

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 14. No. 24.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 18, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

The letter of Lord Keyes to *The Times* of July 30, taken in conjunction with the eagerness of the "B."B.C. to assist the repudiation of King Leopold by M. Spaak and his Socialists, is a further instance of the indifference of Beelzebub's Brethren to the honour of this country. Lord Keyes, who was gratuitously attacked by M. Spaak, makes it clear that the action of the King in refusing to run away with M. Spaak and his valiant ministers gave the British Army those two indispensable days which alone made the retreat to Dunkirk, and the miraculous escape of the shattered British Army, possible. Does the "B."B.C. care? Not at all. What is the country's debt of honour in comparison with Professor Laski's glorious revolution?

We refer to this matter because it clarifies the main issue before the world. Is there a standard of conduct, or is everything simply a question of the aggregation of power by artificial and misinformed majorities? There isn't much time to make up our mind on this question.

My, Clarence, isn't Science Wahnderful! These atomic bombs now, and all they're going to do for us if we produce more and consume less. And the rations, now—they do say that we shan't have very much less this winter than we had in the war. And these pre-fabricated American houses that don't need doors because you can lift them up and get underneath. Mrs. Sammy (Sammy the Rose) Rosenman is over here explaining them. So is Sammy.

And the miners with their wonderful organisation and yearning for efficiency, and less coal and more stones for Four Pounds a ton. My, my.

You may remember that a week after the end of the "Great" War, the shops were full of the most luxurious food, and although prices were absurdly high by reason of the deliberate refusal of the monetary authorities to take steps to lower them, most of the population had "the price." But of course we hadn't P.E.P. then.

There would appear to be no foundation for the rumour that Parliamentary Reports (*Hansard*) will now be published both in English and Yiddish. Both the Cabinet and the Junior Ministers speak and read English without difficulty.

Mr. T. V. Soong ("Bilious billions" to you) has gone to Moscow to confer with anti-capitalist Generalissimo Stalin. There is no truth in the rumour that anyone proposes to come to London to consult anybody about anything, but of course there's nothing to stop us from handing over things without being consulted. Be world-minded, can't you? Or perhaps it's the rotting fish P.E.P. won't allow

us to have. Have you heard of the new way of painting aged herrings to look like kippers? Austerity's the word for you, my lad—you aren't Marshal Tito or a Moscow Kommissar.

"What we have to get at is that there should be in all the States in the world, besides ourselves, only the masses of the proletariat, a few millionaires devoted to our interests, [cf. Mond-Turner Conference], police and soldiers... In a word to sum up our system of keeping the governments of the *goyim* in check, we shall show our strength to one of them by terrorist attempts, and to all, if we allow the possibility of a general rising against us, we shall respond with the guns of America, or China, or Japan."

As British politics are now made in America (Pine Street, to you) it is necessary to read "American," and particularly lo-the-poor-Indian "American" papers to get their drift. "Some of the women visitors from the British Labour Party to this country expressed the hope that while a large Labour vote would be a healthy sign, they would prefer to see the Tories [ha, ha!] "plagued with the problem of Britain's [sic] immediate post-war tasks—and of handling Uncle Joe." —*New Leader*, June 9, 1945.

You notice the single-minded consideration for the interests of the British citizen.

If any remnant remained of the idea that Socialism possesses any moral standards whatever, the entry of Russia into the war against Japan ought to (but in the mind of some of its dupes, probably will not) dispose of it forever. For the moment, we are not thinking of the results of this unprovoked aggression, not to Japan, but to the rest of the world, although those results are bound to be grave, and, as now is usual, gravest to the people of these islands.

What is starkly clear is that mob force has been enthroned as the only law. We have always seen that war is nothing but "the pursuit of policy by other means" and that *in itself* war is policy, whether it is pursued by atomic bombs or Trades Union card votes. It is the imposition of decisions by blind force. If a man builds a house, he obtains a house by following consciously certain natural laws which we call "Theory of Structure." But if an army takes a town, and dispossesses the individuals who obtained their houses by the arts of peace, or a Trades Union such as the Miners' Federation blackmails the community into handing over the coal and the collieries by threats, either political or economic, an entirely new set of laws separating the action from the actor, is in operation—a set of laws which as all history teaches, is purely destructive, and contains nothing of the creative energy which built the houses or developed the collieries. There is a great deal of stored energy—momentum—in all social systems, and they run on

it. (just as Russia has run on energy derived from an earlier system) for a long time. But they run down.

Whatever the outcome, there is no difference whatever between Russia's attack on Japan at this stage, and Italy's attack on England and France in 1940. Both are equally despicable and immoral. "Satan is unchained." It is far from being merely a question of "Christianity." There is not a great religion in the world, with the exception of that travesty of religion, Judaism, which does not recognise, in some form or another, the Golden Rule.

The story of Jael and Sisera as an example to be admired, fortunately stands high as an example of treachery lauded as a virtue.

Election Inquest. From a letter to *The Scotsman*:

(2) A million American soldiers in the country for three years, each believing Britain governed by marquesses in monoclés and spreading Left propaganda in highway and byway, pub and club—a million unpaid propagandists. (3) Military prestige of Russia thought to reflect credit on her social system; German Army, that Russia needed two allies to overcome, not thought to reflect credit on German system—example of popular logic. (4) Temporary glorification of the common man, just because he is common.

The Library

The following additions have been made recently to the Library:—

Douglas, C. H.	These Present Discontents and the Labour Party and Social Credit.
Winkler, Paul	The Thousand-Year Conspiracy.
Queeny, Edgar	The Spirit of Enterprise.
Moulton, H. G.	The New Philosophy of Public Debt.
Herridge, W. D.	Which Kind of Revolution?
Flatau, Dorota	Yellow English.
Foreman, Clark	The New Internationalism.
Smith, Norman	The Politics of Plenty.
Lamarque, R.P., Thomas, M.	Comment rendre l'argent au peuple.
Belilos, Leon	Heralding a New Age.
Belilos, Leon	From Global War to Global Peace.
Buck, Pearl S.	What America Means to Me.
Becker, Carl	How New Will the Better World Be?
Brogan, Colm	Who are the People?
Hayek, Dr. F. A. von	The Road to Serfdom.
Smith, Barclay	The Answer to Socialism.
Stoll, Oswald	The People's Credit.
Easton, H. T.	Money Exchange and Banking.
Weston, W. J.	Economics for Business Men.
Meakin, Walter	The New Industrial Revolution.
Mann, Thomas	The Coming Victory of Democracy.
Brookings, R. S.	Industrial Ownership.
Liberal Industrial Enquiry	Britain's Industrial Future.
Baldwin, Stanley	On England.

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

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

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

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

More Light on "Czechoslovakia"

The Editor, *The Social Crediter*.

Sir,

Some months ago you were good enough to publish an article in which I attempted to describe the part played by Jews and Masons in the creation of the Czechoslovak Republic in 1918. In the interval I have received from the editor of the *Czech Press Service* (16, Thurloe Street, London, S.W.7) some informative and, in parts, very illuminative Bulletins dealing mostly with the Sovietisation of the Czech and Slovak peoples. Bulletin No. 12 contains the following passage entitled "How the Czechoslovaks settled in Great Britain," written by Dr. Karel Locher, a passage which underlines the point I attempted to make in "Birth of a Republic"*:

"In 1938, very shortly after the Munich Agreement, there appeared in Great Britain considerable numbers of refugees who styled themselves—Czechoslovaks. It was a new nationality which had never before existed in the history of mankind. For thousands of years there have been Czechs in Europe, inhabitants of the old kingdom of Bohemia. There have been Slovaks also, one of the nations living formerly inside Hungary. But there was never any such thing as a Czechoslovak Nation, just as there is no such thing as an Anglodutch or Anglomaltese Nation. Czechoslovakia was the name of a State where Czechs and Slovaks lived. It was possible to be a citizen of Czechoslovakia without being either a Czech or a Slovak, just as there are British citizens of even Chinese origin. Czechoslovak does not mean a nationality, but a citizenship.

"Who then are the Czechoslovaks in Great Britain? And how did they settle here? When Hitler came to power in Germany, Czechoslovakia became an asylum for Jews from that country and from many other countries in Central Europe. The Czechs never entertained any anti-Semitism, nor was there at that time any Jewish problem in the country. The Czechs, having themselves been deprived of political independence for 300 years were genuinely sympathetic towards every kind of political refugee and did not hesitate to offer them shelter. Thus in Czechoslovakia, there was asylum for Russians who escaped from the Bolsheviks, Hungarians who escaped from Horthy, Poles expelled by Pilsudski, and eventually, Jews from Germany, Austria, Hungary, Roumania and other countries. The country was a refuge for anti-Bolshevik Russians and for pro-Bolshevik Serbs.

"After the Munich Agreement, the Jews who had found shelter in Czechoslovakia, began to move on. The majority of them obtained Czechoslovak passports. With them went a large number of Jews who had been settled in the country for a long time. This was only natural because by then Jews were the most threatened people in Europe. Every Czech tried to help them to get away safely. They went *via* Poland where they were looked after and administered by the Polish Union of Jewish Socialists.

"The activities of this body, however, were not referred to as a relief for Jewish refugees, but as relief for Czechoslovak refugees. The Polish Union of Jewish Socialists received funds for their work from England; organisation and policy they retained in their own hands. They were the ones who decided who was a political refugee and who was not, and they made all decisions about where individuals

*T.S.C., March 10, 1945.

would be sent. The Communists and Socialist Jews were despatched by them to Great Britain where they appeared as Czechoslovaks.

"When the whole of Czech territory was occupied by Hitler, many genuine Czechs and patriots were forced to escape. When they got to Poland they could not make themselves understood by the Czechoslovak relief committee, because the official language there was German. The aversion of the Czechs to the "Czechoslovaks" dates from that time. Things grew worse when, after the collapse of France, a few Czechs succeeded in reaching England where to their great surprise, they discovered that the Czechoslovaks who had turned up in England eighteen months earlier, were now posing as representatives of the Czech Nation. They were acting the rôle of being martyrs for democracy. Even worse, the bewildered Czechs found out quickly enough that Mr. Benes and his associates who had been expelled by the Czech Nation after Munich, were hand in glove with the Czechoslovaks. Benes claimed to be the representative of the Czechoslovaks, and the Czechoslovaks of various nationalities who had been sent to this country by the Polish Union of Socialist Jews soon proved to him that his claim was quite well-founded. Anyone who dared to say that Czechs should be represented by Czechs and Slovaks by Slovaks was shouted down as a pro-Nazi Jew-hater and sent to jail.

"Mr. Benes and his associates have left Great Britain, but the bulk of the Czechoslovaks have remained behind. They are radical Socialists or Communists, but they do not fancy living under a Communist Government in the Czech Lands or in Slovakia. That is their Business, and we do not want to interfere in the affairs of any foreign nation. What we reject most emphatically, however, is their completely unfounded pretence of being the representatives of Czechs and Slovaks.

"Mr. Erdely who, under the name of Snittler, was Press Attaché in Vienna of the Hungarian Communist Government of Bela Kun, is a Hungarian Jewish Communist, or Socialist—or perhaps he has changed his mind and is now a Hungarian Jewish Peoples' Democrat. What he never will be or can be is either a Czech or a Slovak. If the Polish Union of Jewish Socialists is not ashamed of its name, why are these others ashamed and why do they hide here under the name of Czechoslovaks?"

Elsewhere in the same Bulletin the editor, M. Vladimir Lezak-Borin, who reveals a shrewd sense of observation of men and things, describes the first acts of M. Benes's 'Moscow'-directed government which the British tax-payers have sustained during their long exile in London. (We may note in passing the remark of the *Jewish Chronicle* of June 15 that "the [Benes] Government itself is very friendly to the Jews, and fully recognises the zealous service rendered by many during the period of exile").

Citing private channels of information, the writer says all the inhabitants of the former Sudeten German districts are being expelled from their homes and from the country in which their ancestors have lived for 700 years by the Benes Government. This follows the usual Communist technique of uprooting rural populations, and the traditions they uphold. We are further informed that all the former political leaders of the genuine Czech nation which during the German occupation were the prisoners of the Gestapo, are now imprisoned by the Benes-Communist government, much as their Polish colleagues have been

turned from German into Russian concentration camps, and in another connection M. Borin points out that of all the Nations whose countries are occupied by the Russians, the Germans are receiving the best treatment, (cf. the passage of a recent leader in *The Social Crediter* to the effect that 'the heart of the conspiracy is now in Russia and there will be no peace before this heart is cut out').

I am, etc.,

BORGE JENSEN.

PARLIAMENT

The following passages, omitted from reports of House of Commons debates, have present interest:—

February 15, 1945.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (RECONSTRUCTION)

Mr. David Eccles (Chippenham): ... In conclusion I would remind the House that the concentration of power in any one place is an enemy to liberty, and local government is our way of distributing the increased volume of power which has to be placed in the hands of the Executive in a modern society...

Sir Stanley Holmes (Harwich): ... I will put forward an evident truth which, because it is so evident, is sometimes neglected. It is that local government, if it is worth while, must be local government and not government from Whitehall or from any other point so remote from the influence of the people in matters where local government most intimately touches the lives of the people. If fundamental changes are brought about in the structure of local government their only effect would be to remove from the people the control over their own affairs. Whatever gain there might be in efficiency—and that is a debatable point—is discounted by other and more far-reaching consequences. The services which local bodies administer must at all times and at all points be sensitive and responsive to the needs of the people of any particular locality, and such sensitiveness and responsiveness can only be secured by adhering to the localisation of those services; and by encouraging, because the work is responsible, the best men and women to take part in local affairs...

There seems to have been a great deal of unanimity to-day with regard to this proposal, but it would not do us any harm if we considered for a few moments the proposals of the Labour Party embodied in a document entitled "The Future of Local Government," published in 1943. It would certainly seem, from what has been said to-day, that they have changed their opinion since 1943.

Mr. Messer: No, that is still the policy of the Party, carried at their last Conference.

Sir S. Holmes: Then I am on good ground in discussing it. It appears from the pamphlet that the Labour Party realises the amount of feeling which exists against any tampering with local government in any way, unless a greater end is to be served, and this may account for some of the inconsistencies and confusion in this pamphlet which try to give a democratic veneer to proposals which are essentially authoritarian. Let me read what it says:

"The Report says that the democratic position in local government must be preserved; yet it declares that there are too many local authorities. It does not, however, state by what number local authorities should be reduced, or in what types

(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: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 14. No. 24.

Saturday, August 18, 1945.

Fulfilment of 'Prophecy'

"I have a great mind to make a prophecy, and they say" (our emphasis) "prophecies work out their own fulfilment."

— John Keats: *Letters*.

We return to this subject for the reason given by the great poet, who, like all great poets, was gifted with intuition. It is quite likely, moreover, that he moved in circles much affected by the Illuminati of the French Revolution.

Now, it is on record before 1933 in a form which is quite beyond question that September, 1936 ("the Entrance to the Hall of the Grand Orient" of the Pyramidologists), August 20, 1938, March 3-4, 1945, and February 18, 1946, are predicted by the "prophets" as key dates in history. We do not recall at the moment anything critical which occurred in September 1936 although it would be easy to say that it was a fateful time. But the other dates deserve attention. August 1938 was evidently intended to be the date of the outbreak of war. It has been stated, and never contradicted that only the personal action of Mr. Chamberlain in arresting the issue of a certain document from a Government Department deferred the war for a year.

The "American" Press and Jews everywhere, foamed with fury at "Munich." Senator Pittman, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Government, kindly informed once-great-Britain that it was better to die than to be disgraced. He was subsequently the bitterest opponent to any participation of the United States in the war, and the early stages of hostilities, a year later, were characterised by the systematic stripping of Great Britain of her overseas securities by the cash-and-carry policy. The prophecy miscarried by a year, but it was evidently an unpleasant surprise to numbers of people that it did.

Now it would be impossible to contest the significance of the early days of March, 1945. In the first place they were marked by the death of Roosevelt. It was at this time that the defeat of Germany was announced and practically every competent military commentator expressed the opinion that political rather than military considerations alone justified this view.

As these words are written, an announcement has just been broadcast from Washington by President Truman that the first atomic bomb has been dropped on Japan (August 6). This date, August 6, was given by an American officer speaking at Clifton College, as the date on which the Germans would have dropped a similar bomb (see T.S.C. July 14). February 18, 1946, is still in the future—but not much.

There are three explanations of this phenomenon. The first is that the future exists now, can by certain people be seen now, and cannot be avoided by anyone. We refrain

from elaborating this theory because clearly it undercuts all human endeavour.

The second is that as, at any given instant of time, an infinity of events is taking place, any given prediction can be verified by attaching it to something contained in infinity. At first sight, this seems plausible, but it becomes less plausible as the area of the event becomes larger. It is always possible to prophesy that an un-named Englishman will die on a given date. But a prophecy that all Englishmen will die on a given date is another matter.

And the third explanation is that *there are individuals concerned to procure the fulfilment of "prophecy" for their own ends. And those people will naturally publicise the "prophecy" and finance its fulfilment, while remaining in the background.* The most expensive advertisement of the Pyramid "Prophecy" is alleged to have been paid for by B'nai B'rith, the Jewish Secret Society, in New York. And all the significant dates point to war and catastrophe as being the Divine Will.

Instead of the revolting "War Trials" of ninety-year old Petain (not Gamelin, you notice) and similar puppets, why not do a little enquiring as to who paid for prophecies which involved disaster for Europe, but not for New York?

Morgan versus Rothschild?

The Scotsman for August 7, under the double heading, "U.S. Financiers' Aid for Hitler: Support for the Nazis in 1930" contained the following:—

"Documents released by the U.S. State Department, in accordance with its policy of publishing State papers after 15 years, indicate that U.S. financiers actively backed Hitler and the Nazi movement in 1930 as a means of combating Socialism in Germany.

"The chapter on Germany gives considerable attention to Hitler, then first clutching at power on a national scale. It shows that American policy worked closely with the financiers of Wall Street, who were anxious to float loans in Germany.

"Mr. George A. Gordon, American Chargé d'Affaires in Berlin, wrote to the Secretary of State, Mr. Henry Stimson, that 'Hitler received very substantial financial support from certain large industrial interests.' He judged, however, that their influence on him 'has been definitely a restraining one.'

"Elsewhere he wrote that he had heard 'certain American financial interests' were actively supporting Hitler as a means of fighting Socialistic trends.

"There was a sharp difference of opinion between Mr. Joseph P. Cotton, Under Secretary of State, and the American reparations agent in Paris, Mr. S. Parker Gilbert, on the advisability of a huge loan to Germany.

"Mr. Gilbert, states a document, 'was against it unless it was specified that the Germans had to use the funds to pay debts.'

"Mr. Cotton, after conferring with J. P. Morgan and representatives of other Wall Street bankers, felt that Britain and France were trying to push the United States out of the German market, and saw no reason to block the deal."

[Note: This report confirms an opinion formed at the time of the abdication of Edward VIII that that event was largely the outcome of a feud between the Rothschild-Schiffs and the Morgans. Stettinius was a Morgan nominee, and Byrnes, who has replaced him is a Baruch (? Rothschild-Schiff) "front." Sidney Hillman is alleged to have stipulated the nomination of Truman as Vice-President as payment for delivering the C.I.O. vote—the decisive vote—to Roosevelt.]

The Squid

It may not have escaped notice that a prominent, if not the most prominent feature of the actual effects of the atomic bomb as reported is mention of 'an impenetrable cloud of dust.' While there seems to be every intention that the 'cloud of dust' should hide other things from view than the destruction in Japan, it is by no means clear that the obscuration is so complete as is desired, and, to assist the acquisition of clear vision concerning a matter obviously important, the following notes have been compiled:—

(1) The 'prophetic' element is dealt with elsewhere in this issue, from a political angle.

(2) As it stands, the latest ramp would seem to be most fearful as an ultimatum to all who stand outside of the ambit of Grand Orient to accept its terms for the future conduct of human life. Unless, however, something has gone seriously wrong with 'the works'—which is not apparent—the sanction suggested of total extinction of the race of men is not really very formidable. It is hard to imagine that the ruling oligarchy envisages its own extinction. That writers like Dr. W. R. Inge (*Sunday Dispatch*, August 12) should fall for the "Man's Last Chance" bluff indicates the grave psychological danger, namely that "we are now thoroughly alarmed"—but not about the right thing. We should be thoroughly alarmed at the prospect that the bluff may not be called, and less concerned about the possibility that it may not be a mere bluff. Mr. Bernard Shaw (the *Sunday Express*) seems to have an inkling of this state of affairs when he writes that atomic bombs would be useless to half-a-dozen policemen out to capture a handful of gangsters because "they dare not destroy London or Chicago, themselves included, to arrest Ned Kelly, however desperate he might be." In the past, Mr. Shaw has paid higher tributes than that to the London policemen; but, setting that aside, he retires at the critical point with a request that he should not be asked "to pontificate about it." Such detachment from responsibility is, of course, the root weakness of most public discussions at the present time.

(3) The disappointment engendered by Mr. Churchill's published statement is greater in proportion to that statement's greater seriousness. We must do more than pray "that these awful agencies will be made to conduce to peace among the nations, and that instead of wreaking measureless havoc upon the entire globe they may become a perennial fountain of world prosperity," which, unimpeachable as it is as a sentiment, ignores the previous existence of other perennial fountains of world prosperity to a degree which makes prayer more than a little disingenuous. But the major offence of Mr. Churchill is of a subtler order. There has to be a show down, and it is not a promising start that the whole perspective should be distorted, as it is, in our opinion, in the statement that "the whole burden of execution... constitutes one of the greatest triumphs of American—or indeed human—genius of which there is record." While he did not disguise the salient features of the military aspects of the present lay-out materially, he did not explain or attempt to explain, except by the suggestion that the United States was relatively far from the bases of German bombers, the strategical weaknesses inherent in allowing America to come into effective possession of the new power. Canada, India and Australia were just as much out of range, and, actually, the raw

material was, and is, in Canada; but, according to Mr. Stimson, "steps have been taken, and will continue to be taken to ensure an adequate supply" (for the United States).

(4) The statement, in various forms, that the first atomic bomb is already 'obsolete' may be mere 'sabre-rattling'; but we are still far from the attainment of the computation published by John J. O'Neill, President of the U.S. Association of Science Writers, and quoted in the *Sunday Dispatch* of January 11, 1942, of a ten-pound bomb which would wreck every structure within 100 miles.

(5) The "B."B.C. broadcast a statement, which may have appeared also in print, that the thoroughness of organisation of the £500,000,000 factory in the U.S.A. extended even to the point of "protecting those employed from fear." This frank admission of the use in industry of the resources of 'psychology' should not be disregarded, or its implications allowed to go unexamined. Every day, in every way, we fear our enemies less and less; and every day, in every way, in consequence, our enemies have less reason to fear us.

(6) Great play has been made with the theme that "we" must on no account allow the new power to get into the wrong hands. Our opinion that it is in the wrong hands now makes it unnecessary for us to discuss further that aspect of the matter. We note several suggestions that the *knowledge* essential to the development of atomic energy is too widely disseminated already to control it. This, if true, as we believe, ignores the wide practical difference between knowledge and the power to use knowledge, and, let it be repeated, what is under consideration is *power, and power more abundantly*.

(7) The foregoing 'notes' by no means preclude the possibility that Mr. Churchill is playing a very deep game. So are a lot of other people; and we would only remark that the results of the game, or games, as played more or less continuously during the Christian Era, are progressively uncomfortable, demoralising, and destructive for more and more people, and there is no sign that we can see that a victory for any visible party to the game or games would be less disastrous than the present state of suspended decision. The game, and the players, must be stopped. If we lack the authority to call it off, we can at least point out the evident chinks in the armour of those who persist in carrying it on.

From this point of view, it may be noticed that, surprisingly perhaps, it is the psychological features which are most prominent among the features open to inspection.

Take Mr. Churchill's quite unnecessary certificate of quality issued to the scientists and industrialists. We by no means deny the fact that 'genius' is real, that it exists, and that it is important. Possibly 'genius' is a prerogative of many men, and not necessarily anything rare of its nature but only, if at all, of its occurrence, or of its mere exercise: the faculty, yet a common faculty, which combines, in some way or other, the scriptural injunction to be perfect with a realisation of the promise resident in the words of the New Testament quoted recently in the Notes which customarily introduce this journal: "Be of good cheer, for I [not we] I have overcome the world."

The condition of a young man scarcely more self-conscious than an adding machine provided with an unlimited supply of volts to play with seems to us very far from this,

and to bestow the title of genius upon him seems to us quite unwarrantable. Virtually it has been admitted extensively during the present discussion that, apart from not by any means exceptional mental equipment, the only thing really necessary for the prospective performer is *a permit*; and, of course, not everyone can afford the £500,000,000 fee. But, the fact that the scholarship boy finds a friend to fork out, doesn't make either of them a genius. This point of view might with advantage be gently (at first) introduced to the notice of back-room boys "everywhere" and not necessarily only at bed-time. A suitable condiment might be direct denial of the worn-out legend that scientists are humanitarian individuals who invent blessings for mankind which a wicked capitalist transmutes into curses: the 'geniuses' knew this time what they were doing—every one of them!

But the possibility of a course of counter-action does not end there.

It is not impossible to press home responsibility for the demoralisation of which the perverted standard here described is a part at least far enough towards its source to constitute, we hope, a deterrent. To make the point clear, we combine two published statements, one recent and the other clearer now than when it was written. *The Tablet* for July 28 carried the following accusation, which we endorse:—

"Bishops, chancellors, professors, writers, all who can encourage or discourage thoughts and moods, have this duty, to seek not popularity but truth; and it has been the most fruitful recent source of weakness and moral decline that in the universities and in letters this duty has been so much neglected. To hold a great institutional office and then to assist the forces to disintegration and decay, under the impression that they are forms of progress and good growth, is intellectually feeble and morally base; but it is the history of innumerable old men in the universities with an itch to be thought truly liberal and sympathetic to the dissolute young. A steady series of abandonments and betrayals has transformed the clear, serious, and concentrated Oxford and Cambridge of Newman's day into the intellectual marshland they are to-day, and no dogmatic Christian can pretend the essential loss does not far outweigh any intellectual gain..."

The second is the following from the Protocols:—

"In order to effect the destruction of all collective forces except ours we shall emasculate the first stage of collectivism—the universities, by re-educating them in a new direction. Their officials and professors will be prepared for their business by detailed secret programmes of action from which they will not with immunity diverge, not by one iota. They will be appointed with especial precaution, and will be so placed as to be wholly dependent upon the Government."

But, lest that is not deemed evidential, it may be underlined with some passages from "The Government of Oxford," published by the Oxford University Press in 1931, the work of a self-constituted group headed by A. D. Lindsay:—

"It was never intended that the group *itself*, or any section of it *as such*, should propound policies, still less agitate for their acceptance."

"On the other hand, there was a general feeling that

continuous appraisal of the governmental institutions of Oxford, regarded impartially and as a whole, by those actually engaged in running them *or privately concerned* with their success, was much preferable to the spasmodic investigation by Royal Commissions, by which method large reforms in the government of Oxford have been initiated hitherto."

"In devising a form of government for any institution—political, educational, religious, commercial—or in criticising its existing government, one would naturally begin by inquiring what was the purpose of the institution, what functions it was expected to perform. For Oxford the problem is in a sense inverse... to render a given form of government capable of expressing a purpose *as yet unformulated*." (Emphases not in original.)

"There is no person or body *in Oxford* [our emphasis] competent to declare what the functions of the university are."

Of nineteen members, it is probably not specially discourteous to say that some of them have no evident connection with high politics. On the other hand R. H. Brand was Managing Director of Lazard Brothers and Company; Lionel Curtis had been Town Clerk of Johannesburg, a member of the Transvaal Legislative Council and a Beit Lecturer at Oxford; Lord Lothian's history is well-known; B. H. Sumner was of the I.L.O.; H. V. Hodson was editor of *The Round Table* later; W. L. Hitchens was Chairman of Cammell Laird and Company; Sir H. Hartley was Vice-President of the L.M.S. and later Chairman of the Fuel Research Board; C. R. Harris was later Director-General of the Buenos Ayres Great Southern and Western Railways; J. L. Brierly an *international* lawyer, and K. N. Bell had been a Beit Lecturer.

The motive inspiring the group in its quest for 'continuous appraisal' of the suitability of Oxford to implement a policy "as yet [1931]* unformulated" is not apparent in its essay, unless in the longest of four appendices: "With these changes clearly in prospect, Oxford would be poorly advised to neglect the instruction as well as the caution embodied in American experience."... "The spread of science, among other causes, demands a greater and greater centralisation of university functions..."

How to drain the "intellectual marshland"!

It is often asserted that such bodies as the Government of Oxford Group do not *do* anything to regulate the cultural tide. What does the regulator of a clock *do* to regulate the clock?

T. J.

1931

*In 1931 Mr. Israel Moses Sieff circulated "Freedom and Planning"; the New Dealers were organised in preparation for the Presidential Election; the introduction of control of exchange represented complete seizure by the (German) State—and by groups hiding behind the State—of all export and import business—the New Fabian Research Bureau was set up with Mr. Attlee as Chairman; Mr. Benjamin Turner of the Mond-Turner Conference was made a Knight; the Gold-Exchange standard was abolished and control of currency established by Mr. Neville Chamberlain, and interlocked with the big German-affiliated Cartels, which in turn had been interlocked with the Chase National Bank (U.S.A.) and the Midland Bank. An odd year, 1931. As *The Social Crediter* has remarked, Hitler must think of it with reverence.

PARLIAMENT (Continued from page 3)

reduction should be made. If the reductions are to be drastic, they must result in weakening in many areas the control exercised by citizens over their local affairs.

"The Report appears to take the view that there is too much permissive legislation. It may be pointed out that permissive legislation allows variations between one area and another; furthermore, the alternative to permissive legislation is mandatory legislation, which allows no voice to the locality as to operating the legislation or not.

"The Report condemns regionalism, and yet proposes the setting up of regional authorities with powers of delegation to smaller authorities...

"The Report envisages a set-up of local government in which one authority (the 'Major Authority') will be a precepting authority and another (the 'Area Authority') will be a rating authority. Thus one authority would have every inducement to be spendthrift and the other to be parsimonious."

This scheme shows that the Labour Party desire that local government should not be local government at all, but Whitehall Government, either by means of nationalisation of services now performed by localities or by the central Government, in the name of uniformity and efficiency, making local authorities their agents to a far greater extent than has obtained in the past. Local authorities would then become only the local executive of whatever Government was in power, to the sapping of local initiative and responsibility, and would take their political complexion necessarily from such a Government. With an authoritarian central Government, its domination would extend immediately over every local authority in the country, and its will would be imposed universally, whatever local desires might be. If this is thought to be a fanciful picture, reference may be made to a book entitled *Problems of a Socialist Government* published a few years before the war...

(Interruption)

... the Minister of Aircraft Production said this:

"Another means that has been adopted for getting rid of congestion in Parliament is the delegation of power to local authorities. This method is satisfactory provided the local authorities are willing and capable, but it is necessary to retain some measure of central control to ensure that the delegated powers are fully and properly exercised, more especially while the political complexion of certain local authorities is different from that of the Central Government... It is, however, of the first importance that the whole conception of Local Government responsibility should be revised. A larger unit will be required, acting in more direct consultation with the central authority and with the widest administrative powers in its own area. Regional councils having such powers and functions must form a most important link in the Socialist scheme if Socialism is to be more than a name. It will not only be necessary for the Central Government to pass Socialist measures, but it will be necessary to have Socialist Region Councils to see that they are carried through promptly and efficiently..."

(Interruption)

March 14, 1945.

MINISTRY OF SUPPLY Plastic Polythene Process

Mr. Ellis Smith asked the Minister of Supply on what date the new plastic polythene was perfected; whether it was sent to Duponts of U.S.A. before the U.S.A. entered the war; and whether I. G. Farben, Germany, were furnished with the secrets of polythene in accordance with the pre-war arrangements.

The Joint Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Supply (Mr. Peat): Small scale production of polythene

began before the war, but continued improvements have since been made. I.C.I. Ltd. inform me that Duponts were furnished with research information and samples over a period before the war and were given detailed manufacturing information in November, 1941, for the purpose of erecting a plant on behalf of the United States Government. I.C.I. also inform me that they have not at any time supplied information concerning polythene to I. G. Farben.

Mr. Smith: Will the hon. Gentleman now answer the Question? Did Duponts, in accordance with their pre-war arrangements, inform I. G. Farben, of Germany, of this British invention?

Mr. Peat: Under the agreement between I.C.I. and Duponts all the information furnished by I.C.I. is to be strictly confidential, and for the use of Duponts only. This applies to information furnished on any subject, but having regard to the secrecy of polythene a letter was sent to the chairman of Duponts by Lord McGowan on September 17, 1941, stressing the importance of keeping secret the uses for which polythene had already proved itself in this country.

Mr. Smith: May I ask whether Lord McGowan's request to the American company was carried out, and whether we can have a "Yes," or, "No," to the question of whether I. G. Farben, of Germany, were informed of this British invention?

Mr. Peat: I cannot answer for Duponts. We only know that up to date there is no evidence that this material has been used by Germany.

Mr. Mack: Will it be embarrassing to the hon. Gentleman if I ask him what is polythene?

Mr. Peat: It is a production from gas, or ethylene, which is used for the purpose of covering high frequency cables, particularly for radiolocation, and has special qualities which make it better than any other form of cable covering.

Commander Sir Archibald Southby: In view of the great importance of this Question, will my hon. Friend take steps to find out whether Duponts did or did not disclose to I. G. Farben in Germany the details of this process? Will he take steps to find out?

Mr. Peat: If there is anything I can do I will certainly do it.

April 18, 1945.

REQUISITIONED LAND AND WAR WORKS BILL

Mr. W. J. Brown (Rugby): ... I have had during this war enough dealings with Government Departments to make me very nearly an anti-Socialist. [Interruption.] I said "very nearly." I was restrained from saying "completely" because I know the passion for liberty which animates hon. Members on these benches. I submit we ought not to give the Chancellor of the Exchequer the vast powers contained in this Clause, until we know how he will use them. I have seen during this war powers used and abused by a Government on a scale which I, as an old civil servant, thought I should never live to see. I have seen the Government repudiate moral obligations which were as stark and sharply outlined as they possibly could be. From now on, this Committee would be well advised never to give powers to a Government merely on the supposition that they will be used reasonably. We had better be quite sure that they cannot be unreasonably used...

May, 2, 1945.

ESSENTIAL WORK ORDER (ABSENTEEISM)

Sir L. Boyce asked the Minister of Labour how many persons have been convicted for absenteeism under the Essential Work Order; and how many have been sent to prison under that Order.

Mr. Bevin: Up to March 31, 1945, 18,436 persons were convicted in England and Wales for absents themselves from work or for being persistently late in presenting themselves for work without reasonable excuse, and of these 1,323 were sentenced to imprisonment.

Progress: Right or Left?

The following to the Editor of *The Scotsman* has not appeared in its columns:—

Sir,

The current arguments called forth by the recent General Election seem to assume that the desired objective is something called "Progress"; that the progressive parties are to the Left and that legislation which has followed the lines advocated by Leftist, or so-called "progressive" parties has improved the conditions of the world, and the people in it.

The most casual examination of the situation, if it is objective, must be sufficient to show that such real advance as has been made in the past hundred years is solely due to the progress of the industrial arts, and that the political use made of this progress of the industrial arts (which have nothing to do with politics) is far inferior to the political sense and use of *e.g.*, the Tory Party of the early 17th century with the facilities at its contemporary disposal.

It is difficult to say what percentage of the population was economically insecure immediately before the Cromwellian Revolution (which paved the way for the "Whig" Revolution and "Dutch" finance), but it is certain that the percentage was far less than it is at the present time.

Perhaps the two most dangerous fallacies which obtain wide currency at the present time are (1) that mere lapse of time involves automatic progress, an idea skilfully attached to the very dubious Darwinian hypothesis, and (2) that there is some virtue in a majority which justifies it pragmatically in penalising successive minorities, a theory which is concealed under such phrases as "The Common Good," or "Public Ownership." Precisely the opposite is the case: society has always been most successful when minorities have been most secure.

The result of the recent election is not a vote for Socialism; it was a protest against Socialism and was the inevitable result of the idea so sedulously propagated by Professor Laski that the Left has an historic right to victory. The conditions and controls of the past six years are the ideal of the Left and the so-called Conservative Party has no future until it repudiates them as having been imposed upon it by such organisations as appear to be dominant in the Labour Party.

I am, *etc.*,

(Signed) W. L. RICHARDSON

Lawyer, August 5.

The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket

By C. H. DOUGLAS
Price 2s. (Postage extra).

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2.

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.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction.....	6d.
The Use of Money.....	6d.
Social Credit Principles.....	1½d.

Also

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold.....	4/6
Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson.....	2/-
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.
You and the State Doctor by Charles Mellick.....	6d.
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.	
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
The Beveridge Plot.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Nature of Social Credit by L. D. Byrne.....	3d.
The Representative's Job.....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.