

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 19. No. 23.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Any misapprehension which might be entertained in regard to the interests served by the late Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, by those unfamiliar with the Indian scene, must have been dispelled by the "B".B.C. in its really remarkable panegyric, absorbing the whole of the six o'clock News Bulletin of January 30, not to mention the oration by Mr. Attlee at 9-15.

We have probably heard most of the important news broadcasts in the last twenty-five years; and we cannot recall anything like it, either in length or content. Probably no one man, not being the head of a sovereign state, has cost directly or indirectly the British taxpayer more than has Mr. Gandhi; he was an African nuisance before he became the ostensible head of the so-called Indian National Congress, the puppet of the millionaire Tatas and Birlas and their friends in Wall and Pine St., New York; his activities have gone far to wreck the immense possibilities for India which were opening under the British Indian Governments of the nineteenth century, and have substituted the hundreds of thousands of murders (and the score is only beginning) which have marked the Socialist scuttles inaugurated by Sir Stafford Cripps and carried out by Lord Mountbatten.

But to the British public, to most of whom he is, if anything, a name, he is presented by "it's" official broadcasting agency as not merely a servant, but one of the greatest servants of the British Empire and people; the fact that he has been assassinated by a *Hindu*, not a Mohammedan, be it carefully noted, while in passing it is mentioned, is not elaborated as being, as it is, the logical consequence of his own actions against the background of Hindu mentality. As we have tried to explain, no-one can understand Indian agitators who has not grasped the effect of Lord Macaulay's Indian Universities on the glut of *vakil*s and barristers, and their use of notoriety for professional advancement, and, bearing this in mind, there is a sense in which Gandhi was a sincere man. But only the "B".B.C. would pretend that he was anything but a very practical enemy of Great Britain, and the friend and assistant of our deadliest foes. He died in the house of the Birlas, and he is canonised by the "B".B.C. ("Our country, always wrong").

We believe that there is a small number—loyal and valued members of our public, who although, because of their loyalty, they accept our views on certain aspects of the Jewish race, yet have an idea that these are an excrescence on "Social Credit" and, they feel, might have been left unnoticed. We are not concerned with the reactions of the crypto-Communists and their accusations—"anti-Semitism," "racism," "negative criticism" and other catchwords;—but we are ready at all times to explain to our friends what we recognise as a very excusable failure of comprehension.

Perhaps the simplest way in which to deal with this

matter is to enunciate certain propositions.

- (1) Both Judaism and Social Credit are rooted in philosophies. Even in the case of non-orthodox Jews, race and philosophy are inseparable. Heine refers to Judaism as "the portable Fatherland."
- (2) Social Credit is Christian, not primarily because it was designed to be Christian but because it was painstakingly "dis"-(un)-covered reality. If Christianity is not real, it is nothing; it is not "true," it *is* Truth. "Ye shall know the Truth, and the Truth shall make you free."
- (3) Judaism is implacably anti-Christian, and it is, by definition, an Incarnate Lie. "Ye do the deeds of your father . . . he is a liar, and the father of it."
- (4) Both philosophies have a policy and these policies cannot live together. The Founder of Christianity was quite unequivocal on the question. "I came not to bring peace, but a sword." It is remarkable that many people who complain of the suppression of vital information by the Press and the Broadcasting Agencies, will resent the exposure of Jewish policy, even if the exposure is merely the publication of statements made by Jews themselves.

Bearing these propositions in mind, it must be recognised that the practical problem which we have to face is not intellectual, it is militant. Mere conversion to an understanding of the A + B Theorem, the creation of credit by the banks, the foreign Acceptance swindle, and the whole network of International Finance *by itself*, leads nowhere. Probably ninety *per cent* of the adult population of this country suspect that they are being swindled. Even if they understood exactly and technically *how* they are being swindled, it would make little difference. But it does make a great deal of difference if they know *who* is obstructing the rectification of the swindle, and who is the major beneficiary. The general population of the country has been completely misled as to the identity of its enemies, and has turned on its most effective leaders, who were far from perfect, but were incomparably better than the mixture of Trades Union careerists and alien schemers who now afflict us. Witness the state of the country, and the worse future with which we are threatened.

For all these reasons and others, we conceive it to be our vocation to indicate, without prejudice but without favour, those whom we conceive to be the enemies of our culture and ideals; to unmask their aims. It does not make a cheerful story; many people would prefer to escape into Utopia, just as "the workers" have been hypnotised into the Utopia which is spreading over Eastern Europe; but it is our conception of Reality at this time, and only from Reality can you proceed to Realisation.

Your life is to be changed by the efforts to make everything *ersatz*, as the result of the activities of "one of the most brilliant and colourful young scientists in Britain" [*sic*]

Sunday Dispatch, January 25. You are to have new foods made out of—well, well; soap that has no fats in it; shoes that aren't leather; cotton that isn't cotton and other attractions. Your future is in the hands of Professor Solly Zuckerman, who is, oddly enough, the son-in-law of the Marquis of Reading (Isaacs). Solly came from Capetown and, as a qualification for giving you boots without leather, is Professor of Anatomy at Birmingham University. Unlimited resources are to be placed at his disposal. The end of the *goyim* (cattle) appears to be in sight.

It would appear that fraudulent book-keeping, spurious currency issues, and financial freebooting are the groundwork of Planning and Socialism, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, (TVA) so eulogised by Mr. Thomas Johnston as the shining example for the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board, is perhaps only one more of a wide range of examples.

But it is a compact instance, and one on which the P.E.P.-New Dealers place much importance because of its adaptability to administrative piracy.

In an article entitled "The Hidden Red Ink in TVA's Books" in the *Readers Digest* for December, 1947, (American Edition—omitted from British reprint), a periodical which has printed much favourable propaganda for TVA, Mr. John T. Flynn, amongst other damning evidence, points out that if TVA's accounts were kept as a commercial power company's accounts are (by law) kept, it would show a deficit of 130 million dollars where it claims a profit on power sales. Exactly what the amount of profit claimed amounts to, is not clear, because the accounts are not sufficiently intelligible and mix up fertiliser production, agriculture, forestry and other activities with power sales.

We are rapidly approaching this state of affairs in the British Isles; and it is quite time that the public should be made aware of the fact, and the consequences which must accrue from it. It seems at first sight incredible; but if the statement is understood it is true to say that book-keeping is at the root of the world tragedy.

The wrangle which has accompanied the latest currency juggling trick, this time fathered on "France", has, so far as we can judge, brought only one fact to light—that Sir Stafford Cripps, or those for whom he speaks, are determined on a fiat, or managed currency, and that even a free gold market, which is associated with the London-School-of-Economics (sorry, London University) conception of finance, does not content them. A managed currency requires managers; who could be more ready to oblige?

To the extent that we can claim acquaintance with anything which the present Chancellor has said in his private capacity, he is blissfully ignorant of the implications of the policy for which he appears to contend, or its converse, an accountancy currency; and his advocacy of it confirms other indications that we are now back to 1932 and the rule of P.E.P., with Mr. Churchill, Mr. Harold Macmillan, Sir Arthur Salter, and others ready to assist when required to maintain a P.E.P. majority in the House of Commons.

Anyone requiring an explanation of the startling decay of morale, as well as of morals in this country has only to observe and consider the psychology displayed by the Jewish Agency in regard to Palestine. The fact that the Jews want

Palestine is a complete and sufficient reason why they should have it. The fact that someone else has it, is not an argument, it is an outrage. Compare this with the attitude of the Socialist agitator for the past hundred years, of which we are reaping the fruits. The fact that the "worker" did not own the means of "production, distribution and exchange" was, and is, an argument for despoiling those who owned a small part of them, not for endeavouring to acquire fresh values. The so-called class war is identical in character with the Zionist attack on the Arabs; and both of them are rooted in the insolent claims of the Chosen People, which show every sign of destroying the planet.

We have heard Socialist agitators say that they would not have Social Credit at any price; what they wanted was to make the rich poor.

CANADIAN JEWISH CHRONICLE, January 9, 1948:—

"Ottawa. (J.T.A.) Leaders of the Social Credit Party have finally announced a ban on the publication of anti-Semitic articles in the organisation's official organ, following conferences with Joseph H. Fine, Chairman of the Public Relations Committee of the Canadian Jewish Congress.

"In addition to the ban, party leaders forced the resignation of the Editor and assistant Editor of the publication, *Social Crediter*. Chiefly affected by the new policy will be Norman Jaques, Social Credit Member of Parliament, who has been using the magazine as one of his platforms for anti-Semitic propaganda."

Waal, waal, waal.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: January 20, 1948.

National Insurance Unemployment Benefit

Mr. Hollis asked the Minister of National Insurance for what reason *Mr. Rideout*, of 5, Sunny Hill Lane, Oare, near Marlborough, when applying for an increased unemployment benefit in respect of his child, was required to state his parents' income.

Mr. J. Griffiths: As I explained in my letter of December 31 to the hon. Member, the child was living with *Mr. Rideout's* parents, and the information referred to was, therefore, necessary in order to determine whether the provisions of the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1935, were satisfied. *Mr. Rideout* has been informed that he has a right of appeal to the Court of Referees, but he has not exercised that right.

Mr. Hollis: Has not the general impression been spread abroad that the Socialist party are opposed to means tests, and will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to correct that false impression?

Mr. Griffiths: The new Act does not come into operation until next July; this is under the old Act.

Employment: Directed Person

Mr. Hogg asked the Minister of Labour why *Mr. John Selfridge*, of 65, Clydesdale Street, Hamilton, was directed to the mines on December 20, 1947, despite a doctor's certificate.

Mr. Isaacs: *Mr. Selfridge* went into coalmining as an

alternative to service in His Majesty's Forces. He subsequently left without notice, and, as he refused to go back voluntarily, he was issued with a direction after being pronounced fit for coalmining employment by an independent medical referee. He appealed against the direction, and the local appeal board dismissed his appeal. As, however, a further medical certificate had been submitted by Mr. Selfridge from his own doctor, he was again examined by an independent medical referee, who on this occasion pronounced him unfit for coalmining employment. The direction was thereupon withdrawn.

Mr. Hogg: Does not this entirely illustrate the folly of directing people against their will?

Mr. Isaacs: It may also indicate the folly of relying always on a doctor's opinion.

Mr. Hogg: On three doctors' opinions.

National Insurance: Weekly Contributions

Sir E. Graham-Little asked the Minister of National Insurance if he will now give an estimate of the average total per week of the compulsory levy made under the National Insurance Act, 1946, on each insured person in respect of insurance, and of Health Services, and of any other costs incidental to the working of these two Acts.

Mr. J. Griffiths: It is estimated that the total yield of the contributions payable by insured persons and employers under the National Insurance Act, 1946, will be about £7,000,000 a week and that out of this amount about £700,000 will be allocated to the National Health Service.

House of Commons: January 22, 1948.

Foreign Affairs

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Ernest Bevin): . . . We have always accepted—I would emphasise this—and I repeat it now, that the friendliest relations should exist between Russia and the States on the Russian frontier; indeed, not only on the frontier—we want these friendly relations with everybody. It is madness to think of anything else if we are ever to have peace. That is quite a different thing from cutting off Eastern Europe from the rest of the world, and turning it into an exclusively self-contained bloc under the control of Moscow and the Communist Party.

Mr. Gallacher (Fife, West): That is not true.

Mr. Bevin: The European Recovery Programme brought all this to a head, and made us all face up to the problem of the future organisation. We did not press the Western Union—and I know that some of our neighbours were not desirous of pressing it—in the hope that when we got the German and Austrian peace settlements, agreement between the Four Powers would close the breach between East and West, and thus avoid the necessity of crystallising Europe into separate blocs. We have always wanted the widest conception of Europe, including, of course, Russia. It is not a new idea. The idea of close relationship between the countries of Western Europe first arose during the war, and in the days of the Coalition it was discussed. Already in 1944 there was talk between my predecessor and the Russian Government about a Western association.

His Majesty's Government at that time indicated to the Soviet Government that they would put the establishment of

a world organisation first on their list. In any case, they proposed to rely on the Anglo-Soviet Alliance for the purpose of containing Germany, and eventually there might be similar arrangements between France and Great Britain and France and the Soviet Union for this purpose. That was in 1944. We also indicated that it might be desirable to have defence arrangements with Western Europe for the purpose of instituting a common defence policy against the possible revival of German aggression, and to determine what role each State should play in the matter of armaments and the disposal of Forces. We indicated that when these matters arose, we would keep the Soviet Government informed, which we did. In 1945, however, there was a great deal of Soviet criticism, especially of this country, over the supposed formation of a Western bloc against the Soviet Union, which was quite untrue. At that time, we had not even had a meeting with our Western Allies to discuss the matter; and yet daily this criticism was poured out on the radio and in *Pravda* and the rest of it—a constant repetition.

When I was in Moscow, therefore, in December, 1945, and saw Generalissimo Stalin, I explained that the United Kingdom must have security arrangements with France and other neighbouring countries, just as the Soviet Union had with their neighbours, to which he raised no objection. I stated that whatever we did would not be directed against the Soviet Union. To this he replied, "I believe you." Anything His Majesty's Government does now in this matter will not be directed against the Soviet Union or any other country, but we are entitled to organise the kindred souls of the West just as they organised their kindred souls. As late as January, 1947, Stalin took a similar line with Field-Marshal Montgomery.

In 1946, I communicated to Mr. Molotov our intention of entering into negotiations for an Anglo-French Treaty. Mr. Molotov expressed interest, and asked to be kept informed. He made no comment. I kept him fully informed about the Treaty of Dunkirk. I have had no communication since about that matter. When the European recovery proposal was put forward in the same spirit, it was offered to the whole of Europe, including Russia. There were no grounds, therefore, for the fear that it was to be directed against the Soviet Union or used for any ulterior purpose. So clear was it that it was intended for the whole of Europe, that in Poland we know that even the Communist Party were anxious to participate. So they were in Hungary and Roumania, and Czechoslovakia even announced her intention to accept the invitation. About Yugoslavia and Bulgaria I never had any precise information. Eventually all these States were ordered to abstain. What about sovereignty? We took no step to advise; we merely sent out our invitation for people to answer, and come freely if they wished to. If they did not, we knew that they were not staying away of their own volition.

The House will remember the conversations I had with M. Bidault and Mr. Molotov. At first, I was reasonably hopeful that everyone, including Russia, would play their part in this great offer. What was the idea behind this European recovery programme? First, that we should do what we could for ourselves and in co-operation with one another, and then secure from the American people supplementary aid. If we want to maintain our independence we have got to do all we can for ourselves. I think it is quite right when all neighbours co-operate together to see what

(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. 19. No. 23.

Saturday, February 7, 1948.

Orientation

From 1918 to 1947 social crediters moved from phase to phase, successively aligned on different aspects of political and economic realism. Emphasis has matched events. Since 1939, *The Brief for the Prosecution* stands on the centre line of an advance, in the public exposure of individuals and institutions responsible for the disintegration of society and the integrity of individuals. For some two years the advent of another phase has been discernible—the spearpoint of what went before, not the replacement of it. In January, 1946, social crediters were asked to assist in the development of ideas involved in the Constitutional Issue. These have since been amplified.

There is frequent enquiry, from those who have gained some knowledge of underlying causes. "Yes; but what can we do about it?" "Where do we go from here?" are characteristic questions. It is precisely at this point that Douglas opens up the road towards a realistic apprehension of the Constitution and of any workable Constitution. The time is long past when financial adjustment alone would have set society upon an even keel. The campaign to abolish poverty showed us that 'democracy' here and now is incapable of taking the initiative, or of steadfastly pursuing a right initiative. Nevertheless the principle which underlay the Electoral Campaign remains valid: to bring the common sense of the ordinary man to bear on public affairs in such a manner that he will gain the results he wants.

How can that be done? The electorate is bewildered and perhaps it is the more intelligent who turn away from the appalling confusion of issues presented to them; politics, economics, morals and aesthetics hopelessly entangled. The inescapable question—and it is a desperate question—is, in what respects is the ordinary man capable of applying his common sense, and in what conditions can that be made effective?

The answer is that the ordinary man is still capable of saying "Yes" or "No" to alternatives which he can understand. What can he understand? The Englishman, as well as the Scotsman, Irishman and Welshman, can still use his common sense when it comes to buying or selling. And he is not yet beyond knowing that when he puts his hand in the fire he will be burnt; *i.e.*, that he must answer for his own actions.

Now the essence of the electoral proposals is for the Parties to be compelled to approach the Electorate somewhat as: "This is what we propose to do. It will affect so and so in such and such a manner. It will cost you so much,

Will you buy it? If you do, it is *your choice*, and therefore your responsibility; and you will gain or lose according to how it turns out."

What would follow the implementation of such proposals, the elector knowing that he would not be taxed for what he did not 'buy', and able to contract out if he did not want to join in? Imagine an electorate presented with masses of letterpress and figures setting out the last budget, competing, perhaps with more modest proposals from some other Party which saw what was coming? "Will you buy it? Yes or No?" Nine out of ten would soon turn to the totals and vote for the 'least.

To *obtain* power is the objective of every Party. Therefore, seeing that power is only to be obtained by smaller and smaller budgets, their legislative proposals would go in that direction.

No government can *retain* power without certain essentials—Defence, Justice, and Foreign Relations are the most obvious, and such are 'political'—they properly belong to the political system. The load which can be shed (*i.e.*, where cost can be reduced) is in economic experiments and social legislation.

The first results of these proposals would therefore be: the disappearance of *majority rule* in the right to *contract out*, the radical reduction of legislation, the separation of politics from economics and divestment by the government of responsibility for economic *policies*.

Without going further it is evident that this amounts to putting the Parties in competition to produce results. And in the process the Parties would find another master in the Electorate; a master whose common sense would grow in the use of it. It is in that direction that we 'go from here.'

What can be done to forward this major strategy?

(1) Vital ideas come to us through *The Social Crediter*, which must be maintained and extended in circulation.

(2) 'Interior' preparation. Unquestionably by far the best way to grasp an idea is to work on it, hammering it out, perhaps, with one or two of those whom you have interested, and trying it out as occasion can be found. When so handled an idea will develop, and project itself in action. The closest attention is required in study of the notes, and articles in *The Social Crediter*, linking these up with what has gone before; as for example the *Church of England* with the *Constitution*. To focus attention is to engender *conviction*, from which action springs.

(3) 'Exterior' preparation, which, following on and concurrent with the above, grows out of current events in minor convergent action: *e.g.*, the Municipal Elections appear to have indicated some change of mind on the part of the Electorate. What has to be done is to dispel the illusion that a change of policy will follow such a demonstration, and further that nothing is to be gained by the success of the Conservative Party. (Use *Extracts from Macmillan*, from K.R.P.)

(4) Direct advocacy in newspapers, *e.g.*, as successfully undertaken recently by readers.

(5) Forcing the issue. All Parties are in collaboration to avoid a Constitutional Crisis, the central factor of which is the assumption of unlimited power by Parliament (or in a more real perspective, the Commons, the Cabinet, to those behind the Cabinet). References in *The Social Crediter*

(continued on page 5.)

Six Lectures on Politics and Political Action*

(5)

You will hear it said on all sides, but with particular insistence by persons interested in either the political parties or the reaping of the fruits of Party action, that "the world" has been seeking a settled order, "good" government, and a solution of the political problem for a long time. Such people dub "idealistic," "Utopian" or merely imbecile any concrete suggestion for the improvement of our lot. Particularly at the present moment, when an "ism" which we think (not quite correctly) has only a brief history in political thought appears to be in the ascendancy, it is perhaps well to recall to mind that the salient feature of the present government's schemes is their "idealism"—*i.e.*, they are paper schemes the fruits of which are for the moment purely imaginary: *i.e.*, they exist only as "ideas", and the certain and inevitable reality when it takes shape, may or may not correspond to the "idea" in the minds of their advocates. Nor must we lose sight of the real meaning of "Utopia," *i.e.*, a state of static perfection, not requiring or permitting any advance at all!

Remember that there is a real connection between ideals and realities; and that, properly understood these two kinds of things never walk apart and asunder, but that on the contrary, they are always tied up to one another, joined, inseparably, like the two different and opposite ends of a stick. Anything real that is ever accomplished consciously by man has existed first in an ideal form in someone's mind, and whatever exists as idea will, somehow or other, not necessarily in an expected form, reveal itself in some realisation.

ORIENTATION—(continued from page 4).

develop this.† On January 11, 1947, (for example): "Tactical successes against this (the enemy's) policy are entirely inadequate . . . the entire conception of democracy has to be recast if the world is to survive." On February 22: "The Constitutional Issue grows plainer, and we advise our readers to master its intricacies and to throw what weight they have into an effort for its settlement." On June 7: "The omnipotence of the Cabinet has to be challenged." Then followed the suggestion of a tactic: "From now on all petitions should be addressed to the Chiefs of the three Armed Services, for transmission to His Majesty the King."

In these few words is contained the rejection of Single Chamber Government, an indication of where, in our Constitution, redress should lie and sanctions, in the suggestion that the Armed Forces are more trustworthy (and that they are Armed forces) than Parliament as constituted.

Consider the Cabinet, the Commons, Lords . . . and the King, thinking that one out, if it were put into action.

Note that it does not matter what replies the Service Chiefs may make; if 'enough' Petitions were so directed (and that means enough social crediters to see that they are) the result would be to throw the development of the crisis in the right direction, *i.e.*, towards *realistic constitutionalism*. To follow this up is one of the most urgent necessities; but it is just as necessary to increase and consolidate that hard core of informed individuals to follow up such a blow.—*H.E.*

*Lectures prepared for and delivered to the members of an *ad hoc* body active in some parts of England and since revised.

†A list of references has been prepared and will be published shortly.

tion, perhaps the realisation of a marvellous work of engineering or of art; perhaps as the realisation of misery which is the result of wrong ideas. "Nothing is but thinking makes it so." Thinking always makes something: at the best some sublime memorial of human aspiration; at the worst it makes "mistakes."

So, to answer our critics at the outset of this lecture, what they say, namely, that we are seeking a will o' the wisp which has been pursued without capture during the civilised life of man, is simply untrue. There have been long periods of human history when it might be said that, within a small margin of error (which attends all our affairs) Social life was, in the main, successful and satisfactory to the majority of those who contributed to it.

Moreover, throughout more of that time, the principles underlying successful association have been capable of as exact statement as the principles underlying the construction of bridges are in our own time. That these have not been universally recognised does not matter. The correct principles of bridge construction are not universally recognised even to-day—ask your neighbour who sits next to you what they are and see!—but that does not prevent their adoption and application to the building of the Forth Bridge, or the Hudson Bridge, or the Sydney Harbour Bridge. But something prevents the application of the correct principles of human association—perhaps your critics know what it is! I have very little doubt that some of them do, although they show a curious indisposition to sharing their knowledge with others; but to do the others justice, I think they belong to the uninformed and, if we must impute blame to them, it is on the grounds of either an unwillingness to learn or sheer stupidity. You know the phrase—"Live and let live"?—Well, they "let." And so, evils they might quickly overcome, evils which considerably reduce their style of living even if they do not immediately blot them out, gain the mastery over them. They do not weigh the motives which are suggested to them for their actions. They take them on trust: they "let." It is a kind of hypnosis. Perhaps the worst result of the increase in size, scale, complexity of modern life, its "shameful power over us," is this tendency for individuals to be overcome by it: hypnotised by it. The group has mastered the individual.

Our mission is to assist in adjusting the balance. Society, like the Sabbath, is for man, the individual man, not man for Society.

It seems that the final stages of the struggle between the Individual and the State are destined to be traversed in our time. Whether all forms of non-Christian philosophy are ranged on the side of the supremacy of the State, the Group, may be doubted. It cannot be doubted that the primacy of the individual is peculiarly a Christian doctrine. This primacy of the individual before the group may be an assumption: the point is that it is *our* assumption. We start here. It is our first plank. It may not be axiomatic; probably it isn't, since it at least appears that some people do not recognise the truth of the proposition that whatever is done in society has its justification, if any, in the benefit of individuals, wherever it is a matter of choice and not of necessity. This is by no means a doctrine of selfishness: it is, as we see it, merely a statement of fact. As we see it, not only the man working hard to secure the election of a Socialist to Parliament (in the belief that he, the worker and voter, will be materially benefited—individually) but the Saint loving his enemy from the belief that his individuality is enlarged and the purpose of his life somehow achieved thereby, is illustrating the truth

of this doctrine: "Seek ye first the Kingdom . . . and the rest will be added unto you"—(not added to the Kingdom be it noticed!)

Our policy then is the individual.

And now about these principles. Can we find anything that is axiomatic—*i.e.*, that no one will doubt—as principles. I think we can.

The first and most important principle of successful association is that those who are associating must be led to do so by a common purpose. The desirability of the objective which will be gained by their associating is what unites them.

Are there any objections to this? Ah, yes, someone may say! A man may offer to help another man to gain some end which he does not himself desire. He may do so on the understanding that assistance will be given in return in gaining an objective which he does want, or he may do so out of what we may call pure goodness of heart. Very well; but if you look at it that is not an objection at all. Let us call the men Smith and Jones. Jones wants something which Smith doesn't want either because he has already got it or because it is not an end which interests him. Nevertheless Smith lends Jones a hand. Notice that, Smith's freedom of action being assumed, he wouldn't lend Jones a hand if he didn't want to. So he at least does want and is willing to assist Jones in succeeding in getting the end Jones has in view, and he understands what it is. We might say that Smith wants Jones to succeed, and Jones wants Jones to succeed. So, after all, in this case all that we find is that both men wanted the same end although the end meant entirely different things to the two men. To one it meant some concrete benefit; to the other it meant some spiritual benefit. Let us take care, however, to watch this point, namely, that if, for example, Jones had wanted a job and Smith had offered to help Jones get a job *in order that this obligation Jones had laid himself under to Smith might be used to put pressure upon Jones to (let us say) let Smith into the office or factory employing Jones for some unlawful purpose*, then the conditions are entirely different. What Jones wants is the wages, activity and security attendant upon getting the job. What Smith wants is increased facility in some criminal enterprise. Jones, according to the assumptions of the case, does not want that; but he did desire the satisfaction of Smith's moral advancement. Of course both men might desire to enrich themselves by robbing the factory. In that case what Smith does is to let Jones help him to rob the factory. Jones's getting a job in the factory is only a means to this end.

A second objection which may be raised is that neither Smith nor Jones does or can know what he wants. I leave you to deal with that one. In its crude form it amounts to an assertion that Smith and Jones are both insane (in at all events the legal sense) for it asserts that Smith and Jones habitually act without knowing what are the consequences of their actions. It is possible, of course, that we are all mad; but I don't think the available evidence for this contention is conclusive. At all events you are trying to increase the number of those who have recovered or are recovering.

A third objection is merely an evasion, namely that no good can come of our discussing such matters since "things" work this way or that way or the other way, *etc.*, or that what we want is more control, or an election or a differently-coloured patch of sun-spots. A man is not necessarily a fool because he has the misfortune to fall into a trap, which may

be a trap very cleverly laid and baited, but one of the best definitions of a fool, and a dangerous fool, that I can think of is a man who, finding himself caught stands admiring the exquisite finish of the bars and disdains to inspect what evidences there may be of trustworthy means of escape.

There may be further objections; but I do not know of more than one besides those already mentioned. It is that ends may be hidden, occult, and nevertheless may unite those who co-operate in their attainment. This is really a perfectly valid objection to another proposition, not to this one. Instinctive associations obviously have something of this characteristic and they are very important. There is, however, no party political instinct and we need not refer to this matter again.

Let us return to Smith and Jones. They were introduced to illustrate the objection to the proposition that only an objective entertained in common can unite people in an association with any prospect of success. Instead of reinforcing the objection we found the reverse, that it destroyed it. The discussion showed, however, how important it is to secure *clear, full, honest formulation of the objective*. This is our second principle, and becomes of increasing importance in proportion to the number of people associating. *The most dangerous societies are secret societies*. The next most dangerous societies are societies which *work* openly for a *secret* end—"half-truth Societies", and, as you know, a half-truth is next door to a lie.

There is a difficulty—indeed, several difficulties both in theory and in practice—here. Clearly most people can be united in association for objectives of the "Kingdom-of-Heaven-on-Earth" variety. Lately it has become usual to leave the Heavenly part of this title out of it—*e.g.*, to reduce it to the "Kingdom-on-Earth-Society," leaving Heaven to the imagination or, to go one step further, the "Atlantic Charter Idea" or just "Bretton Woods," the angelic intentions of these objectives of corporate endeavour being left to the imagination—supplied *gratis* by the newspapers, cinemas, pulpits, *etc.*

The *statement* of the policy must be (a) not too abstract for accurate assessment of the progress made to realise it or (b) too concrete for general understanding. This is in itself an important and indeed necessary *principle*. The statement of policy must be concrete enough for both general assessment of its meaning and practical application. The public services and those who administer them must not be in a position to say to our dissatisfied Public: "You asked for mumbo-jumbo, and we have faithfully done our duty in giving it to you." These principles work reasonably well in regard to that characteristically English game, *Cricket*: "What's this club (association) for?"—"To play cricket."—"Who chooses the team?"—"the Captain."—"What are the rules?"—"M.C.C. Rules; here they are."—"Can't I choose my own rules?"—"Yes, but if you do you must get your own club together to play in accordance with them."—"Can I disobey the Captain?"—"Certainly, the Captain can then order you off the field."—"Can't I get another Captain?"—"Certainly you can, if you become a member, propose another Captain, yourself if you like; here is a copy of the Club's Constitution."—and so on. Notice that, Cricket Clubs are *voluntary* associations: we have not yet had compulsory cricket imposed on us by non-cricket players who alter the rules while play is in progress, with or without telling us either what the rules were or what changes they have made. That method (which is "not

cricket") rules only in our greater national game of politics.

Besides principles, successful association demands two things (a) machinery to implement the principles and (b) power to set and keep it in motion—and to stop it when necessary. Broadly the *principles* of modern politics will not bear inspection by honest men. The *power* of modern politics, to give or to withhold, is yours, ours, everybody's. It may be that correct principles have only to be stated to secure that they will replace the false principles which cause so great a sense of frustration. The machinery is not a difficult matter: look around you and you will see many working models to serve your turn.

(To be Concluded).

PARLIAMENT—continued from page 3.

they can do for one another. Then if they find they are stuck they can go to a pal to borrow something to help them through. I do not think that that is taking away one's independence.

In the course of the discussions in Paris there came a change as it was decided by the Soviet Union—and I have very good grounds for accepting this—that rather than risk the generosity of the United States penetrating Eastern Europe and Europe itself joining in a great co-operative movement, the Soviet Union preferred to risk the Western Plan or Western Union—that is to say they risked the creation of any possible organism in the West. My further opinion is that they thought they could wreck or intimidate Western Europe by political upsets, economic chaos and even revolutionary methods. . . .

. . . What Mr. Molotov said at Paris to M. Bidault and myself— . . . on the last day when we were there was that if we proceeded with this plan he indicated to us quite clearly that it would be bad for both of us, particularly for France.

. . . As the discussions went forward since the Paris Conference last June we knew almost the precise dates as to when these troubles were going to take place, and when these upsets were likely to occur. I must say this is rather unpalatable for me to have to do, but I suggest the world will never get right unless the thing is seen in all its nakedness and probably we will get on a better footing then.

As I have already said, it is no secret that Mr. Molotov threatened both ourselves and France that we would have to look out for these squalls if we went on with the European recovery programme. My answer to him, not boastfully but quietly, was that Great Britain had been accustomed to threats, that we should face them and that they would not move us from doing what we believed to be right. We have not, nor has France or any of the other nations who assembled in Paris deviated from that course. The best evidence that what I am saying is correct, as I am sure the hon. Member for Mile End (Mr. Piratin) will agree, is that the Cominform came into existence very quickly. M. Zhdanov and M. Malenkov are closely associated with it.

It has been clearly stated that the object of that body and of Soviet and Communist policy is to prevent the European recovery programme succeeding. I do not object to them coming to that conclusion, but because they came to that conclusion I do not see why I should be a party to keeping Europe in chaos and starvation. I cannot accept that proposition simply because the Cominform says it in their proposals. The fact is there have been great political strikes in France. Who disputes that they are behind them?

[Mr. Gallacher did.]

Mr. Bevin: . . . I was indicating that these strikes have been taking place and that the intention of the Soviets was to anticipate the interim aid from America so that by the loss of production at home American aid would be nullified. That is not the way to express love of one's country and for one's own people.

Now for the steps we have taken in connection with this European recovery programme. . . .

. . . But surely all these developments which I have been describing point to the conclusion that the free nations of Western Europe must now draw closely together. How much these countries have in common. Our sacrifices in the war, our hatred of injustice and oppression, our Parliamentary democracy, our striving for economic rights and our conception and love of liberty are common among us all. . . . I believe the time is ripe for a consolidation of Western Europe. . . [With France] we have a firm basis of co-operation in the Treaty of Dunkirk, we are partners in the European recovery programme, and I would also remind the House of the useful and practical work being done by the Anglo-French Economic Committee. . . .

I hope that treaties will . . . be signed with our near neighbours, the Benelux countries, making with our treaty with France an important nucleus in Western Europe. We have then to go beyond the circle of our immediate neighbours. We shall have to consider the question of associating other historic members of European civilisation, including the new Italy, in this great conception. Their eventual participation is of course no less important than that of countries with which if only for geographical reasons we must deal first. We are thinking now of Western Europe as a unit. . . .

Mr. Zilliacus (Gateshead): . . . I now come to the question of non-interference in the internal affairs of the countries concerned. There is the system of the blocked accounts, that is, the fact that the sterling equivalent of materials we receive from the United States has to be paid into a blocked account, which can be drawn upon only for purposes approved of by the American agents of the Marshall Plan, who, of course, will apply their judgment as to what are sound economic purposes. I would refer also to the recent speech of Mr. John Snyder, the Secretary of the American Treasury, in which he said that America would insist upon her views as to balanced budgets, taxation and currency policies in the countries accepting American aid. There is a further indirect control. President Truman pointed out to Congress that it is voting this appropriation for 15 months only, at the end of which the whole thing has to start again and Congress has to approve a further appropriation; and, as President Truman told Congress, naturally approval will be conditional upon whether the Americans are satisfied, and whether Congress is satisfied, with the behaviour of the States which have received assistance in the first 15 months. All that adds up to a pretty comprehensive system of control over our economic and social policy.

However, that is by no means all . . . President Truman's message to Congress . . . explained in some detail that, to use his own words, the Marshall Plan is

"a major segment of American foreign policy."

It must be applied in conformity with the objects of American foreign policy, and the State Department must have a large part in the system of supervision of how the Plan is administered and carried out. There is not much ambiguity or

doubt about American foreign policy. As described by the Americans themselves, it is the defence of democracy and Western civilisation against Communism and the Soviet Union. I think a somewhat less tendentious description would be to say that it is a policy of containment and cold war against the forces of social change and social revolution in Asia and Europe, which are identified with Communism, which, in its turn, is identified with Soviet aggression and expansion.

The United States proposes to carry out this policy by using the threat of force, and ultimately the threat of war to back its views, its rights and interests against any challenge. It wishes to associate Great Britain and Western Europe closely as instruments of that policy, and as adjuncts of it. It is in fact, as the Leader of the Opposition has several times rightly declared, the Fulton Policy that has been adopted by President Truman. The Leader of the Opposition claims both the Foreign Secretary and President Truman as his fellow-travellers in world affairs.

Let us take the relationship of the Marshall Plan to American foreign policy. Let us take, first, the question of full trade with Eastern Europe. It must be considered together with the fact that the United States have been deliberately cutting down their trade with the Soviet Union. In four months, they have cut it down from 30 million dollars to 3 million dollars per month, purely as part of their political cold war. . . .

They have used their influence to prevent the International Bank of Reconstruction granting loans, for instance to Poland, when such loans clearly come within the four corners of the Bank's competence, and when the scheme put up by the Poles was one of the most constructive in Europe—that is, for expanding their coal production. . . . The French have already broken off their commercial negotiations with the Soviet Union. . . .

So long as the Marshall Plan is dominated by this American foreign policy, there is little or no chance of getting the Scandinavian countries to come into this Western Europe group. . . . When I was in Sweden last Spring, I met several leading members of the Social Democratic Government who . . . told me that whereas the Right would like Sweden to line up with a *bloc* of Western Powers pitted against the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, the Socialists were grimly determined to cling to neutrality and not allow themselves to be caught up in the Great Power rivalry. . . .

. . . The view of American leaders has been made quite clear. Secretary for War James Forrestal, in his recent speech, called for a Western European *bloc* tied up militarily with the United States, as well as through the Marshall Plan. Mr. Bernard Baruch, who is affectionately known as the wolf of Wall Street, also pressed this proposal with great emphasis. That is why I say that because the Marshall Plan is part and parcel of the present American foreign policy, I fear that it will prove no solution to our economic difficulties, and may land us in the next American slump, unless the latter is forestalled by another world war. . . .

. . . The House may think that my judgment of American foreign policy is harsh. If so, I would refer hon. Members to a sympathetic account of it, which was given by one of America's most intelligent and best informed of American newspaper publicists, Mr. Walter Lippman, in his book on American foreign policy entitled "The Cold War." He is no starry-eyed idealist, but a hard-boiled realist, who himself

accepts the principle of containment and cold war, but objects to the way in which the Administration is trying to carry it out. What he says about United States foreign policy is that it is based on the Truman doctrine, which is derived from the views on foreign policy of one of Mr. Truman's leading experts, Mr. George F. Kennan, who is head of the policy planning department of the State Department. He is also the author of what I can only describe as the monstrous article in the quarterly "Foreign Affairs," by Mr. X, entitled "Sources of Soviet Conduct."

The whole thesis of that article, according to Mr. Lippman, was that American foreign policy is based on the theory that the Soviet regime is inaccessible to reason; cannot be dealt with by peaceful means, has no elements of and cannot evolve towards democracy, and will respond only to threats of force. He says, further, that they will not respond readily to threats of force, and the treatment must be continued for 10 to 15 years until, as a result of continued frustration, the Soviet regime will be modified or overthrown from within. . . .

. . . The most important point Mr. Lippman makes is that this policy is bound to end in failure. His reasons, I think, are convincing. They are rooted in the very character and structure of American Government and democracy, which cannot be geared for war in peacetime and cannot go on threatening countries over a long period of years without disrupting the internal life of the country and sickening its people. The policy is already failing. . . .

"Science, Liberty and Peace"

Messrs. Chatto and Windus state that Mr. Aldous Huxley's book is sold out and that it is not possible, in present circumstances, to give a date at which reprints will be available.

DOES IT FIT THE FACTS ?

(Major Douglas's correspondence with the Rev. Dr. Salis Daiches in *The Scotsman*: collected by B. M. Palmer).

4/.

From K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution	8/6
Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy	6/6
Warning Democracy	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket	2/-
Money and the Price System	7d.
The Use of Money	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1s.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.	1d.

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.