

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 13. No. 15.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

The Importance of Quebec (II)

By C. H. DOUGLAS.

Mr. Knowles, as befits an agent of the Bankers' Association, was careful not to let his right hand know what the left was doing. In 1939 another priest, Thomas M. Lamarche, published a travesty of Social Credit concluding in three volumes that Social Credit is a collectivist formula, pure communism and socialism, and would communise the economic system more surely than the plan of Karl Marx himself. So far, so good. The next objective was obviously to make this opinion official. The Quebec Hierarchy of Bishops were in 1939 induced to nominate nine theologians to examine the doctrine of Social Credit and to give a verdict, yes or no, whether that doctrine was tainted with the socialism and communism condemned by the Church. They deliberated at length; and the verdict was that it did not appear to be so tainted, and was worthy of close attention. Check to king. The case must be retried before a new jury with fresh evidence.

Mr. Knowles prepared, or caused to be prepared, a document which I have not seen, but the existence of which is provable, which was submitted direct to Cardinal Villeneuve. It was followed at no great interval by a Communication from the Cardinal to the Clergy of Quebec, minimising the pronouncement of the nine Examiners to a purely negative opinion and openly attacking "the claims of Douglas's system" to any title to support from the Church: and at the same time forbidding the clergy to take any part whatever in activities connected with it and the faithful laity from invoking religious benediction. This was better, and carried a political weight which in most cases would be decisive. But panic was abroad, and it was evidently considered that it was not enough.

I have in my possession a document, which bears no date and no signature, which is a copy of one said on good evidence to have been handed to a Quebec bishop by Monsignor Antoniutti, the Apostolic Delegate at Ottawa. It is rather a peculiar document. In the first place so far as any responsible representative of Social Credit philosophy, policy, or technique is concerned, it is *ex parte*. It is unusual for a body of the importance and responsibility of the Vatican Secretariat, from which it is said to proceed, to report on any subject—certainly not on any subject of great importance—without making sure that the subject is not misrepresented or misunderstood. This document both misrepresents and misinterprets what it somewhat invidiously persists in calling "le mouvement politique et social de Douglas." It contains the significant remark "il est utopique, comme le juge Son Eminence le Cardinal Villeneuve." (It is utopian, as His Eminence Cardinal Villeneuve judges). This sounds to me much more the language of a

banker than that of a believer in a Power to whom nothing is impossible. "Utopian" is a very familiar word to me.

The general conclusion of the document, however, is that Social Credit both in the nature of its philosophy, and in its actual proposals, is collectivist in intent and tendency, and it advises;

(1) Inactivity in regard to the technical proposals (because the Church expressly disclaims technical competence on these matters) notwithstanding its having reported on them.

(2) Distrust of the sociology.

The position taken up, and imposed on his clergy by Cardinal Villeneuve was now no longer that of a neutral: it might be described as that of an unsympathetic non-belligerent.

Important consequences were bound to emerge from this situation. A large proportion of the Quebec clergy were sympathetic to the activities of the Social Crediters, and many of them were enthusiastic. But they were put in the extraordinary position of having to contend that (a) the subject was purely technical and (b) they were nevertheless inhibited from taking any part in propagating it. It is not unfair to say that this was the strongest possible hint to them to influence their parishes against it. The laity, in the event, took the widest possible interest in the subject, but dare not vote for it. That was the immediate outcome of the Cardinal's efforts, but it was far from the total result.

Out of a rural population of less than two millions, there are probably half a million individuals, and the number is growing daily, who believe that they are kept in needless poverty by the financial system. But they do not stop at that. The events of the past few years have embroiled the French-Canadian in a war which he does not understand, and in which, in consequence, he does not wish to participate. It is a most unfortunate fact that Finance and its consequence is becoming identified with the British connection, and the attitude of Cardinal Villeneuve is attributed to Anglo-Saxon perfidy. Both the Church and the Empire have a stake in this matter.

If anyone should suppose that such a situation is of local interest only, I must refer him to the lessons of history.

(Conclusion)

"... as Parliament has no time to do its job properly, being in such a hurry to fulfil a 'programme,' it follows that the laws of the country are being made, more and more by the bureaucrats. In time, unless Parliament sees the red light, the bureaucrats will take on the whole job."

— Truth, December 8.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: November 29, 1944.

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS

Sir C. Edwards (Bedwelty): ... Reverting to the question of material for house building, we have in Monmouthshire the best stone in the world. In the old days the sea walls, river walls, bridges and everything else were built of stone, and a house built 80 or 100 years ago of this material still looks well. I am surprised that it is not being used to-day. It seems to have gone out of fashion altogether, and I am not sure that you would find a stonemason now. It is a strange thing that one scarcely ever sees a stone-built house to-day. We had a quarry at Cross Keys where there would be a hundred people working with a dozen or more stonedressers. That represented the maintenance of a large number of homes. It was an important industry. If we reconsidered the position, and brought this stone back into our building operations, we should be doing a very good thing indeed. Amalgamation and concentration have been the rule during the last few years. We have amalgamated our small places almost out of existence. I make a plea for the smaller places which have had industries and I hope to see them introduced again. A large number of people were employed in the three brick-yards in my constituency, but none are employed to-day. They have been centralised, and gone into some big unit elsewhere. We have carried amalgamation too far, and we should do well to get away from it, and distribute our industries much more than is done at present.

... Another very important point relates to the leasehold system, which I think is a disgrace to the country and ought to go. If you build a house, you pay ground rent for the whole term, and at the end of the lease it goes back to the ground landlord, though he has not spent a halfpenny in putting it up. The matter will have to be considered before long. It cannot continue very much longer. It is unjust and unreasonable.

DEBATE ON MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT PENICILLIN (MANUFACTURE)

Mr. G. Griffiths (Hemsworth): ... In 1941 a Research Corporation was formed, including Boots, May & Baker, the Wellcombe Foundation, the Glaxo Laboratories, I.C.I., and Kemball, Bishop, Ltd., to inquire into penicillin production. These firms are trying out different processes so that they can make penicillin more effective. I challenge the Minister of Supply to bring forward a penicillin which is better than that which is being produced in the West Riding laboratory. Is it not time that this monopoly was finished...

House of Commons: November 30, 1944.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Sir Herbert Williams: May I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman will arrange, when the Scottish Hydro-Electric Bill is reintroduced—it was formally introduced for information purposes in the last Session—that some explanatory memorandum will be attached to it, because it is quite unintelligible in its present form?

Mr. Eden: I would like to look into that matter, if I may.

BUSINESS AND SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Austin Hopkinson (Mossley): I think the House ought to give rather more serious consideration to this Motion. It is one of a series of attacks by the Government on Private Members' privileges. Any civil servant may put forward what amounts to a Private Members' Bill. He can draft something which has the force of law, and which later becomes the law of the land, and people can be charged as criminals under that law. I say that, to allow any clerk in any Government Office to introduce Private Bills in that way, is an outrage on the liberties of this House. I hope the House will give really serious consideration to that point, because these encroachments on the liberties and privileges of this House has been going on continuously, ever since the present Government came into power. Unfortunately, at the time when the Defence Orders were passed, the House was rather hysterical and divested itself of an immense number of its prerogatives and privileges. Ever since, we have been getting continuous pressure from people outside—the electors of this country—who have been telling us that we ought to try to preserve the liberties of Parliament for the benefit of the nation, but, one by one, they are filched away from us. This is one more example.

If I may say so, the defence of the Leader of the House was not complete, and was rather disingenuous. The idea that a Government Department is going to spend days, and to be diverted from the conduct of the war, in looking at Private Members' Bills to see whether or not they are in general accordance with the policy of the Ministry concerned is as, I say, somewhat disingenuous. My own experience, as one who has taken an active part in the conduct of the war, and the production of munitions for it, is that it would be a jolly good thing if some staffs of Government Departments were diverted for a short time to the examination of Private Members' Bills, instead of interfering with industry and lessening production. If hon. Members had been as actively concerned as I have been in the production of munitions, they would not think for one moment that there is any lack of time for Government servants to do this. These people are interfering with production, and surely it is monstrous to say that staffs may not be diverted for a few minutes, in most cases, to look into the draft of a Bill and advise the Minister whether it is in accordance with the policy of the Ministry concerned or not?

I hope the House will make its protest. We have gone much too far. I remember, when the Government came into power, reminding the House what happened in another period when it was being robbed of its privileges and prerogatives, one by one. That ended in a civil war, due to the fact that Parliament, in those days, allowed the Crown to assume more and more of the powers which belonged to Parliament. The resulting state of affairs was such that only by civil war could a solution be found.

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS

Mr. Hore Belisha (Devonport): ... Is our policy, having fought this war, merely to reconstitute the nations of Western Europe as they were and say, "That is the end?" Do not our past experiences show that we cannot stand aloof from the organisation of Western Europe?

I should be the last to wish to embarrass the Foreign

(Continued on page 7)

From Week to Week

"Christianity has failed, and the Russian ideal is taking its place as the inspiration of mankind, and as the standard of public morality. The Old Testament is the Gospel of hard work, while in the New Testament, the central figure of Jesus shows no deep concern for the workaday world. The trouble with Christianity is that it is subdued to nationalism."

—*Faith, Reason, and Civilisation*, by Professor Harold Laski, p. 27.

Well, you can't say you haven't been warned. And hundreds of so-called Christian clergy and ministers can see no contradiction between their profession and their support of Communism. And how they love the "Old Testament"!

The volume from which the foregoing quotation is culled, is, as you would expect, issued by a Jewish publisher, and bears the imprint "Left Book Club Edition. Not for sale to the public." It consists of about 60,000 words, but its author insists, and adopts as a sub-title for it, that it is an *Essay in Historical Analysis*. An *Essay* is an attempt; and this is an attempt to cover the whole range of history during the past two thousand years by the positive proposition that religion is, and always has been purely a governing device, that governing and governors are only tolerable when they are "Russian," and, negatively, that the money system does not require to be mentioned. (Professor Laski attacks Sir Ernest Cassel—for collecting pictures!).

It is really rather remarkable that an individual who may be supposed, from his academic position, to have received at least a moderate education, can so demonstrate his failure to profit by it as to write "When Christianity came, it enlarged the power of conscience, but its sources and its protection were alike an assurance that it would not enlarge the power of reason. In the result, it had relatively little influence on the realm of social constitution..." Considered as a self-stultifying form of words, it would be difficult to better that statement. Perhaps that is why the edition is "Not for sale to the public."

"Reason" is a pure mechanism, a tool, a dead thing. A slide-rule is an elementary reasoning machine, and it is not in the least improbable that a machine could and may be designed which will give the "reasonable" answer to any question submitted to it, however meaningless the answer may be. But it will give no guidance as to the nature of the question, or to the morality of the answer.

It is significant that the French Revolution, which Professor Laski obviously regards as the dawn of civilisation (with the Bolshevik Revolution as its sunrise) was called by its progenitors 'the Age of Reason.' Because the Jew has always deified reason, in which he has been followed at no great distance by the German; and the Jew and the German have been the real dominant factors in the formation of social values in the last two hundred years; it is 'reasonable' that we have arrived at the apotheosis of reason—V2, the rocket-bomb, which falls alike on the just and the unjust.

And so the little man thinks that the enlargement of the power of *conscience* (which, being interpreted, means 'with knowledge' had relatively little effect on society,

Quem deus perdere vult, prius dementat.

We trust that the highly unsatisfactory nature of Mr. Eden's reply to Mr. Austin Hopkinson will neither go unnoticed nor undealt with. It is downright intolerable that the body in which such shattering powers as are supposed to reside—the House of Commons—can have those powers abrogated and "restored" either by Mr. Asquith (as quoted by Mr. Eden) or by the Cabinet (as alleged by Mr. Hopkinson). The patent fact is that the Government has altogether excessive powers (which it has transferred to itself from the two Houses of Parliament) and that, even if, which is by no means indisputable, those powers are necessary for the prosecution of the war, it is nothing less than downright treachery to use them to produce constitutional changes. At bottom, it is irrelevant whether the concentrated power is in the hands of Mr. Churchill, or Mr. Emanuel (God with us) Shinwell. It is their concentration which is so menacing, a concentration which, short of the most energetic action on the part of those who are, or can be made to be, aware of the frightful danger of the position is heading us straight for national and individual disaster.

The fervent assurances of "Mr. Stalin" that the Soviets are entirely willing to recognise the existence of two distinct economic and political systems in the world is evidence, if any were required, that the clever Moscow Jews realise that socialism is a marvellous technique for living off private enterprise, just as the nationalised Post Office gets its work done, to the diminishing extent that it does get it done, by sub-contracting it to the village shop. Behind all the blare and blast of propaganda stands the stark fact that it is the individual Russian who is the outstanding feature of the Russian effort—a Russian whose characteristics have not substantially changed in centuries and are the product of a definite cultural tradition having no relation to Socialism.

Not a single weapon or tool which is superior to the product of Great Britain or the U.S.A. has emerged from the Paradise of the Worker, and the system would have crumbled years ago if it had not been sustained by Big Business in the so-called 'capitalistic' countries.

Prophecy is a hazardous and thankless pursuit; but we venture to predict that the Russian bureaucracy will soon (if it has not already done so) elevate by contrast the performance of the so-called parasitic class under *laissez-faire* capitalism to a monument of high endeavour and incorruptibility. We have little doubt that the Kaganovich clan is giving its opposite numbers in London and New York the latest tips in the art of hypnotising the populace into believing that if they are good, and work hard enough, they will be allowed to "export" their best products to Russia for the use of the nice, kind Kaganovitches.

It is probable that European culture, both individual and communal, reached its high water mark in the Austria of the late nineteenth century, and it was not accidental that the most savage onslaught of the Judaeo-Masonic League of Nations was directed to its obliteration. The skilfully-cultivated impression that the Austrian was merely a provincial German, was of course absurdly false. Most

(Continued on page 7)

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: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 13. No. 15. Saturday, December 16, 1944.

Doctors' Dilemma

Three hundred doctors meeting for four days have debated some of 370 resolutions concerning the revolutionary proposals embodied in the "Government's" White paper on the future organisation of medical services.

With only one dissentient, a motion was passed declaring that the proposals could only form a satisfactory basis for negotiation if altered in essential particulars.

The Times calls this "showing by its attitude [the

THE SIZE OF CIVIL SERVICE WHICH
 SUITED THE BANK OF ENGLAND IN
 1931 WILL SUIT US NOW

REFUSE TO VOTE FOR ANY CANDIDATE
 WHO DOES NOT PUT THE REDUCTION
 OF THE CIVIL STAFFS TO 20% BELOW
 THE 1931 FIGURE as THE FIRST ITEM ON
 HIS AGENDA

Pay them if necessary: but don't pay them to
 put Great Britain in irons

THE POWER OF THE BUREAUCRACY
 MUST BE REDUCED

B.M.A. representatives' meeting's] a desire to continue negotiations with the Minister."

Newspapers which favour disingenuousness flavoured differently treated the doctors' disinclination to be engulfed in a scheme of regimentation to 'banner'-headline publicity, designed to suggest obstruction by the medical profession to a scheme intended to benefit the underprivileged seeker after 'benefits.'

The doctors (and patients) of the country have thus succumbed, so far as this skirmish is concerned, to the fatal 'manipulation of the agenda technique' about which the

medical profession at least has been warned by the Medical Policy Association recently constituted in the interest of the freedom of doctors as individuals. A resolution proposing to defer consideration to a more suitable time—*i.e.*, a crucial resolution—was passed over on the pretext that it would 'prevent discussion.' Thus, in the opinion of the Chair, the objective of the 'representatives' meeting was discussion, not conclusion. Through its failure to behave realistically in this matter, all the meeting got was discussion, with a liberal allowance of opportunity for misrepresentation by 'interests.' There were some sensible speeches, and probably there has never been a 'representative' meeting where so many evidences were shown of the grasp, by individuals, of the techniques employed by managers to defeat the policy of the managed. Yet, having decided that there was no basis for negotiation the meeting, by passing a succession of conflicting resolutions, gave the managers the opportunity they wanted to compile a catalogue of bases for negotiation.

A misplaced confidence in technical ability has once again strangled will. The doctors present at the meeting thought that because they understood the technique of medicine and surgery they must perforce be competent in politics and administration as well.

Is the detestation of regimentation strong enough to bring them to their senses after the event? It is strong; but, whether strong enough remains to be seen.

If it is there are many things the medical profession as a whole (and the B.M.A. is far from being the whole of it) can do to prevent its extinction as an independent force in society. It can say: "Through our own fault, we have allowed ourselves to be tricked. We have erred. We repudiate both our own error and those who have conspired to confuse us. Where we sought representatives we have found managers. We repudiate them. This is the indictment against them." And there is enough knowledge now current in the medical profession to load that indictment heavily enough to sink the whole hell's brood of traffickers in human freedom.

Dr. Dain, Chairman of the Council of the B.M.A., has told the *Evening Standard* that "We have much more use for ginger groups inside the Association than outside." Of course "we" have! The phraseology should not pass unnoticed. The implication is direct, namely, that "we" are the users, and the 'represented' are the used. "We" cannot misrepresent a policy unless those who entertain that policy are geared to "our" misrepresentative machinery.

The doctors need not any longer confine themselves to a professional issue, however broad and general its impact. They can give their own professional planners the victory in a discreditable intrigue and blow them to kingdom-come by a blast in the midst of their ammunition dump. The armament of bureaucracy is the bureaucrat.

Who is there so well-situated as the doctor gently and sensibly to explain the power of the people to the people? Let those doctors (and we know how many there are) who have received light in a dark place during past months do but a little illuminating, and the experience which has brought, and justly, humiliation to themselves may yet be profitable to others—and to themselves by reflection. *Sic vos non vobis.*

Freedom and Omnipotence

By BEATRICE C. BEST

In an article on "Personality and the Suprapersonal" which appeared in an old number of the *Philosophical Review* (September, 1915,) the following statement was made: "... the attribute of omnipotence to any existence is contradictory if that existence be only a part, and meaningless, if it be the whole of reality. If it is the whole to which you attribute omnipotence, over what is it omnipotent? If only a part, the part again becomes the whole, for the attribution to it of omnipotence deprives the rest of the character of existence. If one person be literally all-powerful, all other persons are phantoms. If, however, I really have power so much as to move a finger at my will, so much as to conceive a thought, that power destroys the present claim to omnipotence of any other power in the Universe." The author goes on to conclude from this that "omnipotence is an impossible, because finally an unmeaning attribute of any personality."

This quotation is cited as throwing an interesting light on the problem of freedom and omnipotence. The problem is especially acute for the Christian, believing, as he does, in God as all-loving and omnipotent (God the Father with whom all things are possible), and at the same time in the freedom of the individual, subject to the will of such a God. He cannot, therefore, dismiss the problem—as does the author of the article above quoted—by cancelling its most difficult factor. He cannot allow, that is, that man's freedom to act and to think destroys the claim to omnipotence of the personal power of God; he has to find the way to reconcile these apparently irreconcilable factors.

The clue to this search may be looked for in the contention that: "If one person be literally all powerful; all other persons are phantoms." This statement raises the question of the nature of personal power itself, and it is here that the reconciliation between freedom and omnipotence may be found.

An answer to this question can more easily be arrived at by an examination of the nature of power *as such*, that is power seen not as an attribute of, but rather as extrinsic to, personality. (I am not thinking of natural physical power, *i.e.*, wind.) This power may, for the sake of convenience, be called 'functional' as opposed to 'personal.' Its nature or character is that of an instrument, or weapon, forged by persons who, without this means, would be powerless. There are, in fact, two of these instruments of power devised by those who, being without power within themselves, nevertheless (perhaps because of this impotence) itch to exercise power over others. The first, and most obvious instrument is that of physical force, the agents of which are the police, and the different military organisations. This weapon is designed to regiment and control people's actions, and cannot, of itself, subdue the will. Indeed the exercise of it may even galvanise the will to opposition, where it does not create apathy and despair. It is deficient, therefore, as an instrument or weapon of absolute power, being limited in its range of operation. This range must be extended to include the will, and for this purpose other means are required. These come under the head of propaganda, mass suggestion, mass 'education,' and are, by nature, occult. (In this connection it is significant that the Prime Minister in one of his speeches spoke of the Government

having been successful in *forming*—note, not *informing*—public opinion. Here we have the essence of propaganda which consists in foisting upon the public an opinion already formed—and useful to its promulgators—not in giving facts and information upon which the public may form its own judgment. But the public is ignorant of the trick played on it, hence the occult nature of most, if not all, propaganda.)

The most useful agent, therefore, for carrying out this purpose and forging this secret weapon is the State, regarded as a power organisation imposing its will on the people, not as an organisation administering the will of the people. By means of the press, pulpit, and B.B.C. such a state can form and control public opinion to the point at which the individuals composing that public cease to have a mind or will of their own. But this power, aiming at omnipotence, cannot tolerate the continued existence of a rival power State, or group of such states. After these have succeeded, by the methods outlined above, in their appointed task of depriving the individuals under their several jurisdictions of freedom, and reducing them to a condition of impotence, they in their turn must be similarly reduced, and the heads of these become puppet rulers under one omnipotent World State.

The design of this power to subjugate the individual and annihilate his will meets with a formidable obstacle in the Christian Faith, which gives to individual personality supreme value and importance. We should therefore expect to find this faith an object of attack. In fact we do find this, though less by way of direct and open attack upon it, than by methods of perversion calculated to deceive, even the elect.*

An instance of this may serve as illustration. Mr. Gerald Heard in his *Social Substance of Religion* advances the theory that the individual is a kind of pathological irruption appearing at a certain stage of man's development, and which can only be healed by the formation of "charitic" groups of a specific size, and the absorption of the individual in the group. But the point is, Mr. Heard refers back to Christian origins in support of his theory, at which time, he contends, the first true 'charitic' groups were formed. Thus he appears to enlist Christianity in support of a theory of the meaning and value of individuality entirely anti-Christian. (In view of this it is not unreasonable to suggest that the exercises in Yoga advocated by the "Heard-Huxley" association have as their aim this annihilation of individual personality. Mr. Aldous Huxley's treatise on mysticism in *Grey Eminence* would appear to give support to this suggestion. Much in it is equivocal, but it seems clear Mr. Huxley considers that a belief in the personal nature of Deity, and a mystical approach to the Kingdom of God are incompatible. He also condemns a mystical approach to Deity through the medium of personality, (hence, of course, through the medium of Jesus Christ) and attributes the decline of mysticism to this practice in the Christian Church. His attitude appears to lean towards a mysticism mainly associated with oriental and pre-Christian thought. Here God is represented as undefined undifferentiated Ultimate Reality, and the union with this Reality, arrived at by the devotee, one of identification, or deification, of one's personal being; in either case an end to it as a

*Examples may be found in the annals of secret societies revealing this anti-individual, anti-Christian aim. Readers are referred to *Light Bearers of Darkness*: Boswell Publishing Co., Ltd.

separate entity. There are practices in Yoga which have this end in view. With regard to this question of 'identification' Mr. Huxley makes a gross understatement when he maintains that Christians have adopted a cautious attitude towards it. There is no question of caution. The Church has always been emphatic, and without compromise in condemning and denouncing this heresy.)†

This digression is not altogether unrelated to the contention that the annihilation of the individual as a freely acting personality is the essential condition for the operation of a power that aims at omnipotence by the exercise of an overriding will, imposed by means of mechanical force, or by subtler methods of coercion. Of such a power it can justly be said that it is "unmeaning." By its methods it deprives all under its sway "of the character of existence," and reduces them to "phantoms," hence in the end one may rightly ask "over what is it omnipotent." But this argument cannot be applied to omnipotence regarded as an attribute of personality. Rather the nature of the means and tactics resorted to by those exercising this power testify to an *absence* of personal power. They are the signs and insignia of essential, personal, impotence.

Because of this paradox the lust for this power is, perforce, insatiable. Faced at each stage of its destructive course with a situation in which its claim to power is seen to be empty and meaningless, it is doomed by its nature to pursue the unattainable. At the last it can only turn and rend itself.

It is in regard to freedom that the distinction lies between this satanic destructive power relying on extrinsic means (force, and the fear engendered by the use of such a sanction) for its realisation, and power intrinsic to and an attribute of personality. Whereas freedom, as contended, is inimical to the exercise of power used as an instrument of domination, it is an essential condition for the operation of intrinsic personal power. For power used for the purpose of domination renders all reciprocity of relationship, impossible, indeed it is the negation of true relationship. But power that proceeds from personality seeks realisation by means of co-operation, which itself demands relationship, and that reciprocity which is the mark of true relationship, and which cannot exist without freedom.

It is in their respective effects upon the will, however, that the contrast is best understood. For a 'functional' omnipotence working to frustrate the freedom and initiative of those over whom it is exercised, annuls and paralyses the will, to the end that it may have 'empty vessels' it can possess, and use as mediums to carry out its own designs and purposes. But personal omnipotence working not by possession, but by inspiration, instead of paralysing, stimulates the will, instead of annulling it, creates within it the source of original action. Omnipotence, therefore, far from being "an unmeaning attribute of personality," personality is seen to be the true and only ground for its operation. Indeed it is in the voluntary acceptance of, and obedience to, the will of God, that man's free will and God's omnipotence are at one and the same time vindicated.

The bearing of Social Credit upon this issue is im-

portant. By showing the way to economic freedom it is a challenge to the power that would keep men in bondage. Now a state of conflict is necessary to that power, since it provides occasions and excuses for the exercise of authority, and the use of force to support its rulings. "Divide and Rule" is the policy best suited to arouse this conflict, and it is the aim of state craft, alias state craftiness, alias party politics, to use the means best suited for the pursuit of this policy. Social Credit having revealed the main cause of this conflict, and shown how it can be resolved is therefore regarded as public Enemy No. 1 by the powers that be, *i.e.*, by the power intending to establish World Dictatorship, and a world armed force for upholding it.

It might be thought that cessation of conflict would be the chief concern of the Church. Oddly enough, however, priest-craft is also interested in maintaining conflict. The stresses and strains, the frustrations, the difficulties and miseries set up by a system that automatically produces these results, even when they are not deliberately contrived,‡ supply the raw material for many, if not for most sermons. More important still, they tend to produce that dichotomy between soul and body, mind and spirit, which provides matter for priestly administrations, and so helps to maintain the authority and prestige of the Church itself. It is therefore hardly reasonable to expect the Church to hail with enthusiasm an economic freedom that would go far to heal this dichotomy.§ Moreover many people would be shocked to think that a change in our money system, however fundamental and far reaching in its effects, could in any way effect it. Regarding it as a purely spiritual problem, to be dealt with by purely spiritual means—a change of heart, for instance—they would consider a change in material environment, even if desirable, as irrelevant to it. Man's aim, however, is not to preserve an uneasy and precarious alliance between soul and body, nor to develop the soul at the expense or disregard of the body; it is to achieve *wholeness*, to become *a person*. This he cannot do unless he is free to choose, only this freedom of choice must be extended to include his whole being. To suppose that he can be spiritually free without freedom of choice, freedom of action, in matters relating to his material existence is religious romanticism, or isolationism; it is not, in any case, Christian.

The significance of Social Credit here lies in the fact that it is the 'policy of a philosophy' that recognises this truth, and shows how it may be realised. Summed up the truth is conveyed in the familiar phrase that you cannot serve God and Mammon; and this means that you cannot consent to remain a bond slave to that negative and abortive power that rules by force, and compulsion, and at the same time enjoy the "glorious liberty of the children of God."

Only, however, if man is free can Divine Power work in him for righteousness. Some might argue that this implies a limitation of divine power. Such an argument,

†"It was not accidental. It was a carefully contrived occurrence—the International Bankers sought to bring about a condition of despair here so that they could emerge as rulers of us all."—Mr. L. T. McFadden, Chairman of the U.S.A. House of Representatives' Banking and Currency Committee.

‡It is not intended here to accuse priests and ministers of the Church of a conscious and deliberate intent to promote or maintain conflict, or even to accuse all politicians of the same intent in the political sphere. Nevertheless, put bluntly, they all have a vested interest in such a state.

†"Distinction will persist. The creature never becomes God. The union is made by love; and there exists between the Soul and God an eternal and invincible distinction."—Ruysbroeck.

however, is not worth serious attention; it is equivalent to the question of the small boy who asked if God could make a stone so heavy that he couldn't lift it.

We live in time, and therefore belief in the ultimate manifestation of God's omnipotence is an act of faith; but to be willing and ready to establish those conditions in which His power may operate is a matter of immediate and critical concern.

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

Secretary by asking him to make a declaration. There has been an offer by Belgium to give us the same kind of strategic outposts, and economic outposts as well, in that country as we gave to the United States in the West Indies. There is an offer. It is a matter for consideration. It is sometimes suggested that any advocacy of an economic, political or strategic unity in Western Europe is a threat to Russia. There should be no such thought in our minds, and if that thought exists in the minds of Russians it can easily be removed. There is nothing more challenging in our desire to organise the strength of the nations on our flank than there is in Russia organising the nations on her flank. I derive that as the first of the lessons of our past experience.

The second lesson is surely that America from the first great war, and now Russia from the second, have emerged as great economic federations. This is the size of the modern unit—the United States and Russia. Britain is no counterpart to federations of that size but the British Empire is. It was the policy at the Ottawa Conference in 1932—there the bases were at any rate established by men who foresaw the development, men who were clairvoyant—there the policy was to make at any rate the beginning of an economic unity in the British Empire. What has happened to that policy? We go to Chicago for a Conference on Civil Aviation and the Empire speaks not with one, but with many voices. One voice would be decisive.

Mr. Ivor Thomas (Keighley): ... already many of the most responsible American leaders recognise the necessity for such a Western association. I would like to refer in particular to the support given to it by that great newspaper, *The New York Times*, which, after pointing out the dangers that are possibly inherent in such a scheme, said:

"Such a *bloc* can easily become"—

"*bloc*" is not the word I should use—

"the nucleus for a new organisation of Europe, not only for mutual defence, but also for political and economic collaboration for the benefit of all." ...

DEBATE ON THE ADJOURNMENT

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (EXIT PERMITS)

Mr. Hamilton Kerr (Oldham): The immediate occasion of this Debate is the refusal of the Home Secretary to grant exit visas to the hon. Member for Harborough (Mr. Tree) and myself...

It is an open secret that planes leave this country twice a day, often half empty, and that Members of the United States Congress, 18 in number, have recently flown to Paris, and that three weeks ago another party, numbering 14, went by air. In addition, people like Professor Harold Laski attended the Trade Union Conference in Paris. I take that as natural and use it as an argument for all responsible Members being allowed to go to France...

FROM WEEK TO WEEK (Continued from page 3)

upper-class Austrians used French as their normal language, and both in looks and temperament, were more suggestive of the Faubourg St. Honoré than of Unter den Linden.

Lord Grey's sad and prophetic remark, "One by one, the lights are going out" certainly had Vienna in mind; the bestial excesses of Bela Kün (Cohen) were let loose upon a defenceless population from outside; and it may not be for purely strategic reasons that the Red Army, while very leisurely in its entry into East Prussia, is driving hard towards the Austrian frontier. Every day that passes demonstrates the fear which the governing clique in Russia has of the effect of contact between its dupes and even the remnants of the culture they are concerned to obliterate; and if this contact cannot be avoided, they are determined to see that it takes place in the distorting atmosphere of war.

It is absolutely essential to the survival of this country that its inhabitants should realise the nature of the Labour Party—a nature which is quite independent of the merits of its constituent members. The Labour Party is, for all practical purposes, the Trades Union Party. It is a Labour Cartel, and it can only maintain its power by exactly the same methods as any other cartel—cornering the market, fixing prices, wrecking competitors. Not only is it a complete tyranny, but it is a tyranny which cannot stand competition, and must go to war at its appearance.

Probably not the hundredth of one *per cent.* of its supporters have the faintest understanding of its objectives; but we are confident that the directors of *I. G. Farben* understand perfectly. That is why they say "Germany" cannot lose the war.

Recent Publications

Programme for the Third World War

by C. H. DOUGLAS

Price 2/-

The Problem of the Medical Profession

by B. W. M.

Price 1/-

Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: the Grid

by W. A. BARRATT

Price 4d.

The Beveridge Plot

by C. G. D.

(Reprinting)

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

Federal Union Again

Federal Union, the first 'kite' of the war, is being given another airing as a "pre-General Election shot," according to *The Patriot*.

The description comes from a meeting held on November 30, when Mr. T. L. Horabin, M.P., Dr. C. E. M. Joad and Commander Stephen King-Hall, M.P. were among the speakers.

"It is hardly necessary to recall," says *The Patriot*, "that the idea of the Union is to form a federation of European States, as a start, with this country called on to take a share, and to this federation is to be handed over sole control of arms, armed forces, arms supply and, last but not least, foreign policy. Trade relations between the States would also be taken in hand. To use the words of the Union itself the machinery required to make the Federal Government work would be:—

1. A legislature or parliament, elected by the peoples of the federating states.

2. An executive, or government, drawn from and dependent on the legislature (Cabinet system), or elected directly by the whole union (Presidential system).

3. A supreme Court which would (a) adjudicate on all matters involving the interpretation of the federal constitution and in disputes between the federating states; and (b) uphold the rights of federal citizens against any individual or individuals who might try to deprive them of these rights.

4. A Federal Police Force, as distinct from the federal armed forces, to carry out the orders of the Federal Courts."

Stripped of verbiage, says *The Patriot*, it can be seen that essentially the programme of Federal Union is to destroy the sovereignty of the nations involved, including the British Commonwealth of Nations. In support of this contention it quotes from an article by Mr. L. D. Byrne in *The Patriot* for April 4, 1940:—

"It would reduce the status of each nation in relation to the unspecified international authority to that of, say, a Canadian province or an Australian State, to the central Government. In fact it is likely to go even beyond that, for, in the last resort, an issue raised in a province or state within a national Federal union can rapidly be made a national issue which can be decided by a sovereign people, but the practical possibilities of this under an international federation are nil.

"Social reform—and in particular monetary reform—would naturally be removed from the scope of national powers for, it would be argued, such reforms would affect external trade and relations with other members of the union, and must, therefore, be left to the international authority, [That is, of course, the case in Australia and Canada, U.S.A. and Switzerland, which are quoted by the Federal Union Council as examples of the successful working of Federation.] If the people of any country did not like this state of affairs, the International Police Force would be available to bring them to their senses.

"The concept of a Federation of States under which sovereign nations would surrender their sovereignty is the logical development of totalitarianism. Its advocates are, in effect, saying that the peoples of the British Empire are fighting the menace of totalitarian Germany in order to establish a greater totalitarian system of universal government—starting in the first instance in Europe. These men,

though they may not realise it, are telling us that the British people are fighting—not to preserve the Empire and its free institutions built upon the absolute sovereignty of its people and symbolised in the Crown—but that they are fighting and risking their lives to give up their sovereignty, to surrender their democratic rights, to destroy the integrity of the Empire and to reduce the Crown to a meaningless farce.

"There is an ugly word to describe this kind of poisonous intrigue, and it is high time we came to our senses and realised just what is afoot."

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.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	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.....	(reprinting)
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.
The Representative's Job.....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

FROM K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.