

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Volume 40. No. 16.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1960.

Postage 2d. 6d. Fortnightly.

### Gold

A correspondent has sent us the *Washington Times-Herald* which is humorously described by itself as "Washington's *Independent Newspaper*." (Emphasis is the *Times-Herald's*).

Its independence is strikingly exemplified by the issue's leading article which is propaganda for Gold Finance. "The only thing wrong with gold is not to have it. We have it. Let's hold what we have, work for more, and try better to appreciate (*sic*) gold's value to us all."

But the bit we like best is: "Citizens, your old Uncle has been plenty stupid at times, but not about gold. Not yet, anyhow. That buried gold won World War II."

How true that is. If you lost a son in the war, or your house was destroyed by bombs, and you see little ahead of you beyond austerity and Shinwell's tinker's cusses, you may have imagined that you made some small contribution. But you are wrong, and it's easy to prove it. The Land of Buried Gold, whose chief inhabitants just murmured, "Tch, tch, Britain sure is taking a whale of a licking!" while they sorted over our assets, won not merely the war, but the peace, because the two main objects of the war were to destroy the British Empire and to re-establish Gold and shift the centre of world Finance permanently to New York. All the present evidence goes to prove the complete attainment of both these objectives. The *Times-Herald* is too modest. There have been four great wars in this century, so far, and Gold has won them all.

—*The Social Crediter*, November 1, 1947.

*The Economist* of December 11th, 1944, had the following:

"Although representatives of Soviet Russia have taken part in the recent informal talks on post-war currency plans laid in Washington and London, it is not until this week that a semi-official expression of Russian views on the subject has been made. It comes from the leading Soviet economist, Professor Varga, and takes the form of an article contributed to the periodical *War and the Working Class*. Professor Varga's position in the Soviet Union would suggest that his views have behind them a wide measure of official support. As far as may be judged from the cabled summaries of his article, Professor Varga states that Russia, while interested in all steps calculated to hasten the restoration of world economy, is not impressed by the international bank or stabilisation fund proposals of the Keynes and White schemes. His own country, writes Professor Varga, would prefer a return to a world gold standard.

If all the Soviet Union's trade with the rest of the world could be done on the basis of a fixed value gold currency, this would undoubtedly facilitate trade operations.

For Soviet Russia the 'gold standard' has never meant what it means in the context of free and liberal economies. All that Professor Varga asks is that there should be stability of exchanges, which Russia needs for her foreign trade, and that there should be a fixed world-price of gold, which Russia also needs since she is the second largest gold producer in the world. For Russia, a return to the gold standard would have none of the implications which such a move would have for a country operating a relatively free economy. The fixed external value of the Soviet rouble has at no time maintained a close relation to its internal purchasing power. The problem of maintaining equilibrium with international cost and price structures hardly arises in a wholly planned and socialised economy, where the State undertakes the whole of foreign trade. For that reason the Soviet experts are bound to be profoundly disinterested in the technical devices by which the Keynes and White plans propose to maintain international discipline in matters of currency policy . . . . It is true that in the early years of the revolution an attempt was made to break completely away from a money economy. The printing presses were used consciously as an instrument of indirect taxation, and the old rouble was inflated out of existence. . . . The chervonetz was . . . . created as a new monetary unit stabilised in terms of gold. Its introduction synchronised with the concessions to private enterprise embodied in the New Economic Policy. Those concessions were only a temporary pause in the revolutionary process . . . . But whereas NEP was to pass fairly quickly, and make way for the intensified socialisation of the Five Year Plans, the concessions to monetary orthodoxy remained. Soviet Russia has never regarded gold as backing for the currency . . . . Gold reserves were built up in Russia to maintain a fund out of which temporary disequilibria in the balance of external payments could be met. That is still the main role which gold is expected to play in the economy of the U.S.S.R. . . .

### The Last Chance: A Conspectus

This review, by Dr. Monahan, is now available as a leaflet from K. R. P. Publications, Limited, 9 Avenue Road, Stratford-on-Avon, at 1/- per copy (posted) or 5/- per dozen (posted). It should be given the widest distribution.

# 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.*

*Office—Business and Editorial:* 9, AVENUE ROAD, STRATFORD-ON-AVON.

*Telephone: Stratford-on Avon 3976.*

### 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: EUSton 3893.) Canada: L. Denis Byrne, 7420, Ada Boulevard, Edmonton, Alberta. *Secretary:* H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W.

### From Week to Week

Lord Acton's comment on the French Revolution may well be adapted to the contemporary African Revolution: "The appalling aspect of the African Revolution is not the chaos, but the design."

*American Opinion* (Sept. 1960) quotes, without references, a statement attributed to Molotov in 1953: "A period of decolonization . . . will be followed by a period of general independence. Then . . . a period of unbelievable disorder. There will be political and general anarchy. Afterwards, and then only, the dawn of Communism will rise." This statement has a great inherent probability of being authentic; in the light of it the 1960 meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations, apparently so farcical, can be understood. The underlying objective is disorder in Africa, to culminate in chaos.

The germinal civilisation in the Belgian Congo was dependent on *ten thousand* Belgian technicians and administrators. Obviously, they cannot be replaced in a short period by an equivalent number of 'U.N.' technicians and administrators—who, even if they could be mustered, would have neither the knowledge nor the experience of the country to carry on where the Belgians left off—even if the transition were effected under 'normal' conditions. It is clear that the Congo is headed for a complete reversion to barbarism, complicated by epidemic diseases so much the worse for having been controlled for a period by the Belgian health services.

The antics, conscious or unconscious, of the world 'leaders' at the U.N. General Assembly are merely dust thrown in the eyes of the public while this ghastly conspiracy ripens to fruition. One thing, and one thing only, could have saved the Congo: the return of the Belgian technicians and administrators under the protection of a military police-force sufficient to maintain order while the former situation was restored—necessarily the Belgians—because they know the country, the problems, and the techniques, and nobody else does.

That the African disaster must result in millions of deaths

on that continent is a measure of what we are up against: the immolation of the peoples of a continent, as Douglas prophetically wrote, means no more to those who are contriving it than does the death of a sparrow.

" . . . In a way, the world-view of the Party imposed itself most successfully on people incapable of understanding it. They could be made to accept the most flagrant violations of reality, because they never fully grasped the enormity of what was demanded of them, and were not sufficiently interested in public events to notice what was happening. By lack of understanding they remained sane. They simply swallowed everything, and what they swallowed did them no harm, because it left no residue behind, just as a grain of corn will pass un-digested through the body of a bird."

-George Orwell: *Nineteen Eighty-four*.

The late George Orwell's book was first published in 1949. The world-view which is being imposed on us only ten years later differs in kind rather than in degree (of credibility) from that which Mr. Orwell imagined as occurring thirty-odd years after he wrote.

It is fantastic, for example, that almost daily the news 'plugs' landings on the moon (let alone various planets) by men within the next few years, when only a few expeditions to the Earth's own poles have been successful, when Mt. Everest's peak has been reached once only, when the whole surface of this planet has not yet been fully explored. If manned space flight is practicable, surely a pilot experiment, in the shape of landing a manned 'capsule' on the North Pole, and subsequently the return of its crew in another 'capsule' under conditions simulating a take-off from the moon, would be a reasonable preliminary?

### The "Aggressive" Kennedy

A FREEMASON'S "CATHOLIC"

KRUSCHEV'S "PREVENTIVE" MAN

*The Christian Science Monitor* for July 15, 1960, reporting the Masonic Press of Europe, warns us who read between the lines, that Kennedy is *persona grata* with the devil's agents. In a special article the *Monitor* says of Kennedy:

"He would depend for advisers on intellectuals and politicians," "maintained a discreet silence in the McCarthy episode," "in 1956 Senator Kennedy voted against the Knowland amendment to ban military aid to Marshal Tito." He

"wanted to relax the ban in the Battle Act, which prohibited aid to Soviet-bloc countries." "At 23 he prepared as a Harvard thesis, 'Why England Slept.' It sold 40,000 copies." "In the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Kennedy deplored French colonial policy in Indo-China, and in 1957 made his controversial speech advocating Algerian independence. On January 28, 1955, he was paired in favour of a resolution by . . . Herbert Lehman . . . to amend the Formosa resolution to exclude Quemoy and Matsu from the guarantee of United States interest." "He was bold to the point of audacity in tackling the subject of labour controls in the Senate."

"Summing it all up—first hand observation creates the impression of formidable power concealed under boyish appearances proceeding with a kind of resistless, steam-roller energy, under superb control—and toward tremendous goals."

Wake up, Annie! Get your gun. Order more copies of *The Last Chance*. P.L.

### Lumumba

*Vers Demain* (Montreal, September 15, 1960) carries a long article by M. Louis Even on Events in the Congo, of which the following is a freely translated section.

"Who is this fellow Lumumba, who, hitherto unknown, fills the pages in the press reports of chaos in the Congo?"

"Patrick Lumumba, aged thirty-four, Prime Minister of the Belgian Congo, was a disorderly and riotous pupil at several Belgian schools from which he was expelled. After leaving school he was employed in the Post Office for eleven years, apparently without blame. Then it was discovered that money was missing to the extent of twenty-thousand Belgian francs. Tried, he was sent to prison for twelve months.

"When released he got a job at a *brasserie*. With the arts learned there or with those he used in the Post Office, he soon became the owner of a fine house.

"With money and some status he joined a political party, founded by the negroes, called the National Congolese Movement. The movement grew and Lumumba became President, the other negroes following willy-nilly his forceful leadership."

The article goes on to describe the better educated if less picturesque Kasavubu, who was given the powerless position of President. It relates the outrages committed against Belgian women and children. It describes how, after the further humiliation of Belgium, Lumumba was accorded every honour on his arrival at Washington, to the sound of "twenty-one guns."

### 'Pockets' of Civilisation

"All through the Middle Ages and long afterwards, the fact of local isolation, due to badness of communications, protected many things individual and excellent, permitting to survive not on principle but by neglect. Moreover, on the positive side, mediaeval folk had one supreme merit; they rejoiced to create privileged autonomous societies to perform special functions: beginning with clerical corporations, they

went on to craft-guilds, and self-governing cities; Parliaments and Inns of Court; Universities and Grammar Schools; all of these proved invaluable 'pockets' for the development of civilisation, for they could perform their special functions freely in their own way. And so the Middle Ages prepared the Renaissance and the Reformation, the Tudor, Stuart and Hanoverian epochs, because in mediaeval times there had been so many 'pockets' guarded, either by privilege or by neglect, from the surrounding tyranny and barbarism.

"In a totalitarian State all 'pockets' are eliminated. In present-day England our still surviving love of political liberty protects 'pockets' to a certain extent, but the centralising tendency of the age and modern means of locomotion destroy them apace. Without 'pockets' any civilisation becomes stale. Those who desire uniformity in all things lose sight of this important policy. Where there is nothing with independent life outside the State machine, civilisation must lose all power of healthy growth. It is from minorities, small groups and individuals that fresh life has always come."

—G. M. Trevelyan: *An Autobiography and Other Essays* (1949).

### Nuclear Fission and World Government

*From our Canadian Correspondent we have received a copy of the following letter addressed by him to the Secretary to the Board of Evangelism and Social Service of the United Church of Canada:*

Dear Sir,

In a previous letter you stated that "nuclear fission has made the modern nation obsolete. Lord Hailsham in his recent address pointed out this truth with much force and clarity."

I have been trying to find the text of Lord Hailsham's statement. After writing his office I am informed that it is probably a speech in the House of Lords, March 9, 1960, and would seem to be covered by the following quotation. ". . . as I contemplate the hideous weapons on both sides . . . I regard either a world authority or total dis-armament in the long run, as the only rational objectives; and of the two I must say that I have regarded the first as the more rational. It is not that I favour at any given moment one course of action or another. It is that contemplating those weapons against the backdrop of history I am solemnly convinced that either humanity must find a means of abolishing or controlling these and other weapons—and by that I mean their manufacture, their sale and possession, and not just their development—or sooner or later a situation will arise sometime, somewhere, when one will go off and give rise to a political chain reaction not the less predictable because its causes are in the realm of politics and physics alone.

"We cannot contract out of a world war, whether we have initiated it or not. We cannot incur a world war without disaster . . . we could not remain effectively neutral without appalling casualties."

They key word in your statement that nuclear fission has rendered the modern nation obsolete I would take to be the

word "modern." That is, you still conceive the earth as being peopled by nations but could be something constitutionally different from modern nations. I make so bold as to suggest that that is where you and Lord Hailsham are in error. You are wrong in your conception of what constitutes (constitutionally) a nation.

In the sense that they are galaxies of people with some common viewpoints and values seeking to express what is peculiarly their own culture, you would probably agree that they are desirable things. The following quotation develops that viewpoint.

"The point of view of the nation should be borne in mind both on the grounds of theoretical justice and of practical politics.

"A nation has a right to exist. And this might well be the best moment for establishing it on objective grounds. We start from the individual as the only tangible and concrete thing there is; and we re-assert that his chief purpose in life is to find himself in experience, i.e. to acquire a culture. Instruction, information, craft are all excellent for earning a living and as elements of culture. But culture—a merely relative concept—is the degree of realisation, or awareness of adequate relationship between himself and the world which a man has reached.

"Now, the nation is the best setting for most human beings to rise up the slope of culture. It is the depository of tradition, the 'cup' in which the sub-conscious life of a community is held and accumulated; the setting of individual experiences. This function it is which gives the nation its *raison d'être*.

"It follows that the nation has the right to persevere in its being, as Spinoza would have said. And therefore it is plain that the right of moving about and settling anywhere of any one man must be balanced against the right of any nation to remain what it is or to become what it wanted to become" (from de Madariaga in an article contributed to *Human Rights: Comments and Interpretations*, published by Allan Wingate, London and New York, 1949).

More explicitly speaking, it is not the broader concept of nations with which you are concerned. It is with the more limited idea of national governments. This is because it is national governments which declare war and conscript or commandeer troops and weapons for it.

National governments of some type will be necessary as long as there are entities which can still be called nations. You would strip them of sovereignty because you bow to the dogma that the salvation of the world lies in one overwhelming force.

Let us approach the problem from the other end. What constitutes the nature of a government which will be satisfactory to the people concerned? A satisfactory answer depends upon the answers to such basic questions as the following:

1. Who are to be chosen to exercise the power necessary for the satisfactory government of a nation? History is a record of experiment and shows some progress and many regressions.
2. In what bodies is power to be vested, and how can power be balanced and controlled? Power and authority are two distinct factors.

3. In the eternal quest for a stable and just government, how can the following be provided for:
  - a. Security of persons, of *bona fide* institutions, and of minority rights.
  - b. Just laws embodying fair trial and right of appeal.
  - c. Freedom of expression, enquiry and criticism.
  - d. Individual initiative in business, education and leisure activities.

These are in our Anglo-Saxon or British tradition. I submit that they are more important than even threatened disaster by nuclear fission in any of its hideous forms. It is inconceivable that they could be retained under any form of "world government." I have tried to give some reasons for this statement in a previous letter to you.

How would a world government be operated? Would there be a world president? A world cabinet? How selected? How controlled? What reality could there possibly be in a representative system so far removed from the represented? What are the actual sources of pressure forming the major part of actual government, and which would be even more dominant in a world government?

Is it not true that behind such a concept is the same idea as behind Communism and Socialism—"the energising factor is physical force and the fear of it?" In reality, the position taken by so many Christian leaders is anti-Christian. "Be not afraid of them that kill the body and after that have no more that they can do . . . are not five sparrows sold for two farthings, and not one of them is forgotten before God? But even the very hairs of your head are all remembered. Fear not therefore: ye are of more value than many sparrows" (Luke 12. 4-7). In the Christian doctrine, is not life far more than just temporal existence?

The author of the quotation immediately preceding in the first part of the paragraph above (regarding "the energising factor," etc.) continues very perceptively: "The object of Anti-Christ is to keep mankind in ever larger mobs thus defeating the object of Christ, to permit the emergence of self-governing, self-conscious individuals exercising free will and choosing good because it is good. The energising factor is attraction, inducement," (C. H. Douglas in *The Realistic Position of the Church of England*, K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 9 Avenue Road, Stratford-on-Avon, England).

We do not here criticise discussions, agreements and organisations operated co-operatively (and honestly) for such purposes as relief of refugees, assistance to needy nations, even for the maintenance of national borders by a co-operatively raised force in certain instances, but with the policy underlying these things we do take issue. The provision overlooked is that at base they depend upon the existence of freely associated sovereign nations with the policy of safeguarding that sovereignty.

Yours sincerely,

D. STEWART.