

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Volume 41, No. 16.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1961.

6d. Fortnightly.

The Patrons and Partisans of Usury (Continued)

By NORMAN A. THOMPSON, B.A., Cantab., A.M.I.E.E.

(Originally published in these pages in August, 1943).

By the purchase of British and sale of German securities after the hasty publication of the first paper of the battle of Jutland, which underestimated the value and extent of the victory, and a subsequent reversal of this procedure at the publication of the second and more correct report, operators netted some £55 million sterling during an interval of about twenty-four hours. By chance, this story was also related independently to the writer five or six years ago in Berlin by a highly informed German intelligence expert.

Nor must anyone hoping for a "better Britain" ever forget the enterprising trading efforts, largely emanating from London, which neutralised our blockade during the last war. According to Admiral Consett, our Naval Attaché then in Scandinavia, in his book *The Triumph of Unarmed Forces* (1923) p.296, the proportion of Scandinavian foodstuffs sent to Germany (plus Austria) and to England, which in 1913 was 1 to 1½, was transformed by the beginning of 1917 to three to the former against one to England—a result held responsible for prolonging the war by about two years. On page 288 is given the following quotation from a letter written by Admiral Consett in December, 1918 to Sir Esmé Howard, British Minister at Stockholm:—

"Unfortunately it was well known to all our allies and to the Americans in Scandinavia that we were ourselves competing with neutrals in supplying the enemy. It is obvious therefore, that we were never in a position to approach even our allies with a view to restricting imports to Germany—far less America when she was a neutral—without causing friction. If the statistics of imports to Denmark for the year 1917 are carefully studied any uninstructed person would be tempted to assume that we had started the blockade at America's suggestion."

The *Official Report* of the House of Commons Debates for August 2, 1928, relates an exposure by the late Walter Baker, M.P. for East Bristol, of the methods and ramifications of the interests which conspired to acquire the rights and opportunities necessary to carry through a fusion in Cable and Wireless properties. The official report of the debate repays perusal, for the Press notices were most inadequate. Among an interconnection of well-known financial and trading firms both of English and Foreign origin, of directorships, Members of Parliament and Government officials, one notices such typical names as that of the late Lord Melchett, Lazard Brothers, F. A. Szarvasy, Hambro, Owen D. Young, Chairman of the Radio Corporation of America, and so forth. Lazard Brothers, whose mind was held to have conceived the merger, shared a director with *The Times* and Mr. Szar-

vasy was referred to as "the person of most interest in all this business."

A similar network of interested firms in U.S.A. was organised under the *aegis* of Sosthenes Behn, and the underlying aim of this merger was undoubtedly to place the control of cable and wireless communications of the world in the hands of Jewry.

In view of the present war situation the immediate opening up of a new oil field for the service of Great Britain and her Allies would be of vital importance to their efforts. Such a field exists in Palestine, especially in the district of the Dead Sea. Its presence has been indicated by various exploring parties sent out by different nations, the Palestine Government's own handbook writes of it as "the most promising area," and its situation is strategically central and convenient. Nevertheless there has been a persistent and hitherto successful campaign to deny its existence. Years of unremitting effort have convinced the main advocates of its exploitation that the "Oil Kings" do not want this, as its development would diminish the vast profits they already draw from a restricted output. Nor do the Zionists want its existence made public, their hope being that it may become one of the great assets of their future "National Home" and World State.

The deposits of potash offer perhaps still more striking possibilities. There are vast quantities of potassium chloride dissolved in the water of the Dead Sea, an amount estimated by Government experts at 2,000 million tons representing wealth commensurate with the cost of the war but it would take many years to evaporate it. But still vaster quantities of potash in mineralised and easily mined form lie under the surface of much of the ground in this region, the oil in many cases is under these, and neither at great depth. Yet it is impossible to get the Government to exploit these urgently needed riches, or the Press to call attention thereto. In the Ministries concerned there seems to be a bottle-neck, which blocks information on the subject on its way to the Ministers, who can thus profess ignorance of the existence of these supplies. As for the great newspapers, only the *New Leader*, *Truth*, and the *National Message* (organ of the British Israel World Federation) have had the will and courage to draw attention to the scandal which envelops this question, whose immediate solution is of paramount importance.

One of the most convincing proofs of the existence of hidden, sinister influences, working their will to the detriment of our country is afforded by the case of the Hon. Violet

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

C-Major

The first leader in *The Times* on October 16 was so headed. The reference is to the ascendancy, in this well-informed newspaper's opinion, of crisis potential in "the three Cs,"

The Class War
The Common Market, and
The Commonwealth,

over Berlin, the cold war, etc. The cold war may be dominant, "but it will not be decisive." The events "that can and will" effect the future way of British life are "the three Cs."

Assuming that "C Major" really is the key in which the article is written, it seems to us uncommonly crowded with 'accidentals,' and an expert (whether in music or the Wall Street tune) might easily correct the notation and say "Not at all! I know what key it is in! D for dollars, every time!" Heard in C Major, however, it does sound as though *The Times* were merely adding one more to the several recent occasions on which it was advancing the theme of an early change of Government. (The 'accidentals' already referred to may, of course, arise from the well-known practice of *The Times* to entrust each paragraph of an important article to a different hand. Collation cannot always be easy).

"C Major" is *The Times'* own choice. Let us take it from there. "It is in the nature of politicians to want the best of both worlds. The Prime Minister sets up as a hope the idea that Britain can make some kind of stable equilibrium between both her Common Market and Commonwealth interests. When the time comes it will be found that any such enduring equipoise is impossible . . . From that would be no short distance to a topple." Well, who set the Prime Minister's feet on the slide? The *Christian Science Monitor* is very far

from being alone in saying President Kennedy and the United States' State Department. Who are they but Wall Street's American political shop front? So what?

Absolutely nothing short of the discarding of the party-political system (that is, the *Party* system) can rescue Great Britain from its dilemma. Under the Party system, the electorate *must*, willy nilly, *buy* its pup, and as the colour of the string by which it may take it home fades to the point of indistinguishability, the mangy thing becomes more conspicuous by comparison. How long have we? A February election? A January election? Wake up!

A Bank Review

According to *The Tablet* for October 14, the current number of *Lloyd's Bank Review* contains a challenge to "the whole assumption . . . that it is the stimulus of the Common Market which deserves the credit for the economic expansion of its members, and not rather the other way about, that these expanding economies are expanding because of their sensible policies as nations, and owe much less to each other."

Notwithstanding the fact that the expressions 'economic expansion' and 'sensible policies' invite enquiry or criticism, the suggestion that one member of the 'Big Five' is doing a little re-thinking (if only a little) is supported by one or two indications that complacency is not universal. Douglas derided the notion that Finance was capable of even a death-bed repentance. But in these days of hiring executives, the personnel upon whom everything ultimately rests may be less complacent. By implication, a policy need not be 'international' to be 'sensible.' It remains that 'economic expansion' as a policy is not 'sensible:' it is merely, as Douglas called it in his first article on Social Credit, "The Delusion of Super-Production." An alienist might say of *Lloyd's Bank Review* that it showed faint signs of insight, and that, therefore, recovery from its affliction was possible, even if its insight was, for the present, wrongly directed.

"History Teaches That . . ."

Douglas said that history was five per cent fact and ninety-five per cent historian. This statement has been much doubted by those brought up on an overdose of Karl Marx. Well, here it is again.

" . . . Who does not admit that every great historian begins with a theory, and though he modifies it in the face of evidence, he is nevertheless driven by it to select his evidence and marshal his facts? As we look back upon past histories we can see that they have been all in part conditioned by the outlook of their time and by the passions and prejudices of the particular authors. If we take the subject of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, we have Gibbon attributing it to the triumph of religion and barbarism; Seck attributes it to the destruction of the Elite, Kaphan to physical degeneration, T. Frank to racial decline, Huntingdon to climatic conditions, such as the drying up of the soil, M. Weber to the decline of slavery and the return to a natural economy, Rostovtzeff to a class struggle. Piganiol declares that this noble civilisation was assassinated in the barbarian invasions, while Toynbee sees a failure of response to a challenge, the disaffection of the masses at a time of mortal crisis."

—M. C. D'Arcy in *The Sense of History, Secular and Sacred*.

And Now The Cameroons

The passing of British rule from the South Cameroons on October 1st, has had repercussions that were not unforeseen. The *Daily Telegraph* reports (October 12, 1961) that "villagers near the frontier area and government workers moving in this region are already finding security units tougher than in the more lenient days of British administration."

Few people know much about the South Cameroons, which lies between Nigeria and the French Cameroun Republic. The 800,000 inhabitants were given the choice of joining Nigeria or the Cameroun Republic, which was formerly ruled by France. They disliked the idea of Nigeria so on the day of their independence they became federated with the Cameroun Republic, which is torn by civil war.

The prime minister of South Cameroons, and the leader of the opposition, told a *Daily Telegraph* correspondent that they sincerely wished the British forces and the British administrators to stay on. But they were callously abandoned to their fate and not given the choice of staying within the Commonwealth. Pressure was brought by U.N.O. and was feared from the Afro-Asian group at U.N.O.

The whole business is a plea for responsible administration, whether it be called colonialism, imperialism or common sense. But now a people that would once have stood firm on behalf of 800,000 people who needed their help is deterred by U.N.O. and an Afro-Asian group. Possibly, if they had stayed, they would also have met the American reproach of "mercenaries," which Europeans in Katanga have received.

The Portuguese appear to have managed better. According to "Peter Simple" (*Daily Telegraph*, October 12, 1961) they have brought the war to an end at the cost of 1,400 casualties. He comments, "Somehow, it seems, the war has been brought to an end without this almost daily promised massacre ever taking place. Am I being cynical in believing that some progressive journalists will actually be disappointed?"

I am sure that the Bishop of Southwark who accused Portugal and the various clergy who solicited church collections on behalf of the refugees did not desire a massacre: nevertheless some "progressives" seemed anxious enough that Portuguese should be killed, or at least indifferent to bloodshed.

Meanwhile some evidence about subversion in Africa has been officially accepted. "Sierra Leone has been worried about disruptive elements entering the country, Mr. Nelson-Williams, Minister of Information, said in London yesterday." (*Daily Telegraph*, October 17, 1961). Mr. Nelson-Williams also mentioned the "shocking methods" these elements employed to gain their ends. One hopes that they are thwarted before they engineer a massacre or a civil war. —H.S.

Dollar Domination

According to *Inside Canberra*, a privately circulated weekly review of Australian National Affairs, "Some Government economic advisers believe Australia may be much closer than is generally realised to reaching a situation that now faces Canada, with Australian industry dominated by American capital."

No mention is made of the situation in the United Kingdom. No remedial action is reported or suggested.

Angola and the Press

The following extract is from a report by Hugh Kay in the *Catholic Herald*, London, August 18, 1961:

"As the second correspondent to enter Angola since the foreign press was barred early in the uprising, I am now wondering how far I can ever trust British news reporting again.

"I have in the past written my own criticisms of Portuguese theory and practice—and I found enough to complain about as a result of my on-the-spot enquiries. But the image, projected by English press, television and Baptist missionary reports, of an enslaved Angola, its aspirations brutally and contemptuously repressed by a genocidal army, bears little relation to the situation as I found it.

"The British public has been substantially misled, albeit unwittingly. For one thing, far too much reporting has come from over the border in Leopoldville, where the Angolan terrorists have their headquarters and their propaganda rides high.

"For instance, it is incredible to me that Mr. George Thomas, M.P., reporting as a 'practising Methodist' to Portugal's detriment from the wrong side of the Congo border, should be unaware that leading Methodists in Portuguese territory have taken the Baptists to task for factual inaccuracy and have defended the Portuguese concept of multi-racialism as a reality, for all its inadequacies in practice.

"It is even more incredible that Mr. Basil Davidson's roundup in last week's *New Statesman*—in effect a re-hash of all that has been alleged against the Portuguese in Angola over the past few months—took no account of the counterbalancing evidence offered by the one British newspaperman who has spent some time in Angola during the uprising, namely Mr. Richard Beeston of the *Daily Telegraph*, whose reports I have had the opportunity of following up.

"Mr. Davidson carefully selected the one passage in Mr. Beeston's reports which severely criticised—and I tend to concur—the activities of the security police.

"But he totally ignored the main body of despatches in which the *Daily Telegraph* correspondent suggested—in my view rightly—that many of the anti-Portuguese charges have been greatly exaggerated, spoke well of the Portuguese army, and told us some home truths about the nature of the rebellion, its leadership and methods.

"The first wave of senior American journalists, chosen for their familiarity with Africa, who came hard on my heels to cover last week's visit to Angola by Assistant Secretary of State "Soapy" Williams, found themselves—much to their surprise—reaching conclusions similar to my own.

"I understand that 'Soapy' himself, that inveterate dropper of anti-colonial clangers and staunch champion of the 'Africa for the Africans' slogan, began to learn a few new tricks in Luanda, reproached the Portuguese (with infinite justice) over their genius for misrepresenting themselves, and even offered to teach them some lessons in propaganda.

"It is ironical, perhaps, and symbolic, that I returned to Lisbon in the company of an injured suspect terrorist, paralysed from the waist down, who was being flown 4,000 miles by his 'oppressors' for treatment too specialised for the local hospitals. It was of a piece with much that I saw inside Angola . . ."

(Continued from Page 1)

Douglas-Pennant. Owing to her exceptional record of important posts held with uniform success Miss Douglas-Pennant was invited by the Air Council in 1918 to take command of the newly formed Women's Royal Air Force, which was then in a very unsatisfactory state. At the end of two months, her chief, Vice-Admiral Sir Godfrey Paine, expressed his strong appreciation of her work and told her with the concurrence of the Air Minister, Lord Weir, that the Air Council valued her services most highly and could not spare them in war time. Ten days later Sir Godfrey Paine on promotion was succeeded by the head of the Equipment Department, General Sefton Brancker, a total stranger to Miss Douglas-Pennant, who, without any adverse report from a Senior Officer was summarily dismissed by General Brancker, on Lord Weir's orders, from her post and from the Corps. She was informed only that "though most efficient Lord Weir had heard she was a woman no one could meet or have anything to do with." He added that she was unpopular with a Mrs. Beatty and a Miss Andrew.

Miss Douglas-Pennant was ordered to leave instantly, before even a successor had been appointed. Lord Weir did not see her or allow her to know what was alleged. Later in the House of Lords he stated that he had made no inquiry before ordering the dismissal, as it was "foreign," he said, "to my own methods of working." He added that he had been influenced by what he had heard from a Miss Andrew, a W.R.A.F. officer whose unfavourable opinion of her Commandant had, he said, shaken his faith in Miss Douglas-Pennant. Thus it transpired that Lord Weir had permitted this W.R.A.F. officer to interview him over the heads of all her Seniors and bring complaints against her Commandant. Miss Andrew was 23, inexperienced, and had had only a few weeks' service in the Corps.

The Inquiry or Court Martial authorised by Service Regulations was refused to Miss Douglas-Pennant, but after a year's agitation the House of Lords by a two-thirds majority voted the appointment of a Select Committee to investigate the matter. The Government stipulated that no Peer who had voted for the Inquiry should sit as a member of the Committee, which therefore, together with its Chairman was nominated by the Government.

The Chairman at the outset placed Miss Douglas-Pennant in the position of having to prove wrongful dismissal without being allowed to know of what she was accused and without access to official papers. It was only allowed to emerge at the extreme end of the Inquiry—long after Miss Douglas-Pennant's case was closed—that secret charges had been brought to Lady Rhondda (Women's Branch of National Service) which, without testing, were conveyed by her to her own Chief, Sir Auckland Geddes, and then to Lord Weir and General Brancker, when the dismissal followed immediately. The Select Committee under the guidance of their Chairman omitted to make any investigation into the nature of the charges or to ascertain whether there was any reliable evidence in support of them, which is the more extraordinary as they were shown to have been brought by the two "mutinous" (the word applied in the Select Committee's report) ex-W.R.A.F. officers, Mrs. Beatty and Miss Andrew. Also the Committee were aware that Mrs. Beatty had been previously dealt with by a Court of Inquiry in another Corps for insubordination and making untrue statements regarding its Head. When it transpired during the Lords' Inquiry that secret

charges had been conveyed by Lady Rhondda, the cross-examination of Lord Weir by Miss Douglas-Pennant's counsel, who were endeavouring to find out why he had dismissed her, was stopped by the Chairman. Later when certain witnesses came forward spontaneously to give important evidence on behalf of Miss Douglas-Pennant, because they saw that she was being wrecked by perjury, the Chairman refused to allow them to be heard unless she undertook to pay the whole of the expenses of all parties in the Inquiry from that moment onwards. Miss Douglas-Pennant was obliged to refuse these terms for financial reasons and the Chairman then declared the Inquiry at an end.

Thenceforth a body of men and women, representing all grades of society and shades of thought, have carried on a campaign to obtain redress for Miss Douglas-Pennant, maintaining that no man or woman should be condemned without fair trial and opportunity for defence. In 1931 Sir William Jowitt, then Attorney-General, was led after full personal investigation of the case to draft a statement to be read to the House of Commons, which admitted the wrong that had been done, and that Miss Douglas-Pennant stood without blemish as to character or efficiency. The then Premier, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, agreed to it subject to Lord Weir consenting. Lord Weir objected and the Cabinet allowed his decision to prevail. Under the new premiership of Mr. Baldwin, Sir Thomas Inskip became Attorney-General, from which position he wrote in a letter to a Member of Parliament as follows:—"The statement you want read, that she (Miss Douglas-Pennant) ought never to have been dismissed implies a censure upon Lord Weir, and it is exactly this that I am certain no responsible authority will ever agree to."

Since then fresh important evidence has come to light. According to the report of the Lords' Select Committee Sir Auckland Geddes "practically compelled" Lord Weir to act as he did, and it has now emerged that Sir Auckland Geddes was moved to bring this pressure to bear on Lord Weir because very serious accounts had reached him personally regarding conditions in certain Air Force Camps in which women were employed. Sir Auckland Geddes had asked Lady Rhondda to investigate rumours concerning certain camps, but during the House of Lords' Inquiry the names of these camps were withheld from Miss Douglas-Pennant and her advisors. Now that the names of these camps have been disclosed it appears from evidence beyond dispute that the women employed in them were never under Miss Douglas-Pennant's jurisdiction.

(To be continued)

THE SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

The following books have been added to the library:—

- M Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, London 1958.
- M John Gunther, *Inside Europe Today*, London, 1961
- C Sir Ivor Jennings, *Party Politics*, Vols. I & II (Cambridge, 1960, 1961).
- C George B. Mair, *The Day Khrushchev Panicked*, London, 1961.
- M H. H. Wilson, *Pressure Group—The Campaign for Commercial Television*, London, 1961.

M: Miscellaneous. C: Controversial.