

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 23. No. 13.

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

"It may be that both Tory and Labor politicians here [London] are misinterpreting American [*i.e.*, U.S.] sentiment to-day. The Labor Party seems to take it for granted that American opposition to their socialist programme is inspired by 'Wall Street' and the Tories also seem to assume this. But I have found that our [U.S.] hardheaded businessmen in London are giving all kinds of tolerant excuses for the blunders and difficulties of the Labor Party, while the old-timer from the A.F.L. [American Federation of Labor] isn't having any.—*Saturday Evening Post*, U.S.A.

Now isn't that odd? And you may shout the story into the ear of practically any "Conservative" and he will say, if anything, "My dear fellow, it is so difficult to see what you Social Crediters are driving at. Just put the matter in a nutshell."

It must be that we simply haven't got what it takes.

• • •

We understand that Mr. Ernest Bevin and Mr. Solon Low, the Canadian Social Credit M.P., were seen laughing together in Ottawa, recently. No doubt they're right.

• • •

It is essential that the readers of this review should have a clear conception of the High Policy of the New York Kahal and the various Gentile groups, Masonic, Banking, and Industrial, who together make up the body of men to whom Walther Rathenau made reference (and paid with his life for the reference) when he said "The world is ruled by less than four hundred men, all of whom know each other, and who choose their successors."

MONOPOLY is the key word, and Cassell's Dictionary correctly and suggestively defines the word as meaning "exclusive right." Dr. Skeat connects the second half of the word with a Greek word meaning "to be busy." Comprehensively, then, "monopoly" is the "sole *right* to be busy." Note that it does not mean that the monopolist alone is busy, it means that the right is vested in him, and any "business" by anyone else must be carried on under licence.

Now, "Full employment" under monopoly means that everyone is busy *under licence*, not under either attraction or initiative, still less fundamental necessity. The policy behind the license is that of the monopolist. It is always the same policy; to confirm and strengthen the power and privilege of the monopolist.

"Labour" is almost the primary basis of monopoly. Clearly, every "employment" on "private initiative" (domestic service, undirected farming, private medical practice, *etc.*) is a breach of "Full Employment." To keep this from becoming too blatant the propaganda of "in war, or under threat of war," "the dollar shortage," "the export drive," together with fantastically excessive capital production to compete with identical production elsewhere and the development of industrial sabotage by every possible means

(breaking-up of surplus war stocks, demolition of German factories so as to build them up again, construction of immense Highland Hydro-electric plants sixty years after they are economically justifiable, and myriads of other examples) are broadcast to the public on Hitler's principle that if you only make a lie big enough and repeat it sufficiently most people will believe it. Anyway, it doesn't matter much whether they do, or not. The trap has been sprung.

The first point to recognise in the consideration of a countervailing strategy is that the Kahal is not concerned for one moment with the success of a policy of monopoly *from any point of view except that of the monopolist*. He doubtless derives great pleasure from the contemplation of his work in the finance of "the workers" in their destruction of their only defence—the small employer, and much cynical amusement at their aid in "bringing down the landlords" by ferocious taxation. That this has prepared the ground for equally ferocious taxation of "the worker" quite probably adds the final spice to the dish. But it must be recognised that the objective of the New Order is "Full Employment"; *not results*.

Grasp this clearly, and it is easy to see that the first objective of a strategy directed to the defeat of the Kahal should be widespread unemployment in the mass-production industries. It ought to be obvious to anyone that the State Monopolies such as the Post Office, Fuel and Power Industries and Transport do not, now, even claim to be "efficient," their pet word. They are controlled from behind by the Kahal, which is why the "hard-headed [U.S.] business-men" to whom the *Saturday Evening Post* makes reference, many of whom are called Cohen, are thoroughly pleased with the "Labor" set-up and make every effort to prolong its sway.

• • •

Mr. Emanuel (God-with-us) Shinwell complained to the Gateshead audience he addressed recently that the food at the Guildhall Banquet which was graced by his presence compared unfavourably with that to which he is now accustomed.

We have heard that banquets given frequently in Park Lane by a Zionist co-racialist who specialises in the entertainment of Cabinet Ministers compare favourably with anything obtainable outside the Kremlin. After all, what is the Guildhall to the Kremlin? And is not Mr. Shinwell more widely connected with Russia than with England?

• • •

We notice reference in several quarters to the death in Paris of M. Georges Gurdjieff, the mysterious promoter and Head of the Institute in the Forest of Fontainebleau at which Mr. A. R. Orage spent some years in the latter portion of his life. What we have not noticed is any reference to the fact that Gurdjieff of Paris, and M. Dorjjeff the Russian Agent in Lhasa, who was the proximate cause of the Younghusband Military Mission to Thibet, were one and the same.

The world has by no means finished with Thibet.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: November 9, 1949.

Colonial Empire (Loans)

Mr. Thomas Reid asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies in how many cases since 1900 have the repayment of Colonial loans been waived and therefore met by the British taxpayer; and what was the total sum so waived.

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Creech Jones): As the reply contains many figures I will, with my hon. Friend's permission, circulate a statement in the OFFICIAL REPORT.

Mr. Reid: Can my right hon. Friend say what the total sum was, and if in the case of the very big loans which have been raised recently by the Colonies, the British Government although they may have no legal responsibility for repayment of loans are in fact responsible because the funds in question are trustee securities?

Mr. Creech Jones: The total sum, including loans to the High Commission territories in South Africa and, I believe, Newfoundland as well, is in the neighbourhood of £17 million. I should have to consider the last part of the supplementary question before giving an answer.

Sir Waldron Smithers: Do these loans and their destinations come under the scrutiny of the Auditor-General?

Mr. Creech Jones: Yes, Sir, most emphatically.

Following is the Statement:

Since 1900 the repayment of 28 Colonial loans has been waived by His Majesty's Government; the total sum waived is £16,681,384. This figure includes three loans in respect of the South Africa High Commission territories of Swaziland and the Bechuanaland Protectorate, totalling £653,400, and one loan of £124,098 in respect of Transjordan.

In addition there have been 61 cases in which loans made for schemes under the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts of 1929, 1940 and 1945 have subsequently been converted either wholly or in part, to free grants, involving a sum of £1,203,349. Of these conversions five, totalling £563,773, have been in favour of Newfoundland and 28, totalling £273,069, in favour of the South Africa High Commission territories.

House of Commons: November 10, 1949.

Gold (Dollar Price)

Mr. Stokes asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer what instructions were given to the British representative at the recent meeting of the International Monetary Fund in America at which it was decided that there should be no change in the dollar price of gold.

Mr. Jay: I presume that my hon. Friend is referring to the resolution placed on the agenda of the fourth annual meeting of the Board of Governors of the International Monetary Fund by the Union of South Africa. This resolution did not relate to the official dollar price of gold, but to gold sales at premium prices. The resolution was taken by a committee of the Board of Governors which recommended that the resolution be referred to the Executive Board for study and report to the Governors. This was in accordance with the instructions given to the British representative. The recommendation was accepted, and so no decision on the

substance of the resolution was taken.

Mr. Stokes: I could not hear half of that answer, but is my hon. Friend aware that I was not referring to that resolution at all, and that I merely want to know whether the British representative at this meeting was instructed or was not instructed to press for a rise in the dollar price of gold? That is the question to which I want an answer.

Mr. Jay: As I have explained, that question did not arise and, therefore, no instructions were necessary.

Mr. Stokes: Might I ask whether neither my hon. Friend nor his right hon. and learned Friend understand the significance of a difference in the dollar price of gold? Surely some instructions were given to the British representative who went there?

Mr. Jay: As I have informed my hon. Friend before, the question of the dollar price of gold is a question for the Government of the United States.

Mr. Stokes: In view of the continued dissatisfaction which I have got from both the Chancellor of the Exchequer and my hon. Friend, I beg to give notice that I shall raise this matter on the Adjournment.

National Coal Board (Annual Report)

The Minister of Fuel and Power (Mr. Gaitskell): I beg to move,

"That this House takes note of the Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the National Coal Board for 1948."

This Debate is important, not only because it is concerned with, perhaps, our greatest basic industry, but also because it is the first occasion on which Parliament has had an opportunity of discussing the annual report of a nationalised board. Of course, on many occasions in recent months and years we have discussed the progress of the coal industry, and, indeed, argued for a time about the organisation of the National Coal Board. But this is the first time that we have had under consideration the annual report. . . . The nationalisation Act places upon the Board a duty to make supplies of coal available

"at such prices as may seem to them best calculated to further the public interest in all respects."

In other words, under the Act the Minister has no specific powers of price control whatever. The National Coal Board however, continued a voluntary agreement which had been entered into by their predecessors, the former mine-owners, with the then Minister of Fuel and Power, not to increase prices without permission.

This voluntary agreement still applies to the home market, but in 1947, when exports were resumed, the Government freed the Coal Board from this agreement on export and bunker prices. This was a deliberate decision of the Government; we considered that it was best and right that the National Coal Board should operate completely freely and commercially in the export market and, in fact, they are free to fix their prices on commercial considerations, in the same way as any other exporter.

I must make it clear that I have complete confidence in the Board's judgment on these matters. There is no doubt that they take fully into account the important aspect of goodwill and they have not taken undue advantage of the rather strong situation in which any seller in the coal export market has stood recently. They have reduced prices where they thought they could sell more, for instance of some

of the poorer qualities of coal. . . .

. . . There has been much talk about the recent increases in the case of Denmark, and one of my hon. Friends has referred to that matter. I want to explain to the House what has happened here. Following an increase in the prices asked for coal by the competitors of the National Coal Board, and in particular Poland, the National Coal Board put up the price of some of the scarcer qualities. The actual increase was, I think, 12½ per cent. on large coal and only 3 per cent. on graded coal. It is, therefore, not a very striking increase, and even after this increase the National Coal Board's prices compare favourably with those of their competitors. . . . It does not seem to me that there is any reason, bearing in mind the factors I have considered, why the National Coal Board should not get a reasonable price for coal in the foreign markets. I think we should be making a great mistake if we were to intervene and, indeed, it would be surprising if the Opposition were to tell us to do that in view of the strictures passed upon us in connection with the sterling balances.

There is one other matter in this connection to which I should refer. As the House is aware, and as I mentioned in reply to a supplementary question last week, the O.E.E.C. is considering what is known as the dual price system—that is a difference in price in the home and the foreign markets. I am sure the House will appreciate that it would not be right for me to say very much on this matter at this stage, but I do want to say that our prices at home are lower than our foreign prices, partly because we happen to control prices at home. We deliberately keep them down, and certainly there would be a very different picture if there was no control of the kind I have indicated.

The second point is that this system of dual prices is by no means confined to coal. It would not be right, I think, for me to go into cases of the products of other countries, but I can say that in at least one other major industry in this country, namely, the steel industry, there is no doubt a similar dual price system. The Opposition, therefore, should be very careful before they criticise too severely a system which may be bringing us considerable benefits.

I now turn to the record of the National Coal Board as set out in the report. . . .

Consumption was 192½ million tons and, after taking into account open-cast production and a slight fall in total stocks, the result was to achieve a level of exports and bunkers of 16¼ million tons, which is about three times the level in 1947. The causes of the increased output are perfectly clear. There was an increase in the year of 5,000 face workers, there was a slight improvement in the attendance among face workers and there was an increase in the output per man-shift at the face from 2.86 to 2.92 tons. These figures are in themselves unquestionably encouraging figures. On all reasonable standards they constitute a good performance. There is no doubt, I think, that 1948 was a good year for the National Coal Board and the industry.

Moreover, the financial position of the Board was much improved. A trading loss of £6,000,000 in 1947 was converted into a trading profit of £17,500,000. A total deficit after meeting capital charges, including revenue payments, of £23 million was converted into a surplus of £1,500,000. Of course, it is perfectly true—and I do not wish in any way to disguise the fact—that this favourable result was largely the result of the higher prices continuing over the full year; and it is also the case that costs as between 1947 and

1948 rose by about 4s. 4d. a ton; but it is also a fact that throughout the year the increase in costs was gradually dropping off, and by the end of 1948 costs had begun to fall.

Nevertheless, we cannot ignore two less favourable items which have to be brought into any unbiased survey of the industry. Undoubtedly, increased output was partly due to Saturday working. . . . This increase, though it affected the increase of output in 1948 over that of 1947, obviously could not lead to an increase in 1949 over 1948. The second feature which was less favourable was, that during the year attendance deteriorated, as the following figures show. The average number of shifts worked per worker in November and December, 1947, was 4.85. It had fallen to 4.74 in the corresponding months of 1948.

The main subject we are considering is the 1948 Report, but I think the House will expect me very briefly to refer to the 1949 position—to what has happened since the Report came out. . . . From 202 million to 207 million tons were the figures we put as an estimate of deep-mine output. We put opencast at 13 million tons. On the basis of a consumption of from 198 million to 200 million tons we thought that we might export between 17 million and 20 million tons.

Well, the industry is now going full out to get within those brackets. Whether they succeed or not it is far too early to say, but, fortunately, consumption has been slightly below the estimate, and it now seems certain we shall achieve the export estimate. . . .

The financial position has also, of course, much improved, and in the first six months a clear profit, after capital charges had been met, of £6,500,000 was achieved. . . .

. . . I now turn to a sphere in which I think we all agree the National Coal Board have been notably successful—the sphere of productivity, or output per man-shift. The figures are pretty well known. Output per man-shift which was 1.14 in 1938, had fallen to 1.00 in 1944 and 1945. It then went up to 1.03 in 1946. In the first year of nationalisation, in 1947, it was 1.07, 4 per cent. up; in the second year it was 1.11, another 4 per cent. up; and this year it is, I think, certain to be at least 1.15, and may very well be 1.16. . . .

Mr. Pickthorn (Cambridge University): I think that I am the first speaker to venture into this Debate with no possible kind of claim to any sort of expertness. I hope that the House will think it fair to remember that the House of Commons is not primarily a panel of experts but a common jury on a grand scale. . . .

. . . Today the right hon. Gentleman made some remarks about the double price system, and it seems to me that this wants a little more elaboration and elucidation than we have had so far. As I followed him, he said, "Well of course prices in this country are low, because they are fixed; we fix them, and we fix them as low as we can. And of course," said he, "prices to foreigners are high because we can get it out of them. And why not?" That I think, was the argument. It has already been said that that argument does not show a very long-term kind of political wisdom. I think it has already been indicated, if not expressly said, that that argument is an extremely strong argument against the socialisation of industries which necessarily reach across the frontiers, and that does really want considering.

There are other reasons why it wants considering. You

(Continued on page 6.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: *CEN*tral 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone *SEF*ton Park 435.

Vol. 23. No. 13. Saturday, November 26, 1949.

The Hand of Treachery*

The devaluation of the pound sterling constitutes an outrageous act of treachery against the British people everywhere. It is a racket of the first magnitude. This may seem a harsh statement unless there is an understanding, both of the effects of the devaluation and of the general policy involved.

In the inspired propaganda which accompanied the devaluation announcement and the carefully arranged stage-setting for this action by the Washington conferences and the subsequent statements that were released, great care has been taken to emphasize the advantages which devaluation of the pound will have on stimulating British exports to dollar countries. This supposedly will help Great Britain to secure much-needed imports.

What has been carefully concealed are the results, and the actual purpose, of this act of treachery.

First, the devaluation of the pound in relation to the U.S. dollar by a further 30 *per cent.* will have the effect of increasing the British debt to her U.S. creditors (*i.e.*, the financial corporations of Wall and Pine Streets) by over 70 *per cent.* above the par rate of exchange, and by over 40 *per cent.* above the rate of exchange ruling immediately before the announcement.

This means that the people of Great Britain will have to work for nothing to produce wealth in the form of production for her creditors to the extent of 40 *per cent.* over and above what they were doing immediately before the devaluation.

Secondly, the British people will be forced to produce goods for export to an even greater extent than previously in order to get the imports they need. Every bushel of U.S. wheat, every U.S. film, every U.S. product they require will have to be paid for by over 40 *per cent.* more in British-made goods.

Put in another way, immediately before the devaluation the people of Great Britain had to export goods costing £5 to produce in order to obtain a credit of 20 U.S. dollars. Now they will have to export goods costing £7 to obtain a credit of 20 U.S. dollars, either for the purchase of goods or for the payment of debt.

Thus the people of Great Britain, like the slave labour of other days, will be forced to work harder so that the proceeds of their labour may be given away without any return.

Thirdly, because imports will cost more, and prices will increase, and therefore purchasing power in Great Britain will be curtailed, British manufacturers will, to an

*From *Social Credit* (Ontario), "the official organ of the Canadian Social Credit Movement, a non-party organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise."

increasing extent, be obliged to produce for export markets, thus causing even greater hardships to the British people.

This is apart from the appalling price the people of Great Britain are having to pay for the disastrous luxury of a Socialist regime—for every penny paid in the crushing taxation being imposed upon individuals means that, in the final analysis, the workers in the field of production are giving the equivalent in the wealth they produce to "the State"—*i.e.*, primarily to those who benefit from the debt and tax structure of the State.

Time was when British people sang lustily that "Britons never, never shall be slaves." The stark fact is that the British people have been reduced to abject slavery.

That this has been achieved by the pursuit of a pre-meditated and deliberate conspiracy, there can be no doubt. It forms part of a general plot to impose upon the entire world an absolute tyranny modelled on the pattern of the Soviet Union. And because Great Britain and the ideal of democracy inherent in the British social structure were formidable barriers to the achievement of that goal, a full-scale offensive against them has been the focus of higher international politics.

The plight of Great Britain—and, for that matter, of all Europe—has not been caused by the American people or the U.S. Government, nor by any people or government as such, but by the hidden Dark Forces in the world who are pursuing a deliberate conspiracy for the enslavement of humanity. Until people recognise the identity of these forces and the nature of the conspiracy they are pursuing, they will continue to fall helpless victims to their machinations.

Such an understanding will open people's eyes, not only to the implications of such actions as this devaluation racket, but to the powers controlling governments and international affairs, and the terrible peril of the situation which is developing—L. D. BYRNE.

Domestic

Our readers will be pleased to hear that the first-fruits of the recent distribution of the Social Credit Secretariat Statement of Constitution in which was suggested a new method of collecting subscriptions for the maintenance of the Secretariat are reaching the Liverpool office in numbers which encourage the belief that the results will be satisfactory. The Secretariat thanks its supporters for this response. Several interesting letters have been received from readers who do not often correspond with us. Replies have been sent to these, but instructions to banks, on the printed forms supplied, are not acknowledged in most cases until payments are notified by the respective banks concerned.

May we say that extra copies of the Statement are available for distribution by readers who want them?

In general, there is no occasion that we can see to be greatly dissatisfied with the situation. The Social Credit movement in Great Britain has an exceptionally hard row to hoe, and no opportunity is allowed to it avoidably. Most Social Crediters understand that this is so. Nevertheless there are opportunities which cannot be prevented, and the increasing apprehension of not only rank and file members or followers of the "Conservative" Party but their leaders, that the supposititious "victory" upon which they are staking, or pretend to be staking their all is uncertain, is one of them. The field for work on "Light Horse" lines is constantly widening.

Afterword to Planning the Earth

by C. G. DOBBS

The Earth has been called our Mother; but so far as this life, and these bodies, are concerned we never escape from her womb. As Bryan Monohan has pointed out, our bodies are a part of the Earth's crust, as it were clouds or vortices moving over the surface through which its matter is for ever flowing and passing on so that in seven years all is replaced. In this we are at one with all the other creatures which are in, and on, and of the soil; and of which, and by which, the soil is made. For the land is not merely a mass of rock fragments, nor even a mixture of these with living things, but a flow of matter through living forms, a continuous movement of unthinkable variety and awe-inspiring complexity, the type of balance known as a dynamic equilibrium—a balance of separated powers constituting, in any given place, one whole, one entity.

For a century now the followers of Malthus and Darwin and Marx have emphasised *the struggle for existence* until it has become an obsession with mankind, and thoughts being things, thinking has made it so. As if there were nothing but war in Nature—as if in Nature there were no peace. No peace in Nature! Where then do we go for peace?

It is not, of course, that there is no struggle, or that we should not concern ourselves with it, but the struggle is incidental to the existence, for in so far as things exist they constitute an equilibrium. But our Darwinists seem very readily to forget what the struggle is for! A struggle which is not for existence is necessarily for non-existence; and that is the sort of struggle which is brought to mind by phrases such as 'the survival of the fittest,' 'Nature red in tooth and claw,' which suggest that it is the *aggressive* forms of life, the cruel and cunning killers, who are the winners in the struggle for existence.

But the plain fact is that, in Nature, it is not so. It is the meek who inherit the earth, and the killers have enslaved themselves to them by becoming parasites whose very existence depends upon the survival, in superior numbers, of their hosts; whom they the predators and parasites, serve, in their servile and unpleasant fashion, by ensuring that their meekness shall not become weakness. But if these slaves become masters then indeed they make a solitude which may be called peace, but has nothing in common with the peace of Nature;—a desert in which at first the lion's voice is heard alone (the Prince alone speaks) hungrily roaring for his prey, and then—the universal silence.

It is a thing that we, who kill and eat and dig up and cut down, would do well to remember: that we are stewards, not masters, that what we take away we must give back, and that when we fail to do so we cut our own throats, we dig up our own roots, we cut down our own family trees, and all our pride, and our civilisation, comes down to the earth.

That life and liberty are aspects of the same thing is not just a sententious saying, it is the literal truth; for life is an equilibrium, and the maintenance of an equilibrium is dependent upon the existence of independent, separated powers, *i.e.* upon liberty; but even more than that, the whole course and development of a life is effected by its expression in the material world. In the simplest case, if we are not free to breathe, or to eat what we need, then that something

which expresses itself by causing matter to flow into the form of our bodies ceases so to express itself; and though there are restrictions less total and immediate than these they all cripple and abort the development of life in some direction. Thus, if we say that it is liberty alone that we fight and contend for, we are only saying that we are fighting for life, that our struggle is for existence and not against it, the defensive, reactionary (in the biological sense *i.e. responsible* at the human level) struggle which the 'progressives' so despise, and which alone can preserve the balance necessary for life.

As for the idea that 'progress' can result from the conflict, it is an hallucination. The struggle is between death and life, between the destruction and the survival of the *status quo*, with its potentiality for growth and development; but the progress itself does not arise from conflict of any sort, but from discovery—the development of new sympathies of the mind for the world outside it—the very reverse of a conflict with Nature or any of her creatures.

Meanwhile there are many solitudes which the Planners make in the name of peace, all having the uniformity and inertia of death: the solitude of statistics, in which the voice of the Statistician alone is heard in the silent wilderness of units substituted for living things; the solitude of monoculture which, like all other forms of Monopoly, is a standing invitation to all parasites to flourish unchecked until they have destroyed their hosts and themselves; the solitude which follows the use of the atomic bomb and the biological poison, the solitude of the World State and all forms of remote control and Monopoly, and the desolation of all things which are too big.

Fortunately there is waiting for every Planner, as for the rest of us, the further solitude of the grave, soon to give place to the plentiful companionship of the earth; and though most of them seem to try to escape this by being cremated and rendered, quite appropriately, into gas, a little sooner than is strictly necessary, they cannot thereby escape their personal responsibility, to give back to the earth its due.

But if they think that their responsibility ends there, they are indeed taking an enormous risk, and staking everything upon the blind faith that the law of action and reaction is limited to material things. Every day the Planners are doing things to other people which are not material. It is not merely that they starve us or keep 'in short supply,' as the phrase goes, the things which are not scarce. The graver crime is that they tempt and bully us into greed and meanness and constant worry and pre-occupation with what we shall eat and what we shall drink and wherewithal we shall be clothed; they tempt and trick us into lying in filling in their forms and questionnaires; daily they make new crimes for us to commit; and always they seek to bind our spirit, by the lethargy and inertia of the body, to the physical means of life and comfort under their control.

It is indeed an improbable theory that these things can be done in a vacuum, without effect or response; that when the earth receives its own, all is finished and paid for; and that that something which expresses itself in the flow of the earth's crust into the form of a man arises *de novo* from the fusion of two small bits of jelly and may be brought to an end at any moment 'with a bare bodkin'. This assumption, that life arises from the properties of matter, though a long overdue reaction has set in against it, is still generally accepted among 'scientists,' despite the fact that it lies completely outside the 'universe' to which they have limited

themselves, and beyond the reach of the only proofs they are prepared to accept. There is no attempt to rely on physico-chemical evidence, or estimates of the statistical probabilities; it is no more than an arbitrary denial unsupported by a fragment of evidence, of the basis of Christianity, and indeed the wisdom of all Ages and of all races of humanity. Now that it has dominated 'progress' and 'progressive' thought for over a century it is possible to come to a conclusion about it; and, judging by the way it is working out in the world, the only sane conclusion is that it is unjustified.

But in that case the material world is of more, not less, significance than if it were all, for it expresses something of greater significance than itself, which, nevertheless, may be altered and affected by it; and our responsibilities must begin with the earth, yet cannot end with it. Life, in the commonly understood sense of an incarnation in time, is an opportunity for choice; and choice is that substance of life which determines the direction of its development; but choice involves responsibility, and it is dependent not only upon *life* (incarnation) and *liberty* (freedom to choose between real, not Planned, alternatives) but also upon the third member of the trio, *property* (in its deepest sense). When we speak of a property of anything we mean that which is proper to it, which makes a part of its nature. In this sense choice is a property of the human personality as we know it. When the word is applied to material things, and especially to the land, it still retains the meaning: that for which one is responsible, one's own, of which one is made.

But a choice must be a *proper* choice; proper, that is, to the one who makes it, not somebody else's choice. Centralised Planning is the stealing of choices.

The effect, which is everywhere apparent in the world to-day, of making other people's choices instead of one's own, is to destroy the personality. It is *suicism*—suicide of the self; perhaps the only way in which the soul of man can be destroyed. Ironically enough it is attained by the Planners through over-weaning pride, a monstrous attempt to swell the self until it can engulf other people, if possible the whole world. It is a fact of observation. As a young man becomes increasingly involved in Planning other people's lives his personality is gradually replaced by another which is much the same everywhere. It is not a human personality; it is the Adversary of the human race.

As for the rest of us, the victims or intended victims, to the extent that we seek to save ourselves by submitting to improper choices, we also lose our lives; literally, we lose the very substance and property of life which enables us to develop our personalities. The Planned and regulated years pass, and we do not live. Is it not so?

But there is always a proper choice left to us. The wealth and power, the comforts and conveniences, of the modern world are potentially additions to the range of choice and the abundance of life; not indeed in the centralised form in which they now serve the purposes of Planners, but in the decentralised form in which they could obviously be planned to serve all our purposes. They are the alternative to our present frustration—the alternative which the real universe offers to us, and which sane men and women very properly choose when it is placed before them. The means whereby this choice could be generally made available, both financially and politically, are known, and the knowledge is preserved in the body of thought called Social Credit. But so long as the true alternatives are not presented, so long as the surrender of choice, of the very substance of life, is represented as the

necessary price of bare material sufficiency, let alone plenty, the choice is made an improper one.

In the last resort the life (person) is more than his life (incarnation), and so it is possible to understand how our lives may be crippled and lost by 'saving' them on the Planners' terms, or, in the final necessity, saved, and given the fullest available expression, by 'losing' them. But the choice offered by the Planners is always a false and a fraudulent one. The material and the spiritual are not in antithesis as they would have us believe, they go hand in hand. The material cost of Planning is always heavier than any possible gain. They give us the 'flood control' and 'soil conservation' of the Great Lakes of the South, the 'security' of the Atom Bomb. On the reverse side of this coin there is a Head, representing the Kingdom and, if we choose it, all the material things which we need will be added to us.

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

see, it has to be looked at upon a basis of our requiring help from foreigners—Americans and others—and upon the basis of our trading being open to objection in the opposite respect from the point of view of some foreigners. For instance, the other day we were told that we sell motor cars to the United States public at a loss. Now if as a result of the nationalisation of some industries, and practically complete control by the Government of export industries, we are to be under the risk of being justly accused by foreigners whenever it may suit them, although we depend upon them for their kindness, on the one hand of profiteering out of them and on the other hand of dumping on them, then the continuation of an international economic system will become extremely difficult.

Nor on any explanation thus far given us by the right hon. Gentleman is this double price system at all compatible with any of the principles upon which hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite have risen to greatness. Where is your egalitarianism now? Where is your hate of profiteering now? Where is your internationalism now? If when you have got something to sell to a foreigner it is right to get as much out of him as you can, within limits of reason, and so on, regardless of your costs, then there is much to be said for that within the price-mechanism of a capitalist-enterprise system.

If that is right when you are dealing with foreigners, why is it not right when you are dealing at home? Alternatively, if there is some distinction between the two, where is your internationalism, the internationalism of the miners, particularly, who are or were awfully keen on internationalism and the like, sending money to chaps at places like Lens, for instance? These things do not really stand together, and we ought to have some explanation of that, otherwise we are bound to conclude that there is a good deal of muddle-headedness in the matter.

The main reason why I rose to my feet was because this is an important constitutional occasion, as the right hon.

THE OLD TESTAMENT

(Translated by Ronald A. Knox)

Two Vols.

42/- net.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.

Gentleman very properly indicated to us in his opening remarks. Incidentally, the fact of his indicating that it was an important constitutional occasion—and I think this should go on record in HANSARD—makes complete nonsense of the leadership of this House during the last four years on the matter of nationalisation bills; because over and over again I argued that even one large nationalisation Bill had necessarily a large constitutional content, and that any planned complex of several nationalisation Bills *a fortiori* had an extremely large constitutional content.

Although that was admitted sometimes at the beginning of this Parliament by hon. Gentlemen opposite before they saw the point of the admission, and although the Lord President of the Council over and over again promised at the Select Committee on Procedure, that Bills of any constitutional content should always be taken on the Floor of the House, yet they were not. But today the right hon. Gentleman, when he reminded us that this was an important and unprecedented constitutional occasion, made nonsense of the whole way in which the main legislative business of this House has been conducted for the last four and a half years.

The right hon. Gentleman told us that there were considerable fields of activity in mining where the Minister is not responsible, and I really think this question ought to be asked, even if it cannot be answered on the first of these occasions, and then perhaps repeatedly asked on other occasions until we do think out the answer to it: On those parts of this business where the Minister is not responsible, who is responsible? Really, all this technique of boards, corporations and whatnot, which have no liability, however limited, and have no responsibility which any man or any court can perceive, is only a way of removing from democracy those things which the people are presumed to care most about. That is all they are, and let hon. Gentlemen opposite who are keener on proclaiming themselves democrats than I am, reflect upon that. Who is responsible? The right hon. Gentleman told us, "The ultimate control of course rests with Parliament." Well, "ultimate" is a question-begging word. But waiving that, "of course" seems to be the interesting part of that sentence. In what course of Parliamentary procedure can we really make the Coal Board responsible to us, if it ought to be responsible to us, directly or indirectly? No indication was given to us of how that could be done.

Finally, I return to the point at which I began, where the right hon. Gentleman quoted approvingly the "Financial Times" as saying that we ought to treat this as a non-party matter, as a shareholders' meeting, or a council of State. He said that there was much to be said for the view of the "Financial Times." I agree; I think there is a great deal to be said for the view of the "Financial Times," and in that respect I ask the right hon. Gentleman to consider some remarks of his own made—I have forgotten when—at Porthcawl, I think it was. He will remember the occasion; he was bathed that time—in tears. Do not think for a moment that in giving this quotation I am adopting the right hon. Gentleman's indictment of the miners. I do nothing of the sort; I do not know enough about it. This is what he said:

"How can any of us defend those who week after week are content to work four shifts only? How can we answer the criticism 'It is high wages that have done it. They make enough in four.?'"

Incidentally, practically every speech from the other side

today has echoed that criticism rather strikingly. Any hon. Member carefully reading HANSARD tomorrow will see that time after time, implicitly, that has been said by almost every speaker opposite. The right hon. Gentleman went on:

"How can we explain the conduct of men who work three weeks full time and then take the fourth week off? Men who are supporters of the Labour Government, to whom that Government appeals at the moment of its greatest crisis?"

That was at the greatest crisis in July, 1948. Of course, we have had two greater ones since. No doubt if the dissolution is put off for another six months we shall have two more. That was in the days of the greatest crisis to date. What is meant by these words "Supporters of the Labour Government"?

How is it supposed that constitutional government of any sort is to survive and this House is to have any kind of constitutional control, how it is supposed that there is to be any real responsibility, how will those who manage and finance and direct and exploit—I use the word in no offensive sense, but in a neutral sense—the coal industry, be in any sense held responsible to this House and the British people if it is to be suggested that somehow or other men ought to work more when there is a Government of their party and less when there is a Government of another party?

Is that the suggestion or is it not? That suggestion was often made at the last General Election. It has been repeated explicitly and implicitly quite often by Ministers—I was going to say important Ministers—I mean more senior Ministers up till recently. We ought to be told before there is another General Election. . . .

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fuel and Power (Mr. Robens): . . . I regret very much indeed the remarks of the senior Burgess for Cambridge University (Mr. Pickthorn). I sometimes think that the greatest and best reason for abolishing the university Parliamentary seats lies in the Parliamentary representatives of the universities. I have been brought up amongst some rum people, but I have never met such people as the hon. Gentleman, who are supposed to be well educated and yet who can utter the type of cynical abuse he does. My right hon. Friend had more courage than the hon. Member would have. He went down to Porthcawl to the annual meeting of the National Union of Mineworkers at its invitation, and he addressed the miners themselves. He did not make speeches in the country. He did not go abroad to denigrate the miners and the mining industry, but went to the miners and put to them the facts of the situation.

Colonel Stoddart-Scott (Pudsey and Otley): He wept.

Mr. Robens: Yes, and if he did, it takes a brave man to do so; and if he is emotional, then that is a good thing sometimes. . . .

SOCIAL CREDIT and CATHOLICISM

by GEORGES-HENRI LEVESQUE, O.P.,

Professor of Economics, Laval and Montreal
Universities. (Published in Australia)

PRICE 1/-

Freemasonry and Communism

It may go for something that a whitewashing operation seems to be in operation concerning the political effects of Freemasonry in England, about which two letters have been published by the *Sunday Times*. The first asked for intervention by Freemasonry to combat Communism, and this has been followed by the following anonymous letter in the issue of November 20:—

"Sir,—I wish to support strongly Past Master's letter in your issue of last Sunday. Not long ago the question of the infiltration of Communism into Freemasonry was raised at a Masonic gathering which I attended. I was shocked when one of the highest ranking officers of Grand Lodge who was present said that Grand Lodge could take no preventive or eradivative action.

"Communism has already destroyed many countries and peoples, and unless it is combated resolutely it will ultimately destroy both Britain and British Freemasonry."

The Breakdown

The Ministry of Food informs us that we can play our part in "the dollar-saving struggle" thrust upon us by mis-government in the following ways, each of which illustrates the deterioration of the living standard which is alleged to have risen:—

By mixing saccharin with sugar in the proportion of 30 tablets of saccharin to 8 ounces of sugar. This is called "strengthening" the sugar.

By soaking stale bread to make it edible.

By using what used to be thrown away as garbage as food.

By adulterating butter and margarine with the addition of flour, salt, milk and water. This is called "extending" the butter.

By wetting loaves and rebaking them.

The Government Press Officer in Northern Ireland has issued the following concerning rural electrification (italics not in original):—

"For the present, I can assure the House that every effort will be made to avoid in Northern Ireland the suspension of rural electrification," said the Minister of Commerce in the Ulster Parliament to-day. He was winding-up a statement made in reply to a question put by Mr. May who asked whether the Minister had any statement to make regarding rural electrification following on the statement made by the Minister of Finance in the House on Tuesday last.

The Minister replied—My Ministry has had discussions with the Electricity Board at which the latter represented that *progress in rural electrification is meeting with increasing difficulties*, due in large measure to a fall in the per capita consumption in rural areas consequent upon the withdrawal of the guarantee system. This fall, I regret to say, is far in excess of anything which I would have regarded as likely when the 1948 Act was placed on the Statute Book. My Ministry is examining in detail the case submitted by the Board. This involves close investigation of all aspects of the question, including, on the one hand, *the impact of the recently announced economy cuts on the availability of equipment*, both home produced and imported, and on the other hand *considerations of rising costs and of the existing*

structure of the Board's finances. All this will occupy some time but I can assure the House that the Ministry's conclusions and proposals will be presented to the House as soon as possible. The Government fully realises the importance of this matter and the anxiety in the minds of Members representing rural districts. The House will appreciate the difficulties surrounding this matter, and understanding those difficulties, some of which have only recently arisen, they will realise that until my Ministry has explored all the possibilities I am not in a position to advise the Government as to what I consider to be the policy which it is incumbent on us to adopt in the best interests of all concerned. I regret, therefore, that I cannot make a more detailed statement at the moment but I hope to be able to do so at a later date, following the promise given by the Minister of Finance, and to give the House an opportunity for full discussion before the Christmas recess. For the present I can assure the House that every effort will be made to avoid in Northern Ireland the suspension of rural electrification.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Economic Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(<i>reprinting</i>)
Credit Power and Democracy	6/6
Warning Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England	8d.
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	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

ALSO

Secret Societies and Subversive Movements by Nesta H. Webster	20/-
Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Elements of Social Credit, 6/-.....	(<i>Cloth Edition</i>) 7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage Odlum v. Stratton (Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	7/- 2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Protocols of Zion	2/-
Communism in Action U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	1/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

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

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.