

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 47 No. 22

SATURDAY, 27 JANUARY, 1968

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

Hooliganism

When the Foreign Secretary formally announced that Aden would become independent at midnight, Mr. Paget, a member of his own party, asked reasonably enough: "Which of the Six Principles necessary to our recognition of Rhodesia have been applied to Aden?" This provoked a good deal of jeering reminiscent of a rowdy football crowd, while Mr. Brown lamely replied that he had applied the principle of "self-determination", assuring the House that the N.L.F. delegates were hurrying back to Aden from Geneva to form a Government "though he could not say yet what form it would take". (*Daily Telegraph*, Nov. 30, 1967.)

The *Church Times* editorial, written before devaluation, gives a more balanced view than that of the political hooligans. "The spectacle of Britain desperately seeking more foreign loans this week, in order to pay the interest on previous loans, is a national humiliation only equalled by what the Government has been driven to do over Aden . . . handing over power to a gang of murderous terrorists who have gained a semblance of power by nothing except sheer violence." (Nov. 17, 1967.)

The same newspaper reports the next week that Bishop Huddleston of Massai has threatened to renounce his British citizenship unless "fresh initiatives" are taken against Rhodesia's "increasingly racist policies", and he suggests a Commonwealth Conference at Ottawa in which he presumes that Canada, India, Pakistan and the East African countries would "act together". I fear that the bishop, by his none too scrupulous use of such emotive words as "racist", looks guilty of the same sort of conduct as the crowd that yells out, "Shoot the ref", for he totally disregards the racist and tribal activities in Tanzania, Nigeria, and the Sudan, to mention only a few, and gives no credit to those who preserve order in a murderous continent.

The Bishop of Mashonaland (Mashonaland covers North and Eastern Rhodesia) restored the balance when he reported that there were hopeful signs of stability in the university, and that Rhodesia was "one of the most peaceful countries in the world". He added, "Courage and devotion are high . . . there has been increasing peaceful integration of Christians at the congregational level", while the greater part of the white population probably supported the *de facto* government. One can hardly blame the Rhodesian government for taking such elementary precautions as banning from school libraries the works of Bishops Huddleston and Ambrose Reeves, for Bishop Reeves admits that his book on South Africa "is propaganda in a way". Precautions have to be taken, one notes, at some football fields to avoid a riot on the pitch.

The other Rhodesian bishop, of Matabeleland, came to Liverpool and complained about those who were restricted, and he too finds an answer from his own church in Rhodesia, for the Archdeacon of Inyanga writes (*Church Times*, Dec. 1, 1967) that the restriction of these four hundred has enabled over four million to sleep in their beds: "The burning hut at midnight, the petrol bomb among the sleeping children—these belong to the past. The Bishop is still new to Rhodesia . . . the moral problem is not easy . . . witnesses dare not give evidence against the terrorists." He concludes that Rhodesia has devalued neither the pound nor her moral currency "and might have more than her present indifferent success if Bishop Skelton had something better to offer than a veiled excuse for disorder and 'a Christian theology of revolution'. Evolution not revolution is what Africa needs".

But this is not what communism needs, and so the prophets of hooliganism receive a publicity which their arguments never deserve.

—H.S.

Correction, Please!

(From *The Review of the News*, Jan. 3, 1968)

ITEM: From a guest Editorial by FRANK K. KELLY, a vice president of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, in *Saturday Review* for November 18, 1967:

I propose that it should be an obligation of the United Nations to give humanity a full report each year on the state of mankind. The person who could give such a report is the Secretary General, U Thant . . . the Secretary General would speak primarily as a person—as a human being chosen by his fellows to stand before the world as a Citizen of Humanity . . . he could go on to voice his own views as a person concerned about mankind as a whole . . . Mankind needs a spokesman. U Thant could be the first one to speak for the Community of Man.

CORRECTION: Mr. Kelly is insulting the intelligence of his readers if he expects them to agree with this hypocritical twaddle, masked in a concern for "humanity". In the first place it is utter poppycock to state that U Thant has been "chosen by his fellows" to speak for all men. He was carefully selected for the job by the 11 member Security Council, and a few months later was confirmed in office by a "rubber stamp" vote of the General Assembly. Both bodies are made up of officials appointed by their governments, not selected by popular vote. And in a great many cases these appointees do not espouse the views of the people they professedly represent. This is especially true with regard to the Communist dictatorships.

(continued on page 4)

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 40/-; Six months 20/-; Three months 10/-.

Offices: Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London E.11.
Telephone: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1
Telephone: 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001
Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001
(Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2600. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q. Secretary: H. A. Scouler, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Nobody ever accuses Mr. Harold Wilson of being a fool, which means that his policies could not be foolish, and in that case they must be something much worse—wicked. So that arguing back again, we must come to the conclusion that Mr. Wilson is wicked. The charge of foolishness may perhaps more properly be laid against the Conservatives, who followed policies they probably did not understand—socialist policies which they did not recognise—and who largely by default allowed Britain's decline from greatness. No doubt there are some traitors in the Conservative political ranks, but the Labour Party is founded in the concept of treason—the surrender of British sovereignty to an alien power—International Finance, policed by Communism. Treason is punishable by the death penalty.

The British appear unaware of what is going on; but this is because the mass communications are in the control of the enemy. Visitors to Britain report differently, and Mr. Wilson probably knows that the British increasingly know that he is unrepresentative of them. So he is engaged in rendering public opinion impotent.

Economic sovereignty has long since been lost; but political sovereignty in theory remains. But if the Administration signs the Treaty of Rome, political sovereignty is lost too, and this is more easily grasped than economic phenomena.

There must by now be thousands of Britons who increasingly know the score. If they could organise a massive campaign of letter-writing to Ms.P., pointing out that participation in Mr. Wilson's policies IS TREASON, it might prepare the way for a national revival should the world crisis be resolved in our favour elsewhere. And there is a chance—no more—that it may be.

• • •

The *Times* (December 22, 1967) suggests "cancelling the F 111, accelerated withdrawal from the Far East, dropping the Ark Royal refit, and proportionate reductions in manpower and equipment . . .". In short, complete the Nassau arrangements ordered by Washington. And, accordingly, news broadcasts on December 30 announced that a

British team was on the way to Washington, holiday weekend and all, to see about cancelling the F 111 contract—and contracts for other aircraft as well.

There is something fantastic, and probably ominous, in the present velocity of Britain's decline. Something has happened to cause this abandonment of the strategy of patient gradualism. Perhaps it is the public opinion polls.

• • •

A graph published in *U.S. News & World Report*, Dec. 25, 1967, shows that in the past seven years, crime in the U.S. has increased at 8.8 times the rate of population growth. Another shows a steep and continuing rise in major worldwide political violence. Sporadic crime or sporadic violence might be due to a number of causes, but a steady and continuous increase points to a continuing cause—a long-term policy. But the mass communications media present unfolding history as if nothing were related to anything else; but Douglas, who saw all this coming, and devoted the latter part of his life to warning us, knew that history is crystallised policy, and that until the final coming of Communism, manipulation of the money system is its instrument. The fall of Great Britain is primarily a financial fall, initiated by the intrigues and consequences of the First World War, promoted for that purpose.

U.S. Security Leak in France?

Washington, December 21—Representative Bob Wilson (R.-Calif.) expresses concern over reports that the United States continues to furnish France with military secrets even though Soviet paratroopers are now training there. According to Wilson, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, a high-ranking Soviet army general and other Soviet military men were given access to secret facilities in France on the personal orders of French President Charles de Gaulle, and they were authorized to inspect American-designed equipment. In a letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, the California Republican terms the situation "an intolerable security risk" and asks Rusk to supply him with details "on all programs of the United States assisting France in the realm of the military". He declares that such information is needed in the event Congress feels it necessary to restrict the release of data and equipment to French military forces.

—*The Review of the News*, Jan. 3, 1968.

Canadian Gold to the United States

Ottawa, December 21—Canadian Finance Minister Mitchell Sharp announces that Canada has sold \$100 million in gold to the United States "as a measure of continued international monetary cooperation". The sale is the second this year and the fifth in a two-year period to bolster dwindling U.S. gold stocks by \$350 million. (On December 7, U.S. Treasury officials reported that America's gold holdings were down to \$12.4 billion, compared with a peak of \$24.6 billion in 1949.) Sharp also remarks that the sale is "very similar to previous actions we have taken in the past when we sold gold to the United States, but this is a rather larger transaction than usual".

—*The Review of the News*, Jan. 3, 1968.

Playing with Values

Lord Reith, in a television interview, accused Sir Winston Churchill of giving the country no moral purpose during his peacetime premiership. At almost the same time, Dr. Leach, the Provost of King's College, Cambridge, delivered the Reith lectures in which he warned his audience of the danger of moral principles and, it seems, inferred that the moral law was relative or non-existent.

One could answer that the great teachers of mankind—such as Confucius and Cicero—have taught precepts remarkably conformable with those of the New Testament; and that further, the average person feels a natural repulsion against certain acts of which he has never heard before or against which his parents have never warned him.

We need the greatest precision when dealing with politics, the sphere from which Macchiavelli dismissed all ethical considerations, and some correspondence in *The Times* (Dec. 7, 1967) emphasises this need. Lord Fisher of Lambeth writes on "ideals in practice", commending the action of those employees who accepted a cut of 8/- a week, adding that all politicians "in some measure betray their best idealism", but that this does not make them dishonest. He is not prepared to say that "Mr. Wilson and his Cabinet have betrayed their and our best ideals any more . . . than those who have undermined confidence in them". Yet an ideal cannot function in a vacuum, and a nation stripped of its defences, material and spiritual, and pledged to the moneylenders, has little scope for independent idealism.

Mrs. J. B. Priestley (Jacquetta Hawkes) remarks that the "breakaway of the rising generation means a real change of values . . . British behaviour since the war has been at least partly inspired by the new values . . . through renunciations and a restraint sometimes almost saintly we might have been seen to be leading away from past ideas of belligerent national self-interest . . .". The value missing from consideration is that of responsibility. The ideal of renunciation involved no one else except the person turning his or her back on the world; the retreats as well as the confiscations of our period involve the present and future population.

However, I leave it to Sir Charles Mott Radclyffe, M.P., to shatter the illusion of saintly renunciation: "We have handed over to no government because no government as yet exists. We leave behind an embassy accredited to no one. No constitution, no elections, no majority rule . . . In Aden we simply abandoned those whom we originally supported. . . . The Government have thus anaesthetised themselves against any latent sense of responsibility towards many who have long served the Crown loyally . . ."

I will quote from Sir Charles's letter only one further phrase to support my suggestion that renunciation or idealism or values had nothing to do with the Government's action or inaction—"shameful irresponsibility".

—H.S.

Frustration as a Technique

The passage under the above title in our issue of January 13 was signed with the initials H.H. We regret that this was an error, and the initials should have been H.E.

Assisting the Enemy

The following letter appeared in the *Daily Telegraph*, Sydney, Dec. 5, 1967:

The economics of Australia's wheat industry seem to be what the late Winston Churchill would describe as an enigma shrouded in a mystery.

The Minister for Primary Industry recently announced a wheat price rise of nine cents a bushel. Bread, pies and cakes as a result will go up in price. Breadwinners and pensioners will suffer.

No explanation was offered other than that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Wheat Board believe it is necessary.

As a member of Parliament, I am called on to vote on legislation for subsidies connected with wheat. How can I do so when the Wheat Board refuses through the Minister to answer any questions on the terms of contracts to sell wheat to Red China?

While I get the same refusal of information about wheat, as about VIP planes, I read articles and statements by economists who claim they have the information on wheat contracts with Red China denied me as a parliamentarian.

Noting their claim that we are selling wheat to Red China at less than cost of production, I have asked why? The answer is that much of the wheat is sub-standard. When I ask for details, I am refused information.

I am told the secrecy is needed to prevent our competitors being advantaged. But when I write to the High Commissioner for Canada, a top competitor in wheat, he supplies me voluminous details of Canada's wheat sales. Why aren't they afraid too?

When I ask the Government through the Minister for Primary Industry to get me the information from the Wheat Board, the answer is that the Board is an independent body and the Government cannot influence its decisions.

This week I read in Australian weekly and trade papers categorical statements that the Wheat Board wanted months ago to insure our immense wheat sales to Red China against the risk of devaluation, but the Australian Government told it not to, because this could become public and be interpreted as lack of confidence in Britain's economy.

As a result of this omission, devaluation means a loss of \$30 million on our credit sales of wheat. Yet I have seen no official explanation or denial.

Now I shall have to ask when Parliament meets:

•Is the Wheat Board independent when it suits the Government and not independent when it suits the Government?

•Is the taxpayer to be called on to pay for the alleged \$30 million loss caused by the Government's intervention?

•Is he as well to pay for dearer bread to recoup this loss and also to enable us to continue selling wheat to Red China at less than production cost?

F. P. MC MANUS.

(Senator for Victoria)

Melbourne.

Correction, Please!

(continued from page 1)

Even more to the point is the question of U Thant's qualifications to speak "as a person concerned about mankind as a whole". His personal philosophy and past performance are a clear revelation of for whom he would speak. *Human Events* for November 10, 1961 pointed out that: "U Thant is considered something of a weak sister' who would stand up to the Russians less firmly than did the late Swedish diplomat (Hammarskjöld). Burma, itself, has become increasingly friendly toward the Communist bloc in recent years. Examples are numerous where Burma has even been discriminating against its own anti-Communist inhabitants." That *Human Events* was correct was immediately illustrated by the fact that U Thant's first action as Secretary General was to name American Marxist Ralph Bunche and Soviet delegate George P. Arkadev as undersecretaries. A short time before this the Soviet Union had agreed to drop its demand for a troika if U Thant would appoint these two men to those positions. So they ended up with what they demanded in the first place.

G. Edward Griffin has pointed out in his book *The Fearful Master: A Second Look At The United Nations* (Western Islands, 1964) that during his tenure as Secretary-General of the United Nations U Thant has, among other things, sharply criticized the United States for resuming nuclear testing, but said nothing about Russia's series of tests. He tried strenuously to tone down the UN resolution against the brutal Soviet suppression of Hungary. He became very alarmed and disturbed over United States' sanctions against Cuba, so much so that he proposed UN control posts in the Caribbean and in the United States to prevent an American invasion. And after the UN troops had acted like barbarians in the Congo he sent them the following words of praise: "Their loyalty to the United Nations, their team spirit and comradeship have been an inspiration to all who value the peace-keeping role of the United Nations . . . In truth I have every reason to be proud of their discipline and their conduct". The "discipline" and "conduct" were described in part by the 46 doctors at the Elizabethville, Katanga hospital in a telegram to U Thant which read: "We regret your shameful lie that your mercenaries did not shoot at Red Cross vehicles. You will have the right to talk about such things when you have spent nights with us in our hospitals bombed by your faithless and lawless ruffians."

National Review Bulletin for March 20, 1962, reminded its readers that in an address in 1958 to the American Academy of Political and Social Science U Thant had said: "Burma is convinced that in the circumstances prevailing, the democratic method is the only right method to work for socialism . . . Democratic socialism to most of us in Burma is not just a new school of thought, but a new culture, a new civilization." U Thant had the incredible gall to state, in that same speech, that the Soviet Union had not imposed its will on its neighbours but that those nations had wilfully chosen to live under Communist dictatorships! As one writer charitably observed concerning this view, U Thant "is a man who obviously is unable to recognize any real difference between the morality of the West and world Communism".

The Roman Catholic publication *New World* for September 7, 1962 contained the following: "Thant,

speaking to (Red) Polish officials and diplomats, said further that history proves that 'various strong religious and political convictions are not a permanent feature of society—just a passing phenomenon'—and that the United Nations is 'the only hope for the future of mankind'. Just how objectively would U Thant speak for the hundreds of millions of humans whose convictions are held more firmly than his own?

In December, 1962 U Thant praised Nikita Khrushchev, the butcher of Budapest, a man who for many years was one of Stalin's most trusted henchmen, as follows: "Mr. Khrushchev . . . belongs to a different category of leaders, with a coherent philosophy of the world based not on the thesis of the inevitability of war, but on the imperative of competitive coexistence."

In July, 1965 U Thant delivered a speech to the 30th session of the U.N. Economic and Social Council in which according to the *Chicago Tribune*, he "blamed the highly-industrialized countries for widening the gap between rich and poor nations . . . Thant called for a new international spirit to make all nations more equal". Which is simply another way of expressing the Communist doctrine of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need".

Thant has made so many irresponsible statements concerning the war in Vietnam that Vice Admiral Ruthven E. Libby (USN, Retired) stated in an article in the *Boston Globe* for January 22, 1967 that: "I can recall no previous case where a man occupying a highly sensitive position of such worldwide importance and responsibility disagreed so flatly with so many national leaders and with so much contemporary history."

It is not difficult to understand the above statements by, and assessments of, U Thant when one realizes that his own political outlook is fundamentally Marxist. In a press conference on September 17, 1962 he stated: "I believe very strongly in the Hegelian concept of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, and I also believe that unmistakable forces are at work towards a synthesis. I am convinced that this world is heading for a synthesis."

It would be naive to believe that Mr. Kelly of the very Far Left's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, or the erudite editor of *Saturday Review*, Mr. Norman Cousins, do not realize where U Thant's sympathies really lie. And since Mr. Kelly frankly admits that his concern is in "speeding the development of a world civilization", one can easily surmise just what type of a world it is he and Mr. Cousins have in mind when they name U Thant as their ideal spokesman.

Like a Conquered Province, the Moral Ambiguity of America

(The Massey Lectures 1966)

by Dr. Paul Goodman

The lectures were mentioned in the article "Scientific Civilisation" in T.S.C. October 7, 1967.

Price 42/3 posted.

Printed by E Fish & Co Ltd Liverpool