

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 12. No. 25.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 26, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

The Brief for the Prosecution

By C. H. DOUGLAS

PART II. CHAPTER I.*

Certain premises are an essential starting point for any useful suggestions in respect of the situation we have to face. The first of these is that a comprehension of a sound policy is by no means an identity with a comprehension of the means by which it may be achieved.

The first may be emotional or intuitional; but the second must be technical. There is, fortunately, no lack of the former, but there is immense confusion as to the latter. It is in this difference that one of the greatest difficulties of genuine reform resides. The complaints of the under-privileged have been wholly justified; their remedies have often been inspired by their deadliest enemies. In small matters, most people are quite aware that it is absurd to tell their shoemaker how to make shoes, but reasonable to complain that their shoes hurt. But, to take an important example, once the average voter has grasped the idea that there is something wrong with the money system, it is rarely that he does not attribute its defects to something he has been taught to call private enterprise, and agree that it should be perfected by the nationalisation of the banks. Since monetary reform is not merely vital, but is becoming topical, we may begin the examination of a new policy by a consideration of certain elementary aspects of money, and perhaps the simplest approach is by an inspection of its origins. We may observe that, amongst many reasons for this, is the fact that previous researches have established the fact that centralised sovereignty is at the root of the world's ills; and money is connected with economic sovereignty.

The word "pecuniary" derives from *pecus*, L. cattle, and probably the earliest form of currency, by which we mean something which is not wealth, but can be exchanged for wealth, was a leather disc given by a nomadic cattle owner to a buyer who did not at once wish to remove his purchase. The currency was issued by the *owner of the wealth*. To the extent that his ownership was absolute, economic sovereignty resided in him.

The next stage was the accompaniment of war and social insecurity. Wealth was deposited with goldsmiths for safe-keeping, and their receipt became currency. The issue of

currency thus passed from the owner of wealth to the *custodian* of wealth. It is easy to prove that the goldsmith's receipt, which was often a fraudulent receipt, is the prototype of the bank note. Sovereignty largely passed to the goldsmith bankers, who "created the means of payment out of nothing." Finally currency and cheques on drawable deposits became simply bankers' credit, which was not owned by either the owner of real wealth, *per se*, or the producer of wealth. This is quite easy to prove by an inspection of any balance sheet, in which it will be found that "real" items and monetary balances are to be found on the same side, and both are *assets*. This would imply that someone, somewhere, actually owes to the possessor of money, a "real" asset corresponding to the money, and that this individual shows this property in his accounts as a *liability*. There is nothing in the facts or accounts of the business system to confirm this conclusion, but there is much to suggest that bankers have a concealed lien on nearly all property.

There is little difficulty in demonstrating that the money system will only work satisfactorily when sovereignty over his share of it is restored to the individual. It is unnecessary to develop this thesis here, since it has been fully explored in such books as *The Monopoly of Credit*. The point that is germane to our present enquiry is that there is no evidence to indicate that a nationalised banking and currency system would be anything but more oppressive than a partly decentralised system. Each approach to centralisation, and this approach has been rapid, has increased the tyranny of Finance, a tyranny which in itself is technical, but becomes political by reason of the immense advantages which accrue to its manipulators.

It may be objected that the preceding outline ignores the metallic currency of the Royal Mints. So far from this being the case, the royal prerogative of striking coins is a relic and confirmation of the original theory of money. The King was, as the "Crown" in theory still is, the ultimate owner of everything within his sovereignty. Land and chattels were held ultimately from the King, and the possession of his coinage was simply an acknowledgement of a grant by him. Those well-intentioned people who feel that nationalisation of banking, with its attribute of credit-money creation is desirable, would do well to realise what it is they are proposing, which is the Divine Right of Kings, *tout court*, without a responsible King.

It is not necessary to infer from the preceding analysis that the establishment of a mint for every household is desirable. The money system is complementary to, and useless in the absence of, a price system. A corollary of this is that *the price of articles is the direct sum paid for them, together with the proportion of involuntary payments in the*

*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.

form of taxation, which accompany residence within the sovereignty.

That is to say, every rise in price, whether direct, or in accompanying taxation, is a transfer of economic sovereignty from the individual to a centralised Sovereign. And the imposition of any condition of law on the free purchase of any article is a similar transfer.

It will be noticed that managed currency systems ostensibly intended to keep price levels constant, are incompatible with economic decentralisation. Managed currencies are controlled currencies and require a controller. The essential requirement of a free economy is radically different. In such an economy the proper function of money is to reflect facts, not policy. If it is a fact, as of course it is, that the "costs" of production are in reality, if not in unstable currency units, decreasing, then both individual prices, and consequently price levels ought to move to lower levels to reflect this process. The argument that falling prices mean loss to producers and stagnant trade is merely perverse. Compensated prices even of a crude and unscientific type are a day to day process at the present time, and deal with this situation simply, comprehensively and successfully.

Falling prices, by themselves, are the most perfect method of passing improvement of process on to consumers. They have the effect of increasing real and psychological credit, and raise the international exchange value of the unit which loses any economic reality if "controlled" or "pegged." The method of "spending money into circulation to 'preserve' [i.e., to raise] the price level" now being advocated under the title of a twentieth century economic system, is simply a vicious form of managed inflation, ultimately accompanied of necessity by cumulative industrial waste. Assuming that it is understood by its sponsors, it is an attempt to perpetuate government by finance.

There is little doubt, however, that while a price system based on facts and consequently unsusceptible to manipulation, if the facts on which it is based are published, is a primary essential, a national dividend is only less so. The attempt to capitalise this necessity by a levelling down process masquerading as contributory social insurance has already been noticed. The justification for a non-contributory dividend both theoretical and practical has already been explored and demonstrated, and it is unnecessary to repeat the arguments at this stage.

It may be observed that a satisfactory restoration of the money system to its essential principles is vital to the preservation of money systems of any description. Failure to achieve this objective would at no great distance in the future deprive mankind of what might be one of his most valuable mechanisms.

The idea that, in the engaging words of the letter attributed to the American Bankers' Association, "Chattel slavery will be abolished by the war. . . We can achieve the same result by controlling the money" is even yet a fond aspiration in many quarters by no means negligible. But, in the face of wider knowledge of the nature and functions of money the attempt, although it will doubtless be made, will merely result in the final elimination of "bankers' money."

(Copyright)

(All rights reserved)

THE AIMS OF EDUCATION

By Dr. BRYAN W. MONAHAN

V. EDUCATION. We have seen that evolution in the man-line has been towards lack of adaptation of the individual to his environment towards the replacement of organisation of the non-vegetative functions by a condition of lability. This event is subserved by the genetic mechanism, which as a mechanism, is irrelevant to the present enquiry. Organisation of the non-vegetative functions, highly developed in some animals, is virtually absent in the human infant. The infant possesses little more than a potential for development. This potential is manifested in several vague directions—types of behaviour which we recognise as the instincts; but within and beyond the frame-work of these the development of the individual is free to proceed to extraordinary differentiation.

At birth the infant meets problems posed by its environment. Its capacity to deal with these is, practically speaking, nil; it is completely dependent on outside assistance. Knowledge of the answers to the problems is not inborn, as it is to varying degrees in other animals. In so far as standard solutions are pragmatically satisfactory, and correspondingly invariable, they are passed from parent to off-spring not through the genetic mechanism, but by virtue of lability. Thus so far from inheriting certain acquired abilities, we have lost some possessed by other animals. This change of mechanism clearly allows "variation" to become effective infinitely more rapidly than genetic variation, whether the latter is (as is by no means proved) or is not "spontaneous" and haphazard.

Once the full significance of lability is grasped, it can be seen how immensely significant the cultural environment must be. Certain answers to problems are so standardised as to be equivalent to inborn, or genetic, answers; nevertheless they are passed from one generation to the next entirely through the cultural inheritance, and unquestioned and unrecognised for what they are. What has to be realised is that the individual is a product of these answers (which might almost be described as "cultural genes." I shall, however, refer to all these "factors" as cultural elements), in practically the same sense as he is a product of his genes. He is, in fact, the resultant of both.

It is quite impossible to know how the individual would develop if he were fully isolated at birth from the cultural tradition, for the simple reason that he would not survive. Any individual, therefore, available for observation must embody some cultural elements. His environment as he first sees and hears it, is a product and portion of the cultural tradition. Any element of this tradition is highly complex, as shown by Tudor Jones (*Fig Tree*, September, 1936). Now although, and especially in a given Society, the initial cultural elements may be very standardised, the infant is at birth extremely labile, so that almost imperceptible differences will be much more significant to the infant than they would appear to be to the adult observer. This is as if cultural elements were showing "mutations." These elements enter into the structure of the developing personality, and consequently play their part in governing the interaction of the personality with its environment. This interaction

itself becomes part of the environment, so that the initial effect is magnified. For example, if an infant is made angry, and reacts violently against its environment, it suffers the reaction of the environment, and undergoes some particular experience. The effect of this experience, however, may vary with its relation to previous development. If this line of thought be pursued, it becomes evident that environment is extraordinarily subtle and variable, even when to the observer it appears to be fully standardised. The "same home" provides an infinity of different environments for its children. This concept can be analysed and developed at great length.

It is evident that through this mechanism the child acquires many and varied differences; these in turn affect all subsequent acquisitions of cultural differences, though clearly to varying degrees. They affect the *direction* of subsequent development, and this direction may appear as an aptitude. An "aptitude" of this derivation is clearly not genetically transmissible.

This part of the discussion may be summarised and symbolised in the statement that mental development consists of the development of mental "organisation," and that such development is predominantly and increasingly cultural, and not genetic; its physical basis is lability, which has emerged from the genetic mechanism. This conception enables us to define the essential objective of education. We may say that the problem of education is the problem of ensuring the provision of the cultural material to enable the purpose embodied in the individual to build mental structure by serial decisions of acceptance and rejection.

The subjective aspect of a cultural element is, in the broad sense, a belief. This belief may, of course, be true or false. Beliefs differentiate men as effectively on the mental plane as genetic differences on the physical differentiate animals into species. Certain beliefs divide men into immiscible groups. There is, I believe, a true speciation of human beings which has developed away from the genetic mechanism. Its aim is differentiation; there is no significance in the emergence of its mechanism (lability) if differentiation does not occur.

It is obvious that anything in the nature of standardised education is in flat contradiction to the direction of evolution. The infant possesses at birth a potential for development which is gradually exhausted, and a potential for differentiation which is gradually modified as the result of the differentiation already progressively achieved. Certain biases to the direction of differentiation are given willy-nilly from the moment of birth by the immediate comprehensive environment, and the cultural material of the environment is always a factor throughout life. But purpose emerges in the child, and accepts or rejects the cultural elements available so far as it can discriminate them.

The only overriding policy of education which is consistent with the observable trend of evolution is first to aim at the conscious emancipation of purpose, and second to aim at the emergence of conscious understanding. The technique of this policy is to aim at the reduction of any aim through consciousness to automaticity, so that each aim becomes a mechanism to be transcended in its turn by purpose. Thus the alphabet is learnt for the sake of words;

words for the symbolisation of concept; concept for understanding.

The converse policy is that of canalising the individual's development potential in accordance with a pre-arranged pattern—in accordance with some other individual's purpose—or even with some disembodied purpose, a collective purpose such as has already been achieved to a high degree of perfection particularly in the insect world, and there by the genetic mechanism. I repeat, lability has no significance except as a mechanism to permit a high degree of differentiation. The world of living things consists almost entirely of examples of purpose confined by the mechanisms it has devised. Man is the exception. The collectivist idea really is a barrier to progress in just the same sense as the ventral development of a nervous cord proved to be at the epoch when the decision was made. Human progress does not lie in the physical sphere, although no doubt development may there be looked for. Our progress lies in the third dimension of mind, in the continuous supercession of achieved mechanisms; possibly, conceivably, in other dimensions still. The fundamental law of the physical world is the law of entropy; the first achievement of purpose was to reverse it. That was the earliest organic problem. The mechanism devised was subordinated, and made to subserve function. But then function was subordinated to integration, and integration in turn to investigation, investigation to knowledge, and knowledge to understanding. Any one of these stages could be pursued as an end in itself, could undergo enormous elaboration; but elaboration or expansion is not progress. Extrapolation suggests that the next step for us is automatic understanding, the step to which is the recognition of the significance of our own evolution, and the conscious discrimination of its present end-point. Thus education must be applied to the emancipation of purpose. This will probably be achieved by such a cultivation of understanding as will lead to the child's acquiring early the ability to educate itself.

It will probably be realised that this is a problem of dimensions; cultural elements may be one, two, or three dimensional; probably, ultimately, more. But I do not wish to pursue this aspect here.

The starting point of education is the child's curiosity, which is the expression of its potential for development and differentiation on the mental plane. The teacher's part is not to canalise, but to assist, by the provision of cultural material as requested, with developing insight, by the child. It is a striking characteristic of a child, from infancy onwards, who is not interfered with, that it has a pronounced continuity of development, combined with a tremendous capacity for concentration. These characteristics are greatly modified in most adults. We find them disintegrated in most of their aspects. This is the result of interference and distraction, from infancy onwards; it can be verified by simple observation in almost any home.

The basis of educational policy can only lie, I believe, in understanding in that ultimate sense previously discussed, for here we are at the growing point of our true progress, which is affected as never before by our understanding of its direction. A new and genuine emancipation lies ahead, awaiting our recognition of its possibility.

(Concluded).

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. 25.

Saturday, August 26, 1944.

AUSTRALIA WINS A POINT

If Australian Attorney General Herbert V. Evatt ("Thank-God-for-Social-Credit"-Evatt) is to be believed, Australians have voted for unemployment and depression after the war, have refused to allow their Prime Minister, John Curtin to lead them to victory, have refused to give additional powers to themselves, have refused to undertake a great works programme and have refused to "provide work for all."

Since *The Times* did not enumerate these objectives, it was quite free to dismiss the "Case for Yes" to the proposal to alter the Constitution as something presented "in a popular and somewhat emotional fashion." The once-thunderous admitted, on the eve of the referendum just concluded, that the negative case was "slightly more restrained in tone."

"Do you really believe," it quoted, "that a decent and happy future, with wife and family and home and something always to look forward to, will be best assured by allowing Government Departments to run your life?"

To this a majority of the Australian voters and an effective number of the States have said 'no.'

The Times in advance and in retrospect, and the *Sunday Times* and *Sunday Express* in retrospect suggested party politics as the reason for the popular decision. While it is undeniable that we have nowhere in the Empire yet escaped from the net of party politics, the explanation put forward cannot be wholly right.

When, in 1942, a constitution convention summoned to Canberra by the Commonwealth Government agreed unanimously to the transfer of a list of fourteen powers which it thought the States should surrender to the Commonwealth (including such powers as a Social Crediter would expect), and embodied its conclusions in a Bill which the States undertook to pass, only New South Wales and Queensland did so. South Australia and Western Australia each stripped the measure of a quarter of its provisions. Tasmania totally rejected the Bill twice. It seemed that the real rulers of Australia would ride off triumphantly on some plea of emergency. But Victoria passed the measure, and stipulated that it should not become effective unless all the other states passed a substantially identical measure. Mr. Menzies, who has now led the opposition to the centralisers, was himself "prevented from fulfilling" a promise to submit constitutional amendments "by the outbreak of war." The danger of his conversion to Social Credit is not immediate—and if it should occur we can comfort ourselves with the reflection that we survived Mr. Evatt's.

The eyes now focussed expressionlessly upon Canada and Australia are sweeping also the home scene. What will happen here when the electorate gets its first chance to reveal its mind? None can tell.

What part has Social Credit in Australia and in Tasmania played in putting the electorate on its feet, even if the feet are unsteady? To that question "Full-Employment-Thank-God-for-Social-Credit"-Evatt knows the answer better than we do. All we know is that a stalwart section of the Australian Social Crediters whom we respect have done their best.

The door is not merely still open, but is more widely open than ever for the steady application of methods of resuscitating the drowned democrat which have succeeded wherever and whenever they have been tried. Right at the start, the rebuffed Curtin must be shifted from his ground that it is now for his opponents to produce a plan of their own. The Australians have defined a policy of their own, and it is for him to carry it out or get out. The Planners have missed a boat, and they are not pleased about it.

T. J.

From Week to Week

We have always regarded American Presidential Election politics with an awe approaching rapture, but the landing of an "Allied" Nations Army on the French Riviera a thousand miles from Berlin, while the American Army in Northern France moves rapidly south away from the German Panzer Divisions, seems to reach high water mark. The British and Canadian troops who are doing the real fighting round Caen must be tickled pink.

If the Germans are not going to make good their boast that they will fight wars on every soil except that of Germany, we can only observe that the London School of Economics is a Christian Seminary.

We have regarded the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board with undiluted dislike as being unsound in conception, and disastrous in intention. But our attention has been drawn to the fact that the *New Statesman* doesn't like it either, so possibly some virtue it possesses has escaped us.

We expected that the adjournment of Parliament for seven weeks indicated that the bowlers were prepared to put over a few swift ones, and the undertaking to care for the "few remaining" Hungarian Jews is one of them. They will no doubt take the place and the jobs of the English and Scots who will be required to stay in the Army to hold down Hungary.

Not a cheep has apparently been heard at the proposal to sell to us a small proportion at fair prices, and destroy or export the rest, of the enormous quantity of surplus war production paid for out of taxation. The population of these islands is so bemused by the steady stream of propaganda on the virtues of the "Nation" as compared with those of the individual that the cool suggestion that we must pay "the Government" twice over for our own property doesn't make a sheep dog bark.

THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT

By N.F.W.

3. "MID-OCEAN MADNESS."

"The ultimate affect of shielding men from folly is to fill the world with fools." —HERBERT SPENCER.

In the earlier sections of this article was outlined the brief, twenty years history of the origin and establishment of modern political Judaism—Zionism, between the founding of the Movement in 1897 and the Palestine Settlement of 1917.

During this period what had happened was that what might be called the natural trend of Jewish Assimilation (absorption) by the Western democracies—France, the British Empire, the United States—was forcibly seized on by the leaders—and possibly instigators—of the invasion of the West by the Jewish exodus from the East, from Russia and Poland mainly, and not so much superseded as made subservient and supplementary to an active policy of territorial nationalism. These two policies—Assimilationism and Nationalist-Zionism—in combination, containing as they do an absolute contradiction, constitute an enormity; something contrary to nature. But the Zionists insist that it *must* be, that fact notwithstanding; and, as we know, the Jew when he insists is very insistent indeed. Willy-nilly, the Zionist says, he is to be a national and an international, *the* internationalist at one and the same time. The demand is complex and confused, as, from its pathological condition*, almost everything the Jewish mind evolves is apt to be.

Perhaps the best way of getting at the Zionist aim is to quote from an article in the book† edited by Paul Goodman, from the pen of Selig Brodetsky, Professor of Organic Chemistry at Leeds University—a subject that would seem to be almost a Jewish monopoly, at English Universities at anyrate. His argument against the theory of Assimilationism is that it is a solution of the Jewish problem in the Western democracies only. In other words, the Eastern European nations are too "absolute," too, if I may say so, like the Jews themselves, to accept it. So that without a sanctuary from Russian and Polish and Balkan atrociousness (not to mention German), Assimilationism is only a very partial solution of the Jewish problem. Now there is an element of logic in that, which one would be bound to heed, were it not for the fact that the leaders of Judaism—and surely Professor Brodetsky is one of them, or is he only a faithful lieutenant?—are prepared to use their people's real extremity as a cloak for their own designs to dominate society. We sense that in the incompatibility of their claims. What they demand, and intend to achieve, is to be both master and guest in the Gentile home—a secret Controller and a publicly welcomed visitor at the same time, no doubt with credentials based on the Atlantic Charter—as daft a piece of midsummer (or mid-ocean) madness as was ever promulgated.

The way Professor Brodetsky puts it is this: "The Jew living in Britain can call himself British and not raise queries. He may raise queries when he calls himself an Englishman, or a Scotchman, or a Welshman; but for practical purposes it is sufficient if he calls himself British. The

*"The Jew is sick in a world that is sick." —*The Jewish Struggle*, by Ben Jacob.

†*The Jewish National Home*, edited by Paul Goodman, Dent.

American Jew can call himself American. No American expects a Jew to claim descent from the Pilgrim Fathers. . . Where the acceptance of a wide designation is possible the Jew is in a comparatively favourable position."‡ That is sufficiently naive! The implication here is that "British" and "American" are becoming international and abstract terms, and therefore—under the same Atlantic Charter, one supposes—"free" to anyone and everyone, like Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, which were "released" for general consumption by the French Directory at the end of the 18th century. On this basis, to be "British" can mean anything or nothing according to expediency. The term defines nothing innate, no organic culture: it is a label, a convenient cloak, to be put on and off at will. A Jew cannot be an Englishman "without raising queries," but he can be "British" when it suits his purpose—when, for instance, it comes to casting a vote for the nationalisation of the English countryside, or for a return to the Gold Standard on the part of the "British" Empire. Such wishful thinking is confusing enough; but in fact the matter does not stop there; for in the book I have had occasion to quote by Mr. Ben Jacob, in a chapter entitled "The Jew Meets the Anglo-Saxon," along with Cromwell and Palmerston, and Churchill *etc.*, we are treated to Roosevelt and Jan Smuts as examples of the pure type. It may seem simple to Professor Brodetsky; but in fact it is extremely complex indeed, for, "action and reaction being equal and opposite," on his own showing, if Jews become sufficiently numerous and ubiquitous, Englishmen, being British perforce and not like himself at will, might wake up to find themselves Jews; and for some occult reason none of us—not even among the Jews themselves apparently—wants to be that:

What Zionism demands is not that the Jew shall have a territorial Fatherland in Palestine *in place of* his Portable Fatherland, as they themselves have called the Talmud; not that they are to be a nation on their own *instead of* being that anomaly, a nation within a nation, but that they are to have, and to be *both*. The Jew is to possess a territorial Fatherland *in addition to* his perapatetic one—"civil equality," plus his own customs and laws and policy in whatever country he chooses to live. This he calls "Freedom of Religion" (*vide* the same Atlantic Charter), ignoring the patent fact that the quickening principle and aim of Judaism (the Talmud) is not, like Christianity, an inner condition of individual blessedness, which is the only rational definition of Religion (Reality), but a collective policy of "Government" (domination), which can by no possible stretch of imagination be termed a Religion. Judaism is political and legal in essence. So that the demand for "civil equality" for the Jews in all countries, plus Religious Freedom (State-worship), implies the official and legal recognition by all nationalities of the Jewish "right" to be a nation within a nation, and their obligation to accept them as such—that obligation, as far as I can see, constituting one of the "rights" for the privilege of establishing which all the Gentile nations are furiously fighting one another at the present time. In theory, it must be obvious, the aim is to establish that *within* each national policy there should be an international policy in the form of a co-ordinating, over-riding control (domination) of all national policies, exercised, not jointly as it should be, but by one race—the Jews. It would seem as if the Atlantic

‡*The Jewish National Home*, edited by Paul Goodman, Dent.

Charter had omitted as its Fifth Freedom, the Freedom to Dominate.

If therefore we are to concede Professor Brodetsky's definition of the minimum Zionist demand, it is plain that it involves a real dilemma for the territorially-minded, organic Gentile, who has always been handicapped in the International Game by having, as it were, a ball of earth at his roots. It is not for him to skip lightly from one nation-hood to another, or between belligerent capitals, as the Internationalist insists on doing during a war, either military or economic, in which he is doggedly engaged in defending the integrity of those same capitals and their tributary country-sides. For him the matter is not nearly so simple as it appears to Professor Brodetsky; who could just as easily "teach" Organic Chemistry in Peking as in Leeds, and it is hardly to be wondered at if he tends occasionally to the attitude displayed in Sam Johnson's summing-up of the problem where his bugbear, Scotland, was concerned: "Sir, it is not so much to be lamented that Old England is lost, as that the Scotch have found it."

It is a strange quality about all Jewish affairs that the Jew is never to do anything for himself. It is always a question of what other nations, or individuals might, or should, or *must* do for him. The attitude is not adult: the race seems never to have grown out of the nursery stage. Essentially Zionism boils down to that. Little Ikey-Mo must have little Mohammed's train, and Britannia must stand by and see that there are no reprisals. I am not suggesting by that that the Zionist Movement is a matter we can afford to overlook. On the contrary, when children want things it is usually a very serious affair, for those grown-ups whose need is peace and leisure to "get on with the job."

Considerable sums of British revenue have gone in the administration of Palestine in the last quarter of a century, and not a little administrative energy has been diverted from where it was badly needed. And if the showing has not been conspicuously happy or successful, I think as much of the blame may be attributed to the original falsity of the Jewish claim and our own weakness in yielding to it, under no matter what pressure, as to any administrative ill-will or incompetence. After all, no administration, apparently, in the whole period has come in for so much Zionist criticism as that of Sir Herbert (now Lord) Samuel, one of the chief pillars of Zionism in England. "Most Zionists," we are told by Mr. Ben Jacob,** "contend that by taking the standpoint that the development of Palestine was conditioned by the interests of the local population, he [Lord Samuel] was destructive of the just aspirations of the Jewish people." Somehow I feel that if the Jews had armed themselves and taken Palestine by force from the Arabs, as the Italians did Abyssinia, the situation would have been a more authentic, more tractable affair than this legalistically revised title to supersede a centuries-old Arab occupation. It was the full implication of this claim that Arthur Balfour's conscience would not allow him to endorse in his Declaration. Instead he hedged, he actually quibbled! He definitely left an avenue of escape; and down that avenue, forced by the unhappy events with which the whole Experiment has been associated, the British Administration has steadily retreated throughout the period. The process has been undignified and difficult; equivocal situations have undoubtedly arisen;

and Britannia, in the guise of Lord Samuel and the other High Commissioners, has had no thanks—no more than would little Ikey-Mo's mother if she had tried to keep the peace between him and little Mohammed over the wretched train.

The period has been punctuated by disputes and riots of increasing violence—in Jerusalem in 1920; in Jaffa in 1921; those arising from the "Wailing Wall" incident in 1929; and almost continuously from 1936 to 1939, beginning with the Jaffa massacre. This last produced the Passfield Report in May 1939—Sidney Webb, the hoary Planner, reporting adversely on the Plans of the Arch-Planners,—which described conditions as "bad, and the displacement of the Arabs as serious." That same Spring, on the strength of this Report, Jewish immigration was reduced to 75,000 covering the next five years, and the disappointment and bitter anger of the Zionist high-ups—the Jewish Kahal, really,—were focussed on Neville Chamberlain and his Government. Later the same year, to be precise, on September 1, Germany invaded Poland. Again, on February 28, 1940, owing to more trouble the British Government was forced to reduce still further the immigration quota and to draw up a Land Settlement zoning plan, far less advantageous to the Jews than that which had been turned down by the Zionist Congress of 1937. In May 1940 Western Europe was overrun by German arms, and "Chamberlain had to go." In less than a year he was dead.

Yet it would be a mistake to suppose that notwithstanding all this ill success, the urge for the further realisation and extension of the Zionist Experiment will not be even stronger in the coming settlement time than it was at the end of the 1914-18 struggle. It must not be overlooked that the inner need for the Palestine Home is not really concerned with the agreement or success, or happiness of the individual Palestinian Jew or Arab, or even with the victims of Hitler's persecutions, in spite of anything the Movement's superficially active members may think. The inner, "racial" need, as I have said, is essentially political. But the Jewish race is without franchise, and in consequence the individual Jew, in respect of his Kahal, or Central Council, is as powerless as is the individual German to-day where his own General Staff is concerned. That, as we saw, was the danger of all centralised, secret organisations. At the top, power without personal responsibility; and in the ranks, personal responsibility without power. The only hope for the members of a Secret Society is that they should become *enlightened*—in other words that they and the rest of the world, should come to realise and understand what it is their leaders are about.

(Concluded).

"NAME ONE!"

Evidently there is still 'more to' Southern England than Doodle-bugs. The following is reported:—

- A.—"Where I fall out with you Secretariat people is about these 'hidden forces' and 'secret agencies' at work. Who are they? Now, just you name them!"
- B.—"Would you agree that there is a German spy system at work in England at present?"
- A.—"German spies?—Why, yes, of course."
- B.—"Well, name *one*."

***The Jewish Struggle*, by Ben Jacob, Allen & Unwin.

Labour Councillors and Electricity

A resolution of the Huddersfield Electricity Committee, that the Corporation undertake to give complete support to all municipal selected station owners and to co-operate with all company selected station owners who wished to retain control of their selected stations,

was debated on August 7, when two amendments were moved by Labour members. The first of these sought to pledge the municipality to the Brown memorandum of January, 1944, as an essential step towards "national ownership and control." The second sought to delete the part of the resolution pledging support to company selected stations. Both amendments were heavily defeated and the minutes were approved.

Alderman Dawson, the Committee Chairman, according to the *Huddersfield Daily Examiner*, said the Labour party members appeared unanimously desirous of thrusting on to the ratepayers of Huddersfield nationalisation, for which they had no mandate either from the electors or from the country. To further their nefarious schemes they were prepared to sell their trust, held on behalf of the ratepayers of Huddersfield, and to part with the electricity generating station.

Although supposed to represent the ratepayers, they were willing to dispossess the people they represented of one of their greatest assets. They ignored entirely all the advantages that had been built up over a period of half a century by the electricity undertaking on the generating side, and were prepared to sell the inheritance of the citizens of Huddersfield. They ignored the fact that low charges for electricity to industry in Huddersfield had brought work to their own trade union members, as well as others.

"Although these words may appear harsh," said Alderman Dawson, "this is a betrayal of trust. These men are supposed to be elected by Huddersfield folk, and their responsibility is to Huddersfield in this respect. Whatever are our views on nationalisation—and no-one knows mine—our duty will be to resign rather than sacrifice the interests of the people we represent.

"These men are utilising the power that has been given to them to try and force a purely political issue, to the detriment of local interest."

"IS THIS THE GESTAPO?"

Under this heading, *Smith's Weekly* for April 29 last has the following:—

Smith's Weekly has documentary evidence of the existence in Australia of an organisation akin to the Secret Police of the Axis countries. Members of this organisation are volunteers; they are unpaid; they are unknown to one another; they are known only by numbers. They are surrounded with all the mystery and hocus-pocus of a Phillips Oppenheim Service operative.

They are known as military reporting officers, and their job is to furnish secret reports about their friends, acquaintances, neighbours, or business associates.

These reports are written in code or cipher and are posted in plain envelopes to a secret G.P.O. box number which is listed as being held by a non-existent private firm. Reports are signed with the secret number of the operative who can also report by telephone to a secret number, mentioning his own number (such as M62) for identification.

Implications of this organisation are far reaching. At first glance it would appear that the duty of these unpaid military reporting officers is to report on any evidence of subversive activity, disloyalty, sabotage, or happening which may have bearing on the effective prosecution of the war. But it goes a great deal further than that.

Roneoed instructions issued to members ask them to report on the political beliefs of their friends and neighbours; to report any anti-Government feeling; to report conversations they have overheard or statements that have been made by people known to them or with whom they come in contact. Communists have been especially singled out for attention.

In fact it is a gigantic secret espionage system the ramifications of which extend throughout the Commonwealth. These volunteer spies may be watching your every move, listening to your every word and sending their secret reports, signed by a secret number, to a secret address.

One instruction issued to the so-called military reporting officers reads: "That one MRO must not make himself known to another because once his identity is known his value as a secret agent is lost."

Position then is that for all you know the man at the next desk in your office, the chap next door, the man who delivers the milk, the barber who cuts your hair, and the barman who serves your drink, may be military reporting offices who watch your every move, listen to your every word, sound out your views and send secret reports about you to the secret headquarters of this secret organisation.

Particularly does this apply to your political views, your feeling about the Government, your ideas about anything at all.

It is in just such a way that Germany's dreaded Gestapo works.

Has the Gestapo come to Australia under the title of the military reporting officers' organisation?

Smith's has in its possession complete evidence of the existence of this organisation, including secret numbers, secret telephone numbers, secret addresses, secret G.P.O. box numbers, secret instructions, secret codes, secret ciphers.

In fact the whole thing is very secret.

It is so secret that it has no place in a democracy.

Has the present Federal Labour Government gone mad that it allows such a thing as this to exist?

HALF A MISTAKE

It is surmised that the reason for the index-headline FEDERAL RESERVE RADIO prominently on the front page of *The Economist* for August 19 was the considerable glut of d—s following the receipt of (unpublished) telegrams from a place called Edmonton.

Yet, 'twas but a half of a mistake: we assure our hot-and-bothered contemporary that the Federal Reserve Board *has* quite a lot to do with control of publicity.

NO HOPE OF MORE WHISKEY: New Supplies To Be Exported—*Liverpool Daily Post* headlines.—To all Mr. No-Charity-Does-NOT-Begin-at-Home-Dalton's foreign friends, together with your 'publicly-owned' "Government" war stocks. Beer, George, Is Good (enough) For You! (if you can get it).

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

The following Groups and Associations are registered as working in association with the Social Credit Secretariat:—

GREAT BRITAIN

- ABERDEEN D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., W. J. Sim, 18 Adelphi, Aberdeen.
 BELFAST D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. A. Crothers, 20 Dromara Street, Belfast.
 BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., A. Davies, 73 Manor Road, Blackpool.
 BRADFORD D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.
 CARDIFF D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., Miss H. Pearce, 8 Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.
 GLASGOW D.S.C. Group: W. Forrester, 81 Mitchell Street, Glasgow, C. 1.
 LONDON D.S.C. Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.
 MIDLAND D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. Sanders, 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.
 NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE and GATESHEAD D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., T. H. Rea, 23 Clarewood Place, Fenham, Newcastle, 5.
 PORTSMOUTH and SOUTHSEA D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., Mrs. Waite, 50 Ripley Grove, Copnor, Portsmouth.
 SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., C. Daish, 19 Coniston Avenue, Redbridge, Southampton.
 STOCKTON D.S.C. Group: L. Gilling Smith, Eastrea, Durham Road, Stockton.

Registered Groups are also working at LEPTON (Yorkshire), RUBERY AND REDNALL (Birmingham), WOKING, WOODFORD (Essex), and in BERKSHIRE. The last mentioned is a Services Group. Enquiries concerning all these should be addressed c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

AUSTRALIA

- New South Wales**
 NEW SOUTH WALES D.S.C. Assoc.:
 WOMEN'S SECTION
 DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION OF YOUTH
 THE ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN
 (The above are closely allied)
 INFORMATION SHEET
 COWPER D.S.C. Group
 NEWCASTLE (N.S.W.) D.S.C. Group
 BELMONT D.S.C. Group

Hon. Secretary.

Miss Grace Marsden.
 W. H. Hand (Editor).
 J. McDonald.
 B. V. Murray.
 S. H. Morrow.

South Australia

- ADELAIDE D.S.C. Group
 GLENELG D.S.C. Group

C. H. Allen.
 M. R. W. Lee.

Western Australia

- PERTH D.S.C. Group
 EAST PERTH D.S.C. Group

W. F. Andrews.
 A. Cook.

Queensland

- QUEENSLAND D.S.C. Association

A. W. Noakes.

Victoria

- HEADQUARTERS Group
 MELBOURNE D.S.C. Groups:

A. J. O'Callaghan.
 F. C. Paice.

- A Group
 B Group

Tasmania

- HOBART D.S.C. Group

James Guthrie.

NEW ZEALAND

- PATEA ELECTORATE V.P. Association
 AUCKLAND D.S.C. Group

G. J. Billinghurst.
 Mrs. W. James.

SOUTH AFRICA

- PORT ELIZABETH D.S.C. Group

L. W. Smith.

CANADA

- VANCOUVER D.S.C. Group
 OTTAWA (Parliamentary) D.S.C. Group.

Mrs. Brooks.

To all Social Credit Groups and Associations, Home and Overseas

*Associations desiring to act in accordance with the advice of the Secretariat are asked to fill in the following:—

Name, address, and approximate number of members

of Association

We desire to follow the advice of the Social Credit Secretariat.†

To acquaint ourselves with the general character of this advice and the reasons underlying it, we agree to subscribe to *The Social Crediter* regularly in the proportion of at least one copy for every five members.

We agree not to discuss with others, without authorisation, the details of special advice received from the Secretariat.

Date..... Deputy's Signature.....

To accompany the above form, a brief statement is requested giving the history or account of the initiation of the group, and its present activities and intentions.

HEWLETT EDWARDS,

Director of Organisation and Overseas Relations.

*For this purpose an Association to consist of three or more Social Crediters.

†The Secretariat is the channel used by Major Douglas, the Advisory Chairman, for the transmission of advice.

The Times and Social Credit

The Times deals with a problem of journalistic ethics as follows in its leader of August 11, 1944:—

Elections in Canada

The provincial elections in Quebec and Alberta were both fought on local issues and, possibly for that reason, both have abruptly checked the advance of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. Whereas, however, in Alberta the administration, already nine years in office, has been given a fresh and sweeping vote of confidence the Quebec Government has been defeated, though by a narrow margin, and will now go into opposition...

"We fear we must tell our readers..." "We fear we dare not tell our readers..." In any case, "We FEAR."