

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Volume 41. No. 10.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1961. Postage 2d.

6d Fortnightly.

### Racist Demagoguery vs. the Status Quo

[This copyright article is republished, with permission, from *Human Events*, (Washington D.C.), May 26, 1961.]

Unless the lessons of all these ubiquitous "international crises" are completely lost on our national leadership, we ought to be hearing less and less about the United States being "a revolutionary country and a revolutionary people" (President Kennedy); and about how we must avoid being "linked with the forces of reaction and stagnation" (Chester Bowles); and that "unless we march with this revolution, unless indeed we share in leading it, the future it will one day shape may have no place for us" (Adlai Stevenson).

Such talk hasn't made any sense for a long time, but at long last events must have forced even the three individuals quoted *supra* to understand, however reluctantly, that their assignment is to do what Dean Rusk declared as recently as last February we would never, never do—"undertake an active defence of the *status quo*." Survival demands recognition of a truth which theorists sneer at—that the United States is not a revolutionary country at all, but is what has been called a "satisfied power," whose interest is to maintain "things as they are." This assumes, of course, concern for orderly progress and promotion of economic growth and workable political systems, but calls for a roll back of the revolutionary forces that our liberals have had so much fun playing with.

Even Junior Schlesinger is not likely to want replays of that line about how Castro "betrayed the revolution" in Cuba, because from now on the Kennedy Administration will be compelled to act on the plain evidence, rejected by Eisenhower's State Department, that the Castro revolution was a Communist putsch from the beginning, conceived in Moscow, nourished in Mexico and delivered in the U.S.A., with the New York *Times'* Herbert Matthews as midwife. Our interest in Cuba was the maintenance of orderly government, with respect for U.S. property interests in the island, under a regime tolerant of our security requirements in the Caribbean. According to the testimony of two of our Ambassadors to Cuba, we could have helped the Cubans inaugurate such a regime minus Batista, but this "join the revolution" nonsense had the State Department so hypnotised that nothing but Castro would do.

The propaganda designed to equate Communist-fomented upheavals among the "lesser breeds without the law" with the American Revolution was idiotic in the first place. As Professor Arnold Whitridge, formerly of Yale, puts it, "Our Revolution was a family quarrel fought between white men for the benefit of white men." One would think from much current babble on the subject that the Revolution was fought for the benefit of the Indians! In his *In Defence of Colonies* (George Allen and Unwin), Sir Alan Burns points out that "at the time of the American Revolution few people seriously considered that the aboriginal Red

Indians (or the African slaves) had any political rights, or that the Red Indians had any inherent right to the lands which the white colonists coveted."

The American Revolution was a taxpayer's revolt against the British Government's fat-headed effort to force the colonies to help Britain balance her budget. As the late Professor Charles M. Andrews noted years ago in *The Colonial Background of the American Revolution* (Yale Press), the leaders of the colonial cause, even including Franklin, attempted to steer these justifiable complaints toward some compromise. "Manufacture as much as possible and say nothing" was Ben's advice. However, the British cabinet managed to parlay the tax battle into a war—for the benefit of a rising imperialism and against the interests of British traders, whom Pitt described as "little, paltry, peddling fellows, vendors of two-penny wares and falsehoods, who under the idea of trade sell everything in their power—honour, truth, conscience."

These "little, paltry, peddling fellows" would probably have been willing to settle for almost anything in order to build up customers in the American colonies. Indeed, the Revolution had an astonishing amount of support in England. John Fiske in *The Critical Period of American History*, which ought to be read more than it is these days, states that "the Whigs did all in their power to discourage enlistments and in various ways so thwarted and vexed the government that the success of the Americans was by many people ascribed to their assistance." Indeed, the matter could doubtless have been settled with a reasonable amount of good will had reasonable men in both countries found a way to settle anything.

Anyhow, there is no historical justification for identifying the leaders of 1776 with the Sukarnos, Nkrumahs, Mao Tse-tungs, Castros, and other contemporary revolutionaries. The intense nationalism of Sam Adams and the Sons of Liberty, which often embarrassed the more cautious leaders of the colonial cause, had little in common with the kind of revolution going on today or even with the kind of revolution that convulsed France a few years after our own fracas. Not even the post-war bitterness toward England enlisted much important American support for the violent revolutionaries of the continent. Not even Jefferson—a more persuasive advocate than Chester Bowles—could sell us on the virtues of the *sans culottes*.

But the best indication of what the men who fought the British from 1775 to 1783 thought they were doing is not so much what was said during the war or in the period of tension preceding it, or even in the stirring words of the

(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 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices—Business: 9, AVENUE ROAD, STRATFORD-ON-AVON. Telephone: Stratford-on-Avon, 3976.

Editorial: PENRHYN LODGE, GLOUCESTER GATE, LONDON, N.W.1. Telephone: EUSon 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, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. (Telephone: EUSon 3893.) Canada: L. Denis Byrne, 7420, Ada Boulevard, Edmonton, Alberta. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W.

### Pressure Group

“Although it was not recognised at the time, the General Election of October 25, 1951, marked the beginning of the end of the twenty-five year reign of the BBC. That the future of broadcasting in Great Britain should have played no part in the election campaign provides an opportunity for speculation on the role of the electorate in shaping critical decisions.” (*Pressure Group: The Campaign for Commercial Television*, by H. H. Wilson. Secker & Warburg, 1961. 18/-).

Speculation? Douglas died in 1952, having failed to provoke speculation on this subject even among ‘Social Crediters,’ although he had tried persistently for well over a quarter of a century, and had himself put an end to all speculation on this point. *Outside the narrow range of influence of the Social Credit Secretariat* mankind is totally blind to this point, and ‘to a blind horse, a nod is as good as a wink.’

The little work cited above is *not* a handbook for dissident Social Crediters, or for the Secretariat. It is “an attempt to describe what was in essence an intra-party conflict over the introduction and passage of a single piece of legislation. . . . Apart from the intrinsic interest in the change in the position of a venerated institution. . . . it is intended to provide some insight into the actual operation of the Conservative Parliamentary Party and its relation to external pressures. Though it has become a commonplace to speak of the Member of Parliament as powerless to oppose the authority and prestige of the Cabinet, it was hoped that detailed analysis of a single ‘revolt’ might suggest circumstances in which individual Conservative Members can successfully influence events. . . . This is a political study, an attempt to present the history of the

38

events, forces, techniques involved in the passage of a single controversial legislative act. . . . Caution certainly dictates restraint in generalizing on the basis of a single legislative enactment. Yet as an example of a successful pressure group operation, the passage of the Television Act warrants analysis, even though it be pressure politics with differences not readily to be subsumed under the usual descriptions. . . . For an observer a most curious aspect of the history of this act is the defeat of the Conservative Party leadership by a very small group of nominally insignificant Conservative backbenchers. Actually, of course, they were not insignificant because they were, in effect, spokesmen for powerful economic groups in the Conservative coalition, e.g., the radio-television manufacturing industry, major American and British advertising agencies, and financial institutions. Furthermore, they were re-inforced by the professional publicity and public relations practitioners who had been brought into the Conservative Central Office by Lord Woolton when he reorganized the Party after July 1, 1946.”

### U.N.O. and Portugal

“ . . . . In view of the votes cast against Portugal and of the abstentions, many people infer that Portugal has been dangerously isolated in the international concert.

“I hope we will not be intimidated, those of us who are sure of having reason on our side and are convinced that we can demonstrate it.

“International life does not take place in the U.N.O. alone and the votes are the result of a quantitative process set up there rather than an expression of solid judgement on international and overseas problems.

“Notwithstanding, one notices in many countries a kind of a wave of panic and intimidation, corresponding to the lack of faith in the principles of Western civilisation which continue to be regarded as valid. . . .”

—Dr. Salazar in an address to the Portuguese National Assembly.

### Witness

“Whittaker Chambers is dead, the Communist who repented, the man who exposed the traitor Alger Hiss and wrote, in his strange, powerful half-mad book “Witness,” one of the greatest of modern autobiographies.

“Here Chambers described, in every curious and squalid detail, the lives and methods of Communist agents as they crawled underground, gnawing at the roots of America.

“His story was almost incredible. No wonder it was not believed, and among the more obstinate progressives, is still not believed.

“When Chambers denounced Hiss, he became the victim of a smear-campaign of unheard-of viciousness, not because, as a Communist, he had betrayed his country in the past, but because he had exposed a traitor still active in the present. No doubt the slanders will pursue him in the grave.

“Hiss was scarcely out of goal before he was invited to lecture at Princeton University. And the people who invited him still babble about McCarthyism.”

—Peter Simple in *The Daily Telegraph*, London, July 13, 1961.

## Speculation

The following letter appeared in *The Times*, August 11, 1961.

Sir,

Would it be too much trouble to ask that someone should tell me—and other worried citizens—(i) who are the international speculators responsible for the attack on sterling which has made necessary the massive support given by the International Monetary Fund; (ii) why is it possible for them to endanger the financial security of those countries dependent on sterling; and (iii) what can be done to prevent a recurrence.

Yours sincerely,  
(Signed) Marjorie Hooper.

35, Clifton Road, Ben Rhyddin, Ilkley, Yorkshire.

A correspondent tells us he has replied direct to Mrs. Hooper but has *not* written to *The Times*. His letter is as follows:—  
August 11, 1961.

Dear Madam,

Your questions in this morning's *Times* newspaper are not in the least naive. Allowing for some assumptions implicit in the phraseology used, they are realistic, and should, in my opinion, be asked over and over again until they are convincingly answered *in public*. I think it would be naive to expect to see the sort of answer that is a real, comprehensive, truthful answer in *The Times* or in any other newspaper, or to hear it expressed by one of our politicians or 'reputable' economists. But, if you will bear with me, I will offer brief answers to all your questions.

(1) The small, closely-knit group (according to Baron von Neurath\* in an indiscreet moment, not more than 200) who set the policy of the financial machine composed of such parts as the financial acceptance houses, banks, central and trading, *etc.*, who control financial credit. As Montesquieu said long ago: "Financiers sustain the State as a rope sustains the hanged man". They are not truly 'speculators': they merely set the conditions in which speculators work. When they themselves enter the money market, there is nothing 'speculative' about it: they are just 'lending a hand' to heat up the pot; although I would agree that the amount of heat they lend is very often great. The International Monetary Fund is just one of the instruments in this complex. 'Making it necessary' to apply to it is another way of saying 'making it necessary' for a particular 'government' (in this case ours) to come to heel. One of the means relied upon to keep this state of things going is to force (by suitable publicity) electorates to rely upon false axioms in judging questions of economics and finance. The nature and scope of these false axioms is beyond the range of your question, and is, of course, technical.

(2) No nation has any 'financial security' other than that which the policy-makers permit, and that is 'as much as we desire *on terms*—or none'. Finance is supra-national and pursues a continuous policy, and a consistent policy—Power by progressive centralization of all activities.

(3) Ah yes, of course! There are two answers, the first

\* We believe the writer has confused Baron von Neurath with Walter Rathenau, to whom this statement is generally attributed.

technical and the second political. Although Mr. Krushchev has just announced the virtual abolition of the use of money (for civil purposes at all events) within the next 20 years, the money system could be made, without great alteration, to work perfectly well, *if* the present policy implicit in its present use were reversed. No one knows better than the financial hierarchy that this is so: they know what they are doing and how to do it. So we come back to the second answer, which is political: how are we to become 'democratic' in the sense of ourselves determining to what purposes our lives are put? Party politics is not democratic: it is merely the manipulation of caucuses to substitute a choice of 'platforms' for a true choice of alternative policies. The British Constitution as it developed from the eleventh to the fifteenth century was a valid instrument of government. It had three feet, like a tripod, which is the simplest mechanical structure that will stand—compare the three legs of the Isle of Man, with its motto, "It will stand". The 'legs' were perfectly intelligible: a body of men who understood how human power could be directed for the accomplishment of some desired end (the Lords), a body representing the necessary physical power, man-power (the Commons could give or withhold 'supply') and a head, who could address both 'Houses' together and say, to one in the hearing of the other: "Gentlemen, this objective is wrong" or "Gentlemen, this objective is right." (The King). In the one case he might say: "If you continue objection to the course put before you, these are the consequences which will ensue. I can do nothing to prevent your obstruction, but I have warned you"; or "My Lords, if you persist in this course, these are the consequences which will ensue. . . . etc." This works; but all the political effort of recent generations is to abolish the Constitution as I have described it (doubtless in very imperfect terms). The Commons are 'boss,' the Crown has been shorn of its prerogatives, and the Lords are only such and such as the House of Commons may decide. (This is called 'The Crown on the advice of Her Ministers' or just 'Legislation' as you please). But not one of the three feet is intact. If it advocates a policy divergent from that set before it by the policy-makers, it will not get elected. As the American, Ferguson, said some years ago: "The power of finance and the power of publicity are concentric." All the Members of Parliament do is to "get out the vote" (See Sir Ivor Jennings: *Party Politics*).

I think I know *how* this situation can be brought to an end; but to evoke the will of the people to bring it to an end is another matter. Just as a passenger in a train invited to play cards with strangers can save himself by refusing, so the electorate can save itself by simply saying: "Thank you! We have experience of that one! We are not playing." I imagine the result would be spectacular. In such circumstances there is literally nothing the so-called 'government' dare do.

It is not impossible that there is some dim awareness of this situation at the present time. That is why there is so much noise about space flights, 'crises,' threats of a now quite impossible war—to distract attention from realities. The most outstanding reality which no-one seems to notice is the paradox that, as scientists and technologists speed up the rate at which anything you like can be produced without

human agency otherwise, the dearer it gets instead of the cheaper. . . .

P.S. Note the reported French comment on the new Russian programme—"everything is to be 'free' except Freedom." The *policies* (the objectives) to be reached finally by 'East' and 'West' are identical. They are just wrapped up in bottles with differently-coloured labels.

#### RACIST DEMAGOGUERY VS. THE STATUS QUO (continued from page 1)

Declaration of Independence itself. Those who look upon the Revolution as a sort of prelude to the liberation of Angola should put in some time reading the story of the making of the Constitution. This document, hammered out undemocratically "behind closed doors," set up a system of government about as revolution-proof as a group of mostly conservative and conspicuously able English gentlemen could make it.

James Madison, in his notes on the proceedings of the convention in 1787 in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, records himself as saying this:

"In all cases where a majority are united by a common interest or passion, the rights of the minority are in danger. What motives are to restrain them? The only remedy, is to enlarge the sphere, and thereby divide the community into so great a number of interests and parties, that in the first place, a majority will not be likely, at the same moment to have a common interest separate from that of the whole, or of the minority; and in the second place, that in case they should have such an interest, they may not be apt to unite in the pursuit of it. It was incumbent on us, then, to try this remedy and with that view to frame a republican system on such a scale, and in such a form, as will control all the evils which have been experienced."

Hence "checks and balances." Far from supporting revolution, the founding fathers, who had seen anarchy and collapse at close range, had little use for pure democracy. Madison regarded democracies as "incompatible with personal security or the rights of property." He believed that democracies "have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths." John Adams, who as a young lawyer had defended the British soldiers involved in the "Boston Massacre," said as President: "There never was a democracy that did not commit suicide."

When the more recent revolutionary forces which deserved American support, if only on the low level of self-interest, arose, our kibitzers of revolution were silent. The Hungarians who rose against Communist tyranny in 1956 might have fared better had the United Nations been as quick to recognise Nagy, the head of the revolutionary regime, as the State Department was to recognise Castro three years later. Conceivably such a gesture from Washington might have kept Soviet tanks at home. A direct challenge to this country was probably more than Khrushchev cared to undertake. Promising revolts against Red dictatorship in Poland and East Germany got only editorial support over here. Indonesia's suppression of the Moluccas is ignored, and the peripatetic Sukarno, who quotes Jefferson when in Washington but speaks his own principles when in Moscow, is greeted by President Kennedy as the "father of his country!" There have been some curious omissions in the list of revolutionaries considered worthy of our Big Hello.

40

We have bawled out Portugal, Belgium, France and the Netherlands: indeed, taken an active part in support of revolutions in their areas. The supposition, largely based on the mistaken theory that we are a revolutionary country, has been that "world opinion" required this meddling. But are we happier with Sukarno in Indonesia than we were with the Dutch? Is it likely that our interests, or those of the Congo, will be furthered if all Belgians are compelled to leave the area? The more responsible Congolese do not think so. Some of them doubtless agree with Charles T. O. King of Liberia who, as Liberia's representative at the United Nations, said that his country had always been free and "had never reaped the advantages of colonialism."

Even an "unsatisfied country" ought to hesitate before supporting United Nations interference in such matters. Are we prepared for a U.N. resolution expressing disapproval on what amounts to segregated housing on Long Island, followed perhaps by a demand that we do something about it. If an Indian neutralist can use force against anti-Communist leaders in the Congo, why not a Czech task force to round up the John Birch Society?

Of course changes are being made and not even a "satisfied country" can ignore them. But the effort to fool ourselves and others into believing that the United States should be out in front of the world revolution, even at the cost of breaking our ties with the civilized countries of Europe in order to make time with primitive tribesmen, has been a strategic and moral mistake. During the 1960 campaign William S. White cut loose in his column with words which now seem prophetic. White detailed the various areas in which the "bad old colonials" had been put to flight, and envisioned these withdrawals as leaving "large sections of the world either in chaos—a chaos for which the word 'democracy' is a sentimental fraud—or ready to fall into the Soviet sphere. Moreover, they have broken the western alliance, in truth if not in formality. For all this we may thank a professional-liberal passion for a politics which assumes not that the races are of equal value before God and the law—as indeed they should and must be—but rather that all wisdom and all virtue rests within the coloured peoples alone."

Mr. White attributed the adoption of this nonsense, which nobody really believes, to "racist demagoguery that has already all but paralyzed our politics abroad."

The poor critters we have been trying to shill with this silly propaganda don't fall for it anyway. They take our dough and our flattery and still call us "imperialists." Our allies are naturally disturbed, and angry men stone our embassy in Lisbon for supposedly backing the Communists, while in Moscow they stone our embassy for backing Batista, as if Rubottom and Herbert Matthews had never existed.

So now poor Mr. Kennedy has to say "To Hell with Harvard, Adlai and Bowles!" and get on with the job, carrying out policies dictated by events, whatever his liberal advisers say about it. He isn't likely to find much in common ground between U.S. interests and those "revolutionary forces now sweeping over the world." His job is to defend the *status quo*.

It's all very tough on the President, because it isn't all his fault. Nevertheless, he must have nightmares now and then when living over some of those campaign speeches.