

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 10. No. 2.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper
Postage (home and abroad) 1d.

SATURDAY, MARCH 20, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket (XV)

by C. H. DOUGLAS

PREAMBLE

"As in [? into] Adam [Urdu, *Adme* Mankind, Collectivity] all men [individuals] die, so in Christ [Individual Consciousness and responsibility] all Men [Individuals] are made *Alive*."

The idea that a corporation, State or otherwise, can be held responsible has been proved to be a mere abstraction. "The Power of the Central Government has increased, is increasing and ought to be diminished." It is therefore inexpedient that land should be held other than by individuals who can sue, and be sued. Any Government Department or Public Body requiring the use of land in peace-time to acquire it through a nominated individual whose responsibility will be identical with that of any other landowner.

Central Government is merely a disguised military organisation, the power of which grows with what it feeds upon. If, as is now freely advertised in quarters which arranged the present war, a third World War is inevitable, we must have a strong Central Government. The Land question with all others need not detain us.

But if we are to escape final destruction, then the firm, drastic, and early elimination of land administration from Whitehall, or through disguised Trusts, Commissions, and other Corporations interlocked with Whitehall, is primary.

Stripped of all the abstractions, "rights," moralities, and other complications which make any problem permanently insoluble, I do not believe that the land question is unduly difficult. I should say that the essentials of the solution are:

(1) Absolute security of tenure for life, including complete abolition of land taxation of every description. The imposition of a land tax shall be *ultra vires*.

(2) Abolition of land sales between individuals as of right. Registration of sale to take place five years after payment of purchase price, on petition by purchaser supported by six adjacent neighbours, who are landowners.

(3) County Council Authority to be obliged to purchase at valuation (see 6 *infra*) all land offered for sale, and to advertise for re-sale only to approved purchasers who must obtain support of six adjacent landowners.

(4) No State or Public Body to hold land for which a properly supported application from a private individual is made at the valuation price.

(5) Where a legatee is non-resident on land which he inherits, he shall be given twelve months to take up the occupation of it. If he decides to reside, his title shall be confirmed after five years. If not, his land shall be acquired by the County Authority for re-sale as in (3) *supra*.

(6) All land to be classed as A, Amenity Land. B, Agricultural Land. C, Industrial Land. All land titles shall restrict the land to which title is given, to the class in which it was placed on the grant of first title. No change of Class shall be permitted without the offer of sale as in (3) *supra*.

(7) The initial valuation of land to be that shown in the last conveyance as consideration. Every five years, a landowner shall be entitled to make a claim, properly substantiated by accounts, in which his own activities shall be included as manager, for increased value. On the admission of this claim by a properly constituted County Authority against whose adverse decision appeal to a Committee appointed by the Land Agents Society shall lie, seventy-five per cent. of the cost of this increased value shall be refunded to the landowner in County Bonds bearing interest at three per cent., and twenty per cent. of the increased valuation shall be added to the transfer value of the land.

(8) No public official shall have any right of entry whatsoever, without a magistrate's Warrant.

Deus est demon inversus.

All rights reserved.

Concluded.

Points from Parliament

House of Commons: March 10, 1943

UNITED NATIONS (POST-WAR POLICY)

Mr. Rhys Davies asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government have considered the concrete proposal of responsible United States Government spokesmen that the United Nations should forthwith set up an organisation to study post-war reconstruction problems; and with what result?

Mr. Eden: His Majesty's Government warmly welcome Mr. Sumner Welles's proposals for discussions with members of the United Nations on economic matters. His Majesty's Government for their part have been in touch for the past six months or so with the Dominions and India on various post-war financial questions of common interest and have also had a number of informal meetings with the Allied Governments in London. These consultations will be continued. In addition to the work undertaken by many of the Government Departments in their individual spheres there

are a number of Interdepartmental Committees, under the general guidance of my right hon. Friend the Minister without Portfolio, engaged in studying these problems and preparing the ground for negotiations with the United Nations.

Sir P. Hannon: Will my right hon. Friend take the opportunity from time to time to inform the House of the progress made in these negotiations?

Mr. Eden: Yes, Sir. They are, of course, at present in an informal stage.

Mr. Rhys Davies: Is it intended at some near future date to send an authoritative body from the United Nations to deal with the problem more effectively than can be done, as now suggested, dispersed among several Government Departments?

Mr. Eden: When that course is thought useful I have no doubt it will be examined. My own view is that bodies can sometimes be set up without proper preparation for their work. I do not think that is very good....

Mr. Stokes: Can we be assured that the Government will not commit the country?

Mr. De la Bère: Can we have an assurance that the whole matter will not be cut and dried before the House has had an opportunity of dealing with it?

FLOWERS (TRANSPORT)

Sir H. Williams asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of War Transport what instructions have been given to employees of railway companies and to police officers to search passengers' luggage in order to ascertain whether such luggage contains flowers?

Mr. Noel-Baker: No special instructions have been given. Police officers enforce the law in the normal course of their duty.

Sir H. Williams: Do police officers go on to railway trains in performance of their duties under the law?

Mr. Noel-Baker: If necessary, they do so.

Sir H. Williams: Without the sanction of a superintendent, does a police officer go on to a railway train and say, "I want to look at your luggage"?

Mr. Noel-Baker: If he has an authorisation, he can do so.

Sir H. Williams: Who gives it?

Mr. Noel-Baker: It can be given by the competent authority.

Sir H. Williams: Is not the authority of a Minister of the Crown needed?

Mr. Noel-Baker: If my hon. Friend will look at the Defence Regulations, he will see.

Mr. Levy: Is it not impossible without a complete search of the various passengers' luggage to ascertain whether flowers are contained in the luggage or not, and is it not highly improper to use these Gestapo methods to examine peoples' luggage?

Mr. Noel-Baker: If my hon. Friend will make inquiries, he will find that only a small number of passengers' luggage has been examined and that no passenger has refused to open his bag when asked to do so. I think there is a general desire that this Order shall be upheld, and the present arrangements are working extremely well.

Mr. George Griffiths: Why is there this great interest

in flowers at the present time? Is it because the hon. Members desire to have wreaths for the burial of the Beveridge Report?

House of Lords: March 10, 1943

GERMANY AND THE HITLERITE STATE

Lord Vansittart: . . . With regard to that great force for evil [the German armed forces] I will only say this: The German word for "Army" is *Heer*, and the German word for "devastate" is merely the verb of that noun, *verheeren*. I think that the German Army has lived down to its traditions!

Furthermore, I am in warm agreement with the right reverend Prelate in not wishing to destroy Germany. I desire only, in company with hundreds of millions of other sensible people, to destroy Germany utterly and forever as a military power; and I further desire, in the company of an equal number of sensible people, to make an end for ever of all German pretensions, intrigues and efforts to gain the economic hegemony of Europe, which is only another road to Germany's intolerable tyrannies. Subject to those trifling reservations, I welcome the survival of Germany with one proviso only; and that is that it shall be a totally different Germany; in other words, it shall bear no relation in shape, soul, or substance, to either the Second or the Third Reich, which have brought these measureless miseries on mankind.

Even that does not exhaust the measure of my concord with the right reverend Prelate. I agree with him that there is a difference between Hitlerite Germany and the very small number of Germans who are not working for Hitlerite Germany, and the still smaller number who are actually working against Hitlerite Germany. Let us by all means, from every practical point of view, distinguish between entity and non-entity. That is exactly what I have been always trying to do. For that purpose, you must put yourself in the position of the victims. Where, the victims have cried in vain through the centuries, are these good Germans of whom we have heard so much and seen so little? Well, here is the answer. Throughout those generations, the good Germans have corresponded exactly with Euclid's definition of a point: they have position, but no magnitude. Some, indeed, have exceedingly good positions, but I cannot tell you, and none of the victims can tell you, what they have done about it. I have spent a long time looking for them with a microscope, from the practical point of view, and I have invariably found a full-stop. . . .

There are no illusions in Soviet Russia in regard to Germany. In Soviet Russia they do not suffer Germanofools gladly, nor have they any great understanding of that numerous Anglo-American caste, the Unteachables. Therefore I hope His Majesty's Government will be very cautious in replying to this Motion. There is nothing to be afraid of in the truth. Truth is only terrible when one tries to dodge her. And the truth is that there is really no such place as Hitlerite Germany. Hitlerite Germany be hanged! It will be, but your problem will remain. Therefore I say that if, in deference to any illusory refinements, this Government or any other Government, American or Russian, were to leave to Germany one shred of wherewithal to put the youth of the world for the third time through this hell and shambles, if for the third time blindness were to allow Germany the least chance of claiming again the broken bodies of the young and the broken hearts of the old, why then, before God, I

would hope that there would be a general revolt, and I would be the first to join it.

The Chairman of Committees (The Earl of Onslow):
 I went first to Germany in 1888, and lived for some time with a peasant family in a wild part of the Palatinate. From 1894 to 1902, although I was not educated in Germany, I spent some months there every year, and sometimes more than half the year. For two years about 1908 I was at our Embassy in Berlin and travelled all over Germany, seeing a good deal of the German people.

The point that I want to make to your Lordships is that during all those twenty-five years the Germans spoke very freely and readily, and exactly the same sentiments were expressed by them as are expressed to-day, or as were expressed before this war began by the National Socialist Party in Germany. I do not think one ever heard a different view. *Lebensraum* was not the word then used, but there was a great deal of talk about "A place in the sun" and about mailed fists and the "German Michael" and *Realpolitik*. Germany wanted to dominate and to expand. Domination and expansion were the aims in the life of the German people. Your Lordships have no doubt read German political writers like Nietzsche and Treitschke and the same sentiments are expressed in their writings. . . .

The sentiment in Prussia which existed before the war, I venture to maintain is exactly the same as that which guides the Nazi Party to-day and is felt by Germans at the present time. There was in Germany after 1918 a period of confusion. Then Hitler came forward and it appeared to the Germans that Hitler was the man who would be able to carry out their wishes and obtain for them that power to dominate and expand which they had been desirous of obtaining for so many years, and which they had failed to obtain during the last war. If your Lordships remember the circumstances under which Hitler came to power, you will recollect that at first he was a member of a Coalition Government. About eight months after he first came to power an Election was held and there was a tremendous swing over to his Party, which made him the head of the State. That, I venture to suggest, was due to the fact that the Germans had become convinced that Hitler was the man who would be able to give them what they wanted, the man who, if I might express it in the vulgar phrase, could deliver the goods. . . .

The only remedy which you can hope for to cure the German desire for aggression, for conquest, for domination and expansion, is to make it physically impossible for them to make further aggression. There are all sorts of means to that end, which my noble friend on the Front Opposition Benches has discussed, and it is a question of what means will be efficacious. I do not think it is much good making up our minds as to that until the war is over and we see how we stand. . . .

The State of the Country

The following passage is from the "Review of World Affairs" for March, 1943:—

"The broad mass of these Islanders are firmly determined to get rid of restriction and compulsion at the earliest possible moment after the war. Any politician who fails to notice this will get into an appalling amount of trouble.

Oddly enough, although nothing is more striking than this national determination to see the greatest possible measure of individual liberty restored at the earliest possible moment after the war, yet a growing number of political leaders of all parties have failed to see it—especially so those of the left.

"There are two extremely important movements afoot in direct opposition to each other. The masses are talking and thinking more of the return of freedom than almost any other subject, while the politicians are talking more about planning and regimentation of every kind than has ever been heard in British history before. It is a very strange business and almost inexplicable. It foreshadows a great struggle by and by. Many people are still too busy to notice the clashing tendencies and still fewer have had time to think about the possible consequences.

"One politician after another commits himself to post-war schemes involving bureaucratic management of the individual from birth to death. The Leftists are more totalitarian than anyone else though there are not a few amongst members of the Conservative Party. That any politician with even a meagre knowledge of British history can seriously believe that this highly independent nation will capitulate to bureaucracy is incredible—a people which has pulled down and destroyed every repository of power which has dared to manifest itself during a thousand years, which has faced and overcome every form of tyranny upon which it could lay hands, will never give itself over to control by an executive decreeing when and where one shall be born, in what subjects one shall be educated, the kind of work one shall do, the measure of one's amusements, the size of the house: one may build, the day upon which one must finally cease work, and the type of State coffin into which one will be placed at the last.

"Any system which threatens to produce uniformity—especially an ugly uniformity—will in the end be rejected. Britain is a country of highly aristocratic instincts. The masses are radical, democratic and rough—but they are aristocratic to the core. Their easy-going tolerance, love of sport, uncommon respect for human life in peace and personal disregard for it in war, all illustrate this. They love splendour when it does not affront good form, and are dangerously extravagant. They quickly recognise mediocrity and despise it. To imagine that such a people will consent to become a planned nation of leaden creatures is ludicrous. They are an incurable race of individualists who will never be levelled.

"If in a moment of national weakness clever politicians ever succeeded in imposing a managerial system, it would be overthrown quickly. The danger is real because too many politicians of all parties are saturated with continental doctrines of one kind or another. Too few know British history. In journalism and in politics there is a dangerous tendency to copy continental ideas. Indeed half the phrases used for describing military campaigns and the post-war world are recently borrowed from some foreign country or another. Far too many political and economic ideas now widely propagated as ideals are in fact the very doctrines from which foreign tyrannies have sprung.

"The British people already dimly realise all this but many politicians don't. There is a dangerous and widening gap between the broad mass of the nation and political leadership."

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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.
 Offices: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
 LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 10 No. 2.

Saturday, March 20, 1943.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

The Berlin radio announced the North Africa landing as a coming event weeks before it occurred—the only mistake they made was that they were sure that the main landing would be on the Atlantic Coast. That was why General Nogues shifted his troops to Casablanca.

Much of the subsequent trouble was due to the naive diplomacy of Mr. Robert Murphy, the American representative, who placed all his money on General Giraud, planted on him by M. Jaques Lemaigre-Dubreuil, a close associate of the Comité des Forges, and other highly reactionary French organisations.

It is clear to anyone who will give the matter the requisite attention, that the international bankers are preparing to sabotage all dividends in order to validate national debts, the controlling proportion of which they hold.

“The leaders of the R.A.F. hoped to stage two or three 1,000 plane raids a week on Germany throughout the fall [autumn] of 1942. This hope was based on the belief that American bombers would participate . . . but during the first year of American participation in the war, not a single U.S. Air Force plane dropped a bomb on Germany. . . Up to now they have made experimental short range raids [most of them with as many as twenty (British) fighters escorting each bomber] on targets in occupied Europe, but they have not once pushed their attack into Germany. . . . On October 9, 1942, 110 Fortresses and Liberators claimed to have driven a total of 102 *Luftwaffe* fighter planes from the skies of Northern France. . . . They were escorted by 460 Spitfires and Hurricanes. . . . The bombers claimed 56 German fighters “destroyed,” 26 “probably destroyed” and 20 “badly damaged.” The R.A.F. after careful consideration of these claims, refused to issue a joint communique on that day with the U.S. Air Force, a fact that was apparently missed in America.

“ . . . Veteran pilots of the R.A.F. who were along in the raid told me afterwards that the Americans actually claimed to have shot down more enemy fighters than there were in the air—a fact that the Germans lost no time in announcing.” — ALLAN MICHIE, an American aeronautical commentator in a forthcoming book *Germany can be bombed to Defeat*. Condensed in *Readers' Digest* (an American periodical).

Colonel Clifton Brown, the newly-elected Speaker of the House of Commons is a member of the family of international

bankers whose firm, Brown, Shipley and Company, provided us with our dearly loved Mr. Montagu Norman, of the Bank of “England.”

The Anglican Primate of Australia, the President-General of the Methodist Church of Australia, and the Moderator-General of the Presbyterian Church, have written to the Prime Minister of Australia asking that a decision be made by the Federal Government in response to a request that a considerable area in Australia be set apart as soon as circumstances permit for refugee settlement.

The signatories refer to the German persecution of the Jewish race in Europe and the need for increasing the population of Australia.

Commonwealth Powers Transfer Bill in Australia

The Victorian Parliament has passed the Commonwealth Powers Transfer Bill with two amendments, one providing that the Act shall not be proclaimed till the other States have passed substantially similar measures, and the other stipulating that if the High Court holds that it is illegal to transfer powers to the Commonwealth for a limited period such as the five years after the war, as provided by the Act, it will become void.

New South Wales, Queensland, and Victoria have now accepted the Bill. The South Australian Parliament, which has not completed its consideration of the Bill, has already much diminished the transfer powers, Western Australia has not yet considered it, and Tasmania rejected it, but will be required to reconsider it. The Commonwealth Government will not determine its course of action till all the States have dealt with the Bill.

English Houses

“If these English houses of ours were all to be turned into institutional buildings, schools, asylums, hotels and the like, something of our national heritage of pride and beauty would be gone. Museums? A museum is a dead thing; a house which is still the home of men and women is a living thing which has not lost its soul. The soul of a house, the atmosphere of a house are as much part of the house as the architecture of that house or as the furnishings within it. Divorced from its life it dies. But if it keeps its life it means that the kitchen still provides food for the inhabitants: makes jam, puts fruit into bottles, stores the honey, dries the herbs, and carries on in the same tradition as has always obtained in the country. Useful things, practical things, keeping a number of people going throughout the year. So much for the house itself, but there is the outside life too; the life in which the landlord is a good landlord, assisting his farmers, keeping his cottages in good repair, adding modern labour-saving improvements, remitting a rent in a case of hardship, employing woodmen to cut trees for his own hearth and theirs.

“The system was, and is, a curious mixture of the feudal and the communal, and survives in England to-day. One wonders for how long?”

— V. SACKVILLE-WEST in *English Country Houses*.

Art in a Planned World

By B. M. PALMER

After reading the article in *Garvin's Gazette* by Christopher Martin, Administrator of the Arts Department at Dartington Hall, one is inclined to ask, with Tolstoy, "What is Art?" Though it is certainly beyond the scope of the writer to attempt to answer a question which is probably unanswerable in the present stage of civilisation, a definition by the Planners of the purpose of Art would be helpful. For they certainly have an answer of their own. We are beginning to experience the results of their beliefs.

Christopher Martin writes:—"I have known Dartington all my life, and I well remember it before the war as a cheerful, very beautiful place, part ruin, part farmyard, part manor. The gardens, though full of shrubberies, odd corners and exciting places for hide and seek, were not, I suppose, as spectacular as they are now. The courtyard was full of chickens, hay stacks and pigs. The barn theatre was piled with hay at one end, with farm implements at the other; among them I remember a brand new reaper and binder."

Now the buildings are "transformed out of all recognition into one of the most stately quadrangles I know of in all England."

Yes, Christopher Martin is an honest believer in planned art. He writes so sincerely, that his choice of words gives another picture in the background, like one photograph superimposed on another.

So the result is "spectacular" and "transformed out of all recognition." It is not surprising to learn that the quadrangle impressed another who knew Dartington well, as "very beautiful, but so Americanised that what little atmosphere is left is utterly theatrical. The buildings have been entirely revolutionised and the whole thing brings vividly to mind 'The Ghost goes West.'"

Restoration of ancient buildings betrays more clearly than any other branch of the applied arts the philosophy of the age. Until within the last hundred and fifty years nobody bothered to restore anything. And why should they? Haddon Hall was five hundred and fifty years in growing. Its founder did not set out with a plan of the finished article. Lacock Abbey is built in four different manners, covering four centuries, but all in Bath stone, thus attaining a natural unity. Repairs and alterations were made in the style familiar to the period. As a result these English country houses and hundreds of others like them, fitted into their background, completing perhaps one of the most beautiful landscapes that has ever existed. Dartington seems to have been built before 1650, during the best period of the manor house. Then came the destruction wrought by Cromwell, followed in the eighteenth and nineteenth century by the gradual decay and loss of real comfort so feelingly described by Cobbett. Towards the close of the nineteenth century, when economic destruction was in full career, restoration and preservation became a serious architectural study, not always with the happiest results. The tide flowed on. It could not spare the Adelphi terrace, yet this loss seems as nothing in the light of the London fires, which were in reality, the logical result of the economic destruction of the previous century. Not many years before they were burnt, a Bishop of London had suggested the destruction of the London churches for their site value.

Restoration in harmony with the spirit of the past (I think the word is reverent) is one thing; restoration in accordance with some imaginary future which exists only in the minds of a few men, who yet have the means to compel us to go with them, quite another. And if these people believe, as they usually seem to, that you can add "Beauty" to things in much the same way as you can add icing to a cake, why, there you have your dangerous idealist, and if in addition you have foolishly allowed him the control over several millions of pounds, then so much the worse for you.

"Passed to You, Please!"

Every Civil Servant who has retained some measure of individuality, and probably most other people, must, on reading the title, smile in pleasant expectation as to the contents of this book.* What a feast it should be! Alas, what a disappointment awaits them—the farther the reader gets, the more puzzled he becomes at the point of view of the author.

The book is mainly concerned with the War Office and the new war-time departments which are attacked chiefly for their inefficiency during periods of expansion. Every time there is a war certain arrangements break down. The author blames the men at the War Office, men who at the time were probably faced with overwhelming labours and with many tasks of varying importance. The great importance of something after the event is often very different from its apparent importance before the event. At such times things are bound to go wrong and that the author should go fishing in such troubled waters is strange. This is especially so, as invariably wars have been preceded by periods of retrenchment during which the financial powers have by their deliberate parsimony ensured that the existing organisation would break down to some extent when the real strain developed. This financial preparation is not given any lime-light in the book at all.

Where it is obliquely referred to, incidents in the seventeenth century are chosen: "Money... was supposed to come by vote of Parliament, but so little was doled out, that..." etc. A number of these incidents are obviously attempts, some successful, by Parliament to curb the warlike aspirations of some sections. That is inefficiency, only if war is the normal policy of a country. At the time in that century when British arms were deficient and the armies in arrears with their pay, the Dutch army and navy were lavishly equipped. There is no hint at the financial pressure being a deliberate policy by the controllers of finance. Cromwell, "our" Hitler, seems to have been favoured by those powers and hence is considered by some more "efficient."

More remarkable than the choice of examples and the point of view from which "efficiency" in the Civil and other Services is judged, are the author's conclusions. There is no hint that the kind of inefficiency typified by the title of the book is inherent in bureaucracy. It is actually suggested that a kind of Gestapo reporting inefficiency and drawn from "a well organised Labour Party and a well organised Trades Council" should be set up. The reason for the inefficiency

*Passed to you, Please by J. P. W. MALLALIEU; Gollancz.

is given, *i.e.*, as follows: "So long as Britain is ruled by a small owning class, so long will the State machine be directed to serve the needs of that class. Only by overthrowing that class can the great mass of the people hope to secure a machine that will cater to their needs."

As this passage indicates, the book finally degenerates into Socialist propaganda. The unconscious humour of this is lost on the author.

The book has an introduction by Harold J. Laski who uses this opportunity for still more Socialist propaganda. One passage seems to be a fitting epitaph and to summarise the purpose of the book: "It is because the survival of democratic government seems clearly to involve what Mr. and Mrs. Webb have called 'planned production for community consumption' that I believe the adjustments the post-war Civil Service will require are likely to be profound." In plain English "the survival of democracy can only be secured by its abolition."

H. R. P.

Bureaucratic Regulation in U.S.A.

The United States is a land of extravagant contrasts and exaggerations. If things "stick out a mile" with us over here, they are apt to stick out two in America. When America plans, she plans. Besides which, it is to be remembered that next to Germany, she is a pioneer in planned economy.

That she is rapidly overtaking Britain in that war-within-the-war euphemistically known as "emergency control" is shown by the following comments quoted from a long and witty editorial from the *Textile Colorist* (New York) for October.

"The Federal Trade Commission has laid another egg, which the Office of Price Administration is endeavouring to hatch, and this one was laid in the nests of the textile and dye industries.

"Some one, who seemingly never made, dyed, finished or sold a textile fabric, concocted a document that is as useful as fly paper in an aquarium."

"... He formulated his nightmare into a collection of rules and handed them to the Federal Trade Commission, which organisation conferred with the Office of Price Administration.

"Then, with much waving of the flag, they broadcasted multigraphed copies of the hodge-podge with instructions that they must be adopted at once as a war measure, but how advising the purchasing public as to the relative fastness of dyes would win the war has not as yet been explained."

"... The rules set forth 32 different degrees of fastness to light, 16 different degrees of fastness to washing (or laundering), three degrees of fastness to pressing (dry or wet), three degrees of fastness to perspiration, two degrees of fastness to crocking (rubbing) and two degrees of fastness to gas."

"... Consider the textile manufacturer. He will make 10,000 yards of a fabric of one or more textile fibers containing four or five different colours, each having its own peculiar idiosyncracies with regard to fastness. After the goods are made, but before he can offer them for sale, he must test them for seven different fastness properties..."

"... It is quite evident that whoever formulated this extraordinary document has an idea that all textile fibres possess the same chemical and physical properties and that each dye is capable of dyeing every fiber in the same manner and with identical colorfastness."

Anyone conversant with the most elementary properties of textile fibres and dyes knows that the above quotation from the rules is alone sufficient to make them inoperative.

The Federal Trade Commission states "The need for such rules is accentuated by wartime conditions which is necessitating the conservation of critical dyestuffs..."

"Even Solomon with all his wisdom and his many wives, each one of whom undoubtedly continually worried him for new coloured dresses, could not have found a single thought in the entire document which will decrease the sale of dyes or effect the quality or quantity of dyes used for war purposes.

"The taxpayers, whose financial burdens are becoming greater every day, naturally wonder why their money should be expended for such purposes, when every dollar and every person on the Government's pay-roll should be directed to winning the war."

The whole picture, most graphically drawn, is much worse than that. The appreciation of the inherent impracticality of such schemes is quite well developed in the editor of the *Textile Colorist*. But the vital question is—To what extent is the public mind in the United States (so deeply infected with propaganda and so standardised in thought) equipped to resist the apparent "inevitability" of this sort of thing, and to realise as the writer of the above dimly sees, that the war is being made an excuse for putting over a standardisation of industry that it was desired to instal long before there was a war; and that the insistence on doing so is going seriously to slow up war production and perhaps ultimately, if it is allowed to, cripple the war effort.

The situation is really serious, for American industry is much more highly centralised than ours, and its collapse, if it should be brought about by the attempt to utilise the occasion for this sort of thing, would be proportionately more sudden and complete—a comparison might be drawn between America and Britain during the 1929-32 financial collapse. To be pessimistic for a moment, and just to lend an added sense of realism to the fight that Social Crediters are waging against the "nazification" of the Home Front, imagine a collapse like that happening in the States, and Germany dug in and concentrating on the U-boat campaign!

Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, managing director of Messrs. Marks and Spencer, is reported to have complained before the Retail Commission in Washington, according to the editor of the *Drapers' Record*, that the "rugged individualism" of the British shop-keeper was hampering the war effort over here. But what of the obstruction caused by the 'polished (not to say oily) individualism' of the Government adviser who puts over such schemes as these?

N. F. W.

FIRST STEP

"My main interest now is... the problem of how to maintain employment and avoid mass unemployment in Britain after the war. As the first step I am going to the United States and Canada." — SIR WILLIAM BEVERIDGE to the American Outpost in Great Britain.

Faith to Move Mountains

By RALPH L. DUCLOS.

President, The Douglas Social Credit Bureau of Canada, Inc.

The technique for keeping "the people" quiet is changing but the policy of those who would control remains the same. The doleful whine of the hungry thirties that "there is no money" is changed to loose promises of freedom, security, social justice and what not. "The world with a fence around it' is yours if you follow me," is the style of the day.

Plans and super plans are being produced from every direction designed to be attractive rather than effective. The people, however, are becoming wary. They seem to sense that intangible promises mean little if the plans surrounding the promises are based on methods which in the past have produced the opposite results.

The promise of freedom and security by means of a work state doesn't "hold water." It didn't in Germany, Italy or Japan. The work state may give you security, the security of the slave, but never freedom. Canada can be turned into a national ant hill but when ant methods are used, Canadians will live ant lives. Ralph Waldo Emerson expressed it thus: "The end pre-exists in the means." You can't get right results by wrong methods.

You can't get freedom by regimentation or bureaucracy; you can't distribute abundance by the economics of scarcity; you can't get social justice by planning other people's lives; you can't get universal peace by continuing economic war, by a scramble for foreign markets; you can't have a democracy with a Gestapo or an Ogpu. Those who look for a great leader to do their thinking for them—a sort of Moses to lead them out of Egypt—invariably end up with a führer.

These facts are more or less obvious and in view of the tremendous amount of knowledge available to anyone interested it is difficult to understand why any people are attracted by the "planners'" schemes. This may possibly be explained by a peculiar phenomenon in our phase of evolution: That this vast amount of knowledge is accompanied and counteracted by an intense lack of belief, of faith, not in a religious sense, but faith in ourselves and our powers of doing things.

Little birds would never fly or babies walk if they didn't believe they could; Stephenson wouldn't have driven his locomotive or the Wright Brothers flown their plane if they hadn't believed it possible; Edison wouldn't have invented the incandescent light, Marconi the radio, or Bell the telephone if they hadn't believed. Said Sir William Osler:—

"Nothing in life is more wonderful than faith—the one great moving force which we can neither weigh in the balance nor test in the crucible."

We "know" but "disbelieve." We have knowledge without conviction and thereby suffer from a scarcity complex in an age of plenty. It has produced poverty, destitution and misery in the past, made war possible and it is now materially hampering our war effort. We "know" that in this day and age of science, power and automatic machinery, there is a tremendous productivity but somehow or other we don't "believe" that that productivity can be converted into a superabundance for everybody.

We are just now, after three years of war, beginning to believe that our production can be accelerated to yield

unprecedentedly great quantities of war materials and supplies, but we cannot divorce ourselves from a sense of lack and national poverty. We know that money really isn't wealth, that it is largely figures in books, that our money system is merely a bookkeeping system with currency as tickets for petty cash, yet we don't "believe" that we dare do anything about it and we hang on for dear life to "balanced budgets" that won't balance. "When a bank lends or invests it extends credit, *i.e.*, creates cheque-book money." — Professor Irving Fisher, Yale University.

We know that money is created "out of nothing," that it should be created according to our needs, but we believe in terms of "where will the money come from?" and frighten ourselves with uneconomic tax schedules. We know that a war is paid for in "blood, sweat, tears" and materials, yet we raise our blood pressure worrying about a pyramiding debt.

We know that "what is physically possible is financially possible," in other words that we can fit our bookkeeping system to suit our needs, yet we still think in terms of millions or billions of dollars instead of thousands of tanks, planes and guns or corvettes. We frighten ourselves into impotency with astronomical figures in dollars when we know, or ought to know, that a money system should do its job or be scrapped for one that will. Sir Stephen Demetriadi, K.B.E., president of the London Chamber of Commerce, has declared:

"The world's problem is no longer one of production, but merely one of distributing that production."

We know that war debts have never been paid in the past; that the British are still paying interest on the debts incurred for the Battle of Waterloo, yet we don't "believe" that debt can be avoided and are seriously worried about how to pay off the current war debt and think that taxes will likely be higher after the war for that purpose.

We "know" that "the purpose of production is consumption"; that it is useless to make shoes unless they go on feet; that houses are valueless unless people live in them; that food just rots unless it is eaten. We also "know" that we are capable of producing almost limitless quantities of all these goods. Yet we don't "believe" that people can have them, because of this and because of that, and we trot out all the stumbling blocks that we really do believe in, hailing from the age of scarcity; like "no money," or "the poor are poor because the rich are rich," or "we'll have to create work," *etc.*, and *etc.*

Our knowledge is of the present but our beliefs are of the past. Present-day economic and scientific knowledge and achievements have failed to register on our subconscious minds and as a result our beliefs lag behind in the dead past of yesterday. Thus we blunder from catastrophe to catastrophe like a high-powered motor ship floundering on the rocks because its master doesn't "believe" in his compass.

We know that Japan captured world markets and built up a huge war machine by using her national credit to undersell all competitors. She used her credit to finance consumption in other countries—to achieve diabolical aims. We don't connect up the process and realise that the same technique could be used to finance consumption in our own country—to achieve the greatest possible good and highest aims. The fact is we don't "believe" it possible.

We are dimly aware of the vast production proved

possible by the war but we fail to realise that it may be used in the future to usher in an era of leisure and culture. Leisure? We tremble at the thought of leisure because we "believe" in "work for work's sake." We don't realise that culture is the product of leisure well spent; that work slaves do not develop a culture—they have no time for such "nonsense"—they must work. Hitlerism is incompatible with leisure just as democracy is incompatible with a work state. Said Donald M. Nelson, war production chief, U.S.A.:—

"Poverty is not inevitable any more. The sum total of the world's greatest possible output of goods divided by the sum total of the world's inhabitants no longer means a little less than enough for everybody. It means more than enough."

We "know" that by the use of solar energy and science we've attained the power age of super-abundance that there can be more than enough for everybody but actually we don't "believe" we can break away from scarcity. This truly is the age of "knowledge and disbelief."...

We now have the results of thousands of years of knowledge, discoveries and inventions and we haven't the faith to apply those results. Lack of belief paralyses action and instead of abundance we cling to want. Instead of wealth and happiness we, by our disbelief in what is possible, cling to penury and wretchedness.

We are commencing to believe that people should not starve so we initiate unemployment insurance, old age pensions and the like—all at bare existence level. We raise the standard of poverty instead of eradicating it. We know we can produce enough for everybody and more but we cleave to the past and somehow don't believe that poverty can be abolished. Yet Professor A. H. Hansen of Harvard University states: "We can afford as high a standard of living as we are able to produce."

What we grudgingly do is done by taxing some to help others. We rob Peter to pay Paul. We "know" that money can be increased or decreased at will and almost costlessly yet we don't "believe" that it's safe to make the system work. We frighten ourselves with the inflation bogey and desperately cling to the system of taxes, debts, poverty and misery.

We're afraid of abundance. We actually tremble at the thought of what abundance will do—to the other fellow. Of course it won't hurt us—but the other fellow—? Besides, if there is plenty of everything, who'll do the drudgery? We avoid drudgery pretty well ourselves but we don't "believe" it can be avoided by all. We "believe" more in scarcity and drudgery than we do in abundance and freedom. We don't "believe" in our fellow man. At another epoch in man's history when doubters wouldn't "believe" the doctrine of freedom and abundance their Lord and Master in exasperation exclaimed: "Oh! Ye of little Faith!"

When we believe that the knowledge available can be applied, that the kind of life we want is possible and then want it hard enough, public opinion will become so strong that no government on earth, Grit, Tory or what you will, would dare refuse to implement our wishes.

"It is the business of government to yield to pressure" stated President Roosevelt. That, in a sentence, tells the secret of a successful democracy. It is the only method that ever obtained the results the people wanted. That was how the great reforms of the past were achieved: The Magna Carta, the trial by jury, the abolition of slavery and child labour, the universal suffrage, the six-day week, votes for

women, and many, many more. All were attained by the people "believing" them possible, wanting them hard enough and applying the necessary pressure, regardless of the cost.

If we "know" we have the means, "believe" that what we want is possible and apply the necessary pressure, we'll get the results we want. That is all the "plan," all the "planning," we need. In fact it is the only "plan" that is effective—it has never failed in the past.

Reprinted from the "Ottawa Evening Citizen" of January 16, 1943.

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is now in regular use. The Library will contain, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit, together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, 21, Milton Road, Highgate, London, N.6.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	3/6
Credit Power and Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea.....	2/6
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	6d.
"This 'American' Business".....	3d.
Social Credit Principles.....	1½d.

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold.....	4/6
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson.....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.

Leaflets

The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell.....	9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6
Carthorse Conditions for All (the Beveridge Report issue of <i>The Social Crediter</i>)	2d.
World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long- Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.)	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.