

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 13. No. 21.

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 27, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

It is a most unfortunate, but not the less incontrovertible fact, that only a very small minority is able to say what it means, to ask for what it wants, or to recognise it when it gets it. This fact, simple as it is, lies very near to the root of the world's troubles, because it provides the background for the *Fuehrerprinzip*—a perversion of functional hierarchy into the region of political absolutism. "Big Business as Government."

An instance of this is the growing condonation of trespass, in the general as well as the more conventional sense. "Property" simply means decentralised sovereignty.

A man who "owns" a small business in a regime of *genuine* private ownership, is sovereign in that business. The political power of ownership is almost entirely a financial perversion. Every intrusion, whether by a Trades Union or a bureaucrat representing a State or Local Authority, is a trespass—whether legalised or not is largely immaterial. Socialism, of course, is legalised trespass carried to its logical conclusion—all sovereignty is centralised in the bureaucracy, and the individual has no "rights." Once again, it is largely immaterial to a consideration of this question whether such trespass—currently termed "sweeping away vested interests"—appears to meet a functional necessity, because functional necessity is conditioned by policy. "Who wills the end, wills the means." Certain fundamental and vastly important consequences proceed from trespass as a recognised principle, and the violent reaction against it in the international arena (and all war is excused as a reaction against trespass) is for that reason certain to be reflected in domestic politics. And the further the trespass proceeds, the more violent will be the reaction. For this reason, if for no other, there is no inherent stability in Russia, and the exceptional stability of England under great provocation from financial and social injustice, has been largely due to the tenacious insistence on the principle of "rights." Hence the stealthy undermining of them from quarters which regard "traditional Britain" as the great stumbling-block to world dominion.

It is far from accidental that "trespass" is the generic crime alone mentioned in the principal Prayer of Christianity.

It is of course easy to see that Marxian Socialism—dialectical materialism—is a tool. It is a weapon almost perfectly designed to distract attention from the imponderables—to induce the acceptance of a mess of pottage in exchange for a birthright.

Man must have bread. There is plenty of bread, or it would be necessary to conceive of the material universe as essentially evil, the Manichaeian Heresy. But if you can persuade a man that there isn't, you may be able to persuade him to give up something which, besides assuring him of

bread, would eventually give him the universe. It is a terrifying truth that man has the possibility of atrophying his capacities by disuse. Man does not live by bread alone; but we can observe a steady policy directed to the end of ensuring that he either doesn't live, or regards bread and life as synonymous. Religion has always proclaimed and warned us of the danger, without perhaps defining sufficiently its nature. And it is part of the triumph of European civilisation that it has always exalted the imponderables. When Americans came to England and France in the last century, they did not come to admire our mass-production methods. They came to imbibe imponderables—the spirit of the Gothic Cathedrals, the chateaux of the Loire, or even the changing of the Guard. Those are the things which are being attacked, just as Cromwell attacked them, and the modern argument is that they stand in the way of bread. It is a cosmic lie.

A New York Jew telegraphed the Egyptian Judge presiding at the trial of the Jews who boasted of the murder of Lord Moyne that "American opinion was much moved, and hoped the men would have a fair trial." We exonerate American opinion from the obvious intention of the telegram, but we suggest that the word "American" appears to require definition.

It is always important, but it never was more important than now, to observe "the thing in itself," rather than its name. It is no use whatever merely driving out the bureaucrats into Imperial Chemical Industries and the Co-operative Wholesale Society. What, on peril of extinction, we have to re-establish is genuine alternative service. Monopoly is the thing in itself; and centralised control of any kind is the essence of it.

An article, which in its title, "The Political Drift in America," conforms to the sinister convention that no-one or no-body is to blame for anything, appears in the December number of the *Nineteenth Century and After*, a Review which, although very attenuated, is maintaining its long and high tradition. The author, Mr. Michael Derrick, sketches the development of the ideas embodied in the New Deal with the hand of a man who really knows what he is writing about, and its relation to the world in which he lives. The implication of the title is perhaps most concisely contradicted in the paragraph: "The sort of oppressions that are accepted now with the thought that they are part of the price of war would have come in any case, only more gradually, because of the nature of technical progress, and because of the apostles of efficiency, new heirs to the apostles of private wealth, new-style capitalists busy building up their monopolies and corners and combines, not in capital, but in administrative authority."

The article, which concludes "The United States has the urgent message for which the whole world is waiting, but it is not contained in the New Deal. It is 'Hamstring your Governments'" forms a fitting commentary on what Social Crediters suspected twenty-five and knew ten years ago—that we are the victims of the most amazing plot that has even been conceived in the period covered by history, a plot which is completely comprehensive, which balks at nothing, which regards the world panic of 1928-32 and the shambles of 1914-1918 as trivial incidents (from which the plotters have been careful to protect themselves) not of any consequence in relation to 'The Big Idea.

Mr. Derrick's article should be given the widest publicity.

As the result of the accumulation of malpractices, abuses, and social unrest which resulted from the acquisition of land by Corporations in perpetuity (in those days, mainly ecclesiastical corporations), Edward I and his nobles passed, in 1279, an Act, commonly known as the Statute of Mortmain, which provides that "no religious or other person shall buy, on pain of forfeiture, sell, or under cover of gift, or any other title, or by any device or ingenuity, dare to acquire lands or tenements for himself, by which they may in any way come to be *in mortmain*." Several successive Acts were passed to reinforce the main Statute.

Paragraph I (2) of the Coal Act 1938, by which the minerals of Great Britain are alienated from the effective control of the British, reads:

The Commission shall be a body corporate by the name of the Coal Commission, with perpetual succession and a common seal, and with power to hold land without licence *in mortmain*.

Well, there's Magna Carta, Habeas Corpus and Mortmain gone, anyway. We're gettin' on. And all with the assistance and at the request of the "Labour" Party, and the champions of "der gommon people."

It is becoming increasingly clear that British coal is not far from the centre of the Great Racket. It is rumoured that Trades Union officials are advising miners to go slow to reinforce the policy of "nationalisation" and that when the mines are nationalised, they will be paid almost anything they ask.

Behind all this is the Ministry of Fuel and Power, which is merely concerned to centralise light, heat, and power, and the bye-products of fuel combustion—where the chemicals come from. There is absolutely nothing in the situation to guard the native population of these islands against finding themselves in the position of tenants-at-will, who can be expropriated by a bureaucracy composed of "refugees from Hitler's tyranny." We do not say it will happen just yet. But it could happen. You don't think so? Then consider Eastern Poland... And why was the Coal Report unavailable to Parliament until "the Americans" agreed?

We should feel happier about the burst of calculated fury directed to the United States if it came from some other quarter than *The Economist*, but that plain-speaking was necessary and long overdue is certain. Culturally the Great Democracy is about twelve years old; and its manners are of a nature fitting to its age. Most healthy young people

aged twelve have their manners improved by a good kick in the pants; and we should have had far more co-operation from them if their opinions on their betters had been treated with the time-honoured remedy, twenty-five years ago.

At the C.C.F. (Socialist) Conference in Montreal on December 1, an effort was made to include in the programme of the party "the complete and final severance of Canada from Great Britain." Mr. Caldwell, the Leader of the Party, was born in England, and is in close touch with the London School of Economics. We are not responsible for him, but we apologise.

The downfall of the British Empire has been the steady objective of international intrigue, of which Socialism is one limb, and High Finance another, during at least one hundred years. It has been said of Great Britain that she acquired an Empire in a fit of absence of mind, and many people, and more especially American and German Jews, translate "absence of mind" by "paucity of intellect."

But, in fact, it is not difficult to prove that whatever its genesis, the genius of Great Britain, which to some extent has extended to the countries linked by the Crown, is insistence on the importance of quality as compared with quantity. Parenthetically, we have no doubt whatever that a return to that principle is the only hope of survival of British culture.

Socialism is an assertion of the importance of quantity and the irrelevance of quality.

Since International Finance is determined to be the only fount of honour as well as the Permit Office for bed, board and clothes, British culture is incompatible with its aims, and it has, in fact, already been driven underground. The effective policy of Great Britain at the moment is that of the big cosmopolitan industrialists, the banks and the Trades Unions, all of whom hate the traditional independence of thought, which distinguished the natives of these islands, much more than they hate Germany. That is why Mr. Montagu Norman has retired with a peerage after collaborating with Dr. Schacht to build up "Hitler."

"Nationalisation (Socialism)? we welcome it."

Even in production and manufacturing, Socialists and Financiers dislike a policy of quality first. One of our ineffable Socialist Ministers, Dr. Hugh Dalton, hardly attained office before sponsoring "utility" clothing of the slop-shop standard, which no rank and file Socialist will wear, and "utlity" furniture which has sent up the price of other kinds to black market levels.

Anyone who wishes to obtain a "pre-view" of the kind of civilisation to which these gentlemen wish to reduce us with the help of the Russian myth, as propagated by the "B."B.C. and the Communist propaganda in the factories, should read "Report on the Russians" by the American journalist, William L. White, which is appearing in abbreviated form in *The Readers Digest*. But, of course, Russia is scheduled for the greatest internal explosion in all history, although perhaps not just yet. Two hundred millions of people will not tolerate a penitentiary such as the Soviet regime when they have seen anything else. The emergence of the ordinary Russian into a Europe which still contains the remains of civilisation is probably the most important event of our times. But at the moment she is framing up for war with America.

PARLIAMENT

House of Lords: December 19, 1944.

UNIFYING FORCES OF EUROPE

Lord Templewood: . . . Upon this impression, I would lay the greatest possible emphasis, let us not divide Europe into definite camps. Let us not divide Europe into Reds and Whites, Communists and Fascists. This is playing the German game. This is what the Germans are trying to do in Spain and every other country on the Continent. I do not believe in such cut-and-dried divisions. I have said very often to my Spanish friends in Spain, that I do not believe in this division in Spain between two clear-cut Parties, the Reds on the one hand and the Nationalists on the other. I believe that in Spain, as in other parts of the Continent, the great body of the population, the ordinary men and women, are neither Red nor White. They are very much what they would be here, simple people who wish to live their lives free from foreign aggression from outside and from civil war within. I would therefore say to your Lordships again, basing this upon my own experience, do not let us think of the Continent of Europe as divided into these distinct, clear-cut Parties.

I have made these observations upon what I call the preliminaries for a moral revival in Europe. Let me assume that in the immediate future we do our utmost to realise and carry into effect the safeguards which I have said are the necessary preliminaries. Let me come on from what is rather a negative type of case to certain proposals of a more constructive character. As I said at the beginning of my speech, Europe at the present moment is in a state of moral devastation. Somehow or other we have got to get Europe back on to its basis of civilisation. I would venture to define European civilisation—it is not an original definition by any manner of means—as a civilisation that differs from the other civilisations of the world in that it concentrates upon the sanctity of human personality and upon the development of the individual soul. Let me take that as the objective that we should keep in mind, when we are trying to get moral standards re-established upon the Continent. When I was abroad I lived in a totalitarian country. I do not say that the totalitarianism of Spain was identical with the totalitarianism either of Germany or of Italy, but I do say there were certain factors in common between the system in Spain and the totalitarian system in other countries. These factors gave me the opportunity of realising at first hand what should be the basis of this human development which, as I say, is the very essence of European civilisation.

I venture to suggest to your Lordships this afternoon that the first step that ought to be taken should be taken by methods upon which I will say something before I finish. The first step to be taken is to obtain for Europe—and for the world if it is possible—a guarantee of certain liberties for every European that would enable him or her to develop his or her personality in accordance with the very principles of European civilisation. Let me suggest to your Lordships what I mean. I mean first of all equality before the law; no preferential treatment for members of a particular Party. I mean, secondly, a unified and established system of justice—the very opposite, that is, of the system that has grown up in so many countries of Europe of special courts, very often military courts, to try particular offences; the very opposite, also, of what is common in many countries of Europe at the present time, arbitrary arrest and imprison-

ment without trial, without even examination, for very many months. I mean, thirdly, no racialism. I mean, fourthly, religious freedom; and I mean, fifthly, admission to professions and public employment. No doubt there would be other liberties that will occur to your Lordships in addition to these basic liberties—freedom of discussion for instance, the freedom of the Press, freedom of movement—all of them so well described by the Prime Minister in the statement he made on August 19. These are basic liberties, they are fundamental to European civilisation, and if as a result of the peace we could obtain their acceptance by each country in Europe we should have taken a long step forward to recreate the moral values of Europe that are now in such urgent danger.

It may occur to your Lordships to ask how it would be possible to obtain agreement for these basic liberties in all the countries on the continent of Europe, and in particular you might ask, what about Russia? I think it is much better to dis-

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

cuss these questions frankly and not evade any issues. As I said at the beginning of my speech the whole of what I say to-day is unreservedly within the framework of the Anglo-Russian Alliance. What about Russia? I am not sure whether every one in your Lordships' House realises the fact that all these liberties are guaranteed under the Russian Constitution of 1936. The history of that Constitution is worth a word of comment. I do not suppose that ever in the history of the world was a Constitution composed with greater care or with more effective publicity. The consideration of the Constitution took many months. There was subsequently a campaign of unprecedented extent. . . .

. . . Your Lordships will see that from the side of Russia there ought to be no kind of opposition to the guarantee of elementary rights that I have insisted is the very basis of any European moral recovery. Your Lordships will see from what I have said that I have insisted as strongly as I could upon these basic rights. I venture to suggest that, looking to the future of Europe, it is much wiser to concentrate upon certain basic rights than it is to start upon any plan for

(Continued on page 6)

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. 21. Saturday, January 27, 1945.

The Next Six Months

The history of the dissemination of Major Douglas's philosophy of Social Credit and the continuous effort to make it effective in human society has been marked by clearly discernible phases. There have been periods of rapid and sometimes spectacular advance, alternating with periods during which it appeared to superficial observers that we were losing rather than gaining ground. Any disposition on the part of the Finance-supported publicity agencies to allow either the general public or serious students of society to know anything about us was changed; public interest seemed to flutter to something else; the numerical strength of Social Credit groups fell—and so on. As every countryman knows, the fact that a tree loses its leaves does not necessarily mean that anything untoward is likely to happen to the tree. The strongest elements of the trunk are invariably those laid down during periods of least efflorescence and slowest growth. The most rapidly growing shoots are the softest. The apparent cause of the different rate of growth is the geniality of the environment. But these seasonal phenomena are not the only variations in the life of trees. The seasons of one year differ from the seasons of another, and so 'waves' of higher or lower 'frequency' are superimposed upon the seasonal 'wave.' The effectiveness of the forces producing these 'waves' is not impaired by the mere fact of our knowing little or nothing about them. There are harmonic laws, and in the field of human interest they are more numerous and complex than on lower levels of experience. The 'waves' in the rise of Social Credit ideas belong to the domain of natural phenomena of this order.

One rhythm affecting the rise of Social Credit is that referred to in the opening sentence of this article. It is not, apparently, a symmetrical wave; according to one observer who merits attention, its upward phase lasts about six months; but the time between each rise and the next is considerably longer. This 'distortion' may be due to the peculiarities inherent in ourselves or in the opposition to Social Credit. Possibly another rhythm can already be discerned, affecting the internal structure of Social Credit: quite naturally and perhaps inevitably, the published work of Major Douglas himself exemplifies this best (or indeed exclusively), since it is something affecting the growth of the idea, which is *his* idea. Generally speaking, it is not the fate of great and fundamentally important ideas to become enriched, excepting by the accretion of associations. Nor, on the other hand, do they seem (the few there are) to come from the minds of their originators as it were fully fledged. An idea of importance seems to have a relatively brief history in the mind of its originator; and if and when it

becomes general—becomes part of the normal consciousness of everyone—it does not develop perceptibly. Disciples are consumers, not producers. The nature of the progress of an idea seems to be to make the origination of ideas of a kindred order more assured, and, we hope, their pathway into the heart of mankind smoother. But this notion concerning a second rhythm affecting Social Credit is highly speculative, and proportionately unimportant here.

The first mentioned rhythm is important because it is evident that we have already entered upon one of those upward phases of our history which, so far from carrying us towards our objective, are times when we can carry the Social Credit idea into the consciousness of the race—if we will. It was doubtless the intention of the planners, and a conscious intention, that we should at this point find ourselves so tied to the diabolical mechanism they have devised (and called it an 'order': their 'New' Order) as to be quite incapable of taking advantage of our opportunities. This is palpably untrue; and, without assisting them by pointing out in what respects precisely we have succeeded in retaining the initiative, we can at least fortify ourselves against attack clearly recognisable but of a nature which can scarcely be intensified without doing us more good than harm.

First in regard to the anti-bureaucracy canvass. What we have to say concerning the servitude which threatens has been noticed. For the first time in our history we are pushing at an open door. We must get into the fight, and well in. But all the time we have a particular function to perform, which no one else can perform, and that is to keep our fellow fighters constantly and vigilantly aware of the gentry waiting to enter in our train, not for the purpose of keeping open-house, but for the purpose of replacing the dislodged garrison. To repeat words which appear elsewhere in this issue: "It is always important, but it never was more important than now, to observe 'the thing in itself,' rather than its name. It is no use whatever merely driving out the bureaucrats into Imperial Chemical Industries and the Co-operative Wholesale Society. What, on peril of extinction, we have to re-establish is genuine alternative service."

Further, Social Crediters must learn to disengage themselves from the gentry of the Economic Reform Club who desire "a little"—and preferably only a very little—enlightenment. And, last but not least, *The Social Crediter* is written to be read—and we have satisfied ourselves that it can be read with zest by any honest and not hopelessly unintelligent adult. Don't be afraid to show it to anyone: it bites far harder than he can; and it bites the things he wants bitten. — T. J.

HOW MANY?

Sir John Wardlaw-Milne said in the House of Commons on December 1 that there were more than 1,400,000 full time civil servants at the end of 1943, for 600,000 odd before the war.

The Treasury said a fortnight later that there were (more than) 666,000 odd in 1943 for (more than) 376,000 odd in 1938, including part-timers.

However many there are, there are far too many. Whether in the service of 'the Government,' or in the service of Big Business, they must be restored to the service of themselves, either individually or collectively.

The Planners' Plan

By B. M. PALMER

The crisis will not be over when the last rocket has torn a shattering way across Southern England; and if we are to surmount it and ride into harbour it will be because of an infinite number of personal policies, which while they are not identical (and it is against human nature that they should be) are yet in harmony one with another. We may expect to see, as awareness of the problem grows, an increase in the amount and the *quality* of the literature which makes those policies known; rightly to be termed literature because it speaks to the spirit of those who read, and is in harmony with the soul of the people of the country—indeed of Europe. This is the true spiritual culture for which we are fighting. To quote the opening paragraph from a *Social Crediter* article of December 2, "We have frequently expressed the view that, in the first place, what we know as European civilisation, which it is the express objective of this paper and of the Social Credit Movement so far as in them lies, to preserve, restore and enhance is the embodiment of the culture of the mediaeval Church, for the most part institutionally but not individually now represented by what is commonly known as Roman Catholicism."

Captain Rogers's book* assuredly takes its place in this literature: it bears the hallmark on every page. The author starts from the position that in Great Britain, as in other countries, power is in the hands of a small number of individuals who have deliberately rejected the Christian view of the nature of man, working instead for the apotheosis of materialism, and for the time when they themselves shall become the masters of mankind in a millenium of their own choosing. This small group of secret rulers, with the far larger number of those they have misled, and who do not realise they are serving the cause of Anti-Christ, make up the army of planners.

Few books of this size (it is less than one hundred pages) have given a view more vivid, concise and complete of the Planners' Plan. Captain Rogers shows how *Freedom and Planning*, and later the P.E.P. broadsheet, formed the culture ground on which the cells grew and spread. The detailed information concerning the growth and interlocking of the cells is most valuable. As an example of this interlocking, we learn that the *Association for Education in Citizenship* has on its council three members from the council of P.E.P., two from the Fabian society, five leading supporters from the *Federation of Progressive Societies and Individuals*, a number of persons from the "Next Five-years Group," as well as Sir William Beveridge and Professor Harold Laski. Affiliated to this association are such institutions as *The Incorporated Association of Headmasters*, generally supposed to be a purely professional body.

The first part of the book gives information concerning the cells, and their personnel; the second part deals with the steps that have already been taken to put the planners' policy into practice. Captain Rogers shows how the process began before the war, and received an enormous impetus from the passing of the Emergency Powers Act, postulated as long ago as 1932, by Sir Stafford Cripps. From that time on, the Planners were descending an easy gradient leading down to the Beveridge Plan for State Insurance and "Social Security." All this is competently dealt with, including the

inroads on personal freedom now possible under 18B, and the support given to the hoped-for dictatorship by so-called Christian ecclesiastics.

Part three deals with a wider canvas, "for many years we have been subjected to totally unnatural conditions which, besides influencing every sphere of our national economy, are largely responsible for the growing alliance between the controllers of big-business, the controllers of the trade unions and, generally, those who are concerned to excite discontent among industrial wage earners and the poor generally." Now this is entirely true, but does not go far enough. If we look at the sentence as it stands (and its removal from its context does not take from its meaning) we are forced to ask, if we wish to get to the bottom of the matter, *who* or *what* were the "unnatural conditions"? Short of a complete deterioration of the national character, the unnatural conditions must have been due to activity of some sort, on the part of some agent. We agree that about one hundred years ago a series of statutes were enacted which made revolutionary changes. But important as it was, we should not say that the Companies Act of 1862 was the most important of these. How was it that this act was "rushed through both houses of Parliament without debate"—although "many far-sighted people were opposed"? Granted the Lord Chancellor may have been corrupt; but he could not have done what he did without help and helpers. We should say that the unnatural conditions became a growing menace soon after 1844, that they were due to the infiltration of Germans and German Jews, supported by Freemasonry, and that it was this alliance which got the unwanted statutes onto our records. Captain Rogers has only to consider the names of those who have helped to build up the alliance between big business, trades unions, and political agitators to find the key. But it is impossible but that he must hold it. It may be that he thinks the battle can be won without mentioning the word "German" or the word "Jew," and with just a side glance at those with the "bright dead alien eyes," as he quotes from Chesterton at the close; but we doubt it. It is rather like asking the troops to go into battle without knowing the uniform of the enemy, or at least some method of identifying him. The information given concerning the means by which shady characters may use company law is extremely valuable (page 51) but while it is to the interests of thousands that these laws shall remain as they are, what use is it to say that they *must* be altered? *Cui bono*? This is the question that a Social Crediter would ask all the way through part three, while yet being grateful for the information given.

"Must" implies a sanction. The reforms which Captain Rogers advocates would preserve the best features of the "Old Tory" way of life, but how is it to be done? We are in entire agreement with the major part of his programme, particularly that the State must withdraw from participation and interference in industry, that those in control must bear full responsibility for their actions, and that *it would be cheaper to pay Civil Servants to stay quietly at home than to pay them to stop trade*; and we hope Captain Rogers would agree with us that at the next election the first thing to do will be to give them the chance, and ourselves the chance of freedom from their interference in our affairs. We agree "with both hands" that taxation must be reduced, if not abolished; that the power of the B.B.C. must be brought to an end; that all the laws of the State (and they should be few) must conform scrupulously to the natural

**Our Peace Crisis*, by Arthur Rogers: Sterling Press, 38, Bedford Street, London, W.C.2. 1/6.

and moral law. In fact, there are only a few words with which we strenuously disagree, but they are important:—"The State must encourage, and in no circumstances supplant, private charity and voluntary social services."

In our opinion Captain Rogers in those words gives his case away to the Socialists. It seems that Captain Rogers is afraid that, even if the whole nation were to take the new direction he indicates, there would still be unemployment and poverty, and he is trying to meet objectors halfway by giving this solution. We commend to Captain Rogers the Social Credit answer:—that the main, if not the only function of the state is to pay dividends to its citizens, dividends that shall cover the military sanction and provide a basic security against want and unemployment. As Douglas has shown for the last twenty-five years, there is no other solution. Or if "Economic Democracy" is unacceptable, Captain Rogers may remember how Dr. Hayek in the "Road to Serfdom" lays it down that basic security must be provided outside the market, and competition be left to function unobstructed. There is not the least doubt that this can be done, whether the coming age be one of scarcity or one of abundance. We take the view that only the utmost destruction engendered by Satanic wickedness can destroy the inherent fruitfulness of the earth; but for the moment we are willing to leave this point. First things first. Captain Rogers is one with us in our determination to mind our own business and we hope he would agree that "uninfluenced by alien intrigue, and inoculated, as he will be by the harsh realism of war, against windy abstractions, the native of these islands can be trusted to hammer out his best destiny. He will not be assisted by Secret Societies." (The Big Idea.) Captain Rogers's booklet is one to be read and commended.

PARLIAMENT

Continued from page 3

standardising Constitutions. It would be a fatal error if we attempted to impose upon the Governments of Europe anything in the nature of the Westminster pattern that presupposes a whole series of conditions that do not exist over most of the Continent.

I venture, therefore, to suggest that it is much wiser to accept a great variety of politics and political conditions upon the Continent, but to insist the whole time upon the recognition of these basic rights. After all it is the rights that matter much more than the particular clauses of a particular constitution. You will see, therefore, that I have attempted to approach this issue upon the basis of these elementary rights, rather than upon the basis of proposals of particular methods or particular types of Constitution. You will, also, see that this insistence upon these rights ought not to excite opposition amongst any of the United Nations. The proposals that I am making are in full harmony both with the traditions and the subsequent public statements of our American Allies. They are in full harmony with the Declaration of Independence and the Atlantic Charter. They are in full harmony with the traditions of our French Allies and the Declaration of the Rights of Man. They are in full accord, as I have just pointed out, with the Russian Constitution of 1936, and, so far as we here in Great Britain are concerned, they are really bone of our bone in the history of our constitutional progress. There is the concrete proposal that I venture to put before you; that we should concentrate upon these basic rights rather than upon constitutional uniformity.

I would not, however, sit down without making one or two further observations, very shortly, as to how, in my view, we should make a concrete practical advance in the direction that I wish to see Europe take. I do not wish to see the issue end in a simple declaration. I wish to see something much more than a paper charter. I feel, looking back over the last twenty-five years, that we have had too many of these paper charters that have led to very little in the way of concrete results. On that account, I venture to put before your Lordships, not as a finally considered plan, but as suggestion for an advance, the following proposals. I should like to see, first of all, the United Nations sign a convention accepting and promising to safeguard these elementary human rights. Further than that, I would like to see some body formed by the United Nations, formed very probably within the framework of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, that would be a permanent body, collecting data—there should always be variations between one country and another as to how and to what extent these rights were being safeguarded—making reports and generally helping to raise the moral standard in defence of these rights. I have in mind—though it may not be an exact analogy—the International Labour Organisation as the kind of organisation which might be found to be useful. I am aware that the International Labour Organisation necessarily differs, so far as its constitution is concerned, from what I have in mind, because its constitution is specially adapted to deal with economic questions. I am thinking, however, not of the constitution of the International Labour Organisation but of its functions—namely, advisory, informative, and generally for the raising of standards. I should like to see some permanent body with functions of that kind set up for dealing with these basic liberties of European citizens.

It may be found that such an organisation could deal with the whole world. If so, so much the better. But I am thinking to-day, after my experiences on the Continent, of my conviction that an acceptance of these rights is the fundamental condition of any moral advance in Europe, and I am thinking mainly of Europe. I am asking your Lordships to criticise, if you so desire, the details of my proposals, but to believe me when I say that until these rights are generally accepted dictatorships will continue, moral standards will be lowered, and there will be little or no chance of the recovery that we all so passionately desire. Your Lordships will see that if these rights, which are the very antithesis of everything that is meant by Nazism, were once admitted—equality before the law, a fair judicial system, a measure of public discussion—dictatorships in the future would become impossible. . . .

Moved to resolve, That the unifying forces of Europe stand in urgent need of strengthening, and in particular that every European citizen should be ensured of certain fundamental rights and liberties without which European civilisation cannot continue.—(*Viscount Templewood*).

Viscount Samuel: . . . When I come to my noble friend's diagnosis, as I say, I agree wholeheartedly. But the remedy which he propounds appears to me to be once more rather reverting to the political level. He wants to guarantee certain liberties, to make sure that there shall be the reign of law, no arbitrary arrests or imprisonment, no racialism, religious freedom, equal opportunities. It is easy to declare all these purposes, but why should they be accepted and how can we be sure that they will be maintained? He would say, because they are obviously right and just and

conduce to the welfare of mankind. Perfectly true, but we are in an age when there are schools of thought that care nothing about rightness or justice or the welfare of human beings, and whose emphasis is laid on action, greatness, and power. Those things, and not human welfare, are their aim. If we were to establish all my noble friend's aims and achieve the results he desires, what guarantee is there that they could be maintained against aggressive nationalism, wars of revenge, or revolutionary Communism? What he says in effect is that many of the countries of Europe in this year 1944 have still not obtained what this country secured by Magna Charta in 1215. His purpose is to help or to stimulate all the Continental countries after so many centuries to obtain a Magna Charta of their own, and then he would establish a permanent international organisation to promote and propagate that idea and to watch over its development.

As to his concrete proposals, I would make one observation. In his last words he invited us to criticise. While I accept, of course, whole-heartedly his aims as being right and proper and excellent, there is this one word of caution that it would be necessary to utter before accepting whole-heartedly what is *prima facie* so right and proper. I am not sure that his new charter would not prove to be a charter for subversive revolutionaries. Now revolutionaries are of all types. They may be the friends of liberty who have been struggling to overthrow tyranny, as those great men whose names I have mentioned did in 1848; or they may be the agents of tyranny who are striving to overthrow democracy. We cannot be sure when this war is over and Germany is defeated that there will not be attempts made to re-establish the Nazi ideas in power. Some time after this tremendous storm there is likely to be a ground swell over the ocean, and you may have all kinds of movements, possibly violent movements, to try to upset the settlements that have been arrived at. . . .

. . . My main criticism of the noble Viscount is that while his arguments lead to the conclusion that it is a moral reform that is needed, his conclusion is that political measures, the adoption everywhere of the principles of our own Magna Charta and Bill of Rights should be established. The political, the economic and the ethical all affect one another. He has pointed out that to make these changes in the direction of liberty is a preliminary to some moral revival. Well it might be, or it might not, and I do not know that it is really necessarily essential to a moral revival; but those three factors, the political, the economic and the ethical, must affect one another in some degree. We have read the late Mr. Wendell Willkie's admirable book *One World*. It is one world not only in a geographical sense but also because all human activities affect one another. We cannot divide these subjects into compartments, putting religion into one, politics into another and commerce and industry into a third. They must all affect one another.

But while my noble friend has, as I say, diagnosed a moral sickness, he advocates a political cure. To my mind—as I have intimated briefly in speeches in this House on previous occasions and very frequently outside this House—we must at this stage in the history of Europe set ourselves to bring in the spiritual forces; and not only that vague religion of humanity which does, in fact, in the modern world, to a great degree govern men's minds and influence their actions, but also the great organised religions. However, there we come to the fact that while these political

economic and ethical trends of thought have become manifest during the last century and a half, there has been another which has proved in some respects even more powerful, and that is the scientific. The development of science has revolutionised man's ideas on the universe and the Deity, and when we come to invoke the aid of the organised religions we find—and it is only frank to recognise the fact which is in all men's knowledge—that all the faiths, Western and Eastern alike, have closely intertwined their ethical precepts with ancient theological dogmas which are, to a large degree, unacceptable in the modern world; and thereby their influence has been greatly weakened.

Yet they still have great power and even greater possibilities for the future; and I ask leave of your Lordships to call your attention to a movement which has recently been taking shape in America—in some respects the most lively country in the world intellectually at the present time. In America, in October, 1943, a three-faith declaration was issued over the signatures of about one hundred and forty of the leaders of the Protestant, Catholic and Jewish faiths, which has attracted great attention there and elsewhere. . . .

The Catholics and the Jews also have their Preambles to a document which advocates seven points, which are more closely argued in the paragraphs but of which the headings are these: "The moral law must govern world order"; "the rights of the individual must be assured"; "the rights of oppressed, weak or Colonial peoples must be protected"; "the rights of minorities must be secured"; "international institutions to maintain peace with justice must be organised"; "international economic co-operation must be developed"; and "a just social order within each State must be achieved." A few months afterwards the Council of Christians and Jews in Great Britain issued a statement welcoming the declaration in May of this year. I would remind your Lordships that the Presidents of that organisation were the late Archbishop of Canterbury, whose loss we so deeply deplore, the Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, the Moderator of the Church of Scotland, the Moderator of the Free Church Council and the Chief Rabbi. That Council of Christians and Jews in Great Britain stated that it warmly welcomed the statement on the conditions of world peace signed by the Protestant, Roman Catholic and Jewish religious leaders in America on October 7, 1943, and found itself in general agreement with the principles therein laid down.

There follows further elaboration. The World Congress is now engaged in inviting the adhesion of religions in other countries of Europe and in the countries in the Far East. This matter is, I fully recognise, outside the scope of a Legislative Assembly such as your Lordships' House to consider in any detail, yet I venture to draw your Lordships' attention to it because it is there, and on those lines, that we shall really get the answer to the question posed by the noble Viscount who has opened this debate. Valuable as the diffusion of the principles of Magna Charta may be, there is needed something more fundamental, more universal, more transcendent, if we are to create the right atmosphere in which the world's statesmen may meet after the war to frame a better order for Europe and for mankind.

By MAJOR C. H. DOUGLAS

Security, Institutional and Personal

(Newcastle Address, 1937.)

6d.

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

Liverpool.

THE BATTLE OF WESTBURY

Leading townspeople of Westbury, Wiltshire, according to the *Sunday Dispatch*, have issued a statement concerning events which had led to the resignation of a local bank manager from the honorary Treasurership to the Westbury Urban District Council and from his managership of the Westbury branch of Lloyds Bank.

It is alleged that the bank manager, Mr. H. D. Brown, wrote the following criticism of the Council:—

"The council is tired, apathetic, and unprogressive in the extreme, and for a long time appears to have been governed by proxy, so it might as well be now non-existent."

Mr. Brown was appealing for the formation of a local civil rights association. The council demanded an apology.

This was not forthcoming, so the council asked Lloyds Bank if they approved of Mr. Brown's action while treasurer of the council.

The joint general manager informed Mr. Brown that the bank strongly disapproved of his action.

The local Civil Rights Association was formed at a mass meeting of 600 people. But Mr. Brown has resigned his post of bank manager and as treasurer to the council.

His resignation caused violent indignation among the townspeople.

Twelve of them, including the Rev. J. P. Hinton, vicar, Mrs. W. Macdonald, a doctor, issued the following statement:—

"No hon. treasurer to a council is disfranchised. It is painful to think Westbury men and women in the forces are fighting to destroy the very methods which have now become apparent in their own town.

"Liberty is never safe unless it is jealously safeguarded.

"Dictatorship methods start in a small way, but grow strong if unchallenged. The picking of a victim to intimidate other critics is wrong. We uphold freedom of speech and freedom from victimisation!"

Mr. Brown said in conversation: "I have worked for the bank for 44 years and could have retired four years ago. I never knew I had so many friends until the incident arose between the council and myself. The bank has treated me very well."

THE BASIC STRUGGLE

"The Church has known three great periods so far, each fantastically unlike its predecessor, and each giving place to something very different. . . the governing preoccupation is going to be not, as it was in the Dark and Middle Ages, how to achieve sufficient order, but the opposite, how to protect human life from the excessive pressure of highly organised political power controlling all the means of intercourse and persuasion and seeking to make of the human material within its power the kind of servants for which it has most use. This is the basic struggle, not economic but political, before this generation; and in it the Church has an essential part to play, a new rôle, not less decisive and beneficial to mankind than her earlier rôle as the maker and moulder of Christendom." — *The Tablet*, January 20.

The British Israel Federation is giving addresses on "The Coming Golden Age."

Based on Fort Knox, doubtless.

Anti-Bureaucratic Campaign in Glasgow

All interested are invited to attend a meeting in R.I. Rooms, 200, Buchanan Street, on Tuesday, February 6, at 7-45 p.m.

R. LITTLE.
C. YOUNG.

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.