

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Volume 43 Number 12

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1963

6d Fortnightly.

Russia's Ultimate Aims

Once again we reprint our editorial for February 10, 1945. It shows the unmistakable hand of Douglas.

The Comte de St. Aulaire, from whose remarkable book, *Geneva versus Peace* we quoted recently, remarks "The League of Nations was conceived in Berlin. . . We learn this fact from Von Bulow. . . it is at Berlin that the ring is completed, after traversing Washington, Paris, London, Budapest and Petrograd. The mutual affinities of its ancestry, plutocracy, revolution, Freemasonry and Pan-Germanism, are so close that it may be wondered if there is not, beneath them all, another identity."

In this, the gravest crisis of the world's history, it is essential to realise that the stakes which are being played for are so high that the players on one side, at least, care no more for the immolation of the peoples of a continent than for the death of a sparrow.

They have no nationality, no morals, no scruples and no regrets. The League of Nations was conceived in Berlin, yes. But it was proposed and pressed by Wilson, the representative of men who had fought (well, a little anyway) to defeat the country in which it was conceived. It is not accidental that a film, and we know who controls the films, has appeared at this time which presents Wilson as a giant among statesmen, instead of, as he was, a second-rate school-master completely dominated by Schiff, Strauss, House, Baruch and Brandeis.

To a world not distracted by rocket-bombs and Ministries of Fuel and Power, it would be uniformly obvious that a manipulated clamour is being raised in favour of the scum of the underworld in each country as it is "liberated". This scum has obtained arms in large quantities under the pretext of resistance to the Germans during the occupation. How much resistance was actually offered, we may, or may not, learn at a future date. We may, or may not, also learn the principles on which the arms of the resistance movements were distributed. But we already have sufficient experience of what happened in Greece, Belgium, and parts of France (always backed by a prepared clamour from the "British" Socialist Party) to be assured that a massacre of the Right has been prepared. The text-book is available to anyone who supposes that we are alarmists. It is written by Stalin, and its title is *Problems of Leninism*. In a valuable commentary which should be read by everyone, (*What are Russia's Ultimate Aims?*, etc.), Mr. H. W. Henderson remarks "No one acquainted with Communist tactics in Germany before the advent to power of Hitler, can fail to be impressed with the fact that unity between the Communist and Socialist Parties could have kept the Nazis out. This was, however, rendered impossible by the actions of the Communist Party, acting under instructions from Moscow." Now, the Russian Revolution, and its spate of murder, was financed from New York with the assistance of Germany by some of the richest men in the world. And these same men are those who have persistently opposed effective monetary reform with the obvious intention of retaining

an army of discontent for use against the Right. That is to say, there is a working coalition between the scum of the underworld and the richest men in the world to murder those from whom alone redemption for the underworld can come, in order that any threat to the power of the financier may be removed. The underworld will be dealt with just as easily as Stalin deals with any opposition, when the underworld has done its job.

The quotation referred to, with comments, is from our "Week to Week" note for February 3, 1945:

"Russia . . . is the victim of a syndicate organised to destroy the nations. . . Why are the New York bankers, along with the German General Staff, the responsible authors of the Russian Revolution? . . . The solidarity of faith which obtains between the New York bankers and the Bolshevik leaders, and the feelings inspired by the sufferings of the Jews in Czarist Russia, are not a sufficient explanation of this paradox. . . However, are we not paying too great an honour to freemasonry when we attribute to it the greatest share in the genesis of the League and in responsibility for its acts? Is not this secret society a society with limited responsibility, not only by reason of its mental weakness, but also because it is above all else the instrument of forces more secret still, and more to be feared? Is it not unjustly accused of all the sins of Jewry? And if freemasonry is but an instrument, then President Wilson was but the instrument of an instrument."

The preceding quotations are taken from *Genève contre la paix* by the Comte de St. Aulaire, Ambassador to Great Britain (1920-1924). The English translation is published by Sheed and Ward. It must be remembered that it is written, not by a propagandist, but by a trained professional diplomat of wide experience. It should be read by every serious student of contemporary events.

Contribution To The Good Life

" . . . Anyone who takes a reasonably long view of the prospects before this and other advanced countries must see that automation and a people bored and underemployed will soon—unless war comes—be our greatest problem.

"Surely, then, although their management could be made more efficient, no railways should be closed? They offer a civilised way of travel where people can read, work, think, or sleep in peace. They have a pleasant and human atmosphere which will become more dear as the rest of our installations become more glassy and mechanical. They will offer congenial occupation for just the kind of men and women who will otherwise be declared redundant by society.

"On so great an issue as this one, cannot our rulers look half a generation ahead and see that narrow arguments of profitability, so far from being up to date, will soon be very old fashioned? It is the railways' contribution to the good life that we should be discussing."

From *The Times's* correspondence column,
August 23, 1963.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat 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: 9 AVENUE ROAD, STRATFORD-ON-AVON. Telephone: Stratford-on-Avon 3976.

Editorial: PENRYN LODGE, GLOUCESTER GATE, LONDON N.W.1. Telephone: BUSton 3893.

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business—Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne.

Editorial—Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, Australia (Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Advisory Chairman: Dr. Tudor Jones, Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 36 Melbourne Avenue, Deakin, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penryn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London N.W.1. (Telephone: EUSton 3893). Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O. Sydney, N.S.W.

Your Move? My Move? Whose Move?

"The Vassall Affair" by Dame Rebecca West is dated July, 1963. The Editor of *The Sunday Telegraph* (London) writes a preface and that newspaper publishes it at two shillings and sixpence. It was commissioned and the highly talented authoress was present apparently throughout the public hearings of the Radcliffe Tribunal. She finished the little commentary on June 17, since when a good deal has happened of which, to some extent, the last chapter, entitled "Disaster in the Past: Crisis in the Future", is a premonition.

Let Dame Rebecca put it down to our slight disgruntlement that she has not got on with those vastly more important proings into human personality enshrined and (we hope) to be enshrined in her uncompleted artistic work that we detach from their context in this lesser exploit certain *obiter dicta* which seem to us to have value in any context, instead of reviewing a brilliant piece of contemporary criticism.

And so:—"Fools get into trouble at any time, but not into as much trouble as they fell into in the summer of 1963. They cannot have fallen over: they must have been pushed."

"The normal social controls were not acting: people were not warned by those appointed to keep watch. It was as if a public mischief were being deliberately contrived."

"It would have been a great help if we had known the exact process by which the Galbraith affair was brought into being. It may have been the result of a genuine mistake, but it may have been that great pains were taken to delude someone into making such a mistake."

"Our age is crammed with a mob which makes the claim that it is nobody's fool, cannot be humbugged, will pick up every challenge laid down by authority."

"Against a popular myth the testimony of mere eye-witnesses has almost no power."

(This *The Times's*, not Dame Rebecca's):—Parliament... "rules, or fails to rule, by a tacit agreement with outside

forces in the community that their authority shall not be challenged."

Occasionally (but only occasionally) we are reminded of H. G. Wells' witticism that "a miss is far worse than a mile"—transitory return of disgruntlement! A brief character study of Lord Shawcross reinforces our suspicion that this able man may be emerging from what Mr. Cole once called "the entanglements of loyalty"?

There are passages in the above which we would like to italicise. But they speak for themselves. "For those with ears..." [Editor].

Whose Influence?

"Lord Wittenham described the impotence that seemed to come over each Home Secretary in turn: 'When Sir George Cave became Home Secretary... I said to him. "I am thankful you have come. Now we are going to have the real article". Again there was this subtle, indescribable influence which, whenever he wanted to be bold, seemed to paralyse him.'

"There is an influence in this country today behind these aliens' declared Lord Beresford. 'What it is I do not know. We hear of "hidden hands" and of other suggestions of the character, but there is an influence. There has been an influence all through the War, and the sooner we can get to the bottom of it and find out what that influence is the better.' (*Hansard*, July 26, 1918, col. 1229.)

"... Even as a Liberal, Lord St. Davids found it his duty to protest again against the speech of Lord Buckmaster, ... I used to think that the soft way with which these Germans were handled in Great Britain was carelessness, that it was softness of heart, but, frankly, I am getting suspicious myself, very suspicious.' (*Hansard*, July 8, 1918, col. 669.)

"My personal experiences during the War compel me to believe that these suspicions were well founded. Owing to the fact that my husband was officially employed to make investigations, and that our house, overlooking the Sussex Weald, commanded a wide view over the surrounding country, we frequently received visits from officers sent down to make enquiries in the district. I well remember on several occasions hearing these men employing the same phrase: 'It is no good reporting all this, no notice will be taken. *We are up against a brick wall.*'

"How often were we to come up against that brick wall in future!"

—Nesta Webster, *The Surrender of an Empire* (3rd Edition, 1931—pp. 19, 20.)

"Real Wealth"

The Tablet, whose sense of distinction between the claims of God and Caesar seems often so uncertain, may be maturing with the times, viz:—

"The Monnet Europeans in the Common Market now have a new anxiety, that if the growing freedom of trade is not accompanied by the growth of a common European consciousness, it can easily become a source of recrimination. Farmers everywhere are protectionist for their own home markets and

repositories of national feeling, but they may find urban allies wherever a local industry suffers from the imports of another member of the Six. Free trade has for its corollaries the free movement of capital and labour, which again means a great limitation on what Governments can do. The classical economists developed the concept of labour as a commodity, when what they were really writing about were men and women and children, whose labour was only a part of their life, and who, as they have grown more prosperous, have become less and less ready to be mobile, and more and more anxious that their Governments shall protect not only their right to work but their right to work in the localities to which they belong. This is the strongest of all the arguments for protection: that there is much more real wealth—that is, real human satisfaction—not where there is most abundance of goods for consumption, but where people have peace of mind, living space, and a sense of roots and permanence, such as cannot be had if everything is left open to the free-blowing winds of competitive change. The framers of the Treaty of Rome did not ignore this reality, and made some provision for it of a vague sort. But it is an aspect of the European Community to which much more attention will have to be paid. Its great weakness is that it does not lend itself to statistical treatment or to plotting of graphs: consumption can be measured, but not contentment or peace of mind, or many of the other real goods which statesmanship must seek to help people to secure.

"It has often happened in history that Governments have become isolated from those over whom they rule, but this has generally been because the rulers were conquerors, not claiming in any way to derive their power from the consent of the governed."

(*The Tablet*, July 12.)

How Many Starving Millions?

COLIN CLARK, the distinguished Oxford economist, attacks the "myth" of world hunger.

[WE GRATEFULLY ACKNOWLEDGE PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS ARTICLE FROM *The Sunday Telegraph* (LONDON), JUNE 16, 1963.]

"A lifetime of malnutrition and actual hunger is the lot of at least two-thirds of mankind." This famous mis-statement, which is still believed by a great many people, simply because they have heard it so often, was made by Lord Boyd Orr in 1950 on his retirement from the Director-Generalship of the Food and Agriculture Organisation.

It was shown in 1954 by Dr. Bennett, Director of the Food Research Institute at Stanford University, and probably the world's leading authority in this field, that Lord Boyd Orr could only have reached this extraordinary conclusion by confusing two columns taking ultimate targets for minimum requirements, in a table (inaccurate in any case) prepared for him by F.A.O.

A great many people, however, for reasons which perhaps only a social psychologist could elucidate, seem to prefer myth to fact on this question. F.A.O., once described by the *Economist* as "a permanent institution devoted to proving that there is not enough food in the world to go round", like all big organisations, has developed a strong instinct of self-preservation, and spends a great deal of money on Public Relations, which take precedence over accurate statistics, deciding on the "Freedom from Hunger Campaign" first and later

looking for facts to support it.

While not precisely committing itself to Lord Boyd Orr's figure, F.A.O. has been anxious to take advantage of the hysterical emotions which his statement has aroused, and based its campaign on the statement that half the world was suffering from malnutrition. F.A.O. has been responsible for putting this statement into the mouths of the Duke of Edinburgh and President Kennedy.

At the Royal Statistical Society in London in 1961, Dr. Sukhatme, Director of Statistics for F.A.O., an Indian himself, prepared an original and courageous survey of the available information on the proportion of the world's population who were actually hungry (not enough calories), which he estimated at 10 to 15 per cent. Most of these—though F.A.O. would find it politically very embarrassing to say so—are in fact in China and India; and the causes of their hunger are not agricultural, but political—Communism in China, and caste in India.

Compelled to accept its own statisticians figure, F.A.O., in order to support its claim about "half the world" had to fall back on a concept of "malnutrition", though they could neither define it, nor produce evidence for its existence.

The Cat is Out

I personally asked both the Director-General of F.A.O. and Sir Norman Wright, the Chief Scientific Adviser, for the evidence on which F.A.O.'s statement was based, and was told crossly that the evidence could not be shown at the time, but that it would all be given in the "Third World Food Survey". There has been a long wait for this publication, which apparently has not yet been distributed, but an abbreviated version of it has been made available in F.A.O.'s current "Monthly Bulletin".

The cat is now out of the bag. The evidence that half the world is suffering from malnutrition just is not there.

The survey even begins with an attempt to redeem Lord Boyd Orr's statement, admitting his confusing a minimum with a maximum, but stating that the latter was "needed to ensure good nutrition". Not a scintilla of evidence is produced for this statement. Accepting Dr. Sukhatme's figures all that the survey has to show to prove that half the world is suffering from malnutrition is a table indicating that many countries do not consume much meat or dairy produce.

I worked with Lord Boyd Orr in the 1930s, when he was preparing his book "Food, Health and Income", which appeared to show that a substantial proportion of the population of Britain was malnourished. I believe that physiologists were sincere in stating minimum nutritional requirements as they understood them in those days—that we needed 100 grams of fat per day, 0.9 of a gram of calcium, which should be obtained from dairy produce, and should take half our proteins from animal food—though some of them had at the back of their minds the idea that they were helping the farmers by their advocacy.

And it was rather revealing to see many of the scientists who were telling the country that it was malnourished in the 1930s, soon engaged in explaining that the country was quite adequately fed, on far smaller food supplies, in the 1940s.

But these physiological doctrines are quite out of date, though, as often, we can find Governments acting on out-of-date information. Large quantities of fat in the diet, particularly dairy fats, are now believed to be harmful, and we do

not actually need any. Calcium can be easily obtained from sources other than milk. And the amount of animal protein needed is very small indeed.

Rather late in the day, it has occurred to physiologists that there are communities, such as the Trappists in Europe, and millions of people in Asia, who on religious grounds abstain from meat altogether, and often eat very little dairy produce, but yet can remain quite healthy.

Bicycles Before Food

A diet containing meat, dairy produce and fruit is far more agreeable than a predominantly cereal diet, and we do right to wish that the whole of mankind could enjoy what we do. While Africans and Asians would certainly prefer to eat better, it is quite wrong to say that their predominantly cereal diets are necessarily inadequate to preserve health—and in any case more food is not generally their most urgent need, as they have shown themselves—when they earn more money, they spend most of it on textiles, building materials, medicine and bicycles, and not on food.

But, setting aside the question of the veracity of international officials, does the publication of such mis-statements by F.A.O. do more than academic harm? It does.

Now, throughout the world, every politician under pressure from farmers' unions, and worried by the problem of disposing of uneconomically produced surpluses, will fall back on the F.A.O. report. "Look," he will say, "with half the world malnourished, there is really no problem, and we need not do anything about restricting output, or reducing the number of farmers." Such evasion of the problem of agricultural surpluses in high-cost countries may have very serious consequences indeed.

And, even if a sincere attempt were made to do so, the distribution of greatly increased amounts of American and European agricultural surpluses to poorer countries would raise insoluble diplomatic, political and administrative problems.

Politics and the Crown

A correspondent tells us of the following letter to Her Majesty's private secretary and his reply:—

August 26, 1963

The Right Hon.

Sir Michael Adeane, K.C.B., K.C.V.O.,
Buckingham Palace,
London, S.W.1.

Dear Sir,

My attention has been drawn to an article in a Sunday newspaper, *The Sunday Mirror*, stating that, acting on Her Majesty's behalf, you have sought advice from, among others, Sir Ivor Jennings, described as "Britain's top constitutional scholar", on a Constitutional issue.

May I ask whether this allegation is correct?

Permit me to enclose a prepaid addressed envelope for your reply, which would be greatly appreciated.

Your faithfully,

29th August, 1963

Balmoral Castle.

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your letter of 26th August. I regret that I cannot make any comment on the remarks to which you refer and which were printed in last week's *Sunday Mirror*.

Yours sincerely,

(sgd) M. E. Adearne.

The article to which reference was made was on the newspaper's front page on August 25 under a "banner" headline, and began: "The Queen has called for advice from Britain's top constitutional experts on what she should do if the Prime Minister resigns before the next General Election."

India and Goa

The following letter, from Lord Colyton, was published in *The Daily Telegraph*, July 31, 1963:

Sir—I really cannot let Mr. Sharaf Athar-Ali's letter about India and Goa pass without challenge.

One of the primary purposes of the United Nations as laid down in Article 1 of the Charter is to take effective collective measures for the prevention of threats to peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression. Under Article 2 of the Charter the member States undertake to settle their disputes by peaceful means.

In accordance with these two articles India's unprovoked invasion of Goa, Damao and Diu on December 17, 1961, was brought before the Security Council and a resolution was introduced referring to India's use of force and calling upon her to withdraw her troops immediately. This resolution was supported by a majority of the Security Council, but was defeated by the veto of the Soviet Government.

I should be interested to know on what evidence Mr. Sharaf Athar-Ali bases his claim that the people of Goa had been pressing for union with India. All the information that I possess is in a directly contrary direction.

A recent article in the Swiss newspaper *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* states that it is a proven fact that of the Goans who lived in Goa only a tiny part were interested in being "liberated" from Portuguese domination. This applied equally to Hindus and Roman Catholics.

Certainly the economic effects of the Indian occupation have been disastrous. Exports of iron ore, which were the basis of the Goa economy, have fallen by 20 per cent. More than a third of the mines are closed, and 15,000 to 20,000 miners are out of work.

Import restrictions imposed from New Delhi have paralysed the economy, and many tradesmen are living on the verge of bankruptcy. Heavy taxation is adding to the hardships of the inhabitants. At the moment no less than 100,000 salaried workers and their families are threatened with unemployment.

India would enjoy far more sympathy among the general public in this country in the face of Chinese aggression if she had not stained her good name by this brutal attack on Goa despite all her most solemn obligations under the Charter of the United Nations.

Yours faithfully,

COLYTON.

House of Lords.