

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol 12. No. 24.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 19, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

The Brief for the Prosecution

By C. H. DOUGLAS

CHAPTER XIII.*

To anyone who is prepared to consider the evidence, it must surely be conclusive.

The episodic conception of the history of the past hundred years is quite untenable. It would be absurd to suggest that the period does not comprise a large number of unrelated incidents of high importance, in much the same way that the life of a man with one single and over-mastering ambition is bound to include events which are neither sought nor anticipated. But in the main, the picture is clear. Germany, from the time of Frederick of Prussia, has been the chosen instrument of power politics, the objective of which is simply concentration of power—the stripping from the individual of the freedom of action which is his birthright, and its transfer to an organisation which, from one point of view, enhances the power of a small number of chosen individuals beyond anything conceivable in the absence of the policy and its appropriate organisations. Without in the least attempting to introduce an argument which is germane, but belongs to another plane, it may be observed that this aspect of the matter has been closed some time ago by the enquiry, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"

It may be objected that there is no ground for the separation of this period from any other—that history is one long struggle for power. That this is true is perhaps most clearly expressed in the words of F. R. Bienenfeld, the Jewish writer previously quoted:

"Within the Jewish community as a whole, a phenomenon may be noted which has regularly recurred during the past 2,000 years, namely, that at any given period that section was always considered the most advanced which had most freely submitted to the influence of the high culture of its environment, and had been most active in furthering it. [My emphasis].

"That is why a Babylonian, Alexandrian, Arabian, Spanish, Dutch, and German period may clearly be distinguished in Jewish history. . . . *The German period of Jewry has now come to an end, the Anglo-American period has begun.*" (Emphasis in original *The Germans and the Jews*, p. 245.).

The extracts now being published in *The Social Crediter* from Major Douglas's forthcoming *The Brief for the Prosecution*, of which the first appeared on May 13, 1944, are published with a view to the existing situation, and not in the sequence or detail in which they will appear later.

This is precisely, with certain reservations, the impression which must be obtained by an intelligent observer—that the rise and fall of nations is due to a manipulating influence interested in conflict. That this statement is legitimate must be admitted by anyone who will consider the distance which separates the personal aspirations of the average individual from the life which he is forced to lead when conscripted by the all powerful state to fight in a quarrel which is not his in any fundamental sense.

It is remarkable that, for instance, Herr Bienenfeld does not appear to notice that the passing of Germany is the culmination of a period in which German culture has been almost passionately admired, and largely dominated by Jews, while the transfer of this element to Anglo-Saxondom is contemporaneous with the attempt to impose upon Great Britain and the United States a "planned economy" of precisely the nature associated with the Great German General Staff—a culture and economy which can be demonstrated to lead to the same ultimate catastrophe. But the synchronism is incontestable; and a recognition of it ought to expose the fallacy of supposing that the defeat of Germany, *by itself*, will dispose of the menace to civilisation. Still less, that a so-called Anglo-Saxon hegemony infested and dominated by the ideas which have been uncovered "in war, or the threat of war" would do anything but ensure a further holocaust.

But a consideration of this evidence, while it does nothing to diminish our recognition of the task with which we have allowed ourselves to become confronted, does indicate the general direction which must be pursued. And that direction is radically different from the official programmes current at the moment. Salvation is not to be found in greater and still greater agglomerations of power—in "Law, backed by overwhelming Force," in International Air Forces ruling the skies and the earth by an Aerial Board of Control after the manner of Kipling's story *As easy as A.B.C.*—doubtless an indiscreet dramatisation of an already contemplated policy.

It is, and can only be found, in bringing into actuality the existing cleavage between the individual desire to pursue an individual end and the group pressure to reduce the individual to an amorphous mass—a biological entropy.

Only an outline of major strategy to this end is either possible or desirable at this stage. But it may be helpful to consider this in general terms. Restoration of the sovereignty of the individual over his own affairs is of the essence of it.

(Copyright)

(All rights reserved)

"A keyman in Germany is again Admiral Canaris" [Moses Meyerbeer] "—head of the extremely powerful military intelligence system."

—*Review of World Affairs*, July 28, 1944.

THE AIMS OF EDUCATION

By Dr. BRYAN W. MONAHAN

IV. THE DIMENSIONS OF MIND. To grasp the significance of the possible evolutionary development, it is necessary to differentiate between what may, for convenience, be called the two-dimensional and the three-dimensional activity of mind. The former is exemplified in knowledge, as contrasted with the latter in understanding.

It so happens that there is a word in use which depends on the distinction between knowledge and understanding: *insight*. The use of this word probably derives from the fact that a particular sort of experience is associated with understanding—an experience of mental direction in a plane different to that of the acquisition of knowledge. Thus we have “insight” and “depth” of understanding, as differentiated from “width” of knowledge—usages embodied in our language, of which the referends are not conceived by all who use the terms.

In the sense used here, “dimensions” of mental activity has the meaning not of a special spacial concept, but the generalised mathematical meaning. Knowledge is a two-dimensional pattern, and that pattern, apprehended by the mind from a point in a third dimension, is comprehended as a pattern; this comprehension is understanding. Thus understanding is related to the notion of perspective.

It is characteristic of insight that it is virtually instantaneous (although, of course, purposeful mental effort may precede it). This is perfectly explicable. Knowledge is antecedent to understanding; understanding is a “view” of knowledge from a particular psychic standpoint. That “view” when obtained, and if to be communicated, requires formulation. But the formulation is essentially a separate matter, and may itself require ratiocination. The formulation is a temporal sequence, which distinguishes it in kind from the understanding in which it had its origin. It must be taken in its sequence; but the understanding of the formulation, once obtained, has the same instantaneous quality, and endures as a whole, in the same way as the original insight. Moreover, the understanding may be re-formulated in another sequence. It is clear that the endurance of an understanding, or of a concept, is dimensionally different from its sequential exposition.

It is essential to realise that language is merely a mechanism, and in itself, in this context, possesses no significance. The realisation, perhaps, is not easy, depending on somewhat subtle introspection. It may possibly be gained in this way, at least by those, with cognate experience: anyone who has examined say a piece of machinery with the intention of discovering how it works, will realise that the mental process involved is one of non-verbal cognition, with non-verbal concepts derived from cognate experience. This process, however, is general, but since it is accompanied by verbal processes (relevant or irrelevant), it passes for the most part unrecognised. Yet this non-verbal activity is the actual mental process; verbalism is an epiphenomenon.

Except in the sense discussed next, I do not consider that language is a mechanism of thought at all. It is primarily a mechanism of communication between individuals. Secondly, it is mathematics—a means of calculation which thought can use. Ratiocination is, in fact, calculation. And

just as space-time has proved to be non-Euclidean, so some proportion of Reality is non-syllogistic. Probably one of the major and most dangerous delusions of our time is the idea that Reality conforms to syntax. Language is only “true” in the same way as Euclidean geometry is true; it is, properly used, self-consistent—its truth is immanent; but only if its terms, relations and operations bear a one/one relation to a fragment of Reality is the truth of a proposition transcendent. Even this truth can rarely, if ever, be exhaustive, because Reality can be conceived only in fragments. With this qualification, however, language is capable of being used, exactly as mathematics is used, for the investigation of Reality, though with much less precision. But the qualification is frequently—in fact usually—unrecognised, so that brilliant logicians, such as Bertrand Russell, are led to realistically nonsensical conclusions.

The real importance of language lies in its use for communication, and for the embodiment of discovery. The task of the communicator is essentially a craftsman’s task—the embodiment of concept. Language, in this, is both instrument and material, and communication is limited by its limitations. The procedure, however, is a craft. The communicator of knowledge or of understanding is faced with the task of utilising his material to produce something which bears the same relation to Reality as say an engineering design bears to the completed project. A careful writer will choose one word rather than another; and this process gives us a key to understanding what he is doing; the process of rejection and selection of particular words and constructions implies the existence of a non-verbal concept to which they are referred for suitability. Such a process requires, but all too seldom receives, the converse treatment by the recipient of the communication—a continuous effort at understanding, not the communication, but the Reality symbolised by it, in exactly the same way as an engineer studies a design. I do not think my experience is exceptional, but it is that the majority of people who receive a non-trivial communication simply do not reach Reality through it. They recognise the words and follow the syntax, but do not see the project in the design. The realistic meaning remains unperceived. One can be familiar with a word and with the use of a word, without having first-hand knowledge of its referend.

Unless language is seen in its proper relation, it is probably not possible to progress, at any rate not rapidly, beyond verbalism, as things are. This is a difficulty that must have arisen with increased perfection of language, which has grown from its origin as an instrument of communication to be a thing in itself, an end rather than a means. As such, it has intervened as a curtain between Reality and understanding. Yet much ancient wisdom bears evidence of an understanding vastly beyond the capacity of its language to express it, as well as a comprehension of the inadequacy of language. (As a mental exercise, I recommend the elucidation of the expression “paradox: ambiguity”).

What we find at any level of evolutionary development (in the man-line) is a mechanism evolved which may be mistaken, broadly at that level, for that “something” of which purpose is an aspect. Progress involves the reduction of that mechanism to its subordinate position—its relegation to automaticity—; the mechanism must be passed through consciousness, but beyond it. The mechanism must first be recognised as a mechanism, then understood in its setting.

The technique of the instrumental virtuoso is unconscious; he is concerned only with the *interpretation* of his music; but it is evident to an observer that the learner has technique in itself as an end in itself as a preliminary stage.

The next point to grasp is the difference between understanding and memory. Memory, for our present limited purpose, is simply a form of knowledge. It is knowledge which can be recalled, and as such may include knowledge of an understanding. Understanding, however, is a mental development in another dimension. It is equivalent on the mental plane to a new bodily development on the material plane. Every new understanding is a new attribute of mind; the mind is altered thereby just as the body would be by the acquisition of a new function. Thus the pattern of all future knowledge will be comprehended differently as a result of each understanding gained.

But we can go further than this. Understanding itself can be understood, made a habit, and subordinated as a mechanism. In this way we can approach the direct perception of Reality as a matter of course. This, I believe, marks a fresh stage in evolutionary development. Understanding itself is an emancipation of purpose from some limitations, and of this emancipation we need to be conscious, in order to pass beyond it. It appears probable that emancipation of purpose may be an acceleration when consciously pursued in the light of automatic understanding. The direction of evolution certainly indicates the emergence of super-men; but the emergence will not be on the material plane where materialists at present anticipate it. The materialist never looks for anything but the hypertrophy of present capacities; he is, accordingly, a mental Crustacean.

It follows from the nature of understanding that it cannot be taught, any more than vision can be taught. Those who wish to achieve conscious control of understanding must first, by contemplation and introspection, differentiate from the total flux of experience the element that is understanding. Isolated, it must be brought into consciousness. It is a recognisable, but indescribable experience. Once gained, the recognition of the experience can be applied to the understanding of other experience, and to the penetration of the mechanism of language to the Reality underlying it.

It may be added here, because of a wide-spread misconception of the subject, that delving into the unconscious brings, not progress, but retrogression. It may, possibly, be helpful occasionally in the same way as a surgical operation may be necessary occasionally on a diseased physique. It seems more probable, however, that mental disorder will respond best to a correct orientation of purpose; but this is a discussion outside the scope of these articles.

(To be concluded).

AT GLASGOW TOO

A mechanical break-down at the Pinkston Electricity Station, which supplies power for the Glasgow Corporation Tramways and the Glasgow Underground, brought both these services to a standstill on August 9, the effects of which lasted from tea time until late in the evening according to a Glasgow newspaper. The City Transport Department published an apology to the public for the inconvenience caused.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK (Continued from page 4.)

whose defects they were born to rectify. There are aspects of his writings which make him an easy target, but to anyone familiar with politics below the music-hall level, it must be obvious that either he was in touch with highly important sources of information, and dramatised what he learnt, or he was gifted with the sixth sense of poetic genius. To such of us as can recall the freedom we possessed in the last years of the nineteenth century, and the conviction of assured opportunity, his warning, *The Old Issue*, published in 1899 borders on the miraculous:—

*Howso great the clamour, whatsoever their claim,
Suffer not the old King, under any name.*

*Long-forgotten bondage, dwarfing heart and brain,
All our fathers died to loose, he shall bind again.*

*Here is naught at venture, random or untrue.
Swings the wheel full circle, brims the cup anew.*

We do not know how many of our readers realise it, but unless Governmental and Departmental Sovereignty is effectually limited, the serfdom of Soviet Russia, which is far more effective than that of Tsarist Russia, is ahead of them. "The Government" is buying up property of every description all over the country, either openly or under cover of Forestry Commissions, Trusts, or otherwise. Does anyone suppose that our derisory elective system, with the "B".B.C. and other agencies to assist it, can prevent a capital levy cancelling the purchase "Money" paid, leaving the sellers in the position of the German middle class in 1923?

Whatever endearing qualities may be missing from that funny-but-not-vulgar organisation, P.E.P., confidence in its ability to settle everything in the face of uniform failure to settle anything, is not one of them. Turning from the contemplation of its labours in once-great Britain (facetiously called "home") it is now devoting a few well-chosen words to the arrangement of the affairs of Europe, and the "peoples about to be liberated from the Nazi tyranny." (*Planning*, No. 223, July 21, 1944). "It would be intolerable [to whom?] to condemn them again to the conditions of political insecurity and economic backwardness which were their lot before the war. *With their political future it is not proposed to deal here* [our emphasis]; but the economic problems will remain..."

So let's settle them without going through the formality of enquiring whether they would prefer to settle them themselves. That's liberation, that was.

For sheer confusion of argument the Broadsheet in question would be difficult to excel. (We are straining our charitable instincts.) An adequate analysis of the statements in regard to agriculture alone would require considerably more space than the Broadsheet requires to settle the complete economy of occupied Europe. But we can dispense with it.

Would you believe it: the solution is more employment, more industry, and more chemical fertilisers?

"... it is obvious that when a man runs the wrong way, the more active and swift he is the further he will go astray."

— FRANCIS BACON.

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. 12. No. 24.

Saturday, August 19, 1944.

THE CANADIAN PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS

At the time of writing, in a Legislature consisting of 57 members, 39 Social Crediters have already been elected and in the majority of the remaining constituencies Social Credit candidates are leading.

That is the condition of affairs in Alberta in the third election in the past ten years, and seems to be a fitting reply to Mr. Mackenzie King's recent sneer that Social Credit is on the way out.

It is not impossible that Mr. Manning's majority may even eclipse the landslide which brought Mr. Aberhart to power; and it is already larger than before the election.

The direct consequences are important; but the indirect consequences may be world-wide. During the previous election, international finance poured money into the province to secure the election of so-called "Independent" members on every "ticket" which could attract votes, the only condition being that they should attack Social Credit. Fifteen were elected, and with three Liberals and an "Independent Social Crediter" formed the Opposition.

But it disintegrated. In the present election, four "Independents" refused to stand on any platform; one stipulated that he should stand as a Liberal, and it seems doubtful whether the remainder have made any effort to secure re-election. The explanation is not far to seek—in fact, any reader of *The Times* or the *Economist* during the past six months would be passing dull to miss it. Big Business and P.E.P. Socialism put the whole of their combined weight (assuming that it has not always been a combined weight) behind the Socialist C.C.F. with the obvious intention of preparing in the Provincial field the alternative Government to that of Mr. Mackenzie King in the Ottawa Parliament which has served them so well. They have sustained a resounding defeat—and what is equally important an open and comprehensible public defeat. For months past, paid organisers on a scale previously unknown in provincial politics have been touting any brand of socialism, or anything else, which would secure a C.C.F. vote. On the other hand Mr. Manning and his Cabinet have, most commendably, carried the war to the enemy by broadcasting and otherwise. The aggressors were the C.C.F.; and they and their international backers have been systematically, and none too gently, taken to pieces and placed on exhibition to the interested eyes of the rest of Canada.

Here for the moment we can leave Alberta, which has demonstrated that it is quite capable of managing its own affairs. But to the Social Crediters of the adjoining Province of Saskatchewan, which recently elected a C.C.F. Government as an intimation that it didn't want a Liberal Government and didn't like Mr. Mackenzie King, we might perhaps suggest that they are now in possession of a potentially winning hand. Their strategy is wide open, and they doubtless understand it. It is to make the C.C.F. carry through every socialistic measure they advocated, while dissenting from it, and to see that the C.C.F. do not build up their credit by measures stolen from across the border. We are convinced that so long as Mr. Mackenzie King is in Office, the Ottawa Government will not only discriminate against Mr. Manning, but will assist the Saskatchewan Administration in socialistic measures both openly and covertly. The price is control.

A dose of Socialism will finally eliminate the C.C.F. from Saskatchewan.

The Quebec elections prove two points conclusively. The first is the determination to end the long reign of Mr. King and the "Liberal" dominance of the Montreal Banks. And the second is the demonstration that the so-called anti-British, anti-Empire sentiment, exemplified by the *Bloc Populaire*, has no popular support. As for the C.C.F., which put forward twenty-four candidates, it elected one—in a constituency newly formed for this election.

In general, the situation is more encouraging than it has ever been before, and much more promising than in the widely publicised entry of Social Credit into politics in 1935. There is a long way to go, and hard battles are ahead: but there is a compact army of experienced fighters in the field, and a far better informed public.

From Week to Week

PRE-VIEW OF THE NEXT WORLD WAR. Brazilian Troops enthusiastically welcomed on landing at Naples.

"In the territories cleared of the Nazi invaders, the Soviet Government is re-establishing its political regime of lawlessness and violence, while prisons and concentration camps continue to function as before."

—VICTOR KRAVCHENKO, Ex-Soviet Purchasing Commissioner in Washington.

The Generals who have been hanged for "plotting against Hitler" have had their estates confiscated to the Reich. Now, Clarence, you guess whose the Reich is.

Have you heard of any directors of *I. G. Farben* having their shares confiscated to the Reich?

THIS WEEK'S BELIEVE-IT-OR-NOT. During the mid nineteenth century, the London *Times* was generally regarded as the world's standard of journalism.

It has been the fashion of the Bloomsbury intellectual, kindly guided by Professor Laski and the London School of Economics, to deride Kipling as part of that Victorianism

(Continued on previous page)

THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT

By N. F. W.

(2). "APPLYING THE LEVER."

"From the first moment I entered the movement my eyes were directed towards England, because I saw by reason of the general conditions there the Archimedean point where the lever could be applied." — THEODORE HERZL, First Zionist President.

It is claimed by his followers that Theodore Herzl, from whose presidential address at the Fourth Zionist Congress, held in London in 1900, the above quotation is taken, foresaw that "events"—i.e., the 1914-18 phase of the World War—would bring Palestine under British control. True to his premonition, he seems to have centred all his efforts on England from the beginning. He was in touch with Joseph Chamberlain in 1903, and got the refusal of Uganda for a Jewish national home. After Herzl's death in 1904, his policy was carried on by his successor, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, who still occupies the presidency; and by the middle of the 1914-18 war, by far the greater number of influential Zionists had come to England and settled. Up to 1916 the Zionist H.Q. had been in Berlin, where Max Warburg, brother of Paul and Felix Warburg, of the Banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Company, New York, was in charge. All through the war, we are told, the perfect "internationalism" of the Movement remained unimpaired: funds, information, individuals passed freely from one belligerent capital to another. By 1916, in January of which year at a conference held in London, where we first hear of Simon Marks, head of Marks & Spencers, and Israel Sieff, chairman of P.E.P., in a political connection, it was decided to move the headquarters from Berlin to London. And by October of that year the draft programme for a Palestine Settlement had been completed, to which Arthur Balfour was subsequently to give his name.

One point to be noted, I think, is the ceaseless, concentrated activity of the Committee, carried on apparently quite unhampered, and not the least cramped in style by the life-and-death struggle being waged around them by the country in which these men were guests. Dr. Weizmann's political activities in particular were prodigious; alternating between his academic duties as lecturer in Organic Chemistry at Manchester University, and Zionist work for both Sir Alfred Mond and Sir Herbert Samuel, in addition to his task of bringing Lord Rothschild round to the Zionist point of view. He was in touch with Arthur Balfour and, through Scott of the *Manchester Guardian*, contacted Lloyd George, for whom he undertook vital research work on the production of acetone. Of that episode one has read in Lloyd George's Memoirs and elsewhere. Dr. Weizmann's chemical triumph actually supplied the last fraction of the "Archimedean" leverage referred to in my quotation from Herzl required to precipitate the Balfour Declaration.

It was Sir Alfred Mond who, in 1904, had brought Weizmann over as chemist in the Brunner, Mond laboratories, and we are told by Paul Goodman in the editorial to his symposium,* that "around the Balfour Declaration has arisen the saga of the Mond-Rufus Isaacs families, which Jewish history will tell to future generations." Unfortunately, Mr. Goodman himself tells us little more than that. Doubtless

on the Mond side the saga is not unconnected with the concession of the Dead Sea obtained by I.C.I. in 1929. In the case of the late Marquis of Reading, however, we are left guessing, although there is a hint that the later understanding came to between "America" and "Britain," i.e., the New York Zionists and the London Zionists, touches that side of the 'saga.' According to Mr. Goodman, Orthodox Christian Russia, having long had designs on Palestine, early in the war obtained a promise of it from her Allies "which would have been fatal to Jewish interests." It sounds an unlikely story, particularly in view of the fact that it was promised to the Arabs in 1915. Or was Palestine, which has been referred to as 'the Twice-Promised-Land,' the Thrice-Promised or—if we count the Kaiser's promises at the time of the Berlin-Baghdad Railway scheme—the Four-Times-Promised-Land? New York Jewry may have believed the story. There can be no doubt that the Jewish attitude towards Greek Church-cum-Tsarist Russia has always been unbalanced.

As the war situation deteriorated for the Allies, Jewish influence, which had been more or less ignored in the early stages, began to assume greater importance. "It gradually came to be realised in London that the sympathies of American Jews, whose pro-allied sympathies were withheld owing to the barbarities inflicted by Tsarist Russia on their Jewish subjects, would be won if Britain took a hand in a pro-Jewish gesture."† I think the plain English of that is that the British War Cabinet, after the collapse of Russia, was told that recognition of the Zionist aspirations in Palestine was the price of "America's" coming into the war. In 1915 the German Government had renewed their somewhat premature offer of Palestine to the Zionist Headquarters; but it appeared that it was not to come into Jewish hands *via* the Kaiser or on German conditions. To the London Committee, at least, England promised to be a better intermediary. New York Jewry on the other hand was still strongly pro-German, as we learn from the correspondence of the British Ambassador, Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, who refers to Wilson's concern over the matter.

In August 1917 was set up "Zionist Organisation, London Bureau," with Dr. Weizmann at its head, and, among others, assisting him, Simon Marks, Israel Sieff, Asher Ginzburg, of Odessa, Benwick, and Kessler. By this date Russia was "out" of the picture and the need to get America "in" appeared dire. It was upon this situation of Gentile extremity that the London Bureau "cashed in," with that undeterable objectivity we have already noted, and upon it, apparently, was built the Mond-Isaacs saga. Sir Rufus Isaacs, as the late Marquis of Reading then was, went to America that year, and "the immediate effect was striking," as Paul Goodman tells us. For him, one must suppose, that America came into the war was neither here nor there beside the fact that "... messages were sent in cypher through the Foreign Office on behalf of the Zionists to the Zionists of New York," and "The London Bureau was granted every facility for its activities." On November 2 of the same year, came the Balfour Declaration, in the form of a letter to Lord Rothschild. Beyond peradventure the Zionist balloon was going up, and whoever else ascended with it, apparently the Mond and Isaacs families were assured of seats.

No doubt the leverage had been terrific, and applied

**The Jewish National Home* edited by Paul Goodman: Dent.

†Goodman: *Op. cit.*

with consummate skill. None the less, the complacency of British statesmanship is hardly credible without allowing for the existence of some occult forces. Dr. Weizmann's first encounter, as a young foreign chemist, with Arthur Balfour in 1906, which, to quote Mr. Goodman, "is already one of the best known events in the annals of Zionism. It is to be found in almost every textbook of Jewish history," is hardly credible. To Balfour's enquiry as to what was wrong with Uganda, Weizmann replied, with that extraordinary irrelevance which is a marked Jewish trait,—“‘Mr. Balfour, if you were offered Paris instead of London, would you take it?’ He looked surprised: ‘But London is our own,’ he said: ‘Jerusalem was our own when London was a marsh.’ He said, ‘that’s true.’” Are we really to believe that the experienced, philosophical statesman collapsed with a feeble squawk like that, before a palpable dialectical quibble, bearing no relation whatsoever to the realities of the matter under discussion? If that is typical of the quality of realism at the disposal of the British War Cabinet in 1917 one can hardly wonder that Versailles made such a mess of it. That Cabinet, besides Balfour, contained Lloyd George, afterwards solicitor to the Zionist Movement; Lord Cecil, President of the League of Nations Union; Lord Milner, the friend of the Zionist Rabbi Hertz who, after he fell foul of Paul Kruger in South Africa, “where he won the confidence and personal esteem of Lord Milner,† became Chief Rabbi of the British Empire, a post he still occupies in spite of the fact that he is an American citizen; Ormsby-Gore; and Amery, later a co-director with Simon Marks and Israel Sieff of Marks & Spencers Limited.

In the Cabinet itself, the only constructive opposition apparently came from Edwin Montagu, the Jewish Secretary of State for India. He belonged to one of the older families of Assimilationist Jewry, and in consequence was bitterly opposed to Zionism. None the less, his arguments that the Declaration would set the Moslem world by the ears, and injure British prestige in India, was statesmanlike and unanswerable. Without a doubt no single British commitment abroad has done so much injury to the nation's reputation. The Assimilationists were mainly of the Western, Sephardic and German Jews, with the Montefiores at their head, who deeply resented and dreaded the Eastern Zionist invasion. They had long dominated the London Board of Deputies, and it was with them Dr. Weizmann and the London Bureau had to deal. But eventually the Zionists triumphed both in London and later in New York. It is obvious their superior instinct for the “Archimedean point” of leverage—a mathematical faculty highly developed in the young of the cuckoo—stood them in good stead. A few packed meetings, it would seem, and a liberal use of the blessed word Democracy, and Dr. Weizmann became chairman of the London Board of Deputies.

America was now a belligerent—on paper; but no doubt powerful forces had already been set to work inside Germany, and the time had come for Arthur Balfour, on behalf of England, to underwrite the Jewish National Home in Palestine by putting his name and reputation to the terms drafted by Simon Marks, and Israel Sieff, and Asher Ginzburg the previous year. This he did, with certain not unimportant reservations, in November, 1917, thereby repudiating the

pledge we had given the Arabs regarding Palestine in 1915 in return for immediate military aid—aid of a much more tangible and effective character than anything “America” was destined to contribute, and at a much lower rate of interest.

(To be concluded).

TOM KENNEDY

In the death of Tom Kennedy on June 26, the Social Credit Movement lost one of its oldest, in the sense of original, adherents.

It was in the summer of 1920—twenty-four years ago—that a notice appeared in the *New Age* suggesting that any Belfast subscribers interested in the facts or attracted by the ideas contained in Douglas's articles in the paper, and in the book *Economic Democracy*, should communicate with Tom Kennedy, then a member of the Linen Industry. As a result, what must have been the first Social Credit Study Group, of about twenty, was formed straight away, and met at his house. Later a room was taken and meetings were held almost weekly, when Douglas's philosophy was expounded from every aspect with growing success. Various addresses were also given to outside bodies.

In the winter of 1921 circumstances led Kennedy to live in Dublin, in the then newly-formed Irish Free State, and in an atmosphere of high tension. Here a group was formed, but in spite of anything its chairman could do, it has always suffered from the prevailing political complex which prohibits a wholehearted acceptance of anything of Anglo-Saxon origin—even a correct idea. In spite of that, its founder was constantly and indefatigably active, both in agricultural and industrial circles, lecturing everywhere, and writing in the provincial, as well as the Dublin press, the most amazing number of letters, which continued right up to the time of his death. He was *persona grata* with editors all over Eire, and in spite of his association with the “Black North” always managed to keep in close touch with the Catholic Church. Father Coffey, a lecturer in Maynooth College and a well-known Social Crediter, was his personal friend.

Whatever useful pioneering work in the Social Credit field Belfast has been permitted to achieve, there can be no doubt that a large share of the credit for it is due to Tom Kennedy, with his almost instantaneous appreciation of the “value” of *Economic Democracy*, and his prompt action and decisive and unwavering adherence to his “glimpse of Reality.”

Just two years ago the writer sat talking with him in the pleasant look-out in his garden on top of Killiney Hill, with its wonderful view over the bay to the Wicklow Mountains, and he seemed mainly conscious of the little he had achieved. But it is safe to say that the real influence of his individual activity, infused with the correct understanding of *Economic Democracy*, was, and is, greater by far than much of the “organised noise” going on all about it. It was certainly too varied and immense even to enumerate, here, for the happy leisure which the economic security of his later years brought him, was spent without stint.

—N. F. W.

†Goodman: *Op. cit.*

POINTS FROM PARLIAMENT

Mr. Churchill's Review

House of Commons: August 2, 1944.

Mr. Churchill's review of the war situation contained the following points:—

I approach, not without natural anxiety, the delicate subject of foreign affairs. I still hold to the view which I expressed last time, that as the war enters its final phase it is becoming, and will become, increasingly less ideological. Confusion was caused in some minds by mixing ideology with idealism, whereas in fact there is quite a notable difference between them. While I cherish idealism as a cheerful light playing over the thoughts and hopes of men, and inspiring noble deeds, ideology too often presents itself as undue regimentation of ideas and may very likely be incompatible with freedom.

I have rejoiced to see the Fascist ideology overthrown, and I look forward to its complete extirpation in Italy. I rejoice in the prospect, now becoming sure and certain, that the Nazi ideology, enforced in a hideous manner upon a vast population, will presently be beaten to the ground. These facts and manifestations which I see taking place continually as the world war crashes onwards to its close make me increasingly confident that when it is won, when the hateful aggressive Nazi and Fascist systems have been laid low, and when every precaution has been taken against their ever rising again there may be a new brotherhood among men which will not be based upon crude antagonisms of ideology, but upon broad, simple, homely ideals of peace, justice, and freedom. Therefore, I am glad that the war is becoming less an ideological war between rival systems, and more and more the means by which high ideals and solid benefits may be achieved by the broad masses of the people in many lands and ultimately in all.

Since I spoke last on the general position to the House marked improvements have occurred in several quarters. Foreign affairs are powerfully influenced by the movements of the war situation. The successes I have been recounting to the House have carried all our affairs into a more favourable condition.

The whole of Europe is heading irresistibly into new and secure foundations. . . .

. . . It is one of the main interests of Great Britain that a friendly France should regain and hold her place among the major Powers of Europe and the world. Show me a moment when I swerved from this conception and you will show me a moment when I have been wrong. I must confess that I never liked Trotsky, but there is one thing he said at the time of the brutal German treaty of Brest Litovsk which stuck in my mind. He said to the German bullies:—

The destiny of a great nation has never yet been settled by the temporary condition of its technical apparatus.

So it will be with France, struck down in a few weeks of agony and deprived thereafter of the power of self-expression and almost of the right of existence. . . .

We all feel deep regret and also anxiety as friends of

Argentina that in this testing time for nations she has not seen fit to declare herself wholeheartedly, unmistakably, and with no reserve or qualification upon the side of freedom and has chosen to dally with the evil, and not only with the evil but with the losing side. I trust that my remarks will be noted because this is a very serious war. It is not like some small wars in the past where all could be forgotten and forgiven. Nations must be judged by the part they play. Not only belligerents but neutrals will find that their position in the world cannot remain entirely unaffected by the part they have chosen to play in the crisis of the war. . . .

At the present time no speech by a prominent politician in any of the victorious countries could be deemed complete without a full exposition of the future organisation of the world. I was severely reproached last time for not having dealt methodically with this considerable topic. One of my difficulties is that it does not rest with me to lay down the law for all our allies. If that was the general wish, I could certainly make one or two suggestions; but, odd as it may seem, countries like the United States and Soviet Russia might wish to have their say in the matter and might not look on it from exactly the same angle or express it in exactly the same terms as would gain the loudest applause in this House. I am sorry about this, because nothing would have given me greater pleasure than to devote a couple of hours in giving my personal ideas about the general lay-out but it would be very troublesome to all of us here if I made a great pronouncement on this subject and found myself contradicted and even repudiated by our most powerful allies.

From time to time a great many very eloquent statements are made on the future organisation of the world by the most eminent people. In spite of all urges that we should take the lead in laying down the law, I, personally, should prefer to hear the opinions of other powerful nations before committing our country to too many details. Can we not be content with the broad declaration upon which we are all agreed, that there is to be a world council to preserve peace which will, in the first instance, be formed and guided by the major Powers who have gained the war, and that thereafter other Powers, and eventually all Powers, will be offered their part in this world organisation? Can we not be content with that, and concentrate our efforts on winning a victory, bearing ourselves so prominently in the conflict that our words will receive honoured consideration when we come to the organisation of the peace?

House of Commons: July 25, 1944.

SURPLUS GOVERNMENT STORES (DISPOSAL)

Dr. Russell Thomas (Southampton): May I ask one question? Can the right hon. Gentleman give an assurance that he will not give to Europe what will be required here?

Mr. Dalton: I do not think that is the way to approach it.

Dr. Thomas: Why not?

Mr. Dalton: Because there are moral duties which we owe to those of our Allies who have had a much harder war than we have.

Dr. Thomas: Charity begins at home.

Mr. Dalton: No, charity does not begin at home, unless

your home is large enough to contain all your friends. If my hon. Friend does not see that, I do not think it is worth my while to spend more time upon it. . . .

There will be a great danger of inflation during the transition period—a far greater danger of that than of mass unemployment. Later on the relative importance of these dangers may change, but in the immediate transition period inflation will be much the greatest danger we shall have to face, and therefore it is essential to keep a firm grip, as we can under the existing statutory powers, upon prices and profit margins.

Mr. Bowles (Nuneaton): May I put one question upon a point which seems fundamental? Does this visualise the disposal by the Government of Government stocks through private traders who will be making profits for themselves.

Mr. Dalton: Yes, Sir, but what I am saying is that the profit must be controlled.

Mr. Bowles: It will be profit out of Government stocks.

Mr. Dalton: The alternative would be to set up new *ad hoc* distributing machinery. . . .

Mr. Bowles (Nuneaton): . . . I deny the mandate of any Member of the Government, particularly the President of the Board of Trade, to commit his party to their policy so far as the post-war distribution of war stocks is concerned. . . .

With this stock which the Government are likely to have at the end of the war, a very good job of work can be done by proper and adequate distribution amongst the people of this country. . . .

I suggest that my right hon. Friend, as a member of the Socialist Party, should steel his face against the distribution or leasing of public property to private traders.

Dr. R. Thomas: The right hon. Gentleman made it quite clear that the trade unions agree to that policy, and also to the profit margin.

Mr. Bowles: I did not hear him say that the trade unions agreed. —

Dr. Thomas: He did. The right hon. Gentleman was probably in a dilemma in regard to the demands of his Party on the one hand and the needs of his country on the other.

Mr. Bowles: Well, I will accept it, but I did not hear him say anything about consultation with the trade unions, and I was here all the time. I hope the Parliamentary Secretary will say whether the right hon. Gentleman the President has had negotiations with the leaders of the trade union movement and that they have agreed to the disposal of Government stock and the making of profit out of it, because it is most important. It is true that we are not committing ourselves for one minute to the contents of this White Paper, but I do say that neither Labour Ministers nor trade union leaders have the right to commit members of this party to the contents of either the President's speech or of the White Paper. . . .

SOVEREIGNTY Part II

Price 6d.

Now obtainable from "NEVER AGAIN" ASSOCIATION,
13, Wanstead Road, Bromley, Kent.

Divergent Squint

"Only 32 per cent. [of 47 per cent. who 'voted'] believed that the introduction of a National Health Service would enhance 'the quality of the country's medical service.'" — *B. M. J.*

"It is . . . clear . . . the doctors are in sympathy with the aims of the White Paper." — *The Economist.*

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy	7d.
Reconstruction	6d.
The Use of Money	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold	4/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.	1/-
Aberhart: Manning	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards	8d.
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.
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin	4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.
The Beveridge Plot	3d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus	3d.
The Voters' Policy as applied to the Beveridge Report (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet)	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.
Cross-section of Bristol discusses Work (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet)	1d.
The Representative's Job	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.