

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

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. 31. No. 12. November 14, 1953. 6d. Weekly.

## From Week to Week

"By forcing on mankind more and more lethal weapons and at the same time making the whole world more and more inter-dependent economically, technology had brought mankind to such a degree of distress that we were ripe for deifying any new Caesar who might succeed in giving the world unity and peace."

The opinion is Professor Toynbee's, confided to a Gifford Lecture audience at Edinburgh on November 6. Evidently he thinks the softening-up process is complete. Observe that it is 'technology' which has done this—lately described as the monstrous over-expansion of industry. Not impossibly, the same 'technology' will provide the new Caesar ready for deification, like the decapitated "Head" in Mr. C. S. Lewis's "That Hideous Strength." Professor Toynbee's 'Cyclical' History, does not provide an answer to the question What animates 'technology?' which is an abstract cloak for a method. Means and ends. But why the means?

Are we right in assuming that the new Caesar will be black?

Infiltration is so universal a technique of Communism, that it would be strange indeed if it were never tried in regard to Social Credit. And, of course, it not only has been tried, but the trial is continuous. Not much study of Communist activities is necessary to convince anyone that the Communists are in possession of a virtually inexhaustible list of objectives in which to enlist public support. They are just so many crackers, or, better, cartridges, which anyone may use, and the more the merrier, if they have any weapon into which they will fit—and, if they have not, they can just stuff a guy-fawkes with them. The distinguishing mark is that while, in most cases, these objectives cannot be gained without inflicting at least some damage on this or that *Government*, in no way do they endanger the Money Power or draw the slightest attention to its effects.

*The Tablet* was at one time suspected of being the channel (or a channel) through which the Prime Minister attached his name to certain ideas without saying anything. Someone just thought something about Mr. Churchill, which Mr. Churchill desired to be thought about Mr. Churchill. The suspicion is brought to mind by *The Tablet's* references last week to the final phase of this 'Great Man' as a parliamentarian as one in which he may enunciate other precepts of politics than those of partisanship which he has pursued "whole-heartedly" for so long. Failing to play a

significant role in establishing better relations in the international field, "he may be able to contribute something of unique value to British party politics." Perhaps the "new Caesar" will not be black after all—White, on a Light Horse?

Nero fiddled, too.

"The famous Baruch Plan provided for the international control of all processes of atomic production, as well as for the international ownership and control of fissionable materials in whatever part of the world they might be found. International control implies international controllers, and there should have been no doubt in anybody's mind as to who the controllers were intended to be. When Mr. Baruch retired from active participation in the planning, the chief task devolved upon Mr. David Lilienthal, and from him it passed to Admiral Lewis L. Straus, who had been promoted to his exalted rank from the quarter-deck of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., the New York international banking firm whose partners financed the Russian Revolution of 1917.

"The supreme objective was . . . clear—world government. Mr. Lilienthal even appears on the record as declaring such internationalisation to be the particular civilising mission of the men of his own particular racial origin. Dupes all over the world were quick to interpret this bold plot to gain the masterdom of the world in terms of dewy-eyed idealism. And some not so dewy-eyed. Mr. Bertrand Russell went to the length of broadcasting through the B.B.C. a demand that world-government should be imposed upon the nations, if need be, by the use of the atom bomb.

"Mr. Baruch's original plan did not succeed. It was frustrated by Stalin."—(*Candour*, November 6).

But was it frustration?

THE AGE OF THE COMMON (STATES-) MAN: "Suddenly Sir Alexander Cadogan asked: 'What would be the effect if we guaranteed Poland?' . . . 'It would help the situation in Germany,' I said. Neville Chamberlain sat and stared and fidgeted with his neck . . . At the end of the war I called on Mr. Churchill . . . he said pleasantly: 'So you have survived the war. And it was you who started it with that Polish guarantee.'"—(Ian Colvin reviewing "Nemesis of Power" by the official biographer of King George VI, Mr. Wheeler-Bennett).

"Americans who are convinced that it was a mistake for the United States to enter either World War will gain confirmation from Captain Grenfell's book ["Unconditional Hatred"]. He even adduces plenty of evidence that England, also, should never have entered either war. She probably would not have done so had it not been for the fact that, from 1905 to 1914, she had a vain charlatan at the head of the Foreign Office [Sir E. Grey] and that, in March, 1939, Neville Chamberlain drew a mental blank long enough to guarantee Poland.

"Much space is given to a critical appraisal of the 'statecraft' and military leadership of Winston Churchill, which is like a breath of fresh air after all of the reverential credulity which has been bestowed on 'the British bulldog' for nearly a decade and a half."—(Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes: review in *Human Events*).

Take your choice. Mr. Colvin may be right in saying

that he was "certain that Treasury influence in Downing Street was either suppressing or minimising bad news [about Germany] before it reached the Cabinet"; but what is "Treasury" influence? Your guess is as good as anyone else's: the rough and tumble of Power without Authority is anybody's guess.

Now that the chief guesser has perorated:

There is no doubt that if the human race are to have their dearest wish and be free from the dread of mass destruction they could have as an alternative what many of them might prefer, namely, the swiftest expansion of material well-being that has ever been within their reach or even within their dreams. By material well-being I mean not only abundance but a degree of leisure for the masses such as has never before been possible in our mortal struggle for life.

we may take it that *that* part of our argument is now as much common knowledge as the facts of the A plus B Theorem.

"The Sheffield Little Theatre Players, who have always a keen eye for the things that are worth doing in the theatre, whatever the difficulties, are now to undertake what is so far, perhaps, their most ambitious production. This will be Goethe's *Faust* in its entirety. Part 1 will be presented at Christmas, and Part 2 follows at Easter. In announcing this, they say, with understandable pride, 'we are attempting something which perhaps no other theatre in England would dare to attempt.' The part of Faust will be played by the actor who played Prometheus when the Players staged the *Prometheus Bound* of Aeschylus, and afterwards brought it to London.—(*The Times*, November 3).

CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE PLEASE NOTE: *The Daily Telegraph* on Guy Fawkes' Day had it that "P.E.P., the social and economic research organisation, is to make a comprehensive inquiry into trade associations. The terms of reference are so wide that this study might well fill 20 volumes and as many years. But the report must be ready in just over two.

"The money for this work has been supplied by the American Government to help increase productivity here. They are giving rather less than a third of the total annual budget of P.E.P., about £17,000

"Half of this comes from industry and much of the rest from the sale of reports. Individual contributions—such as those from Mr. Israel Sieff, which I mentioned—play a relatively small part."

If propagandist activities in (for example) the Foreign Office are out of reach of public knowledge (for what it's worth), can we save the two-and-a-half millions spent on British Council "study boxes"?

### To Australian Supporters

The disappointment occasioned in Australia by the suspension of publication of *The Australian Social Crediter*

is apparent from several letters received. It seems to us that a perfectly clear account was published by *The Australian Social Crediter* in its last appearance of the reasons which made the decision to suspend publication for the time being necessary. Some subscribers have elected to take *The Social Crediter* instead of *The Australian Social Crediter*. The time taken to transmit the paper by surface mail varies, but is rarely less than six weeks. Airmail delivery is expensive. *The New Times* (Melbourne) has permission to republish matter from *The Social Crediter*, which it receives by the quickest route, and makes use of this facility frequently. The choice of matter is, however, its own, not ours. It is obvious to us that in Australia, as in England, modest personal service is what lacks (the question discussed in St. Matthew XXV, 23 and St. Luke XIX, 17, which, represented there as concerning the return on financial capital, is nevertheless written down as something little as matter yet great as trust). The key to the problem may be the question to Mr. Scouler: "What can I *do* to help you."

### "Sub Judice"

How is it that no one seems to have ever applied the principle underlying the phrase *sub judice* to the major issues of politics? We purposely avoid saying the major crimes, because that would imply that what we have in mind is cases of Treason. Treason is, of course, actionable; although, significantly, a charge brought under the Law of Treason may be wrested from the judgment of the Courts by the device of *nolle prosequi*, technically the mere edict of a particular Minister of the Crown (the Attorney General). Whether this was so before the Treason Act of 1945 assimilated the procedure in all cases of treason and misprision of treason to the procedure in cases of murder, thus repealing the relevant parts of earlier statutes, seems to be irrelevant. The legalising of swindles (from the post-war credit swindle to the credit monopoly swindle) transfers private grievances from ventilation before the bar of justice to ventilation before the bar of public opinion. However encrusted with absurdities, this bar, in theory at least, does exist. Its constitution is very peculiar—ha-ha; there are innumerable counsel for the defence, but none for the prosecution. Counsel for the defence speak all at the same time, which makes it impossible for the judge to distinguish one argument from another; but members of the jury (the taxpayers) are allowed to entertain unlearned counsel individually in chambers, at their own expense, and make what they can of his arguments. Since the major indictments of modern society are all perpetually *sub judice*, and are never brought to trial, for the writ of *habeas corpus* does not apply, the appellants' access to a remedy for their injuries is gravely obstructed, and justice is never done. An injunction restraining the litigants from publication while trial is pending would result in a state of almost complete stagnation in the printing, entertainment and education industries. Road, rail and sea transport would be cut by half. Agriculture, textiles, building and war would become almost the sole avocations open to the would-be tax-payer—and not much war either. *The Social Crediter* would disappear overnight, and indeed nothing but a solitary fig-tree would be left standing.