for so long and press reports were so almost entirely confined to tit-bits from the case for the prosecution, that the British public can be pardoned for being confused and bewildered by the whole affair. Montgomery Belton has however given the English reader a summary of the necessary information in his two books *Victors' Justice* and *Epitaph on Nuremberg*.

Von Papen does not risk a storm of abuse by commenting on (b) or mentioning the trial and its sequel as anyone's deliberate policy. He merely states the case for the absurdity of the trial, from the allies' point of view as well as from that of the victims, and in doing so presumes that the allies (with the exception of Russia) were concerned with the well-being of their own peoples.

(To be continued).

Realistic Constitutionalism

by

C. H. DOUGLAS

Notes for an Address by Major C. H. Douglas to the Constitutional Research Association at Brown's Hotel, Mayfair, May 8, 1947.

8d.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL 2.

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3.)

pursuance of its 100,000 dollar offer to MiG fighter pilots in Korea who desert, bringing their fighter planes with them; and for how long that offer is to remain open to them.

The Minister of State (Mr. Selwyn Lloyd): With regard to the first part of the hon. and learned Member's Question, the answer is, so far as I am aware, None, Sir. With regard to the second part, I know of no time limit.

Mr. Hughes: Does the Minister realise the remarkable synthesis between this Question and the latest news that another MiG has reached the West? Is that latest news true and, if so, will the pilot of that machine get the 100,000 dollars and the other rewards?

Mr. Lloyd: I am told that the information which the hon. and learned Gentleman has just suggested in the middle part of his supplementary question is correct.

Mr. Shinwell: Is it not better that this episode, like the Prime Minister's declaration that it is better to be bribed than to be killed, should be forgotten as soon as possible?

Refugees (Relief)

Sir R. Glyn asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs the total moneys paid either direct or through the United National Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East from British Treasury sources; and how much has been paid by other North Atlantic Treaty Organisation countries, respectively.

Mr. Nutting: Her Majesty's Government have contributed directly to the United Nations Agencies for the relief of Palestine refugees up to June, 1953, the following sums:

£1,100,000 to United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees.

£12,000,000 to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (of which £8,500,000 has been paid so far).

In addition, in 1949 Her Majesty's Government made an interest free loan of £1,000,000 to Jordan specifically for refugees.

The Director's reports to the General Assembly show that, up to the end of the Agency's financial year 1951-52 (which ended on 30th June, 1952), other North Atlantic Treaty Organisation countries had contributed in cash to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency as follows:

	\$
U.S.A.	57,450,000
France	4,857,143
Canada	894,313
Denmark	58,000
Netherlands	25,000
Luxemburg	2,000

The figures for any contributions made by other North Atlantic Treaty Organisation countries to the refugees other than through the United Nations Relief and Works Agency are not available.

The Good Samaritan

We are so familiar with the rôle played by "The State" as criminal in present day relationships that the moral superiority of the soft-drinks trade to a government department may pass unnoticed in the midst of other details of the deal just reported in which three-quarters of a million pounds' worth of orange juice, bought by the Ministry for consumption, at public expense, by children was rejected because it contained a preservative (not specified) prohibited by regulation. Backed by the inducement of an extra sugar quota, the Ministry tried to unload the consignment at cost price onto the soft-drinks trade, who fell not into temptation. The suggestion that, though prohibited, the preservative was innocuous is cant. Why proscribe what is not harmful? The truth is that the effects of modern chemistry are unexplored.

THE BRIEF FOR THE PROSECUTION

by C. H. Douglas.

This book is the last of the contributions to the understanding of world politics written during the war of 1939-1945 by the author of SOCIAL CREDIT. The series began with THIS 'AMERICAN' BUSINESS (August, 1940) and continued and expanded with THE BIG IDEA (1942), THE 'LAND FOR THE (CHOSEN) PEOPLE' RACKET (1943), and, PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR (1943).

There is no comparable commentary on the causes of the war and the ultimate seat of responsibility for the threat to civilisation and even the continuance of human life, which outlasts the coming of "Peace," by any writer in any country.

It embodies an analysis of the policy now known as *Mond-Turnerism*.

8/6 net.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD., LIVERPOOL, 2.